



City of New Bedford
Community Preservation Committee
133 William Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740
Telephone: (508) 979.1488

JONATHAN F. MITCHELL
MAYOR

MINUTES

April 26, 2018

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Janine da Silva, Co Chair
Ross Nunes, Vice Chair
Jessica Bailey, Clerk
Christopher Amaral

Arthur Glassman
Sylvia Gomes
Paul Pacheco
Elaine Safioleas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ABSENT:

Tim Walsh

STAFF:

Edward Bates, *Neighborhood Planner*
Anne Louro, *Preservation Planner*- **arrived 6:23**

Call to Order

Chair J. da Silva called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

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

New Business

Post Recommendation Process

E. Bates explained that the May 8th Meeting will be held at Brooklawn Park Community Center and that Staff had developed a format for Recommendation Sheets to provide to City Council which provide a summary of the project and the recommended funding amount and its CPA budget source. J. Bailey recommended moving the project budget from the front of the sheet to the back and to add the city ward along with the project address. There was discussion regarding the order in which to present the projects to City Council with J. Bailey stating she felt they should be grouped by city ward and that the City projects be integrated, and not separated as a group.

J. da Silva recommended including the earlier developed map which demonstrated the geographic locations of the projects. E. Bates stated that the information will be provided to City Council; however he was not certain what their schedule would be. Members noted that City Council would most likely send the item to Committee and that June seemed reasonable.

MOTION to take an item from Old Business out of order. Moved by S. Gomes and seconded by a. Glassman.
Motion Carried.

CPC Administrator Position Status

E. Bates stated that he was uncertain on the status of the matter indicating that A. Louro had spoken to Patrick Sullivan regarding the position. J. da Silva stated that she had spoken to A. Louro who informed her that at least two applications had been received which is why she asked for an update. J. da Silva indicated that she felt the Committee should review the applications and have input regarding the position as the Committee will work closely with the person and furthermore the Committee had direct input developing the qualifications required for the position. P. Pacheco agreed, as the CPA budget funds the position and the position collaborates with the Committee. A. Louro indicated that ideally the position would take over the roles that she and E. Bates currently perform.

MOTION TO send a request to Patrick Sullivan that the CPC Administrator Position applications be sent to the CPC for review. Moved by J. Bailey and seconded by P. Pacheco.
Motion Carried.

CPA Project Signage

A. Louro indicated that Staff had received a quote from DPI relative to project signage. The sign specifications were 3'X3' aluminum signs with vinyl lettering. She noted that the quote contained a cost for installation, but believed that the applicants could install their own signs to the CPC's specifications. If labor was extracted, the average cost of the sign is approximately \$48.00 each. There was brief discussion regarding the design of the sign, with Staff indicating that they could develop some draft designs for Committee approval. There was confirmation that the signs would be used during the construction period of the project and if requested, certain projects could be required to have permanent signage. Members agreed that the signs cost should be paid from the CPC administrative budget.

CPA Trust Fund Match Update

A. Louro informed members that DOR has projected the FY19 match to be 11%, down from previous years due to the addition of Boston and other larger communities. She noted that a budget amendment was before the legislature seeking an increase in the Registry of Deeds fees which supplements the State Trust Fund. The suggested fee increase would provide a 30% match. A. Louro indicated that she has provided this information to the Mayor's Office in order for them to reach out to the local legislators.

The meeting recessed at 6:37 for a dinner break and reconvened t 6:48.

Old Business

Comparative Evaluation of FY18 Applications

A. Louro indicated that she had three laptops and the scoring thumb drives for member's use in case they wanted to amend their scoring during the following discussion. She also noted that she had provided a hard copy version of J. Bailey's scoring/funding spreadsheet which was also being used on the screen to track funding amounts. Also provided was a hard copy of the project rankings based on the average scores of the five members who had previously provided that information to staff.

A. Louro stated that members would not be formerly voting on the projects but noted that it would be optimal if there was consensus on the amount of recommended funding for each project in order to facilitate the formal vote which would take place at the next meeting. She also stated that during the formal vote, the specific funding source must be indicated and stated that Staff would be able to provide that information based on the CPA budgets.

