



Community Preservation Committee

January 23, 2017 – 6:00 PM – **Minutes**

Department of Planning, Housing & Community Development
2nd Floor Conference Room
608 Pleasant Street, New Bedford, MA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Janine Da Silva, Co Chair	Sylvia Gomes
Colleen Dawicki, Co Chair	Arthur Motta -6:13 PM
Jessica Bailey, Clerk	Ross Nunes
Diane Berube	Tim Walsh

ABSENT:

Dennis Audette

STAFF:

Edward Bates, *Neighborhood Planner*
Anne Louro, *Preservation Planner*

Call to Order

Co Chairman Dawicki called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Call the Roll

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present and absent as stated above.

Icebreaker

Co Chairman Dawicki introduced an “icebreaker” exercise as an opportunity for everyone to learn about each other, asking for members and staff to share a little known fact about themselves.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made T. Walsh and seconded by J. Bailey to approve the October 25, 2016 and November 30, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion passed unopposed.

Old Business

Checking in post-training November 30th

Co Chairman Dawicki sought questions or comments from members regarding the November 30th training session with Stuart Saginor. S. Gomes stated that she had difficulty accessing the Somerville Community Preservation Plan from their website with E. Bates responding that he had noticed that the City of Somerville was in the midst of updating their website S. Gomes indicated that she would revisit the website. J. Bailey provided positive feedback for the thoroughness and quality of the training. C. Dawicki referred to Stuart Saginor’s advice to address the budget and asked staff if they had information regarding the process in which to do so. A. Louro briefly reviewed the two years of funding, FY16 and FY17, which required attention, and that City

staff hoped to provide the warrant language and fund amounts to the CPC at the next meeting for discussion in order for the CPC to recommend budgets to the City Council. There was brief discussion regarding the use of the Reserve Funds and the use of the CPA Administrative Fund for Community Preservation Coalition membership dues. A. Louro noted that the Coalition would be providing technical assistance to the CPC at no charge until the FY18 budget is set, and when determining the FY18 budget, the CPC could choose to obtain membership to the Coalition utilizing the CPA Administrative Fund. In response to S. Gomes, A. Louro affirmed that the members would receive budget language to review prior to discussing it at the February meeting.

C. Dawicki raised the topic of community concerns or “buzz”. R. Nunes stated that he felt there was a lack of understanding of how CPA can be used from both citizens and political leaders. He suggested an informational packet be available for political leaders or that a copy of Stuart Saginor’s training presentation be sent to them. A. Motta asked if the CPC had a city web presence. S. Gomes stated that after reviewing other community websites, she felt that New Bedford should post the CPA Allowable Use chart on the city webpage as a tool to assist people in understanding the type of eligible projects CPA can fund. J. da Silva also suggested posting project examples on the webpage. A. Louro stated that the CPC had a dedicated webpage on the city website and that the training presentation was posted there. She indicated that staff could extract the Allowable Use Chart and category eligibility information from the plan framework document and post it on the webpage within a short timeframe. The members agreed with that suggestion. T. Walsh expressed his disagreement with suggesting potential local projects and recommended using examples from other communities. S. Gomes suggested providing the website link to the Coalition’s Project Database instead. C. Dawicki reaffirmed the need to provide CPC webpage content and suggested the development of a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ’s) section as well.

C. Dawicki stated that New Bedford has the opportunity to be a leader within the Gateway Cities in its implementation of CPA and encouraged members to think creatively as a means to achieve that goal. As the plan is developed and review of other communities’ practices is underway, she expressed her hope that New Bedford would seize the opportunity to use CPA funds to build capacity and fulfill a variety of city objectives.

