



Community Preservation Committee Meeting

Thursday, July 17, 2025 at 7:00 PM
149 Main Street, City Hall, Lower Hearing Room

Agenda

Pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, the meeting and public hearing will be conducted with remote opportunities for participation. Remote participation and access methods include:

ACCESS INFORMATION:

- A. This meeting will be held on July 17th at 7PM. Location: City Hall, 149 Main Street, Lower Hearing Room
- B. The meeting will be recorded through WCATV (Watertown Cable Access Television): <http://vodwcatv.org/CablecastPublicSite/watch-now?site=3>
- C. The Public may join the virtual meeting online: <https://watertown-ma.zoom.us/j/91525442843>
- D. Public may join the virtual meeting audio only by phone: (877) 853-5257 or (888) 475-4499 (Toll Free) and enter Webinar ID: 915 2544 2843
- E. Public may comment through email: lhandy@watertown-ma.gov
- F. Please Visit the Community Preservation Committee Website here: <https://www.watertown-ma.gov/352/Community-Preservation-Committee>

-
1. Call to Order
 2. Acceptance of Minutes
 - A. 2025-6-26-Draft-CPC-Minutes
 3. CPA Financials
 - A. CPA Funds as of 2025-6-26
 - B. Community Preservation Coalition Membership Renewal
 4. Coordinator Update
 - A. CPA Projects Financial Reports
 5. Committee Discussion
 - A. Onboarding New Members and Leadership Transition Planning
 - B. Community Preservation Committee and Affordable Housing Trust Relationship
 6. Re-vote of 6/26/25 Motions
 - A. Acceptance of 2025-4-17-Draft-CPC-Minutes
 - B. Acceptance of 2025-5-15-Draft-CPC-Minutes
 - C. Election of Temporary Officers

7. Adjourn

Mark Kraczkiewicz, Chair
Jonathan Bockian, Vice Chair
Bob DiRico

Dennis J. Duff
Allen Gallagher
Abigail Hammett

Jamie O'Connell
Matthew Walter

CPA Public Hearing 6/26/25 – Public Comments via Email

Hi, my name is Jacob Smith and I live at 7 Hosmer St. I wanted to provide a public comment to the CPC via email given the difficulties with the Zoom meeting on 26-Jun-2025.

I am excited by the Willow Park Redevelopment project. Watertown has a large, unmet need for affordable housing and would like to see more CPA funds being used for this purpose in the future. I would ask the CPC to take an aggressive approach towards funding affordable housing projects in its next five-year plan.

To that end, I would also like the CPC to consider routine, annual disbursement of CPA funds to the Watertown Affordable Housing Trust. Granting funds for affordable housing directly to the AHT will allow Watertown to better leverage the expertise we have within the Trust and also allows more flexibility in regards to funding housing projects as they will not be subject to an annual application cycle. Sixty-five CPA communities are already providing funding to their AHTs not tied to a specific project, so this is not a novel approach.

My name is Kevin Ryan, I live at 80 Edgecliff Rd. and am part of Housing for All Watertown

After listening to many meetings over the past couple of years and reviewing the website including applications and awards, I'd like to offer the following comments:

1. I'd like to see more CPA money designated to be used for housing
2. I'd like to see proactive coordination between the CPC and the Affordable Housing Trust (AHT), led by the CPC, to help determine the best use of CPA funds for housing and to implement it
3. I'm confused by the term limits on the website. It seems like a number of CPC members have served past their term limits. Please adjust the website and/or committee policy to align with each other. I believe term limits should exist, are important, and should be enforced.
4. Consider putting out a notice of funds available-especially to housing operators and developers. I'm somewhat surprised by the low volume of applications

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin

Dear CPC,

I can't attend the annual public meeting, but I wanted my email read into the record during the meeting. Please note, I'm not speaking for any group with whom I am affiliated. I'd like to know why the CPC only allocated the minimum 10% to housing since it is not logical to not fund Watertown's biggest and most unmet need to the maximum available. With approximately \$23.206 million on hand, the CPC must reassess the allocation decision, especially when the city is having to make cuts because of the current federal administration. The housing allocation should at the very least be 55% to deal with the housing crisis effectively, and the reserve should only be 20% per usual business practice.

I'd also like an explanation of the expenditures. The expenditures "Personnel" and "Purchased Services" are unclear, and this makes it difficult to assess if 5% is necessary. It may very well be necessary. Please provide some clarity. Regardless, the CPA was adopted by the city because Watertown residents voted nearly 2:1 in favor of adoption. Watertown residents voted to generate these funds and to have said funds spent on items listed under the act. Sitting on the money, in effect, thwarts the will of the people.

Per previous CPC Budgets, historical preservation projects and open space projects have regularly had money awarded to them. I've heard reasoning along the lines that funding requests for housing projects have not come in. However, the reasoning cannot assume lack of want or need. I see ways in which the CPC can bring in more housing project requests. First, more education and outreach to the public is necessary. The CPC has to educate organizations, developers and the public in what housing-related projects CPC money can fund. It is my understanding the members do attend Community Preservation Coalition trainings. Does the public know that funds can be requested for the following?

mixed-income developments and workforce housing

rental assistance and first time home buyer programs

the purchase of land for future affordable housing

adaptive reuse; convert underutilized commercial spaces into affordable housing

Senior & Special Needs Housing

Secondly, the unusual direct involvement of the CPC in reviewing these projects creates an onerous request process. Having the CPC add another layer of review on project specs is redundant, if not detrimental especially with complex issues involved housing. This appears to be evident in the case of 103 Nichols, the housing project for intellectually disabled individuals. The situation requires specialized knowledge. There is no expert on persons with

intellectual disabilities on the CPC, and as a result, the delays to this project could be seen as bordering on exclusion. The Affordable Housing Trust made a special call out for more senior and disability housing during its Annual Planning meeting. So there is an urgency to address this need. I am very disappointed with the status of 103 Nichols.

