Malden Community Preservation Committee
Remote Public Hearing Meeting
MAY 8, 2020, 6:00 P.M.

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance: Julianne Orsino, Chair; Roberto DiMarco, Jnna Babitskaya, Lisa Sulda, Frank Molis, Kalil Kaba, Kenneth Antonucci. (Cameron Layne joined the meeting in progress.)

Committee Members Absent: None

Also Present: Ron Cochran, Communications Director, who acted as moderator of the remote public hearing.

Meeting Called to Order: 6:00 p.m.

Chairman Orsino called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. She noted that, before opening the public hearing, there were a number of people she would like to thank – committee members both past and present, for their commitment to the work of the committee; applicants for their patience with the long process and for the good projects they had presented; the public for their participation in the process; and Communications Director Ron Cochran for making the public hearing possible and keeping things running during the present crisis.

Chairman Orsino displayed the following information on screen and verbally described the public hearing process as follows:

1. One Speaker at a time
2. Comments will be specific to the project presented either in favor or opposed
3. Those in favor will be asked to speak first
4. Those opposed will be asked to speak next
5. Speakers will be asked to state their name and address
6. Comments and questions will be documented
7. Time permitting and if the committee and applicant chooses, applicants may answer questions specific to their project presentation once all comment has been given.
If you wish to participate in the public comment portion of the public hearing, you may do so by entering the Zoom meeting:

**If Using Zoom Software:**
1. Click on the “Q&A” button, then click “Ask Question.”
2. In the question box that is shown, enter your full name and your home address for the record.
3. This will give the hosts a timestamped request that you want to speak and we will respond to these requests during the public comment section of the meeting in the order they were received.
4. When it is your turn to speak, a host will announce your name and will unmute your line and allow you to speak.

**If Dialed in to Zoom by Phone Only:**
1. Press *9 which will show you with a raised hand
2. When it is your turn to speak, a host will announce your phone number (last four digits) and unmute your line.
3. You will then be asked to say your full name and street address for the record

Chairman Orsino then read the remote meeting notice into the record as follows:

“In accordance with Governor Baker’s 3/12/20 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor’s 3/23/20 Revised Guidance on Order by the Governor Prohibiting Assemblage of More than Ten People, this meeting will be conducted via remote participation. In person attendance by members of the public is prohibited, and all effort will be made to permit public attendance of this meeting, in the manner specified below, via remote access by internet, telephone, and if available via public broadcast of the meeting by Malden Access Cable Television on public access television channels. Public access will also be provided by posting draft minutes, and/or a transcript, recording, or record of the meeting on the City of Malden website at cityofmalden.org as soon as practicable after the meeting.”

Chairman Orsino proceeded to make a brief presentation on the mission, funding and history of the Community Preservation Committee (attached). She noted that funding for FY2021 were estimates and might be lower, as a result of the present crisis.

She then opened the public hearing, inviting applicants to make a brief presentation on their projects and allowing public comment for or against each project in the order listed on the agenda.

(Note: Applications are available for review at [https://cityofmalden.org/313/Community-Preservation-Committee-CPC](https://cityofmalden.org/313/Community-Preservation-Committee-CPC))

**UNDER ONE ROOF**
Project Representatives: Gabriella Snyder Snelmack, Executive Director of Bread of Life, and Alice Krapf, Project Manager

Ms. Snelmack said that the proposal was comprised of two parts. The first would provide 14 permanent studio apartments for homeless families and veterans – a needed supply in the available housing stock. She said that the funding through CPC put the project over the top in their application to DHCD, so the housing portion of the project was now completely funded. The second part of the proposal involved improvements to the entrance to the Northern Strand Community Trail from the Bread of Life facility and would provide improved access, appearance and open space to the trail amenity.

Ms. Krapf said that was an excellent summary of the proposed project. She added that the funding for this project would also enable the project to keep its federal home fund loan and that they were hoping to start construction by the end of the year.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Steve Winslow, Councillor At Large 83 Jacob St.

Councillor Winslow thanked the committee for a great list of projects. He said that he was very supportive of this application for both aspects of affordable housing and improvements to the trail.

2. Ryan O’Malley, Ward 4 Councillor 706 Main St.

Councillor O’Malley said that he thought that the timing for both projects was perfect and that improvements along the trail would be good both for the environment and the health of residents.

