



Ruthanne Fuller,  
Mayor

**City of Newton, Massachusetts**  
Department of Planning and Development  
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone  
(617) 796-1120  
Telefax  
(617) 796-1142  
TDD/TTY  
(617) 796-1089  
www.newtonma.gov  
Barney S. Heath  
Director

---

**Community Preservation Committee**

**MINUTES**

**13 November 2018**

The meeting was held on Tuesday, 13 November 2018 starting at 7:00 pm in Newton City Hall Room 204.

Community Preservation Committee (CPC below) members present: chair Peter Sargent, vice chair Mark Armstrong, and members Dan Brody, Byron Dunker, Beryl Gilfix, Susan Lunin, Robert Maloney and Jennifer Molinsky. Member Rick Kronish was absent.

Community Preservation Program Manager Alice Ingerson served as recorder.

[Blue, underlined phrases](#) below are links to additional information online.

**PROPOSALS & PROJECTS**

[Allen House Historic Rehabilitation – pre-proposal for supplemental funding](#) –requesting CPC consideration of an off-cycle full proposal for \$600,000 in CPA funding, to supplement \$2.3 million of CPA funding previously appropriated for this project if the full proposal is submitted by November 16 (slightly less than the usually required 1 month prior to the requested December 11 public hearing date)

Adrienne Hartzell Knudsen as Newton Cultural Alliance (NCA) managing director and on behalf of the NCA board, Ted Hess-Mahan (member) and Laurel Farnsworth (president), summarized the pre-proposal. The Allen House at the corner of Cherry and Webster Streets in West Newton is a local historic landmark and on the National Register of Historic Places. It was the home of and was for a time used as a school by 19<sup>th</sup>-century abolitionist and educator Nathaniel Topliff Allen, a pioneer in racially and gender-integrated schools and in physical education. NCA is adaptively re-using the house and its attached barn as a community center for arts, culture and education. Parts of the main house are now serving as nonprofit offices. Much work on the house has been completed by spending about half of the total \$2.3 million in CPA funds committed to date and through interior design and remodeling for the spring 2016 Junior League Show House. The major work remaining is to convert the 18<sup>th</sup> century barn, which was moved to this site in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, into a small black box theater and a performance space for music, theater, and dance. The building's performance spaces will be available to both the public and to arts organizations. Hess-Mahan noted that making all of the public spaces accessible required an expensive elevator with stops at 5 different levels. NCA has projected operating revenues conservatively, but the sooner the performance spaces begin generating revenue, the easier it will be to raise additional capital contributions. Susan Lunin also agreed that earning income from the building was important for ensuring its future.

In the summer of 2018, construction bids for the remaining work came in about 50 percent higher than budgeted. In addition, NCA has learned that the effective contribution of federal historic tax credits toward project costs will be significantly less than previous estimates. NCA has obtained interim additional bank financing and has committed to additional fundraising. The architect and contractor are working on value engineering. NCA would like to retain the planned geothermal heating system, which is expensive but will make the project more sustainable in the long run, both environmentally and economically. NCA hoped that supplemental CPA funding would cover a portion of the project's funding gap. NCA hoped the CPC would accept a proposal submitted less than its usually required 1 month in advance, for a public hearing at the December 11<sup>th</sup> CPC meeting.

website [www.newtonma.gov/cpa](http://www.newtonma.gov/cpa)

contact Alice E. Ingerson, Community Preservation Program Manager

email [aingerson@newtonma.gov](mailto:aingerson@newtonma.gov) phone 617.796.1144

*Minutes  
continue on  
next page.*

In response to questions from Dan Brody and Bob Maloney, Hartzell explained that the summer 2018 bidding process overseen by the City Purchasing Dept. had chosen Classic Construction as the General Contractor. Classic did most of the previous primarily exterior construction and seems willing to hold their price while NCA seeks additional funding. However, subcontractors' prices are not yet locked in.

Brody suggested that NCA talk to Trinity Church in Boston about their geothermal system, which he believed had worked out well. In response to Lunin's comment that this system would be an important environmental model for other projects, Hartzell said NCA also saw an emphasis on sustainability as a way to honor the memory of Nathaniel Allen as a social progressive.

Beryl Gilfix repeated the comment she had made on the CPC's October 31<sup>st</sup> site visit that she was transcribing an 1872-73 journal kept by a student at the Allen School, who wrote enthusiastically about his daily use of the gymnasium that will be converted into the theater.

