



Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Kathy Calvanese

Tuesday, November 9, 2021

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on November 9, 2021 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

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

II. Public Portion

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

Regular Meeting

November 9, 2021 at 6:00 pm

Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic and pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order concerning the Open Meeting Law, the Springfield Community Preservation Committee will continue to meet remotely until further notice. A video recording of this meeting can be viewed here:

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

Public comments can be mailed to Community Preservation Committee, City Hall Room 412, 36 Court Street, Springfield 01103 or e-mailed to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com

Present:

Robert McCarroll, Chair (Springfield Preservation Trust), Gloria DeFillipo - (Planning Board) - (Juanita Martinez - (Conservation Commission) - Clinton Harris - (Park Board) - Willie Thomas - (Housing Authority) Lamar Cook (Neighborhood Representative) - Rhonda Sherrill -(Neighborhood Representative)

Not present: Ralph Slate - (Neighborhood Representative) - David Finn - (Historical Commission).

Agenda

Approve Minutes of October 5

Anti-Wage Theft Policy

East Springfield Library Recreation Restriction

Project Contract Extension Requests

Community Preservation Plan Modifications

Administrator's Updates

Other Matters

Next Meeting-December 7

Approval of October 5, 2021 minutes was moved by xxxxxxxxxx, seconded by xxxxxxxxxx, and voted unanimously.

Anti-Wage Theft Policy

State Representative and current City Councilor Orlando Ramos was invited to discuss the wage-theft ordinance. He stating that wage theft is an issue that is very prevalent and it happens every day in the construction industry. The construction industry is notorious for these irresponsible contractors that participate in waste. The idea behind this policy is to follow suit with what we have done with the City Council, the Tiff Ordinance, the Responsible Employer Ordinance and the Waste Ordinance which are aimed at preventing or making sure that the City of Springfield is not using tax payer money to fund waste stuff. We want to discourage anyone who is receiving tax payer money for their projects, from using contractors who are breaking the law and encourage them to use responsible contractors. This policy would do just that because it has already been precedence in Northampton and we feel it would be good for the city of Springfield as well and it's follows in line what we already have accomplished with the four ordinances that I have mentioned.

Orlando then asked Robert if he would mind that he asked Lisa Clauson to attend this meeting.

Lisa is the wage stuff expert and she has been very instrumental for ordinances here in Springfield. If you don't mind I would love to turn it over to her. She can cover anything that I have missed and I believe that she also has a recommendation as to how to tweak the Northampton policy in order to make it better and stronger here in Springfield.

Robert agreed that Lisa would be welcomed to speak at this time.

Lisa thanked those present and the only piece that I would add to what the representative has said. In Northampton Ordinance it differs from the policies are different passed by the CPC there it differs a little bit from the Springfield TIF Ordinance from the Wayfair Theft Ordinance and it's the component what all the ordinances do and policies do that say essentially that if you are a contractor that has been caught by a federal or a state agency we have engaged in wage theft over the last three to five years then you can't get a contract currently until more time is passed. There are one hundreds of contractors to use unfortunately Wage Theft happens quite a lot in the industry and the amount of times they get caught is a small number amount of times because the attorney general's office doesn't have the resources to do as much investigations as many as broad investigations that they would like. They are lobbying to increase that ability. The numbers that are caught in terms as who is doing it out there is a small

amount of contractors. In Springfield ordinances it says that those contractors cannot work on a current project that is getting public funds if in the last five years they have had a violation. The Northampton policy does is a little different is because it is one of the first policies past addressing wage theft in the region. They took a more cautious approach and said if a contractor wants to use a contractor on one of the projects and they have been found in engaging in wage theft that they still can be used by purchasing a Wage Bond essentially taking out insurance that covers the employee payroll to insure or that any employees on the project come forward would get covered and be paid. So that's good that it does insure that any workers on the project actually get paid. In our community it isn't good and it still rewarding a contractor that has high previous violations and still being able to do a publicly funded project. As you take it up we would recommend that you not have that clause that allows a contractor to be able to take out a wage bond the statute states that if a contractor has been found in violation of wage theft by state or federal agency, an actual finding and it has been proven that they did it that they cannot be used on one of these projects. Again, there are hundreds of contractors available for work and it is not excluding by a large number by any means. That would be in keeping with the different ordinances that Springfield City Council has already taken up and passed on this issue.

Karen then asked Robert if he would like to bring this up on the screen. Robert agreed to that.

Robert felt that this is a wonderful discussion and whether we vote on it tonight or whether we vote on it at our next meeting with the modified form it fits with the timetable as it is going to be applying to the 2022 application cycle. I also want to recognize committee member Willie Thomas he is the representative of the Springfield Housing Authority and our helpful attorney from the Law Department Cathy Breck is now on the call so I am certainly happy to tweak this as to makes what people want to be

made comfortable in a policy that says that we don't want folks using CPA money to be using employers who are guilty of wage theft. Robert then asked Lisa if she could see the Northampton Document. Lisa responded and stated that she could see it. Robert then stated that it's the long sentence that ends in the word three lines from the main paragraph; as procured a wage bond or insurance. If you were to modify that where would you end that statement? Or would you have an entirely different section or would you have a Section B? Lisa replied that she could take a look at it and send something back to the Committee to review. I think that it would be essentially just taking that part out. Robert then asked if section B would be deleted is that correct. Sub Section A would be the entire part of the text that is after the underlined words "fair wages." Everything that follows B is deleted. Lisa then stated that you might want to delete that bottom paragraph. Robert then answered "the grantee shall be obtained from any General Contractor etc. Yes, that still stays there. Lisa stated that in Northampton it was following the City Councils ordinance that they called it the Fair Wage Ordinance. That was just terminology that they used. In Springfield, so far they call it Wage Theft has been the term used. I don't have a strong preference in that regard. Robert then stated that it would probably be best if our legislative body is using the term Anti Wage Theft or Wage Theft that we should probably use that