Going forward, I'd like to see the CPC increase the allocation for housing above the legal requirement to realistically address the housing crisis. Clarification on administrative expenditures is also needed to understand the allocation more fully. It is also incumbent upon the CPC to educate organizations, developers and the public on available funds and what can be funded; putting out a Notice Of Funds Available more frequently would help. Finally, the CPC should concentrate on financials and feasibility of projects, such as has the organization secured funding before or do the developers specialize in the area.

Thanks,

Rita Colafella
56 Cuba Street

Hello!

I wanted to email my comment as I am unable to attend the annual meeting.

Recently, I have learned a lot more about CPCs and how other CPCs have operated in other municipalities (such as Arlington, Lexington, Malden, Cambridge, etc.)

I would like to express how much I hope CPC and AHT can work more together. As Watertown continues to navigate our affordable homes crisis, I find it imperative that resources from CPC are more easily funneled through AHT in some capacity. Or at least used to support more affordable housing projects in collaboration with AHT.

65+ MA communities have grant agreements with their CPCs that give AHT a specific amount each year. These agreements also require AHT to give details on amount, how it will be used, timelines, reporting, etc. It seems like something that would be great to replicate in Watertown!

I am so grateful for a project like Willow Park to receive tremendous funding from CPC with support from AHT. It makes me see so much potential for trusted organizations to help our residents when that funding is more accessible. I hope the CPC and AHT can see the same thing.

On a related but different topic, I noticed that CPA's 2025 total fund balance after Willow Park's appropriation is \$13,157,990. And in 2024 and 2023, it was ~14 million and ~\$12 million respectively. This seems like a lot of funds to be kept in reserves that could be used for

projects that have long-lasting impacts on our community. Is this much in reserves really necessary for the CPC? Or is it more because of a lack of projects asking for these funds?

Thank you!

- Brian Ho
31 Elton Ave

Housing for All Watertown Steering Committee PUBLIC COMMENT for 7/17/25 CPC

The Steering Committee of Housing for All Watertown welcomes the opportunity to offer public comment as part of the CPC's Annual Public Hearing. After attending CPC's 6/26 Public Hearing, we were encouraged by the CPC's discussion about the possibility of creating a Grant Agreement with Watertown's Affordable Housing Trust. A collaboration where significant funding is provided not for a specific project but instead in support of a mutually agreed-upon strategic plan, accountable to real metrics, will afford the experts on the Trust the resources and flexibility to maximize affordable housing development in our city.

These general purpose Grant Agreements are commonplace among Massachusetts communities that have adopted the Community Preservation Act; in fact, over 60 communities already have existing agreements. They typically include specific conditions that give the AHT direct access to needed funds, while still ensuring wise deployment of the taxpayer dollars and a CPC accountability process. In Watertown's case, the AHT could potentially access funds on the spot should an opportunity arise to purchase a site.

The statewide Community Preservation Coalition provides a [sample](#) grant agreement for appropriations to a housing trust, which Watertown's CPC can use as a template for its agreement with the Watertown AHT. This sample was drafted by the Coalition and includes detailed comments explaining how communities can customize the agreement for their particular situation. The Watertown CPC can also review specific communities' agreements to see how they've used these contracts, such as [Malden's](#).

We believe that establishing a partnership with the AHT would demonstrate wise leadership and a responsible use of CPC funds for two key reasons:

- Imminent, drastic cuts in federal housing funding will exacerbate our existing housing shortage and disproportionately affect Watertown's low and very low-income residents, who are already on the edge of not being able to afford housing. As a community, we must be looking for every possible lever to pull to generate more affordable housing; by empowering our Affordable Housing Trust with increased

funding and flexibility, we will maximize the odds of securing additional sites for affordable housing development.

- Our AHT members are Watertown’s housing experts. They have professional experience in planning, financing, and building affordable housing, and can be trusted partners in judiciously spending taxpayer money.

As a next step, we would suggest hosting [Shelly Goehring](#) from the Massachusetts Housing Partnership for a presentation on how the CPC and AHT can most effectively collaborate. Shelly is one of the foremost experts in the state on how to construct grant agreements between CPCs and AHTs, and we believe that she can help Watertown leverage other communities’ experiences to great effect. We would be happy to facilitate an introduction if it would be helpful.

Given the CPC’s measured approach to funding projects to date, it has accumulated one of the largest balances of any community in the state. While we appreciate the CPC’s desire to be responsible stewards of “the people’s purse”, our money does no one any good simply sitting in a bank account. As taxpayers and housing advocates, we believe that now is the moment to move with greater purpose, and we urge the CPC to take the next step in developing more affordable housing in Watertown in partnership with the AHT.

Thank you for your consideration.

Housing for All Watertown Steering Committee

Hello,

I am writing to express my support for creating affordable housing for all in Watertown. Housing should be accessible and available for all of us-not some of us. Children and families deserve a place to live and call home.

Housing insecurity creates stress and trauma for families. I want Watertown to be part of the solution.

