



Malden Community Preservation Committee

Hybrid Committee Meeting

Virtual Meeting: Zoom

February 15, 2023 | 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance: Eric Henry, *Co-Chair*, Lisa Sulda, *Co-Chair*, Rachael Running, *Vice-Chair*, Cameron Layne, Monique Ching, Inna Babitskaya, Brenden Brett (late)

Daniel Koff, CPA Administrator

Committee Members Absent: Khalil Kaba

1. Meeting Called to Order

Sulda called the hearing to order at 6:04 p.m. and read the provisions of the Governor allowing remote participation at the meeting.

2. Approval of January 2023 Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes approval was tabled until the next meeting in March.

3. Deliberation and Possible Vote on Applications for FY23 Funding Cycle

Sulda summarized the potential outcomes of the CPC meeting: vote to approve, invite to resubmit, deny, or table a decision on funding to next month.

3.a) Trafton Park Construction Phase II

Sulda summarized that this project is requesting \$100,000 for a \$1.13m project to develop 100% construction plans along with issuance of the BID package, construction, and oversight. Construction is scheduled to start in the summer of 2023. The plan is currently at 25% design. CPC granted \$45,000 in 2019 for the creation of a master plan. CPC granted \$250,000 in 2020 for Phase I construction. The project proposes to use the full \$100,000 towards construction including benches, water filler stations,

tree guards, and the play area. They requested an additional \$60,000 for add-ons including the water bottle filler, solar lighting, and public art.

Sulda opened the floor for questions and comments.

Running clarified that the applicant was not OSPCD; but Bob Knox. Joe Gray and Councillor Winslow provided the presentation during the public hearing. The Coordinator confirmed that Joe Gray is listed as the main contact on the application.

Layne is pleased that grass will be installed, and not artificial turf. Sulda clarified that no artificial turf is proposed for any projects before the Committee; there is rubber surfacing on some parks to make it ADA accessible. He also clarified that there would be no trees removed as part of the project. Sulda answered in the affirmative. Babitskaya confirmed that 8 new trees will be installed.

Sulda raised a concern that the park may be overused by Mystic Valley School. She also brought up the elements that were removed from the plan due to ledge that was found close to the surface, including a parkour course, and a shade structure.

Henry inquired if the water fountain in the park was planned to be for humans and animals. Sulda clarified that it was originally planned to be for humans and dogs but was to be located inside the dog park. For an extra \$10k+ separate water facilities could be built for dogs and humans. Henry expressed that he would prefer that one fountain be installed for dogs and humans within a zone that is dedicated to humans.

Henry inquired if the field would be used for snow storage and expressed concern that it would lead to the park's demise.

Sulda discussed that this project will patch the historic wall to match what had previously existing on site, and that a poorly constructed patch that had been built along the wall during an earlier renovation will be replaced.

Babitskaya inquired whether a study of the wall should be conducted before construction begins. Sulda clarified that this project is requesting open space funds, and not historic funds to restore the wall. Babitskaya clarified that they can try to make it nice and conduct research.

Sulda inquired how the CPC should treat the application given that there is an historic component that has not been fully studied nor addressed in the application.

Running expressed that along with the decision the CPC could recommend the applicant return to CPC for an additional project outside of the park renovation. This proposal will not damage the wall in a way that it would be destroyed, so the CPC could recommend that the applicant return to CPC for an additional project.

Layne expressed that it could be an old wall in an old park without historical significance.

Babitskaya expressed that the Historical Commission could make a determination as to the significance of the object by assessing its age, social, and architectural significance. If it is older than 65 years, it would fit the age category. She provided an anecdote where a Jewish cemetery was denied an historic designation because improvements were made to a fence that did not fit the historic guidelines.

Sulda expressed that the CPC could request that the applicant seek a determination on the historical significance of the wall before voting. Henry concurred.

Ching inquired whether there was any urgency for voting on this funding. Lisa noted that the ARPA funds must be spent by 2024, so their plan is to start construction in the summer. Sulda clarified that CPA funds may not be necessary to start construction.

