



Community Preservation Committee

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103

<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Regular

~ Minutes ~

Kathy Calvanese

Tuesday, August 2, 2022

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on August 2, 2022 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Judith Crowell			

II. Public Portion

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

Regular Meeting at 6:00 p.m.

August 2, 2022

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/>
<<https://www.facebook.com/Springfield%20CommunityPreservationCommittee/>>

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
<<mailto:cpc@springfieldcityhall.com>>

Present:

Juanita Martinez (Conservation Commission) - Ralph Slate (Neighborhood Representative) - Gloria DeFillipo (Planning Board Representative) - Clinton Harris (Park Commission Representative) - Willie Thomas (Housing Authority Representative) - Bob McCarroll the (Springfield Preservation Trust Representative).

Rhonda Sherrell - (Neighborhood Representative) **Not present:** - Judy Crowell - (Historical Commission) Lamar Cook (Neighborhood Representative)

Agenda

Approve Minutes of July 5

Deliberations for 2022 Project Recommendations

Historic Homes Program

Administrator's Updates

Other Matters

Next Meeting-September 6

Motion to approve the July 5th minutes made by Gloria and second by Juanita. All in favor, yes.

Deliberations for 2022 Project Recommendations

Robert stated the committee has recommended five projects and we'll continue deliberating tonight. Until we have a final accounting of the funds in each of the reserves, we'll base our recommendations on \$2,720,799.39 of available funds. As a reminder, for example, when we closed out and terminated the Parsons Apartment Complex at 169 Maple Street, the money was originally disbursed from both the historic reserve and the undesignated funds. When funds are returned or unused, the monies are returned to the same reserve account/s of which they were originally allocated.

Last month we agreed to review the remaining projects by grouping the votes and to apply a priority order to review projects tonight. The projects received an average number within each category (1-3). Priority items, previously sent to the administrator, created the vote chart on the screen. The selections of members were read out loud they were offered the opportunity to change a selection. Votes confirmed and the committee began with the priority projects

Robert then stated that the City Council has approved our fiscal 2023 budget. The other update is that the Procurement Office is extremely under-staffed and even though we provided them with the request for proposals for the administrator job, (contractual employees are under contract for three years) to advertise the position we updated it to reflect the Historic Homes Administration part of the budget. The Procurement Office only issued the posting last Friday. There is a fifteen-day window of response time and the deadline is August fifteenth. Last time around Gloria, Ralph and I think it was David Finn were the Sub Committee that looked at what applicants came in. I am hoping that you will do it again and maybe if there are any other Committee Members who are here tonight because otherwise maybe Lamar can be part of that. Of course, we must get a contract together for the position.

Robert opened deliberations.

Christ Church Cathedral. Ralph made the motion that we recommend funding for Christ Church Cathedral but not for the full dollar amount. I would like to recommend funding for repairing the windows and the cost and the cost it would take to basically do the job without doing historic windows. In other words, let's just say it is fifty thousand dollars for the windows. I'm a little concerned that there was a lawsuit against a Church in the Eastern Part of the state and the Supreme court of Massachusetts ruled that you are not supposed to aid the operation of a church. I think that we need to figure out what amount of money is going to preserve these windows versus aiding the church. I am going to make some numbers up here. Let's say it is going to cost fifty thousand dollars to repair the historic windows and it costs twenty-five thousand dollars to put in non-historic windows. We need the difference between those numbers or the amount of the Historic Preservation aiding the church. I will try to get the number for you while we talk and that is what I would like to discuss at least. I would not like to recommend funding for the addition of an entryway to the building because I do not believe that is consistent with the Community Preservation Act since it is not preserving the Historic Resource. It is just adding a new feature to the Historic Resource and I don't see that as a good enough expense for the Community Preservation Act for Historic Preservation because it is adding something new.

Robert then asked if there were any other comments. Gloria stated that she would second Ralph's motion so we can talk about it. Gloria stated that you wouldn't want to do the windows.

