



# City of New Bedford

## Community Preservation Committee

133 William Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740

Telephone: (508) 979.1488 Facsimile: (508) 979.1576

**JONATHAN F. MITCHELL**  
**MAYOR**

### MINUTES

**March 28, 2017**

Meeting at City Hall

1st Floor Ashley Room

133 William Street, New Bedford, MA

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS

#### PRESENT:

Janine Da Silva, Co Chair

Diane Berube

Colleen Dawicki, Co Chair

Sylvia Gomes

Jessica Bailey, Clerk *Departed:6:30 PM*

Ross Nunes

Dennis Audette

#### ABSENT:

Arthur Motta

Tim Walsh

#### STAFF:

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.

### Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by R. Nunes and seconded by J. Bailey to approve the February 27, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unopposed.

### New Business

#### *Review of Needs Assessment Comments from City Boards and Commissions*

J. da Silva referred to the CPC informational flyer which the CPC members who represented a city board, distributed to their respective boards for review and comment. She asked for a brief reporting of any comments offered by the boards and offered her comments first, as she presented the information to the Historical Commission at their March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- **Historical Commission.** J. da Silva stated that she received no formal comments at the meeting and no email comments from the Historical Commission as of date.
- **Conservation Commission.** D. Audette informed the CPC members that he distributed the informational flyers to the Conservation Commission and instructed them to review other CPA communities and the types of projects undertaken to get a sense of how CPA could be used in New Bedford. One of the questions posed from one of the Conservation Commission members was specific as to whether funding could be used for the City, through its Conservation Commission, to purchase a particular parcel of open space in New Bedford, which was an abandoned cranberry bog. Members agreed that as a potential project, a proposal of that type could be put forth by the Conservation Commission as a City entity.

- **Recreation.** D. Berube stated that her meeting with the Park Board was to take place on April 8<sup>th</sup>, as part of a Retreat exercise, and that the CPA would be discussed at that time.
- **Housing.** T. Walsh was not in attendance, and therefore was unable to update members regarding the Housing authority meeting at which he presented the CPA materials.

*Review of First Draft Community Preservation Project Application*

J. da Silva noted the draft application consisted of a two-part format including an initial eligibility form and the full application. S. Gomes expressed her approval of the application layout, based on other CPA community applications she has reviewed. J. Bailey asked if the entire application packet would be available on-line, or only the instructions and eligibility form. There was consensus that the entire application should be available for review, for both full transparency and to enable potential applicants the ability to understand the full breadth and depth of the application funding process. A. Louro stated that the notice and requirement of the eligibility form submittal could be highlighted more prominently within the application packet, and that some type of tracking number could be assigned to an applicant who has received confirmation to proceed to a full application. J. Bailey referenced a few other CPA communities that do not have their full application accessible to complete on-line and is only sent to eligible applicants who have completed an eligibility form.

C. Dawicki suggested separating the eligibility form from the application when it is posted on the webpage as another means of lessening the likelihood that someone would proceed to the full application prior to submitting an eligibility form. Everyone was in agreement that separating the two documents and utilizing a tracking system would be the preferred method of implementing the application process. There was brief discussion regarding the use of a fillable PDF application, question prompts and sufficient space for character or word counts.

The timeline chart was then reviewed, with particular focus on the City Council review period. A. Louro stated that the timeline had been developed after staff had researched other CPA community review practices. C. Dawicki indicated her satisfaction that the CPC's application review would be completed prior to the end of the calendar year. D. Audette voiced concern regarding the time period associated with the City Council review. A. Louro explained that the City Council would most likely review the funding proposal recommendations at committee meeting(s) and that the timing of a new calendar year with the election of City Council committee chairs would likely extend the City Council review period currently reflected in the chart. In response to S. Gomes' question regarding the procedure for presenting proposals to City Council, A. Louro stated that the method varies from each community, with some CPC Chairs presenting the proposals, while in other communities the project proponent presents. She informed members that Patrick Sullivan would confer with the City Council to gauge their preference.

