



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

Draft Minutes: Thursday, June 16, 2022, held remotely via Zoom at 7PM.

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

Others Present: Lanae Handy, Community Preservation Coordinator; Caitlin Browne, Watertown Library; Joyce Kelly; Sharon Schumack; Donald McDonald; Nancy Hammett; Michele Waldman; Liz Cremens; Alisa Gardner-Todreas; and Annie Martin.

1. Open Public Hearing and Introductions

Mark Krackiewicz opened the public hearing and noted it was being held remotely under the Acts suspending certain provisions of Open Meeting Laws. He asked CPC members present to introduce themselves. Mark added the meeting was a public informational session and an opportunity for the CPC to hear from the public.

Jason Cohen mentioned that comments would be taken at the end of the presentation and asked commenters to introduce themselves and give their name and address.

2. Presentation of Annual Update

A. CPA Program Update

During his presentation of the Annual Update, Mark:

- Gave a CPA Fund Overview noting there was a cash balance of over \$13 million in the fund with \$1.2 million in the category specific reserves, and \$370,000 budgeted for each reserve in FY2023.
- Described the two projects that were recommended to the City Council for CPA funding (City Hall Geographical Paintings and Irving Park).
- Spoke about the survey results obtained from 175 respondents and indicated there were many ideas submitted. Also, he pointed out several ideas were not eligible for CPA funding. Mark highlighted comments objecting to the need for consent from the city for projects on city-owned property. Jamie O'Connell emphasized that applicants would need to work in partnership with the city

since the city would own the resource and be expected to manage and maintain it. Jason highlighted none of the project examples in the Annual Update were endorsed by the CPC.

- Explained what would improve historic preservation projects and that more complicated projects would benefit from a phased approach. He also mentioned there was a table delineating what was fundable was in the CPA Program Update.

Mark pointed out many respondents had ideas for open space and outdoor recreation projects. He noted in rural towns or towns with more open space there may be entities such as the Trustees of the Reservations to propose and manage projects. Mark emphasized that with the little open space left in Watertown and lack of land trusts or other land conservation organizations, the city needed to take on that responsibility. He encouraged activists to approach the city to get their buy-in and get projects done.

The committee learned many things over the past year—especially the need to better educate the public about what could be funded. Elodia Thomas added people not only needed to be more informed about which CPA projects were fundable, but the committee also needed to improve their marketing in general. Mark said he would like to have a table at the next Comprehensive Plan visioning session. He remarked that he had also been attending the walks related to that planning process.

B. Turning Good Ideas into Successful CPA Applications

Mark presented how to turn a good idea into a successful CPA project application using the City Hall Geographical Paintings and Irving Park projects as examples.

City Hall Geographical Paintings - Mark cited how Joyce Kelly of the Historical Society of Watertown brought together a team of specialists and experts—a conservationist, a framer, and transport company. He noted the project will be a public/private partnership on city-owned property and that Joyce had needed to obtain the permission or consent of the city. Though she will manage the project and it will be owned and maintained by the city.

Irving Park - Mark highlighted that while the Department of Public Works (DPW) project initially had required more detailed information, DPW solicited community input, resulting in 3 design options. With public input, the architects developed a plan that incorporated this feedback. Mark stressed the importance of getting the public involved and assembling a talented team.

Jon Bockian commented that ideally DPW would have completed several items before their submission of a CPA Funding Application. Elodia pointed out the CPC and applicant were working on a compressed deadline to get projects out the door and that the DPW had paid for their design costs.

3. Open Public Comment

Name	Address	Comments	Responses
Liz Cremens	199 Coolidge Ave.	1)What kind of housing applicants applied? 2)When does CPC decide the 10% allocation? 3)When people start to apply are the applications available to the public?	1)Mark indicated there were 3 housing projects -Support for the Watertown Municipal Affordable Housing Trust at the Project Eligibility Form step; it was not an entity yet, therefore they withdrew their Project Eligibility Form. -Funding to build senior housing at Rosary Place by Metrowest Collaborative Development; it had purchase price issues and condo association agreement problems. They withdrew due financial infeasibility at the CPA Funding Application stage. -Funding for construction of a group home for low income and developmentally disabled adults by the Watertown Housing Authority. It had environmental/site issue and may apply again in the next round. 2)Elodia explained funds come from a CPA surcharge, state match, and interest and that revenue is budgeted each fiscal year. 3)Lanae said that only the Project Eligibility Forms for projects deemed eligible were summarized and posted on the CPC website and CPA Funding Applications were posted after CPC review to allow for the addition of missing or further information requested from applicants. She said with a new platform it may be easier to post applications throughout the process.
Annie Martin	17 Avon Rd.	Are there spending goals or limits set and what does that looks like over the next few years?	Lanae said in the first year there was more funding available than requested so there was no competition between applicants. There are no goals set beyond the 10% allocation at this time and that could possibly change in the future based on community needs.