J. Bailey indicated that the Committee should review the projects based on the order of that ranking and the members agreed. S. Gomes asked if the approach would be to spread the funding amongst the projects with J. Bailey and J. da Silva noting the funding spreadsheet would track the amount of funds as they move through the list of projects, helping to determine the allocation amounts. There was brief discussion relative to reviewing project budget line items in order to determine the most critical needs of an overall project as a means to spread funding to the most projects. J. Bailey indicated that for the rehabilitation projects, her preferred approach is to fund the project budget line items which would allow for the exterior of the building to be “buttoned-up”, allowing the greater allocation of funds to more projects. S. Gomes asked if it would be prudent to reach out to the applicants in order for them to provide the exterior budget information, however J. Bailey and J. da Silva disagreed, feeling that there was adequate information provided in the submitted budgets.

Ernestina Morrissey

There was consensus among the members to fund the project at the requested \$100,000, noting that it was the highest scoring project, was matching the request in full, and met nearly all of the scoring criteria as being a highly advantageous project based on the priorities within the Community Preservation Plan.

Veterans Transition House

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$300,000; however J. Bailey reminded members that there was a discrepancy in the funding request amount on the application cover sheet and the submitted budget which listed \$220,000. A subsequent budget submittal requested \$300,000. Reviewing the budget’s exterior work, members sought to remove the soft costs and determine the line items associated with the exterior of the project. Members agreed to fund the exterior items related to demolition, concrete, masonry, windows and plastics, doors, roof and insulation. There was consensus to fund \$200,000 towards the project and that they could revisit the figure as the allocations proceeded.

Hazelwood Park

J. da Silva noted that the City was seeking \$604,900. J. Bailey stated that in her review of the project she had eliminated the amphitheatre and bowling green, as well as decorative wooden fence, the walking paths and rehabilitation of the stone wall. A. Glassman sought clarification regarding the design of the amphitheatre with A. Louro explaining its similarity to the one that exists at the Acushnet Saw Mill, where granite is seating is set within the slope of the ground, confirming that it would not be a covered structure. J. Bailey stated that she did not believe that the amphitheatre addressed a community critical need, particularly since only two people identified it as a goal at a community meeting. Members agreed not to fund the bowling green for the same reason.

Members agreed that the lighting was a priority that needed to be funded. A. Louro noted that the walking paths were integral to park’s ADA accessibility, and that the stone wall was crumbling and was a life and safety issue. Reviewing the budget, members agreed to fund the lighting, walkways and stonewall repair for a total of \$374,400, noting that the amount could be revisited. J. Bailey sought confirmation that those funding items would be conditioned within the grant agreement. A. Louro affirmed that request and reminded members that each project funding could contain conditions and directed their attention to a sheet she had provided with sample funding conditions.

Acushnet Saw Mill Expansion

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$370,000 with J. Bailey stating that it was the only Open Space project and A. Glassman stating that it was the only private project located in Ward One. S. Gomes indicated her favorable review of the project. There was brief discussion relative to the project’s critical need and time sensitivity, as the Purchase and Sale agreement had a limited timeline and potentially the land could be divided into house lots. Members agreed to eliminate the soft costs and construction line item and fund the land acquisition cost at \$335,000.

Seamen's Bethel

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$200,000 in funding and that she had considered funding the project at \$125,000 and J. Bailey indicating her amount of \$135,000 which covered the rehabilitation costs and permitting fees within the budget. A. Glassman informed members that based on the applicant's public presentation and conversations he has had with the applicant, he noted that the Port Society had indicated that of the two applications that they submitted, and the Seamen's Bethel was the more critical. He stated that fully funding the Bethel and not funding the Mariner's Home in this round should provide the Bethel consideration of full funding at \$200,000. J. Bailey questioned the need of the Mariner's Home funding as the application indicated that the Port Society had \$50,000 to put towards that project. A. Louro informed members that after the application was submitted, the roof required immediate attention and the \$50,000 went towards that project, leaving the need for an additional funding source. A. Louro stated that the Seamen's Bethel wall repair addressed a critical need and that the Mariner's Home chimney repair was less critical and could be funded in a future round. S. Gomes stated the significance of the Bethel as a tourism resource and would base her figure on the applicant's indication not to fund the Mariner's Home in this round.

