



Setti D. Warren
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

Community Preservation Committee

MINUTES
9 May 2013

Candace Havens
Director

The meeting was held on Thursday 9 May 2013 at 7:10 pm in Newton City Hall, Room 222.

Community Preservation Committee (CPC) members present: Leslie Burg, Jim Robertson, Nancy Grissom, Joel Feinberg, Dan Green. Absent: Michael Clarke, Thomas Turner.

Also attending: from the Board of Aldermen President Scott Lennon, Vice President Cheryl Lappin, and Alderman Susan Albright; Newton Parks & Recreation Commissioner Bob DeRubeis, Newton Interim Public Buildings Commissioner Josh Morse, Newton Public Buildings Director of Project Management Adam Gilmore, and Jackson Homestead Director Cindy Stone.

Program manager Alice Ingerson served as recorder.

PROPOSALS & PROJECTS

Historic Burying Grounds – requested use for remaining funds

Presented by Historic Newton Executive Director Cindy Stone and Structures North project engineer Stephanie Davis.

Cindy Stone introduced Historic Newton archivist Sara Goldberg and several members of the Board of Directors, including Harry Lohr, Laurel Farnsworth, Jane Galli, and Sheila Donohue.

In spring 2013 Structures North had updated its 2011 assessment of current conditions at the three Historic Burying Grounds (East Parish on Cotton Street, West Parish on Cherry Street, South Burying Ground on Winchester Street). As the first priority, they recommended repairs to several tombs at East Parish Burying Ground that they felt now presented safety hazards. Stone explained that these repairs were needed to allow the educational use of the site proposed by Boston College. Structures North estimates the base scope of work will cost \$30-\$50,000. If bids come in lower, Historic Newton would contract for additional work in the order of descending urgency identified by Structures North.

In response to Ingerson, Stone explained that National Lumber owns the damaged chain link fence between their parking lot and the South Burying Ground, and that she would ask them to repair the fence.

In response to Jim Robertson, Davis and Ingerson explained that conditions at the three sites had changed during the course of the project, which received its first funds in 2003. Most recently, when remaining work from the original scope was bid out in 2010, the lowest bid for the base scope exceeded remaining funds. At the CPC's request, the scope had been restructured and re-bid in 2011, which had allowed all funds except the final approximately \$60,000 to be spent.

VOTE Nancy Grissom moved, and Dan Green seconded, a motion to approve the proposed use of remaining previously appropriated funds for this project.

The motion was unanimously approved, 5-0.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & EVALUATION

role of *Capital Improvement Plan* in Newton's CPA funding process for City projects – discussion with Board of Aldermen President Scott Lennon and Vice President Cheryl Lappin

Ingerson distributed to the Committee, to President Lennon and Vice President Lappin, and offered to the audience, the analysis she had done the previous evening at President Lennon's request, identifying potential Community Preservation Act (CPA) projects with strong citizen involvement or cosponsorship, from the City's *Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)* and other sources.

Burg thanked Ingerson for producing these handouts. Since the next item – the proposed revised budget for the Jackson Homestead archives project – was also being distributed for the first time at the meeting, Burg noted that the CPC generally did not deliberate on information received in this way, because they needed time to read and digest materials before discussing them.

President Lennon began by apologizing for not returning the phone and email messages left by Robertson to follow up on Lennon's email sent to the CPC just before their 14 March 2013 meeting (email attached to these minutes). He explained that he had requested Ingerson's analysis of the *CIP* primarily to see whether it would agree with his own analysis. He felt the City administration was right to see the new *CIP* as an important accomplishment, but of the 41 projects listed in it as CPA-eligible, he saw 38 as driven solely by the City, without support from neighborhood groups or citizens.

In particular, Lennon had worked closely with neighborhood advocates and with the Parks and Recreation Department to move proposed projects for Farlow Park forward. He felt that the CPC's current policy of considering the ranking of proposals in the *CIP* had prevented the presentation of the next proposal for that site to the CPC. He believed that the ranking criteria in the *CIP* would never make this project a top priority for the Parks and Recreation Dept. In contrast, he felt a strong case could be made for the project as a historic resource project under the CPA.

In general, Lennon felt that most Newton residents who originally voted for the CPA saw it as a funding source for neighborhood projects that would never be funded through the regular City budget. He was concerned about the CPC's current proposal review process, which he believed took into consideration the ranking of projects in the City's *CIP* in a way that differed from the CPC's past practices. He felt that City departments should be able to bring forward proposals that residents support and have raised funds for, regardless of their ranking in the *CIP*. He had asked the Executive Office to pull the citizen-driven proposals out of the *CIP* and to request an up-or-down vote on each of these proposals by the CPC.

Vice President Lappin shared President Lennon's concerns. She had been unhappy to see the CPA listed as a possible funding source for projects in the new *CIP*. She also worried that the CPC might be pressured to prioritize City proposals over other potential uses of Newton's CPA funds. Lappin believed that the CPC should not consider the *CIP* in its proposal review process, but should review each proposal on its own merits, using only its own *Funding Guidelines*. The CPC should be a truly independent body. She felt the CPA might be overturned in Newton if the community perceived the program as tied to the City's capital budget.

Burg acknowledged that there had been some pressure of the sort described by Lappin when the new *CIP* was first published. However, she and other members of the CPC had stated clearly at their public meetings that, although the CPC was willing to consider CPA-eligible proposals initiated solely by City departments, those proposals must compete for funding on the same basis as all other proposals. Ingerson explained that she asks City departments to list community residents, rather than City

employees, in the “community contacts/support” section of the proposal form for City-sponsored proposals. Lennon wondered whether the CPC would enforce this advice.

At Burg’s request, Ingerson read into the record the language about the *CIP* in the current CPC *Funding Guidelines*, stating that for “projects to be managed by City departments” the CPC will seek to support “projects that address both the risk-based priorities in the *Capital Improvement Plan* as well as the community-character priorities in other plans.” Burg noted that the CPC was willing to consider projects ranked near the bottom of the *CIP*, even though this might create tension between the CPC’s decisions and the overall priorities of City government, or at least of the executive branch. As an example, Burg noted that the Civil War Monument had been funded quickly based on its urgency, despite its low ranking in the *CIP*.