In response to questions about the project's historic tax credits, Hartzell acknowledged that the pre-proposal listed the state and federal credits on different bases. Peter Sargent thought the state credits would bring 88-90% of face value, though Hartzell had been told to expect 93-94%. Sargent suggested that recent tax changes had reduced the value of the federal credits by 7-8%. For the full proposal, the CPC asked that all credits be listed on the same basis and requested a summary, written for a general audience, of how these credits will be monetized, especially since the federal credits usually require for-profit ownership before the project is put into service. Ingerson also asked for clarification of any private investor's role in executing a new CPA grant agreement or amendments to the existing grant agreement.

Sargent and Maloney asked whether the CPA share of the additional funding needed could be reduced, by pursuing additional tax credits or other non-CPA funding. Hartzell said NCA was pursuing additional Mass. historic tax credits, additional Mass. Cultural Council funding, and an expanded capital campaign. She said some portions of the construction scope could potentially be deferred while additional funding was sought: the geothermal system and basement support spaces for the theater (green room, toilets, kitchen).

Sargent was concerned that the pre-proposal's operating budget projected unrealistically low cost increases and inadequate annual contributions to a replacement or operating reserve, especially since the development budget listed no initial capitalization of such reserves. He thought the private investor involved with the federal tax credits might also require addressing these concerns. Maloney suggested that if the projected operating surplus actually materialized, it should be committed to the reserves. Ingerson suggested that the CPC might require an updated, independent evaluation of the operating budget, similar to the one submitted with the 2016 proposal, but that this analysis could be a condition for the final release of funds (usually 10% of the total grant), rather than for the initial release of any supplemental CPA funds. She noted that the grant agreement for the current \$2 million in CPA funding released the CPA funds in phases, contingent on the commitment of specific amounts of non-CPA funding. NCA had already met all of these conditions.

VOTE Gilfix moved, and Maloney seconded, considering an off-cycle full proposal received by November 16<sup>th</sup> for \$600,000 of supplemental funding for the Allen House. The motion was approved 8-0.

**[Newton Homebuyer Assistance Program](#)** – discussion of Planning Dept. intent to return approximately \$805,000 of unspent funds and request to use up to \$75,000 of retained funds to plan program revisions

Amanda Berman, Director of Housing & Community Development, and Malcolm Lucas, housing planner, explained that this program's purpose had been to create new permanently affordable home ownership units by helping individual buyers purchase market-rate units in return for accepting a permanent affordability restriction. The program had started with CDBG and HOME funds, then added CPA funds. Since 2003 it had relied entirely on CPA funding. The program had created its last new unit in 2012 and has been formally on hold since 2015. Of the CPA funds previously appropriated for the program, approximately \$1.5 million remains unspent, in the custody of the Planning Dept.

Since Lucas joined the Planning Dept. after 2012, and Berman after 2015, neither had participated in adding new units to the program, but both have responded to requests by assisted homeowners to sell their deed-restricted units. The program's units have a range of deed restriction terms and monitoring agents (including the City, the state Dept. of Housing and Community Development and Mass Housing). For each resale, staff must follow the rules in that particular unit's restriction to set the maximum resale price and seek a new income-qualified buyer. If a new income-qualified buyer cannot be found, most deed restrictions limit the appreciation the owner may receive from the resale; some allow for recapturing the original public subsidy but also require the owner to share with the City any appreciation realized through resale. In response to Maloney, Berman explained that the 3 units for which a new income-qualified buyer had not been found by the deadlines in their deed restrictions had been sold at market prices, but both the public subsidy and some share of appreciation had been recaptured and returned to the City. Berman also noted that the Newton Law Dept. had recently advised that formally releasing a deed restriction also required a public hearing.

Berman briefly summarized the Planning staff's November 2017 presentation to the CPC, which had explained that some of the program's restrictions resulted in resale prices that were not really affordable to current income-qualified buyers and had proposed to use the program's remaining CPA funds and possibly new CPA appropriations to re-subsidize all units in the program. Based on their cumulative experience with resales, however, the Planning staff would now like to hire a consultant with expertise in affordable ownership housing to analyze each unit in the portfolio and provide more nuanced, detailed recommendations for which units should be preserved and how, as well as estimates of the associated costs.