There was brief discussion regarding the soft costs associated with the budget and R. Nunes stated that the CPA funding request for construction costs within the budget totaled \$143,000. J. Bailey suggested funding the project at \$160,000. J. da Silva stated that for construction projects, soft costs are required for contractor oversight and management and may need to be included. A. Louro indicated that this project would most likely be a controlled construction, requiring the architect's oversight as well. J. Bailey agreed but pointed out that with the limited funds, some items must be eliminated. Members agreed to fund the project at \$160,000 to include \$143,000 of construction costs and \$17,000 of soft costs. Members agreed to revisit it at the end of the allocations to see if there would be additional funding available.

First Baptist Theatre

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$400,000 and she was considering funding less than that amount, perhaps \$175,000. J. Bailey directed member's attention to the project architect's cost estimate and the costs for the Phase1 Exterior Stabilization totaling \$275,500. She indicated that staying with the approach to button up buildings; this amount should address the exterior even if the applicant does not receive anticipated grant funding. R. Nunes stated that he was comfortable with that amount and others agreed as well.

Abolition Row Park

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$231,600 and J. Bailey noted that the budget and application figures for Phase 1 did not reconcile. Her addition of Phase 1 was \$183,958 and there was brief discussion as to whether the statue cost was included or not. In response to S. Gomes, A. Louro confirmed that the project intends to break ground immediately. R. Nunes suggested funding the Clearing and Grubbing only, with A. Louro indicating that was only site preparation with no development. After reviewing the submitted budget, members determine that Phase 1 without the plantings could be funded. Members agreed to fund \$125,000 for Phase 1 subject to the use of the funding for the Site Preparation, Utilities and Site Improvements.

Rotch Jones Duff House

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$75,000. J. Bailey stated that the funding was being matched by an existing Mass Cultural Facilities Grant and addressed a critical need of water infiltration by repairing the RJD roof and gutters and fascia boards of the Coachman House. She suggested funding the requested amount and there was unanimous agreement.

Buttonwood Field Diamond 1 Lighting

J. da Silva noted that the City was seeking \$244,000. Members agreed to fund the full amount. In response to S. Gomes, J. Bailey stated that the full amount should be funded as the two quotes indicated construction and labor costs, and that there were no soft costs associated with the project that possibly could be eliminated. She also indicated that the City also had funds to put toward the total project cost of \$354,000. Members

acknowledged the significant need of improved lighting for the park. J. da Silva stated that she felt that the top City projects that were scheduled for FY19 should be funded in full.

Dias Field

R. Nunes spoke in strong favor of the funding the project in full, noting that it was the only project in Ward 3 and in an area that needs support and additional green space. Members unanimously agreed funding the full amount of \$205,000.

Brooklawn Basketball Court Upgrades

J. da Silva noted that the City was seeking \$121,127 and that in response to the CPC's inquiry, the City indicated that the project could be scheduled for FY19. R. Nunes indicated that with the FY19 timeframe and the need within Ward 2 for the project, he was in support of fully funding the project. S. Gomes confirmed that the funding would be conditional with the project being executed in FY19. Members were in agreement with the condition and the full funding amount.

305-307 Pleasant Street

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$150,000. J. Bailey stated that she had reviewed the budget sent to the members after the public hearing and pulled out the exterior rehabilitation costs. Members reviewed the budget and determined to fund the project at \$105,000 to address the exterior rehabilitation to include demolition, masonry repair, insulation, clapboard siding, flashing, doors and windows. S. Gomes questioned whether this project met the critical need of stabilization and buttoning –up, as the roof was not leaking. J. Bailey stated that the restored housing would provide housing for two families and compared it to the Veterans Transition House as a blended project.