In response to J. Bailey asking if the FY18 timeline would remain the same in FY19 and beyond, A. Louro responded in the negative, explaining that the fall application period was one time only to provide a funding period in FY18, and that moving forward applications would potentially be accepted in late winter/early spring. There was agreement that the timeline chart within the plan and application packet should note the special instance of the FY18 timeline.

The application review criteria were discussed. C. Dawicki indicated her preference for simplifying the current draft general criteria list that will be used both for applicant guidance and for scoring review. C. Dawicki suggested making distinctions as to what would be characterized as "thresholds" and "bonuses" to reflect the criteria alignment against the Community Preservation Plan. It was recommended to review the criteria to ensure that it aligns with the application questions, and to add or subtract as needed. Members collectively reviewed the current general criteria list, organized it categorically and made determinations related to threshold and bonus status. A. Louro indicated that she would make the discussed changes within the draft criteria.

There was brief discussion regarding the use of matching funds and the need to have CPA funding contingent upon the applicant providing grant match letters of commitment. A. Louro indicated that she would investigate how other CPA communities handle potential grant matches and contingency plans if grants are not awarded.

#### *Discussion and Vote on 2016 & 2017 Budget Warrant*

C. Dawicki informed members that the anticipated vote on the budget to send to City Council had been postponed in anticipation of some minor changes. S. Gomes had a question regarding the administrative expenses and why that expense reflected only in FY16. A. Louro explained the process of the Administrative Fund, its availability within the fiscal year and its requirement to carry over into the Fund Balance Account. She explained that the Administrative Fund would be available in the FY18 budget. There was brief discussion as to the allowed uses of the Administrative Fund which includes administrative and operational costs as well funding certain types of studies.

#### **Old Business**

##### *Public Engagement Plan Update*

R. Nunes informed members that the Public Engagement Sub Committee had met and he described the plan for the upcoming public meetings related to the CPA plan. He stated that three preferred meeting locations had been identified as the Hazelwood Park, Buttonwood Park and Brooklawn Park Senior Centers, as they are geographically located throughout the city. He described the outreach methods to consist of both traditional and non-traditional methods to include legal notices, press releases, flyers, direct outreach to organizations, and the robust use of social media. He discussed the unique opportunity to broaden the effectiveness of the public engagement by partnering with the United Way in the South End and the Community Economic Development Center in the North End, as both entities have deep roots within the community and are successful in their outreach to underserved and/or underrepresented populations and organizations.

R. Nunes explained the proposed format of the meetings, stating that the meetings should last no more than 60 minutes and that they would begin with a brief (15 minute) informative PowerPoint presentation and proceed to three breakout groups related to the CPA funding areas of historic preservation, housing, open space and recreation. He described that each group would have a facilitator and/or scribe who would capture the participants' comments. He explained that the proposed format would be efficient and effective, enabling participants to focus their comments in the appropriate area(s). He added that a printed survey would also be available for participants to write their comments and directions to the website and staff contacts for further questions or comments.

D. Audette voiced his concerns regarding the format of the meeting, particularly as how it related to the potential inability of members to answer specific questions and the short time allotted to an informational presentation. S. Gomes sought clarification regarding the format of the meetings with R. Nunes and J. da Silva explaining the physical layout of the meeting and the positive attributes of break-out groups. C. Dawicki reiterated the goal of the meeting, which was to capture public comments related to community needs. A. Louro stated that if meeting participants had specific questions or concerns related to CPA, a DPHCD staff member would be in attendance to address those types of situations.

Late May/early June were identified as the months to hold the public meetings with A. Louro indicating that venue availability and meeting partner's schedules would be coordinated by staff in an effort to set specific meeting dates. She indicated that several potential dates would be presented to members for their consideration and for which to schedule their participation.

##### *CPC Member Reappointment Update*

A. Louro confirmed that R. Nunes and A. Motta wished to be reappointed to their terms. D. Berube, due to her busy schedule, confirmed that she would not be seeking reappointment. A. Louro asked if D. Berube would

consider serving as a member until her replacement was appointed, with D. Berube confirming that she would try to do so.

**Next Meeting Date**

Tuesday, April 25, 2017.

**Adjourn**

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by D. Audette and seconded by S. Gomes. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro  
DPHCD Staff