because Karen and I were both somewhat confused hoping that we got the correct Northampton ordinance that we are now starting our tweak. Is the proper term Wage Theft or Anti Wage theft? Lisa responded by stating it is an ordinance that is preventing wage theft or Anti Wage theft ordinance but it is a contractor that has been found guilty of Wage Theft. Kathy Brock I am a deputy city solicitor from the city Law Department. One of the questions I had about this is what does the Committee want for a remedy in the event that it turns out that one of the grantees has hired a contractor that is in fact on that list, the Bard List. If they knew it what would be the remedy for them by having violated this language if you are going to put it in the contract. Just something to think about, we don't have to decide tonight if it is going to be added in next year's contract this is something to think about. How would you remedy this? Robert stated that he would look to either Lisa to see what other communities are doing or to Representative Ramos as to what's the penalty. My understanding is to have two forms. One, every applicant that is proposing a construction project will have to have a certificate in there that basically states that they have not knowingly done wage theft and they are not planning on using the contractors who have knowingly done and have been convicted of wage theft. It is a preemptive warning that they have to attest to and then it will go into the contract. I think that is where Kathy's question is vitally important, what's the penalty if they indeed screw up once the contract is signed.

Mr. Ramos then stated that he would tell you that the one step ordinance is actually a call back.

Any company that has been found guilty of waste stuff through the project will be subject to defaulting on the tax break. That is one option. Lisa then stated that what they have found with these ordinances is that we think that they are good deterrents against wage theft from happening when there is a financial repercussion if it is found to happen. You're giving money to a developer usually who is doing a project and the developer is developing a contract with the general contractor who is then writing contracts that are some contractors. If the developer is told that there is going to be a financial penalty of waste that it's bound to happen the developer will just write a component into their contract with the general contractor. If the general contractor has any wage theft they are not going to be liable to it and the General Contractor will write that into the sub contracts. The sub contract level which is where wage things happen and in our experience when a sub-contractor that is looking into doing it low bid through engaging in wage theft. Many times they kind of straddle this line sometimes cheating and sometimes not cheating at jobs and will at least where they see some oversight and there are some repercussions they will decide it's not worth their while to go and to engage in it in this way. So having that kind of financial repercussion can hold them accountable to run that project. So, that is what we would recommend being considered as well. Robert stated, just so I understand let's say there was a program that we recommended and the city council approved \$250,000 and it is a project that is involved in a variety of building and trades and most of the sub-contractors are indeed behaving

properly, but the painter isn't. It is discovered that the painter is doing wage theft. The painter isn't the

one getting \$250,000 his contract is for \$30,000. If the claw back gets down to his only thirty is that a threat or are we going to pull the \$225,000 from the grant recipient who has hired a general contractor who has now hired sub-contractors. In that case your \$250,000 is not the full price so what that construction contract is for. If you had a claw back of the amount or of some portion of the amount and frankly I don't feel too strongly on what amount should be I just think that it needs to be substantial some type of penalty is what people pay attention to. Not a three hundred dollar fine but some portion of that is more substantial. Your awarding this \$250,000 and it is almost always is awarded to the developer. Say its Lisa Clauson's housing development Corporation is who you awarded it to. I hire Orlando Ramos's general contract and then he hires Wage Theft Cheating Company, the painting company. As the developer I have the stipulation that if there is wage theft you are going to be asking for half of my amount back or full of my amount back or a quarter of my amount back. Then I'm going to write into my contract with the General Contractor to say if there is wage theft I am expecting you to return that amount to the City of Springfield or the CPC. As the general contractor, Orlando would then write that into each sub contracts if they engage in wage theft. It would just be the painting contractor who engaged in it who would be paying it back to the GC because that is where their contractor is and

have a contract with the CPC the GC doesn't have a contract with the CPC they have a contract with the developer to me. I would have that obligation to the CPC. As that money trickles down it would be the responsibility for the wages to go back up the chain. It would be the contractor who engaged in it who would be paying. If it's not affecting all the other contractors you were being responsible including the general contractor if they were being responsible and not looking away from what was going on. At this time Robert asked Lisa if she had some sample wording that Cathy could look at that we would think about incorporating it into the contract? Lisa stated that she could do that and she stated that she could pull something similar and I could put in the HDF and the TiF ordinances because they have the components. The way that they are written Kathy and Bob as well it is written as language that can just be inserted in the contract so that it is really easy to take from whatever the policy is ordinances and put it into the contract with whoever the grantee is. The grantee can take that language and move it forward. In the same way there is an understanding there is no ability on the part of the CPC or the city even to have to do the investigations on whether there is a contractor that has signed that they haven't violated but actually has had a problem with wage theft. The way it has been done in other communities is by having every contractor to sign the certificate or sign an affidavit essentially that they have not have had a problem with wage theft recently, it puts that information in the public record, so if the carpenters union or a worker's center, or if the City Councilor hears of workers coming to them who have had a problem on a project then there is a public record that can be pulled and action can be taken. It is not at all an expectation that Karen or anybody else is going to have to be going through any lists of debarred or contractors on the list of violators because you have enough on your plate and it will not be adding extra work to your list through this type of policy. Robert then asked Lisa who is then the custodian of the certification that all the subs have signed? Assuming that we may adopt this we the