Lucas, Berman and Ingerson explained that, even with new purchase-price subsidies, some units might not be sustainable. In large condominium developments, the owner of the usually sole subsidized unit is always outvoted in decisions about special assessments, either for new amenities or major system replacements or upgrades. Such assessments have created real financial hardship for some owners in the program, to the point where those owners felt compelled to sell their units. In some of these cases, it might make more sense to recapture the public subsidy and a share of appreciation, if allowed by the restriction, then combine these funds with additional CPA funds to re-subsidize units with a more affordable long-term cost of ownership.

In response to a series of questions from Jennifer Molinsky, Lucas said there had also been a separate, small down payment assistance program, using CDBG funds. Ingerson, who has worked indirectly with the program since 2007, suggested that when the program had used federal (CDBG and HOME) funds, the restrictions used had focused on temporary affordability and eventually recapturing the public subsidy and in some cases a share of appreciation upon resale. Once the program shifted to CPA funding, however, the CPC and City Council had made permanent affordability a condition that funding, as they had for previous CPA funding of housing development projects. The City Council had also strongly emphasized giving each new buyer the minimum necessary public funding. Finally, to both the CPC and the Council, the most persuasive argument for this program had been that it created permanently affordable units at about half the cost of creating the same units through housing development projects.

Over time, it became clear that these funding conditions and emphases had some unintended consequences. Over the life of the program, the supply of low-to-moderately priced homes in Newton continued to shrink, the prices of those homes continued to rise, and the area median income had risen much more slowly, when it rose at all. As a result, the subsidies that new applicants needed to purchase even the most reasonably priced Newton home had risen significantly. It was no longer clear that the homebuyer program could create new, permanently affordable units at a lower per-unit cost than housing development. In addition, units whose buyers had drawn on additional family resources to minimize the public subsidy they needed were often affordable upon resale only to new buyers with similar additional resources.

Ingerson was no longer sure that permanent affordability was a practical goal for the program, or advisable. On the other hand, perhaps some of the program's already subsidized units could indeed be made permanently affordable with a single, additional new subsidy, and perhaps the resulting total subsidy would

still compare favorably with per-unit costs for housing development -- especially for homebuyer units 2 or more bedrooms that are not part of large condominium projects. Each unit needs its own analysis.

In response to Sargent and Molinsky, Berman estimated that well over a hundred people were benefiting from the program's current 50 units. Molinsky pointed out that this total would increase as units turned over. [CPC staff note: based on the memo submitted for this meeting, the portfolio currently includes 118 bedrooms, some of which are undoubtedly shared by couples.]

Ingerson was glad that the proposed scope of work for the consultant included advising the City on how to support sustainable affordable homeownership generally, not just through this program. Lunin and Molinsky encouraged asking the consultant to summarize the lessons of other communities' homebuyer programs. Molinsky strongly hoped Newton would continue to support affordable homeownership in some way.

Ingerson emphasized that the City Council must approve any change of the program's purpose from creating new affordability to preserving the affordability of already subsidized units. She also estimated that the requested \$75,000 for consultant costs was about \$50,000 more than the remaining funds that past CPA appropriations had authorized for program management, rather than grants to homebuyers. On the other hand, Ingerson believed the program could not be redesigned successfully without a detailed analysis of the existing portfolio.

Ingerson asked the CPC to decide at this meeting whether it was comfortable authorizing the use of already appropriated funds for this analysis, then approaching the Council with the Planning Dept. to propose a plan for program changes, or whether the CPC instead preferred to consult the Council now about authorizing funds for the consultant analysis, while deferring discussion of program changes. Sargent, Lunin and Mark Armstrong felt the former strategy made the most sense. Sargent felt the requested \$75,000 for the consultant analysis would be money well spent. He noted that this analysis might not persuade the CPC to support using the remaining unspent CPA funds to preserve the affordability of already subsidized units. The program might have run its course and simply might no longer work under current market conditions. This was not unusual for housing programs. However, it seemed worth finding out whether and how such preservation could be accomplished, and what it might cost.

VOTE In response to Gilfix, Berman and Sargent clarified the currently proposed actions as returning \$805,000 of the Newton Homebuyer Assistance Program's unspent CPA funds and authorizing the use of up to \$75,000 of the remaining unspent CPA funds to hire a consultant to evaluate the portfolio and provide detailed recommendations to the CPC for a redesigned program.

A motion by Molinsky to accept these proposed actions was seconded by Gilfix and adopted 8-0.

**Stanton Avenue Senior Housing / Golda Meir House Expansion** – CPC re-vote to accept minor revision in unit mix

The CPC had already voted on 8 October 2018 to recommend that the City Council appropriate \$3.25 million in CPA funds for this project. Ingerson explained that she was now asking for a second vote allowing her to update that recommendation to match the current project description.

