



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

11 July 2013

Candace Havens
Director

The meeting was held on Thursday 11 July 2013 at 7:05 pm in City Hall Room 222.

Community Preservation Committee (CPC) members present: Leslie Burg, Jim Robertson, Nancy Grissom, Joel Feinberg (dep. 8:40 pm), Michael Clarke, Tom Turner, Dan Green (arr. 7:20 pm).

Also attending: Alderman Deborah Crossley, Jackson Homestead/Historic Newton Director Cindy Stone, Newton Public Buildings Dept. Director of Project Management Adam Gilmore, and Director of Urban Forestry Marc Welch.

Program manager Alice Ingerson served as recorder.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Procedure for Fall 2013 Regular Funding Round

Leslie Burg briefly summarized the Committee's discussion at its previous meeting on the procedure for public hearings and funding votes in the upcoming regular funding round, for which full proposals will be due on 15 November 2013. Alice Ingerson suggested ratifying this procedure through a formal vote. Dan Green moved, and Nancy Grissom seconded, that the Committee should complete its public hearings for all proposals received prior to voting on whether to recommend funding for any specific proposal. The motion was adopted unanimously, 7-0.

Ingerson briefly reviewed the program's "available funds" report, which she had just updated on the program website. A copy of that report is attached to these minutes.

PROPOSALS & PROJECTS

Durant-Kenrick Homestead – Final Report

including \$2.7 million in CPA funds (Historic Newton)

On behalf of the private nonprofit Newton Historical Society, the building's new owner and the CPA grantee, Cindy Stone and Durant-Kenrick site manager Jennifer Hance summarized the project's original scope, design and construction decisions, and budget-to-actual comparisons for both sources and uses of funds. Ingerson explained that she asked each final report to include major project "surprises" – unanticipated challenges and opportunities – so past practical experience could inform the CPC's approach to future projects.

The project involved preserving and rehabilitating the older portion of a home originally constructed in the early 18th century; adding a new attached wing with accessible restrooms, teaching and storage spaces, and an elevator; and both preserving and replanting the landscape, to help visitors understand the property's agricultural and horticultural history. "Surprises" included the worse-than-anticipated condition of some sills and beams; discovering the remains of a below-grade room for storing milk and butter, as well as a solid rock ledge, in the area designated for the new wing; discovering that the earliest documentable color for the house was "verdigris" (a vibrant green rather than the dark red shown in project fundraising materials); and the Massachusetts Historical

Commission's requirement to preserve a 17th-century Tudor window installed by Arthur Dewing, the owner primarily responsible for the home's preservation in the 20th century. All of these decisions required modifying plans and budgets after the project was well underway. Ingerson noted that these experiences might suggest funding more upfront research for future projects, such as ground-penetrating radar to identify a site's archaeological features without excavation.

Historic Newton is now completing and raising funds for interpretive audio programs and interactive games about multiple aspects of the site's history: agriculture, trade and politics before and during the American Revolution (the Durant family); agriculture, horticulture and the abolition movement (the Kenrick family); and historic preservation and women's rights (the Dewing family).

The project's total budget evolved over time from \$3.6 million to a high of \$5 million to a final \$4.9 million. Newton's Community Preservation Fund provided an initial planning grant of about \$78,000, followed by \$1.27 million for the purchase of a preservation restriction on the landscape; and \$1.44 million for architectural preservation, rehabilitation and construction. Release of the \$2.7 million in CPA funds was contingent on raising at least \$900,000 in matching funds, but Historic Newton ultimately had to raise about \$2.1 million from non-CPA sources to complete the project.

NOTE: This full presentation is available from the link for this project on the CPC's "Proposals & Projects" webpage, www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/default.asp.

Museum Archives, Accessibility & Fire Suppression Revised Full Proposal – PUBLIC HEARING

\$680,552 of final design & construction funding (Newton Public Buildings Dept. and Historic Newton)

Adam Gilmore presented for the Public Buildings Department, with Cindy Stone representing the Jackson Homestead. Gilmore summarized the project's scope, including expanding and upgrading archival storage and research space as well as the kitchen and bathroom in the wing, making the building's entire first floor wheelchair accessible, and providing fire suppression for the entire building. The current unreliable and antiquated wheelchair lift in the trash storage area will be replaced with "universal design" ramps; all visitors will use the same primary entrance. The project will correct the deficiencies in the current archival space, including the lack of reliable climate control and of space both for visiting researchers and for new donations. The new space will be used efficiently by installing movable compact shelving. Fire-suppression systems meeting current standards will protect visitors, the building itself, and the collections. Although the project has moved slowly to date, it now has all required approvals, including from the Massachusetts Historical Commission and Massachusetts Architectural Access Board, and is ready to go. Stone added that the building needs help desperately, including work to address animal damage in the wing.