Name	Address	Comments	Responses
Nancy Hammett	119 Riverside St.	Other cities and towns have been doing this for a while, is there a resource [database of projects] to be inspired by what other towns have done? Thank you to members of the CPC and Lanae, it is wonderful to see it up and running.	Mark mentioned the Community Preservation Coalition.
Caitlin Browne	123 Main St.	Were there any proposals that the library would be able to participate in and anything the library could do to preserve the history of the city?	Mark responded that historic artifacts or documents could be restored and/or preserved. Elodia offered the Mass Historical Commission for their resources, webinars, and ability to answer questions. She also suggested reading technical assistance information about historic preservation on the Community Preservation Coalition website.

4. Close Public Hearing -

Mark closed the hearing at 8:06PM and thanked attendees for their contribution.

5. Approval of 5/16/22 and 5/19/22 CPC Meeting Minutes

Mark asked if there were other suggested changes to the minutes besides his and Elodia's changes emailed to committee members. Dennis J. Duff asked to make a change to item 2 next to last sentence, "if it were true, he should resign from the committee."

Motion: Dennis moved to accept the 5/19/22 and the 5/16/22 minutes with all the suggested amendments. Matthew Walter seconded the motion.

Discussion: Elodia didn't think the minutes accurately reflected the serious nature of her concerns about withholding documents from the committee. She stated, "I am not making any more changes because it would involve a lot of changes, quite frankly. I reviewed the video of the May 16th meeting. I do not think that the minutes accurately reflect my serious concerns about the CPC process and the omission of critical emails and documents that were not sent to the full committee. I just want to make it perfectly clear I will be voting No on the acceptance of these minutes. You all know

how serious these concerns were - I pulled public records - and this doesn't seem to carry much weight with this committee at this point, but I will be voting No.”

Vote: Matthew Walter, Mark Krackiewicz and Jon Bockian voted in favor, Jamie O’Connell and Jason Cohen abstained, and Dennis J. Duff and Elodia Thomas voted against.

6. Committee Discussion

A. CPA Program Update and Application Schedule Finalization

Mark asked if there was any information from the public hearing that would call for a revision of the annual update. Lanae remarked Elodia’s comments were incorporated and Jamie said she had sent comments to the initial draft. Jon noted he had only minor comments that had not forwarded to Lanae.

Mark requested feedback on the application schedule. Dennis thought potential applicants may be on vacation when the application workshops were scheduled in August. Jamie didn’t see a way around the timing unless the Project Eligibility Form due date was changed. The committee decided to keep the schedule as proposed. Lanae offered to hold an additional workshop for applicants notified of their project’s eligibility if necessary and stated she was always available to meet with potential applicants to answer questions.

Motion: Jason moved to approve the CPA Program Update, and Jamie seconded.

Vote: Elodia Thomas, Jamie O’Connell, Jason Cohen, Dennis J. Duff, Jon Bockian, Matthew Walter, and Mark Krackiewicz, voted in favor.

Going forward, Elodia suggested reviewing how the CPC functions to perform an assessment of:

- What went well?
- Where do committee members see problems?
- What can be improved?
- Should the chair election be changed to the end of the fiscal year?
- What does Lanae need from the committee?

Mark offered that the assessment item would be added to the agenda of the next meeting. There was some discussion about committee members sending questions ahead of time, but it was decided to stick to simply having a discussion at the next meeting.

7. Adjournment

Motion: Dennis moved to adjourn, and Jon seconded.

Vote: Dennis J. Duff, Elodia Thomas, Jamie O’Connell, Matthew Walter, Mark Krackiewicz, Jon Bockian, and Jason Cohen voted in favor.

Adjournment: 8:41PM