The project had not changed its CPA request or other intended funding sources, and the total number of units remained 69. However, the 8 units for households with up to 30% of the area median income (AMI) had been changed from all one-bedrooms to 7 one-bedrooms and 1 two-bedroom. The 9 units without income restrictions had been changed from 5 one-bedrooms and 4 two-bedrooms to 6 one-bedrooms and 3 two-bedrooms. Rather than two units potentially designated for New England Conservatory graduate students, there would be only one.

VOTE A motion by Lunin, seconded by Molinsky, to accept these changes and update the CPC recommendation to the City Council accordingly was adopted 8-0.

**PROGRAM PLANNING:**

CPC working session on updating the [Community Preservation Plan](#) (CP Plan) drawing on [Fy20-24 Capital Improvement Plan](#) (CIP)

Ingerson briefly summarized the continuing mismatch shown on pages 3-4 of the [Community Preservation Plan](#) between the CPC's 5-year target allocations for housing, historic preservation, land acquisition and open space or park rehabilitation, and the potential CPA requests for each these areas listed in the [Capital Improvement Plan](#). Through the worksheet in the CPC packets ([attached to these minutes](#)), she had asked members to comment on the relative "CPA appropriateness" of the CIP's potential CPA requests, based on the guidelines in the [Community Preservation Plan](#). In response to Brody and Maloney, Ingerson clarified the "calculated" and "assigned" CIP rankings on the worksheet: the calculated rankings were produced automatically by a formula using weighted factors such as safety and health risks, remaining useful life, impact on department mission, etc. The assigned rankings were the final priorities determined by the Executive Office by adjusting the calculated rankings.

At tonight's meeting Ingerson hoped the CPC collectively could identify a set of "most CPA-appropriate" projects in each CPA category approximately equal to its target allocation for that category. If so, she would update the CP Plan to list only those "most appropriate" potential CPA projects. She did not think the CP Plan needed to identify priorities within this CPA-appropriate list, or state why particular CIP projects were not seen as CPA-appropriate. She felt that a more realistic list of potential future projects would help the CPC evaluate whether to use current funds for current proposals or instead retain those funds for future use.

Byron Dunker had asked the Parks & Recreation Dept. to work with him to prioritize their CPA-eligible projects more clearly, based in part on the number of people who use each site or resource. However, the CIP also did not include all the projects he saw as Parks & Recreation priorities.

Sargent asked members to identify any specific projects they felt were not appropriate for CPA funding. Armstrong, Gilfix and Molinsky felt that many City buildings projects listed as CPA-eligible in the CIP involved deferred or routine maintenance, which was not an appropriate use of CPA funds. Sargent saw the Crafts Street stable project as questionable, given its cost. Sargent and Armstrong also questioned the listing for the Kennard Estate (current headquarters for the Parks & Recreation Dept.).

Lunin was concerned about the archival storage projects. The City should come up with a way to preserve these records and make them more usable for the public.

Molinsky thought the current or planned use of a building should be considered when evaluating each project's CPA appropriateness. For example, buildings actively used by the public should be a higher priority than those leased to private entities. Ingerson thought none of the City buildings listed as CPA-eligible on the CIP were currently leased to private entities.

Molinsky felt that accessibility was an appropriate use of CPA funds, even if other projects for a given City building might not be. Gilfix agreed that accessibility was CPA-appropriate generally but did not feel CPA funds should be used to add expensive accessibility improvements, such as elevators, to buildings that could or should be sold out of public ownership, such as the former branch libraries or the Kennard Estate. Ingerson suggested that new CPA spending on the current Senior Center might not be a priority for similar reasons, if a new senior or intergenerational center would soon be created elsewhere.

Gilfix thought the CPC's current priorities should be the two recently recommended housing projects – Haywood House and the Golda Meir Expansion – and Webster Woods. Brody pointed out that the \$5 million placeholder figure shown for Webster Woods could be either too low or too high.

Molinsky thought the CPC should give the City general principles for determining which projects to submit to the CPC, whether based on number of users or other criteria. Ingerson said this was the intention of the funding guidelines on pages 1-2 of the current CP Plan, but that those guidelines could always be revised.

