



Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, July 6, 2021

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on July 6, 2021 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
---------------	-------	--------	---------

II. Public Portion

III. Minutes

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

July 6, 2021

Remote Meeting 6:00 p.m.

Robert began by stating that we will approve the minutes of the June 1st, 2021 meeting: Gloia DeFillipo made the motion and Lamar Cook second the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Clinton Harris: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes
David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes.

Robert then stated that the other item on the agenda is to increase the ten percent reserves that we have for Housing, Historic and Recreation, Open Space, to reflect the money that came in fiscal 2021, to pass that request on to the City Council for their July 19th meeting for approval. What happened is when we crafted the fiscal 2021 budget we thought we were going to be taking in a Million Seven Hundred Forty Six Thousand, Seven Hundred and Twenty Dollars. We set aside the required ten percent reserves for the three specific accounts. The amount of money that we took in as of May thirty first this year was Two million, Two Hundred and Eleven Thousand One Hundred and Thirty Two Dollars. We won't have the final figure until the city closes its books at the end of this month. The Department of Revenue requires that if your budget and the actual money you take in is off by more of what they call a dominium's amount a trifle, you have to adjust the amount of money that you are putting into the reserves. Part of the reason why we took in nearly a half million dollars more than we thought was because the Department of Revenue told all of its CPA communities to use a very conservative figure of eleven percent of what the state reimbursement would be. They weren't sure of what the effect would be with the COVID shut down with the real estate transactions. It's the fees

paid at the registries that gives the state the money that they divvy up among the CPA communities. COVID did not shut down real estate transactions, so we ended up getting two and a half times the amount of money the state had predicted. Plus our own tax surcharge brought in a couple of thousand dollars more. The bottom line is that we need to increase each of three pots by about \$50,000. We need to bring them up to Two Hundred Twenty One Thousand Five Hundred. So if I could have a motion to that affect then we can have discussions and a vote. Ralph stated that we increase each of the three mandatory boxes: Historic, Open Space, Recreation, and Community Housing Projects by \$221,500 each to reflect the increase and revenue that we achieved this fiscal year. Robert then stated that at the end of the fiscal year we have taken in more money than we thought we would have. It is increasing the reserve to \$221,500 each. Ralph made the motion to approve. Gloria second the motion.

All in Favor: Lamar Cook: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

We went out for a hiring process to take in an administrative consultant two years ago. Ralph, Lamar and Gloria were part of the sub-committee that worked on that and we ended up hiring Karen. It was a two year contract that could be extended for a third year before we have to go out and bid again. We indeed voted to extend the contract at our last meeting. Some time ago we realized that the amount of time that Karen was on CPA things was more than we had estimated. We were told that we could increase the budget for the contract up twenty to twenty five percent under state guidelines. We voted that about a year ago. I was recently informed by the procurement folks that yes you can extend the contract but you only can vote up the original amount one time. That's the contract that we approved last month was the original amount of \$24,800. We re-bid it on the higher price and once again it will be a two year contract at the higher price and then can be extended. Ralph, Gloria and Lamar agreed to work on this issue. Ralph is going to be following up with the head of the procurement department to see exactly what we have to make sure that our administration person is adequately remunerated. I think that we should probably authorize that I am going to the personnel subcommittee to do what is necessary to either amend the contract if I misunderstood the procurement folks, put it out again for additional proposals. Hoping we will have a recommendation back to us our August meeting. Ralph then stated that he has one more question. Did we vote to increase the number of hours? Robert responded by stating that Karen is an hourly employee and we agreed to increase the maximum that the contract could pay out to reflect that there would be more hours. Robert stated that the maximum is twenty five percent. Ralph stated that he wanted to talk to the Procurement Office if you can have a second contract that is an addition to the first contract. I'm wondering if we can write another contract for another fifty hours that would represent the other twenty five percent. Robert stated that he had no answers on any of this. This is why I want the Personnel Committee authorized to move forward. We need to resolve the issue sooner rather than later. Ralph asked it wouldn't be a lower remuneration would it? Wouldn't it be just for X

amount of hours? Robert stated that he did not know whether you can break the contract once the contract is started for its final year. Then we would find that we were paying her at her usual rate and we run out of money to pay her by the time we get to April or something like that. Gloria stated that I don't think you are going to give her another contract. We have to go through the Procurement Office which means we have to advertise it or do what they want us to do. Robert then stated that we do not have to go out for RFP because the total project cost is under fifty thousand. They said that we can use the three solicitation three bid method. Robert then stated that Ralph and Gloria and Lamar are going to solve this. Lamar then asked: are we able to use the sole source method for this contract? Robert then stated that the only thing they said to me is you could go the three soliciting bid method if sole source is doing something different than soliciting for three bids. My understanding of the three bid thing is you don't have to get the three bids you have to reach out to three qualified people and invite them to put a bid in. Robert stated that I want to thank you for taking this on. On the nineteenth of July I will probably be sitting at the three hour long City Council meeting getting ready to present our increase reserves.