Thank you,

Holly Cachimuel
301 Lexington Street

Hello,

I am a Watertown resident and homeowner, and I wanted to write to express my support for spending more Community Preservation Act funding on affordable housing and open space. The entire Boston area is in a housing crisis, and we should do what we can to make it easier

for more people to live in the places we're proud to call home. As a resident taxpayer, I support my taxes going to this important effort.

Thank you,

Sasha Albert
25 Copeland Street

Dear Lanae Handy,

I'll try to be brief out of respect for your valuable time as the Community Preservation Committee's Coordinator. I respectfully request that the Committee allocates more funds towards the creation of more affordable housing in Watertown. I also request that the Committee consider pooling resources with the Affordable Housing Trust. Such a partnership can be mutually beneficial for both organizations and more importantly for families that are in need of housing.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Regards,

James Caffery
27 Hillcrest Circle

Dear Lanae,

I'm writing to you as a Watertown resident on the topic of allocating funds that the the Community Preservation Committee has collected towards affordable housing projects in Watertown. The median household income in Watertown has rapidly increased year-to-year, making the prevalence of affordable housing an increasingly important issue. Watertown has the largest unspent coffin of funds out of all communities in Massachusetts. I would urge you to please consider working with the Affordable Housing Trust to allocate these funds towards affordable housing initiatives.

Best,

Dhruv Kedar
30 Irma Street, #2

Summary of Watertown CPA Fund Activity (as of 06/30/2025)

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	YTD 2025
Beginning CPA Cash Balance								
Total Fund Balance		1,449,397	3,201,838	5,058,390	7,407,100	9,897,899	12,071,746	14,218,495
Total Category Reserves		450,000	1,160,217	1,904,637	2,684,637	3,272,805	3,843,640	3,480,390
Total Expenditures/Encumbrances				37,150	23,120	327,195	1,046,644	2,414,120
Total CPA Funds		1,899,397	4,362,055	7,000,177	10,114,857	13,497,899	16,962,030	20,113,005
Estimated Annual Revenue								
CPA Surcharge	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,250,000	2,350,000	2,500,000	2,700,000	2,915,000	3,107,000
State Match		367,395	231,400	250,000	551,210	1,000,000	1,085,000	543,000
Total Estimated Revenue	1,500,000	2,367,395	2,481,400	2,600,000	3,051,210	3,700,000	4,000,000	3,650,000
Actual Annual CPA Revenue								
CPA Surcharge	1,899,397	2,080,871	2,163,100	2,511,803	2,386,311	2,744,433	2,995,757	3,130,660
State Match		367,395	498,767	625,041	1,041,504	956,905	578,194	535,797
Interest Income		14,392	23,474	34,927	6,013	7,760	9,373	640,869
Total Actual Revenue	1,899,397	2,462,658	2,685,341	3,171,771	3,433,828	3,709,098	3,583,324	4,307,326
Actual Annual CPA Expenditures								
5% Administrative Expenditures								
Personnel			20,019	40,878	43,557	50,003	46,064	50,614
Purchased Services			27,200	16,213	6,965	12,260	9,702	11,665
Supplies					264	170	127	48
Administrative Expenditures Subtotal			47,219	57,091	50,786	62,433	55,892	62,327
CPA Projects						182,534	376,457	1,078,086
Total Expenditures			47,219	57,091	50,786	244,967	432,349	1,140,413
Ending Cash Balance*	1,899,397	4,362,055	7,000,177	10,114,857	13,497,899	16,962,030	20,113,005	23,279,918

*Ending Cash Balance = Total CPA Funds + Total Actual Revenue - Total Expenditures

Annual Category Reserve Allocation								
10% Open Space	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
10% Historic Preservation	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
10% Community Housing	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
65% Budgeted Reserve	1,050,000	1,657,178	1,612,910	1,690,000	1,983,287	2,405,000	2,600,000	2,372,500
5% Administrative Budget			124,070	130,000	152,560	185,000	200,000	182,500
Total Specific Reserve Allocations	1,500,000	2,367,395	2,481,400	2,600,000	3,051,210	3,700,000	4,000,000	3,650,000

City of Watertown
CPA Category Reserves Activity (as of 6/30/2025)

Category Reserves								YTD
CPA Project Expenditures	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Open Space/Outdoor Recreation								
Prior Balance	-	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	905,805	1,156,000	
10% Allocation	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
Appropriation Not Used							59,121	
Total Appropriations					(294,195)	(119,805)	(1,615,121)	
Open Space/Recreation Reserve Total	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	905,805	1,156,000	-	365,000
Historic Preservation								
Prior Balance	-	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	1,167,000	1,292,640	1,685,390
10% Allocation	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
Total Appropriations					(33,000)	(244,360)	(7,250)	(14,503)
Appropriation Not Used (Closed to Fund Balance)	-	-	-	-			123	-
Historic Preservation Reserve Total	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	1,167,000	1,292,640	1,685,390	2,035,887
Community Housing								
Prior Balance	-	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	1,200,000	1,395,000	1,795,000
10% Allocation	150,000	236,739	248,140	260,000	305,121	370,000	400,000	365,000
Transfer from Fund Balance								4,000,000
Total Appropriations						(175,000)		(4,000,000)
Community Housing Reserve Total	150,000	386,739	634,879	894,879	1,200,000	1,395,000	1,795,000	2,160,000
Budgeted Reserve (Closes to Fund Balance annually)								
65% Allocation	1,050,000	1,657,177	1,612,910	1,690,000	1,983,287	2,405,000	2,600,000	2,372,500
Total Appropriations							(543,624)	
Budgeted Reserve Total	1,050,000	1,657,177	1,612,910	1,690,000	1,983,287	2,405,000	2,600,000	2,372,500
FUND BALANCE								
FY Starting Balance	-	1,449,397	3,201,838	5,058,390	7,407,100	9,897,899	12,071,746	14,218,495
Total Encumbrances						180,284		
Ending Balance	1,449,397	1,758,441	1,856,552	2,348,710	2,490,799	2,173,847	2,146,749	(860,595)
TOTAL FUND BALANCE	1,449,397	3,207,838	5,058,390	7,407,100	9,897,899	12,252,030	14,218,495	13,357,900