I absolutely agree with you, I do not want the other part, I don't think it is appropriate. I'm confused as to why you would not want to preserve the windows? Ralph then explained that there is a lawsuit in the Supreme Court of Massachusetts that ruled that essentially (it was a Stained-Glass Window case) that they ruled that CPA money cannot be used and it could not benefit the church to help religion. We are going by what is in Massachusetts. You can't use public funds on churches. The way that I am defining preservation is the difference in money between basically doing a non-historic job by ripping out the stained-glass windows and putting in windows. Restoring the stained glass will be more. To me the difference that is not going to help the church would be the difference between the cost to repair the existing windows and put in non-historic windows and the cost to repair the cost of historic windows. To me that is not helping the church. The religious aspect is they need windows obviously it is helping the preservation of a Historic resource. I think that is a way we could fund the preservation but not fund the church if we need to repair windows in general. It would be a Historic repair of windows versus the regular repair of the windows. Robert stated that he agreed that the addition in my opinion is not CPA eligible. I tend to be more permissive when it comes to the windows than you. That is, there was a case in the States Supreme Judicial Court that said you must be very careful and you can't do things to advance a particular church. I view this as one of the oldest churches in Springfield. We have windows that are not religious and therefore I am willing to fund the full \$86,895.00 which is the cost to restore those windows. I don't have in front of me the supplement that the church sent us to answer your question as to what it cost if they simply were putting in plain windows. I am less than concerned given that the church gave

us their application. They included a whole bunch of CPA Communities that since the Supreme Court Rulings have helped churches. I think that we are helping to fix the windows but it doesn't necessarily have things that will promote Episcopal Church Worship. Ralph then stated that the lawsuits were specifically about stained windows in a church. I agree with them that those windows were probably religious in nature and may be a slight difference here but when I read the decision it specifically focused on helping the church. You are not supposed to fund that basically helps the church to stay alive. That is why I thought I had a good compromise. In other words, if they were not Historic it would maybe cost about \$25,000.00 to fix the windows with regular glass. That helps the church. The difference is the preservation and that is how I'm viewing this. Robert stated that I guess my feeling Ralph do you remember when you and I were on the Historical Commission and the parishioners and neighbors of Our Lady of Hope Church and the Immaculate Conception came and asked if the Historical Commission would make it into a local Historical District. Ultimately, the Roman Catholic bishop sued and the Law Department quite ably defended us in court. I am hoping that this is indeed something we can fund. If there's someone out there who wants to do a lawsuit that we will be defended in it because my motivation is not to in a sense help that specific church. It is to preserve the windows in a Historic Resource. Gloria stated that she was with Bob. Ralph stated that he would defer. Robert then asked would you amend your motion to \$86,895.00 which is what they asked for in their application? Ralph stated that he would amend his motion. Unless someone else wants to add a thought, we will vote on it.

Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Willie Thomas: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes

Nahorniak Park: Robert began by stating that this was an application for \$250,000.00 to do a child's playground in the Nahorniak Park in Pine Point. Juanita made the motion to \$250,000.00 for Nahorniak Park. Discussion: Ralph began by stating that this is the Park that is next to the preschool. Juanita stated that we received a letter that it was open to anybody all day. Robert stated that we ought to vote that it is one of the extra conditions should this be funded.

The questions submitted to the parks department and answered were addressed to the satisfaction of the committee.

The department of parks, recreation and management and Springfield Public Schools have a collaborative relationship with regards to parks that abut school land and this relationship will continue with improvements to Nahorniak Park. A support letter from the school department was received. Ralph suggested that we put that in as a condition that it will remain for the public as park land from dusk to dawn. I am concerned about using CPA money that ultimately will go to fund closed activities such as next to schools as assumed to be a school day. Robert suggested that you make an amendment for this motion that there should be a requirement that the playground be accessible for Springfield residents from dawn to dusk? Ralph did state that he would recommend that amendment. Ralph asked Juanita if she would make the motion and her response. Robert then stated that the motion is for \$250,000.00 for Nahorniak Park for

children's play equipment with the additional stipulation that it can be available for Springfield Residents for dawn to dusk. Robert then stated we will do the vote. Undesignated funds.

Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Willie Thomas: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes.

Bay Path Cemetery: Gloria made a motion that we recommend approval of the Bay Path Cemetery for One Hundred and Eight Two Thousand Dollars and Clinton second the motion. Ralph began by stating that he liked this project and it is a good solid historic preservation project. It goes back to the city's history as to how things were put out there for people who lived in the poor house. I think that residents from the neighborhood came out to support this by saying they heard stories about it and I think it is an interesting project. Robert asked "are there any more comments? Robert stated that the motion is recommended at \$182,000 for the Bay Path Cemetery Improvements.

Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Willie Thomas: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes.