With those two things we are going to start deliberations for the 2021 CPA Recommendations. We have met with all of the applicants, we have the information and Karen has forwarded that information. We had our initial discussion last week when we all talked about what our top projects were. What we did last year we will do it again this year. We will give everyone a chance to change their top eight. They can, based on what you heard in the deliberations discussion of the last meeting or the information that you received subsequent to that meeting or information that you didn't receive subsequent to that meeting. Certainly, Clinton as a full member you can give us your top eight. So I am going to start with Lamar:

Lamar, do you want to change any of your top eight from what you picked? Lamar stated that he will keep his original copy.

Juanita, stated that she wanted to keep some. I'm just going to keep those and when it is up for discussion I will take pieces of others.

Ralph, decided to swap in the Magazine Park project and I would swap out the Cottage Hill Park.

David, I will take the Science Museum Patio and Exterior project and I will swap that out for the Drama Studio. I will take out the D'Amour Museum of Fine Arts: exterior restoration and I will move that to Magazine Park.

Gloria, I'm fine "thank you."

Robert, I'm keeping mine the same. Clinton if you have the top eight, they don't have to be in any special order they just have to be eight or you can pick six or seven if you don't have eight.

Clinton, At this time Karen suggested that he just give her the number it would be easier. The numbers were: #2, #5, #8, #9 #11, #17, #22, #28

Robert then stated that what we are going to do now is we are going to start with the projects that had the highest number of appeals. We will have three motions: There will be a motion to recommend funding, then a discussion, and that is a vote. If that is successful there will be a second motion that will be the actual dollar amount. Based on what we said we may have decided to recommend a project with fewer components that were requested. If there are any special conditions we are going to be putting it on the proposals as the requirements. Once Karen has the chart revised she is going to put up what are more or less standard requirements that we are putting on every project. We can adopt them so we don't have to keep repeating the standard restrictions and requirements. Normally, we start emptying our three reserves. We need to be mindful of which pot it is coming from because if City Council doesn't approve it or if for some reason the project falls apart or it never takes place we need a paper trail of which pots of money gets put back. Robert asked Karen if she could read the requirements that we have so we will adopt them.

Karen then read the Conditions for CPA Grants that will be inserted into each contract.

As follows:

Conditions for a CPA grant in Springfield.

1. Studies should carry a CPA acknowledgement on the cover page. The language should include "x study received funding (or in part) from the people of Springfield through the Community Preservation Act". When possible use the SCPC logo (without the committee tag). Send a copy of the study and executive summary to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com
2. Construction projects should carry a temporary banner (to be provided) recognizing CPA and a permanent smaller sign/plaque upon completion (to be designed in cooperation with the SCPC).
3. Once the project has commenced, please send a photo of the temporary banner at the project site to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com <<mailto:cpc@springfieldcityhall.com>> and later a photo of the completed project.
4. If the grantee plans a media event or dedication, the SCPC shall be acknowledged and invited.
5. A press release from your office or the SCPC is expected.
6. Quarterly reports are required and due starting three months after the contract is fully signed.
7. Work to Historic Resources must meet Secretary of Interior's Standards and be reviewed by SCPC's preservation consultant prior to the contract being signed.
8. Historic resources not already subject to the exterior controls of a local historic district must petition to become an LHD.
9. SCPC shall be notified if contingency funds are accessed
10. Work to be completed by November 30, 2022 unless otherwise noted
11. Any funds not used should be returned to SCPC with a brief explanation and the amount. Send an email to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com

Robert then stated that he would like to make a motion to adopt these as the general requirements with some specific projects we may have to add on. Gloria made a motion and and Ralph second the motion.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, David Finn: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that we have about two million eighty two thousand dollars that we can recommend should we choose. Some of that is in the housing reserves, some is in the undesignated balance we also have some prior housing reserves and we have some prior undesignated balances. Karen will be the bookkeeper as we move on with the various allocations.

