



Town of Watertown
Community Preservation Committee
Administration Building
149 Main Street
Watertown, Massachusetts 02472
Tel. (617) 972-6417
Fax (617) 972-6595

Committee Members
Elodia Thomas, Chair
Jonathan Bockian
Jason Cohen
Robert DiRico
Dennis J. Duff
Mark Krackiewicz
Allen Gallagher
Maria Rose
Susan Steele

Minutes: Thursday, June 20, 2019, Richard E. Mastrangelo Council Chamber, 7:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Jon Bockian Bob DiRico, Jason Cohen, Dennis J. Duff, Mark Krackiewicz, Maria Rose, Susan Steele, Elodia Thomas. **Absent:** Allen Gallagher

Others Present: Tom Tracy, Asst. Town Manager & Town Auditor, Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner, Community Development and Planning, , Leo Martin, and David Stokes.

The meeting was convened at 7:00 by Elodia Thomas, Chair. The first item on the agenda was to review and approve minutes of the May 16th meeting. Dennis J. Duff voted to approve the minutes as printed. Mark Krackiewicz suggested a couple of minor edits which were reviewed.

- Maria Rose made a motion to approve the minutes with Mr. Krackiewicz's suggested edits. Mr. Duff seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The committee moved on to Informational Updates.

- Budget update and process after July 1st
Tom Tracy, Town Auditor/Assistant Town Manager for Finance updated the Committee on the budget. He provided the committee with the letter he had given the Town Manager and Town Council regarding the passing of the Fiscal Year 2020 budget on June 4th. He stated that the Council did take the two motions from the CPC April 8th meeting, voting to approve the 2019 and 2020 budgets. Within the 2020 budget is a 5% allocation for administrative expenses for the committee starting July 1st. Mr. Tracy stated he would work with Ms. Thomas to process the expenses and they will need to be approved by the committee before he can make the payments. Mr. Tracy would also send a report to the committee for each meeting so they can track where they are with their expenses. Ms. Thomas asked Mr. Tracy about the interest on the CPC funds that had already been accruing. Mr. Tracy said his office will be able to calculate and credit the interest by the end of the fiscal year so it will be credited for FY 18 and 19. Going forward it will be added to the budget quarterly. Ms. Thomas also asked for clarification about the process and payment for joining the coalition. The committee would need to take a vote and then seek out Mr. Tracy's office for the payment. Mr. Duff asked Mr.

Tracy whether the vote on the expenditure of funds would need to be approved by the Town Council. Mr. Tracy said the Council has already approved the budget.

- Town email addresses for the committee:
Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner, Community Development and Planning noted that he has requested the emails through the IT department. Joe Mahoney was under the impression that the typical process does not include giving emails to boards and committees. Mr. Schreiber had clarified to him that there had been requests from multiple departments for the emails and Mr. Mahoney said he would try to get it done that week, but it may take an additional week or so.
- Rules and Regulations
Mr. Duff provided an update on the Rules and Regulations that he had been working on with Allen Gallagher. He noted that they have been reviewing several different communities. They had not come to a complete formalization but when they do, they will send them out to everyone. They hope to have them out by the next meeting for everyone's review. He also noted they are only looking at rules for running the committee and will delve into the application procedures in the next round.
- Committee Bio page
Ms. Rose noted that committee Bios have been updated. Jason Cohen stated that he now finds the tenses (first person vs. third person) to be inconsistent and he believes they should all be in the third person. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Thomas will change their bios to the third person tense.
- Group Photo
Ms. Thomas noted she was unable to coordinate the group photo. She asked Ms. Rose to take over planning, coordination and polling committee members on a proper location. She to ensure that all committee members would be available for the photo
- RFQ Scope of Work for consulting services.
Ms. Thomas and Mr. Schreiber put the Scope of Work together. They also met with Raeleen Bandini, Purchasing Agent, for further information. Mr. Schreiber clarified that if the committee thinks they may spend over \$50,000 they must do an RFQ or RFP and if over a three-year period there is a possibility of consultant services exceeding the \$50,000, they RFP or RFQ would also be required. Ms. Thomas noted that there would only be a few consultants who would meet the committee's criteria. With such a tight scope of work, the RFQ might make more sense. The RFQ would also allow the committee to move forward more quickly.

Ms. Rose asked for clarification on the cost proposal which was not noted in the document. Mr. Schreiber said the cost proposal and multiple other items for regulations would be added later once the consultant was chosen. The milestones were noted in the Scope of Work that was prepared. Ms. Rose noted that the committee should consider that they would not be aware of what the chosen consultant might charge for their work with the RFQ option. Jonathan Bockian asked for clarification of what would happen in the case that the committee is unable to agree on a price for the work by the chosen consultant. Mr. Schreiber explained in that case if there was another consulting group that was a finalist, the group would be able to enter negotiations with them.