CPA Projects: Summary as of 6-30-25

Project Name	Appropriation	Total Spent To Date	Project Balance (+/-)*	Project Status	Date Completed
FY 2025					
Willow Park Redevelopment	4,000,000**		-	Open	
FY 2024					
Saltonstall Park Redevelopment	2,013,745	755,469		Open	
Walker Pond Conceptual Design	145,000	65,050		Open	
Browne House Structural Engineering	7,250			Open	
FY 2023					
Fowle House Gutters	47,300	47,177	(123)	Closed	11/15/2023
Commander's Mansion Cultural Landscape Rpt	102,470	102,470	-	Closed	9/30/2024
Old Burying Ground & Common St. Cemeteries Preservation Plan	94,590	92,610	(1,980)	Closed	10/31/2024
103 Nichols Ave Group Home Phase I - Predevelopment	175,000	175,000	-	Closed	4/2/2025
FY 2022					
Irving Park	414,000	354,879	(59,121)	Closed	8/31/2023
City Hall Murals	47,503	44,422		Open	

*Note: Figures in parentheses are unspent funds to be returned to the category reserve.

- Open Space/Outdoor Recreation
- Historic Preservation
- Community Housing

** These funds are encumbered while the development team pursues state and federal funding.



July 1, 2025

Community Preservation Committee
Town of Watertown
Watertown Town Hall
149 Main Street
Watertown, MA 02472

Community Preservation Coalition Dues Notice

FY26 Annual Membership Dues: **\$7900**

Make checks payable to: Third Sector New England, Inc.
(And please include in the description line: Community Preservation Coalition)

Remit membership dues payments to:

Third Sector New England, Inc.
89 South Street, Suite 700
Boston, MA 02111-2670
Attn: Community Preservation Coalition

Tax ID Number - see attached W9 form.

The Community Preservation Coalition operates as a fiscally sponsored program of Third Sector New England, Inc.

For any questions regarding billing, please contact the Community Preservation Coalition staff at 617-367-8998.

Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification

Go to www.irs.gov/FormW9 for instructions and the latest information.

**Give form to the
 requester. Do not
 send to the IRS.**

Before you begin. For guidance related to the purpose of Form W-9, see *Purpose of Form*, below.

Print or type. See <i>Specific Instructions</i> on page 3.	<p>1 Name of entity/individual. An entry is required. (For a sole proprietor or disregarded entity, enter the owner's name on line 1, and enter the business/disregarded entity's name on line 2.)</p> <p>Third Sector New England, Inc.</p>		
	<p>2 Business name/disregarded entity name, if different from above.</p> <p>TSNE</p>		
	<p>3a Check the appropriate box for federal tax classification of the entity/individual whose name is entered on line 1. Check only one of the following seven boxes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual/sole proprietor <input type="checkbox"/> C corporation <input type="checkbox"/> S corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/> Trust/estate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> LLC. Enter the tax classification (C = C corporation, S = S corporation, P = Partnership) _____</p> <p>Note: Check the "LLC" box above and, in the entry space, enter the appropriate code (C, S, or P) for the tax classification of the LLC, unless it is a disregarded entity. A disregarded entity should instead check the appropriate box for the tax classification of its owner.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (see instructions) <u>501(c)(3) NonProfit Corporation</u></p>		<p>4 Exemptions (codes apply only to certain entities, not individuals; see instructions on page 3):</p> <p>Exempt payee code (if any) _____</p> <p>Exemption from Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) reporting code (if any) _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(Applies to accounts maintained outside the United States.)</i></p>
	<p>3b If on line 3a you checked "Partnership" or "Trust/estate," or checked "LLC" and entered "P" as its tax classification, and you are providing this form to a partnership, trust, or estate in which you have an ownership interest, check this box if you have any foreign partners, owners, or beneficiaries. See instructions _____ <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
	<p>5 Address (number, street, and apt. or suite no.). See instructions.</p> <p>89 South Street, Suite 700</p>	<p>Requester's name and address (optional)</p>	
	<p>6 City, state, and ZIP code</p> <p>Boston, MA 02111</p>		
	<p>7 List account number(s) here (optional)</p>		

Part I Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)

Enter your TIN in the appropriate box. The TIN provided must match the name given on line 1 to avoid backup withholding. For individuals, this is generally your social security number (SSN). However, for a resident alien, sole proprietor, or disregarded entity, see the instructions for Part I, later. For other entities, it is your employer identification number (EIN). If you do not have a number, see *How to get a TIN*, later.

Social security number									
or									
Employer identification number									
0	4	-	2	2	6	1	1	0	9

Note: If the account is in more than one name, see the instructions for line 1. See also *What Name and Number To Give the Requester* for guidelines on whose number to enter.