Robertson felt that the CPC *Funding Guidelines* treat various community-wide plans, including the *CIP*, mostly as a tool for considering the needs of the City as a whole and spending the community’s dollars prudently. Burg, Grissom and Joel Feinberg agreed. Burg and Robertson noted that the CPC does not decide which projects come to them but simply responds to whatever is submitted. Robertson emphasized that the CPC has never declined to discuss any submitted pre-proposal.

Burg said that during the CPC’s year of community outreach for the program’s 10th anniversary, residents had made the same points as Lennon and Lappin – that Newton should not allocate all of its CPA funds to City projects. Burg felt the new *Guidelines* reflected this feedback. She also noted that many projects perceived as “neighborhood projects” were on City property, especially parks.

Lennon asked if the CPC would allow the Parks Department to submit a pre-proposal for Farlow Park as a historic resource, or to prioritize projects on more than one basis. Burg, Robertson and Nancy Grissom confirmed that the answer to both questions was “yes.”

Robertson felt the *CIP* was important to City department heads as a tool for allocating scarce resources. Feinberg thought the *CIP* now provided a clearer sense of priorities than it had in the past, and that the CPC should use it appropriately rather than “do an end run around it.” Feinberg felt the CPC was more than willing to consider project at City sites that were initiated by residents, but that those projects still could not happen without a commitment of City staff time. As the longest-serving member of the current CPC and its former chair, Grissom agreed that the CPC had originally looked to the *CIP* as an indicator of the City’s commitment to proposed projects. In the past, even when CPA funds were appropriated specifically for project management, many CPA projects funded through City departments had not happened or had taken many more years to complete than expected. Grissom and Feinberg were concerned that City departments might not have enough staff to manage CPA-funded projects drawn from the bottom of the *CIP*, in addition to projects ranked near the top of the *CIP* that were funded from other sources. Feinberg, Grissom and Burg emphasized that the CPC did not want to fund projects that would not get done.

Burg noted that the new CPC *Guidelines* require all proposals to identify a project manager with the skills, experience, and perhaps most importantly, the available time – given other, potentially competing assignments – to complete the project successfully. After brainstorming with both Public Buildings and Parks staff, the CPC had also suggested bundling similar projects together so they could share a single contracted manager, if the individual projects might be too small to attract and retain qualified management contractors. To date, however, this has not happened.

Alderman Susan Albright shared the CPC’s concerns about the management of City projects using CPA funds. She felt that the City’s management capacity and commitment were a more significant

obstacle to the funding of projects at City sites than the CPC's *Funding Guidelines*. She had suggested a moratorium on new CPA funding for City projects until those that had already been funded were completed. Lennon understood Albright's points but did not agree with the suggested moratorium.

Lappin agreed that the CPC should confirm that there was someone responsible for each project who will actually make it happen. In response to her questions, Burg, Grissom and Robertson said the CPC regularly asked project managers to explain their projects' status in person, and that nearly all past "stuck" projects had now been either completed or closed out, with unspent funds returned.

Grissom explained that the CPC was also discussing pre-proposals from private organizations. Meeting the *Guidelines*' requirement for a "demonstrated capacity for project management and long-term maintenance" is a challenge for these organizations as well as for City departments.

In response to Lappin's and Lennon's questions about the CPC's approach to matching funds, Robertson emphasized that in its pre-proposal discussions, the CPC often advised proposal sponsors to find more leverage from non-CPA sources when they brought in their full proposals.

Lennon wondered whether recent changes in the Community Preservation Act had opened the "floodgates" for new recreation proposals. Burg explained that at the CPC's request, Commissioner DeRubeis had recommended some criteria for projects in City parks, which the CPC felt were useful.

Feinberg noted that the CPC had been concerned about the small number of pre-proposals received to date. Ingerson thought many would come in just before the June deadline. Grissom commented that turnout at the CPC's 10th-anniversary community events had been disappointing, with few new faces, Lappin asked about outreach. Ingerson briefly summarized the CPC's efforts, including a special 10th-anniversary insert distributed with all City water bills, plus its continuing monthly emails to a list of about 700 addresses, including all PTO newsletters, nonprofit organizations, and neighborhood associations in Newton; op eds, articles and announcements in the *Tab* and the *Boston Globe*; and reminders in the Planning Department's weekly *Friday Report*. Lennon noted that he saw these announcements in the Lincoln-Eliot PTO newsletter.

After a brief discussion of the upcoming June 1st pre-proposal deadline, Ingerson asked the Aldermen present to help potential proposal sponsors understand that projects that missed the June 1st deadline should submit pre-proposals as soon as they could after that, to be early for the following funding round. Such early pre-proposals would help the CPC consider reserving funds for future proposals as they deliberated on the proposals already in front of them.

Lappin and Lennon thanked the CPC for its work. Lennon hoped that he could return to talk with the CPC again about these issues in the fall of 2013 if needed.

In closing, Lennon noted that, although he had to leave the meeting at this point, he supported the next project on the agenda, for the Museum Archives.

PROPOSALS & PROJECTS (cont'd)

Museum Archives – update from Public Buildings Dept. and Jackson Homestead

Josh Morse, as Interim Public Buildings Commissioner and Cindy Stone as Historic Newton director presented this item. Morse introduced Adam Gilmore as the new Director of Project Management for Public Buildings. Gilmore distributed the revised project budget (link at the end of these minutes).

At Ingerson's request, Morse summarized the project's goals and the revised budget just distributed. The project will make the Jackson Homestead's archives more accessible and protect them by adding

new heating, cooling, dehumidifying and fire protection; and will make the entire building more accessible and usable for visitors by creating a fully accessible new main entrance and adding a secondary accessible entrance, along with remodeled or new accessible bathrooms. In August 2011 the CPC voted to recommend the \$461,601 in construction funding requested at that time. Public Buildings would now like to request instead \$680,552 to complete the project, including both additional design work and construction: about \$200,000 for the archives area, \$238,500 for accessibility improvements, and \$125,000 for fire protection.