Mr. Krackiewicz suggested going through the document page by page for committee members to suggest any edits they may have. Susan Steele had already sent updates to the Community background portion which she read aloud. Mr. Krackiewicz suggested edits on bullets listed on page 2 which Ms. Thomas noted. Mr. Bockian and Mr. Duff also suggested minor edits on page 2. Discussion was held over the number of community meetings noted in the scope of work that the consultant would organize. Several members of the committee agreed that at least two meetings would be necessary. Additional edits were made to the document. All edits will be incorporated into the final document.

Discussing the Timeline of the Scope of Work, Ms. Thomas highlighted the plan for interviewing the final candidates. Mr. Schreiber stated that the committee would only interview the finalists who met the minimum qualifications listed in the Scope. Mr. Duff asked Mr. Schreiber if in the case that there were a large number of applicants whether the committee would be able to enter into an executive session to help whittle down the finalists to the top three. Mr. Schreiber said he believes that they will be able to do that, but he would need to double check. Mr. Duff noted that the committee may not need to be set on three candidates and Mr. Schreiber agreed that given the selected qualifications, there may only be two qualified consultants.

Ms. Thomas asked the committee whether they would agree to move forward and publish the RFQ to the public if the edits noted were all made to the document or if they would want to hold an extra meeting to vote on the document. Mr. Krackiewicz moved to proceed with the vote on the RFQ.

Mr. Bockian commented that the number of minimum qualifications are quite subjective and it may turn out that there are very few applicants so there would not be any issues but he wanted to go on record saying that he is sensitive to having someone other than the committee have the initial winnowing down of applicants and who they will get to interview. He also noted that in regard to the timeline it is very aggressive, but he understands that the committee is not bound to it and it is just a guideline for what the committee will try to do.

Ms. Thomas agreed with Mr. Bockian and noted that the committee should trust the fact that they are going to be heavily involved in the vetting of applicants and if everyone cannot meet, they would set up a subcommittee to consider the options. Mr. Bockian noted that it may turn out that there would be so few applicants that it may not be an issue.

Mr. Duff suggested that the committee hold off on a vote until the final document is printed and vote on it at the following meeting. Due to summer vacations, he did not believe that a one-month delay to the schedule would hurt the committee's efforts seeing that it is the most critical portion of the process. Mr. Schreiber chimed in to note that the timeline is the absolute tightest possible and if even one part of the plan falls back within a week every other piece would fall back as well. He noted that per the schedule, he did not believe the committee would be able to hold their interviews as suggested on August 15th even if they voted to move

forward immediately. They may be looking at holding interviews at the end of August or sometime in September.

Ms. Thomas noted that the tight timeframe was constructed as a result of pressure she was feeling by some committee members to get up and running with the process. She stated that she has no issue holding off on a vote until the final document would be prepared. Ms. Rose stated that with the timeframe, she is nervous about requesting qualifications in July given that it is the summertime. She stated that she feels comfortable having Ms. Thomas finalize the document.

Ms. Steele had a thought about the schedule as well. She stated that she would prefer the RFQ to be released to the public sooner rather than later to avoid having potential candidates agree to other jobs. She would rather get the information out sooner and let candidates know they are looking and let the rest of the timeline slide back.

Mr. Schreiber noted that Ms. Steele's point was a valid one. He wanted to clarify that the committee could get the advertisement out to the paper before they have the RFQ finalized because it is released later. In the timeline scenario, the advertisement deadline is Monday for a Friday release. Monday, June 21 was the deadline set to get it to the paper. That meant it would actually get in the paper on Friday, June 28 and the RFQ would be released to the public the following Monday, July 1st. He also noted that the entire RFQ is not yet drafted given the 4th of July holiday and vacations and it would still need to be finalized. He stated that the plan was to have it advertised for a short period of time, but they could have it posted for a longer period given that people may be away for vacations. He suggested that they could send the advertisement to the paper on the 28th instead of the 21st. It would be published on July 5th in the paper and would be released to the public on July 8th. He also noted that it would be sent directly to all the firms that they know are interested in this type of work. The timeline could be extended to give the advertisement a larger window. If the preferred date for interviews is noted that could give a chance for the consultants to prepare as well.

Mr. Duff stated that the deadline for the RFQ is three-weeks time with one of the weeks being the week of the 4th of July. He asked Mr. Schreiber whether that would be enough time for consultants to respond. Mr. Schreiber stated that with the RFQ, the work is at the end and not the beginning and that takes pressure off consultants to do a lot of work at the beginning of the process. All they would need to do is put together their qualifications and a proposed schedule for completing the Scope of Work, so it is not a difficult ask.