Part II Certification

Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:

1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me); and
2. I am not subject to backup withholding because (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding; and
3. I am a U.S. citizen or other U.S. person (defined below); and
4. The FATCA code(s) entered on this form (if any) indicating that I am exempt from FATCA reporting is correct.

Certification instructions. You must cross out item 2 above if you have been notified by the IRS that you are currently subject to backup withholding because you have failed to report all interest and dividends on your tax return. For real estate transactions, item 2 does not apply. For mortgage interest paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, contributions to an individual retirement arrangement (IRA), and, generally, payments other than interest and dividends, you are not required to sign the certification, but you must provide your correct TIN. See the instructions for Part II, later.

Sign Here	<p>Signature of U.S. person <u>Philip Audier</u></p>	<p>Date <u>01/06/2025</u></p>
------------------	--	-------------------------------

General Instructions

Section references are to the Internal Revenue Code unless otherwise noted.

Future developments. For the latest information about developments related to Form W-9 and its instructions, such as legislation enacted after they were published, go to www.irs.gov/FormW9.

What's New

Line 3a has been modified to clarify how a disregarded entity completes this line. An LLC that is a disregarded entity should check the appropriate box for the tax classification of its owner. Otherwise, it should check the "LLC" box and enter its appropriate tax classification.

New line 3b has been added to this form. A flow-through entity is required to complete this line to indicate that it has direct or indirect foreign partners, owners, or beneficiaries when it provides the Form W-9 to another flow-through entity in which it has an ownership interest. This change is intended to provide a flow-through entity with information regarding the status of its indirect foreign partners, owners, or beneficiaries, so that it can satisfy any applicable reporting requirements. For example, a partnership that has any indirect foreign partners may be required to complete Schedules K-2 and K-3. See the Partnership Instructions for Schedules K-2 and K-3 (Form 1065).

Purpose of Form

An individual or entity (Form W-9 requester) who is required to file an information return with the IRS is giving you this form because they

Project Saltonstall Park 40005-580503						
Awardee DPW						
	Award Amount	Total PO's		Expended	Unspent	
	\$2,013,745	\$2,013,745		\$533,112	\$1,480,633	
PO Number	PO Amount	PO Vendor	Invoice	Date	Amount	Remaining PO
2504127	\$1,486,000	UEL	001-8-31-24	12/19/2024	\$337,060	\$1,148,940
			002-9-30-24	1/13/2025	\$97,466	\$1,051,474
			003-1-31-25	2/4/2025	\$98,586	\$952,888
			004-30-25	5/1/2025	\$88,500	\$864,388
						\$864,388
						\$864,388
						\$864,388
2506020	\$50,545	MDLA	3010	4/2/2025	\$1,757	\$48,788
			3034	4/2/2025	\$2,744	\$46,044
			3069	4/7/2025	\$3,005	\$43,039
			3101	6/3/2025	\$1,974	\$41,065
			3173	7/2/2025	\$3,005	\$38,060

Project	Browne House Engineering		40005-580605			
Awardee	Historic New England					
	Award Amount	Total PO's		Expended	Unspent	
	\$7,250			\$7,250	\$0	
PO Number	PO Amount	PO Vendor	Invoice	Date	Amount	Remaining PO
	\$7,250	Historic New England	HNE-1	5/28/2025	\$7,250	\$0

Project		Walker Pond Conceptual Design		40005-580502		
Awardee		DCPD				
	Award Amount	Total PO's		Expended	Unspent	
	\$145,000	\$145,000		\$69,847	\$75,153	
PO Number	PO Amount	PO Vendor	Invoice	Date	Amount	Remaining PO
2503783	\$145,000	Warner Larson	22405-1	9/30/2024	\$10,075	\$134,925
			22405-2	10/31/2024	\$23,575	\$111,350
			22405-3	12/31/2024	\$31,400	\$79,950
			22405-4	5/31/2025	\$4,797	\$75,153

DISCUSSION PAPER

CPC AND WATERTOWN AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST RELATIONS

Background

The inaugural meeting of the Watertown Affordable Housing Trust (WAHT) was held on September 22. The seven Trust members comprise three from the former Watertown Housing Partnership:

- Cliff Cook, worked in Cambridge's planning department and managed an affordable housing grant portfolio for the state
- David Leon, former Executive Director of Watertown Community Housing (now Metro West Collaborative Development)
- Helen Oliver, served as State Street Bank vice president, specializing in affordable housing tax credit transactions

And four other members:

- Jill Hyde, Deputy General Counsel at Beacon Capital Partners and previously served as General Counsel of Trinity Financial, Inc, a major affordable housing developer
- Leo Patterson, a Massachusetts registered architect and senior associate at the Boston office of Perkins Eastman
- Zoe Weinrobe, served as Director of Real Estate Development at 2Life Communities and previously worked at Recap Real Estate Advisors and Urban Edge Housing Corporation
- George Proakis, Watertown City Manager.

The powers and responsibilities of the WAHT in the Watertown ordinance creating the Trust follow closely those set forth in the Massachusetts authorizing legislation. In brief and following the verbs proscribing eligibility for CPA funds, the Trust can:

Acquire: Purchase land for construction for affordable housing or buildings to convert or preserve for affordable housing

Create: Construct or cause to construct affordable housing. For example, through issuing an RFP to housing developers requesting proposals for affordable housing on a site acquired by the WAHT.