3. Janet Green 57 Rocky Nook

Ms. Green said that, as President of Bike to the Sea, she would echo the comments of Councillors Winslow and O’Malley. She said that Bread of Life had been great partners with her organization and that she fully supported this project.

4. John Saia 39 Pierce St.

Mr. Saia said that he would like to ask, given current concerns around social distancing, if there was any flexibility in the floor plan or if those issues had been taken into account. In response to a question from Chairman Orsino, he said that he had not researched this sufficiently to speak either in favor or opposition, but, seeing the floor plan had raised a general concern. Chairman Orsino reiterated the previously described rules for the public hearing. She assured him that his question had been heard and, time permitting, would be answered at the end of the hearing.

5. Amanda Linehan, Ward 3 Councillor 83 Blomerth St.

Councillor Linehan said that she was in favor of this project. She said that she knew that the need for this type of housing was dire and that this would go a long way toward meeting that need.
Speaking In Opposition To The Application:
NONE

START SECURE

Project Representative: Alex Pratt, Malden Redevelopment Authority

Mr. Pratt said that this was a program led by ABCD, with the goal of helping low income people to pay security deposits. He said that large up-front payments which amount to a couple of month’s rent were insurmountable for many low income families, leading to housing instability. He said that this would allow ABCD to float money to landlords as a security deposit, which would be handled as required by state law. At termination of the tenancy, the money would go back to ABCD for use by another tenant or could be used for another purpose by ABCD.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Roxanne Reddington-Wilde 35 Baincroft Rd.

Ms. Reddington-Wilde said that she was an ABCD employee and, as a resident of the city, she was in support of this project as well as the Bread of Life project. She said that she was a member of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Board and was listening to the hearing as a way of getting an idea of the projects going on in the community. She said that this was a very important issue and she was in support of this type of funding.

2. Steve Winslow, Councillor At Large 83 Jacob St.

Councillor Winslow said he had heard a very good presentation on this project that was made to the City Council. He said this was an important program as high deposit requirements were an impediment to housing for low income families. He said that the money cycling back to the fund was a good use, as it increase the impact the funds had. He praised the work done by ABCD in other communities and said that he looked forward to them doing equally good work here.

Speaking In Opposition To The Application:
NONE

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Project Representative: Alex Pratt, Malden Redevelopment Authority

Mr. Pratt said that the program was designed to stabilize housing during the present crisis by providing one month’s rent to approximately 300 to 400 households. The exact number of people served would depend upon the levels of rent that recipients were paying. He said that RFPs for housing service
providers were due on Tuesday. He said that contacts would be awarded next week and the program would launch. He said that 40% of Malden households were at 50% or less of the AMI, meaning that they were cost burdened by housing and in unstable housing situations. He said that court closures were currently preventing evictions but the expectation was that, when the courts reopened, there would be a huge rush on eviction proceedings. He said that the program was trying to prevent this by helping as many households as possible. He said that applications would be available next week and the application period would remain open for 10 days. At the end of the application period, there would be a lottery, most likely in late May. He said that those applicants chosen by lottery would be referred to housing service providers who would have 30 days to submit completed applications and documentation to the MRA, who would then cut checks directly to landlords.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Ryan O’Malley, Ward 4 Councillor  
   706 Main St.

Councillor O’Malley said that he was in favor of the application. He said that he thought it was a good idea for the CPC to stipulate that priority be given to owner-occupied housing and to households with school aged children. He said that keeping a tenant in the property helped keep the property owner in the property as well and was a creative way to help two residents at the same time.

2. Steve Winslow, Councillor At Large  
   83 Jacob St.

Councilor Winslow said that he would echo Councillor O’Malley’s comments. He said that there were two sources of money in the program and that the flexibility of city money should allow focus on households with school aged children. He said that his experience on the School Committee had taught him the critical importance of housing stability on the education of kids. He said that he agreed that focusing on owner-occupied housing would double what the money was able to accomplish. He said that the need here might greatly exceed the resources and suggested that the CPC might consider freeing up additional money for this program by bonding out longer term projects like the one proposed by Bread of Life.

3. David Camell, Ward 6 Councillor  
   35 Williams St.

Councillor Camell thanked the CPC for recommending funding for this program. He said that it was an incredibly important program for a number of residents. He said that it not only protected some of the city’s most economically vulnerable residents but also helped to preserve community. He said that housing displacement effected not only those who were evicted, but also impacted friends and neighbors who had developed relationships with them, so this program also helped to preserve the fabric of community in the city.