CPC would have the contract with Lisa Clauson Housing Development that would include the fair wage anti-theft requirements. Who then is in possession of your general contractor's certification and all the sub certification in order to make that public record. Is that us? She replied I think its procurement because isn't it City Council that actually issues the contract? Kathy then stated the Community Preservation Committee makes the recommendations to the City Council and once the City Council approves them the contract is actually between the grantee and the Community Preservation Committee. Procurement has no role in it. What I'm thinking is that the grantee would have to collect all those certifications. I don't know if the grantee has to do their own and submit everything to the CPC as part of the contract process. Another thing that I just want to notice is that sometimes the grants are not to and the Committee might want to think about how much money would you take back from a homeowner because the homeowner didn't know wage stuff was going on and it turned out it was they

might not have the same level of sophistication or understanding of how to detect it and how you look for that or how do you find that out.

At this time Karen stated that my understanding was anything over two hundred and fifty thousand. Kathy then stated that it doesn't have any dollar limit. Karen then added, isn't there a dollar amount with the city contracts that are over \$250,000? Robert then stated that the responsible employer's ordinance indeed has a threshold for a total project. Robert stated to Kathy that she had brought up a very good point. Robert stated that sometimes we do give some contracts to owners of Historic District Homes and I think the maximum is \$30,000 so maybe if Lisa is comfortable and Orlando is comfortable maybe we set a threshold that any project over \$50,000 or over \$30,000 whatever is subject to this, or any project that is not an owner occupied structure is subject to it. The bulk of our recommendation is to go to City Departments: the Park Department, the Library and those because they are doing the work.

They are going to the Procurement Office. Every year there are grants that go to our private developers. Some are non-profit like the Springfield Museums. Some are profit making developments like the folks that are fixing the Indian Motorcycle Building although we never gave them a grant. There are some very small grants. Kathy then stated that she would be comfortable in having a higher threshold on what it this covers and it certainly is not an intention to give a residential market. I think it is too challenging to oversee. Back on the records filing Karen do you have a place where you just electronically are filing away the packets of the agreements that you have of different grantees currently? Karen responded by stating that she has a digital copy and a paper copy. Kathy stated that this is what these have gone into in other Cities. A digital file and it gets filed in a city department and then has public records covered so that if someone is requesting to take a look at it and may want to challenge something they would have the ability to have the information there. Karen then stated that

it would be for a request for a public record and then and the file would be at City Hall. Robert then asked if there were any questions from Committee members. Robert then stated that he would like to

ask you if this is a form of the sense of the committee. Are folks comfortable with the path that we are going down which is exploring a policy where ever there is a specific threshold of money we require certifications in the application and we would require certification as they are actually hiring their

contractors and their subcontractors that we are in possession of that. Gloria stated that it was a good idea. Juanita questioned does the City of Springfield have an anti- wage theft policy? The answer to that is that they do. Could we not use the same policy? Kathy then stated that the current policies do not cover the CPC funds because you folks have your own committee and entities so there is currently both a policy that covers and it is the same five year look back. It's a policy that covers city contracts, as

well as tax relief. When tax relief is given to a private developer through a TIF so it is similar policy but it is just a smaller more modified component. Willie asked do we know how this is affecting woman businesses and woman contractors and minority contractors, do we have any sense of the ratio in numbers that have been affected here? Kathy stated that she doesn't have a breakdown on contractors that of what the demographics were in ownership of contractors that were found guilty of wage theft. I do know the workers are overwhelming workers of color who are victims of wage theft, often immigrant workers. Sometimes they are documented and sometimes they aren't documented it is often immigrant workers who are being exploited and not being paid their full wages. I sense that immigrants are less likely not to speak out about their rights where contractors are highering them with the intention of doing that. I don't have any sense that this capturing more of the minority or woman on businesses I don't have numbers with me at all. The Attorney General I would be happy to forward on and get it to Karen and get it to people the different places that where there are state lists that violators that comes from different forms, the Attorney General that maintains the data base so that the office of industrial accidents maintains a data base of contractors that have sort of been and debarred over a workers compensation and not having it. The problem is that it is hundreds of companies listed on it because it's not just construction, its construction it's restaurants, violators of a whole numbers of different entities so it is kind of hard and it isn't listed on whether they are designated as an MBE or WBE. I can certainly forward to you those links to the state. Karen then stated that it isn't her responsibility to take those certifications and check on those, right? If something is reported who do they report it to would they tell us and would they notify the AG or what's that change of? Kathy if the way it works with the city ordinances that are passed already that is gets reported from the city's compliance on a unit that is part of the procurement office and is currently Chase Swan is one of those compliance officers. It is also under the responsibility of the REO committee to also do some oversight to look into the issue and then it would come to City Council for them to decide whether they wanted to do the claw back component that they have is not an automatic it is city kinds of option for council to do. I would guess in this case that it would be in the same way the city would oversight, investigate and if there is a state agency that found a state violation that would come before the CPC to decide what

you want to do if you have that claw back component to it. Robert thanked Lisa for attending and

thanked Councilor Representative Ramos for bringing this to our attention and Lisa if you could send to Karen and to Kathy some sample wording that we might be able to use so this will be back on the committee's December's agenda to adopt as a policy as we move forward with the twenty two cycles. Kathy then stated that she will follow up in the next few days with a sample language as well as the links and I will send it to Karen. Kathy interjected by stating her address. Representative Ramos thanked those present.