Ms. Thomas asked the committee whether the proposed interviews on August 15th should be moved to the September 19th regular CPC meeting instead. Mr. Cohen agreed. Mr. Schreiber suggested also having an alternate date to ensure that everyone is available. Mr. Cohen stated that holding interviews at a regularly scheduled meeting would not allow the committee to discuss anything else and it might make more sense to setup a separate meeting in September so that one could be for regular business and the other for interviews. Ms. Rose suggested

arriving early on the 19th to hold both the interviews, take a break, then hold the regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Schreiber stated that the committee would still need to consider an alternate date as well and suggested the following day or following week. Mr. Schreiber also said that the committee would need to consider holding a discussion and a final vote.

Mr. Cohen said did not believe all nine committee members would need to be in attendance for the interview and the vote. He would be comfortable with other committee members making that decision.

Ms. Thomas summarized the options that the committee had suggested:

- Regular meeting on Thursday, September 19th
- Holding a second meeting on Thursday, September 19th from 3:30-6:00 PM with a break before the regular meeting
- Possible second meeting on Friday, September 20th starting from 3:00 PM
- Additional meeting on Thursday, September 26th

Mr. Schreiber stated that scheduling a date is something the committee could discuss via email, also including absent committee member Allen Gallagher. Ms. Rose suggested setting up a Doodle for the committee members to vote on their preferred day and time.

- Ms. Rose motioned that the Chair, Ms. Thomas in concert with Ms. Steele and Mr. Bockian would finalize the RFQ and submit it to the Procurement Office and Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Duff seconded the motion. All were in favor.
- Mr. Duff motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 PM. Ms. Rose seconded the motion.

Mr. Krackiewicz stated that he also believes getting a CPC staff person in place is very important so that individual can be part of the planning process, so he believes they need to deal very quickly with the description for that position. He suggested holding a special meeting to work on the job description. He suggested discussing scheduling of the special meeting over email. Mr. Bockian agreed that it was a good idea. Ms. Rose would also include the special meeting in the Doodle poll that she would send to the committee.

All were in favor of the motion to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 9:25 PM.

Attachments:

1. Tom Tracy letter 05.30.2019
2. Committee Bio page
3. RFQ Scope of Work - Draft



Thomas J. Tracy
Town Auditor

TOWN OF
WATERTOWN
Office of the Town Auditor

Administration Building
149 Main Street
Watertown, MA 02472
Phone: 617-972-6460
www.watertown-ma.gov
ttracy@watertown-ma.gov

TO: Honorable Town Council
Michael J. Driscoll, Town Manager

FROM: Thomas J. Tracy, Town Auditor/Assistant Town Manager for Finance

DATE: May 30, 2019

RE: Fiscal Year 2019 and Fiscal Year 2020 Community Preservation Fund Budget

The Community Preservation Act (CPA) requires that the Town Council approve the Community Preservation Fund Budget. Furthermore, the CPA requires that the estimated revenue for each Fiscal Year be reserved as follows:

A minimum of 10% for Affordable Housing
A minimum of 10% for Historical Preservation
A minimum of 10% for Open Space/Recreation

Additionally, up to 5% of the estimated revenue may be appropriated for CPC Administrative purposes. The remaining estimated revenue would be reserved for designation for a later date.

As you are aware, the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) held it's first meeting on February 21, 2019, which was after the establishment of the Fiscal Year 2019 budget. For Tax Rate Setting purposes, I reported to the Department of Revenue that the estimated revenue for Fiscal Year 2019 in the CPA Fund would be \$2,367,395 which included the state matched for Fiscal Year 2018 received in Fiscal Year 2019 of \$367,395.

The CPC voted at their April 8, 2019 (minutes of the meeting are attached) the following:

- On a motion made and seconded it was voted unanimously (Vote 8-0) to request the Town Council to appropriate and transfer from the fiscal year 2019 Community Preservation Funds (T= \$2,367,395) the following funds: 10% to the affordable housing reserve (\$236,739), 10% to the historical preservation reserve (\$236,739), 10% to the open space/recreation reserve (\$236,739), and 70% to the undesignated fund balance (\$1,657,178).

Therefore, I would respectfully request that the Honorable Town Council adopt this recommended action for Fiscal Year 2019.

Also during the CPC's April 8, 2019 meeting the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget was requested as follows:

- On a motion made and seconded it was voted unanimously (Vote 8-0) to request the Town Council to appropriate and transfer from the fiscal year 2020 Community Preservation Funds (T=\$2,481,400) the following funds: 5% (\$124,070) for the administrative expense of the Community Preservation Committee, 10% to the affordable housing reserve (\$248,140), 10% to the historical preservation reserve (\$248,140), 10% to the open space/recreation reserve (\$248,140), and 65% to the undesignated fund balance (\$1,612,910).

