JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

Somerville CPA

Open Space | Affordable Housing | Historic Preservation | Recreation

MEMBERS
Michael A. Capuano, Chair
Dick Bauer, Vice Chair
Tanya Cafarella
Elizabeth Duclos-Orsello
Michael Fager
Arn Franzen
Ezra Glenn
Courtney Koslow
Uma Murugan

STAFF
Emily Monea

CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2014

The Community Preservation Committee (CPC) held a regular meeting at 7:00pm in the Community Room at the Visiting Nurse Association at 259 Lowell Street, Somerville, MA 02144. An audio recording of the meeting is available upon request.

Members Present	Chair Michael Capuano, Vice Chair Dick Bauer, Tanya Cafarella, Michael Fager, Arn Franzen, Ezra Glenn, Courtney Koslow, and Uma Murugan (arrived late)
Members Absent	Elizabeth Duclos-Orsello
Staff Present	Emily Monea
Others Present	None

The Chair opened the meeting at approximately 7:05.

Agenda item 1: Public Comment Period
No members of the public were present at the meeting.

Agenda item 2: Approve minutes from July 7th meeting
Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Cafarella, the Committee voted 5-0 to approve the minutes from the July 7th meeting, with Mr. Bauer and Mr. Franzen abstaining as they were not present at the meeting.

Agenda item 3: Discuss and vote on model CPC will use to handle housing applications and to allocate funding to the Affordable Housing Trust
The Chair began the discussion by referring the Committee members to the summary of the comments made by Stuart Saginor, Executive Director of the Community Preservation Coalition, in a phone call with Ms. Monea, which Ms. Monea circulated to the Committee members on July 21st in an email.

The Committee members discussed whether to encourage the Affordable Housing Trust (the Trust) to change its ordinance to allow one or more members of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) to serve on it, as suggested by the Trust in its 2014 Strategic Vision Plan & Guidelines. Ms. Monea informed the members that she discussed this issue with Assistant City Solicitor David Shapiro, specifically the clause in the CPC ordinance that states that the four general public members on the Committee cannot be City employees or currently hold elected or appointed positions. It is Mr. Shapiro's opinion that the general public members therefore would not be able to serve on the Trust; as a result, only the ex-officio members would be eligible to serve on the Trust, which would require one or more of them to serve on three boards. The Committee members agreed that they do not want to encourage the Trust to pursue a change to its ordinance to allow one or more CPC members to serve on it but that some mechanism should be developed to allow for coordination between the two bodies if the CPC establishes a formal relationship with the Trust.

The Committee members discussed the model the CPC should use to handle housing applications. Many members spoke in favor of having the Trust serve as the housing arm of the CPC, which would mean that any applicant interested in receiving CPA housing funding would apply to the Trust and not to the CPC. Reasons for this included that doing so removes the funding of individual affordable housing projects from the political process; that the Trust has more experience and expertise than the CPC does in evaluating affordable housing projects; and that doing so does not create an additional application process for affordable housing developers. One member disagreed with this model, noting that it would not remove the funding of projects from the political process, that requiring all housing applications to go through the Trust is an abdication of the Committee's responsibility, and that the CPC may not agree with the Trust's decisions about which projects get funded.

Ms. Murugan arrived at approximately 7:35.

Many members also spoke in favor of allocating a certain proportion of CPA funding up front to the Trust and then allowing them to apply for additional CPA funding as needed.

The Committee members discussed how to handle blended projects (projects that address two or more of the CPA focus areas). Many agreed that for blended projects that include a housing component as well as an open space/recreation and/or historic preservation component, the applicant would submit the housing component to the Affordable Housing Trust and the open space/recreation and/or historic preservation component to the CPC. For those projects, many members also agreed that if the CPC decides to fund the open space/recreation and/or historic preservation component, the funding could be contingent upon the Trust approving the affordable housing component.

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by the Vice Chair, the Committee voted 7-1 to have the Somerville Affordable Housing Trust serve as the housing arm of the Committee, which means that a) the Trust will receive a fixed amount of CPA funding to use at its discretion on CPA-eligible affordable housing projects; b) the Trust may apply to the CPC for additional funding beyond this fixed amount for

housing projects; c) all applicants with housing project proposals (or blended project proposals with a housing component) submit their proposals (or the housing component of their project proposal) to the Trust and not to the CPC; and d) the CPC may award funding for the open space/recreation and/or historic preservation component of a blended project proposal contingent on the Trust awarding funding for the housing component.

