



JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES
OCTOBER 1, 2014

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

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** Michael Capuano, Dick Bauer, Tanya Cafarella, Elizabeth Duclos-Orsello (left early), Michael Fager, Arn Franzen, Ezra Glenn, and Courtney Koslow
- Members Absent** Tanya Cafarella and Uma Murugan
- Staff Present** Emily Monea
- Others Present** Peter Forcellese

The Chair opened the meeting at approximately 7:05. The Committee members referenced the materials listed at the end of these meetings, all of which are available upon request.

Agenda item 1: Discuss bonding for CPA projects with Peter Forcellese, City Treasurer

Mr. Forcellese stated that the City will bond for CPA projects in the same manner that it does for non-CPA projects and that all bonds for CPA projects will be backed by the City at the City’s rating, which is currently AA+. He and the Committee members discussed the following:

- Any bonded project must be approved with a 2/3 majority of the Board of Aldermen.
- The City’s bond council, Edwards Wildman, advises and assists the City in all bond-related matters.
- Funding for bonded projects is available as soon as the Board authorizes the bond, not when the bonds are actually issued.
- The maximum amount the City can borrow for CPA projects is limited by the amount of CPA revenue available to pay the debt service for the bond. The City can borrow against the surcharge revenue and the City’s appropriation into the CPA Fund but not the state match.
- The amortization, or payback, period for bonds is determined by the nature of the project and state law.

- The City can use bond anticipation notes (BANs), which are interest-only, short-term bonds (generally up to two years). The City eventually converts its BANs to long-term bonds, and the BAN counts against the amortization period for the long-term bond. The City's most recent interest rate on a BAN issuance was 0.12%. By using BANs, the City takes the risk of facing higher long-term interest rates in the future when it converts to long-term bonds. The City's current rate on 20-year bonds is just below 3%.
- The City does not directly pay bond issuance costs because it forces a premium when it goes out to bond. Doing so requires the bond purchaser to pay the City a premium on the bond to cover issuance costs, but this is generally offset by a slightly higher interest rate.
- The City can pay down its bonds faster than the set amortization period.
- The amortization period for a design/study is five years, but if the study turns into a physical project, the amortization period for the design/study is extended to the amortization period for the project itself.
- The City's finance department will assist the Committee in deciding how to finance the projects the Committee wants to fund.
- Somerville voters can repeal the CPA five years after it was passed, but the surcharge will remain in effect until all CPA debt obligations are paid.

Agenda item 2: Public comment period

Alan Moore, Vice President of the Friends of the Community Path, arrived just after the public comment period closed. The Chair asked if he had any comments to offer. Mr. Moore noted that the Friends of the Community Path submitted three eligibility determination forms and asked why one of the projects, which was described as a historic resources project on the form, was included as an open space/recreational land project on the agenda. Ms. Monea noted that this was a mistake, and other members noted that in their project summary spreadsheet, the project is officially categorized as a historic resources project.

Agenda item 3: Approve minutes from September 3rd meeting

Mr. Fager noted that the date for the next meeting was incorrect in the minutes; Ms. Monea noted that this mistake had been corrected. Upon motion from Ms. Duclos-Orsello, seconded by Mr. Bauer, the Committee voted 4-0 to approve the amended minutes from the September 3rd meeting, with the Chair, Mr. Franzen, and Mr. Glenn abstaining as they were not present at the meeting.

Agenda item 4: Determine eligibility of project proposals submitted after August 29th

The decisions below indicate that the project proposals, as described in the eligibility determination forms, are either eligible or ineligible to proceed to the full funding application. The Committee will and must make final eligibility decisions when it reviews the project proposals as detailed in the full funding applications.

- a. **Open space/recreational land**
 - i. **Growing Center Agricultural Annex**

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Koslow, the Committee voted 7-0 on its determination that the Growing Center Agricultural Annex project is eligible for CPA funding for the creation of recreational land.

ii. Growing Center Upgrade Design/Community Build Planning

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Koslow, the Committee voted 7-0 on its determination that a) the Growing Center Upgrade Design/Community Build Planning project is ineligible for CPA funding because the Growing Center does not own the property and does not have the written consent of the property owner; and b) if the Growing Center obtains this consent, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land.

iii. School Garden Classrooms

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Duclos-Orsello, the Committee voted 7-0 on its determination that the School Garden Classrooms project is eligible for CPA funding for the creation, preservation, and rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land.

iv. Healey School to Mystic

The members noted that a) given the definitions of open space and recreational land in the CPA legislation, the project as described in the eligibility determination form better meets the definition of a recreational land project than an open space project; b) the historic resource in question – the Blessing of the Bay Boathouse – currently does not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation because it is not on the State Register of Historic Places and it has not received a determination of historic significance from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC); and c) the project does not qualify as a community housing project as it does not make housing affordable or rehabilitate/restore housing units for low- and/or moderate-income households.