Camp Angelina Accessible Walking Trail: Robert asked those present if anyone wants to make a motion for that? That is \$250,000. Juanita made the motion and Clinton second. Gloria felt that it was a lot of money for a trail. Ralph stated that this isn't one of his favorite ones. I feel that this is an example of money being used for the camp even though it is accessible for the public. Gloria agreed with Ralph. Clinton stated that he thinks this is a lot of money for a trail. Robert asked if there were any other comments. We will do the vote then.

Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: no, Gloria DeFillipo: no, Clinton Harris: yes, Willie Thomas: no, and Robert stated no. Robert stated that this is not a recommendation.

Chestnut Street Housing: Robert stated that this is \$250,000 dollars to help convert the former "Y" at 275 Chestnut Street into supportive, affordable housing. Clinton Harris made the motion to approve. Gloria second the motion. Juanita then stated that this is a worthwhile project, I like it. It is a project that is costing Eight Point Six Million Dollars. I feel that whatever we give it's so small that the project will continue even without us. We could give them Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars. I don't think that it's going to change whether they do it or don't do it. Clinton stated that as a member the biggest concern that we have now there is such a lack of affordable housing out there in the community. Anything that we can do as a committee to try to foster more affordable housing and I am in support of it. If we contribute in some way to see that it happens, I'm going to be on board for it. That building is under the jurisdiction of the housing authority. So, yes, I support that project. Robert asked if there are

any more comments. Robert then stated that although this is CPA eligible, I don't think this is a type of affordable housing projects that CPA should be involved in. This is more of a social service program that would help people who are coming out of homeless which is a worthy cause but in our community preservation plan, people wanted to see more owner-occupied housing. Does someone else have anything to add?

Willie Thomas: yes, Juanita Martinez: no, Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFilippo: no, Clinton Harris: yes, and Robert McCarroll: no

Robert stated that this was a failed vote because it didn't get the majority.

Venture Pond Phase Two: Robert stated that this is a \$250,000 thousand to continue the work on Venture Pond. Robert asked if anyone wanted to make a motion? Ralph stated that he would like to make a motion to approve a \$250,000 request for Venture Pond, Phase Two. Juanita second that motion. Robert then stated that he went out there early in July and was very pleased to see that Phase One that the walking trail was complete. You can work entirely around the pond with a wood chip trail. I think phase one was successful. I am certainly in favor of phase two. Ralph asked could someone explain it to me? Isn't Phase two primarily about adding a dock? I know that we had the clarification email and they said that none of the money can go until phase one is completed.

Questions sent to the parks department were answered to the satisfaction of the committee. Phase two funding will support the design permitting and construction of a fishing dock. The water table was higher than anticipated and the walking path needs additional work a field layout that will adjust the trail backwards from its original positioning to protect the trail from further erosion. The walking trail was constructed with a revised existing conditions plan. No additional work is needed regarding the water table. Soft costs include design permitting contingency etc. Hard costs prefer the construction tasks, sign amenities, installation, and construction work. Note, at the request of the neighborhood the installation of the benches along the trail are no longer a component of the project. Juanita then stated that basically this Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars is just for a study about the dock or does it include the place of the dock? Robert stated that in the budget. They have included a fishing dock overlooked at One Hundred Thousand Dollars. They have a Trailhead Kiosk at eight thousand. Benches were at seven thousand. Interpretive signage is ten thousand dollars. Those are the hard costs. Everything else is permitting or design related to whatever else. Ralph stated that I don't think that this is a very good proposal because I am looking at the application and they didn't show any schematic on the dock. If you look at the application, it appears to be only ten to twelve feet wide and twelve feet out. That's a lot of money for a dock and I'm not sure that it's worth it. Juanita stated that it's not the dock, it's the study. Ralph questioned if it's not about the dock? Gloria stated that the dock will only be able to hold one or two people. Gloria stated that I would like to know how many people in this city of Springfield are aware of Venture Pond because it is tucked back of Wilbraham Road. Robert stated Gloria when I went for my little walk around it there was a family fishing in the approximate area where the fishing dock is being proposed. It was indeed being used. I do share your concern that people don't know about it

because you can't see it from Wilbraham Road. If we were to fund this, we might require that there be some signage on the fence that goes with this park that would say Venture Pond. Walking trail and fishing dock.