NOTE: This full presentation is available from the link for this project on the CPC's "Proposals & Projects" webpage, www.newtonma.gov/gov/planning/cpa/projects/default.asp.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Alderman Deb Crossley spoke in support of the project. She felt there had been some early missteps, including an unrealistic initial budget, less than optimal management of design services, delays caused by a lack of available staff in Public Buildings, and cost increases caused by two revisions to the building code since the project began. However, she felt that Public Buildings now had sufficient qualified staff to keep the project on track. The building should be brought up to code and fire suppression provided, partly because the building is so intensively used by Newton school students. However, she also felt it would not hurt this project to hold any CPC recommendation for it until after

the CPC's July 24th discussion of the pre-proposal for an overall strategic plan for Newton's historical records. She felt sure this project would be consistent with any such overall plan.

Jay Walter, as vice president of Historic Newton, felt that the this project was critical for the preservation and usability of the Jackson Homestead archives, and that the planned accessibility improvements would have minimal impact on the building's historic fabric.

Jonathan Kantar, as chair of the Historic Newton Buildings & Grounds Committee, felt the project as just presented differed little from the initial conception. The current wheelchair lift is an embarrassment, and the bathroom, kitchen, and overall environment for both staff and visitors is far from ideal. The archives area is not only too small but has insufficient heat and cooling, which is a risk to the collections as well as uncomfortable for the staff and visitors.

Janet Sterman, speaking as a resident of Newton Corner and on behalf of the Friends of Farlow Park, felt that it was unfair for the CPC to have supported \$2.7 million for the Durant-Kenrick Homestead and the Museum Archives project when it had not yet supported full funding for the restoration of Farlow Park, a project first proposed in 2006. She felt that the criteria used by the CPC and its staff to prioritize projects for funding were unclear. Burg responded that there were reasons why the CPC had not prioritized Farlow Park in the past, but since that project was not on tonight's agenda, it was not appropriate to discuss that project at this meeting. She assured Sterman the CPC's staff does not cull or prioritize proposals; Ingerson passes all eligible proposals she receives along to the CPC.

CPC DISCUSSION

Green thought the revised full proposal answered the questions asked at the CPC's 9 May 2013 meeting, but questioned the attribution of the project's relatively high design costs to the long public approval process and the higher-than-anticipated number night meetings attended by the project architects. Stone noted that when the project was first proposed, the CPC had not been willing to consider a planning grant such as the one it had provided for the Durant-Kenrick project, which had led to a more detailed initial budget. In response to Jim Robertson, Gilmore said that Public Buildings had strong confidence in the current project budget, which was based on full plans, a full analysis of compliance with the current building code, and reviews by external cost estimators.

Grissom, Robertson and Burg all recognized that the project's higher-than-initial costs reflected not only increases due to delays and code changes, but also an expanded scope, which they felt probably justified its costs. In response to Grissom, Gilmore suggested it might cost at least 10 percent more than the current request to undertake each of the proposed project components separately.

Ingerson summarized the "for discussion" potential funding conditions she had provided to the Committee, including: project deadlines, project reporting, and reconciling any funding recommended to preserve these archives, held by a single organization, with the goal of fostering more interdepartmental or collaborative approaches to archival preservation.

Gilmore and Stone felt that Ingerson's proposed schedule was feasible - construction to begin within 6 months and be completed within 18 months of any Board order appropriating funds for the project - and Ingerson's suggestion to allow approval of deadline extensions by the Director of Planning and Development, as for the Durant-Kenrick project. Gilmore also agreed that Public Buildings could provide quarterly in-person updates to the CPC during the project, a final in-person and written project report prior to spending the final 10 percent of appropriated funds, and a summary of maintenance funded for the building from non-CPA funds for the 2 years after project completion.

Burg noted that the proposal's 10-year annual operating budget for the Jackson Homestead as a public building seemed too limited to cover major recurring costs, such as painting or roof replacement. Although CPA funds had recently been used for such work at the Jackson Homestead, Burg, Grissom and other CPC members agreed that this was appropriate only as a one-time response to years of deferred maintenance, and that these costs should be covered from other sources in the future. Gilmore explained that the annual budget for the Jackson Homestead had been estimated by prorating the total annual maintenance budget for all City buildings based on square footage. He agreed that preventive maintenance was critical. After further discussion, Gilmore agreed that Public Buildings would provide the CPC with a brief report on preventive maintenance undertaken at the Jackson Homestead during the 2 years following completion of the current proposed project.