A member questioned whether we can use project funding for a planning/study project such as this or whether that funding has to come from the Committee's administrative funding. A member noted that the proposal is messy and doesn't seem eligible. The member was also concerned that the applicant will not get the permissions it needs to accomplish its goals.

Upon motion from the Vice Chair, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 6-1 on its determination that the Healy School to Mystic project is a) eligible for CPA funding for the acquisition, creation, and rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land; b) ineligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource; and c) if the HPC determines the Blessing of the Bay Boathouse to be

historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation of a historic resource.

v. Drainage improvements to the existing Somerville Community Path

The Chair noted that the project proposals from the Friends of the Community Path were submitted on Saturday, September 27 after the deadline of 5pm on Friday, September 26. Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by the Vice Chair, the Committee voted 7-0 to waive the deadline for these eligibility determination forms. The Committee members agreed that they will not accept or review full funding applications that are submitted past the deadline of 5pm on December 1.

The members noted that a) given the definitions of open space and recreational land in the CPA legislation, the project as described in the eligibility determination form better meets the definition of a recreational land project than an open space project and b) the project could also qualify as a preservation project since improving the drainage on the path would protect it from further destruction. Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Duclos-Orsello, the Committee voted 7-0 to on its determination that the project is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land.

vi. Installing railroad artifacts in the new Community Path section (Cedar St. to Lowell St.)

The Committee took this item out of order, after its discussion of the “Surface Improvements to the existing Somerville Community Path” project proposal. The Committee discussed whether the work described in the project qualifies as preservation, which the CPA defines as “protect[ing] personal or real property from injury, harm or destruction.” A member noted that this work could be considered protecting a historic landscape. Another member noted that a part of preservation is putting historic resources where people can experience them. The members agreed that the railroad artifacts do not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation because they are not on the State Register of Historic Places and they have not received a determination of historic significance from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Duclos-Orsello, the Committee voted 7-0 on its determination that a) the project is ineligible because it does not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation; b) if the HPC determines the artifacts to be historically significant, the project will likely be eligible; and c) the applicant may want to consider expanding the historic resource being preserved in the project to include the historic landscape of the railroad corridor.

vii. Surface Improvement to the existing Somerville Community Path

The Committee took this item out of order, prior to its discussion of the “Installing railroad artifacts in the new Community Path section” project proposal. The members debated whether the work as described in the eligibility determination form qualifies as maintenance or rehabilitation/restoration. They noted that some portions of the work (e.g., the side paths) likely qualify as capital improvements but that the paving treatments likely qualify as maintenance. Some members also noted that a full repavement of the Path, which would qualify as rehabilitation/restoration, is necessary.

The Chair made and withdrew a motion to deem the portion of the project that would qualify as rehabilitation/restoration eligible.

A motion from Mr. Franzen, seconded by Mr. Fager, to determine that the project is ineligible for CPA funding and that more information is needed failed on a 3-4 vote.

Upon motion from Mr. Glenn, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 6-1 on its determination that the project is eligible but that aspects of the work summarized on the eligibility determination form (e.g., the paving treatments) are likely ineligible as they appear to be maintenance.

Ms. Duclos-Orsello left at approximately 9pm.

b. Historic resources

i. Milk Row Cemetery Rehabilitation & Restoration

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Glenn, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the Milk Row Cemetery Rehabilitation & Restoration project is eligible for CPA funding for the rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

ii. Prospect Hill Tower Stabilization

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Ms. Koslow, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the Prospect Hill Tower Stabilization project is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

iii. West Branch Library Rehabilitation

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Bauer, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the West Branch Library Rehabilitation project is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

iv. City Hall Rehabilitation Design

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the City Hall Rehabilitation Design project is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

v. 56 Bow Street Exterior Historic Renovation

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Bauer, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the 56 Bow St. Exterior Historic Renovation project is eligible for CPA funding for the rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

vi. Temple B'nai Brith Preservation

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the Temple B'nai Brith Preservation project is ineligible for CPA funding because it does not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that it is not on the State Register of Historic Places and it has not been determined significant by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the property to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

vii. Somerville Museum ADA Access For All and Capital Projects

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Franzen, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the Somerville Museum ADA Access for All and Capital Projects proposal is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

viii. Somerville Museum Restoration of 5 Historic Treasures

Though the eligibility determination form states that none of the resources are on the Register, Mr. Bauer stated that the Charles Bulfinch staircase may be on the State Register of Historic Places.