Running inquired how big of an ask it would be to explore the historical significance between now and next month. She did not know about the timing or cost and deferred to Inna. She agreed with Layne.

Babitskaya clarified that applicants can use the local library, newspapers, records from the city, and register of deeds information, along with data from the state about objects. She believed that one month would be sufficient time to make a determination.

Sulda clarified that the Committee may ask the applicant to make an historical determination of the wall, including studying how best to repair it in an historically appropriate manner.

Henry inquired as to when the project would be completed. Sulda clarified that the applicant's timeline shows it would be complete by September 2024.

Babitskaya suggested that CPC can ask for clarification as to the use of other funding sources.

Ching clarified that ARPA funding needs to be encumbered by the end of calendar 2024 and spent by 2027.

CPC agreed to ask the applicant to:

- 1) Obtain an historical determination as to the significance of the wall*
- 2) Inquire about snow storage on site.*

3.b) Kierstead Park Construction Phase I

Sulda clarified that this project would include reconstruction of the playground, little league field, and lighting at Kierstead Park. Total cost for the project is \$2.5 million, and the ask to CPC is \$400,000. The final community meeting for the project is happening concurrently with the CPC meeting.

Sulda expressed that she would like to receive a report on the community meeting before making a determination for funding, especially concerning the community's feedback on the reduced size of the playground.

Babitskaya agreed that it would be useful to get more information before making a determination.

Sulda inquired as to whether PARC funding had been secured.

Granoff was permitted to speak. She confirmed that the City has received a commitment of \$900,000 in ARPA funds as well as \$400,000 from the PARC grant. Kierstead also has a \$100,000 earmark from the State Legislature. \$2.3 million is the final construction cost estimate. The original request was for \$2.5 million but it was scaled back due to available funding.

Pratt was allowed to speak following his attendance at the Kierstead Park community meeting. He confirmed that the City did not receive comments on the size of the playground. They were pleased with the tradeoff for increased open space.

They did receive comments on ADA accessibility. There was a good conversation about ways to make the project more ADA accessible – including the composition of swings – so that some may be open to people with special needs, including young children.

Pratt also confirmed that a member of the Little League was present at the community meeting and supported the removal of the scoreboard. They did not want to replace it because they get more field space this way. It was their idea to take it down. There was discussion about the height of the fence as it is planned to be raised to ensure that balls do not go into the street, but they agreed to demarcate a home run line with a ribbon that would be lower than the height of the fence. The Little League was pleased with this compromise.

Additionally, there were comments recommending the installation of a communication board so children may learn to communicate without words. OSCP has committed to figuring out a way to include one, possibly with the assistance of the Disability Commission.

Henry inquired whether a site survey was conducted. Pratt clarified that a site survey is done by sight and has been conducted. At times the City conducts boring tests to determine the existence and depth of ledge. At Trafton, some changes were made to accommodate ledge. Even with borings, not everything can be known until the ground is dug up. Borings are done where there is little wiggle room in the design.

Sulda inquired as to the reasons why borings are completed after community meetings have taken place so that major changes may have to be made based after the community can provide meaningful input. Pratt confirmed that the reason is that borings are expensive and only convey the conditions of that one location, whereas the conditions could change dramatically surrounding that point. He confirmed that it would be expensive to conduct boring holes throughout the park. Sulda inquired as to whether a couple boring tests could be conducted at the earlier stages. Pratt clarified that a design contingency may be used on those types of elements. He confirmed that finding ledge would not substantively change the park – elements could be moved to other locations where ledge isn't an issue. Pratt clarified that a master plan is needed to figure out what people want, so they can identify locations where boring holes may be drilled.

Sulda agreed to speak with Pratt about the community process at a later date. Pratt agreed.

Running inquired as to which projects it was a problem that significant changes were made after the design stages and approved the master plan.

Babitskaya suggested that OSCP look for records in the library for previous files about earlier phases of construction. Pratt acknowledged that records are not often well-kept. Especially in places where nothing has been built in the past, there is often ledge underneath – and no records of it.