Robertson felt the project was "under-leveraged." Feinberg summarized the challenge before the CPC as providing an incentive for leveraging additional non-CPA funds without delaying the project and thus further increasing its cost.

Burg asked if the sponsors could request more than the listed \$40,000 from the Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG). Stone and Gilmore agreed that this might be possible. Alderman Crossley noted that approving additional CDBG funds would take time that might push the project into January 2014, when another scheduled update of the building code might require further changes to the project design, and further cost increases.

Stone said the project's already elongated schedule had discouraged funding from non-CPA sources, none of which would have allowed the project to retain a grant for 6 years while awaiting the start of construction. Historic Newton's capital campaign had targeted specific sources for specific capital needs, and the sources already targeted cannot be approached again. New fundraising for this project would compete with Historic Newton's current campaign to raise \$250,000 for interpretive exhibits at the Durant-Kenrick Homestead. Stone also suggested that even if the CPC imposed no fundraising target, Historic Newton would raise funds on its own for the archives project, and any appropriated CPA funds not needed in the end would be returned.

Robertson was concerned that recommending the proposal as submitted, with only 7% of costs covered by non-CPA funds, might set an undesirable precedent for future projects. Mike Clarke felt that the CPC needed to show clearly that it would require a significant level of non-CPA funding for all projects. Green suggested requiring this project to raise 25 percent of its costs from non-CPA sources, or about \$100,000. Robertson supported recommending \$640,000 rather than the requested \$680,552 in CPA funds, which would require raising about 13% of project costs from non-CPA sources. If the additional \$40,000 in non-CPA funds were applied strictly to furnishings, fixtures and equipment (FFE), Historic Newton would have until completion of construction to raise those funds. Stone felt that raising an additional \$40,000 from non-CPA sources was possible.

The Committee also discussed the relationship between this proposal and the pending pre-proposal for an interdepartmental strategic plan for Newton's City archives. Burg said Newton needed a more collaborative approach to this issue across all City departments. She felt that if the currently proposed project were funded, the Jackson Homestead should still be asked to participate in future collaborative strategies for Newton's archives. However she did not think this would mean moving the Homestead's archival collections into centralized, shared storage.

Stone responded that Historic Newton would be happy to keep its 3-dimensional collections in a shared facility, because museum staff and visitors used these collections less often than the archives. She also noted that Historic Newton's archival staff had collaborated with the City Clerk and the

Newton Free Library on past projects and would continue to do so in future. Stone acknowledged that the Homestead's collections included some City materials, such as the historic property survey and the Engineering Division slide collection. However, the City Clerk had assured her that any facilities proposed in a future strategic plan for City archives would not affect the Homestead's archives. Stone explained that the archives cared for by Historic Newton staff went far beyond City records and were critical to the Jackson Homestead's museum accreditation.

Feinberg felt that requiring Historic Newton to collaborate in implementing any future strategic plan for City archives was amorphous and unenforceable as a condition for CPA funding. He saw the archives collected and curated by Historic Newton as uniquely appropriate for CPA funding. In contrast, he felt it would be more appropriate for non-CPA funds to support the preservation of records generated by the normal running of City government.

VOTE Robertson moved recommending an appropriation of \$641,000 for the project as described in the proposal, with a maximum of \$10,000 for FFE (furniture, fixtures and equipment), and with the additional conditions listed below. Grissom seconded the motion.

- ♦ construction to begin within 6 months and be completed within 18 months of when funds are appropriated, or by any extension of these deadlines approved in writing by the Director of Planning and Development
- ♦ quarterly in-person status updates to the CPC, during the project
- ♦ a final in-person and written project report from Public Buildings to the CPC, prior to spending the final 10 percent of appropriated funds
- ♦ a brief written summary to the CPC of preventive maintenance undertaken at the Jackson Homestead during the 2 years after this project's completion

The motion was approved by 6-0, Feinberg having left the meeting prior to the final vote.

Historic Burying Grounds Pre-proposal

for additional \$410,000 of preservation/restoration funding (Historic Newton)

Cindy Stone, Director of Urban Forestry Marc Welch, and Chair of Historic Newton's Burying Grounds Committee Harry Lohr summarized the project, which will focus on repairing tombs in the East Parish Burying Ground, plus tree work and vegetation removal along the fences around all 3 historic burying grounds. Lohr emphasized that the burying grounds represented 350 years of American history and had received international attention. The proposed project would continue the work done with CPA funds over the past 10 years to compensate for the City's neglect of these sites during the previous 60-70 years.

