

TOWN OF STOW
Community Preservation Committee

Minutes, January 8, 2018 - Amended

Community Preservation Committee Meeting

Community Preservation Committee members present:

Cortni Frecha (chair), Rick Connelly, Ernie Dodd, Andy Crosby, Atli Thorarensen, Bob Larkin, Vin Antil*

Not present: Mike Busch and Bill Byron (vice chair)

Minute Taker: Deb Seith

The meeting began with a quorum at 7:30pm

MINUTES

VOTE: Bob made a motion to approve the minutes of December 11, 2017 as written, Rick seconded, and the vote was unanimously in favor.

* Vin arrived at 7:35 when the Town Hall project update had just started.

TOWN HALL PROJECT UPDATE

Doug Hyde, assistant building inspector, updated the committee. There are three projects that are being looked into:

1. Structural repair to the back wall: They do not have a quote yet because the wall would have to be opened up and that will require permission.
2. Stripping and re-roofing: 3 quotes were received and Craig Martin (Building Inspector) is carrying \$30k forward.
3. Rebuild damage between lower level and ground floor: Doug and Craig will meet with Wendell Kalsow on Thursday to discuss the \$170,000 quote. They hope the estimate can be reduced.

INVOICES

VOTE: Bob made a motion to approve invoice 10844 from TSS Inc in the amount of \$250.00, Andy seconded, and the vote was unanimously in favor.

VOTE: Bob made a motion to approve invoice 389669 from Artex Inc in the amount of \$735.00, Ernie seconded, and the vote was unanimously in favor.

VOTE: Bob made a motion to approve invoice 0004457 from McGinley Kalsow & Associates Inc in the amount of \$5142.28, Ernie seconded, there was discussion confirming that this invoice is being paid out of the construction funds per the original quote of services, the vote was unanimously in favor.

PROJECT PROPOSAL: Stow Municipal Affordable Housing Trust (SMAHT)

Mike Kopczynski and Laura Spear explained a new affordable housing project proposal. There has been a lot of resistance to building new affordable houses in Stow. This program would use CPA funds to assist qualified affordable housing buyers purchase existing housing in Stow. The CPA funds will make up the difference between the market rate cost and the affordable housing price (as set by the State). In exchange a perpetual deed restriction will be placed on the property.

- Both the buyer and the property would have to be approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD).
- This will be more expensive than building multi-unit new construction projects but it may gain more support with the Stow residents.
- Bedford has done about 5 houses in 7 years.
- The committee discussed modifying the current deed restriction program to include this type of project and include a time limit on the program (if the money is not used for a successful project in a certain amount of time then the money will be returned to the budget line item it originally came from).
- SMAHT estimates a 2 bedroom would require about \$145,000 plus legal and DHCD costs and a 3 bedroom would require \$168,000 plus legal and DHCD costs.
- Refurb house to meet the DHCD standards not included in the price.

PROJECT PROPOSAL: RANDALL LIBRARY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS

Doug Hyde gave an update based on information he was given by the Randall Library Trustees.

- Asbestos was found in 4 out of 12 windows.
- The asbestos testing cost \$1200.
- From the original \$380,000 for the project there is \$299,220 left.
- Bids have come in higher than expected and UV protection for the windows was added.
- The Trustees believe the project will require an additional \$50,000.
- In general there was some confusion about the original quote and actual costs. Doug Hyde offered to research the project and create a spreadsheet to show the breakdown.
- There were 3 alternatives listed in the original project proposal. The alternatives must be done in the order they were written in the project proposal.
- There was some discussion about the amount of money appropriated for the moving and storage of historical artifacts. The members asked if Krista could find out if it was \$15,000 or \$20,000.

STOW CP PLAN REVIEW (GENERAL CRITERIA pages 16-19)

General Criteria for Project Proposals from All Categories

These criteria will be used to more fully evaluate the highest priority projects from each of the ~~four or three~~ categories, particularly when there are not sufficient funds for all. ***All projects recommended by the Community Preservation Committee must be approved by Town Meeting prior to implementation.***

In determining which projects should receive CPA funding, the CPC will give preference to projects that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- ~~CPA projects for Historic Preservation, Affordable Housing, and Open Space/Recreation shall benefit the public. Applications that demonstrate how the project will benefit the public, such as by providing public access or incorporating educational components into their project, will be preferred.~~
- ~~(needs discussion)~~ Preserve or utilize currently owned Town Assets which would otherwise have to be funded through the capital budget will be viewed favorably. For example, repairs to a town-owned historic building for community benefit would be preferred over repairs to a historic building that is not publicly owned or used.
- Preservation of private historical assets requires that the public has a benefit from access to the asset and that appropriate restriction is placed in perpetuity.
- Preserve the essential character of the Town ~~as described in the Comprehensive Plan.~~
- Projects shall clearly demonstrate how they are consistent with this Plan and, when appropriate, consistent with other town and state plans such as the Master Plan, Open Space and Recreation Plan, or Housing Production Plan.

- Receive endorsement from other municipal boards or departments.
- Projects that can demonstrate that they have been developed through a participatory process in which the public has had the opportunity to provide input will be viewed more favorably than those that have not had public input. Demonstration of public support (i.e., with letters) will be viewed favorably.
- ~~New:~~ Projects have notified and gained support by abutters, if that has not occurred it should be explained with appropriate documentation.
- Save resources that would otherwise be threatened.
- Benefit a currently under-served population.
- Serve more than one CPA purpose (especially those that link open space/recreation and community housing).
- ~~CPA projects shall benefit the public. Applications that demonstrate how the project will benefit the public, such as by providing public access or incorporating educational components into their project, will be preferred.~~
- Demonstrate practicality and feasibility (especially those that can be expeditiously implemented within budget).
- Produce an advantageous cost/benefit value.
- Leverage additional public and/or private funds.
- Provide long-term contributions to the Town.
- Private and not-for-profit applicants must demonstrate that they have the staff and other resources necessary to see the proposed project successfully through to completion.

Preliminary Recommendations

A high priority for expenditure of Stow's Community Preservation Funds ~~in the first decade and a half of participation in the program has been is~~ to leverage additional funds using Stow's Community Preservation Funds. The Committee strongly encourages projects that advance more than one CPA purpose.

Schedule and Review Process

In a typical year, the Community Preservation Committee will conduct one funding round each year as follows:

	<u>Round 1</u>
Project Eligibility Forms due deadline	December 1st
Completed Applications due	January 31 st
Estimated Project Award (post Town meeting)	July 1 st

DISCUSSION: HOW TO REVIEW/APPROVE ENTIRE STOW CP PLAN

The committee decided to hold a public hearing after the warrant closes for annual town meeting.

PROJECT UPDATES

None

NEWS AND VIEWS

None

MEETING SCHEDULE

January 22

Feb 5th

Feb 26th

Rick made a motion to adjourn at 9:28 pm, Atli seconded, and the vote was *unanimous*.

Respectfully submitted by: Deb Seith