Therefore, I would respectfully request that the Honorable Town Council adopt this recommended action for Fiscal Year 2020.

Please be advised that before any project can be approved for funding by the CPC, the Honorable Town Council would need to approve the funding of the project.

cc: Community Preservation Committee



Town of Watertown
Community Preservation Committee
Administration Building
149 Main Street
Watertown, Massachusetts 02472
Tel. (617) 972-6417
Fax (617) 972-6595

Minutes: Monday, April 8, 2019, Philip Pane Meeting Room, 7:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner, in lieu of an elected chairperson of the Committee. Present were Jonathan Bockian, Jason Cohen, Robert Dirico, Dennis Duff, Allan Gallagher, Jason Cohen, Maria P. Rose, Susan Steele and Elodia Thomas. In addition to Committee members also present were Thomas Tracy, Town Auditor & Assistant Town Manager for Finance, Councilor Vincent Piccirilli, Leo Martin, and Bruce Coltin.

2. Discussion on and Election of Officers

Maria Rose nominated Jonathan Bockian. There was a discussion about the role of the chairperson which concluded without any agreement on the role other than convening meetings and proposing the meeting agendas.

Dennis Duff nominated Elodia Thomas since she is dedicated to the community, does research, is well prepared, collaborates with committees, departments and staff, represents our community thoughtfully and objectively, willing and able. Allen Gallagher seconded, and Thomas accepted the nomination.

Rose again nominated Bockian and identified his preparation and guidance, his background as a lawyer, has time to do the work, and the grassroots CPA group respect. Bockian accepted and looks forward to working together.

By a show of hands, the vote tied at four votes for each nominee. Schreiber asked if there were other options such as co-chairs, vice-chair, or interim committee member who would run the meeting. No member identified an option. Schreiber then requested the Committee to confirm that he would fill in as Chair to finish the meeting, which was confirmed. The committee agreed to postpone the vote until the next meeting.

3. Scheduling and location of future Community Preservation Committee Meetings

The members discussed options and decided on the third Thursdays of the month.

4. Consideration of Rules of Procedure

Thomas volunteered to send some examples of some rules of procedure for further discussion. Schreiber identified that the Watertown Housing Partnership had adopted rules and would send a sample document that could be considered as a template.

5. Record keeping and clerical support

Schreiber stated that there will administrative support for the time being from Community Development and Planning, the Manager's Office, and that there would be a person available to take minutes. Several members identified a desire to have a town email and others wanted to be sure that it could be automatically forwarded to personal emails. Schreiber said he would request that through IT.

6. Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 budget requests to Town Council - Thomas J. Tracy, Town Auditor & Assistant Town Manager for Finance

Mr. Tracy provided information regarding the budget process and procedures. He identified there was \$1.899 million in 2018 and that the Committee should look to the budget (below) so the CPC could review and vote on them.

- On a motion made and seconded it was voted unanimously (Vote 8-0) to request the Town Council to appropriate and transfer from the fiscal year 2019 Community Preservation Funds (T= \$2,367,395) the following funds: 10% to the affordable housing reserve (\$236,739), 10% to the historical preservation reserve (\$236,739), 10% to the open space/recreation reserve (\$236,739), and 70% to the undesignated fund balance (\$1,657,178).
- On a motion made and seconded it was voted unanimously (Vote 8-0) to request the Town Council to appropriate and transfer from the fiscal year 2020 Community Preservation Funds (T=\$2,481,400) the following funds: 5% (\$124,070) for the administrative expense of the Community Preservation Committee, 10% to the affordable housing reserve (\$248,140), 10% to the historical preservation reserve (\$248,140), 10% to the open space/recreation reserve (\$248,140), and 65% to the undesignated fund balance (\$1,612,910).

TOWN OF WATERTOWN CPA FUND AS OF 4/5/19

	FY 2018 6/30/2018	FY 2019 4/5/2019	
Assets:			
Cash	\$ 1,899,468.66	\$ 3,827,930.54	
CPA RE Tax FY 18 Receivable	\$ 26,572.12	\$ 5,790.17	

