



CITY OF PITTSFIELD

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

MEETING MINUTES MONDAY, JULY 24, 2017 6:00 P.M. CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Attendance:

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

Other attendees: CJ Hoss, City Planner (CH)

Absent: Shirley Edgerton (SE); Simon Muil (SM)

JC called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

1) ROLL CALL

A quorum was present with two absences.

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 24-2017

SI made a motion to approve the minutes with a second from GM. JD asked for a clarification of location of the PowerPoint presentation referenced in the minutes. The presentation will be uploaded to the Community Preservation Committee site with the approved minutes. All in favor.

3) APPROVAL OF FUTURE MEETING DATES (8/28, 9/25, 10/30, 11/27, 12/18, 1/22)

DS made a motion to approve with a second from SI. All in favor.

4) REVIEW OF CPC ORDINANCE/RESPONSIBILITIES

JC provided a brief overview of next steps which led into a discussion of the memorandum prepared by staff providing a potential timeline leading to the allocation of Community Preservation Act funds in Fiscal Year 2019. AG asked for clarification of whether a reference to funds that could be used for eligible housing projects carries over to other areas as well. CH responded that it is up to the CPC to decide, but given the large amount of recreation and open space in Pittsfield that eligible dollars would likely be directed to existing spaces versus creating new space. DS quoted text from the ordinance creating the CPC for guidance on how funding can be used for recreation and open space. CH followed that the purpose of the upcoming planning and prioritization process will be to evaluate the priorities of how funds are allocated. JC provided a brief overview of the purpose of the timeline and how the committee can potentially move forward.

5) REVIEW OF DRAFT CPC BUDGET

JC introduced the draft Fiscal Year 2018 budget and the purpose of the preparation of the document and clarified that the state match for CPA will not be estimated until the budget provided for Fiscal Year 2019. CH provided an overview of why the CPC should adopt a budget despite not having full funding available until July 1, 2018 – adopting a budget would allow for expenditures in case of an emergency situation. CH went on to explain how this fits into the timeline document provided to the CPC. JD stated that his impression was that the surcharge should be listed on the tax bill but it was not on his most recent bill. Discussion ensued, with CH explaining that his belief was because of timing of implementation, the surcharge would only be found on the tax bills for the final two quarters of the Fiscal Year but he would verify for the next meeting. DS requested an explanation for the proposed administrative fund in the draft budget. CH explained that the proposed administrative line in the budget was the maximum allowable as part of the CPA fund and explained the types of costs that could be absorbed under administrative costs. The CPC is not required to fund administrative costs. DS brought up the timeline and the description of the creation of the CPA prioritization plan. CH explained that staff would provide the support to develop the plan but it would be largely based on previous planning work and public feedback.

CH provided an overview of the Community Preservation Committee page provided to give the CPC a web presence and the goals for information that will be made publicly available. JC asked if the Committee wanted personal information listed with their names or if CH should be the primary contact. The CPC decided to allow CH to be the primary contact.

6) REVIEW OF POTENTIAL APPLICATION FORMAT

JC opened up discussion on the draft CPC funding application. AG asked for clarification on dates listed in the timeline. CH explained that the timeline wouldn't necessarily be set in stone, but to illustrate how the next steps could unfold to allow for allocations by July 1, 2018. It is likely dates could be pushed back at the end to allow for a more concentrated application/review schedule. JC commented that he favored the two step application process. Discussion ensued on the timing of the process and meeting with applicants. JC suggested the Committee review the materials and provide CH with comments in advance of the August meeting.

7) OTHER BUSINESS

DS noted that some of the documents she had reviewed to date reference that historical objects and documents could potentially be eligible for funding and asked if this needed to be specifically delineated in the planning phase. CH responded that it would be up to the Committee on how to handle these types of requests and whether or not they are a priority.

AG asked if the Committee decides to utilize a two-step application process whether it could be changed in the future. JC replied that the Committee could make changes to the application process.

GM asked how interaction with the various City bodies with representation on the CPC should be managed moving forward. CH responded that the members of the CPC representing the five bodies are tasked with providing that representation, and that an ideal forum for additional voices from those bodies may be best served at the public meetings that will be scheduled for the planning process.

DS asked who would handle outreach. CH replied that the City would handle part of the public outreach but that members of the Committee would be expected to do outreach as well.

JD asked if the September 25th meeting is the planned public meeting. CH responded that the goal is for a September public outreach meeting and the Committee could decide in August whether a second meeting is required.

8) ADJOURNMENT

JD made a motion to adjourn at 6:47 pm, seconded by DS.

Submitted by CJ Hoss, City Planner.