Morse explained that since August 2011, the project managers had pursued required design approvals from the Newton Commission on Disability, the Newton Historical Commission, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, and the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board. MAAB approval was finally received in March 2013. However, during this long process the building code also changed. Construction cannot be bid without first certifying that the design meets the new code, so Public Buildings plans to hire an outside consultant with CPA funds, to analyze the minimum current applicable code requirements. Public Buildings is currently negotiating the additional fees requested by the contracted project architect for changes required by the new building code, some of which might require revised approvals from the list of reviewers above. Grissom noted that the Newton Historical Commission had never heard back about whether the design changes they had requested previously were actually made, or whether those changes had any impact on project costs.

Morse noted that additional fire protection is not necessarily required by the other planned changes, but Public Buildings recommends it because the building is highly flammable, has narrow entrance/exit options, and is a place of public assembly. Historic Newton archivist Sara Goldberg reported that the Fire Dept. recently told her the building would burn very quickly if struck by lightning, for example. Morse felt that bidding fire protection separately might reduce costs.

In response to Grissom, Morse stated that the 5% construction contingency proposed for this project was sufficient, because no walls were being taken apart. Ingerson noted that prior work on the building's foundation and drainage had removed some of the uncertainty that often required higher contingencies for projects involving historic buildings.

In response to Green, Morse explained that the project would create approximately 1200 square feet of archival space. Green asked whether it would be more cost-effective to create this space in a separate structure. Morse said the least expensive option for a separate modular archives building would be \$300,000, plus fire suppression. Robertson and Green were both also concerned that the revised project budget showed that the cost of design would be over 22% of construction costs.

Burg said that the project's overall cost gave her pause. She was hesitant to spend this much money (total cost \$845,897) addressing the archival needs of a single department, in a historic wooden building, when there are many other endangered archival collections in the City. She would like to see a strategic plan for an interdepartmental approach to Newton's historic public records. Robertson, Grissom and Feinberg supported this view. Robertson noted that the City of Boston had taken a combined, strategic approach to all of its historic records.

Cindy Stone felt that keeping the Jackson Homestead's archival collections on site was critical to the Jackson Homestead's ability to renew its accreditation as a museum, through the American Association of Museums. Most of these collections are not official public or City records that could be combined with those of other City departments.

Morse endorsed Stone's view of the Jackson Homestead archives, but he also agreed that a more collaborative or coordinated approach to City archives made sense. He anticipated more requests for CPA funding in the future for other archival projects.

Stone also stressed the Jackson Homestead's general need for better accessibility. Currently the main floor of the museum is accessible only through an antiquated lift in the trash storage area. Ingerson noted that both accessibility and fire protection might need to be improved for the sake of the building's many visitors, including school groups, even if the archives were moved.

Robertson would like to see the requested CPA funds leverage more funding from other sources. Stone felt that Historic Newton had used all its fundraising capacity for its Durant-Kenrick project.

Several CPC members were concerned that the project had already taken much longer than originally anticipated, and that it had been re-assigned several times to different managers within the Public Buildings Department. Morse noted that the department was adding 3-plus new project managers and felt that with additional funding, the project would now be completed promptly.

Burg suggested that a formal funding request include both a minimum alternative budget, as well as the maximum budget distributed to the CPC for the first time at tonight's meeting.

- VOTE Nancy Grissom moved that the CPC agreed to consider an updated proposal using the CPC's current proposal form and instructions, with
- a minimum alternative budget as well as the proposed maximum budget, with each budget broken down by component – archives, accessibility, fire protection – and accompanied by a timeline for its scope of work, including any required approvals
 - a narrative explaining the project's costs and progress to date, including why design costs are anticipated to be so high relative to construction costs
 - the attachments currently required to document project management capacity (project manager's resume and anticipated other work while assigned to this project)

Grissom also moved delegating to Alice Ingerson as staff the option to approve omitting any other attachments, such as those required to demonstrate CPA eligibility.

Dan Green seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 5-0.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Approval of CPC minutes for 11 April 2013

Robertson seconded Grissom's motion to approve these minutes as submitted. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0. Green abstained because he had not attended the April meeting.

CPC meeting schedule for June-July 2013

After a brief discussion, the sense of the meeting was to leave the currently scheduled meetings on the calendar for June 13 and July 11, but to add two extra meetings on Wednesdays – June 19 and July 24 – if needed to discuss all submitted pre-proposals. Members hoped this would allow cancellation of the CPC's scheduled meeting in August.

The committee adjourned by consensus at 9:00 pm.

Newton's *Capital Improvement Plan* & CPA Funding Process



INCLUDED IN PRE-MEETING PACKET

- ♦ 27 February and 14 March 2013 emails from Board of Aldermen President Scott Lennon to Chief Operating Officer Bob Rooney, other senior City staff, and Community Preservation Committee
- ♦ with selected follow-up emails from CPC staff

NEW HANDOUTS distributed at the meeting

- ♦ potential proposals (co)sponsored by residents or neighborhood groups, starting with those listed in the *CIP* as of October 2012 (requested by President Lennon)
- ♦ section mentioning the *CIP* in *CPC Funding Guidelines* (added by CPC staff)
- ♦ *CIP* analytical categories & how they are weighted (added by CPC staff)

From: Scott F. Lennon <sflennon@comcast.net>
To: bderubeis@newtonma.gov, cschein@newtonma.gov, chavens@newtonma.gov,
leslianneburg@gmail.com, entasis@rcn.com, keith mjones <keith.mjones@verizon.net>,
aingerson@newtonma.gov, jjf@bostonbusinesslaw.com, rooney@newtonma.gov
Cc: allanicconejr@comcast.net
Sent: Thu, 14 Mar 2013 18:34:13 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: **CPA Projects in the CIP**

Hi All

Sorry for getting this out so late. Can someone please insure this gets into the record somehow either by reading it or disbursing it to members of the CPC?