Armstrong thought the CPA-eligible listings in the CIP constituted a kind of “laundry list.” Dunker similarly described the CIP as a “master list” of projects that should be done eventually, not necessarily with CPA funds. Molinsky and Armstrong agreed that since the CIP did not really predict when proposals would actually come to the CPC, it was neither necessary nor possible for the CPC to plan around the CIP. The CPC simply had to evaluate individual proposals on their merits, when and if they were submitted. Gilfix thought the current comparison in the CP Plan, between the CPC’s target allocations and known potential projects for that resource, provided enough of a context for the CPC’s funding decisions.

Sargent asked all members to send Ingerson which 4-5 potential future projects currently listed in the CP Plan should be seen as “lower priority or not CPA-appropriate,” so she could report whether there was any consensus on these projects. He felt the CPC could not eliminate everything of questionable CPA appropriateness, but it could focus its own list more clearly.

Finally, Sargent noted that one duty of the CPC was to evaluate the community’s CPA-eligible needs, in collaboration with the bodies that appoint one of their members to the CPC. He hoped these groups could be invited to discuss their views of Newton’s CPA-eligible needs with the CPC at meetings over the next 6 months.

### **Committee Business**

Based on a motion by Armstrong, seconded by Maloney, the minutes for 9 October 2018 were approved with corrections as noted, by a vote of 8-0.

The Committee adjourned by consensus at 8:50 pm.

**Attachment:** CIP/CPA worksheet distributed to CPC members for this meeting.



**CIP FY2020-FY2024:****worksheet for applying CPA appropriateness guidelines from *Community Preservation Plan***

Staff notes to CPC members about this worksheet:

**Our 13 November 2018 discussion will move more quickly if you can do two things ahead of time:**

- ♦ **Briefly review this packet's guidance about allowable & appropriate uses of CPA funds**, both at the state level (CPA statute, Dept. of Revenue, Community Preservation Coalition) and the local level (Newton's *Community Preservation Plan* and CPA ordinance). Staff can also answer questions about any of these at the meeting.
- ♦ **Fill out this worksheet & bring it to the meeting.** If you check off *each site*, you'll need only 25 check marks (vs. 40 if you check off each project) .

**Newton "CPA appropriateness" guidelines, adopted April 2018**

**highest priority for CPA funding**, with these minimums from other sources: 30% for public projects, 50% for private projects -- **special public resources and public-private partnerships:** publicly or privately owned assets that benefit all Newton residents & neighborhoods, including housing that is both deed restricted to ensure permanent affordability and proactively marketed to all eligible households

**lower priority for CPA funding**, with a target of at least 60% non-CPA funding -- **limited-benefit special public resources:** publicly owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods

**usually not appropriate for CPA funding -- core public resources:** assets already in public ownership and that the City of Newton would be obligated to rehabilitate even if Newton had not adopted the CPA; with one primary exception: **CPA funding may be appropriate for the *difference between* lowest-cost and historically appropriate** methods or materials for the rehabilitation of publicly owned historic resources

**not appropriate for CPA funding -- limited-benefit private resources:** privately owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
<p><b>Staff notes for CPC members about spreadsheet entries below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ "Calculated CIP Ranking" is a formula that includes multiple weighted factors, such as centrality to dept. mission, impact on community quality of life, remaining useful life of the asset, etc. For detailed methodology, see appendix beginning on page 178 of the CIP, at <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/executive/cip/default.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/executive/cip/default.asp</a>.</li> <li>◆ Long-term plans for the use of some City buildings below are not yet clear. <b>The CPA statute requires historic rehabilitation (adaptive reuse) to comply with federal standards, which require basing treatment decisions on clear plans for the building's use.</b></li> <li>◆ In 2011-12, <b>\$98,780</b> of CPA funding was used to evaluate the historic significance of nearly all buildings the City owned at that time, and to provide detailed recommendations for the most historically significant of these buildings (the CPC at the time agreed it should consider funding only these most significant City buildings). <b>For these detailed historic City building reports, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/building/historic_reports.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/building/historic_reports.asp</a>.</b></li> <li>◆ See additional notes below on specific sites or projects..</li> </ul>								
<b>CPA funds already appropriated</b>								
8	65.3	Manet Rd. Recreational Reservoir	Improve recreational space 5 acre parcel recently purchased from MWRA	\$ 375,000	CPA funds remaining from those already appropriated.			
21	57.3	Newton Highlands Playground - Phase II Design & Construction	Part of 2008 Master Plan for park renovation in 2 phases. Phase II is for construction	\$ 3,345,000	\$2.5m CPA funding already spent. Is add'l \$445,000 for Fy19-20 an anticipated add'l CPA request?			
170	23.7	Restoration of Historic East Burying Grounds	Tree work. Tomb restoration, gravestone repair, and other restoration. Repair stone gate posts. <b>Install educational signage.</b>	\$ 85,000	CPA funds remaining from those already appropriated.			
<b>CPA pre- or initial full proposal submitted to CPC</b>								
10	63.5	<b>Webster Woods</b>	Implementation of Webster Woods Plan	To Be Negotiated	<b>\$5,000,000</b>			
						Note: This placeholder amount for CP Plan could be a significant underestimate.		
57	42.7	<b>Crescent Street Project - Rehab Ford Park</b>	Rehabilitation of Ford Park	\$ 1,300,000	<b>\$1,300,000</b>			



CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
<p>Note: This estimate was for the total cost of Ford Playground expansion, with housing also on the site. If the entire site is proposed for recreational use, playground/park costs may increase. Approximately <b>\$180,000</b> of the CPA funds previously appropriated for playground design should still be available.</p>								
<b>Listed in CIP, no additional notification to CPC</b>								
<b>Branch Libraries (Current or Former)</b>								
119	30.4	Auburndale Library - Exterior Windows & Doors	Remove existing exterior wood doors and frames and replace with new doors and hardware. Repair/replace building windows.	\$ 127,000				
150	26.9	Auburndale Library - Accessibility and Site Upgrades	ADA upgrade for the building.	\$ 265,000				
199	15.4	Auburndale Library - Building Envelope and Roof	Repair broken roof slates. Reflash where leaks are occurring. Repair/replace gutters and downspouts. Pitch rain leaders away from building. Repair concrete ramp.	\$ 128,000				
		<b>Auburndale Library subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 520,000</b>	<b>\$520,000</b>			
<p>Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.</p>								
148	27.1	Old Newton Centre Library	Building requires envelope work. Cost for complete building reno.	\$ 1,500,000	\$1,500,000			
<p>Note: This 2010 estimate may be seriously outdated. For <b>\$18,962</b> of CPA funds spent in 2006-08 for a historic preservation assessment of this individual bldg, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/healthdept.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/healthdept.asp</a></p>								
132	29.0	Old Newton Corner Library- Building Envelope	Repair front entry concrete. Install new side entry stairs and handrails. Remove and replace wood stairs. Install vents throughout balance of soffits	\$ 114,500				
154	26.0	Old Newton Corner Library - Exterior Windows & Doors	Restore/replace historic exterior doors and windows. Weatherstrip and seal for energy efficiency. Window bay foundation repairs.	\$ 217,000				
		<b>Newton Corner Library subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 331,500</b>	<b>\$331,500</b>			

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
		Note: for previous \$274,661 of CPA funds spent on historic rehabilitation of this bldg, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/library.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/library.asp</a> .						
169	23.8	Nonantum Library-Accessibility/Site	Reconfigure entry vestibules and reconstruct ADA compliant ramp. Upgrades for toilet rooms and drinking fountain.	\$ 204,000	\$204,000			
		Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.						
105	31.7	Waban Library-Accessibility Upgrades	Upgrade toilet rooms, Replace door hardware; Modify door at stairwell or install automatic door opener.	\$ 110,000				
182	20.8	Waban Library-Building Envelope and Entrance	Replace main entry walk and foundation walls and install railing. Rebuild side stairs at main entry. Rebuild stairs at rear entry. Install hand rail on one side of rear entry wall. Repair flashing of parapet walls.	\$ 200,000				
194	17.9	Waban Library-Exterior Windows & Doors	Restore exterior wood door and install panic hardware. Replace areaway and rear door. Restore windows.	\$ 118,500				
		<b>Waban Library subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 428,500</b>	<b>\$428,500</b>			
		Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.						

