



# City of Lowell – Community Preservation Committee

---

## Community Preservation Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 17, 2022 6:30 p.m.

Conducted in-person and via zoom

**Note:** These minutes are not completed verbatim. For a recording of the meeting, visit [www.ltc.org](http://www.ltc.org)

### Members Present

Adam Baacke, Chair  
Eric Slagle, Vice Chair  
Sinead Gallivan, Member  
Sidney Liang, Member  
Brad Buitenhuys, Member  
Christine McCall, Member  
Troy Depeiza, Member

### Members Absent

Philip Shea, Member  
John Linnehan, Member

### Others Present

Dylan Ricker, Associate Planner  
Francesca Cigliano, Senior Planner  
Serena Gonzalez, Assistant Planner

---

A quorum of the Committee was present. A. Baacke called the meeting to order, the time was 6:31pm. Vice Chair Slagle, Member Gallivan, Member Liang, and Member Depeiza were participating remotely.

### I. Minutes for Approval

#### January 13, 2022 Meeting Minutes

C. McCall motioned, and E. Slagle seconded the motion to approve the January 13, 2022 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously, (5-0).

### II. Continued Business

### III. New Business

### IV. Other Business

#### Update on City Council CPA Votes

Provide an update on City Council votes for projects approved for funding by the Community Preservation Committee.

#### Discussion:

A. Baacke stated the City Council unanimously approved each project not being bonded. A. Baacke noted that that the two projects being bonded will be on the Council agenda a week from Tuesday.

### **Discussion and Review of Application Process and Materials**

Discussion on the 2021 Community Preservation Act application process and provide input for way to improve the application process for 2022, as well as reviewing updated application materials.

#### **Discussion:**

B. Buitenhuis stated one shortfall in the process was the transition from CPC approval to the Council and noted there was miscommunication. B. Buitenhuis said he was unsure how this could be remedied. C. McCall agreed and said this was due to the approvals being published without the full context and said that correspondence regarding actions should be done through staff. C. McCall said Councilors are welcomed to attend each CPC meeting, but they are not always available to attend. C. McCall recommended allowing staff to provide the information and context of the projects.

A. Baacke agreed and added part of the challenge was that this was the initial year. A. Baacke requested that when recommendations are communicated as a memo the conditions be explicitly stated. A. Baacke noted people will likely be more aware of the process in the future.

E. Slagle stated that going forward the plan should be to submit a formal recommendation to the City Council that they will receive after the CPC votes. B. Buitenhuis noted the unanimous Council vote was a positive.

C. McCall said some applicants were confused about the conditions imposed on the projects. C. McCall stated that using the approval process similar to other land use boards which more clearly outline conditions would be beneficial. A. Baacke agreed and said being clear about conditions for each project being voted on is important.

A. Baacke noted the updates on the CPA eligibility form makes sense and asked whether any members had any questions or comments. B. Buitenhuis said a questions about receiving funds over multiple years would be helpful. A. Baacke agreed and said this will be more important moving forward since there will be less available funding. A. Baacke asked this questions be added to the full application.

E. Slagle said having applicants' select only one program on the eligibility chart and purpose would be helpful. A. Baacke suggested using the chart to have applicants select only the category which best describes their project.

C. McCall stated that being more clear about what exactly funds are being used for in the full submission will be beneficial. A. Baacke and E. Slagle agreed.

S. Liang agreed, and S. Gallivan said she had no questions or comments.

### **Discussion of 2022 CPA Plan Outreach**

Discussion of outreach to update the Community Preservation Plan. Note that the 2022 public hearing will be held on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Discussion:**

A. Baacke stated the public hearing helped the CPC understand community priorities and help guide which projects should be supported.

F. Cigliano provide an update on DPD's outreach plans to be completed in addition to the public hearing. F. Cigliano noted last year's public outreach included a survey, and noted she would like to expand this to include micro-engagement to outreach to residents that are less likely to attend a public hearing. F. Cigliano stated this will include tabling at different locations throughout the City in each neighborhood. F. Cigliano said the plan is to have a board split into the 3 CPA categories and respondents would put stickers in categories they feel CPA funding would be best spent on in their neighborhood. F. Cigliano notes having neighborhood level data will be helpful and added that

respondents will have the option to write an open response for more in-depth information. F. Cigliano the plan would be to conduct this micro-engagement annually, and conduct a survey every 5 years.

A. Baacke appreciated the plan and commended the outreach efforts to reach out to a broad cross section of the community. A. Baacke noted getting more public information is good. A. Baacke said he is concerned that voting on each category does not necessarily provide actionable information, and noted that more specific information relative to each category is helpful.

C. McCall said based on F. Cigliano's plan this is possible. C. McCall said she is unsure about 3 events per neighborhood as that could be too much and added that if you are at a park it may be helpful to focus only on parks.

S. Liang said getting input from regular folks is helpful. S. Liang stated that considering the district's each have a Councilor now, it may be helpful to get their input on good tabling locations. B. Buitenhuys agreed with S. Liang, added that the most common comment he heard was the need for improvements to City property.

C. McCall thanked F. Cigliano for her plan, and noted the importance of having specificity in responses. C. McCall asked to keep the CPC updated on outreach efforts so they can participate at tables.

S. Gallivan asked for clarification whether micro-engagement will be annual and the survey every 5 years. F. Cigliano confirmed. S. Gallivan said this was great and added it is great to build upon what has been done. F. Cigliano said the plan was to add the findings to the CPA plan in addition to the past outreach efforts.

A. Baacke said a number of good ideas were identified in the public hearings, but the projects had no champions for the ideas and asked how the ideas can be translated into action. A. Baacke asked how the information can be shared with City Departments or City partners. C. McCall said that within DPD as it relates to Open Space and Outdoor Recreation ideas the staff is following the City's Open Space and Recreation Plan which was completed 2 years ago. C. McCall stated there is more focus on individual neighborhoods and DPD staff will be implementing projects based on the Open Space and Recreation Plan. C. McCall noted there are more challenges with Historic Preservation and Community Housing projects.

## **V. Notices**

## **VI. Further Comments from Community Preservation Committee Members**

D. Ricker introduced S. Gonzalez as the new Community Preservation Act Coordinator, and C. McCall stated they are happy to have her on board.

A. Baacke thanked CPC for their work.

## **VII. Adjournment**

C. McCall motioned, and B. Buitenhuys seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously, (8-0). The time was 7:04 PM.