Thanks
Scott

Dear CPC Members,

My apologies for not being able to attend this evening for the discussion on park priorities within the CPA program. I also apologize about the tardiness of this inquiry. I have recently discussed with the Mayor my concerns about the inclusion of certain CPA-related projects in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

In summary, there are a number of CPA projects in the CIP that are not scheduled very high in terms of priority and/or risk from an overall city-wide and departmental budgeting standpoint. However, these projects have been driven by citizen petitioners (along with city departments as co-petitioners) with an incredible amount of time, energy and in most cases money (previous CPA or otherwise) and they are not being given their "day in court." My feeling is because at some point the CPC has shifted its focus from weighing in on very worthy citizen-based projects on their merits and asking each other and/or department heads, "where does this stand in the CIP?" Granted, it is a reasonable question but that was not the original intent of the Community Preservation Act. The CPA was explained to citizens that their tax dollars would be used for specific purposes for projects that while worthy, probably would not be funded with limited city funding. Therefore, an incredible amount of citizen energy went into the development of these petitions. Now, over the years, the line of questioning and approach has incorrectly transformed and I feel it is unfair to people who worked under the original guise of the CPA. Most notably, I am advocating for the Farlow/Chaffin Park restoration in Newton Corner. In fairness to Cmr. Bob DeRubeis, in terms of priority or risk, this project would not "rate" very high. However, in terms of historic preservation, it would. The CPA committee is not even asking him this now because of where it stands in the CIP. All this being said, I feel the CPA has "lost its way" with regard to the citizen-driven projects buried in the CIP.

Under the "CPA Eligible" projects identified in the CIP, I have asked the Mayor to separate the 'citizen petition projects' out from the 'city identified projects' and please give them an opportunity to be properly vetted and heard in the CPC under the guise they were originally formulated under: worthy citizen-driven petitions that were 'outside' of existing city planning, operations and funding. That was how the CPA was originally presented to people when it began. The people who worked so hard on these deserve an answer, up or down, as to where they stand. I also informed the Mayor and Bob Rooney I expect to raise this issue when the CIP is discussed during our upcoming FY14 budget deliberations.

Thanks and I look forward to the Committee's response,

Scott Lennon, President
Board of Aldermen

Ward Alderman/Ward One
617 584 5723

=====

Date: Wed Feb 27 11:40:10 EST 2013
From: "Scott F. Lennon" <sf Lennon@comcast.net>
Subject: **CPA Projects in the CIP**
To: rrooney@newtonma.gov
Cc: aingerson@newtonma.gov

Hi Bob

Hope you're well. As I have discussed with the Mayor, I would like to raise the level of discussion on certain CPA projects in the CIP to get their due course in the CPA committee. I plan to raise this during upcoming budget discussions so I am hoping he has mentioned this issue to you.

In case he has not and in summary, there are a number of CPA projects in the CIP that are not scheduled very high in terms of priority and/or risk from your budgeting standpoint. However, these projects have been driven by citizen petitioners (along with city departments as co-petitioners) with an incredible amount of time, energy and in most cases money (previous CPA or otherwise) and they are not being given their "day in court." The reason? My feeling (this belief may not be shared by others) is because at some point the CPA has shifted its focus from weighing in on very worthy citizen-based projects on their merits and asking each other and/or department heads, "where does this stand in the CIP?" Granted, it is a reasonable question but that was not the original intent of the Community Preservation Act. The CPA was explained to citizens that this was taxpayer funds to be used for specific purposes that would not normally be funded with limited city funding. Therefore, an incredible amount of citizen energy went into the development of these petitions. Now, over the years, the line of questioning is different and I feel it is unfair to people who worked under the original guise of the CPA. Most notably, I am advocating for the Farlow/Chaffin Park restoration in Newton Corner. In fairness to Bob DeRubeis, in terms of priority or risk, it probably would not "rate" very high. However, in terms of historic preservation, it would. The CPA committee is not even asking him this because it is not being moved forward because of where it stands in the CIP. Most importantly, the funding for these projects is coming from an allowable, available source which was the very purpose the funding source was created. What incentive do citizen petitioners have if their CPA idea/project is sitting number 300 on the city list? Or, even though CPA eligible, not very high on a departments lists in terms of their overall projects. In this sense, I feel the CPA has "lost its way."

Under the "CPA Eligible" projects identified in the CIP, I have asked the Mayor to separate the 'citizen petition projects' out from the 'city identified projects' and please give them an opportunity to be properly vetted and heard in committee under the guise they were originally formulated under: worthy citizen driven petitions that were 'outside' of existing city planning, operations and funding. That was how the CPA was originally presented to people when it began. The people who worked so hard on these deserve an answer, up or down, as to where they stand.

Thanks,
Scott

*CPC staff follow-up to March 14th email above on following pages,
in reverse chronological order.*

From: "Alice E. Ingerson/Applied History" <appliedhistory@rcn.com>
To: "Scott F. Lennon" <sflennon@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2013 4:23:17 PM
Subject: **CPA and CIP - where are we? plus worries about June 1st pre-proposal cutoff**

Dear Scott,

Please let me know where we are on your Feb 27th and March 14th emails about the CIP and the CPA. I gather that your meeting with the Mayor about this was postponed from last week, and it seems as though that meeting should precede any next steps with the CPC. But please let me know if I'm wrong.

Just as a reminder, if you do still want the response you requested from the CPC as a group in your March 14th email, the CPC must discuss your email with you (and we hope Cheryl Lappin) at a public CPC meeting. If this should be on the CPC's May 9th agenda, or if we need to reschedule that CPC meeting so both you and Cheryl can attend, I should probably be working on that now.

As I noted before, I'm also getting a bit worried about the long-announced June 1st cutoff date for pre-proposals, which are now required.

The CPC will of course find a way to schedule discussions of all the pre-proposals it gets, but if at all possible, I'd like to help everyone avoid a last-minute rush, and to make sure that no one associated with a possible project suddenly realizes in mid-June that they missed the cutoff.

-Alice

=====

From: "Alice E. Ingerson/Applied History" <appliedhistory@rcn.com>
To: "Scott F. Lennon" <sflennon@comcast.net>
Cc: "Leslie Burg" <leslianneburg@gmail.com>, jjf@bostonbusinesslaw.com, "James P. Robertson Jr." <jimrobertson_csr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 1:41:07 PM
Subject: **next steps on CIP and CPA**

Thanks so much for responding, Scott.

Please let me know by tomorrow (Wednesday March 27) if either of these next steps sounds wrong to you!