CPA RE Tax FY 19 Receivable	\$ (1,487.74)	\$ 538,865.24	
Tax Liens Receivable	\$ 6,303.74	\$ 4,696.05	
Total Assets	\$ 1,930,856.78	\$ 4,377,282.00	
Liabilities:			
Deferred Revenue - RE Tax	\$ 25,155.76	\$ 544,655.41	
Deferred Revenue - Tax Liens	\$ 6,303.74	\$ 4,696.05	
Total Liabilities	\$ 31,459.50	\$ 549,351.46	
Fund Balance:			
Open Space/Recreation Reserve	\$ 150,000	\$ 386,739.00	
Historic Preservation Reserve	\$ 150,000	\$ 386,739.00	
Affordable Housing Reserve	\$ 150,000	\$ 386,739.00	
Undesignated Fund Balance	\$ 1,449,397.28	\$ 2,667,713.54	
Revenue Control			
Total Fund Balance	\$ 1,899,397.28	\$ 3,827,930.54	
Total Liabilities & Fund Balance	\$ 1,930,856.78	\$ 4,377,282.00	
Actual Revenue:	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
CPA Surcharge	\$ 1,899,397.28	\$ 1,559,392.33	
State Revenue		\$ 367,395.00	
Interest Revenue			
Tax Liens		\$ 1,606.50	
I&P Liens		\$ 139.43	
Total Actual Revenue	\$ 1,899,397.28	\$ 1,928,533.26	
Estimated Revenue:	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
CPA Surcharge	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,250,000
State Revenue		\$ 367,395	\$ 231,400
Other			
Total Estimated Revenue	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 2,367,395	\$ 2,481,400
Reserves:			
10% Open Space/Recreation		\$ 236,739	\$ 248,140
10% Historic Preservation		\$ 236,739	\$ 248,140

10% Affordable Housing		\$ 236,739	\$ 248,140
5% Administrative Budget		--	\$ 124,070
70%/65% Undesignated		\$ 1,657,158	\$ 1,612,910
		\$ 2,367,395	\$ 2,481,400

7. Discussion and consideration of upcoming Community Preservation Committee organizational tasks

Thomas suggested that consultant options and procurement could be discussed. Steele suggested that work schedule and consultant services should be discussed. Thomas added Notify Me, Emails, doing work themselves, or getting a needs assessment which could cost \$15K +/- . Bockian added website content, community engagement plan which could include the website, needs assessment, etc. Rose mentioned that Newton has one-page blurb of each member and this could be done for Watertown. Steele identified that the procedural process could be started but others felt that should be discussed later. Bockian suggested looking at the Town's plans and discussing.

Schreiber said he would send the Comp Plan memo and Rose said she would send example links and compile the one-pager info sheets.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the CPC will be held on Thursday, April 18, 2019, 7:00 P.M., Richard E. Mastrangelo Council Chamber, Administration Building, 149 Main Street

9. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting of the CPC, seconded and adopted unanimously on a voice vote; the meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Watertown, Massachusetts
2019 Community Preservation Committee

Elodia Thomas, Chair, as a resident for 40+ years, she is aware of the significant changes and challenges reshaping our town. A citizen-advocate, she is engaged in protecting and expanding our parks and open spaces, improving our school facilities, balancing development, and enhancing the quality of life for all in our community. Her professional background includes community mental health & wellness, higher education administration, and sales & marketing. With a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology, her work has focused on people's psychological well-being across the settings of family, school, work, and community. She loves Watertown for its diversity and its dynamic community environment.

Jonathan Bockian is a Town Manager-appointee and Watertown resident for 42 years. He is a retired commercial real estate attorney. He served as real estate counsel to Historic New England for over 30 years, was a member of the Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition's Easement Defense Committee, a board member of the Mosesian Center for the Arts, the Boston Home, and the housing organization Heading Home. He has been a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals and is on the Watertown Transit Task Force steering committee.

Jason Cohen is the Planning Board Designee on the CPC - he has served on the Board since 2018 and on the Zoning Board of Appeals for the previous 3 years. In that capacity, he is well-attuned to the myriad qualities of Watertown, as well as the unique challenges that it faces as a city. He is an architect practicing in Boston, and has specialized in several different areas of design including multi-family residential, retail, academic, and historic preservation. Originally from Montreal, he has lived with his wife and 2 daughters in Watertown since 2001.

Bob DiRico is Watertown's Supervisor of Parks and Cemeteries and serves as the Board of Parks Designee on the CPC. Prior to working in Watertown, Bob was in the Golf Course Management field for 35+ years. He is a 30-year resident of Newton. Bob has served on the Newton Integrated Pest Management committee and was a Turf Consultant for Newton Parks and Recreation.

Dennis Duff is a Town Manager appointee and life-long resident. He recently retired after 35 years serving the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the House of Representatives. He has served Watertown for over 50 years in various roles including: Town Meeting member, the Watertown Redevelopment Authority, the 2010 Charter Review Committee, he served on the Building 121 Committee and the Local Growth Policy. His education is in Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; and he is a Board Member on Trees for Watertown.