Blunt Park Tennis Courts:

Robert asked if someone wanted to make a motion that we recommend it. Gloria made the motion and David second the motion. Lamar stated that we had a discussion regarding maintenance to the Parks Department. Robert asked is there any further discussion on recommending it?

All in Favor: Lamar Cook: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Motion For the Amount: Ralph made the motion that we allocate \$250,000 which would come from \$221,000 would come from our recreation bucket and the remainder would come from our undesignated bucket. Juanita second the motion. After much discussion Robert made the motion to recommend the \$250,000 which will come from the Recreation Reserve to \$215,000 and the remainder from the Designated Fund Balance.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

After much discussion Robert stated that if someone cares that my issue is that I don't think we should pay for bleachers. I would need a motion with a second and then we will have a vote and see if that is a special condition of this particular grant. Gloria made the motion and Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Ralph Slate: no, David Finn: no, Lamar Cook: no, and Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that the special condition passes.

Westminster Children's Playground: Robert stated that this project is for \$30,000. Is there a motion to recommend? Gloria made the motion. Juanita second the motion. Juanita then stated that she felt this is a no brainer. It was a great project from the beginning, Covid made the prices go up and I feel it is perfect. Robert then stated we will take a vote.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, David Finn: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Lamar Cook: yes and Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that they asked for \$30,000 which is to cover the inflation since they presented their initial budget. Since we have wiped out the Recreation Reserve all the Park Projects that we end up recommending their money will be coming out of the undesignated fund balance. Gloria made the motion and Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria De Fillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes
David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

The Drama Studio: Robert asked does anyone want to make a motion to recommend funding? Gloria DeFillipo made the motion. David Finn second the motion. Ralph Slate stated that this was a property that was added as a Historic. This is a beautiful building it was built in the early twentieth century. It has been designated as a Historic District building, it is owned by a non-profit corporation. It is in need of exterior renovation and I think that the CPA is in good shape on that work to preserve this Historic structure.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes
Lamar Cook: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert stated that they asked for \$175,000. Ralph stated that he wants to make a motion to approve \$170,000. I would like to remove the landscaping, following water service expansion for \$5,000. Gloria second that motion. Robert then stated that the motion is for \$170,000 not to include the landscaping request. Robert stated that this would come from the Historic Reserve.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes
Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes and Robert Mc Carroll: is yes.

The Byer Street Housing: Robert stated that this was the Wayfair proposal to renovate four existing affordable housing historic buildings to continue with historic as affordable housing. I think you saw the comments from the Law Department as long as we can find our money to the exterior they feel that this can indeed be preservation affordable housing. Robert then asked does someone want to make a motion. Karen then stated that it is five hundred thousand dollars by the way. Robert stated that they stated a two year request. I took it that they were aware of the fact that we don't give more than \$250,000 in a cycle and I assume that was their total request. Robert stated that it is four different buildings in two different ownership statuses. Robert stated that right now we need a motion as to whether we recommend it. Ralph made the motion and Gloria second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes,
Lamar Cook: no, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes
Robert stated that now we can have the motion on the amount. Ralph made the motion that we recommend \$250,000 in funding for this project and that would come out of our

our housing allocation. Gloria DeFillipo second that motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: no, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Restriction: They gave us a supplemental budget that broke down the exterior costs. For example their roofing costs came to the amount of \$710,000 (between the four buildings). Robert stated that to be on the safe side we should have the restriction that CPA portion of the funding is to go to the roof. Secondly, they will be entering into an affordability restriction with all of their funders they would need to include us on that list of funders. Gloria made the motion and Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Kilroy House: Robert stated that this is the Museum project. We paid for the study last year as to how to fix the masonry, and paid to repair the Spanish tile roof. This is actually to repair the stucco. Gloria made the motion and David Finn made the second motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes
Robert then stated that they asked for \$250,000. Robert then stated that they had the estimated budget in being more than the \$250,000 that they requested. Gloria stated that the masonry repairs were to be determined and the asbestos abatement is to be determined. Juanita added that they are getting the rest of the money from the Museum Fund. Gloria made the motion that we fund it for \$250,000. Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then asked are there any restrictions on this property? Lamar mentioned previously that we had talked about some idea of a maintenance schedule for the city projects. Robert then stated maybe we should do an am-onus for all our open space projects and that we want a maintenance plan submitted. Gloria made a motion that we add that. Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: no, Juanita Martinez: yes, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes and Robert McCarroll: yes

At this time David asked is there any reason why we can't get through further projects that we are ready to fund tonight? Robert stated that we cannot vote simply on amounts and their sources. When we can get to a point where we are getting close to running out of money we can stop voting and we can table everything until next meeting. We could end up

recommending more projects when we have money to give them. Robert then asked Karen is there a way that the spreadsheet can be enlarged? Juanita asked why don't we just continue this, it is what we have done in the past and it has always worked and we have more money that we have had ever before.