1. We will postpone the CPC's public discussion of and response to your March 14th email because you cannot attend their April 11th mtg.
2. In the meantime, the CPC officers, Jim Robertson and I will work with you, Cheryl Lappin, any other members of the Board as you and Cheryl recommend, and senior City staff as directed by the Mayor, to address the broad concerns in your Feb 27th and March 14th emails.

Since #2 depends on everyone's availability to meet, it might not move quickly because we're now headed into budget season.

Still, I hope some pre-proposals for City-owned parks, buildings or archives can be submitted by the CPC's long-announced June 1st cutoff date. I'd be happy to walk you through this process by phone, but basically:

Discussing a pre-proposal with the CPC doesn't force anyone to submit a full proposal next November, it just keeps that option open. The form for a pre-proposal is only 3 pages long, and not every section has to be completed. I think the CPC would also be open to other formats, especially for discussing multiple potential projects at once.

Finally, if you'd still like a response from the full CPC to your March 14th email, we need to put this on the agenda for a future CPC meeting, since that's the only way they may deliberate as a group under public meetings law. Please let me know if you and Cheryl can both attend either of the next CPC mtgs after April - on Thursday May 9th or Thursday June 13th. If not, I'll start polling everyone (including both of you) about alternate dates.

Thanks again,
-Alice

=====
From: "Scott F. Lennon" <sflennon@comcast.net>
To: "Alice E. Ingerson/Applied History" <appliedhistory@rcn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 4:43:35 PM
Subject: **Re: confirming you can attend April 11th CPC mtg, other contacts to coordinate**

Hi Alice

My apologies to you & Jim. I was not available to chat last week as I was traveling for work and the evenings were just as hectic. Again, my apologies. I will give you both a call this week. I will not be able to attend on 4/11 as I will be out of state through 4/14.

I cannot recall if I have connected with Cheryl on this issue. I will forward her my emails.

I have also not doubled back with Bob Rooney on this issue either. In terms of other city staff, I have spoken with Bob DeRubeis and I believe Candace Havens was on one of the emails.

Scott

From: "Alice E. Ingerson/Applied History" <appliedhistory@rcn.com>
To: sflennon@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, March 22, 2013 9:55:56 PM
Subject: **confirming you can attend April 11th CPC mtg, other contacts to coordinate**

Hi Scott,

Can you give me a call back by next Monday, March 25th? Cell phone 617.529.9337, office 617.796.1144. Jim Robertson tried to reach you on behalf of the CPC several times this week but never succeeded.

First, could you attend the CPC meeting on Thursday April 11th?

The CPC officers have tentatively put a discussion on that agenda about your Feb 27th and March 14th emails re: the CIP and the CPA. But before I begin publicizing that agenda next week, we'd like to confirm that you can attend. The meeting starts at 7 pm, but we could put your item on at 7:30 or even 8 pm if you'd prefer.

Second, the CPC officers would also like to invite Cheryl Lappin to that meeting, to participate in this discussion. But before I contact Cheryl, is she already aware of your Feb 27th and March 14th emails? If not, may I forward them to her?

Finally, can you let me know if you've had further conversations or correspondence about your concerns with the Mayor or any of the City staff who received those two emails, other than me? The CPC would like to avoid crossing wires with those conversations.

Thanks,
Alice

partial CPC correspondence with Board of Aldermen President Scott Lennon

=====

From: Alice E. Ingerson/Applied History <appliedhistory@rcn.com>
To: leslianneburg@gmail.com, jjf@bostonbusinesslaw.com, clarke@bc.edu, ngrissom@comcast.net, dg@greencos.com, dgreen@greencos.com, turnert473@aol.com, jimrobertson csr <jimrobertson_csr@hotmail.com>, donald fishman 1 <donald.fishman.1@bc.edu>
Sent: Fri, 15 Mar 2013 15:46:59 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: **Itr from Board of Alderman President Scott Lennon to Newton CPC – pls do not discuss by email**

Dear CPC,

On Feb. 27th, Alderman Lennon sent an email very similar to the one below to Newton Chief Operating Officer Bob Rooney, cc'ing me. I forwarded that Feb 27th email to Leslie and Joel, just as an fyi, as well as to Parks & Recreation Commissioner Bob DeRubeis and Planning Director Candace Havens.

The newer email was sent last night at 6:30 pm, while I was already doing room setup for your mtg. You could not have discussed it last night in any case, because it was not on your published agenda. For similar public meetings law reasons, please do not respond to or discuss it now by email.

However, in contrast to his Feb 27th email, Alderman Lennon's March 14th email specifically requests a response from you as a group. So it will be on your April 11th agenda for discussion.

Sincerely,
Alice Ingerson

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighbor- hood org. as (co) sponsor
FY13-18 CIP, ranked 11, Pre- Proposal - CPC declined to consider full proposal	High	City Bldgs - Carr School - Exterior (Windows & Doors)	Restore original 1930s windows and doors or replace with historically accurate new units.	\$882,000	\$882,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 84, 164, 166, 260	Low	City Bldgs - City Hall	Multiple projects	\$1,535,000	\$4,228,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 102, 287	Low	City Bldgs - Newton Corner Library (Parks & Rec HQ)	Multiple projects.	\$292,500	\$292,500	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 107 & 272	Low	Archives - Engineering	Preserve and digitize the oldest and most fragile engineering maps and plans that the City is legally required to retain. The project will provide backup records as part of disaster recovery planning, and reduce the chance of further deterioration caused by active use, and allow access to the data from these maps through the City's geographic information system (GIS). Cost of 2 phases in fy13-18 CIP \$1m, 2011 proposal to CPC \$1.9m.	\$1,000,000	\$2,241,534	
FY13-18 CIP, ranked 109, 176, past proposal	Low	City Bldgs - Crafts Street Stable	Multiple projects	\$1,443,000	\$2,698,669	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 121, 218, Inquiry	Low	City Bldgs - Auburndale Library	Multiple projects	\$555,000	\$2,433,500	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 128, 219, 301	Low	City Bldgs - Waban Library	Multiple projects	\$570,500	\$570,500	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 144 (but not listed as CPA), Parks &	Low	Parks - Gath Pool (new)	Replace current pool with a new, larger one, including removable/ retractable roof to allow for 4-season use.	\$2,000,000	\$7,000,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 149, 206, Inquiry	Low	City Bldgs - Police Annex - (former West Newton branch library)	Multiple projects	\$650,500	\$650,500	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 177 (but not listed for CPA)	Low	City Bldgs - Elliot Street Stable (Operations Center)	Exterior restoration: slate, downspouts, gutters; Interior restoration: flooring, windows, bathrooms, walls, electrical.	\$500,000	\$500,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 179; Fy13- 18 R&OSP	Low	City Bldgs - Crystal Lake - Bathhouse	Construct new bathhouse on land acquired with CP funds; or incorporate part of historic structure into new structure.	\$5,000,000	\$7,000,000	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 184	High	City Bldgs - Burr Park Field House - Exterior	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	?	