Agenda item 4: Discuss and vote on how the CPC intends to allocate CPA funding, including:

a. **The distribution of CPA funding among the following uses: 1) admin, 2) historic resources projects or reserve, 3) open space and recreation projects or reserve, 4) community housing projects or reserve, 5) undesignated funds for projects in any focus area in the current funding cycle, 6) undesignated funds for projects in any focus area in future years (savings account)**
b. **Whether to set strict allocations or flexible guidelines**

The Committee members discussed whether to maintain flexibility over the CPA funds or to dedicate additional funding beyond the 10% to one or more of the three focus areas. They referenced Mr. Saginor's email, in which he urges flexibility, and the summary of the Committee members' email comments distributed by Ms. Monea at the meeting. Some members argued for allocating a large proportion of the funding to affordable housing and therefore to the Trust to respond to the critical need for affordable housing in Somerville. Others argued for maintaining maximum flexibility, thereby allowing the CPC to respond to opportunities that present themselves in this year and in the future, and inviting the Trust to apply for additional funding beyond an original allocation of 10 to 15%. In response, some members argued that the original allocation to the Trust should be large enough that it doesn't immediately request additional funding. Some members argued that one of the Trust's key needs is a consistent funding source, so the initial allocation of funding should be sustainable. They argued that a majority of CPA funding, or close to it, is not sustainable.

There was general agreement that the Committee should leave at least a portion of its funding unreserved or flexible to spend on projects in any focus area in the current funding cycle or in future years.

A motion from Mr. Fager, seconded by Mr. Capuano, to allocate 10% of FY14 and FY15 CPA revenue to each of affordable housing, open space and recreation, and historic preservation failed on a 1-7 vote.

A motion from Mr. Glenn, seconded by Mr. Capuano, to allocate 50% of FY14 and FY15 CPA revenue to affordable housing failed on a 4-4 vote.

Upon motion from Ms. Murugan, seconded Mr. Glenn, the Committee voted 5-3 to allocate 15% of FY14 and FY15 CPA revenue to the historic resources reserve, 15% to the open space and recreation reserve, 45% to affordable housing and therefore to the Trust, 20% for undesignated/flexible funds, and 5% for administrative expenses.

Agenda item 5: Finalize and vote on Community Preservation Plan

The Committee members discussed whether to include the housing priorities in the Community Preservation Plan and ultimately decided to do so as these priorities will serve as a guideline for the grant agreement between the CPC and the Trust.

The Committee members agreed to make the following changes:

- Remove the priorities indicating how affordable housing funding should be targeted by income and household type, and the associated graph, as the Committee members felt these priorities were too specific given that the Affordable Housing Trust will be awarding the funding.
- Add language indicating that the City is not required to spend all CPA funding every year and therefore that funding can be saved for projects in future years.
- Add a general priority for projects that address two or more CPA focus areas (blended projects).
- Remove the general priorities "demonstrate the CPA funds are a source of last resort" and "generally represent good value for the money," which the Community Preservation Coalition, in its review of the document, felt were too subjective.

Ms. Monea stated that she will add a section on discussing how much funding is available and how the Committee has decided to allocate the funding as well as a section on the composition of the Committee.

Upon motion from the Vice Chair, seconded by Ms. Murugan, the Committee voted 8-0 to adopt the Community Preservation Plan with the amendments described above.

Agenda item 6: Finalize and vote on application packet

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 8-0 to amend language in the application packet to require recipients of CPA funding to post a sign at their project site with the Somerville CPA logo and language to be determined at a later date.

The Committee members agreed to make the following changes to the application packet:

- Explain the process for applying for funding for affordable housing projects and remove unnecessary housing language.
- Remove language asking applicants whether their project will require bonding
- Add language about the amount of funding available and the fact that applicants can apply for funding beyond the amount available as the City can bond for CPA projects.

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by the Vice Chair, the Committee voted 8-0 to adopt the application packet with the amendments described above.

Agenda item 7: Discuss strategy for releasing Community Preservation Plan and application packet

Ms. Monea informed the Committee that she met with the City's Communications Department and established a strategy for releasing the Plan and application packet. The Committee members agreed to write an op-ed as well.

Agenda item 8: Next meeting: Wednesday, September 3rd at 7pm

The Committee agreed to meet at the Visiting Nurses Association for the September meeting.

Meeting Adjournment

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 8-0 to adjourn at approximately 9:30.

Documents and Exhibits:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Email from Stuart Saginor, Executive Director of the Community Preservation Coalition, "Feedback from Coalition on CPP, application & key issues"
3. Summary of Committee members' email comments on agenda items 3 and 4 (all emails sent to Ms. Monea)
4. Draft Community Preservation Plan from 7/31/2014
5. Draft application packet from 7/23/2014