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
179	21.6	West Newton Library / Police Annex - Roof Restoration/ Replacement	Remove and replace slate roofing, gutters and downspouts. Install new EPDM Roof. Reattach downspouts.	\$ 250,500	\$250,500			
Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.								
<b>City Archives</b>								
128	29.3	City Hall - Increase City Clerk Archive Storage	Develop plans to expand archival storage to accommodate and preserve archival collections and to comply with MGL mandated record storage requirements.	\$ 100,000				
168	24.1	Map Scanning Project for Engineering: Phase II	Phased project. Current maps are deteriorating rapidly. A new storage system would allow DPW to store maps after scanning.	\$ 900,000				
<b>City Archives subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>			
Note: These project descriptions are outdated, but their total \$1m probably underestimates actual need. Former City Archivist found Engineering maps had been microfilmed, so scanning is not needed. However, archival-quality storage space is very much needed to replace current storage in City Hall's damp basement. State recently authorized the City to create this space outside City Hall and the main Library if necessary.								
<b>City Hall</b>								
114	30.6	City Hall - Repair Front stone entry stairs	Repair and repoint stone cornice. Rebuild/reset main entry stairs and install code-compliant railings.	\$ 325,000				
116	30.5	City Hall - Masonry Restoration of War Memorial Steps	Implement recommendations from 2007 Study of the Memorial Stairs.	\$ 450,000				
191	20.0	City Hall - Exterior Windows & Doors	Restore/replace windows in phases to improve energy efficiency, functionality and comfort, and to preserve exterior wall.	\$ 3,000,000				
<b>City Hall building subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 3,775,000</b>	<b>\$3,775,000</b>			

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
165	24.7	City Hall & War Memorial Historic Landscape Preservation Project	Restoration and preservation of City Hall grounds Historic Landscape	\$ 1,500,000	\$1,500,000			
Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.								
Note: For prior \$386,150 of CPA funds spent to rehabilitate or restore City Hall's historic balustrade, lighting & windows and to create preservation/rehab plan for City Hall's historic landscape, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/cityhall.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/cityhall.asp</a>								
<b>Crafts Street Stable</b>								
117	30.5	Crafts St DPW Operations (Stable) - Interior Renovation	Design and Construction for renovated interior including mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and accessibility upgrades.	\$ 1,500,000				
173	22.7	Crafts St DPW Operations (Stable) - Restore Building Envelope, Windows & Roof	Preserve/repair historic significance, lintels, sills, brick veneer, windows, doors, roof and cupola as historically appropriate.	\$ 2,000,000				
<b>Crafts Street Stable subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 3,500,000</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>			
Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.								
<b>Jackson Homestead</b>								
187		Jackson Homestead - Object Collection Storage	Create offsite climate controlled space with fire protection to house 3-D museum collections.	\$ 100,000	\$100,000			
209	20.7	Jackson Homestead - Exterior Windows & Doors	Restore existing windows and doors as historically appropriate.	\$ 192,000	\$192,000			
Note: For prior \$1,280,018 of CPA funds spent for exterior preservation, to install fire suppression, and to upgrade accessibility and archival storage at the Jackson Homestead, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/museum.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/museum.asp</a>								

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
<b>Historic Burying Grounds</b>								
183	24.9	Restoration of Historic East Parish Burying Ground	Tree work. Tomb restoration, gravestone repair, and other restoration. Repair stone gate posts. Install educational signage.	\$ 85,000	\$85,000			
193	19.2	Restoration of Historic West Burying Grounds	Preservation of gravestones. Repair stone wall boundary. <b>Install educational signage.</b>	\$ 75,000	\$75,000			
--	--	Restoration of Historic South Parish Burying Grounds	Tree work. Preservation of gravestones. Change or remove fence. Install educational signage.	\$ 150,000	\$150,000			
						Note: Educational signage is not CPA-eligible.		
						Note: For prior \$653,679 of CPA funds spent for the three City-owned historic burying grounds, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/burying.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/burying.asp</a> .		
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation</b>								
111	30.7	Burr Park Field House - Accessibility/Site Upgrades	Accessibility upgrades to toilet rooms and fixtures, signage, drinking fountain, and door hardware. Provide accessible path to entrance and an accessible parking space.	\$ 160,500				
135	28.5	Burr Park Field House - Building Envelope and Window Restoration	Repair damaged exterior brick walls and trim. Remove entry landing stairs and railings and install new code-compliant landing, stairs and railings. Restore windows.	\$ 313,500				
			<b>Burr Park Field House subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 474,000</b>	<b>\$474,000</b>			
						Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.		