Preserve: For example, purchase housing which now provides naturally occurring market rate rents which are now affordable, but which is threatened by teardown or conversion to higher end housing. Extending the life of existing restrictions for affordable units.

Support: Financing predevelopment plans and surveys. Establishing rental assistance or home ownership programs.

WAHT currently has access to funding from the following sources:

- HOME Investment Partnership Program: \$80,000 a year plus can apply in competitive round for any pooled money from the 13-member community West Metro HOME Consortium (generally

less than \$500,000 a year). Some uncommitted funds from \$265,000 in program income from prior projects.

- Community Development Block Grants: Some \$36,000 in program income from prior awards.
- Affordable Housing Trust Fund: approximately \$269,000 in cash in lieu payments from developers (inclusionary zoning developments)
- Watertown Budget: \$250,000 to cover WAHT startup costs.

CPC and WAHT Relations

How the CPC and WAHT work together is determined not only by decisions of the CPC but importantly by how the WAHT chooses to operate. Of the 131 Housing Trusts in Massachusetts, some choose to be primarily a funder for affordable housing, establishing an application process for project proponents. Other Trusts take a more direct approach, initiating projects on their own account. And then some pursue a mixture of both approaches. Some also focus on advocacy. Were the WAHT to take the first approach, would the CPC continue to accept applications for affordable housing projects? Or would the CPC direct applicants in the first instance to apply to the WAHT, which would either use CPA funds it had already received or would apply to the CPC for funding for each particular project once approved by the WAHT?

Given the scarcity of land and available sites in Watertown, it is likely that WAHT will eventually opt primarily to initiate projects. In such a case, there still remain issues about how the CPC might provide funding to the WAHT. In all cases, the WAHT is required by law to maintain a separate accounting of any CPA funds received and to report this accounting to the CPC and the CPC in turn reports trust expenditures to the state. (MHP created a fillable form to assist MAHTs with their reporting to CPCs) Moreover, best practice dictates that any transfer of funds between community preservation committees and affordable housing trusts be subject to grant agreements. The experience of other communities provides a range of models. These are broadly described below and should not be taken as the only possibilities.

Major Block Grant of CPA Funds. A set portion of CPA funds are allocated automatically each year to the Trust; Cambridge sets aside 80%; Somerville 45%. In these instances, the trusts basically perform as the affordable housing arm of the CPC with the CPC having only a limited reporting role. The transfer of CPA funds is akin to a “block grant,” or transfer payment, and no limits are placed on the use of the monies other than the restrictions set by the Community Preservation Act (e.g., definition of affordable housing as 100% of AMI, no funds for rehabilitation if the housing has not been purchased with CPA funds, placement of affordability restrictions etc.). This arrangement makes for a “one-stop” shop for affordable housing projects, giving the autonomous WAHT wide latitude to initiate and carry out projects and programs and an ability to move quickly as market opportunities arise.

Programmatic Grant of CPA Funds. A lesser and either annual or periodic grant of funds is made based on an agreed upon program of goals and activities and may include predevelopment activities. The transfer of CPA funds to Trusts may specify, for example, that funds be only used for supporting affordable rental units, not ownership programs, or that funds be used to provide housing to those at 60% or less of AMI, etc. In some communities, if the allocation is not used within a certain period of time, the funds are returned to the CPC. Under this arrangement, CPCs and Housing Trusts basically negotiate an agreed upon set of goals, targets, and eligible projects/programs. As the proposed grant

must go through the CPC and City Council, the proposed program is subjected to an additional layer of transparency and public scrutiny. In this model, affordable housing projects may or may not also apply directly to the CPC for funding.

Case by Case. For any program or project, the Trust must separately apply to the CPC through normal CPC procedures. If the project is of high priority and requires rapid action because of a pending real estate transaction, application could be made off-cycle. The case-by-case approach ensures multiple levels of review as well as approval from the highest political level, the City Council. On the other hand, having to complete the CPC application process and the time required for review is burdensome and may impede the finalization of transactions and deter co-funders. In purchasing a site or building, negotiations must take place in closed session, requiring a trust to apply for funds to the CPC and then the City Council would make public the negotiations, absorb time, and create uncertainty for the seller, and thus likely doom the transaction. Should WAHT seek to finance an affordable housing project through issuance of bonds with their debt service covered by CPA funds, the project would of necessity have to pass through the CPC.

Regardless of the model or approach chosen, there remains the issue of how the Trust and CPC keep each other informed. While some communities specify in their Trust ordinances that a CPC member is also to be a member of the Trust, that is not the case in Watertown. At a staff level, Larry Field in the Office of Communities and Development backstops the Watertown Affordable Housing Trust, and some coordination and information sharing does and is likely to continue to take place among Larry and Lanae. At the Committee level, the chair and other members have attended sessions of the Trust's predecessor – the Housing Partnership, and now the Trust. That too is likely to continue.



Mark Krackiewicz, Chair
Jon Bockian, Vice Chair
Bob DiRico
Dennis J. Duff
Allen Gallagher
Abigail Hammett
Jamie O'Connell
Elodia Thomas
Matthew Walter

CITY OF WATERTOWN Community Preservation Committee

Minutes of CPC Meeting Thursday, April 17, 2025, at 7PM held in hybrid format in the Lower Hearing Room of City Hall.

Committee Members Present: Mark Krackiewicz, Chair; Jon Bockian, Vice Chair; Bob DiRico; Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher; Abigail Hammett; Jamie O'Connell; and Elodia Thomas.