4. Amanda Linehan, Ward 3 Councillor  
   83 Blomerth St.

Councillor Linehan said that she was in favor of this project and wanted to emphasize the sense of urgency to get Rental Assistance up and running. She said that she wanted to share, as a ward councillor, the kinds of calls she had received over the last month or two from constituents. She said that people were in fear of losing their housing. These were people of all ages, from younger people living independently to senior citizens. She said that it was important to keep in mind the breadth of
people who were being effected by present circumstances. She said that she recognized the concerns regarding families with school aged children but felt it was important to recognize that this crisis spans a broader group of people. She said that she would echo the idea of bringing more resources to bear on this program by shifting other projects to bonding. She said that the Affordable Housing proposals that were being funded were varied and equally important. She said that a strong strategic vision was needed to stabilize neighborhoods.

5. Bonnie Scalida  
98 Beltran St.

Ms. Scalida said that she had a question about the percentage of CPA funds that would go toward administrative fees. She said that she thought that was an important factor in terms of the whole picture of funding. Chairman Orsino asked if she was in favor, opposed or just had a question. Ms. Scalida said that she was asking because she had heard that up to 20% might go to administrative fees. She said that was important to know because, although she was in favor of assistance, she might not be in favor of the amount that would not be going directly to renters. Chairman Orsino explained, again, that questions would be answered as time permitted, at the end of the hearing. She said that the question had been noted and would be addressed in that portion of the hearing.

Speaking In Opposition To The Application:

NONE

DEVIR PARK REVITALIZATION

Project Representatives: Janelle DeVits and Ward 2 Councillor Paul Condon.

Councillor Condon said that he would like to thank the chair and all committee members for the extra efforts to move this project forward at this time. He said that he was supportive of the project, although two of the more controversial items were the removal of a tennis court and installation of a dog park. He said that he had allocated $10,000 of his ward funds to design of the project.

Ms. DeVits said that she was born and raised in this part of the city and both as a child and now as an adult with children in the household, the park was a big part of family life. She said that the goal was to revitalize and update facilities, while retaining and planting additional shade trees. She said that the park was the largest in the city and was currently used for a variety of activities, including Youth Soccer, Baseball and more recently a Cricket club. She said that the renovations would be designed by residents and park users. She said that a community meeting was held in August and there was a lot of excitement and support for the idea. She said that several concerns were raised but that there were a number of ideas that were helpful as a result of open discussion. She said that they had then reached out to Shadley Associates. She said that there were two steps of the process: first, presenting the original plan for feedback and ideas and then providing that information to Shadley, who would produce two plan alternatives, which would again be presented at a community meeting, the goal being to finesse this into a Master Plan for the Park.
Ms. Devits noted that the park was named after John Devir, the first Alderman from the area who served when Elisha Converse was Mayor. She said that she would like to see a plaque installed that commemorated him, as well as memorials to other figures of historical significance to the park.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Rob McCarthy 227 Emerald St.

Mr. McCarthy said that, as a resident of the area, he was in favor of the project and was excited for the proposed updates and seeing the project get started.

2. Steve Winslow, Councillor At Large 83 Jacob St.

Councillor Winslow said that he would echo Councillor Condon’s support and would commend the great work of Janelle DeVits and the neighborhood. He said that this was what Community Preservation was all about – residents stepping up and designing projects that benefitted their neighborhood.

3. Ron Cochran 105 Cherry St.

Mr. Cochran said that he was in favor of this project. He said that one of the things that most pleased him about the city was seeing residents come together for shared activities and interest. He said this was a place where all sorts of people came together to share in activities. At any given time in this park, you might see baseball games, soccer matches, a high school game, people playing tennis. He said that this represented Malden at its finest.

4. Ryan O’Malley, Ward 4 Councillor 706 Main St.

Councillor O’Malley said that he had spent a lot of time in Ward 2 in earlier years and recognized this park as a great resource. He said that he believed that Devir was one of the best parks in the city, located as it was on a DCR parkway which connected it to other recreational areas. He said he looked forward to great things happening at that park.

5. Brian DeLacey 1 Earl St.

Mr. DeLacey said that he supported the project and would like to thank Joe Levine for the work he had done to put this together.

6. John Saia 39 Pierce St.

Mr. Saia said that he supports the project and felt it was important that the plan was to keep real grass on the fields. He said that was the original plan for Roosevelt, but it was changed.