Robert then stated that we recommended funding at the East Springfield Library to create an outdoor reading garden. When we were in discussion with the library that CPA doesn't fund temporary improvement we need to make sure that what we are funding is protected in the future. Molly was

content with that however, the neighborhood council was a little concerned and City Councilor Fenton because there has been some talk about expanding the library and clearly building an extension on improved recreational land and that is not something that we wouldn't particularly like to see. So we are trying to figure out some type of wording that would make everyone happy if that is indeed possible so we can move forward with this. At the last meeting Kathy brought up the issue that putting it on a preservation restriction, an open space restriction might bring in the oversight of the state legislature as if it were like parkland which if it were ever removed as recreational land the city would have to do a replacement for it. We talked about other possibilities which is basically having a clause in the contract that says: if the recreational use is un-replaced by some other non-recreational use we get our money back. There may be other options as well. So, who wants to speak first?

Kathy stated that she could address the legal issue which at the prior meeting I was asked to look into whether or not it is an actual requirement to have the deed restriction. We did some research and the Community Preservation statute only requires a deed restriction on record at the registry. If the property of the open space is being acquired with CPC funds and that is not the case here because the property is owned by the city, it is part of the library, it is not required by law so if the committee is so inclined they could revisit that condition on this particular grant and replace it with something else. For example, a contract clause, that if the library that is down the road, that area on the property would be approved by the reading garden for some other purpose such as an expansion. They would have to pay the entire amount of the grant back. Molly then stated that first of all there won't be another Mass Board of Library Commissioners construction grant for at least five years and possibly eight years because they are still working on the last construction grant round. There are still fourteen libraries is on a waiting list. They are not looking at a construction grant in the near future. That could be written to the grant proposal as part of the specks so you can acquire land for funding for the proposal. There are things that are eligible that the total project cost could include the \$85,000 if there is an addition, if

the grant is awarded and that addition impacts the work that was done with the funding. We have walked around there several times already and there will be a contractor that will be working with Laura

Walsh and Pat Sullivan to work with their designer to come up with a plan and our attention is to put the majority of the funding that would be permanent more on a perimeter it's a small lot, it is less than half an acre and it's already occupied. There is not a lot of space to add probably the most you could have about 1500 to 2000 square feet that are out in the back which we don't have to put any plantings and things. So, I think if we brought it to the grant proposal or whatever funding came is available and the renovation of the building that could be part of the expense of the project. If there is any impact and I don't think there would be any that funding would be part of the grant construction project and then we could reimburse the CPC for any work that was done that funding, that's my thinking. Robert asked those present if there are any comments or questions from committee members? Gloria stated that at some point the committee is going to change its members so how are the new members going to know about this?

Robert responded by stating that his feelings are the current administrator is putting together a handbook so that the future administrators don't have to recreate the wheel. Perhaps there should be a page in there that is called a tickler file so that this would be in there that says special condition to be noted in the future and who knows if there will be other projects that have this kind of condition attached to it. I would say that would be the way that it goes into the administrator's handbook that is a time sensitive thing to be. Molly did say that it is a city contract so I think the city law department would be aware of it. Before anything that is done to any property there are so many city departments that would have to sign off on it there are so many steps to doing that kind of addition. There would have to be some checks and balances. Karen then stated that the next library grants that are coming up you are writing up that \$85,000 into that grant. That is what you said isn't it? It's the paper trail right there and Molly agreed to that. From the Law Department I don't think the Board of Library Commissioners would be interested in paying your penalty for using Community Preservation Community Funds for a purpose and then reverting back for not using it for that purpose. It wouldn't be funded by the Mass Board of Library Commissioners they have a very strict list of eligible. For example they don't fund painting, landscaping and a whole bunch, that is part of the total cost of the project. For example of east Forest Park that was a nine and a half million dollar for a total project cost. The Board of Library Commissioners close to five million and the City bonded for Two Point Seven million and the rest of it was the Capitol Campaign. Even with the list of projects, what the city is paying for is their bond and the Capitol Campaign paying for ineligible costs according to the State Regulations for that grant round. If it disturbs an area we will have files at the library. The Capitol Assets Department manage's all of our construction so if there is damage at whatever percentage of eighty five thousand that was damaged I suppose that we would write in the full eighty five thousand as part of the possible expense. It is just a cost estimate. There are so many ways this can go that I would hate to see not doing this project in

anticipation that something would go wrong ten years from now. To be fair to other applicants we don't want to take money and taxpayer money and then build something and destroy it. I feel that I could

work with Cathy as to what the best way to make sure this would happen. Any Capitol Project is managed by the city capitol assets so we work with Peter Garvey and Myron Hatchett they manage the project, they pay the bills, they hire contractors and we could make sure how your money will not be disturbed for the most part.

