

Gloucester Community Preservation Committee

Committee Meeting Report for September 8, 2010

Members attending: Stacy Randell, Sandy Dahl-Ronan, John Feener, Karen Gallagher,
Dan Morris, J.J. Bell

Members absent: Scott Smith, Bill Dugan, Ian Lane

Staff: Matt Lustig, Community Development Staff

Public: Peggy Hegarty-Steck & Maggie Meffen, Action

1. Minutes from the CPC meeting held on August 25, 2010, were accepted unanimously and without amendment. Moved, Ms. Dahl-Ronan; seconded, Ms. Gallagher. Mr. Feener suggested that the CPC consider tape recording future meetings, when deliberating and making decisions on funding recommendations. There was some discussion and questions about the City's policies and resources to support recordings. Mr. Feener did not suggest that a verbatim transcript of the meetings to be made, but noted that the recordings may prove to be handy references/reminders in the future. Mr. Lustig was asked to investigate the City's policies, legal requirements for recording meetings and disposition of the recordings, and equipment for making the recordings.

2. At the suggestion of the co-chairs, two representatives of Action, Inc., attended the meeting to discuss their proposal and to respond to questions. Ms. Peggy Hegarty-Steck & Ms. Maggie Meffen described Action's project proposal. It is similar to the program funded through CPA funds in Rockport. Essentially, the funds are used to help people who have fallen on hard times, typically, as a result of an incident such as an injury that rendered them unable to work for a period. Considered a soft subsidy, the funds would be used to keep these unfortunate individuals and families in a home in the community for up to six months. While in the program clients would have access to other supportive services, such as advocacy, job training, and mandatory budget training. In Rockport, client use of the program has ranged from one to twelve months and recidivism has been low.

There was some discussion regarding the project spending plan. CPC members said that if the project is funded, none of the money should go to staff and overhead expenses; all of it should go to the rent and mortgage assistance component of the project. Other points made by the Action representatives include:

- Rent and mortgage assistance payments are made to the landlord, rather than the client.
- To participate, one would have to be a resident of Gloucester, but there is no minimum residency time.
- Potential clients are assessed for their readiness to participate; *i.e.*, their attitude and preparation to engage with staff and take advantage of the wrap-around support provided by Action.

The CPC thanked Ms. Hegarty-Steck and Ms. Meffen for coming to the meeting and speaking with the Committee.

3. Ms. Gallagher and Mr. Lustig spoke briefly about financial reporting. All of the required annual reports will be submitted to the state on time. Since no projects have been funded, there is very little to report. Also, since we are in the second fiscal year of the CPA collections, the CPC has approximately \$902.5k budgeted from which to make award recommendations.
4. Mr. Lustig and Mr. Bell reviewed the process path that the CPC is on. The CPC will host a public hearing on the proposals later this month, and then will make decisions and submit a recommendation for funding certain projects to the mayor. The mayor has an unspecified time to review the recommendations before forwarding it to the City Council and may include her own recommendations. The Council's process is still to be determined. We do not know whether the Council will refer the package to committees or deal with it entirely in full session. The Council's action is likely to take a minimum of four weeks, therefore the committee decided to try to complete funding recommendations at the Sept. 21 meeting in order to meet the anticipated award date of mid-November outlined in the Community Preservation Plan.
5. The CPC then discussed the meeting for public input on the proposals. The meeting is set for 6:00 p.m. on September 21, 2010. The CPC's normal meeting will follow the public input session. Mr. Feener offered to prepare a powerpoint presentation providing a summary of the proposals. The simple presentation may come in handy at the public input meeting or when going over our recommendations with the City Council.
6. The members each reviewed a list of proposals and discussed in general terms the projects and possible funding amounts. This exercise sparked some discussion about the merits of the individual projects, as well as a consideration of the implications for future funding cycles of the various funding levels considered in this one. This latter issue was not concluded.
7. There was a short discussion of the City Hall project and whether the CPC should move directly to funding a portion of the preservation project or just the development of the specific detailed plans for the project. The latter would help firms form reasonable and more accurate competitive bids for the project. The former assumes that the project descriptions and details drafted by the consulting architectural firm would suffice. The CPC did not come to a conclusion on this question.
8. The next meeting of the CPC will be on September 21 at 7:00 p.m., following a public input meeting, which begins at 6:00 p.m. At that meeting the CPC will reconsider its previously proposed schedule of meetings (October 13 and 27).
9. The meeting adjourned shortly after 9:00 p.m. on Ms. Gallagher's motion, Ms. Randell's second, and the CPC's unanimous consent.

Documents used during the meeting.

1. A table prepared by Mr. Lustig in which members could enter the amount they would recommend for funding of each proposal.
2. Tables (2); August 25, 2010; City of Gloucester; Revenue and expenditure reports and an account level balance sheet.