7. Emmanuel Marsh 65 Wentworth St.

Mr. Marsh said that he supported the project and would echo Mr. Saia’s comments about the importance of a grass field, saying he thought that natural grass was really important.

Speaking In Opposition To The Application:
TRAFTON PARK REVITALIZATION

Project Representatives: Councillor At Large Steve Winslow, Ward 6 Councillor David Camell and Alex Pratt, Malden Redevelopment Authority

Mr. Pratt said that this project was based on a Master Plan developed through an inclusive community process. He said that the goal of the project was to provide universal access to the park. He said that the playground area would be expanded, 10 trees would be planted, there would be upgrades to the dugout and benches, fencing removed, and new benches installed in the dog park.

Councillor Winslow said that he and Councillor Camell had hosted four community meetings and the resulting plan had been used to secure a $400,000 PARC grant. He said that the CPC funding would be used to leverage that. He said that he thought this was a good solid project and that the park was an important asset to the neighborhood that received a lot of use on a daily basis. He said that the dog park would also be resurfaced.

Councillor Camell thanked the committee for their support of this project. He said that the park was a cornerstone of the community and that this would enable the city to expand access to it for people of different abilities and ages. He said that a project like this was particularly important at this time, as it brings a lot of hope that there will be a time when we can again meet face to face. He said that the project would retain all existing trees to the greatest extent possible and would add to existing trees to expand green space and shade.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Ryan O’Malley, Ward 4 Councillor 706 Main St.

Councillor O’Malley said that he was in favor of this project for many reasons. He said that it was a beautiful presentation and would result in a safer, more functional park, and it utilized matching state grants which would pay off in dividends given the tough economic times ahead.

2. Kathleen Sullivan 27 Oliver St.

Ms. Sullivan said that she agreed that this was a beautiful project and that she commended the inclusion of the public in its design, as well as the preservation of the grass field.

3. Ron Cochran 105 Cherry St.

Mr. Cochran said that he would like to thank the proponents for the resident engagement in the project. He said that there were two aspects of the redesign that he felt were of particular significance. He said that first was inclusion of baseball as part of the park design. He said that baseball struggles for field time and, as the Trafton field fell into disrepair and was taken off the table, it created a particular hardship. He was glad to see that the field would be rehabilitated and would again be available for baseball. He said that the second was the inclusion of a mixed use court. He said that he loved the idea of being able to accommodate many sports in the same space.
4. Brian DeLacey  1 Earl St.

Mr. DeLacey thanked Councillors Winslow and Camell for their work on this project. He said that it was clear that the park gets a lot of use and he was supportive of the renovations with two caveats. The first was that he had noticed heavy dog use of the park outside the confines of the designated dog park and that should be corrected. The second, he said, was the heavy use of this facility by the Charter School, which limited resident’s access to the facility. He said that use should be kept to a minimum and scheduled, since many of those users were not from the city. He said it was a versatile space and an important asset to the community.

5. Angela Zimmerman  65 Echo St.

Ms. Zimmerman said that she was in support of both this and the Devir Park projects. She asked if any consideration had been given to creating pickle ball courts. Chairman Orsino thanked her and explained that questions would be addressed in a later portion of the meeting.

Speaking In Opposition To The Application:

NONE

SPOT POND BROOK GREENWAY

Project Representative: Yem Lip, City Engineer

Mr. Lip thanked the committee for their time and consideration. He said that there were two components to this application. The first was to provide the matching 20% share to a DCR grant that would create a multi-use trail along Banks Place. He said that granted needed to be spent by the end of June and the matching funds would be used to replace the existing chain link fence. He said that the second part involved funding for a feasibility study, community engagement and engineering on connecting sections at Oak Grive to the Malden River Greenway and the Northern Strand Trail.

Speaking In Favor Of The Application:

1. Ryan O’Malley, Ward 4 Councillor  706 Main St.

Councillor O’Malley said that he wholeheartedly supports this project. He said that it was a true multi-agency collaboration involving a number of groups including the city, Bike to the Sea, DCR and the MWRA. In addition to providing the match for an existing grant, it would allow for a feasibility study and design of the southerly connection with existing trails and would be of great benefit to residents.

2. Steve Winslow, Councillor At Large  83 Jacob St.

Councillor Winslow thanked Councillor O’Malley for his work on this project. He said that it was a great project and he was very supportive of its goals.