Allen Gallagher is the Chairman of the Watertown Housing Authority and their appointee to the CPC. He served as the Executive Director of the Watertown Boys and Girls Club for 21 years and is now retired. He is a graduate of Boston University; is the Treasurer of the nonprofit Friends of Matt Galligan; is a member of the Board of Corporators of Watertown Savings Bank; is the past President and Honorary Life Member of the Watertown Ancient Order of Hibernians, and the former owner of American Glass and Mirror, Inc.

Mark Krackiewicz is a Town Manager appointee and has spent most of his career as an economist for the U.S. Agency for International Development aiding countries on privatization, improving business

environments, and financial sector development. Earlier he had helped put together the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management plan for the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs. He is a past board member and current advisory board member of the Charles River Conservancy. A Watertown resident for twenty-seven years, he lives in a home protected as a Watertown historic landmark.

Maria Rose is the vice-chair of the Watertown Conservation Commission and their designee to the CPC. She is a civil/environmental engineer with over 25 years of experience in stormwater management, environmental assessments, permitting and construction. She is the chair of the Charles River Watershed Municipal Stormwater Collaborative and their representative to the MA Statewide Municipal Stormwater Coalition. She understands the importance of people connecting with nature and parklands and works to preserve and improve these valuable resources.

Susan Steele has been a member of the Watertown Historical Commission for 11 years; and is their designee to the CPC. Her career has been focused in marketing, business development and knowledge management for several architectural firms in Boston; several of these firms have specialized in areas of historical renovation, restoration and reuse. She has lived in Watertown for 45 years, and values our rich history - reflected in stories, structures and neighborhoods.

Watertown Community Preservation Plan

RFQ: Scope of Work

RFQ Introduction

The Town of Watertown (technically a city) will accept proposals from qualified firms and individuals to enter into a contract with the Town to provide consulting services for developing a process to accept, evaluate, and recommend funding requests for the Community Preservation Fund and to develop the Town's Community Preservation Plan, including a robust public engagement process.

Community Background

Located six miles west of Boston, with a population of just over 35,700* in 4 square miles, Watertown is a densely populated municipality that retains the title of "town" while functioning under state law as a city with a Council/Manager form of government. [*Estimate 2017 U.S. Census Bureau]

Watertown has significant cultural and natural assets, unique retail areas, diverse housing stock across its residential neighborhoods, and easy access to public and highway transportation networks. At the same time, the community enjoys the advantages of being part of the Boston metropolitan area and its strong regional finance, education, tech and life sciences economy.

Approximately 119 acres of parkland and open space are owned by the Town, augmented by the Charles River Greenway, parts of the historic Gore Estate, and Mount Auburn Cemetery (the first garden cemetery in the U.S.). The entire area of Watertown is no more than a mile and a half from the Charles River.

The Town is home to Perkins School for the Blind, Mosesian Center for the Arts, the Armenian Cultural and Educational Center, and the historic Watertown Arsenal established in 1816, which manufactured armaments and conducted material research. The site was converted to civilian use in 1995.

Watertown has a long and proud history. Archeological evidence suggests that two tribes - the Pequossette and the Nonantum - had settlements on the rich fishing grounds of the river, later called the Charles. In 1630, the first permanent settlers arrived, sent by the Massachusetts Bay Company. First known as Saltonstall Plantation and later as Watertown, this was one of the earliest [Massachusetts Bay Colony](#) settlements. It became a center of trade and agriculture. In the early years of the American Revolution, Watertown played a significant role. It was here, in July 1775, that General George Washington met with members of the newly formed Massachusetts Assembly before setting out for Cambridge where he took command of the Continental Army.

Watertown has been innovative in its re-use of old industrial sites along the river and the former rail corridor. New and proposed development supports the existing network of community squares, retail hubs, and multi-modal corridors that make Watertown a well-connected town, a close-knit place to live, and a convenient place for a variety of work options with burgeoning engineering, health, and life science companies.

On November 8, 2016, the City voted (60% to 40%) to adopt the Community Preservation Act,

M.G.L. Chapter 44B. The vote authorized a property tax surcharge of 2% with exemptions for low income and low- or moderate-income senior homeowners as well as the residential property exemption. A nine-member Community Preservation Committee (CPC) is responsible for making recommendations to the Town Council for Historic Preservation, Open Space, Recreation, and Community Housing projects. Watertown's annual tax surcharge totals approximately \$2,000,000 plus the annual state match.

Scope of Work

The consultant will provide technical assistance, guidance, and leadership as to best practices to prepare and implement a Community Preservation Plan that complies with the requirements under MGL Chapter 44B referred to as the Community Preservation Act, and specifically Subsection 5 (b)(1), in consultation with the Community Preservation Committee.