Strand Theatre

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$320,000. Members voiced their concern regarding the capacity of the organization to manage the project and maintain the building, as most of their past major building improvements had been publicly funded. S. Gomes referred to the approach to button-up buildings and to provide an applicant the ability to demonstrate their ability to manage a sizeable project. J. Bailey stated that in this particular project, reviewing the scope of work (SOW) indicated that there is little opportunity to trim items and that the building is currently buttoned-up. A. Louro informed members that the roof was recently funded through CDBG funding as in good shape and that the bulk of the exterior SOW is for the façade restoration. S. Gomes compared this project to the Zeiterion's request for a marquee, and the similar opportunity to revitalize a neighborhood and streetscape by an exterior enhancement.

There was brief discussion regarding the CPC's funding approach to address exterior stabilization, critical needs and the creation of housing by utilizing historic restoration. J. Bailey noted that both the Zeiterion and the Strand are buttoned-up and do not have critical needs, and she is considering not funding the projects in this round due to those factors. In response to S. Gomes question relative to spreading the funding to as many projects as possible, J. da Silva indicated that she was considering funding both theatre projects equally. R. Nunes indicated that he felt there was a distinct difference between rehabilitating an exterior of a theatre building and adding a marquee.

S. Gomes spoke to the capacity of the organization and the distinction between the Strand and the Zeiterion Theatre to leverage funding within the community. S. Gomes advocated providing some amount of funding in order to provide support for an organization that has been slowly addressing the building rehabilitation. There was review of the scope of work and budget with the purpose to identify items to possibly fund which demonstrated that the exterior work items were comprehensive and costly. S. Gomes did not think it would equitable to fund the Zeiterion and not the Strand, particularly when the Zeiterion has greater capacity to raise private money. J. Bailey recommended providing \$50,000 for general exterior rehabilitation to allow them to utilize it in the best manner with the encouragement to return in the next round for further funding.

River's End Park

S. Gomes stated that she was not in favor of bonding or in favor of funding non shovel-ready projects. She indicated that she felt that all of the City projects were good and that the City now had four priority projects which are scheduled to be executed in FY19. Aligning with her philosophy to fund shovel-ready projects, S. Gomes stated that she was not in favor of this project. J. da Silva agreed with S. Gomes' philosophy and stated that she had only funded the four priority FY19 projects and asked that if the other members did the same, then there was no need to discuss the remaining City projects. J. Bailey and R. Nunes indicated that they also only provided funding for the four priority FY19 projects. A. Louro inquired whether the members were considering the West Beach Boathouse, as it was a FY19 project. S. Gomes stated that she likes the project and the intended use of the building, but was having trouble with the high amount requested. J. da Silva felt that a more detailed budget was required. A. Louro stated that the rest of the building rehabilitation was being funded through a Capital Improvement Bond which the City Council was considering that night. There was discussion that perhaps the Capital Improvement Bond could supplement the roof repair. E. Safioleas stated that the size of the roof and the waterfront location affects the roof specifications and costs. P. Pacheco agreed with E. Safioleas relative to the building location and need for storm resistant construction. Members agreed that they would return to the matter.

Members agreed not to fund the rest of the City projects (Riverside Park, Monte Park, Cove/Harborwalk Entrances, Buttonwood Parking Lot Rehabilitation and Buttonwood Path Lighting) not because they were unfavorable projects, but because they were not shovel-ready. J. Bailey also indicated that the Buttonwood Pond Parking Lot project should return as a Recreation project specific to water quality enhancement.