Robert then asked do you think that the best route forward then is for you, Molly, and Kathy to work on specific workings. I know that Kathy and I talked about a one sentence blurb about if what's improved if ever gets money use for the money comes back but if there needs to be something a little bit more specific. Right now our recommendation to fund with the condition that there be recreation restriction on it is sitting in council committee. We would need to inform the council committee that both the SCPC and the library commissioner are in agreement of a different condition that this CPC has voted in favor of. Then they would move forward in taking it out of committee. I am assuming that two of you are not ready to do that tonight. It will be ready for the December meeting do you think? We are not running near that City Council Rule, that if you are in committee longer than a number of days your right. I think it's like six months or something like that. I think we are in the time frame. Robert then asked if any other committee members have any questions. Clearly I would like Kathy and Molly going away with sort of the idea that we can take a vote. Is that the compromise that we can live with? Is that what we are paying for out of CPA improvements that the unimproved money comes back? We will be looking for a specific wording for the contract condition at the next meeting.

Robert then stated that the first thing on the agenda was the approval of the minutes of our October meeting. Karen had forwarded to everyone. Can we have a motion and have a second to adopt the minutes. Clinton stated that he would like to adopt the minutes of our last meeting. Lamar second the motion. Robert then stated that we will take a voice vote.

All in Favor:

Clinton Harris: - yes, Lamar Cook: - yes, Gloria DeFillipo: - yes, Juanita Martinez: - yes,

Rhonda Sharrell: - yes, Willie Thomas: - yes, and Robert McCarroll is: - yes.

Robert then stated that the next thing on our agenda is tweaking the Community Preservation Plan. As we have discussed in previous meetings the state law requires that we have a plan which we created when the committee was created and it was our first project. We revise it annually and we are holding a public hearing to solicit public comments on CPA needs and opportunities in the city. This is a several meeting process. Some of the plan is simply data collection and Gloria is getting some information from the building department regarding vacancies and Karen is going to be getting us the most recent figures of what income levels constitute eligibility for Community Housing and I will be talking to the Springfield Preservation Trust regarding the list of endangered buildings. One of the things that we can do tonight

is we can vote on this plan and the component is adopting some of them and one of them is a discussion on the time frame for next year. The current year that we are in the applications were due April first

and then we met with applicants in April and May we did our own deliberation which took June, July and August and we thought we would have our recommendation that the City Council in August but we didn't get them there until September.

I would like to suggest that a similar time table for the coming year except I would move the application deadline to March 31st. That it is a Thursday and it gives Karen the time to pick up the applications on Friday and deliver them over the weekend, so we will start meeting with people at our April meeting. Clearly, it will take several months to meet with all of the applicants and several months to deliberate among ourselves and recommendations to city council instead of September even if we got it to them in August that is their abbreviated summer schedule and they don't do anything with them anyway.

The other thing that I want to discuss is last year we held two training sessions were informational workshops for people that might be interested in submitting an application. There was some discussion within the committee members as to whether; two of them were more than what was needed. So I am looking for some kind of sense as to whether you still want to have two workshops or whether we plan on only having one workshop. Karen said you were the one that ran both of them. Do you have any

thoughts on that? Karen stated that I think if we are doing it on line one is enough. If we want to do it live we could go to different neighborhoods. Do we have to write that in stone? Robert then stated that his feeling is if indeed tonight we adopt a time table, the sooner we can let the neighborhoods know when the city department knows, here is the time table. The more they have to make a plan to meet that. We can certainly say that we are having one and pick a date and tell people. Then we can tell people we can actually add a second one. It isn't like we were precluded from having a second

workshop if that were the case. Karen then stated that she felt we reached more people on line with the workshop when we were physically there so we should probably still do one on line. Robert then stated backing up what we did this past year is our only meeting in February and our meeting in March and with the workshops and after the workshop was over we had whatever regular business we had. So as we look at that as a guide we would be having a workshop on March first and a workshop on February first. Karen asked if they wanted her to add this right now. I can add it as we speak. Robert stated that what he is not sure of if we are going to program one for sure. We might program the other if we are back in live meeting formats perhaps we should just be scheduling officially so neighborhood groups can put it on their calendar that there is a workshop on February first. When we get closer to the March one and we may decide to have a second one on that date.

Karen then asked do we want a remote workshop in here. Robert stated that on February first no one knows what the pandemic will be in two months. How long has the governor extended the ability to do remote meetings? Karen felt it was until the end of March. Robert stated that he felt we don't necessarily have to designate if it is a remote meeting or not. We can say application workshop on

February first. If we decide to have a second one we could do that for our March first meeting. The applications are due on March thirty first which means that when Karen goes to City Hall in case the Post

Office is late and delivering things that are properly post marked they will be ready. Juanita stated that those meetings will be February and March first of 2022. Robert noted that our regular meetings on January 4th and we will have a regular meeting on February first and March first and for sure we will start our February first meeting with a workshop. We are holding a decision as to whether when we start our March meeting with a workshop until we can see what the demand is and how many people will be going into the February one workshop. Juanita said that it makes sense this way. Karen stated that looking back at the views the last two I don't think that we will get many live. Karen said that she will start that in January, like the second week of January to send those invitations out for the workshop. Robert felt that assuming we vote on this time frame tonight it's getting on the web site the workshop on February 1 and applications are due on March 31st. Karen then stated that meeting with applicants would be April and May like last year. Last year the deliberations were June and July but we also took August to do it and clearly even though this past year they would have the recommendations to the City

