



Community Preservation Committee

February 27, 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 <i>Remote /Departed:7:00 PM</i>	Arthur Motta <i>Arrived: 6:25 PM</i>
Jessica Bailey, Clerk	Ross Nunes
Dennis Audette <i>Arrived: 6:22PM</i>	Tim Walsh
Diane Berube	

STAFF:

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

Call to Order

Co-Chair Da Silva called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Call the Roll

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present and absent as stated above. J. da Silva announced that C. Dawicki would be participating remotely due to her out-of-state travel itinerary.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by T. Walsh and seconded by R. Nunes to approve the January 23, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unopposed.

New Business

Review of Draft Informational Flyer

J. da Silva referred to the informational flyers which were distributed to members for their review. She explained that there were four separate flyers for each category within the Community Preservation Act (CPA), and that the intent was for their use to inform city boards and commissions regarding the CPA. A. Louro asked that CPC members who represented a city board to provide the flyer to their respective board staff liaison to be

included in the March agenda and distributed to the board members in their March meeting packets.

J. da Silva explained that the front page of the informational flyer was the same for all the categories and that the back page contained the needs and priorities of each specific category [open space, recreation, historic preservation and community housing] which had been identified through researching the current relative city plans and studies.

There was brief discussion regarding how many CPC members should attend the city board meetings, with consensus that it was sufficient that the appointed representative for each city board attend alone and capture the feedback.

T. Walsh affirmed that the goal of the meetings was to inform the city boards about the CPA and to gain their input. E. Bates explained that the current identified needs and priorities are based solely on existing studies, reports and plans. The next step in developing the Community Preservation Plan (CPP) includes soliciting the input of city boards, and then the general public. E. Bates explained that many of the needs, goals and objectives which have been identified may have changed, and that the forthcoming meetings with the city boards will be able to provide vital information to include in the CPP.

Review of First Draft Community Preservation Plan

J. da Silva noted that members had been provided the first draft of the Preservation Plan to review and stated that the intent was not to go through the plan page by page at that time, but rather, to provide comments to staff at a later time. A. Louro briefly explained the sections of the plan and noted that although the application section had been developed, it needed further internal review; as such, it was noted that it would be available for the members prior to the next meeting.

There was brief discussion regarding the most productive methods of reviewing the plan. The use of a sub-committee, email and other methods were discussed.

Discussion and Vote on 2016 & 2017 Budget Warrant

J. da Silva informed members that the anticipated vote on the budget to send to city council had been postponed due to the city's CFO being away; as such an updated financial report was unavailable.

Old Business

Development of Public Engagement Plan

J. da Silva opened discussion concerning the committee's goals for the public engagement piece. She reiterated the CPC's previously articulated desire to have three separate meetings and reviewed some of the logistics associated with the meetings, such as cable access filming, legal notices, meeting announcements utilizing media outreach and notice to neighborhood groups. A. Motta suggested the use of a cable access commercial to bring attention to the public meeting dates.

May and June were identified as the target months in which to hold the public meetings, as it was hoped the plan would be at the appropriate draft level for public review and comment by that time. A. Louro explained that the DPHCD is well-versed in public outreach and would recommend the use of both traditional and non-traditional outreach methods that have proven successful in an effort to promote the meetings. She encouraged members to advise staff of outreach ideas that they may think of within the next few weeks.

C. Dawicki asked members to think about the over-reaching goals of the public meetings and to consider connecting with other city groups which have recently engaged the public to learn what was successful for them; she suggested members form a sub-committee to work with staff in developing the public engagement details.

Members suggested different types of meeting structures such as the use of PowerPoint, a moderator, podium speaking, and small group breakouts. Several members voiced the concern that everyone needed to be heard and that cable access required a group setting, versus breakout groups. There was consensus that the overarching goal was to provide the information, provide everyone the ability to speak at the meeting and to capture the public comments.

There was discussion regarding the type of audience expected to attend the meetings, with members acknowledging that they anticipated two types of audiences: those who were familiar with CPA and were potential project proponents seeking detailed information, and those seeking general information as to how tax payer funding would be used.

J. da Silva suggested that the application and its details should not be discussed at the public meetings. A. Louro reminded everyone that application workshops were suggested at the last meeting, with consensus that the workshops were still desired. A. Louro and E. Bates reiterated the goals of the public meeting were to inform the public and to gather input to inform the plan. C. Dawicki suggested that a sub-committee group meet with staff to discuss and plan the public meeting process. R. Nunes, S. Gomes and J. da Silva indicated their interest in serving on such a subcommittee and that they would participate in the public meeting planning.

The upcoming meeting schedule was distributed and D. Audette stated that Monday meetings were difficult for him to attend. Members and staff reviewed the calendar and determined that the fourth Tuesday of every month accommodated everyone, and it was agreed to set that date for future meetings.

J. Bailey noted that three committee member appointments were set to expire in April, and asked how that affected the committee and future meeting quorums. A. Louro stated that the members' appointments are staggered and explained the reappointment process through the Mayor and confirmation by city council. She confirmed that A. Motta, R. Nunes and D. Berube's appointments were for one year. R. Nunes and A. Motta indicated that they would like to be reappointed, with D. Berube stating that she was considering stepping off the committee; however she would advise staff with certainty in the near future. A. Louro noted that Patrick Sullivan would bring the reappointments to the Mayor's attention, and that if the members were not reappointed by April, city board policy allows a member to remain as a full member until either they are reappointed or replaced.

Other

CPA Legislative Action Plan

J. Bailey stated that the Community Preservation Coalition, through their newsletter, was seeking a representative from each CPA community to participate in a Legislative Action Committee. J. da Silva stated her concern regarding city employees participating in lobbying, which is not an allowable action. It was determined that this matter would be brought before the city solicitor for review and there was consensus that the committee, still being new, would most likely prefer not to participate at this time.

Old Business

No old business was discussed.

Next Meeting Date

Monday, March 28, 2017.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by J Bailey and seconded by T. Walsh. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro
DPHCD Staff

Approved: 3.28.17