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 185, 186, 292, 298 (but not listed as CPA), Fy13-18	Low	Parks - Tennis courts at multiple City parks	McGrath, Cabot, Weeks, Cold Spring Park	\$1,000,000		
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 203	Low	City Bldgs - Newton Centre Playground, Jeanette Curtis West Rec Ctr	Rehabilitation of building envelope, mechanical, electrical, plumbing systems, life-safety, and accessibility of this historically significant structure.	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 209	Low	City Bldgs - Newton Health Department Building - Exterior	Multiple needs identified in CPA-funded 2008 study of this building, which is on the National Register of Historic Places. As of 2012, building envelope is current highest need. Building is in	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 217, Archives Survey	Low	Archives - Overall, esp. City Clerk	Create & implement strategic plan for preservation, including expanded/improved storage to comply with MGL-mandated records retention	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 220 (but not listed as CPA), Fy13-18	High	Parks - Newton Highlands Playground	Implement CPA-funded Master Plan. Rehabilitate and restore this community park to enhance accessibility, provide recreational	\$2,200,000	\$3,575,000	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 241 (but not listed as CPA), Fy13-18	High	Parks - Upper Falls Playground	Complete implementation of CPA-funded Master Plan. Rehabilitate and restore to provide recreational benefits and aesthetic enhancements.	\$1,675,000	\$2,334,000	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 242, 244, 279	Low	City Bldgs - Senior Center	Multiple projects	\$544,000	\$544,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 246 (but not listed for CPA), Inquiry	Low	City Bldgs - Kennard Estate	Rehabilitate this historic 1903 residence, donated to the City along with surrounding conservation land in 1983.	\$240,000	\$500,000	??
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 286	Low	City Bldgs - Nonantum Library - Exterior	Remove and replace slate roof. Install new gutters and downspouts. Remove and replace existing flat roof.	\$200,000		
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 288 and 309, Past Proposals	Low	City Bldgs - Museum	Multiple projects - in addition to Museum Archives	\$332,000	\$332,000	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 315	Low	Parks - City Hall Landscape	Rehabilitate the park in keeping with its historic Olmsted (firm) plan. Est. CPA request shown from CIP, total cost from prior proposal.	\$1,500,000	\$3,082,943	
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 318, Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Historic Burying Grounds	Multiple projects	\$700,735	\$1,124,043	Yes
Fy13-18 CIP, ranked 322	High	Parks - Farlow & Chaffin Parks	Restore and rehabilitate character-defining features of this historic park.	\$640,000	\$1,200,000	Yes
Fy13-18 CIP - not yet listed or ranked, Fy13-18 R&OSP, Parks and Rec Staff Priorities, Pre-proposal	Low	New Park - Manet Road	MWRA Manet Rd. Reservoir - explore opportunities to acquire for active and/or passive recreation use when site becomes available from the MWRA.	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Yes
SUBTOTALS				\$28,373,735	\$48,189,189	

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Hammond/ Webster Conservation Areas	Acquire permanent conservation restriction on land behind Temple Mishkan Teflia, abutting existing conservation areas.			Yes
Proposal	High	Housing - Curve Street / Myrtle Village	Redevelop two existing homes, built in ca. 1880 and 1900, into 7 permanently affordable rental units: 2 for households at 50% of area median income, 2 for households at 70% of area median income, and 3 for households at 85% of area median income.	\$938,063	\$2,982,814	Yes
Inquiry	Low	New Park - Auburndale	Rehabilitate the former Pine Street landfill and acquire abutting private parcels to create a new park for passive recreation.	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	New Park - Newton Corner	Acquire, combine & convert one or more currently vacant / unbuildable lots to new tot lot or pocket park.	\$250,000	\$250,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	New Park - Thompsonville	Acquire, combine & convert currently vacant / unbuildable lots to new tot lot or pocket park.	\$150,000	\$150,000	Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP, Past Proposal	Low	Parks - Albemarle Park	Multiple projects	\$650,000	\$650,000	Yes
Inquiry, Past Proposal	Low	Parks - Cheesecake Brook Greenway	Create new recreation land in Newtonville by replacing existing fence, removing invasive vegetation, adding accessible path or boardwalk and gathering spaces.	\$500,000	\$500,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Parks - Edmands Park	Restore historic built & engineered features, including surrounding stone wall, skating pond, etc. in this park donated to the City by the Edmands Trust in 1913.	\$250,000	\$250,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Parks - Lowell or Prescott Park	Restore and rehabilitate this now largely unimproved but historic small park, based on evidence from historic maps and photographs.	\$150,000	\$150,000	Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Nahanton Park - Historic Almshouse Workshop	Investigate and preserve historic almshouse landscape at Nahanton Pk.	\$750,000		Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Paths & Trails - Aqueducts	Develop and implement plan involving Cochituate and Sudbury aqueducts, connecting with selected open space assets and integrating wildlife corridors where possible. Secure access rights	\$150,000		Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP, Inquiry	Low	Paths & Trails - Lower Falls & Auburndale	Develop and implement pathway plan with DCR: (A) on rail bed from Auburndale through Newton Lower Falls to Wellesley including recently renovated Lower Falls Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge and rail bridges that cross I-95 and Recreation Road, or (B) along the edge of the Charles River.	\$2,000,000		Yes