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
166	24.4	Chaffin Park Wall	Replacement of existing wall along perimeter of Chaffin Park (Vernon and Centre Streets)	\$ 200,000	\$200,000			
50	45.0	Crystal Lake - Levingston Cove, Shoreline improvements	Repair walkways, add rain gardens, remediate erosion, replace amenities.	\$ 200,000	\$200,000			
156	25.7	Crystal Lake Bathhouse - Renovate/Replace	Existing bathhouse is in poor condition with limited accessibility. Renovate/Replace bathhouse and improve swim beach front.	\$ 5,000,000	\$5,000,000			
Note: For prior \$4,164,363 of CPA funds spent for land acquisitions at Crystal Lake, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crystallake.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/crystallake.asp</a> .								
141	28.0	Forte Park	Synthetic Turf field to include softball field, natural turf soccer field, lights and accessibility.	\$ 2,000,000	\$1,000,000			
Note: The CPA statute specifically prohibits using CPA funds to acquire synthetic turf, partly in response to controversy over a prior proposal in Newton to use CPA funds for synthetic turf fields at Newton South High School.								
Note: For prior \$489,225 of CPA funds spent to rehabilitate this park, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/fortepk.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/fortepk.asp</a> .								
97	33.1	Gath Pool/Spray Park/Hockey Rink	Replacement of Gath Pool Facility & creation of a combination of spray park & ice rink	\$ 9,200,000	\$5,000,000			
Note: Placeholder amount for CP Plan. The CPA statute specifically prohibits the use of CPA funds for "gymnasiums and similar structures." The Community Preservation Coalition advises that CPA funds for outdoor recreation should be used to support use of land in a "relatively natural state" (copy provided to CPC members). State Dept. of Revenue guidance should be sought before funding either a structure for 4-season use of Gath Pool or an ice rink.								
115	30.6	Kennard Estate (house)	Accessibility upgrades, gutters, pumbing/electrical	\$ 500,000				
164	24.7	Kennard Estate-Building Envelope, Windows and Doors	Replace shingles and flashings. Repair foundation walls. Replace wood windows and shutters with historic, appropriate units.	\$ 240,000				
<b>Kennard Estate subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 740,000</b>	<b>\$740,000</b>			
Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.								



CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
98	33.1	Lyons Field Drainage Improvements	Complete renovation of the natural grass area including, installing trench sub-drainage, connecting to the park storm drainage system, and sodding the field. Provide accessible route to ball field seating area	\$ 400,000	\$400,000			
99	33.0	Old Cold Spring Field	Renovation of existing field space to include crowning, draiange, irrigation and accessibility improvements.	\$ 350,000	\$350,000			
106	31.1	Newton Upper Falls/Braceland Playground - Design & Construction	Master Plan for park renovation - Construction will include new athletic fields, new play structure and site work and improvements.	\$ 1,675,000	\$1,675,000			
						Note: For prior approx. \$138,250 of CPA funds spent on master plan for this park, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/upperfalls.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/upperfalls.asp</a> .		
<b>Senior Center (existing) or intergenerational New CAL (proposed)</b>								
23	56.2	Newton Center for Active Living - NewCAL	Plan, site, design and build a <b>new community and senior center</b> , the Newton Center for Active Living.	\$ 16,650,000	\$5,000,000			
						Note: Placeholder amount for CP Plan. This facility would be CPA-eligible to the extent that it adaptively reused a historically significant building, and that work on the historic building complied with federal historic preservation standards.		
123	29.9	Senior Center (existing)- Exterior Windows & Doors	Restore/Replace wood windows and <b>aluminum storm windows</b> as historically appropriate.	\$ 125,000				
137	28.4	Senior Center - Sprinklers and Fire Alarm Upgrades	Install code-compliant sprinkler system in building in conjunction with any major building upgrade or addition.	\$ 170,000				

CIP FY2020-FY2024: CPA-eligible projects						CPA Appropriateness (ideally one ✓ site)		
Assigned CIP Ranking (lower nos. = more urgent)	Calculated CIP Ranking (higher nos. = more)	Project Title	Project Description / Justification	Est Cost in FY2019	amounts listed in Oct 2018 draft Community Preservation Plan	highest priority for CPA funding	lower priority for CPA funding	probably not appropriate for CPA funding
155	26.0	Senior Center - Building Envelope	Repoint exterior masonry walls as required. Repair, reset and regrout main granite front stairs. Repair stone veneer at main entry.	\$ 150,000				
171	23.0	Senior Center - Roof Restoration/ Replacement	Restore/replace existing slate roof, gutters, and downspouts. Replace existing flat roof with new membrane roof and provide proper roof drains.	\$ 244,000				
<b>Senior Center subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 689,000</b>	<b>\$689,000</b>			
<p>Note: To be CPA eligible, work must comply with CPA-funded historic report for this building.</p> <p>Note: For prior <b>\$270,114</b> in CPA funds spent to create a new park in the Senior Center's front yard, see <a href="http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/srctr.asp">http://www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/srctr.asp</a>.</p>								