

Gloucester Community Preservation Committee

Committee Meeting Report for June 23, 2010

Members attending: Stacy Randell, Sandy Dahl-Ronan, John Feener, Karen Gallagher,
Dan Morris, Scott Smith, Bill Dugan, Ian Lane

Members absent: J.J. Bell

Staff: Sarah Garcia, Matt Lustig, Community Development Staff

1. Minutes (corrected prior to the meeting based on comments submitted by e-mail) from the CPC meeting held on May 26, 2010, were accepted unanimously and without further amendment. Moved, Mr. Lane; seconded, Ms. Randell.

2. Ms. Garcia discussed bonding with Kenny Costa, the new auditor, with an eye towards the possibility of funding for the City Hall project. The City hosts considerable expertise on the subject of bonding and would need to be consulted as any CP funding plan that involves bonding is developed. A bond term of less than 20 years would be preferred. The April 21, 2010, memo on the subject of bonding, prepared by Mr. Lustig for the City Hall Restoration Committee was reviewed.

Also, Ms. Garcia noted that the City general fund would not be used to supplement CP funding for restoration of the exterior of City Hall. The mayor's priority is on office space.

3. Mr. Lustig reviewed a table listing the preliminary CP funding proposals that we have received. The preliminary proposals were reviewed by staff and the co-chairs for basic eligibility. Some were referred to the City's attorney for a legal opinion on their eligibility. Of the 26 pre-proposals received, seven were determined not to be eligible for CP funding.

Mr. Lustig consulted with Mr. Lane regarding historic preservation of private property. Applicants must show that that buildings proposed for restoration through CP funding are historic and provide a demonstrable public benefit. Mr. Lane broadly described the historic district in Gloucester and the gradations of historic registry – from the local street index to landmark status. Four of the applicants whose projects involved private property were sent letters indicating that they would need to address these points in their final proposals.

4. The CPC discussed its processes for reviewing final proposals.

- All members should read all of the proposals. Hard copies will be provided by the applicants and distributed by Community Development staff. Electronic copies will also be made available, most likely on a shared drive. There was discussion, without conclusion, on version control.
- The first screening will be for basic completeness and any glaring problems with the documents or the proposed project itself.

- The CPC intends to be tolerant of missing details in the proposals (so long as they are substantially complete) and will go back to applicants to seek the further details, as needed.
- Each member will be assigned final proposals and asked to become the CPC's expert on those proposals.
- The expert CPC member will brief the full committee and will lead the discussion of the proposal.
- There should be no expectation of confidentiality. Once the proposal is submitted, it becomes a public document.
- Mr. Lustig will develop a simple table that will make it easy to review a proposal relative to the CP general criteria and category-specific criteria.
- Decisions will be made by voting, a majority of the quorum would carry the vote.

5. Ms. Gallagher continues to meet with City staff regarding reports that will be available for the CPC. There was some discussion of the amounts that may be available for awards in this funding round. The call for proposals referred only to the first year of CP funding (FY2010). Any bonding should be limited to a payment schedule that can be met by an amount less than or equal to 70% of the City's base projected CP collections. Since the state match cannot be projected with high confidence, that portion of the fund should not be the basis of bonding.

6. The next meeting of the CPC will be on July 28 at 7:00 p.m. The CPC noted that meetings may need to be more frequent than monthly in order to work through the proposals in time for November awards.

7. The meeting adjourned around 8:50 p.m. on Mr. Feener's motion, Mr. Dugan's second, and the CPC's unanimous consent.

Documents used during the meeting.

1. Memo; April 21, 2010; Matt Lustig to the City Hall Restoration Committee: Issuing bonds against CPA funds.
2. Letters (8); June 14 & 15, 2010, Matt Lustig to CP applicants: Eligibility of the proposal.
3. Table; June 2010; Matt Lustig for the CPC: CPA funding requests 2010.
4. Note; undated, author not indicated: Proposal for application review process
5. Note; undated, CPC: Community Preservation Committee application evaluation criteria.
6. Tables (3); June 16, 2010; City of Gloucester; Revenue and expenditure reports and an account level balance sheet.