The Committee is looking for a plan that jump starts an exciting town-wide engagement process to develop community enhancing projects - imaginative and doable - that will best serve all residents of Watertown for decades to come.

The consultant will provide services in the following areas:

- 1. Community Preservation Plan: Study and incorporate the needs, possibilities, and resources of Watertown regarding community preservation and establish goals and priorities for grants in the designated areas of Affordable Housing, Historic Preservation, Open Space and Recreation.**

- The plan shall be based on a strong community engagement process:

In coordination with the CPC, gather input from municipal boards, commissions, and community stakeholders, including but not limited to: Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Historical Commission, Housing Authority, and other interested parties such as the Recreation Department, Housing Partnership, Historic District Commission, Historic Society, Council on Aging, Public Works, Town Council, Watertown Public Schools, the Boys and Girls Club, and the Library.

- Organize and manage two general public information meetings at the beginning of the process to inform the public about the CPA and gather input from the public on needs, goals and priorities.
- Organize and manage a public meeting to review the draft plan and obtain feedback and comments.
- Review and incorporate into the plan the relevant and up-to-date portions of existing policy, priorities, and recommendations from existing planning documents such as Watertown's Comprehensive Plan, Open Space Plan, and Housing Production Plan.

- Develop and administer a survey, on-line and/or on paper, to gather input from the public on needs, goals and priorities.
- Propose other creative methods to garner community input such as focus groups, community events, public posters and banners, workshops, and targeted activities to reach the diverse populations in Watertown.

2. Develop Draft and Final Protocols & Procedures:

- Develop a two-step eligibility application process, application forms, and a CPA Eligibility Matrix for reviewing, evaluating, and accepting grant applications.
- Develop a workshop program and toolbox to inform the community about the CPA funding guidelines and procedural rules, the funding application process, and the review and evaluation criteria matrix that establishes minimum requirements, desirable elements, and fair evaluation of all applications based on goals and priorities as established in the Community Preservation Plan.
- Develop project Application Guidelines & Scoring Criteria that reflect the community values, goals, priorities, and available CPA funding as established in the Community Preservation Plan.
- Develop a calendar and process diagram for the proposal process in line with Watertown's annual budgetary process, and a project recommendation template including project description and costs for annual project funding recommendations to the Town Council.
- Develop brand marketing and CPC content and templates for social media outreach, the annual report, and the website.

3. Plan Outline - Watertown's Community Preservation Plan shall incorporate these elements:

- a. Description of the Community Preservation Act;
- b. Overview of the Watertown CPA
 - i. Adoption date
 - ii. Surcharge and Exemptions
 - iii. Available Funds Chart (updatable annually);
- c. Composition and Members of the Watertown Community Preservation Committee;
- d. CPA Eligible Projects Matrix;
- e. Values, Policies, Guiding Principles;
- f. Application Guidelines and Process (two-step);
- g. Sections on Open Space and Recreation; Historic Resources; and Community Housing with each section to include:

- i. Needs, Goals, and Priorities
 - ii. Eligible Activities
 - iii. Resource Factsheet
- h. CPC Project Review Guidelines & Scoring Criteria;
- i. Proposal and project annual schedule and funding process.
- j. Recommendations to the CPC regarding the annual updating of the plan.

4. Required Meetings:

The selected applicant shall attend, facilitate and participate in meetings with the CPC and stakeholders, including but not limited to:

- An initial meeting with the CPC to discuss general requirements of the Plan and the application process;
- At least two community meeting for the public and stakeholders, facilitated by the Consultant, for input into the Plan;
- A public meeting with the CPC to review the draft Plan and obtain comments;
- A public hearing on the revised draft Plan to obtain public comment;
- A meeting with the CPC to review the final Plan.

5. Final Plan:

The selected consultant shall submit the final plan that incorporates the agreed upon comments from the review process identified in item 4.

6. Ongoing consulting services as needed to implement the program.

Submittal Requirements:

A narrative describing the proposer's understanding of the scope of work and experience with the specific items shall be submitted in the order listed below:

- a. A statement of qualifications;
- b. Identification of all consultants with resumes attached. In addition, identify the key individual that will bear primary responsibility for completing the work;
- c. Dates and Summaries of previous Community Preservation Plans completed by the consultant;
- d. Examples of previous experience with the CPA implementation process;

- e. Description of how proposer will achieve the public outreach process with the general public, stakeholders, town staff and officials.
- f. Proposed schedule and delivery for completing the Scope of Work;
- g. Three references from projects or previous professional experience of similar scope;
- h. Any other information that the applicant considers relevant for the purpose of evaluating its qualifications for the project.