Ralph stated that they do have interpretive signage in the budget. Gloria stated that you need something on Wilbraham Road. Juanita stated that it may not be signage but people know it's there because I know that it is a used pond. People go there a lot. If you're not fishing you may not know about it. Ralph stated that he didn't really realize that people did use it. Willie stated that he thought that he read that construction of the dock was part of it. Gloria stated that it is. Ralph stated that the dock is \$100,000 and the other one hundred and fifty thousand dollars is for support of the construction of the dock. Gloria stated that she felt that \$100,000 is a lot of money for a dock. She also stated that she would go along with the dock but not with another \$150,000 to support the construction of the dock. Ralph stated that they do need some, they need the permitting for an example, right? Gloria then stated, what about this? What if we give temporary approval pending the Park Department will be coming back and tell us what are the exact costs for the dock and what else they need for permitting. Forget about the signs and anything else. Ralph stated that they did do that. They submitted that with the budget that is right in front of me. What it says is mobilization/ demobilization/ engineering layout is twenty-five thousand/ they have sedimentation and erosion control which is six thousand and that is during the construction of the dock. There is dewatering silt in the pond which is also from the construction of the dock and they must do that. They took \$10,000 for interpretive signage. They have seventy-five hundred for benches which they said that they are no longer doing. They have One Hundred Thousand for the dock. They have Eight Thousand for the Trailhead Kiosk. They have Ten Thousand Dollars for plantings, landscaping, and site restoration. They have a Thirty-Five Thousand design and construction contingency which is 20 percent of the project. Ten Thousand for plantings, landscaping, and site restoration. They have a Thirty-Five Thousand design and construction contingency which is twenty percent of the project. Ten Thousand for permitting. Seventy-Three Fifty for survey and \$21,150. For engineering, design and construction and administration services. Ralph stated that this is dock related.

Robert stated that the motion on the floor is \$250,000 for Venture Pond, Phase two. Ralph stated that he would like to amend his motion and change it to \$240 Thousand Dollars. Robert said we could always fund it and say no regarding the benches. One of the reasons we are funding it is they must have benches. Robert then stated that we have an amended motion without the benches for Venture Pond. Ralph then stated that he would like to recommend his motion to be for Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars and the project will include the benches. If they decide that they don't want the benches well they can come back to us to explain why and we can take the money away completely or change our mind or tell them "No we have to have the benches." The motion is \$250,000 including the benches which must be constructed. Undesignated Fund Balance.

Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFilippo: no, Clinton Harris: yes, Willie Thomas: no and Robert McCarroll: yes.

Affordable Ownership Itendale Street: Robert began by stating this is a request for \$108 Thousand and Seventy-Five Dollars to fix up a current vacant deteriorated house on Itendale Street, which is in the Forest Park Neighborhood. Does someone want to make a motion so that we can have a discussion. Ralph stated that he would like to make a motion to approve \$108,000 for affordable ownership, Juanita second the motion. Gloria stated that she doesn't remember this one. Is the owner planning to rehab and put it up for affordable housing or is he planning to live there? Robert stated that this is a proposal submitted by the city. The city has foreclosed on this property they will be offering it for development, for people to put in proposals to develop it and fix it with the goal of the house being sold to an income eligible owner occupant. Our money would be going in to help reduce the cost of the house to fix. It is much more than the cost you can get by selling it to an income eligible owner/occupant. Our money is part of the subsidy to reduce the construction cost down to where it is affordable. Ralph stated that they provided a very detailed budget. They think that the budget is going to cost four hundred thousand dollars to rehab this property. They are asking for one hundred eight from us. They said there is also a home subsidy which is a Federal Program and CPA because they are asking for \$216,000 for the subsidy. So, one hundred and eight is half of that. I'm really shocked that it is a Four Hundred Thousand Dollar Rehab.

Gloria stated that there aren't a lot of people who can qualify for this. Even the cost of materials has gone up. Robert stated that they will give it to a developer who will agree to fix it to the city specs. The city will give it to the developer the money from us and the money from the home program. The developer will then give it to an income eligible owner occupant for \$190,000. Robert stated that he heard from the grapevine there was nearly a \$200,000 subsidy for each one of those brand-new homes so they could indeed be affordable to income eligible owner occupants. And that was pre-covid when they built those homes.