Southcoast Scenic Greenway

J. Bailey stated that the Westport CPC had recommended favorably their portion of the funding to Town Meeting, which had not yet voted. A. Louro noted that this project was a good example of how funding conditions could be utilized, providing the example of withholding the funding until some or all of the other communities agree to fund the project as well. S. Gomes stated that she was in favor of funding the project only if all of the three other communities agree to fund it as well. A. Louro had concerns relative to Fall River, as the applicant had stated that they had not yet approached them due to some ongoing trail issues in that community. In addition a Fall River based non-profit group which sent the CPC a communication has been a vocal critic of the project. She advised the members that they could condition it on all of the other communities, or two of the three, as the application stated that the feasibility study could be completed with \$30-\$40,000. J. Bailey stated that she did not want to tie up \$10,000 waiting for other communities, and although it was a good project, she did not view it as a critical need. A. Louro noted that the next funding round would begin in September which would allow time to see whether the other communities would commit funding. J. da Silva stated that she felt that it was a small amount, but R. Nunes stated that he would prefer to see that \$10,000 go towards a shovel-ready project such as the Seamen's Bethel. Members decided to set a placeholder on the application and revisit it at the end.

Sgt. William Carney House

S. Gomes and J. da Silva recused themselves from the matter and left the room during the discussion. R. Nunes stated that the applicant was seeking \$53,800 for the project and discussed the matching grants not being received. J. Bailey stated that this was a significant building within the community. R. Nunes expressed his concern relative to the organizations' capacity to raise the other funds, since the grants were not received. Members reviewed the scope of work and budget and noted that the \$53,800 would allow for the exterior painting of the structure and that the items would have to be funded through another source. Members agreed to fund the application in full.

There was brief discussion regarding projects' use of matching funds associated with grants. A. Glassman asked whether it would be prudent that CPA funding be contingent on matching funds being available. J. Bailey warned against that, as grant funding is always flexible, and if a certain grant is not received another could take its place, or funding could be leveraged from another source. A. Glassman noted his concern that perhaps some projects

could not be completed without the matching funds. It was confirmed with staff that as part of the grant agreement, staff would review the scope of work with the applicants and that the funding was reimbursable based on work completed.

S. Gomes and J. da Silva rejoined the meeting.

Buttonwood Brook Trails

There was brief discussion regarding the change in the application funding from the original amount of \$255,000 which would fund a study and implementation to the revised amount of \$30,000 to fund an engineering study alone. J. da Silva spoke favorably regarding the use of pre-project studies and the value they bring to a project. Members agreed to fund the revised application in full at \$26,000.

Buttonwood Park Outdoor Fitness Equipment

Members discussed whether the equipment idea was better suited for a warmer climate, as was depicted in the video presentation. There was concern commercializing the park, the long-term maintenance not being addressed, and the lack of critical need. S. Gomes stated that she liked the concept, although she recognized other members' concerns.

Mariner's Home

J. da Silva noted that members had previously agreed, and with the request of the applicant, to take the project out of consideration to shift the funding towards the Seamen's Bethel, which had a more critical need with the recognition that they could come back in the next funding round.

Talbot Apartments

S. Gomes stated that she did not understand the applicant's public presentation and although she is not a historic preservation expert, she does have common sense, and recognized that the applicant's proposal did not meet the historic preservation criteria. She recognized its gateway location, but was not inclined to fund it. R. Nunes and J. Bailey agreed. J. da Silva stated that she wanted to fund \$20,000 as a means of protecting the property through a preservation restriction. A. Louro presented a suggestion for members' consideration. She noted that the applicant's quotes were from contractors who do not have a background in historic preservation rehabilitation and suggested providing a smaller funding amount to fund an exterior envelope assessment of the building by a qualified entity. This would allow the project to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and move forward in the next funding round. S. Gomes questioned the need of a study. A. Louro and J. da Silva stated that the project had meaningful outcomes, but the applicant was not taking the right approach, which the study would provide. The funding amount was briefly discussed with the determination that \$6,000 would be sufficient for the assessment. Members briefly discussed the outcome of the building if funding was not utilized and agreed that providing the ability to approach the rehabilitation appropriately should be funded. Members agreed that the funding was conditioned for the assessment only and the need for a preservation restriction.