Minimum Qualifications:

- a. Submission of all required documentation;
- b. Demonstrated ability to complete projects on time and within the budget;
- c. Demonstrated ability to meet with appropriate parties and gather relevant project data and documentation;
- d. Demonstrated ability to coordinate public outreach process;
- e. Demonstrated experience in Community Preservation Act implementation.

Selection Process:

The ideal consultant/firm is thoroughly familiar with the Community Preservation Act and has experience in preparing similar plans and documents. The Community Preservation Committee (the “Committee”) will rate each application according to the criteria below and then interview the top candidates.

Comparative Evaluation Criteria:

In addition to the submittal requirements and the minimum criteria listed above, for which the consultant/firm will receive one (1) point each if submitted and/or in compliance, the RFQ will be reviewed and scored for the degree to which the consultant/firm meets the previously enumerated qualifications and for the skills of assigned staff based upon the comparative evaluation criteria rating system below:

Highly Advantageous (3 points) - Excels on the specific evaluation criterion

Advantageous (2 points) - Fully meets the specific evaluation criterion

Not Advantageous (1 point) - Inadequately meets the specific evaluation criterion

Unacceptable (0 points) - Fails to meet the specific evaluation criterion or insufficient information to determine compliance.

Scoring Category	Highly Advantageous (3 points)	Advantageous (2 points)	Not Advantageous (1 point)	Unacceptable (0 points)
1. Completeness and quality of the application.	The submittal contains complete, concise, informative and highly detailed information that is of superior quality communication and writing skills are excellent.	The submittal is complete, informative, and responsive and of good quality. Communication and writing skills are good.	The submittal has gaps related to the core elements of the required submittals stated in the RFQ. Communication and writing skills appear to be only adequate.	The submittal is not complete. Communication and writing skills are poor.
2. Qualifications and depth of project experience.	The proposer demonstrates superior experience in providing services related to the Town's requirements. The proposer demonstrates a wide depth of experience with similar recent projects in an urban community of similar size and demographics, and prior experience with municipally funded contracts. Project work samples are of excellent quality in content and technical presentation.	The proposer demonstrates solid experience in providing services related to the Town's requirements. The proposer demonstrates a good depth of experience with similar recent projects in an urban community of similar size and demographics, and prior experience with municipal funded contracts. Project work samples are of good quality in content and technical presentation.	The proposer demonstrates fair or limited experience in providing services related to the Town's requirements or with similar projects in an urban community, and work samples minimally meet current standards for content and technical presentation.	The proposer does not demonstrate experience in providing services related to the Town's requirements or with similar projects.
3. Qualifications of proposed staff	The proposed staff have superior experience with and have substantial evidence of assistance to community boards and knowledge of the Community Preservation Act.	A proposed member has some successful experience with assistance to community boards and a proposed member has knowledge of the Community Preservation Act.	No one on the proposed team has substantially contributed to a project involving the Community Preservation Act, but at least one member has other relevant experience.	No one on the proposed team has experience working with community boards or the Community Preservation Act for a municipality in Massachusetts.
4. Approach to the schedule and delivery for completing the Scope of Services.	The elements of the scope of services and schedule demonstrates superior understanding and consideration of the Town and CPC goals for this project.	The elements of the scope of services and schedule demonstrates a good understanding and consideration of the Town and CPC goals for this project.	The elements of the scope of services do not represent a desirable approach to the project and gaps in the understanding and consideration of the Town and CPC goals for this project.	There are missing elements which indicate a lack of understanding and consideration of the Town and CPC goals for this project.

5. Familiarity with Watertown and its needs, challenges, and opportunities.	Demonstrates extensive knowledge and familiarity with Watertown and its needs, challenges, and opportunities.	Demonstrates good level of knowledge and familiarity with Watertown and its needs, challenges, and opportunities.	Demonstrates some knowledge and familiarity with the Watertown and its needs, challenges, and opportunities.	No knowledge or familiarity with the Watertown and its needs, challenges, and opportunities.
6. Approach to public engagement.	Describes a robust approach to facilitating community engagement.	Describes an adequate approach to community engagement.	Describes an approach to community engagement that will require refinement.	Does not sufficiently address community engagement.

Estimated Timeline:

Milestone:	Estimated Due Date:
Legal advertisement to paper	June 28
Published in newspaper	July 5
Released to public	July 8
Deadline for RFQ responses	July 31 by 1:00PM
Candidates review process & selection	August 1 to August 9
Community Preservation Committee interviews (Standby date September 26)	September 19
Committee votes to proceed with top candidate	September 19
Consultant to submit deliverables: scope, timeline, cost. Review begins	October 1
Committee meeting to approve deliverables, budget appropriation is negotiated, and committee makes a recommendation to award contract	October 4
Finalize Contract	October 15
Project Starts	October 21
Project Completion - approximately 6 months	March 2020