3. Emmanuel Marsh  65 Wentworth St.
Mr. Marsh said that he and Councillor O’Malley had recently been bike riding in the area and one of the things he had noticed was that many community trails connected to each other and to trails in adjacent communities. He said that this was a great project and something that Malden needed. He said that hopefully, sections of these trails could be connected with other community trails. He said that Covid 19 was changing the way people commuted and that this was something that people would benefit greatly from in the future.

4. Roxanne Reddington-Wilde 35 Baincroft Rd.

Ms. Reddington-Wilde said that she had been unaware of this project until this evening. But, she said, she walked in the area every day and would love to have a bike or walking path in the area.

5. Janet Green 57 Rocky Nook

Ms. Green said that, as President of Bike to the Sea, she supported this project. She said that Bike to the Sea members were proponents of making trail connections in Malden and beyond and that they were very happy to see this project going forward.

6. Brian DeLacey 1 Earl St.

Mr. DeLacey said that he wanted to thank Councillor O’Malley for a great project and said that, as this develops, he believed that it would provide a good opportunity for community engagement.

7. Amanda Linehan, Ward 3 Councillor 83 Blomerth St.

Councillor Linehan said that she applauded Councillor O’Malley’s persistence in putting this project together and sail that it was a testament to the city’s hard work. She said that she was particularly pleased that it would open access to trails for Ward 3 and recognized that it was part of a greater vision for the whole region. She said that these small links added up to significant gains and would be significant to commuters in the post-Covid future.

8. Brian Holdridge 69 Autumn St.

Mr. Holdridge said that this was a great idea.

9. Beth Harris 329 Forest St.

Ms. Harris said that she was in favor of this project. She said it was an important connection. She said that when she first came to Malden, it was as a rapid transit/bike commuter and she travelled through the industrial area to the south of Oak Grove station. She said that she was now a resident of the area and was so excited to hear that this connection to a vital part of the city was going to be made. She said she was excited about the community engagement process.

10. Julia Swerdlov 29 Wallace Circle

Ms. Swerdlov said that she and her entire family supports the development of any bike path. She said that bike paths kept us healthy both mentally and physically during Covid 19 and beyond.

11. Conrad Maher 11 Payne Terrace
Mr. Maher said that he was in favor of the project, but would be interested in knowing if there was any mechanism to accelerate completion of the project, as he thought that, given the Covid emergency, it would be quite useful in the next 12 to 18 months. Mr. Maher’s question was noted for discussion in a later portion of the meeting.

**Speaking In Opposition To The Application:**

**NONE**

Chairman Orsino noted that concluded the public hearing and that it was now 7:57 p.m. She said that she believed that there were four outstanding questions and asked committee members if they wanted to move to the question and answer portion of the meeting now.

Mr. Cochran said that he had an several additional questions pending in the queue.

Mr. DiMarco said that he would make a motion to open the meeting to questions on proposed projects.

**ON MR. DIMARCO’S MOTION TO OPEN THE MEETING TO QUESTIONS ON THE PROPOSED PROJECTS, SECONDED BY MR. ANTONUCCI**

(8)Y-(0)N

Chairman Orsino asked the clerk read the questions that had been asked during the course of the public hearing.

Questions were read and answered as follows:

1. For UNDER ONE ROOF from John Saia, 39 Pierce St.: Is there any flexibility to the floor plan shown on the design accompanying the application?

Representatives of the Under One Roof project explained that these were schematic designs and more design work remained to be done. They said that they would be able to and were in the process of addressing issues of social distancing. In addition, they noted that the Special Permit restricted units to single person occupancy.
In follow up, Mr. DiMarco asked if they foresaw any delay based on what was occurring such that construction would be delayed to the next funding cycle.

Project representatives said that the current plan was to start construction before winter. Although some demolition and site work was required, they did not see that construction would be delayed unless there was some other unforeseen factor.

2. For the RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM from Bonnie Scalida, 98 Beltran St.: What percentage of the funds would be expended on administrative fees.

Alex Pratt, representative for the program, said that they were committed to keeping administrative fees under 15%, but that the program necessarily had a lot of administrative costs, including contracts with housing service providers, translation, etc. He said that administrative costs would be charged proportionally to funding sources. He said this would enable the program to stay below the 20% administrative cap imposed on CDBG funds.

In response to a follow-up question by Chairman Orsino, Ms. Scalida said that she would need to further review the project before weighing in. She said that there were three projects in that sector and she wanted to look at what the percentages were for the year.

