

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
November 10, 2020

A regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, November 10, 2020 at 6:00 pm via remote participation through Zoom. Present were Chair Bart Hoskins, Carole Hamilton, Ed Moriarty, Deborah Greel, Mark Pattison, Mickey Northcutt, Joy Livramento-Bryant, Bob Callahan and John Boris. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Written Comments Received

Ms. Guy stated that she received an email from the staff person to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, who stated that there were no comments.

Ms. Guy read a letter received from Cathy Hoog, Executive Director of the Salem Housing Authority dated 10/19/20.

Review of Draft Community Preservation Plan for release for public comment

Ms. Guy reviewed the Draft Community Preservation Plan noting that changes from the prior year plan included updates to dates, dollar amounts, pictures and project status. She stated that narratives revised were highlighted in blue on pages 24-32, including one new plan added on page 32. She encouraged the board to review documents referenced in the plan prior to the review of applications in the Spring.

Mr. Hoskins noted that when CPA began, the various studies were included into the Community Preservation Plan, which gives a handy, one-stop shop to see recommendations.

Ms. Guy stated that each year she updates the plan with new studies that were developed that are applicable to CPA funds, such as replacing the old 5-Year Consolidated Plan with the new 5-Year Consolidated Plan this year.

Ms. Guy stated that if the draft is acceptable, she will release it for public comment. She asked for a vote to accept the draft plan and to release it for a public comment period. She asked for an additional vote that if minor or no comments are received, that she be permitted to finalize the plan without requiring a final vote of the CPC (thereby not needing a December meeting) and to proceed with announcing application deadlines. If there are comments that would require substantive amendments to the plan, there would be a December meeting to approve those changes. Ms. Guy stated that she could send any comments received to the Mr. Hoskins for his agreement that changes are not necessary or changes are minor. If it is determined that the comments would result in a substantive changes, there will need to be a December meeting.

Mr. Moriarty noted that an issue that came up last year if there are any planning documents that relate to the issue of equity. He noted that equity has become an increasingly relevant issue in terms of the allocation of public resources. He asked if there were any planning documents that

reflect concepts of equity, fairness or inclusion as it relates to the resources that we fund including open space, recreation and public housing.

Ms. Guy looked at the Human Resources, Studies and Reports and Disabilities Commission web pages. The only document she could see was an ADA transition plan.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she believed the ADA transition plan would be how to bring buildings that are not compliant with ADA into compliance.

Mr. Moriarty stated that it is a concept that is relevant and material to good governance at all levels – national, state and local – and could be something that could be inclusive of CPC goals and objectives in the future. He suggested that it be acknowledged that there are no publications, standards or practices on the concept of equity in the allocation of public resources that can be added to the CPC's revised plan, but is a concept that the CPC would be aware of.

Ms. Greel stated that she brought the subject up last year, and was encouraged to now hear Mr. Moriarty talk about equity in terms of future projects.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he stated it is a concept that is omnipresent in good governance, and that there appears to be no documents that reflect it that are directly applicable to the CPC role, but that he wanted the record to show that the CPC would be interested in any references to or opportunities to utilize the concept of equity, inclusion and fundamental fairness in the allocation of resources going forward in a subsequent year.

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to accept the draft FY21 Community Preservation Plan and FY20 Annual Report as presented and to release it for a public comment period. Mr. Boris seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Greel made a motion that, after the close of the public comment period, to approve the final plan if minor or no public comments are received, and proceed with announcing application deadlines. Mr. Boris seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Approval of Minutes – 3/10/20 and 10/13/20

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Boris made a motion to approve the minutes of 3/10/20 and 10/13/20. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Ms. Greel abstained from voting for 10/13/20 minutes.

Funding Availability Update

Ms. Guy stated that the Finance Department provided the penalties and interest figures. The City is now waiting for the MA Department of Revenue to certify the numbers, which would be \$190,148, available sometime this month. In March, when we get the new State match percentage, we will create the budget which gets approved by the City Council in April or May, which will be added to the balance for the total budget available in Spring.

Project Signs

Mr. Moriarty sent me a request to discuss project signs on CPA funded projects, particularly the redevelopment of the courthouse project. She stated that historically, we have not required project signs for studies, only for construction, but was fine with discussing. She knows where all the existing signage is located, but some are at older projects.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt signage is a critical connection with what the CPC does, the money the CPC provides and the opportunity to see where funds are being spent. He felt it should be default position rather than determined on a per project basis. He suggested signage shall be placed for any place that CPC funds are utilized unless there is a good reason that signage can't be applied. He felt there should not be distinction between a study project and shovel in the ground project.

Mr. Callahan was in agreement, but felt that after the project is completed, there be a certain amount a time that sign remain at project, such as after a year the sign could come down.

Ms. Guy described the four types of existing signs and where they are currently located. Some project owners use their own signage to acknowledge several funding sources.

Mr. Callahan stated that he was impressed with the amount of projects underway or completed with CPA funds. He stated that he felt large sign could be for a limited time, but suggested there be a small, permanent sign.

Ms. Guy stated that she can look into a different sign that could be purchased.

Mr. Hoskins stated that the big impact is when the project is complete, the ribbon is cut and people start using the resource, so for some period of time we would want a sign there. He noted that the signs remind people that CPA provides value to the surcharge to their property taxes. He felt the goal has been to distribute projects all over town. He suggested folding signage into the discussion of project recommendations, such as the size of the sign while under construction and then changed to a smaller metal sign afterwards, noting there may be places where a permanent sign is not needed.

Ms. Guy suggested that she review and put it on an agenda in the Spring.

Next Meeting(s):

Ms. Guy stated that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 8, 2020, which will tentatively be to finalize the Community Preservation Plan, if substantive public comment is received on the draft. If there is no December meeting, the next meeting will be January 12, 2021 to review Step 1 eligibility applications.

There being no further business, Ms. Hamilton made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy
Administrator