The city is not doing it. What the city does with this one they put on a fifteen-year affordability restriction. We should have a longer restriction. I would say Thirty Years because otherwise you're giving the first owner, whoever buys it and owns it for fifteen years when they sell it, they can sell it for whatever price they can get. Ralph stated that he liked that idea. How can we do it, that's the quandary right? It's a double edge sword, his argument in the Gemini Project which I was a little bit sympathetic towards asked why shouldn't that person be able to gain equity? The first person that buys it is the first person to gain equity but the second person is. Is there a way to split it somehow so the equity because it isn't black and white on that? Robert stated that he wasn't a housing expert so I think if you remember when Bobby DeMusis said when he was talking to us that there were various options that you could do with restrictions so that someone is entitled to do certain amount of profits, they are not entitled to the windfall profit that they would get. My feeling is that if we are going to pass this, we should simply say we want a thirty-year affordability level. Keep in mind that HUD Home Money will have the affordability below eighty percent. That will expire in fifteen years. That means that if someone sells it in the year fifteen, they can sell it to someone who is still within our eligibility limit which is ninety nine percent. Robert stated he felt ours must go to thirty years isn't as troublesome as if we were keeping it to eighty percent for thirty years. Ralph stated that he liked that.

In other words, for the first fifteen years it will be harder to sell because they must sell it to someone who can qualify for income. They won't be able to much for it but then after fifteen to thirty they will be able to get more. It won't be like someone is making a ton of money. It will be 100 percent of median income, and after thirty so the windfall will spill out a little more. I like that idea. Robert then asked do we want to have that as part of the motion? That assuming this passes we don't know if this is going to pass. Robert stated that maybe we would have a motion. We take a vote on the motion. Ralph, you made the motion so you get the start. Ralph stated that he would like to amend his motion to attach a thirty-year affordability restriction on this property that would be up to one hundred percent which is a CPA limit. Robert stated that we are putting a thirty-year restriction in our share of the project.

CPA has voted to recommend the full amount but they want a thirty-year affordable restriction on their CPA projects. Then we will hear if anyone has any great problems with that. Robert stated that Ralph your motion is to have a thirty-year restriction on the CPA portion of the project.

Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Rhonda Sherell: yes, and Robert McCarroll is yes.

Robert stated that after this meeting Karen will be contacting the Park Department saying the Committee voted on the Venture Pond but they want the benches. Please let us know before the September meeting if that is acceptable and the same as the Office of Housing for the Itendale house.

Florentine Gardens: Robert began by stating that Florentine Gardens is One Hundred Eighty Thousand dollars to do work on the circular park that is on Florentine Gardens including a fountain. Does someone want to make a motion? Clinton made the motion and Ralph made the second motion.

Ralph began by stating that he lives in the neighborhood and it would be nice if we could get a fountain at Forest Park. I walk by there about every day now and I think if I am not mistaken it also has a proposal for benches which is a nice thing. It is an area which is a bit under used because there isn't really a lot going on there. They do have the illumination property every few years. Robert stated that the dilemma here is that there are no old photographs that can guide us as to what was there. Unlike some places, where there are photographs that show what the fountain looked like. There is nothing there on this. It is clearly a difficult one. They would have to be working with our Preservation consultant, Shannon Walsh to make sure that whatever is going there meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Obviously, it is helpful when you know what was there because then you can put back what was there. Ralph stated that they sent a picture of a map and the shocking thing about the map. If you take the map at scale our area was flowers. I don't think it is true because it is a pretty big area. I can't imagine that it was all flower gardens.

That is not what they are proposing, which is probably better than that because there was only a giant mound of flowers there and it wouldn't be very recreational. They have a bunch of plans and it shows the pool in the middle. The original plan shows a lot of shrubs, which are all around it. That is not what they are proposing. Juanita stated that there was a map in there that was dated as 1897 that showed no houses and there was no garden. It's in the packet and it shows a flower garden from the fountain all the way to Pineywood. It doesn't show any houses there. Ralph stated that they would have not planned for the neighborhood. Robert stated that there weren't many houses in 1899. They were built in 1901, 1905, the neighborhood was not fully developed at this time this particular map was done. Robert did say that there are benches proposed for it and brick pavers. Willie stated that the Forest Park local Historic District in 1975. This is the National Registry of Historic properties in 1982. The Park has been deemed Historically significant at the local level by the Springfield Historic Commission. The Park was established in 1993. Does anyone know why the park was closed off on Spruceland Avenue? Do you know why that was done? Robert responded by stating traffic reasons. People were coming up Longhill Street turning down on Spruceland and Spruceland went all the way over to Firglade and then they would go up Firglade to get to Sumner.