The Marshall Roy Splash Pad: Gloria made the recommendation and Juanita second it. There was no discussion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: no, David Finn: yes, Lamar Cook: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: no, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that recommendation passes and asked if anyone wanted to make a motion of the amount? They asked for \$209,300. Juanita then recommended \$209,000. Gloria second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

The Down Payment Assistance Program: Robert asked for a motion so that we would have something to consider. Lamar made the motion, and Juanita second that.

Robert stated that right now we are just recommending. Is there any discussion?

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Lamar made the motion for \$160,000, Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Gloria Defillipo, yes, Ralph Slate: yes, David Finn: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Acorn Park Tennis Courts: Gloria made the motion to accept this for funding. Clinton second that motion.

Discussion: Lamar asked if the funding amount was correct. Gloria stated that this is what they had initially Lamar. Ralph stated that there was \$650,000 to that total. Gloria stated that they have asked for \$60,000 for a rail road crossing, \$100,000 for the Pavilion. Karen then stated that there was an explanation on the amount. The proponents are accusing the parks department of accusing the numbers so not do the project. They asked for \$50,000. I'm reasonably sure that they can rebuild the tennis courts for \$50,000 so I don't know why we would grant any money on this proposal. There is a disagreement between the proponents and

the Park Department. Ralph stated that this is a case where perhaps a City Councilor from their ward could discuss the fact that they have a disagreement between what we would like to do and what the city says can be done and work that out. Robert then stated that he agreed with Ralph and it is unfortunate because I was really excited about the opportunity to fix up this neglected park. If we will pay for a \$25,000 study on what it is going to cost to rebuild the tennis courts. Gloria asked shouldn't we have a second on my motion so that we can vote and discuss this. If the committee thought this would be a route to go pencil the money in and let both of the partners of the Park Department. We could do a study to see what the price is. It is the Park Departments price. If neither of them don't want to do a study then when we meet in August we will change our decision. Lamar then stated that the executive director of the Boys Club next door actually lobbied for the Blunt Park Tennis Court he actually recommended an all sport court in that area. He thinks that it would give that area more use with a tennis court in that same space. That's what makes it so hard because there are multiple constitutes so they are all saying different things. Lamar added that they want the area fixed up so the tennis court in that community has all been given to the Blunt Park Tennis Courts. So they want theirs fixed up, they want a tennis court from what I am hearing. Lamar stated I am someone who has been active in that community and I live there and the folks want the area cleaned up. The sport court would get more use. Juanita then stated when they first came to us they talked about having a tennis pro who is going to help teach classes there and that's why they wanted the gazebo. I feel this project came from the people in the community. Then Blunt Park estimated three hundred and fifty for Blunt Park and Acorn came up with six hundred and fifty and that doesn't make any sense. Robert stated that it could go down to the issue of the sub soil conditions at Acorn is different than the sub soil conditions at Blunt. So I would be receptive to calling expanding to tennis court or an all sport court. The bottom line may come in that an engineer would say asphalt with a foundation is going to be expensive because of the soil conditions. Or they may come in and say: no the soil conditions are not that difficult and you can build a court here for \$80,000. We have three options in going forward: Not to recommend a project. You need to resolve among yourselves various constitutes among yourselves and come back next year and they were willing to pay for a study let us know by August. It is acceptable or otherwise that's the best we are going to do. Lamar stated that we have already wasted money because the Park Department already has their mind made up on the project. Ralph stated that I felt that way when they put their proposal in that it really felt to me that it was the neighborhood saying that we are sick of this eyesore and we want it cleaned up. I asked them point blank what about something else they were adamant it was tennis courts. I don't feel we should fund anything and let them resolve this and come back next year. Lamar stated that the ones that suffer are the neighbors. Next year isn't being election year and it won't be a hot topic. Next year it will be on the back burner and no one is going to care. David suggested that we should wait for a detailed proposal and come back next year. Lamar stated that he was okay with that. Gloria stated that she would like to know why they came in with a low amount but the Park Department was saying that it was a wet land. Now we find

