



CITY OF PITTSFIELD

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE, CITY HALL, 70 ALLEN STREET, RM 205, PITTSFIELD, MA 01201

MEETING MINUTES MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2017 6:00 P.M. CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Attendance:

Committee: James Conant (JC), John Dickson (JD); Alexandra Groff (AG); Sheila Irvin (SI); George Moran (GM); Danielle Steinmann (DS); Simon Muil (SM)

Other attendees: CJ Hoss, City Planner (CH),

Absent: Thomas Cracolici (TC); Shirley Edgerton (SE)

JC called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

1) ROLL CALL

A quorum was present with two absences.

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 24, 2017

GM made a motion to approve the minutes with a second from SM. All in favor.

3) APPROVAL OF DRAFT CPC BUDGET

CH provided a brief update that he was planning on meeting with the Director of Finance to work out the next steps for submission to the City Council. JC added that City staff developed the estimated surcharge generation that led to the proposed budget. SM made a motion to approve with a second from SI. All in favor.

4) APPROVAL OF APPLICATION FORMAT

CH described the changes made to the application from the prior version discussed in July meeting. Discussion ensued related to largely non-substantive changes to the document, with some amendments made based on further review of how other communities developed application priorities. JD asked if applicants should plan on attending relevant committee/board meetings to seek support for their applications. SM provided an overview of how the Parks Commission reviews applications for use of parks. CH provided that in order to prioritize applications, it will be important for the various bodies to provide recommendations. JC added that those bodies will be best positioned to make recommendations. Discussion ensued that it will be in the best interest of applicants to seek support to strengthen their proposal. DS added that as part of second application step the CPC could encourage seeking project support. DS also added other suggested amendments to the application. SM made a motion to approve the format with changes with a second by SI. All in favor.

5) DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC MEETING FORMAT

CH provided a brief outline of a potential outline for a public presentation. CH described providing an overview of the Community Preservation Act, the CPC, progress made to date, and describing next steps. Overall, the purpose of the meeting is to provide an overview and begin soliciting feedback on community priorities without getting too deep into specific projects. SM suggested allowing open ended discussion at the meeting to create more interest in attendance. CH suggested that a way to allow discussion would be to allow for participation at the end of the meeting similar to the City's recent meeting on the Open Space and Recreation Plan. CH also added that this wouldn't be the only public input provided in the process, that there would be more meetings to discuss the plan and the CPC could consider a public survey. SI asked how the survey would be made available to the public. CH provided several options for encouraging participation. SI asked if the group should be prepared to respond to specifics on projects. DS asked what types of inquiries the City had received regarding projects. CH provided that overall the City has not received many inquiries but the group should be prepared to respond as best as possible at this early stage. GM asked for more specifics on how the group will encourage participation. AG also inquired on participation and encouraging participation. CH responded that if the group is aggressive in marketing the meeting there is a good chance of robust turnout. Discussion ensued on the specifics of what will be included in the public presentation. CH offered up circulating an outline of what would be included in the public presentation in advance of the meeting to allow for individual comment. SI suggested providing examples of the types of projects that could be allowable through CPA funds. CH agreed that would be a good way of illustrating potential projects. DS agreed with previous discussion to provide an interactive exercise at the end of the meeting that would provide a platform for attendees to voice their opinion.

6) OTHER BUSINESS

JS introduced a potential prioritization scoring sheet for projects. JD added that a scoring sheet would greatly assist the review project. JD is going to explore how other communities have taken on developing a scoring system and follow up with the CPC. Discussion ensued on how priorities would be shared with applicants. JC asked everyone to review.

7) ADJOURNMENT

SM made a motion to adjourn at 6:46 pm, seconded by SI.

Submitted by CJ Hoss, City Planner.