

Longmeadow Community Preservation Committee
December 19, 2007
7:05PM
Longmeadow High School – School Committee Meeting Room

Draft – 12/18/07

Meeting Notes

A meeting of the Longmeadow Community Preservation Committee (“CPC”) was called to order at 7:05PM on December 19, 2007 in the School Committee Meeting Room at Longmeadow High School.

1. **Members Present:** Bill Hoff, Arlene Miller, Becky Townsend, Roy Johansen, Susan Hall, Steve Gazillo, Kate Tobin and Dennis Egan.
2. **Visitors:** John Dowd and Jim Brennan were present representing the Longmeadow Youth Sports Council and Longmeadow School Committee Chairman, Geoffrey Weigand, was present.
3. **Minutes of Prior Meeting:** The minutes of the December 5, 2007 meeting of the CPC were accepted, as amended.
4. **Future Meetings:** The next CPC meeting will be held on January 16, 2008 in the School Committee Meeting Room at Longmeadow High School. Meetings are also scheduled for January 23, 2008 and January 30, 2008 in the School Committee Meeting Room at Longmeadow High School.
5. **Public Comments:** John Dowd, Jim Brennan and Geoffrey Weigand all spoke in favor of 2007 CPC Funding Application 2007-2 (Create a New Synthetic Multi-Purpose Synthetic Field Athletic Field At Longmeadow High School).
6. **General Discussion:** Bill Hoff explained that the goal of this evening’s meeting is to review the 2007 CPC Funding Applications in numerical order. Bill also confirmed that email can be used by CPC members for informational purposes but cannot be used for discussions. It was also confirmed that the evaluation forms (rubrics) used by CPC members are part of the public record. Several members expressed their appreciation of the hard work done by all of the 2007 CPC Funding Applicants.
7. **Consideration of 2007 CPC Funding Applications:** The CPC reviewed all 2007 CPC Funding Applications as follows

Application 2007-1: The CPC first considered whether the application meets the Community Preservation Act (“CPA”) funding criteria. Concern was expressed by several members that the master plan may meet the CPA funding criteria but the improvements contained in this application may not meet the aforementioned criteria. It was decided that the application would be put through to the next level of evaluation and the following questions were placed into the record to be asked of the application’s sponsor(s):

1. Has your proposal been vetted through other landscape architects?

2. Does Massachusetts provide funds to combat invasive species?
3. How much work have you looked at in other areas?
4. Have you considered matching funds?
5. Does the Park and Recreation Board support this project?
6. Is this preservation?
7. Which allowable spending purpose are you approaching us on?

Application 2007-2: It was noted that under the CPA's Recreation funding category, CPA funds cannot be used to restore or rehabilitate existing uses. Rather, CPA funds may only be used to create new recreational resources. Although there are questions as to whether funding this application would be creating a new recreational resource, it was decided that this application would be put through to the next round of evaluation and the following questions were placed into the record to be asked of the application's sponsor(s):

1. Is this land currently being used or has it been used in the past as recreational?
2. How much money are you requesting?
3. What would be the amount that we would be required to fund?
4. What is the requested funding amount using current rates?
5. Is this land already dedicated for recreational use?
6. How will this proposal benefit the town as a whole?
7. Have you done any research on whether communities have used CPA funds for projects like this one?
8. How would more use and more noise benefit the neighbors?
9. How will expansion of the high school affect this project?
10. Why do you see an overuse?
11. What is the time-grid for town fields?
12. Why are fields being overused and how?
13. Who is going to assume liability for vandalism?
14. Can we have more information on materials used? Is this a green project?
15. Has there been any long-range planning study as to the use of the fields?
If so, where does this field fall?
16. What is the anticipated increase in town spending to maintain this field?

Application 2007-3: After a brief discussion, a motion was made to not move this application forward to the next round of evaluation. An amendment was then put forward to only move the balustrade portion of the application. This amendment was withdrawn and the CPC voted on the original motion: Motion Failed – this application was put through to the next round of evaluation and the following questions were placed into the record to be asked of the application's sponsor(s):

1. Please explain the budget.

2. Why would this not be considered routine maintenance; why is this rehabilitation?
3. Should we consider the painting maintenance?
4. Is there a total plan to upgrade the Community House? If so, what is the total plan?
5. Has the Capital Planning Committee considered painting? If so, where does this project fall?
6. Where does the Community House fall within the Capital Plan?
7. Have you received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic District Commission?
8. Please provide more specificity about the budget.

8. **Motion:** A motion was made to move all 2007 CPC Funding Applications through to the next level of evaluation; this motion was seconded and a vote was taken. Motion passed 5-3. The following questions were placed into the recorded to be asked of the respective applications' sponsors:

Application 2007-04:

1. Is the applicant willing to do bonding style funding?
2. Can the funding be broken up over the course of four (4) or five (5) years?
3. Is there another source of funding?
4. Is there a way to get these images disseminated for educational purposes which is less expensive?
5. What is the maintenance involved in this project? Will these images be maintained into the future?
6. Who owns the license for the add-on software?

Application 2007-05:

1. Was this the only technology available? What other technology is available?
2. Why have you chosen the particular volumes and not the ones most susceptible to damage?
3. Where will these volumes be stored?
4. Why wasn't microfilm chosen?

Application 2007-06:

1. Would partial funding be sufficient?
2. Are the fixtures that are located in Springfield also being considered for funding? If so, have you approached Springfield for funding?
3. How does this benefit the whole town?
4. Would you be open to a free walking tour?
5. Would all modern street signs be removed?
6. As to the additional cost for concrete, how will you finish this project if the cost exceeds the anticipated budget for this project?
7. Please provide a specific action plan and timeline.

8. Is the neighborhood association willing to share the cost?
9. How is our investment protected from a maintenance standpoint?
10. Why has the cost increased so dramatically?

Application 2007-07:

1. Are you requesting 70% of 10% or 70% of all CPA funds?

Application 2007-08:

1. Who will own the dock?
2. Who has rights to the storage?
3. What is the anticipated maintenance of the dock(s) and storage area?
4. Who will pay for maintenance?
5. What materials are going to be used in the construction of the docks?

Application 2007-09:

1. How was the \$80,000.00 figure arrived at?
2. Are you really asking us to set aside 10% of CPA funds for community housing?
3. Have you determined a need?
4. Why a 10% cap?
5. Why is there a five year residency requirement?
6. How do you propose increasing the role of the housing authority?
7. Have you received agreement from the Board of Assessors?
8. Have you considered using consultants?

Application 2007-10:

1. Is this recreation?
2. What is the land now used for?
3. Is this land already dedicated to recreation?
4. What is the anticipated ongoing maintenance of the project?
5. Why have you decided to use asphalt? Are there more environmentally friendly materials?

Application 2007-11:

1. Where are the tables going to be placed?

Application 2007-12:

1. What is this funding going to be used for?
2. Which system was chosen or have they decided on a system?

This meeting was adjourned at 9:13PM.

-Notes taken by Dennis Egan