Council in August they were sent to City Council in early September. Robert stated if we could have a

motion that the timetable that we are adopting for next year is workshop on February 1st and applications due on March 31st and recommendations made in September. Gloria stated "so moved." Rhonda stated that we are going to do a workshop in February and in March? Robert stated that our March first meeting may begin with a workshop. We are not making that decision tonight. Rhonda felt that the workshops are great and it will alleviate the rumors that the Committee doesn't try to give fairly an opportunity to submit things. I think workshops are great and I am on board with that. I was a little concerned about February that the group of people has sixty days to put their stuff together and those who show up in March only have thirty days. Karen stated that maybe the solution to this is to only have one workshop. Gloria then stated that if we can do a workshop in February and we can put it on Facebook then people can look at that at their leisure and get the information that they need. I have gone back and looked at meeting that I missed in January and it wasn't that big of a deal to look on it on Facebook. So that could be our backup. Rhonda stated that she liked that idea. Gloria stated that they will have the information way before February so they can read through it and see what needs to happen so it won't be totally new to them. Rhonda then stated Gloria would you say the information for the workshop goes up in January then? Gloria stated no, in February. Bob then said that what we have Rhonda as part of what we are doing now with the Community Preservation plan we also talk about what an application would look like and that goes up on our City Hall page on the website and that goes up almost as soon as we adopt it. You are correct about the applicants will probably be up on the web site in January and the instructions on how to fill out the application will be there on January. What is more important is we will now be getting out what the schedule is. If anybody isn't thinking of a project until it is March they are already behind because they need to be thinking of their project now so they can be going to the park department if they want a park project now so they can be going to the Park Department or going to the Historical Commission if they wanted a historic project. All of that has to be done several months ahead of time. The instructions will be up there much sooner than February

first. Juanita stated that those workshops are done for tweaking your project. In general those people are thinking about it now and I see those workshops and with that and people are tweaking their own. Robert then stated that we are taking a vote to adopting a time frame which is February first and applications due on March 31, recommendations to the City Council in September. Gloria made a motion, Willie second the motion.

All in Favor:

Gloria DeFillipo - yes, Willie Thomas - yes, Lamar Cook - yes, Clinton Harris - yes, Rhonda Sharrell - yes, Juanita Martinez - yes, Bob McCarroll - yes

Robert then stated that he sent an e-blast to all the neighborhood groups with the monthly agenda but rather than wait until December I will send it especially with e-blast this week that says we have adopted the time frame for next year please put these dates on your calendar.

Robert then stated that the other thing is the major part of the Community Preservation Plan contains our priority for the three eligible areas. The question comes every year that is given either oral testimony and that we had written testimony. Is there anything that we want to add and adopt as a priority in those eligible areas? Just to refresh your memory what we carry as our priority under recreational use and open space is renovating small neighborhood playgrounds in green spaces, creating and improving community gardens, create and enhance opportunities for bikeways, walkways, trails, on park and conservation land controlling invasive plants species in park and conservation land and improving access to the Connecticut River and for other bodies for water bodies and recreation. Those are what we have been caring for the last couple of years as our priorities. I don't think I heard anything about open space that is different from what they spoke to us about specific open spaces and that they wanted fixed. Has anyone heard about any new priority? Historic Resources : Our priority is focused on structures that are deteriorating, structures that are in eminent danger of demolition. Structures that are vacant that will not be renovated without CPA funding. Structures built before 1850, structures that are landmarks, with significant historic architectural or civic importance. Community Housing: Our priorities are rehabilitating vacant deteriorated houses to sell to income eligible buyers. Providing first time home buyer incentives to increase owner occupancy especially with two and three family houses in the neighborhoods with low owner occupancy. Assisting income eligible owner occupants with repairs especially of owners with two or three family houses. Robert stated that this does not preclude that ever considering funding for apartment buildings that need rehabilitation which are on Byer Street. They are not vacant and not deteriorated but we like the project because it was also historic but we funded it under housing. We don't look at the priorities and say you are not a priority. We will still consider it. Those will remain our priorities this coming year.

At this time Robert told Lamar that let's take up your question. If you said we are getting too many applications that might our time table have to be elongated? Lamar stated yes because we have more

people and I think it takes more time and we only meet once a month. Robert then stated that Lamar was right and the time table we just adopted with recommendations going to the City Council in September. Sometimes if for some reason we got sixty applications and it takes us another month or so to meet with everyone therefore it takes us longer to deliberate. It's not like we are under the gun and we have to get the recommendations to the City Council by September. If it takes us to October then it takes us to October. The other interesting response I would say is the first year that we had CPA which

was in 2018 the voters approved it. Five years ago this month it went into effect in July of 2017 meaning it went on the tax bill in July of 2017. We were just formed and we were spending in doing the

Community Preservation Plan so the first year that we actually had money to give out was in calendar year in 2018. In that year we received something like thirty three applications. The following year it went down to something like twenty four in calendar 2019. In calendar year 2020 it went up to twenty five. This past year it was twenty eight with one dropping out so we had twenty seven. So it will be interesting and I tend to be a believer that the future will be much like the past so I'm thinking that we will have somewhere between twenty five or thirty applicants this coming year. Who knows we could find that there is a huge ground swell of applicants and more than what we are accustomed to reviewing. We can always take our time. Does this answer your question Lamar? Lamar answered "yes."