Joined Remotely: Matt Walter

Others Joining Remotely: Lanae Handy, Community Preservation Coordinator; Joseph Bednar, Cambridge Housing Authority; Margie Wayne; Joyce Kelly; Jamie Gordon; and Jacky van Leeuwen.

1. Call to Order

Mark Krackiewicz called the meeting to order at 7:02PM and noted it was being held in a hybrid format per the Governor's order, suspending certain provisions of Open Meeting Laws.

2. Acceptance of Minutes

A. 2025-3-20-Draft-CPC-Minutes

Motion: Allen Gallagher moved to accept the 2025-3-20 CPC Minutes as written and Dennis J. Duff seconded the motion.

Vote: Dennis Duff, Abigail Hammet, Elodia Thomas, Bob DiRico, Mark Krackiewicz, Matt Walter, and Jon Bockian voted in favor. Jamie O'Connell was absent.

3. Committee Discussion:

A. 103 Nichols Ave. Group Home Application - Phase II

The Committee discussion was launched based on the analysis of the 103 Nichols Avenue Group Home application by Christine Rogers, (the housing consultant hired by the CPC). Her analysis is attached to these minutes.

During the discussion of the 103 Nichols Application CPC Members decided to draft a list of questions to be answered by the applicant in writing.

Lanae commented on Christine Rogers' request for updated support letters. Lanae notified the Committee that she had advised the Watertown Housing Authority (WHA) to apply as soon as possible to give the CPC time to review their application rather than seek updated letters of support. Lanae reasoned it was unlikely entities who had provided support letters would withdraw their support.

Mark was concerned about several items, including the financing uncertainty related to non-CPA funding sources, particularly the status of \$500,000 in state funding (through the Session Law Act of 2024, Chapter 150, Massachusetts Affordable Homes Act) and \$950,000 from the state Facilities Consolidation Fund (FCF), administered by Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC). He emphasized the state bond bill funding was not an appropriation, but merely an authorization. Mark also noted the project manual lacked crucial details about the heat pump's heating and ventilation capacity and operational parameters. He further questioned whether the proposed rent subsidies increasing from \$450 to \$1,500 per month would be available and how affordability would be ensured. Mark also wanted clarity around the multiple contingences (for example, construction, bidding, and soft cost contingencies). Finally, Mark wanted an explanation from Fuss & O'Neill about differences in sampling methods and test results between previous and recent environmental studies.

Abigail Hammett questioned why overall costs had escalated so much and wanted to know if the architectural and engineering fees were fixed-fee as opposed to an hourly contract. She also noted the discrepancy between the request of \$1.5M (that does not include the \$175,000 in development funds) and the construction draw of \$1.378M. Abigail was concerned about the costs of construction administration and how the team would plan for the impacts of tariffs and market volatility, given the cost of \$550,000 per bed and \$800,000 per square foot. [Note: When the project costs increased from about \$309,000 per bed and \$460,000 per square foot] Abigail was also uncertain about who would manage the delivery of the project since there was no project manager line item.

Concerning design, Abigail would like to see better rated insulation than baseline and an increase in the patio size. She questioned whether the patio pavers were accessible and if the overhang at the entrance area was necessary.

Jamie O'Connell would like Fuss and O'Neill to appear at the presentation to provide details about the sampling methods and test results. She also asked if there is an issue with exposed soil.

Dennis J. Duff asked who would be responsible for cost overruns. And Elodia Thomas commented that the design didn't mesh with the neighborhood. She questioned why the costs had ballooned while the number of bedrooms decreased. Elodia also found the maintenance budget to be excessive for a new 5-bedroom home. She asked why a portion of the Willow Park project wasn't used given the amenities there.

Abigail noted that a small community of people living together as a family was a value of a group home setting. Jamie added that the projects were on two very different timelines.

Lanae pointed out the cost increases were troubling, given there was no acquisition fee, and the second kitchen was eliminated. She added, according to the construction draw, CPA would also be funding hard and soft costs for the first 6 months of the project, though the application requested what appeared to be hard construction costs. It was difficult to be sure because the budget lacked detail.

Bob asked if \$1.5M was approved for the project, what exactly that amount would be used for because the budget didn't specify the line items of the CPA request. He also pointed out the stormwater retention requirements could add to the cost.

B. Mark Krackiewicz's and Jon Bockian's Resignation

Mark stated that he and Jon met with the city manager and handed in their resignations. Mark felt it was time for new perspectives and energy on the CPC. He said the city manager thought he could find new candidates by June. Elodia was concerned with continuity through the fiscal year and application cycle.

Lanae stated she had spoken with JoAnna Hand in the city manager's office and JoAnna said the Residents Advisory Board had some candidates who could hopefully be onboarded by the beginning of the new application cycle.

C. Old Business Agenda Item Parameters

Bob notified the Committee that he found a stone and the engraver will probably have it done soon which was a good segway to item 3C on the agenda.

Lanae wanted to know how the old business agenda item would work and asked if she would be tracking old business or would CPC members send her agenda items. Lanae would like CPC members to assist with tracking the dropped or unresolved agenda items.

Elodia added the CPC may want to add a new business item so members could make suggestions for future meetings.

4. Coordinator Update

A. Draft 2025 Community Survey

Lanae circulated a draft community survey which was an update of a previous survey. CPC members decided that the survey was not the best way to inform the public about the CPA in Watertown and since the CPC doesn't initiate projects the survey may mislead and disappoint participants when their project ideas don't come to fruition.