James Arnold Mansion

J. da Silva noted that the applicant was seeking \$250,000. S. Gomes recognized the historical significance of the building but voiced her concerns relative to the organizations' business plan and operating budget. J. da Silva stated her desire to fund a portion of the project to help ensure the work is done correctly. S. Gomes questioned the past deferred maintenance and the capacity of the applicant to continue maintaining the structure. J. da Silva acknowledged that many non profits defer maintenance and that addressing a critical need with an influx of funding can turn things around. There was brief discussion regarding the overlap of the JAMI and the Wamsutta Club and the different business plans. J. Bailey noted her concerns relative to capacity and the organization's long term plan, but recognized the building's significance, the current improvements and the synergy now associated with the property. Members reviewed the budget to determine which portions addressed a critical need and determined to fund the slate roof repair, insulation, copper flashing, window and foundation repair for \$48,000.

Butler's Flat Lighthouse

S. Gomes noted her admiration for the lighthouse and its iconic status, but shared her concerns regarding the high cost, lack of public access, the applicants' lack of non-profit status and no demonstrated experience with this type of project management. R. Nunes noted the members' consensus on the project as it scored the lowest of all the projects submitted. Members briefly discussed the lighthouse disposition and the reasoning why the City did not purchase the lighthouse, with A. Louro stating that the City hoped that a private entity, particularly with non-profit status, would be better positioned to leverage funding. J. Bailey recommended that the applicant should come back to the CPC once the non-profit certification is received. She also noted that the applicant most likely will be unable to receive other grant funding until that certification is in place; however she noted that there are numerous maritime and lighthouse grant funding sources available. Members agreed the application was thorough and A. Louro stated that Pare Engineering worked on the Palmer's Lighthouse. Members agreed that the small amount of funding they could provide in this round would not address the needs of the project and encouraged the project to return once the non-profit certification was in place. There was brief discussion relative to providing some funding conditioned on receiving non-profit status, however everyone agreed it would be foolish to tie up funding when they can return in a future funding round.

Zeiterion Theatre Marquee Project

Members discussed the requested amount exceeding the available funding. A. Louro presented a suggestion for the members' consideration. She noted that the project was seeking funding for both design and implementation. She stated that if there was insufficient funding for the entire application, the Committee could consider funding the design in this round which would have the benefit of providing a better base for construction costs, at which time the applicant could return for construction and implementation funding. Members reviewed the budget and determined that the architectural fees were \$49,524 which they attributed to design. Review of the submitted budget demonstrated that the scope of work was scheduled over two years, with year one to complete the design study and year two for construction and installation. Members agreed with the two year approach and appropriated \$50,000 to the design of the marquee.

West Beach Boathouse

Members struggled with the funding of the project due to the vague estimates provided and thought it should return with a more specific scope and budget. R. Nunes informed members that he received confirmation the West Beach Boathouse City Bond had received a favorable vote at City Council that night. S. Gomes stated that she liked that project, as she thought it would be a good opportunity for a small city business operation.

After review of the funding drawdown Ross Nunes suggested providing an additional \$35,000 to the Acushnet Saw Mill Expansion to provide full funding with member agreement. J. Bailey suggested funding an additional \$15,000 to the Seamen's Bethel leaving \$1300 within the CPA budget; however R. Nunes suggested giving the Bethel an additional \$6,396, leaving \$10,000 within the account with member agreement. J. da Silva believed that it was favorable that the CPC spent 99% of its first round funding for community projects.

Members reviewed the project spreadsheet which demonstrated that the funding was distributed geographically throughout the city.

Staff informed members that the funding recommendation sheet would be provided to the City Councilors. A. Louro described the sections of the form and explained that she and Eddie would fill them in. J. Bailey asked that the budget be relocated to the back of the form and the City Ward added to the location.

There was discussion relative to the City Council presentation with the agreement that the projects would be presented by funding category.

Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, May 8, 2018.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by J. Bailey and seconded by E. Safioleas. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Documents and Exhibits

- Agenda
- Application Presentations
- CPA Criteria
- CPA Budget
- FY19 Project Funding Spreadsheet
- FY19 Project Scoring Rank
- Project Condition Examples
- Project Recommendation Form

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro
DPHCD Staff

Approved: 05.08.18