Robert then stated that it is now seven thirty and I think that what we will be planning doing simply seeing if anyone one else wants to bring up about a plan but short of that we will adjourn and at the next meeting will be when we have an additional discussion of the plan perhaps adopt additional

Sections of it and talk about whether we are going to talk about tweaking the instruction process as to how people fill out the application. Juanita stated that we missed something. We missed the Project Contract Extensions. Robert thanked Juanita and then stated that unless someone else has something else to talk about that relates to the Community Preservation Plan revisions we will move forward to the Contract Extensions. Robert asked Karen to take it away with the Contract Extension Requests. Karen began by stating that Historic Homes is looking for a contract extension, you all received the update from Alvin Allen where one home is complete and you have viewed the before and after pictures. One

more home is almost complete and their homeowners are asking for an extension. That would be until November 30, 2022. We are being asked to extend our contract with the office of planning and

economic development which is administrating this program. They in turn are assuming that if we do

that we will give each of their participating homeowner's an extension, as needed. Gloria stated that she felt that it was a good extension. Robert asked Gloria if that was a motion and Gloria agreed to the motion. Clinton seconded the motion. Robert then stated that now we will take a vote on extending

the contract with the office of planning and economic development for the McKnight historic homes program to November of 2022.

All in Favor:

Gloria DeFillipo: - yes, Clinton Harris: - yes, Willie Thomas : - yes, Lamar Cook: - yes

Juanita Martinez: - yes, Rhonda Sherrill: - yes, and Robert McCarroll: - is yes.

Karen then stated that all the Park Extensions to November 30, 2022.

Two Thousand Nineteen: Angelina Park, Atwater Park Terrace, Colonial Hills Terrace, Dog Park Study, Forest Park Trolley Barn, Old First Church, Westminster Street Children's Park, Venture Pond, and Barrows Park.

Twenty- Twenty One: Springfield Bike Park, Forest Park Aquatic Garden, The Gazebo, Indian Orchard Water Study, Marshall Roy Walking Park, Rockrimin Boathouse Study, Thompson Triangle, Duggan Park and Spanish American Memorial Assessment

Karen then stated that she sent you requests from the park department so you should have that also as an update and a request.

Gloria asked Karen what was the date that they wanted the extension to? Karen responded that she believed that it was November 30, 2022.

Karen stated that some of these won't take that long. Robert then stated that some of them may take longer. For example when they gave us the status report on each one of them and the Marshall Roy walking path is now costing twice as much as they had originally programmed. They don't have enough money to do Marshall Roy. My guess is that they will be coming to us at the time of the funding cycle

to ask us that we help fund that. My guess is that Marshall Roy isn't going to be done by November 2022. The others absolutely!

Lamar asked Robert what is the status of the studies? Robert asked Karen if she had the report from Laura and give us the update. In some cases it's not like they haven't taken place, they may be in process. Karen, maybe you can check. Lamar if it is not answered to your satisfaction Karen can reach out to Laura Walsh at Parks to get a further explanation.

Robert then stated that he can see it but it is too small for me to read. When you do get up to the study update in case their other people who have computer issues like me. Gloria then asked if she could say something. Robert agreed that she could. Gloria stated that she is thinking through this in my head, please bear with me. There are quite a few projects from the Park Department that haven't been completed yet. I just want to say this as a caution, that perhaps in the new funding we look at that as

part of what hasn't been done before we give more to be done. It seems like it will just barrel up. Robert stated that he heard her and let's cross that bridge when we cross it in next June. I think it is a valid point. In your tickler file put a note that says raise this issue during the deliberations. Gloria stated that she would. Robert stated that he would not want to determine that here in November. We have delayed projects that when we need to change policies that we don't have to make decisions until next summer. Juanita then stated with all the studies did the Campanile finish that study? Robert stated that we finished it and we have a voluminous copy in the file at City Hall and if any committee member wants to see it can go and look at it. Robert asked Karen if we have that digitally. Karen said yes we do and I thought I sent it to everyone. Robert stated that we asked for an executive summary which Myron Hatchett the representative of the city department that did the study. He asked the contractor but he never got it, and we never got it. Just for a heads up I don't know if anyone knew whether it was in the newspaper or on television on a little clip where T. J. Plante was being interviewed on the Campanile and he said we will be working on the application to submit to the Community Preservation Committee in the coming year.

Karen then stated that these are the two thousand and nineteen projects and asked Laura if this is what she was looking for, the progress report on each project. Robert then stated in two thousand nineteen we funded the Old First Church study. Juanita stated that the Old First Church study was one of the ones that are going to be asking for an extension.

Robert then stated that he got an e-mail from Cathy Brown and she said she was thrilled to drive by Angelina playground and to see the basketball court was installed the fences are not yet there but the court has been repaved and there were even kids playing on it. She is happy to have seen things have been moved around.

Robert then asked did Laura say where they are in the study. The necessary in depth building analysis the park requests a contract extension until November 30th, 2021. Karen then read that the Old First Church conditions assessment project has completed its designer selection phase with Dietz and Company Architects of Springfield as a selected vendor. Dietz and Company has begun on site

investigations of the first Church as well as the Historical Research for building information and previous work plans. Although the First Church is one of the oldest buildings in the area there were limited architectural plans and documents available. Therefore, one component of the project is to perform a laser scan of the building which will enable Dietz to create an interactive three D model of old First Church that will be used to generate building floor plans and elevations. This step has been completed and the floor plans are being drafted. Additional onsite investigations are scheduled beginning the last week of September for assessment of the overall building envelope. Foundations, windows, doors,

water tightness of the masonry and planning systems. Evaluations of existing roof and structural systems and recondition of the interior finishes and the stairs. Additional review of the building in code

accessibility universal design and Historic Preservation issues or treatments. Review options for a new elevator, wheelchair lift and a ramp and a comprehensive evaluation of the mechanical system, plumbing, fire protection, electrical systems will also be completed in October. The city anticipates receiving a draft assessment for a report in November. Due to a delay in the contract period and the necessary in depth building analysis the part that requests the contract extension. Karen then stated that all of you have this report if you want to zoom on it. Robert asked Lamar if you have any questions on some other specific contracts or do you want to look at this at your own leisure? Raise the issue at the next meeting if it hasn't been answered, and if the report that the Park Department has given us. Lamar stated that he would review the language.