that it is not. They were supposed to meet and get together and now we come back with this proposal for \$811,000 now we are not just a tennis court. I think it needs to go back and it needs to be tailored down to specifics. Ralph stated we cannot fund a \$700,000 so even if we said to them we are going to give you \$250,000 they are still short of \$500,000. If the Parks Department doesn't have this as a priority it will never get built. The Parks Department has a very strong hand in these projects because a lot of these projects are not funding the entire thing. Gloria asked "why can't we give them an amount as for \$250,000 for a tennis court and have the Park Department send back an adjusted budget. Lamar stated that we said the same thing for Blunt Park and we agreed that we trusted their numbers. Robert stated that we have a couple of options: One: we can table it to August and see if there can be any more information provided to us. Two: we can take a vote and if it fails then it fails. Or we can modify it that we are willing to pay for a study to see if the sub soil conditions will support. In the meantime they could probably clean up the place.

Robert stated that there is a motion to recommend:

All in Favor: Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: no, Lamar Cook: no, Juanita Martinez: Abstain
David Finn: no, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Ralph stated: It's three - three- one. Robert announced the motion has failed.

Ralph asked Clinton Harris does the Park Commission have any radar on this at all. Clinton responded yes it is. In fact Patrick suggested to the presenters to meet with them so they could work things out together. I think Patrick was trying to make sure that they somehow got mentored and walked into a problem. Karen then added that they did meet with the Park Department. That is when they came up with the budget. Clinton stated that Patrick would support them and mentoring them through it. I think that they are young and unskilled for the task and they are trying to break in. I think Patrick likes it but finding the money all together I never saw anything about the water table and it was dilapidated and they lost their staffing as well so it went downhill. It is way over due for bouncing back I have to say by contention that there is a different type of community going to Blunt Park verses the population that is going to use the Girls Club Tennis court as well. The community will come out for that and there is no question about it at all. We know that because they got the petitions. Karen then stated that the information that the Park Department sent the line item for the Tennis Court is \$166,500. That only illustrates the material costs and the design and the construction costs are separate items on that budget that they submitted. The total cost to construct the tennis courts including design, permitting and the construction is approximately \$500,000 so that is the stand alone cost. Juanita stated that the property is owned by the city, you have to go through the Park Department. It's not going to happen because the Park Department doesn't want to do it. Robert then said that the petition was included with the application. There are people here who signed the petition in Roxbury, Silver Spring Maryland, and Leominster and also in East Providence. I would be more impressed with a petition that had Sycamore Street, Acorn Street, Oak Grove Avenue addresses on it as opposed to out of town addresses. If for example there

was bedrock one inch below the surface we could not simply say why the tennis court is more expensive here than Blunt Park, because you have to blast out bedrock for the next six inches or whatever. David stated that if you recall, ten years after those courts were restored they were in disrepair. Lamar stated that it was the neighborhood. Robert then stated what do we want to give for feedback? We have to have the Park Department and the neighborhood to be on the same page and to submit an application next year. Ralph stated "yes" they should work with their councilor and they should use the ward councilor with the Park Department and find their feedback through that channel. Robert stated that we need to have the neighborhood and the Park Commission on the same page when they submit an application for funding. Someone should simply say that we invite an application next year and we hope that the neighborhood and the Park Commission could be on the same page. Robert told Ralph to phrase a motion that we can discuss. Ralph made a motion that we give the feedback that the proponent's meet with the Park Department and come to an agreement so that the proposal is submitted together. It is impossible for us to award money to a private entity on public land. The public department has to be on board with the proposal. Clinton second that motion.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Lamar Cook: yes
David Finn: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

At this time Robert stated that we table the rest of the deliberations for tonight and Karen will send out the revised spread sheet so that you can see how much money we have allocated today and what is left. Gloria made the motion. Robert stated that we want the neighborhood and the Parks Department to work on a proposal keeping in mind that the CPA limitations on what we fund. Robert then stated that we will take a vote in favoring the deliberations until the next meeting.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, David Finn: yes
Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert stated that what he would like to suggest we table the rest of the deliberations tonight and Karen will send out the revised spreadsheet so that you can see how much money we have allocated to date and what is left that can be allocated. Gloria stated that it sounds reasonable. Robert asked Gloria if that was a motion. Gloria stated "so moved."
Robert then stated in tabling the deliberations until the next meeting.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria Defillipo: yes, David Finn: yes
Lamar Cook: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that we received two letters for off cycle application consideration. The letters that we received one was from the mortgage holder of a fire damaged house on Mulberry Street which the city has in court to be either fixed or be demolished. The other one