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Paths & Trails - Off-Street	Develop and implement plan, seeking to link as many open space assets as feasible and integrating wildlife corridors. Secure access rights over private and/or public properties as needed.	\$150,000		Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Paths & Trails - Upper Falls	Investigate opportunities and challenges, prepare plan, obtain MBTA lease, and implement Upper Falls Greenway improvements to establish a recreational corridor for pedestrian and bicycle use.	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Private Buildings - village-center churches	inquiries rec'd for churches, synagogues and other bldgs owned by congregations or religious schools	\$2,000,000		Yes
Pre-proposal	High	Private Buildings - Allen House	Rehabilitate this National Register historic building & local landmark as office, performance & classroom spaces for arts organizations & a nursery school.	\$1,500,000	\$3,300,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Private Buildings - Andover-Newton Campus	Rehabilitate one or more historic buildings on the campus of this private college for use as a dormitory or for teaching and public functions.	\$1,000,000	\$2,500,000	Yes
Inquiry, Pre-proposal expected	Low	Private Buildings - New Art Center	Create a historic preservation and rehabilitation plan for this historic church, in the new Washington Park National Register Historic District, which was sold by the City of Newton for \$1 to the New Art Center, Inc., on the condition that it be operated as a community art center.	\$35,000	\$1,000,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Private Buildings - Stone Institute	Update this historic building used as affordable housing for 24 low-income seniors.	\$250,000	\$250,000	Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP, Inquiry	Low	School Playgrounds & Fields - middle schools	Used a rough estimate of \$300,000 for each of the 4 schools. R&OS Plan lists this figure for Brown.	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	State - DCR Charles River Reservation - Accessibility	Continue work on pathway in Helen Heyn Riverway as necessary (not duplicating DCR trails) including bridges over Country Club Brook and others as needed.	\$250,000		Yes
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	State - MWRA Echo Bridge	Repair, restore, and replace the historic cast iron railings and improve access to pedestrian walkway on top of Echo Bridge.	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Yes
Inquiry	Low	Street Lighting - Jefferson Square	Restore 6 antique street lamps in Newton Corner.	\$117,790	\$119,790	Yes
SUBTOTALS				\$14,640,853	\$17,052,604	

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighbor- hood org. as (co) sponsor
Inquiry	Low	New Park - Aquinas College (Newton Corner)	acquire & develop for park land, mix of affordable & market-rate housing; support adaptive re-use of historic building(s) as cultural center	\$5,000,000	\$25,000,000	??
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Flowed Meadow Conservation Area	Acquire two remaining lots on Wabasso Street and Forest Grove abutting the Charles River access and pathway when offered for sale; complete conversion of Wabasso Street to a trail, if possible with some wheelchair access.	\$1,200,000		??
Fy13-18 R&OSP, Prior Proposals	Low	Parks - Newton Centre Playground	Rehabilitate this historic city park, to improve passive recreation opportunities and accessibility, while retaining natural character and historic design.	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	??
Past Proposal, Parks and Rec Staff Priorities	Low	Parks - Stearns & Pellegrini Parks	Undertake substantial improvements to both parks, following scope of work developed through extensive planning and design initiative partially funded through CPA funds.	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	??
Inquiry, Proposal	Low	School Playgrounds & Fields - elementary schools	Used a rough estimate of \$100,000 for each of 15 schools, though Bowen, Cabot & Memorial-Spaulding already received CPA grants. Williams design funding of \$20,000 was canceled after 2007 litigation.	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	??
SUBTOTALS				\$11,200,000	\$30,000,000	
Inquiry	Low	City Historic Art - City Hall Dioramas	Repair and restore these dioramas, installed when City Hall was first built (?).	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Inquiry	Low	City Historic Art - General	Hire a professional conservator to assess, recommend & implement appropriate storage and display options for historic works of art owned by the City of Newton and currently stored at various locations around the	\$150,000	\$150,000	
Inquiry	Low	City Historic Art - WPA Murals at Newton North	Currently in storage at Newton South.	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Andover-Newton Campus	Andover-Newton Theological School -- Explore opportunities for additional CR on suitable portions of campus parcel.	\$1,000,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Beacon Street	600 Beacon Street - CR to protect cliff with geological interest	\$500,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Boston College Law School	Boston College Law School - Newton Campus - CR to protect small, but rare in Newton, Cambridge Slate outcrop south of Colby Road	\$500,000		

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Charles River	122 Islington Road - CR to protect steep, wooded, gravel aquifer bordering on Charles River	\$1,000,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Charles River	Marriott Hotel - CR to protect peninsula at north end abutting Charles River.	\$2,000,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Charles River	56 Farwell Street - bordering on Charles River 2.8 acres for scenic easement or conservation easement without public access.	\$1,000,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Dudley Road	85 Dudley Road - CR on western portion of Horst estate abutting Newton South High School property to protect Brighton Volcanic rock formations.	\$875,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Edmands Brook	Missionary of Franciscan Sisters / Mt. Alvernia High School Property - CR on wooded portion bordering on Edmands Brook	\$1,925,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Golf Courses	Private golf courses - Explore opportunities for negotiating CR's on suitable portions of Brae Burn Charles River, and Woodland golf courses	\$12,600,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Hammond Pond	Hammond Pond - CR on privately owned res. wooded swamp and uplands on east side of Pond off Longwood Rd. at Section 63, Block 37, Lot 13.	\$70,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Hammond Pond	Hammond Pond - CR on privately owned res. wooded swamp and uplands on east side of Pond off Longwood Rd. at Section 63, Block 37, Lot 14.	\$1,225,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Hammond Pond	Hammond Pond -- CR on privately owned res. wooded swamp and uplands on east side of Pond off Longwood Rd. at Section 63, Block 37, Lot 17.	\$70,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Hammond/ Webster Conservation Areas	24 Warren St. - CR on suitable area adjacent to Thompsonville Brook.	\$700,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Oak Hill Park Trustees' Woods	Oak Hill Park Trustees' Woods - CR to protect tree cover, bordering on Charles River floodplain	\$700,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Conservation Restrictions - Scenic Vistas	Identify and map Newton's hilltop and scenic vistas and secure visual scenic easements or provide other development controls.	\$75,000		