Karen then read the dog park feasibility study design process has begun with the Berkshire Design Group as the selected vendor. Construction plans and specifications will be completed by Berkshire for a two acre dog park location and related amenities. We have narrowed the list of potential sites to one parcel of park location and related the amenities. We have narrowed the list of potential sites to one parcel of land next to the T.J. O'Conner center. TJO is to be a partner in maintaining the park, using the park for staff training and dog adoption events. Our next step is to present these sketches to the dog park committee. Due to the continuation of COVID 19 Pandemic and its impact the park requests that the contract be extended until November 30th, 2022. Robert then stated that as much as it is easier for us to have one uniform continuance date if the committee so feels we may say to the Park Department that they need to be more specific. So for something that could be done by next may they should be asking

for an extension to maybe next June rather than next November. Clearly the money isn't going anywhere else. Whatever is done sooner will get done sooner. If you don't want to do a blanket extension next November we can put this off and ask the Park Department to provide us with a more individual completion deadline. Gloria told Lamar that she sort of agrees with you but I think we are coming out of a time that COVID really upset the cart so I would like to just give it to November to see how it all shapes out. Then from there or ask for more specific dates. Robert stated that Gloria is suggesting that we give a blanket extension at this time and going forward that they need to be more specific as to the individual projects to end the project extension. Robert stated that he thinks Lamar

is with the study that it's not that we are waiting for materials maybe the compromise tonight is that we vote all the construction projects are extended to November 30th, 2022. When Karen gets back in touch with the Park Department and says the Committee wants individual more realistic completion dates for the studies. Gloria stated that she can live with that. Rhonda then stated that she thought it was a great solution. Robert then asked that someone make the motion that we extend the construction of the projects to November of 2022 but we want more realistic completion dates for the studies. Gloria made the motion and Lamar second the motion.

All in Favor:

Gloria Defillipo: - yes, Lamar Cook: - yes, Rhonda Sharrell: - yes, Willie Tomas: - yes,

Juanita Martinez : - yes and Robert McCarroll: - yes

Karen give them the good news first and then give them the bad news. Robert then stated that the Bike Park Study, the Indian Orchard Water Study, don't they still have the East Forest Park Rail Trail study? They say some of these studies won't be done by November 2022 and if that's the real time tell us that.

I don't think we just want to give a blanket extension for studies. We want a better estimate as to when they think they will be completed. Karen then stated that the Highland Trail, that you all received the link to that there is going to be presentation on tomorrow night. Karen then stated that the Godfrey Triangle we put this off a couple of times I think if we could settle it and that would be good. Robert stated that what happened with Godfrey is they didn't have enough money to do everything that they said they were going to do. Since they never asked us for more money we never gave them more money. They were going to give us back sixteen or fourteen thousand dollars but in looking at the

application I noticed that the original application also included some extensive tree planting, which hasn't been done in which clearly could be done for the money that is left so if I remember correctly

Karen the Park Department said that the project had been transferred between people in the Park Department the trees fell through the crack. They are now planning on doing that. Karen agreed with that. Robert stated that at this point we don't have to take back the money immediately. They know that the plan included planting trees that will not take place until next spring the earliest. I would say that we can give them an extension on it. Robert stated that the planting is usually in May. Juanita then stated that they can plant them in the spring. They aren't going to plant them in the summer so they should be done by the end of the summer. Robert then stated that we will tell them we are giving them an extension for the tree planting in June 30th, 2022. That will give them time to plant them in May. Robert then asked is someone could make a motion that we extend Godfrey Triangle to June thirtieth. Juanita made the motion that we extend the motion to June 30th, 2022. Gloria DeFillipo seconded that motion.

All in Favor:

Juanita Martinez: - yes, Gloria DeFillipo: - yes, Rhonda Sharrell: - yes, Willie Thomas: - yes,

Lamar Cook: - yes and Robert McCarroll: - yes

Karen then stated that she went to a boot camp at the Community Preservation Coalition and one of the items frequently discussed was the maintenance of the park projects. It was recommended that the park projects, when you are discussing them, ask for a maintenance schedule. That maintenance schedule would be put into their city municipal park budget to maintain what the CPA is looking for.

Robert then stated that when we are discussing the application process we should make sure that there is some wording in there regarding park projects. Robert then made a motion to adjourn. Gloria agreed and Lamar second it. Robert then stated that we will see everyone on December seventh and we will take the amount of adjournment.

All in Favor:

Juanita Martinez: - yes, Rhonda Sharrell: - yes, Willie Thomas: - yes, Gloria DeFillipo: - yes,
Lamar Cook: - yes and Robert McCarroll: - yes

Our next meeting will be on December 7, 2021.