



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

November 28, 2017

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Janine da Silva, Co Chair
Colleen Dawicki, Co Chair
Jessica Bailey, Clerk
Dennis Audette
Sylvia Gomes

Arthur Motta **Arrived: 6:37**
Ross Nunes **Departed: 7:15**
Elaine Safioleas
Tim Walsh

STAFF:

Patrick Sullivan, *DPHCD Director* **Departed: 7:15**
Gloria McPherson, *City Planner*
Edward Bates, *Neighborhood Planner*
Anne Louro, *Preservation Planner*

Call to Order

Co-Chair C. Dawicki 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 J. Bailey and seconded by R. Nunes to approve the October 24, 2017 meeting minutes with a page numbering change. Motion passed unopposed.

Old Business

Application Evaluation Criteria

C. Dawicki referred to the scoring rubric intended to be used to evaluate the funding applications and noted that Staff had developed an electronic version for the Committee's review and asked A. Louro to discuss the formatting.

A. Louro reviewed the scoring rubric with the Committee and explained that Staff had incorporated changes discussed at the last meeting. She noted that the Primary Criteria, which was previously a separate rubric, had been incorporated into the general weighted score evaluation. She explained that the Secondary Criteria received partial weighted scores based on the number of criteria met, and that the Project Category Criteria remained separate.

Reviewing the Project Category Criteria, A. Louro stated that the criteria receives points as a means to distinguish closely scored projects within each category, however those points do not populate into the overall score.

A. Louro called attention to the Financial Administration category within the rubric and explained that two criteria which were previously identified as Secondary Criteria had been placed within this category. She explained that as a result of staff discussions, the criteria were relocated to the weighted rubric to reflect their importance as they were indicators of an applicant's ability to manage a project and its affiliated finances.

A. Louro explained that the evaluation rubric was developed to be user-friendly and scored electronically. She noted that the check box selection populated the numerical score and that staff had incorporated the committee's desire to break down the final score into its comparative ranking. She stated that based on the anticipated number of project applications, the electronic worksheet allowed the scoring to reverse populate into a single location providing staff the ability to easily aggregate each individual reviewer's score.

J. Bailey asked if the Category Specific Criteria, although it would not populate into the overall score, could be able to populate into the worksheet for reviewer and staff reference. A. Louro indicated that it would be possible to formulate that request.

D. Audette initiated a discussion regarding projects receiving numerous grants in order to reach completion and how that should affect their scoring. Staff and committee members indicated that the categories of Financial Administration and Capacity could address that issue and C. Dawicki stated that the Notes section would be useful to place that information for discussion during deliberation. T. Walsh sought clarification regarding D. Audette's concerns, with D. Audette explaining that he would prefer to fund small, first-time projects over multi-year projects seeking numerous grants. T. Walsh and others stated that they understood that certain large projects are phased; requiring multiple sources of funding and often takes several years to execute.

A. Louro brought up the previously discussed process of preliminarily scoring project proposals with the intention of eliminating low scoring projects from the presentation process. She stated that Staff wished to present to the Committee for their consideration, a course of action in which all applicants would participate in the presentation process in order to provide equity. S. Gomes indicated her preference to provide all applicants the opportunity to present their proposal.

Staff reviewed a potential schedule in which members would evaluate the proposals on their own time over the holidays and that the committee would reconvene in January to review the proposals. At that time there could be preliminary scoring, however the final scoring would not be executed until after the project presentations. There was brief member discussion regarding the schedule and timing of the rankings within the process. P. Sullivan recommended that members score the proposals autonomously, formulate notes and finalize their scoring after the interviews. He cautioned against scoring in phases.

C. Dawicki questioned the setting of a policy of interviewing all proposals regardless of their quality. J. Bailey did not fully agree with a policy of providing all applicants the ability to present. S. Gomes advocated that all applicants should be afforded that opportunity and that it provided equity. E. Bates reiterated S. Gomes statement of the equity provided to all applicants and the added benefit of transparency by providing the same process for everyone.

There was brief discussion regarding the Committee meeting prior to project presentations, the potential to formulate interview questions and whether the preliminary scoring would be opened or closed. It was determined that all project applicants would participate in a presentations and scoring would remain closed until after the final project presentations. C. Dawicki suggested that the Committee move on to the agenda item of the Presentation Meeting Format, as that discussion would address some of the Committee's concerns.

Project Presentation Meeting Format

C. Dawicki asked Staff if they could provide insight as to how other CPA communities conducted their project presentations. A. Louro indicated that some communities are informal, asking the applicant questions, while Somerville has the applicants provide a five minute PowerPoint presentation which appears to be based on a template provided by the CPC. A. Louro also indicated that the presentations would take place in the format of a public hearing, most likely in a large public meeting room to accommodate members of the public and would be televised by cable access.