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Pre-Proposal	High	Housing - Affordable Housing Trust	Create a municipal housing trust under the applicable state statute and allocate up to one-third of each year's available CPA funds through the trust, as the primary mechanism for CPA funding of affordable housing development.	\$1,500,000	Unknown.	
Inquiry	Low	Housing - Newton Centre Firefighters' Triangle	Provide architectural and engineering services for a project to develop affordable housing for seniors on the site currently occupied by the Newton Fire Department Headquarters.	\$350,000	\$350,000	
Inquiry	High	Housing - Wyman Street Emergency Housing	Write down Newton Housing Authority's existing mortgage for 2-3 units currently kept vacant at City's request for emergencies (house fires, domestic violence, etc.)	\$300,000	\$300,000	
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	New Park - Village Center Green Spaces	review village centers for presence of spaces, including sitting areas or landscaped areas which provide respite and aesthetic value. Develop a plan to enhance existing spaces or provide such spaces where needed.	\$75,000		
Proposal	Low	Parks - Albemarle Park Central Corridor	Plan & implement capital improvements to the central corridor of Albemarle Park, in Newtonville between Crafts Street and Watertown Street, based on Albemarle Park Master Plan, incl. improved circulation and linkages, restoration of southern portions of Avery Woods, new entry plaza, new plantings, berms, lighting and furnishings.			
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Auburnale Park	Auburndale Pk - bank stabilization			
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Cabot Park	Plan accessibility improvements.	\$50,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Conservation Area Accessibility	Implement accessibility improvements at areas designated pursuant to the Conservation Land Management Plan.	\$1,500,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - River Street Playground	River St. Playground - Undertake improvements	\$500,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Waban Playground	Waban Playground (serves Angier Sch.) - Repair tennis courts.	\$150,000		
Fy13-18 R&OSP	Low	Parks - Weeks Playground	Weeks Playground - Undertake study for accessibility improvements.	\$50,000		

SOURCES CIP = Capital Improvement Plan R&OSP = Recreation & Open Space Plan	RELIABILITY of COST ESTIMATE	project title	project summary	CP funds to be requested	total project cost	resident or neighborhood org. as (co) sponsor
Inquiry	Low	Private Buildings - local historic districts	inquiries rec'd for Walker Center, Upper Falls Stone Barn, Stone Institute, New Art Center; many other buildings could apply if considered eligible.	\$1,500,000		
Inquiry	Low	Private Buildings Revolving Fund for Preservation	Discussion initiated by Newton Historical Commission, no written description of this idea yet.	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Inquiry	Low	State - MBTA Upper Falls Railroad Depot	Preserve this small historic building by acquiring it in full, or by acquiring a preservation restriction, from the MBTA.	\$250,000		
Inquiry	Low	Street Lighting	Replace the city's remaining historic gaslights with energy-efficient electric lights of similar, period-appropriate design.	\$300,000	\$300,000	
SUBTOTALS				\$32,015,000	\$2,200,000	



Setti D. Warren
Mayor

Newton, Massachusetts
Community Preservation Committee
FUNDING GUIDELINES
adopted 14 November 2012

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

Candace Havens
Director

1. Use existing community-wide plans to guide funding decisions.

As required by the Community Preservation Act (CPA), in 2002-03 Newton’s first Community Preservation Committee created a *Community Preservation Plan* analyzing the City’s CPA-related needs, possibilities and resources. Since then, the City has adopted a new *Comprehensive Plan* (2007), conducted several surveys of its CPA-eligible resources and created a new, more rigorous *Capital Improvement Plan*. Newton also regularly updates its *Consolidated Plan for Housing & Community Development* and its *Recreation & Open Space Plan*. Most of these plans involve significant public participation.

The basic analysis in the original *Community Preservation Plan* is still valid, but the CPC now relies primarily on these newer, regularly updated plans to identify community needs. In particular, the Committee will support:

- For all resources, accessibility in excess of legal requirements, where appropriate
- For affordable housing, the development of housing that is permanently deed-restricted to serve income groups prioritized by the *Consolidated Plan*, in locations prioritized by the *Comprehensive Plan*
- For historic resources, projects that address needs identified in plans such as the *Archaeology Survey*, *City Archives Survey*, *City Historic Buildings Survey*, *Early Architecture Survey*, and *Heritage Landscapes Report*
- For open space and recreation land, the acquisition of additional sites or easements for public ownership, and the development or improvement of sites already in public ownership, as listed in the “Action Plan” section of the *Recreation & Open Space Plan*
- For projects to be managed by City departments, projects that address both the risk-based priorities in the *Capital Improvement Plan* as well as the community-character priorities in other plans

2. Balance the allocation of funds across all eligible resources and allowable uses.

The CPA provides state and local funds for affordable housing, historic resources, open space and recreation land. Like Newton’s past funding pattern, these *Guidelines* for future funding reflect our community’s strong, continuing support for all four CPA-eligible resources:

	Program Admin.	Affordable Housing	Historic Resources	Open Space	Recreation Land	General (any eligible resource)
Required by the CPA	maximum 5%	minimum 10%	minimum 10%	minimum 10%	no requirement	maximum 65%
Newton: Past, Fy03-Fy12	3-4%	31%	22%	25%	18%	--
				Open Space & Recreation Land		
				acquisition 36%	rehabilitation 7%	
Newton: Future, Fy13-20	3-5%	25-40%	15 -20%	acquisition 20-30%	rehabilitation 15-20%	--

website www.newtonma.gov/cpa

contact Alice E. Ingerson, Community Preservation Program Manager

email aingerson@newtonma.gov phone 617.796.1144

Preserving the Past  Planning for the Future

*Guidelines
continue on p. 2.*

Analytical Categories & How They Are Weighted
in
Newton's FY2015-2019 Capital Improvement Plan

Priority
(Overall
Ranking)

=

CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE (IF NOT IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM) RATINGS AND WEIGHTS --0 (No Impact) to 10 (High Impact)											
Overall Condition input	% Life Left as input	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight		
Overall Condition 0: Worse to 10: Best	0: Expired to 100: New	2	1	9.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	6.0
				City Operations	Programs / Services	Costs/ Savings Ratio	Codes/ Health & Safety	Property Damage	Quality of Life	Energy	Dept. Mission or Vision

Factors above are combined by formula into:

Likelihood of Failure	Conseq. Factor	Risk Factor
-----------------------	----------------	-------------