



CITY OF WATERTOWN

Community Preservation Committee

Mark Krackiewicz, Chair
Jason Cohen, Vice Chair
Jonathan Bockian
Bob DiRico
Dennis J. Duff
Allen Gallagher
Jamie O'Connell
Elodia Thomas
Matthew Walter

Meeting Minutes: Thursday, April 21, 2022, held remotely via Zoom at 7PM.

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

Others Present: Lanae Handy, Community Preservation Coordinator; Anthony Palomba, City Council; Michael Lara, Watertown Housing Authority; Michael Albano

1. Call to Order

Mark Krackiewicz called the meeting to order at 7PM and stated the meeting was being held remotely according to the Acts extending the Governor's Emergency Order and waiving certain provisions of Open Meeting Law. Mark then requested a roll call and Lanae Handy called the roll.

2. Acceptance of 2022-3-16-Draft-CPC-Minutes

Elodia Thomas requested a change to a statement about Irving Park on page two. The change would replace the statement "Greg committed to repaving the streets bordering the park" with "Greg committed to repaving the sidewalks bordering the park."

Motion: Jason Cohen moved to approve the minutes with the amendment discussed and agreed upon. Elodia seconded the motion.

Vote: Mark Krackiewicz, Jason Cohen, Jon Bockian, Bob DiRico, Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher, Jamie O'Connell, and Elodia Thomas voted in favor. Matthew Walter abstained.

3. Committee Discussion

A. FY 2022 Funding Recommendation to City Council

During the discussion about the FY 2022 Funding Recommendation, Jamie O'Connell asked why there was a difference between the standard funding conditions listed for the two projects. Lanae agreed to add the same standard funding conditions to each project funding recommendation.

Committee members also advised stronger language in one of the specific funding conditions for the City Hall Paintings project to read: "The City shall not dispose of, sell, relocate, or alter the paintings without the notification and approval of the CPC

and Watertown Historical Commission.

Motion: Dennis J. Duff moved to approve and forward the FY 2022 Funding Recommendation to the City Council with the amendments discussed and agreed upon. Elodia seconded the motion.

Vote: Mark Krackiewicz, Jason Cohen, Jon Bockian, Bob DiRico, Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher, Jamie O'Connell, Elodia Thomas, and Matthew Walter voted in favor.

B. Proposed CPA Application Procedures

Mark explained that this proposal on the application procedures came about after a subcommittee to review application forms for possible changes never got underway. He views the proposal as an accentuation of current application procedures. Jamie asked where the proposed information would be located. Elodia had some ideas that she shared with Lanae about putting together a tip sheet for each funding category to be presented in the application workshop. The tip sheet would inform potential applicants of the items they should think about in developing their project and what could be funded according to the Department of Revenue Informational Guideline Release (IGR). She also pointed out committees are not well-informed about the resources available in the form of free workshops on historic preservation.

1. The following items were proposed during the discussion on the historic preservation projects section:
 - Mark suggested, adding “where applicable” after the language “Encourage the engagement of a specialist...”
 - The fact that many proposed items are already in the Application Manual indicates applicants and the public need to be better informed. To address this shortcoming and the issue of where to emphasize these items that are already in the Application Manual, Elodia again proposed the creation of a tip sheet. Jamie suggested posting examples of successful projects on the CPC webpage and labeling the items found in this document common missteps.
2. In discussing complex construction projects Mark said that some projects could be implemented in two phases and when projects are complicated, applicants could request funds for planning first. Jamie considered the two-stage approach a good idea because it was difficult to review construction projects without plans and other details. Elodia stated it would depend on the size of the project. Her example was that a large park project could be funded for a design phase and construction could be funded in a second phase. Jason noted the Irving Park project was compact enough to be implemented in one phase. Dennis had concerns about granting \$100,000 to \$200,000 for planning funds.

Jamie, Jon Bockian, and Matthew Walter agreed that the CPC could use their judgement to determine whether projects were sound, but reasonably in need of some planning funds. Elodia said there were so many items that may be funded as part of the planning phase, and Jamie pointed out it is was merely a list of possibilities.

The committee discussed the topic of determining project eligibility and raised the following issues:

- whether eligibility should be a simple determination avoiding the discussion of project quality.
- conditions being placed on projects at the eligibility stage being problematic.

During the conversation, Elodia brought up issues concerning the 103 Nichols Ave. project and Jason suggested getting through the agenda before discussing the project.

3. In the discussion on off-cycle applications related to phased projects, the following comments were made:

Jamie was in favor of allowing applicants to apply for construction funds off-cycle to maintain project momentum. Jason said funding in two phases went hand in hand with off-cycle review. Elodia emphasized the list of items that could be funded in phase one was too lengthy and the information should be included in the application workshop. Jon suggested removing due diligence from the list. He also didn't think the current off-cycle application policy addressed a phased project approach.

4. Mark noted that last year the CPC viewed project eligibility forms as to whether projects were eligible or ineligible. He would like to expand that review to include comments to shape projects and give constructive feedback. Dennis didn't think the CPC should require specific items that force applicants to spend money because it could leave the CPC open to being sued if the project does not get recommended for funding. Elodia proposed forming a subcommittee to perform an initial review of applications. Jon was dubious about bringing the quality of projects into the eligibility discussion. However, he was in favor of giving applicants more time to prepare their applications.

There was a brief discussion about applicants having site control for their project to be eligible. Members talked about whether the issue of site control was clear cut or a matter of definition without reaching a resolution to the issue. Mark thought the eligibility determination step could provide an opportunity to guide applicants as to what should be included in their full application. Dennis asked whether it was the CPC's job to lead and assist applicants. Committee members agreed it was appropriate for Lanae to provide technical assistance and feedback to applicants similar to planning department staff.

C. Preservation Plan Update Outline

Mark asked committee members to look through the plan for possible updates and forward them to Lanae. Jamie reported she went to the Conservation Commission meeting and there were no updates. Jason said he didn't expect anything from the Planning Board either.

4. Coordinator Update

A. Housing Consultant

Mark spoke about meeting with the housing consultant candidate, mentioning the consultant had worked on both the project development and financier sides of projects. Jon asked about the availability of Larry Field and Mark noted Larry thought hiring a consultant was a good idea. Lanae reported that the meeting with Christine Gimbel Rogers was an initial conversation, and Christine would be happy to meet with a small group of committee members to answer their questions.

B. Community Survey Distribution

Lanae spoke about her efforts to promote the survey and that over 100 surveys had been completed. Elodia mentioned promoting the survey to individual committee, board, and commission members to seek project ideas and asking Jeanne (Ostroff) to share the information in a city Facebook post. Lanae pointed out Jeanne had posted

on Facebook and tweeted about the survey. Elodia also suggested publicizing the project funding recommendations in the Watertown News.

Elodia wanted to talk about 103 Nichols Ave. Mark said it would be on the May meeting agenda. Elodia requested all the materials sent by Michael Lara be distributed to the CPC and that given the documents circulating in the community, emails had been held back from the CPC. Dennis said if Mark asked that emails be withheld from the CPC, he should resign as chair. Jamie stated the item was not on the agenda and the CPC should not discuss the matter. Jason proposed a special meeting to discuss the 103 Nichols Ave. project process. Lanae would find a date for the special meeting.

5. **Adjournment**

Motion: Dennis moved to adjourn the meeting and Elodia seconded.

Vote: Mark Krackiewicz, Jason Cohen, Jon Bockian, Bob DiRico, Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher, Jamie O'Connell, Elodia Thomas, and Matthew Walter voted in favor.