Committee members discussed ways to get community members engaged, such as creating visuals like a video to foster imaginative thinking about possible CPA projects. Abigail suggested involving young people.

Jamie proposed creating a story map of CPA projects on ESRI. Lanae mentioned she didn't have a license to use the platform and would investigate if she could obtain access.

B. Public Service Announcement

Lanae announced that she would be recording a public service announcement about the CPA in Watertown and the upcoming public hearing.

5. Adjourn

Motion: Dennis J. Duff moved to adjourn, and Jon Bockian seconded the motion.

Vote: Jon Bockian, Bob DiRico, Dennis J. Duff, Jamie O'Connell, Matt Walter, Mark Krackiewicz, Elodia Thomas, Abigail Hammett, and Allen Gallagher voted in favor.

Adjournment: 8:31 PM

Attachments:

1. [103 Nichols Ave - Housing Consultant Analysis](#)
2. [Mark Krackiewicz and Jon Bockian Resignation Letter](#)
3. [Draft 2025 Community Survey](#)



Mark Kraczkiewicz, Chair
Jon Bockian, Vice Chair
Bob DiRico
Dennis J. Duff
Allen Gallagher
Abigail Hammett
Jamie O'Connell
Elodia Thomas
Matthew Walter

CITY OF WATERTOWN Community Preservation Committee

Minutes of CPC Meeting Thursday, May 15, 2025, at 7 PM held in hybrid format in the Lower Hearing Room of City Hall.

Committee Members Present: Mark Kraczkiewicz, Chair; Jon Bockian, Vice Chair; Bob DiRico; Allen Gallagher; Abigail Hammett.

Committee Members Absent: Dennis Duff

Joined Remotely: Matt Walter; Jamie O'Connell; Elodia Thomas

Others Joining Remotely: Jacqueline Sullivan, Watertown Housing Authority Director; Jacky van Leeuwen

1. Call to Order

Mark Kraczkiewicz called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and noted it was being held in a hybrid format per the Governor's order, suspending certain provisions of Open Meeting Laws.

2. Acceptance of Minutes

A. 2025-4-17-Draft-CPC-Minutes

Jon Bockian moved to accept the draft minutes but withdrew his motion after Elodia Thomas objected to the omission from the draft of housing development consultant Christine Rogers' report regarding 103 Nichols, CPA Application Preliminary Review. The draft minutes of that meeting will be taken up at a subsequent CPC meeting.

3. Committee Discussion:

A. 103 Nichols Ave. Group Home Application - Phase II

Mark Kraczkiewicz announced that the Watertown Housing Authority asked to postpone their presentation on 103 Nichols Ave. Jacky Sullivan, WHA director, said that the postponement is necessary due to an unforeseen problem raised by the WHA legal team that the presentation will be available in time for the CPC's June meeting. Accordingly, the discussion of that project was deferred to a future CPC meeting.

B. FY 2026 CPA Funds and Budget Allocation Vote

The committee then took up the FY 2026 CPC Budget Allocation. In response to a question by Abigail Hammett, there was a brief discussion about fluctuations in the state's match of CPA funds.

Motion: Jon Bockian moved to request that the City Council appropriate and transfer FY 2026 CPA funds which total \$3,737,500.00 to the following: 5% totaling \$186,875.00 for the administrative expenses of the Community Preservation Committee; 10% to the community housing reserve totaling \$373,750.00; 10% to the historical preservation reserve totaling, \$373,750.00; 10% to the open space/recreation reserve totaling, \$373,750.00; and 65% to the undesignated reserve totaling, \$2,429,375.00. Alan Gallagher seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Jon moved to request that the following amounts be transferred: \$20,000 to the Purchased Services and \$150 to the Supplies accounts. Abigail seconded the motion. Jon read an itemization prepared by Lanae Handy (who was absent due to personal reasons) of anticipated uses of the requests (attached to these minutes), which were rounded up from the itemization. Abigail expressed displeasure that the city continues to be required to place legal notices in The Boston Globe when the online Watertown News has become a primary source of civic information.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

A "Summary of Watertown CPA Fund Activity (as of 05/05/2025)" had been distributed in advance of the meeting (copy attached to these minutes). Alan requested that the unusually large amount of reported year-to-date interest income under "Actual Annual CPA Revenue" should be reviewed, as probably in error. Mark agreed that the matter will be put on a future committee agenda.

4. Suggested Agenda Items for Future Meetings:

Matt Walter requested an update on the city cemetery projects. Bob Dirico reported that a meeting on the subject had been held by DPW Director Tom Brady, Michelle Moon (DCDP Senior Planner for Open Space), Lanae Handy and Bob. As Bob understands it, DCDP and DPW will be co-applicant for rehabilitation funding in the FY 26 funding round, and Ray Dunetz will be asked to manage the bid documents and the project operation.

Elodia asked that the June annual meeting include an update on all CPA projects.

Bob also noted that the CPA funding plaque has been installed in Irving Park. Abigail noted that a community block party was scheduled for the coming Sunday at Irving Park.

5. Adjourn

Motion: Jon moved to adjourn, and Matt seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment: 7:33 PM

Attachments:

1. [FY 2026 CPA Budget Allocation and CPA Administrative Expenses - FY2025 and FY2026 Projection](#)
2. [CPA Funds Activity as of May 5, 2025](#)