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the Somerville Museum Restoration of 5 Historic Treasures project is ineligible for CPA funding because, based on the eligibility determination form, the five artifacts do not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that they are not on the State Register of Historic Places and they have not been determined significant by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the artifacts to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of historic resources.

ix. Somerville Museum Preservation of Light-Sensitive Historic Collections

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the Somerville Museum Preservation of Light-Sensitive Historic Collections project is ineligible for CPA funding because the collections do not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that they are not on the State Register of Historic Places and they have not been determined significant

by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the collections to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

x. City of Somerville Archives - Preservation Plan and Supplies

Upon motion from Mr. Fager, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the City of Somerville Archives – Preservation Plan and Supplies project is ineligible for CPA funding because the collections do not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that they are not on the State Register of Historic Places and they have not been determined significant by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the collections to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation of a historic resource.

xi. City of Somerville Archives - Collection Processing Contractor

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the City of Somerville Archives – Collection Processing Contractor project is ineligible for CPA funding because the collections do not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that they are not on the State Register of Historic Places and they have not been determined significant by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the collections to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the preservation of a historic resource.

xii. 38 Union Square

Upon motion from Ms. Koslow, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the 38 Union Square project is ineligible for CPA funding because the property does not meet the definition of a historic resource in the CPA legislation due to the fact that it is not on the State Register of Historic Places and it has not been determined significant by the HPC; and b) if the HPC determines the property to be historically significant, the project will be eligible for CPA funds for the rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource.

c. Community Housing

i. Affordable Housing Trust Additional Anticipated Need

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Fager, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the Affordable Housing Trust Additional Anticipated Need is eligible for CPA funding for the acquisition, creation, preservation, support, and rehabilitation/restoration of community housing.

d. Blended

i. Prospect Hill Park Design

Upon motion from Mr. Fager, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that the Prospect Hill Park Design project is eligible for CPA funding for the rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land and historic resources.

ii. Aldersey Street

The Committee members noted that the project does not qualify as the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of community housing because the property does not currently have community housing units on it.

The Committee noted that the applicant does not have site control and does not have written consent of the property owner, which, according to the eligibility determination form, indicates that the project is ineligible. However, the members agreed that the project proposal can be considered eligible because the applicant does not need site control or written consent of the property owner to apply for funds to perform a feasibility study.

Upon motion from Mr. Fager, seconded by the Chair, the Committee voted 5-0 on its determination that the Aldersey Street project is eligible for CPA funding for the acquisition, creation, preservation, and rehabilitation/restoration of recreational land, the acquisition, preservation, and rehabilitation/restoration of historic resources, and the acquisition and creation of community housing, with Mr. Glenn abstaining.

iii. WaterWorks

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Bauer, the Committee voted 6-0 on its determination that a) the WaterWorks project is eligible for CPA funding for the preservation and rehabilitation/restoration of a historic resource and the creation and rehabilitation/restoration of community housing; b) the Committee will only fund the historic resources portion of the project; and c) the Housing Authority must apply to the Trust for the funding for the community housing portion of the project (which they have already done).

Agenda item 5: Discuss requests for Board of Aldermen in November

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Glenn, the Committee voted 5-1 to postpone the discussion of agenda items 5 and 6 until the Committee's November 5th meeting.

Agenda item 6: Other business

The Committee postponed the discussion of "Considerations for 2015" until its next meeting (see previous agenda item).

The Vice Chair provided updates on two HPC matters. First, the HPC voted on the historic significance of the two properties from the project proposals discussed at the Committee's September meeting. The

HPC determined the American Tube Works significant. It postponed the vote on First Church until its next meeting as there is significant work ongoing at the Church and the HPC is concerned about the integrity of the property.

Second, the HPC voted to form a subcommittee of the HPC to 1) work with the consultant on the Historic Preservation Plan; 2) provide feedback on historic resources CPA applications; and 3) interact with City departments about their historic resources proposals and be proactive about encouraging proposals for historic resources projects. Several HPC members have volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, and Brandon Wilson will provide staff support.

Agenda item 7: Next meeting: Wednesday, November 5th at 7pm

Meeting Adjournment

Upon motion from the Chair, seconded by Mr. Franzen, the Committee voted 6-0 to adjourn at approximately 9:35.

Documents and Exhibits, all available upon request:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Meeting presentation
3. "Community Preservation Fund Allowable Spending Purposes" from the Department of Revenue
4. FY15 eligibility determination forms for the 23 project proposals considered during the meeting
5. Summary of CPA project proposals received through October 1st, 2014, prepared by Emily Monea
6. Excerpts from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, prepared by Emily Monea
7. "Documents are Historic Resources, too" by Jennifer M. Goldson, Community Preservation Coalition
8. Email from Katherine Roth at the Community Preservation Coalition about the eligibility of archives projects
9. "November Board of Aldermen requests" and "Example Appropriations & Reservations" prepared by Emily Monea
10. Map of the City's Green Space and Community Places, provided by Arn Franzen