

Springfield Community Preservation Committee
June 2, 2026
Remote Meeting Minutes

Meetings are held at 6:00 p.m. on the first Tuesday of the month. The minutes and agendas for all meetings are available on the Meeting Portal of the City website.

<https://springfieldma.portal.civicclerk.com/>

To view the remote meeting:

<https://www.facebook.com/SpringfieldCommunityPreservationCommittee> for 30 days

or view the meeting playlist on Focus Springfield [Springfield Municipal Meetings - YouTube](#)

Mail public comments to: Community Preservation Committee, Springfield City Hall

36 Court Street, Springfield 01103 or e-mailed to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com. Telephone 413-530-1268.

Present: Robert McCarroll (Springfield Preservation Trust), Stephen Bosworth (Neighborhood Representative), Yolanda Cancel (Neighborhood Representative) Juanita Martinez (Conservation Commission), Rosemary Morin (Planning Representative), Willie Thomas (Housing Authority)

Absent: Judi Crowell (Historical Commission) Rhonda Sherrell (Neighborhood Representative), Patrice Swan (Parks Representative)

Approve Minutes of May 19

Feedback for nonrecommended projects

Request for Local Technical Assistance from PVPC

Possible recapture mortgage for 37 George Street

Contract Extensions (any contracts expiring 6/30 which won't be completed?)

Other business

Administrator's Updates

Next meeting—September 1

Approve Minutes of May 19, 2026

Motion made by Junatia Martinez, second by Rosemary Moran, passed.

Feedback for nonrecommended projects

Question. Does the committee allow applicants to lobby committee members individually? The committee was in general agreement that as a best practice its best to discourage private lobbying by applicants and to encourage presentation publicly to the entire committee. It was suggested to inquire with the law department for guidance.

This year, the Community Preservation Committee received 31 applications totaling \$7.5M while only \$3.2 was available for allocation. As a result, the Committee recommended funding for 20 projects. The committee discussed the feedback to offer applicants who were not selected.

The following projects were not recommended for funding this year due to limited funding but otherwise, the application was solid and met guidelines. Applicants are invited to reapply next year.

All Ability Swing Set, and We-Saw and Communication Board
Carriage House Rehabilitation
D'Amour Museum of Fine Arts, Chestnut Street Doors
George Walter Vincent Smith Exterior Preservation
Forest Park Pickleball Courts
Kenefick Park Fitness Course
Restoration of the Former Saint Aloysius Convent IO
Kimball Towers Exterior
Ames House

Motion made by Steve and Second by Juanita to respond with feedback for the Ames House to consider applying for the portico repair rather than the windows. **Yes:** Steve, Juanita, Bob
No: Rosemary, Yolanda, Willie. Motion fails. Motion made by Rosemary and Second by Juanita to limit feedback to guidelines followed and solid application, all in favor.

Specific feedback

Based on the discussion, projects were at a disadvantage when:

- They were difficult to phase.
- The committee couldn't determine what partial funding would accomplish.
- Benefits were harder to explain quickly.
- The project lacked a clear leverage strategy.
- The request was all-or-nothing.
- The applicant didn't demonstrate how CPA dollars would immediately produce visible public benefit.

An application ideally should be designed so that a committee member can confidently say "Even if we only fund half of this, I know exactly what gets built and why it matters." That theme surfaced repeatedly throughout the funding discussion.

293 Bridge Street Elevator Project Feedback offered: Include operating proforma of existing conditions, utilities, expenses, tenant rent, etc. Capital improvement plan for vacancy rate, how an elevator will increase their occupancy rate.

Alden ST Housing Project Feedback offered: provide detailed construction plans, formal drawings, a comprehensive project budget, clearly defined development costs, project timelines, and supporting documentation demonstrating project readiness. Committee members had difficulty determining the scope of work, assessing project feasibility, understanding how CPA funds would be used, and evaluating the likelihood of successful project completion. Additionally, members found the side-by-side duplex inappropriate for the Alden Street location.

Request for Local Technical Assistance from PVPC

We contract with Pioneer Valley Planning Commission for our historic resources to determine how the Secretary of the Interior Standards will apply for each project. Fifteen hours of free service is available upon request. Motion made by Juanita and second by Steve to request the fifteen hours of free consulting service. **YES:** Juanita, Yolanda, Steve, Willie, Rosemary, Bob. Motion passed.

Possible recapture mortgage for 37 George Street

Background. The City issues a 1099 for individuals who receive a CPA grant. This presents a possible tax liability and regarding the \$300,000 grant for 37 George Street, it could be significant. A discussion recently took place with a tax attorney to determine if the CPA could get a legal opinion for the IRS to waive the tax status on individual grants. The legal work could cost up to \$50,000. The other possibility for 37 George Street is to review the possibility of a forgivable loan. A meeting with the law department will be scheduled to discuss options.

Contract Extensions None

Other business 2026 Projects will be presented to City Council for approval on June 22 at 6:30 p.m.

Administrator's Updates None

Next meeting—Annual Public Hearing September 1

Motion to Adjourn