Ching inquired about the bucket swings. Pratt shared his screen to show how accessible swings are built to show that other children may use them. Pratt expects to have at least one adaptive swing included in

the set at Kierstead. And he would ask the rec department and schools to inquire if there is ever a need for multiple adaptive swings to be used at once.

Sulda inquired whether the Committee has enough information to vote on the project.

Running expressed that she thought there is no additional information needed.

Running moved that the CPC approve funding for \$400,000 out of the Budgeted Reserve. Ching seconds. Approved 6-0-0.

3.c.) Early Learning Center Improvement

Sulda summarized that the applicant's request is for \$550,000. The total ask is for \$950,000. CPC and CDBG funds would pay for the project. Sulda made it known that two letters of support in favor of the project were received from members of the public - Sharyon Zeiberg and Lawrence Tamara. No one from the public spoke against the project.

Running expressed that it is a nice project and huge value-add that it will be open to the public and will add green space to the playground in the existing parking lot.

Sulda expressed that signage needs to be installed so that the park is easily accessible and not locked after school hours or on the weekend.

Sulda pointed out that the budget that was recently committed included \$17,000 in estimated costs that are above and beyond the budget. Granoff expressed that there are multiple ways that the City may overcome the budget shortfall of \$17k. The city plans to obtain trees for free instead of paying for them. Additionally there are construction contingencies in the budget that could cover the overage.

If additional funding is needed, then \$17,000 could be found from other sources. Sulda wanted to ensure that nothing in the plan would be cut. Granoff confirmed that they would find the funding. She confirmed that the budget includes signage inviting the public to use the park.

Layne expressed that it is one of the smallest park in the city, but that it is used extensively by the school and people in the neighborhood.

Layne made a motion to approve \$550,000 from the Budgeted Reserve and Fund Balance and Sulda added a condition that no design elements be removed from the plan if the contingency is exhausted.

Running Seconded the motion. Unanimously approved 6-0-0.

Sulda made a motion to add a condition that no design elements be removed from the plan if the contingency is exhausted.

3.d.) Affordable Housing Trust Fund Application

(Brett joined the meeting)

Sulda summarized the application for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund is a request for \$300,000. Sulda summarized the questions that were asked of the Trust Fund in a recent letter – the answers for which are due by March 8, 2023.

Sulda recommended discussing if there are any more requests and opened the floor to discuss whether a decision on this application should be tabled to next month – after the applicant has had a chance to respond to CPC’s questions.

Babitskaya expressed that she is concerned that the funding will go towards developers and not towards direct support to people. She is concerned that this creates a precedent for other departments to request funding for their own uses.

Sulda expressed that the CPC’s vote for the AHTF is not a reflection on whether the group supports affordable housing. The CPC wants to fund the best possible programs available, and if a decision isn’t made it is based on the strength of the application.

Sulda expressed that she would like to see measurable goals from the AHTF Plan and for the affordable units to help people who make lower than 80% of AMI.

Granoff was invited to speak. They are working on producing numbers for the records for different AMI levels and will get those number in advance of the meeting next month. She confirmed that 80% AMI is an income level at which people can be housing burdened. 80% AMI units can help subsidize the cost of 30% units. Sulda confirmed that she would like measurable goals to understand the spread of affordability requirements.

Babitskaya expressed that she is concerned that the funds are not designated to specific projects. She would like a detailed plan as to how many units as to what categories of income levels, and the conditions that will be placed on developers.

Sulda expressed that it is a complicated application. The CPC has many options: to approve the full amount, less than the full amount, to reinvoke to apply, to deny, and/or to approve with conditions, etc.

Layne clarified that Malden is part of the NCS. He inquired as to how other cities in the Consortium are incorporating CPC funding into their Housing Trusts and whether CPC funds in an Affordable Housing Trust would create the potential for those funds to be used in other cities.

Running clarified that the application is for one year’s worth of funding.