is also for a fire damaged home on Mulberry Street which the city also has in court. Ralph stated that I am very sympathetic towards Historic Properties especially when they are threatened. I am not necessarily in favor of off cycle applications in general because I feel that it is a short circuit in the process. I would be in favor of an application to stabilize the property so it doesn't become demolished and off cycled. I could easily see funding a project like this. I don't know how to do an off cycle and we are giving out money. This property burned a couple of years ago right? Robert stated that in the last two years. Robert said to Ralph we know the relentlessness at Code Enforcement. They are not interested in saving Historic properties. My concern would be if we were willing to give them money to fix the roof so water isn't getting in and come back next April and maybe we will have a recommendation for you in September of 2022. The code enforcement attorneys would halt the court action until then. Karen stated that they didn't have a demo order. It was scheduled for July and the people have to come back with their rehab plan. If the rehab plan doesn't get approved by the court then the demolition will move forward. The current owner will have to do it or the city will. There is an urgency to this project. They are asking for a rehab plan.

Ralph stated that we are representing the city and we are fighting the city. The city could very easily say "you know what we are going to wait until the next CPA funding cycle because there has been sort of a proposal for CPA. We will wait for the nine months before we move to demolish this property for blight. We were going out to speak to the public about CPA. We used the example of if we still had to grass the farm and it came up from market it would either be sold to a subdivision or the Park Department. If the Conservation Commission wanted it we could use CPA to acquire it. The analogy here is if grass the farm still existed and Pat Sullivan had a chance to buy it before it got turned into a sub division we would be saying to him oh Pat we will give you the down payment come back and ask for the rest of the money. Tell the owner he needs to wait until next year and then you pay him the full amount. Gloria stated that when you were talking about the funding if we were able to allocate money for this we have no idea how much money they are looking for. Karen stated that we do. Robert then stated would we be able to entertain an application. Under our current policy the most they would ask for is \$250,000. Gloria asked if we were to give them money that still wouldn't be enough to repair the house and then the repair would be more than the actual value of the house. The question comes that when they work on their figures could this house be fixed for a half million dollars and we give them some of that we aren't just giving people money. Is it possible not to make a decision tonight but send to the lawyer asking for clarification if the property was insured. Karen stated that it would be the Mortgage Company that is taking it over. They would be the ones to do the rehab on it. Karen stated that they could use some funds towards that project. Juanita asked is this house, the porch, and everything is this all original? Robert stated that it is original and what isn't original the laths on the porch and the railing. Juanita wanted to know if there were any additions. Karen stated that the Carriage House has to be demolished. Ralph added that if we do accept off cycle proposals then I think we need to hold back money that is granted in order to do that. Robert stated that isn't quite

correct we actually have an approved fiscal 2022 budget and we are now in fiscal 2022. If this is an important project we would take the money out of fiscal 2022 and when we did the deliberations a year from now we would have a little less money to award the grantees. Ralph felt it is an important project for sure. Ralph stated that he would not oppose committing off cycle applications. The city is imminently threatening to tear it down. Robert stated that he agreed with Ralph because it is a vacant, severely deteriorated and a threatened building. Gloria stated that we should let them submit an off-site application. Ralph stated that he thinks the courts immediate rehab or removal. There is a loop-hole here that the city can get around the Historic District protection by conveying a Constructional Service Board. I think the courts will say fix it or tear it down. Robert asked if someone would make a motion to consider an offsite application for this vacant deteriorated house. Ralph suggested we would consider and communicate and serve an application for 63 Mulberry Street for off cycle CPA funding. If they don't have a rehab plan the city will tear it down and it could take six months to a year for that to happen. Ralph asked what is CPA going to do for them other than giving them money. Ralph made a motion that we communicate to the Mortgage Company that we will accept an application for off-site CPA funding for 63 Mulberry Street. Gloria then second the motion.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, David Finn: no, Lamar Cook: no, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: no, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert stated there is a second one. Much of its roof is gone and it is owned by Fannie Mae who is selling it for forty nine hundred dollars. There have been numerous people in buying it one of whom submitted a letter to us that was in the packet which is more specific than the previous houses. I know that this is in the courts and the city needs to review the rehab plan. Something is happening and the city is taking it to the court. Ralph stated that he wouldn't feel comfortable doing off cycle for this one. Ralph made a motion for discussion purposes that we accept an off cycle application for 116 Mulberry Street. Gloria second the motion.

All in Favor: Ralph Slate: no, Gloria Defillipo: no, Juanita Martinez: no, David Finn: no Lamar Cook: no, Clinton Harris: no, Robert McCarroll: no

Our next meeting is August third