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

Meeting Minutes: Thursday, June 17, 2021, Raya Stern Trustees Room and remote access, 7:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Mark Kraczkiewicz, Chair; Jason Cohen, Vice Chair; Jon Bockian (joined remotely), Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher, Jamie O'Connell, Susan Steele, and Elodia Thomas.

Others Present: Lanae Handy, CPC Coordinator

1. **Call Meeting to Order**

   Mark Kraczkiewicz, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Lanae called the roll. Mark Kraczkiewicz, Jason Cohen, Jon Bockian (via Zoom), Dennis J. Duff; Allen Gallagher, Jamie O'Connell, Susan Steele, and Elodia Thomas were present.

2. **Acceptance of 6-3-21 Meeting Minutes**

   Mark asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes. Elodia said the draft minutes were distributed the day before the meeting, which was too late to review them thoroughly.

   Allen suggested delaying a vote until the next meeting. Mark stated the vote would be delayed until the next meeting.

3. **Discussion CPA Project Evaluation**

   Mark spoke of how discussion on the evaluation matrix, which was first presented last fall, had been held off until now. He asked what committee members thought about the draft evaluation matrix and proposed cover page or website landing page for the matrix.

   Susan thought the matrix should look at both the merits of a project and the capability of the project team. Dennis asked if there should be something about maintenance. Elodia found it repetitive, too loose and thought it could be done better. Jason asked if the matrix was the same document reviewed last November.

Lanae pointed out that a few revisions were made to the guiding principles in the plan and changes were made reflecting those revisions.

Mark asked the committee whether the matrix should be used at all.

Jason asked whether the matrix would be used to tabulate a quantitative score. Mark thought of using the matrix in a qualitative way to explain decision-making or selections to the Town Council. Dennis thought numerical scores could create problems if they must be released and projects with a lower score were selected. Mark was not in favor of using a numerical score. He noted that Stuart Saginor stated Grafton was the only town using a matrix. Jamie remarked if there were many projects, using a numerical score could be useful to sort projects. Susan asked if the last column was needed at all. Jamie pointed out that if the "inadequate column" were removed, it would not be just for applicants who were evaluated as "fair." Susan asked if the matrix could be used as a checklist.

On supporting needs and goals found in town documents, Elodia thought calling for consistency with town documents would be sufficient. Jason declared the CP Plan is based on the needs and goals found in town documents, therefore that criterion was redundant. Jon thought that if the matrix was used, the criteria should be broken down the same way as found in the CP Plan. He read the criterion of supporting goals in CP Plan as addressing individual funding category goals. Jon stated that if the criterion of supporting CP Plan goals only referred to the guiding principles, none of the other criteria would be necessary because all are found in the plan.

Mark turned the discussion to the cover sheet or website landing page. Susan and Elodia thought the text needed bullets. Jon preferred elimination of any expectation that all funds would be allocated. After discussion, committee members decided to drop the text for the landing page and simply include a sentence at the top of the evaluation matrix, "This evaluation matrix will be used by the CPC as a guide in its decision-making process".

Elodia asked about adding criteria such as: benefit to the city and non-burden to the city. She inquired whether those two items would be discussed by the committee during their review and deliberation. Jamie voiced concern about adding those criteria to the matrix since they had not been spelled out in the CP Plan. Jamie asked if the other rows in the matrix made sense to committee members. Elodia also asked about adding a criterion about funding. For example, whether the CPA enables a project to move forward or fills a partial funding gap. Jon believed it was worthwhile to have a table that breaks down the guiding principles and gives applicants some indication of what would be found in an excellent application. Allen did not see any harm in attaching the evaluation matrix because it would be a good guide for applicants.

After Mark and Jon suggested sending comments to Lanae, Jason expressed concern that there would be ongoing editing and the document would be at the same point at the next meeting. Elodia proposed sending a simplified version to the committee for review.

Mark summarized the decisions:

1. Use the matrix as a guide and not for obtaining a numerical score.

2. Eliminate the narrative column and remove the verbs from the criteria column.
3. Add a column for not applicable.
4. Generally, simplify wording in the matrix.
5. Distribute simplified document to committee members and members should send any comments to Lanae.

4. Proposed CPC Application Schedule

Mark asked for comments on the proposed schedule for the application process.

Mark had an issue about there not being a meeting before the applicants were deemed eligible. The committee decided to have a meeting prior to notifying applicants of eligibility. Elodia suggested moving the CPC meeting to October 7th. No applicants would be notified before the full committee agrees on the eligibility of projects.

Between the December 16th and January 20th meetings the committee will evaluate and possibly winnow down the applicant pool to decide which applicants will be invited to present their projects.

Jon asked about allowing for an additional meeting to deliberate even if it meant bumping the notification date. Mark stated the CPC could fit in an additional meeting.

Elodia mentioned another town held presentations over the course of two nights when there were 20 projects.

Motion: Dennis moved to accept the proposed application process schedule as amended. Elodia seconded.

Vote: Jon Bockian, Jason Cohen, Dennis J. Duff, Allen Gallagher, Mark Kraczkiewicz, Jamie O'Connell, Susan Steele, and Elodia Thomas voted in favor.

5. Adjournment

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

Vote: Jon Bockian, Jason Cohen, Dennis J. Duff, Allen Gallagher, Mark Kraczkiewicz, Jamie O'Connell, Susan Steele, and Elodia Thomas voted in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:49 PM.

Attachments to 2021-6-17 Meeting Minutes:

1. 2021-6-3 Draft CPC Meeting Minutes
2. Draft CPA Application Evaluation Matrix (6-16-21)
3. Proposed CPC Application Schedule (6-17-21)