New Business

Task List and Responsible Parties

C. Dawicki referred to the task list document that was distributed to members which outlined outstanding tasks related to the plan and application development as well as community outreach, project evaluation, and City Council recommendations. She noted that the task list did not have definitive time frames and that the committee could start to identify some rough timelines associated with the tasks. She asked staff to walk the committee through the task list items. E. Bates and E. Louro explained that DPHCD staff had reviewed other community plans and applications to cull best practices and had drafted a Plan Table of Contents and plan framework for the CPC to review and to provide feedback. Staff indicated that they had identified the scheduled March meetings of the affiliated boards at which to discuss CPA and receive input. There was discussion regarding the CPA mandate requiring the input of the city boards, the preferred approach to meeting with the city boards, agenda postings, and the use of summary sheets to provide to the city boards. A. Louro clarified that CPC staff would develop summary sheets for the city boards and request to be formally placed on the March agendas for brief discussion. There was member consensus with R. Nunes’ suggestion that the appointed CPC members who represent city boards make note at their February meetings that CPC would be discussed in March. Tentative timelines of early spring were discussed for the development of a draft plan and draft application for review by the CPC in order to have public input meetings. Staff explained that they were extracting data and trends from existing city plans and that they would then incorporate the city boards’ input and community input into the final draft plan for CPC adoption.

Discussion turned to public engagement and outreach methods, with members articulating their desire to utilize a variety of promotional means to attract strong attendance. A fall 2017 timeline for accepting the first cycle of applications was discussed, with acknowledgement that a spring application would be the preferred approach moving into 2018 and forward. There was consensus to not have rolling application submissions and to use a

two-part application, with the addition of a preliminary application to determine eligibility. Staff advised members that the application would be user friendly and available electronically. A CPC member city website portal was suggested for reviewing applications. S. Gomes suggested, with member agreement, the use of workshops to aid applicants in navigating the application process would be helpful.

Community Preservation Plan Framework

C. Dawicki indicated the possibility of a May /June draft plan availability in order to begin the public engagement process and asked staff to review the draft framework provided to members. Staff reviewed the Table of Contents with the members, explaining the rationale of making the plan user-friendly. Staff explained that the Needs Assessment section of the Plan was the fundamental backbone for which the community's needs, goals and priorities were assessed; with that section formulated by reviewing current city plans, and incorporating city board and public input. C. Dawicki confirmed that the needs assessment would be the section that the CPC would be focusing on during the public engagement. Staff noted that the Plan is an informational and instructional document for project applicants as well as a guidance document for the CPC when evaluating projects based on the identified goals and priorities set forth in the Plan. Staff indicated that they were currently developing the financial and application sections of the Plan. Members were asked to review the Plan framework and provide comments and suggestions to staff through email.

Committee Member Homework

C. Dawicki asked members if there were areas of the CPA Plan that they wished to be more involved in. Appointed CPC members representing city boards indicated that they would focus on their categories, with brief discussion about combining Parks, Recreation and Open Space. S. Gomes and J. Bailey indicated that they would like to participate in the application process. R. Nunes and A. Motta indicated their desire to be involved in community outreach with A. Motta also stating he was interested in Historic Preservation as well.

C. Dawicki reviewed the next meeting agenda items to be addressed. Members indicated that they would like to review a draft of the application and the application process at the next meeting, as well as discuss a community outreach plan in more detail. Discussion then moved to the possible number of public meetings, with J. Bailey suggesting one or two public meetings due to the compressed timeline and desire to fund projects before the end of the calendar year. J. da Silva and S. Gomes believed that three public meetings, geographically located throughout the city, would be more advantageous. C. Dawicki reminded members that the public outreach process would be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting.

Next Meeting Date

Establishing an Annual Meeting Calendar

C. Dawicki asked members if they would like to set a standing meeting date for the upcoming year. Members reviewed the calendar which identified the other city board meeting dates, with the fourth or last Mondays of the month targeted as a potential meeting dates. C. Dawicki scheduled the next meeting date for Monday, February 27th and asked staff to develop a 2017 meeting calendar with the last Mondays scheduled and to adjust for holidays.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by T. Walsh and seconded by J. Bailey. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Anne Louro DPHCD

Staff Approved:

02.27.17