Members discussed the potential format of the presentations as well as the efficiency of the presentations with the CPC providing guiding points for the applicants to use in their presentation. There was consensus that the Committee would hold a meeting prior to the public hearing at which they would review the applications and develop questions or identify items which required clarification. There as consensus that standardized questions would not be applicable to all projects and C. Dawicki asked if Staff could develop a separate form in which questions could be captured for each project.

New Business

Patrick Sullivan Presentation for Administrative Support

Patrick Sullivan, Director of DPHCD addressed the members regarding the potential of hiring CPC administrative staff support. He provided members with a copy of a sample job description and indicated that he is recommending that the CPC hire a part-time administrator to coordinate the CPA program. He noted that New Bedford was one of the only CPA cities that he was aware of that did not have a dedicated staff person, and that most communities, such as Somerville, have a full time administrator. He reiterated that he is suggesting a part-time staffer, not to exceed twenty hours.

There was discussion regarding the potential role and duties of the proposed staffer with T. Walsh seeking clarification as to whether the title and job description was for an Administrative Assistant or a Project Manager, as there would be a compensation differential. Members discussed the need to adhere to the city residency requirement and there was clarification that the position would most likely be contractual; under the supervision of the DPHCD and the CPC. Members cautioned against the use of a consultant and briefly discussed logistics of work space and access to the city's computer data base.

C. Dawicki sought clarification regarding the work responsibilities of the proposed position, noting that much of the one-time structures and processes have been previously developed and the upcoming project management work load is unclear. P. Sullivan described some anticipated tasks related to the project management and the role of the administrator stating that grant administration is time consuming and that overall, the administration of the CPA program has strained the capacity of the DPHCD.

J. Bailey, S. Gomes, A. Motta and C. Dawicki expressed concern related to potential public criticism of the CPC hiring administrative staff prior to the dispersion of project funding and the ability to document the amount of time spent administrating the program as a means to deflect potential criticism. R. Nunes and T. Walsh did not share the concern and recognized the need for a part-time administrator, especially since other CPA communities similar to New Bedford have found value in that position.

MOTION to empower Patrick Sullivan to seek authorization from the City’s Personnel Department to establish a CPA part-time administrative position and that he would provide to the CPC the job description and salary classification for review and approval prior to the job posting.

Moved by T. Walsh and seconded by E. Safioleas.

Motion passed on a Roll Call Vote

J. da Silva	Yes
C. Dawicki	Yes
J. Bailey	Yes
D. Audette	Yes
S. Gomes	No
A. Motta	Yes
R. Nunes	Yes
E. Safioleas	Yes
T. Walsh	Yes

C. Dawicki suggested, and there was consensus, for the formation of a sub-committee to work with DPHCD in the framing of the job description and classification for the part-time administrative assistant position.

Review of Grant Agreement; Review of City MOA; Review of Project Disbursement Guidelines;

Review of Standard Preservation Restriction; Review of Standard Conservation Restriction

Staff briefly explained the types of legal documents related to funded projects. Staff explained that these are standard documents that have been reviewed by the City Solicitor, and in the case of the restrictions, standardized documents required by state agencies as well.

Members briefly reviewed a map that E. Bates developed demonstrating the geographic distribution of the projects that submitted Eligibility Forms. It was suggested that the map could potentially supplement the CPC’s project recommendations to the City Council.

Staff updated members regarding project eligibility changes since the last meeting. The Zeiterion Theatre project which was initially determined to be ineligible had a change status to being eligible and would be submitting a funding application. The Cuffe Park and Manjiro Park projects, although determined to be eligible projects, had indicated that they would not be submitting funding applications due to the significance of the related Conservation Restrictions.

Staff informed members that the proposed city projects would be seeking bonding through the CPA. It was briefly explained that the CPA budget would carry a debt service, most likely for a ten year period. Staff explained that the bonding proposal was recently brought to the attention of the DPHCD, and that the city’s CFO, Ari Sky, may be able to attend a CPC meeting to better explain the bond’s effect on the CPA budget. C. Dawicki asked that an invitation be sent to Ari Sky to present to the Committee at that he be placed on the December meeting agenda.

Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, December 20, 2017.

Due to a scheduling conflict with a meeting of the Conservation Commission, the scheduled CPC meeting of Tuesday, December 19th, was rescheduled to Wednesday, December 20th. It was requested that CPC members would receive a flash drive and hard copies of the applications as well as an electronic version of the Evaluation Worksheet, a Question Table and Instructions.

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was moved by D. Audette and seconded by T. Walsh. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Documents and Exhibits

- Agenda
- October 24, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- Comparative Evaluation Matrix
- CPA Administrative Assistant Job Description

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro

DPHCD Staff

Approved: 12.20.17