



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

October 24, 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
Sylvia Gomes

Arthur Motta
Ross Nunes
Elaine Safioleas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ABSENT:

Dennis Audette

Tim Walsh

STAFF:

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

Call to Order

Co-Chair J. Da Silva called the meeting to order at 6:11 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 S. Gomes to approve the October 5, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unopposed.

Old Business

Administrative Fund Uses and Protocol

A. Louro reviewed a request from the last meeting that she follow up with Somerville's CPA administrator to determine their activities funded by their administrative fund. She informed the Committee that she was unable to gain that information, as Somerville's administrator was out on maternity leave; however she reiterated the types of uses allowed including printing, legal notices, consultant fees and part-time personnel salary. A. Louro noted the discussion regarding the use of administrative funds for signage and stated that the potential costs of signs were being investigated by staff.

J. Bailey asked about model expenditure amounts with A. Louro explaining that she had previously provided Somerville's CPA Administrative Fund expenditure policy as a model; however the Committee could vote on a policy that they felt comfortable with. There was discussion regarding threshold amounts with Staff stating that generally printing and legal notices were less than \$500.00. C. Dawicki stated that she felt comfortable authorizing staff to spend less than \$1000, and that allocations above \$1000 require a vote of the Committee. E. Bates stated that a part-time CPA administrator had been discussed at the last meeting and that DPHCD Director Patrick Sullivan would explore that position further if the Committee wished. Members stated that they had asked to have Mr. Sullivan appear before the Committee to have that discussion.

MOTION to authorize administrative staff to spend up to \$1000 from the CPA Administrative Fund for expenditures related to the CPA, any expenditure above \$1000 is presented to the Committee for approval and the policy to be revisited in one year's time.

Moved by S. Gomes and seconded by J. Bailey.

Motion passed 7-0.

Arthur Motta asked that CPA expenditures be used for city vendors when reasonable. A. Louro noted that the use of city vendors is always a goal, but not always feasible, as the city has established contracts and retainers with consulting firms and vendors outside of the city. J. da Silva noted the often difficulty of finding specialized services within the city, and there was agreement that the word "preference" was important.

MOTION that CPA staff and committee utilize best faith efforts and give preference to city vendors and firms for the provision of goods and services allocated from the Administrative Fund.

Moved by Arthur Motta and seconded by S. Gomes.

Motion passed 7-0.

Application Evaluation Criteria

C. Dawicki stated that she had performed research related to how other CPA communities evaluated project proposals and met with staff to develop a scoring rubric which would provide a numerical score allowing members to utilize the same definitions in their evaluations. She noted that the rubric appeared to be the best practice versus a simple yes/no answers, or the use of subjective point schemes. Laying out the potential evaluation time frame, C. Dawicki noted that the rubric would allow committee members to score the proposals at home over the holidays using the same foundation of criteria. Members would submit their scores to staff who would aggregate the data in an effort to distinguish high and low scores to determine which proposals would be considered for interviews. C. Dawicki reiterated the importance of using a numerical score for documentation purposes while providing committee members a straightforward evaluation process.

C. Dawicki referred to the draft scoring rubric which was based on the CPC's criteria. A. Louro explained that staff reviewed other CPA community best practices and developed two scoring charts-one evaluating the project proposal, and the other evaluating the applicant and application materials, reviewing the quality of the application, capacity, experience and financial administration of the proposers.

There was member discussion regarding the use of scoring on the Primary, Secondary and Category Criteria with J. Bailey suggesting the merit of scoring the Category Criteria, separate from the overall project criteria, as proposals within each category may require evaluation amongst each other. C. Dawicki advised against giving the category specific criteria a numeric value due to the inequity of the criterion between the categories. Members agreed that Category Criteria would be evaluated with a yes/no for evaluation purposes. It was noted that there appeared to be overlap between the charts and C. Dawicki suggested utilizing the rubric for evaluating the Primary Criteria, which as drafted, was a stand-alone entity with no scoring attached. Members agreed and staff stated that they would move the Primary Criteria into the rubric and keep the eligibility evaluation separate.