3. For the TRAFTON PARK RENOVATION PROGRAM from Angela Zimmerman, 65 Echo St.: Had any consideration been given to providing Pickle Ball courts at Trafton Park?

Councillor Camell said that he was ashamed to admit that he hadn’t heard of pickle ball until last month, so he had some research to do. But, he said, he would be willing to look at any sport that could make use of a multi-use court. He said that the multi-use court was not included in this phase of the renovations.

Councillor Winslow agreed that the layout of the multi-use court was an open item in the plan.

4. For the SPOT POND BROOK GREENWAY Project, from Conrad Maher, 11 Payne Terrace: Is it possible to accelerate the schedule to achieve a more immediate completion of this project?

Councillor O’Malley said that the MWRA was in the process of relining the sewer that goes directly through the easement that would be used to create the trail and that project was out to bid now. He said that he thought that could well provide the possibility of accelerating the schedule.
Mr. Cochran provided the following additional question:

5. For the RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, from Roxanne Reddington-Wilde:

The chart representing income limits to qualify for assistance showed the maximum income for a single person as $41,000. She said that was over 50% AMI and asked why.

Alex Pratt said that $113,000 is the AMI and, while you would think that 50% would be half of that, HUD publishes AMI at different levels for different purposes.

Ms. Reddington-Wilde said that was interesting; she works in the ABCD Fuel Assistance program and the AMI used for fuel assistance is considerably lower.

As a follow up question, Ms. Sulda asked if Mr. Pratt had made any progress on determining whether or not owner occupied housing or households with school aged children could be used to weight the lottery.

Mr. Pratt said that would result in too many complications with respect to Fair Housing Laws. He said, for example, if you used school age children, you would be discriminating against senior citizens who were unlikely to have younger children. Or, if you used households who had children in Malden High, you might be discrimination against people who chose not to use public schools. He said that the one place where weighting seemed appropriate was with people who were not eligible for unemployment, and the program would use that factor to weight applications.

As a follow up, Chairman Orsino asked if CPA funds needed to follow the same standards, as they were not federal funds.

Mr. Pratt said that CPA funds were still public money and, although he was not certain, federal law or similar state laws might apply. In addition, it said, it would significantly increase overhead costs to be running two distinct programs simultaneously.

Chairman Orsino noted that that concluded questions related to the proposed projects. She said that she had not heard opposition to any of the projects this evening and asked if any members were prepared to make a motion.
Mr. Antonucci said that he thought it would be most appropriate to consider each project individually. He said, with that in mind, he would make a motion to move the Under One Roof project forward for consideration by the City Council.

**ON MR. ANTONUCCI’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. MOLIS, TO MOVE THE UNDER ONE ROOF PROJECT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

**ON MR. KABA’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MS. SULDA, TO MOVE THE SECURE START PROJECT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

**ON MS. SULDA’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. ANTONUCCI, TO MOVE THE RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

**ON MR. MOLIS’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. KABA, TO MOVE THE DEVIR PARK REVITALIZATION PROJECT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

**ON MR. LAYNE’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MS. SULDA, TO MOVE THE TRAFTON PARK RENOVATION PROJECT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

**ON MR. ANTONUCCI’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. DIMARCO, TO MOVE THE SPOT POND GREENWAY PROJECT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COUNCIL.**

(8)Y-(0)N

Mr. Cochran said that he had three questions that were unrelated to these projects and asked if the committee was prepared to address them.

Committee members agreed.
Questions were asked and answered as follows:

1. Steve Winslow asked when the Committee intended to take proposals for FY2021 or to take comments on FY2020 proposals not listed for hearing this evening.

Councillor Winslow said that he had recently participated in a Ward 7 Zoom chat on Kierstead Park. He said that the group had been a bit slow in getting their proposal together but that it was a worthy project. He said that he was not sure whether or not it would be possible to come up with some money for the project this year. He said that, when working with a more diverse neighborhood, community outreach could be a challenge and he believed that was why things took longer in this instance. But, he said, some money this year might put the project in line for a grant sooner rather than later. He said that he was also concerned with the Rental Assistance Program and the speed with which they would deplete present funds.

Chairman Orsino explained that they had suggested to the MRA that they come back when data on the first round of payments came back. She said that, at that time, the Committee would be better able to assess the program, determine the level of need, and see what additional funding might be available.

Mr. DiMarco said that, during this cycle, they had moved 6 of 14 applications forward. He said that he agreed that a lot of the projects were very worthy and he said that he believed that the Committee was more than willing to keep meeting and plugging away at applications.