Hearing no comments, we will start the vote.

Ralph Slate: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Rhonda Sherell: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes.

Marshall Roy Fitness: Ralph stated that it is a small budget project. The neighborhood seems to want it. Juanita stated that we all know people need some sort of fitness programs. It is situated in the park. I know there is one here at Forest Park and it is used all the time. During COVID there were lines to use it. Robert questioned, are there any other comments?

Juanita Martinez: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Clinton Harris: yes Rhonda Sherell: yes, and Robert McCarroll is a yes.

Gemini Townhouses: Robert began by stating this is new Townhouses on Central Street near Main Street for affordable owner occupants. Rhonda made the motion and Gloria made the second motion. Rhonda stated that Home City Developers are doing a great job trying to get housing into the city. I just went to see one of the Old Brunton School and I feel that they did a fantastic job. I also think that it is needed. Gloria stated that housing is needed but they are asking for more than we normally give and we don't have enough money to give our usual amount of Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand. I would like to know if the amount of money we are going to give them will be significant to them. The project is twenty-one point two million dollars and again it is like the supportive housing on Chestnut Street. I think the project will continue even if they don't get our two hundred thousand dollars. Ralph then stated that we are offering less than one percent. Juanita believes in the project, what we could give would probably do more someplace else. Gloria agreed with Juanita. Robert then stated unfortunately a few housing projects that we helped fall into that category. Certainly, Brooking School was a

multimillion project at which our contribution was small potatoes, yet they gladly took it and they were very appreciative of it. The Wayfinder project on Byer Street, is a multi-million-dollar project of which we are small potatoes. I don't have so much trouble being a participant as at least creates owner occupied housing as opposed to other home city projects that only created rental projects. I am more interested in participating in this one. Does anyone have any comments before we vote? We are voting on two hundred thousand ten with the ability to increase the amount in September if we find out we're reclaimed funds from completed projects that haven't been closed out. Recommend Two Hundred Thousand ten. Clinton stated that this is classic affordable housing. We are going to take a vote.

Rhonda Sherell: Yes, Clinton: yes, Gloria: yes, Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Robert McCarroll: yes

Robert stated that something I want to suggest is a thirty-year Affordability Restriction on our portion of the project. Whether that is the equivalent of a one town home, because they are building forty or however, they want to handle it. Affordability housing must be longer than fifteen years. Ralph said let's get to them and see what they say. Robert agreed.

Robert then stated that we have a very small amount of money we will know next month what has been closed and can decide that there is something else in these categories. The only one left in Category number two is the Science Museum. The other thing that we must do is if you remember the last meeting, we voted to allocate \$248,000 for the Down Payment Assistance program and took a final vote on hold until they answered our questions which they did and Karen I don't know if you want to review that. We need to finalize the recommendation for the office of Housing Down Payment Assistance Program.

Karen stated that the Office of Housing did respond to the questions that you had and they submitted the revised policy and corrected parameters, you have that information. The Committee requested to learn the number of applicants served under eighty percent AMI and for eighty to one hundred AMI in the last program. There were forty recipients each receiving a Four Thousand Dollar Loan.

Twenty-Four Households were between eighty one percent and one Hundred AMI.

Sixteen Households were less than eighty percent AMI. Then they broke it down by neighborhoods.

A map of where homes were located in the city was included.

Since we have no idea how many of these people may be at for example, eighty two percent, we'll require this year a more finite breakdown. Ralph stated that those sixteen people would not

have received the assistance of the city's regular program because those people who were between eighty or one hundred would not have gotten money from the city otherwise. What we need now is a motion to formally recommend the Down Payment Assistance Program for the Two Hundred and Forty Eight Thousand which we will earmark for them. Ralph then made a motion to formally recommend the Down Payment Assistance Program. Juanita second that motion. Robert asked: any discussion? With that we will vote on that recommendation.

Ralph Slate: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Rhonda Sherell: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes

Ralph made the motion and Juanita second the motion to correct the allocations of the projects into their proper reserve account.

Ralph Slate: yes, Juanita Martinez: yes, Gloria DeFillipo: yes, Clinton Harris: yes, Rhonda Sherell: yes, and Robert McCarroll: yes

Historic Homes Program. Most of the homeowners have submitted their paperwork and we have one house scheduled for the consultants to go over on Thursday and another two on August twelfth.

Next meeting will be held on September 6th.