Layne pointed out that the applicant is showing a \$300,000 request each fiscal year from the CPC after this inaugural year.

Sulda expressed that the measurement of success to simply use the funds is not acceptable. Sulda expressed that other Trusts use funding in other ways besides creating new rental units.

Babitskaya requested more information beyond the Housing Needs Assessment to understand a more detailed demographic assessment of the need. Sulda encouraged Babitskaya to review the Housing Needs Assessment and to let the Coordinator know if there is a specific question she’d like to ask of the Trust Fund.

Brett expressed that he would like more information as well. He expressed that the CPC takes a long time to make a decision. The Trust Fund would be nimbler to support projects when they pop up. He expressed that the point is to streamline the disbursement of funds to the people who need it when they need it. The CPC also cannot help people directly when they need support.

Running expressed that the CPC does not have capacity to directly support people in need – programs are necessary to be put in place in order to distribute CPC funds. She expressed that giving money to individuals is not going to address the problem. She supported providing funding to developers to create the needed housing. The Trust Fund has the overall plan and vision to implement Affordable Housing.

Sulda clarified that the current plan is to provide funding to developers quickly, and not to create other programs as other city's trusts do.

Ching commented that the CPC could create conditions that say the funding would have to go towards Affordable Housing. She advocated not to require the use for specific programs.

Sulda thought there could be ways to structure the funding to earmark funding for the Trust, but still retain the right for the Committee to have final sign-off before the funds are released, which would cut out the wait time.

Babitskaya advocated for not providing all the funds to developers, and to provide rental assistance or other programs to help people directly.

Henry expressed that the CPC has not been able to disburse Housing Funds themselves, but the Trust has not had time to answer the questions from CPC, so he did not think the CPC would be able to vote tonight.

Running clarified her opinion that she felt comfortable voting on the full amount for the application, but that she's also comfortable tabling until the next meeting.

Layne would like other information from other cities and towns in the consortium and whether they have approved a Trust.

Running made a motion to table the conversation to next month. Brett seconded. Unanimously approved 6-0.

The Committee agreed to invite members of OSPCD to attend the next meeting to answer questions.

4. CPC FY24 Budget

Sulda clarified that the CPC is proposing to allocate the minimum 10% to each category. This budget proposes a conservative estimate of the state match at 20%. The budget may be amended in April or May depending on the estimated state match that is issued by the Coalition after the mandatory deadline of March 1 for the submittal of the CPC budget to the Mayor.

Babistakaya made a motion to accept the budget as proposed and to send it to City Council and the Mayor. Running accepted. Unanimously approved 7-0.

5. Other Business

No other business.

Next meeting was scheduled for March 15 at 6pm.

6. Adjournment of CPC Monthly Meeting

Ching moved to adjourn the Monthly Meeting. Running seconded. Approved 6-1.

Meeting Packet:

1. [0 GRANITE ST - 2021 Aerial](#)
2. [0 GRANITE ST - Assessor](#)
3. [0 GRANITE ST - Zoning](#)
4. [0002-Affordable-Housing-Trust-Fund-FY23-Application](#)
5. [0005-Kierstead-Park-FY23-Application](#)
6. [0006-Early-Learning-Center-Playground-FY23-Application](#)
7. [010423 Kierstead Park-Concept Plan](#)
8. [010423 Kierstead Park-Design Narrative](#)
9. [010423 Kierstead Park-Prelim Cost Est](#)
10. [02 Affordable-Housing-Trust-Fund Co-Chair-Questions-Answers 2022.10.14](#)
11. [031022 Proposal for Trafton II 10 Plan](#)
12. [04 Trafton-Park Co-Chair-Questions-Answers 2022.10.14](#)
13. [05 Kierstead-Park Co-Chair-Questions-Answers 2022.10.14](#)
14. [05 Kierstead-Park Co-Chair-Questions-Answers 2022.10.14](#)
15. [061722 Trafton Park II.Program](#)
16. [062119 Trafton-Master Plan \(2019\)](#)
17. [080522 Malden Trafton Park II.Existing Conditions Summary](#)
18. [082622 Trafton Park II PROJECT PROGRAM](#)
19. [091222 Trafton II-Concept Sketch.Utilities](#)
20. [091222 Trafton II-Product Material Images](#)
21. [091222 Trafton Park II Prelim Cost Est](#)
22. [092822 Trafton II-Updated Concept Sketch](#)
23. [092822 Trafton Park II Updated Cost Est](#)
24. [101722 Trafton II-Preferred Concept Sketch](#)
25. [101722 Trafton Park II Updated Cost Est](#)
26. [171 091222 Trafton Park II Prelim Cost Est 1689](#)
27. [194 Trafton Phase II Pre-App v2 4687](#)
28. [20210623 Malden AHTF Action Plan FINAL](#)
29. [20230118 FY23 AHTF Application - CPC Presentation](#)
30. [203 091222 Trafton II-Concept Sketch.Utilities 538](#)
31. [220516 Approved CDBG budget implemented contingencies](#)
32. [Advocate Pg 1](#)
33. [Advocate Pg 2](#)
34. [Affordable Housing Development Application](#)
35. [Affordable Housing Trust Fund Project Narrative](#)
36. [AHTF Budget FY22-FY26](#)
37. [AHTF Fang-Qiuting 20230125](#)
38. [AHTF Kaur-Parneet 20230125](#)

39. [AHTF Liou-Angie 20230124](#)
40. [AHTF Phu-Angela 20230125](#)
41. [AHTF Wang-Christine 20230125](#)
42. [AHTF Wang-Ivan 20230125](#)
43. [AHTF Wong-Elise 20230125](#)
44. [Book 1950, Pg 576-580 \(1\)](#)

1. [CDBG Commitment Letter](#)
2. [Correspondance with Joseph Gray re Trafton Park Application](#)
3. [Court Fencing](#)
4. [Deed information](#)
5. [Dog Park Gravel 2](#)
6. [EJ Map Trafton 2020v3](#)
7. [ELC Budget Summary](#)
8. [ELC Deed memo](#)
9. [ELC Project Narrative](#)
10. [ELC Lawrence-Tamara 20230126](#)
11. [ELC Zeiberg-Sharyn-Rose 20230125](#)
12. [Field Home Plate Backstop](#)
13. [Field Left Field 1](#)
14. [FY23 Open Space Earmark Commitment Letter](#)
15. [FY23 0004 Full-Application Trafton-Park-09-19-2022](#)
16. [FY23 0005 Kierstead-Park Full-Application Invitation Letter 2022.07.07 \(1\)](#)
17. [GIS screenshot](#)
18. [Kierstead Budget Summary](#)
19. [Kierstead Park Deed](#)
20. [Kierstead Park-Draft Master Plan](#)
21. [Kierstead Project Narrative](#)
22. [Malden Community Preservation Committee Survey FY24 - Google Forms](#)
23. [MaldenHousingNeedsAssessment June2019](#)
24. [Map-GIS Screenshot](#)
25. [Mayor C LOS](#)
26. [Mayor C LOS \(1\)](#)
27. [Mayor C LOS \(2\)](#)
28. [Pratt Answers-to-Co-Chair-Questions 2022.10.04](#)
29. [Presentation for Kierstead and Tartikoff Park 3rd Public Meeting](#)
30. [Satellite screenshot](#)
31. [Satellite view](#)
32. [SPW Commitment](#)
33. [SPW Cost Estimate Comments](#)
34. [Street view](#)
35. [Trafton Park Applicant Response to CPC Questions 11.16.2022](#)
36. [Trafton Park Meeting Notice June 2022](#)
37. [TRAFTON PHASE II - TIME LINE](#)
38. [TRAFTON PHASE II - TIME LINE](#)
39. [Trafton Structural Report](#)
40. [Ward 6 - 4th - Lay-out 2022-1](#)
41. [Ward 6 - 4th 2022](#)
42. [Winslow Response-to-CPC-Co-Chair-Questions 2022.10.03](#)