Mr. Antonucci said that he agreed. He said that the Committee was working through each application before making a determination, but that there were only so many hours in the day.

Chairman Orsino pointed out that the Committee would be meeting again on Tuesday to run though applications that were not on tonight’s agenda.

2. Kathy Sullivan, 29 Oliver St. asked what the process was for following up on projects that had been approved but ground had not been broken yet, and had the city yet bonded for the Roosevelt project.

Chairman Orsino said that she believed that the city had bonded 1.4 million for the Roosevelt project and asked Mr. Antonucci, as Committee Treasurer, if he could provide additional information.
Mr. Antonucci said that the city had bonded the project – it had been included as part of a larger bond. He said that repayment of the bond would start next year and noted that three was no time limit placed on the award agreement.

Chairman Orsino said that the disposition of unspent funds was being discussed with Chuck Ranaghan, the City Controller, to assure that they would be returned to the proper account.

Mr. Antonucci said that was correct. He said that there were projects that had received approval that were tied up in the public bidding process. If a project came in under budget, the excess would come back to the fund; if a funded project subsequently did not appear to be viable, it would be monitored until a final determination was made.

3. Brian DeLacey, 1 Earl St., requested that the following statement be read into the record:

I would like to hear a recap of CPC recommendations on 14 project applications submitted during this project review cycle. In general, I would like to hear a summary of reasons for approving, denying or inviting a resubmission of each project. Additionally, I would like to hear your current plan schedule for advancing this cycle of recommendations to the Mayor and City Council. Thank you.

Chairman Orsino thanked Mr. Cochran for reading the statement and noted that it did not appear to ask a question.

Mr. Antonucci said it was important to remember that they were not done recommending projects – these 6 projects were expedited because it was important to get the three housing programs approved. He said that there would be a meeting next week to summarize the additional projects for this year.

Mr. DiMarco said that he would direct any citizen who wished to, to review meeting minutes or be present at meetings where issues were openly discussed. He said that he be reluctant to go through a litany of comments on proposals, as he was sure that he would miss something. And the projects deserve more respect. He said that all the issues were on the record.

Ms. Orsino said that over the past three years, the Committee has shown the commitment, talent and passion to pull together and do what is right for the city. She said that she expects that will continue going forward.

4. Rob McCarthy, 227 Emerald St. said that he was curious as to the timetable for acceptance and the start of work on projects.
Chairman Orsino explained that the Committee did not initiate projects; it was the funding source. She said that the applicant set the timeline. She said as soon as possible was great but many had issues like procurement that would delay and immediate start.

Mr. Antonucci agreed, adding that not all projects were shovel-ready and many involved design work and planning.

5. Carol Melle, 35 Wyoming Ave. asked if this hearing meant that only the six projects discussed were under consideration. She said that she did not understand why all the projects that had been reviewed were not included. She said that project that she was involved with had been scheduled for review in April and that meeting was cancelled but the project was not put on this agenda.

Chairman Orsino explained that, because of the Covid crisis and the Governor’s Emergency Order, meetings had been cancelled. She said that they had scheduled one meeting on an emergency basis for the Rental Assistance Program and that a meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, where the Committee would review the remaining 2020 applications.

Mr. DiMarco said that he understood that the project she was concerned with involved two competing applications and review had not been finished. He said that this was the hearing for projects that were ready to go. He said that the three rental projects went forward because it was imperative that those in need be helped as quickly as possible. Further, he said, the three open space projects were as complete as anyone could possibly want. He said that the remaining projects were still being discussed but that the Covid crisis had interrupted the flow.

Ms. Melle asked if those six projects were the only ones going forward.

Chairman Orsino said that the Committee would review the remaining applications and make a determination at that point. She said that there would be another public hearing to get community feedback on the types of projects residents would like to see. But, she said, applicants needed to allow the Committee to do its work on the remaining applications.

Mr. Antonucci said that he thought it was great that the Committee could meet like this and hadn’t lost a lot of time due to Covid. He said that, as a result of Covid, other issues had come up that took precedence over existing applications. He noted, however, that applications were being reviewed but, as Mr. DiMarco had pointed out earlier, there was only so much time in the day.
Mr. Cochran confirmed that there were no additional questions.

**ON MR. DIMARCO’S MOTION, SECONDED BY MR. MOLIS, THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED.**
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MEETING ADJOURNED 8:51 P.M.