Members briefly discussed the final format of the evaluation materials to be in Excel and to include a comment and a question box for each project in order for the questions for each project to be aggregated by staff. It was agreed upon that a draft of the evaluation form would be provided to the committee for review at the November meeting.

A. Motta questioned the importance of weighting the evaluations with C. Dawicki explaining that using a numerical value is useful in separating advantageous proposals from those which are less advantageous. J. da Silva stated that in her opinion, the use of a numeric based rubric provided the most objective form of evaluation.

C. Dawicki brought up the need to formulate an evaluation process for the project interviews and the need to begin developing a portfolio based on CPC values. The factors which determine the portfolio could for example include geographic distribution, projects spread among categories, and the limitation of projects from a single applicant. The development of a portfolio would require discussion at a later date and could be determined based on a number of factors. J. Bailey acknowledged that the committee had the authority to make those determinations but that the committee needed to be clear and transparent in its decision making.

New Business

Eligibility Determination Form Submittal Update

J. da Silva directed the attention of the members to the matrix which staff developed to illustrate the thirty six eligibility forms submitted for funding consideration. Prior to reviewing the submissions, staff apprised the Committee of a telephone conference they had with Stuart Saginor, Executive director of the Community Preservation Coalition, in which together they assessed the submitted projects for eligibility purposes.

Members briefly discussed the geographic distribution of the submitted eligibility forms and Eddie Bates stated that he could map the locations using a city ward map as the base layer. Updating the City Council on the current CPA process and timelines was discussed with J. Bailey suggested using the map as part of a communication tool for the City Council. Members asked staff to advise Patrick Sullivan to update the City Council President on the current CPC matters related to the application process.

Staff reviewed the submitted eligibility forms, briefly discussing each project proposal, its CPA category, project location, and eligibility under CPA regulations.

E. Bates explained the Attorney General's Receivership Program which the City participates in to rehabilitate blighted properties within neighborhoods. E. Bates explained that two project submittals were participating in the Receivership Program and because they were technically owned by another entity, would require court authorization for the required property restrictions.

Two projects proposing recreation on private property –Manjiro and Cuffe Park- were briefly discussed with staff relaying Stuart Saginor's comments of concern related to recreation proposals on private property. Staff explained that the projects were technically eligible but prohibitive due to the associated challenges of subdividing lots, developing and recording the conservation restriction and the long-term continuance of ensuring and protecting the public's right to access. Based on the size of the lots and the relatively small amount of funding, Mr. Saginor also noted that the costs associated with the conservation restrictions outweighed the benefit of funding. C. Dawicki and J. da Silva asked that staff discuss the associated challenges of the projects with the applicants to ensure that they understood the restraints that potential CPC funding would bring to the project.

There was brief discussion regarding the Ernestina Morrissey proposal with members voicing their concern as to whether New Bedford would remain as its homeport. J. da Silva noted that a preservation restriction would be difficult for a vessel, as most ships are not preserved, but recreated over time due to deterioration. Members agreed that further discussion regarding the project would take place during the Project Application review.

The subject of supplanting took place with A. Louro explaining that projects which have previously received authorized funding from the City Council, or were part of a bond related to a Capital Improvement Plan, could not receive CPC funds as that would be considered supplanting. Staff noted that the Hazelwood Park project put forth by the Department of Parks, Recreation and Beaches may fall under the category of supplanting and that they would seek further information from the applicant. Members asked if the Covewalk/Harborwalk Entrances project would also qualify as supplanting due to the fact that the project had already started. Again, staff stated that they would explore that possibility with the applicant.

The Phillips Avenue Pocket Park and Philips Avenue School projects were briefly discussed with staff explaining that ownership was a challenge with both of the properties. Staff noted that the pocket park was a tax title property that may require deeding to the Park Department and that the school was being disposed of through a Request for Proposals process whose award for ownership would most likely not align itself with the CPA funding timeline.

Next Meeting Date

Tuesday, November 28, 2017.

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 8:01 p.m.

Documents and Exhibits

- Agenda
- October 5, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- CPA Eligibility Form Submission Matrix

Respectfully submitted,



Anne Louro
DPHCD Staff