Burg, Grissom and Green asked whether the vegetation and tree work could be funded from non-CPA sources, since it seemed like routine maintenance and therefore might be considered ineligible for CPA funds. Welch explained that the City's *Capital Plan* ranked the trees in the burying grounds as less critical to City operations and public safety than trees on public streets and in public parks, so tree work at the burying grounds probably would not be funded from non-CPA sources for many years to come. In general, he recommends major tree work every 10 years. In future, the Parks Department would be responsible for keeping the fences clear of vegetation. Lohr explained that two of the three burying grounds are only open to the public on holidays, due to the danger from trees that have deteriorated since previous CPA-funded work at these sites. In response to a question from Ingerson, he could not explain why the sites were safe to open on holidays.

In response to Grissom, Lohr felt that once the vegetation had been cleared along the fences, volunteers could probably keep the fences clear. In response to Burg, Welch thought that the corps of volunteer tree pruners he helped to train might also be able to help with tree work at these sites. Green suggested also approaching local tree care companies for volunteer contributions.

Burg questioned whether Stone herself, listed as the project manager, had the time and expertise to manage the project directly. Stone agreed that, with his permission, Frank Nichols in the City's Engineering Division might be listed as the project manager instead. Nichols' time for overseeing bidding, contracting, design and construction work for the project would be charged to any CPA grant. Stone clarified that her time on the project, as well as bookkeeping by her assistant Bridget Jeffs and Welch's oversight of tree and vegetation work would all be contributed through the operating budgets of the City or the Newton Historical Society, and would not be charged to any CPA grant. Ingerson noted that CPA funds can be used to pay for contracted managers, but Stone pointed out that the engineering contract for this project would have to be competitively bid. So although the pre-proposal listed Stephanie Davis of Structures North as the contracted engineer for current work at these sites, Structures North might not be hired for the next phase.

As evidence of broad, City-wide support for the project, Burg suggested that the full proposal list supportive community contacts who were neither members of Historic Newton's Burying Grounds Committee nor immediate abutters of the sites. Lohr agreed this would be possible.

Burg and Grissom suggested that the full proposal budget include two separate annual phases, to give the CPC the option to recommend funding for each phase in a different fiscal year. Ingerson suggested that the full budget also distinguish the cost of tree work from the cost of fence clearing.

In response to suggestions from the presenters, Robertson agreed that before-and-after photographs of previously funded CPA work at these sites would be helpful.

Robertson felt that the CPC should look for significant additional leverage of non-CPA funds in a full proposal for this project. Ingerson suggested that Historic Newton might be able to value volunteer efforts at the burying grounds as leverage, at least in the maintenance or operating budget, by asking the Parks Department what it would cost to pay for the work currently done by volunteers.

VOTE Grissom moved that the CPC agree to consider a full proposal for this project in the fall 2013 funding round. Green seconded the motion, which was approved 6-0.

In response to a question from Stone, Ingerson noted that full proposals would be due on 15 November 2013.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Green proposed approval of the draft minutes for the 19 June 2013 meeting, with one noted correction. Grissom seconded the motion. The corrected minutes were approved by a vote of 6-0.

Ingerson distributed a proposed meeting schedule for the remainder of 2013 and all of 2014, and explained that she would ask the Committee to vote on a final schedule at its 24 July 2013 meeting.

After a motion by Green, seconded by Robertson, the meeting was adjourned by committee consensus at 9:20 pm.

City of Newton, Massachusetts
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION PROGRAM



**Available Funds Fy13-14 &
Summary of *Funding Guidelines***

showing potential impact of:

- CPC-Recommended Proposals
- Submitted Pre-Proposals
- Anticipated Pre-Proposals

for 11 July 2013 meeting of the
Community Preservation Committee

City of Newton, Massachusetts		last updated 17 June 2013, A. Ingerson	
Community Preservation Fund		Fiscal 2013	Fiscal 2014
AVAILABLE FUNDS		revenue updated from CP-2 submitted to DoR	revenue from budget approved by Board 20 May 2013
REVENUE			
local CPA surcharge		\$2,472,625	\$2,534,441
state matching funds <i>(26.6% in fy12, 26.8% in fy13, est 26% in fy14)</i>		\$652,294	\$642,882
additional local revenue:			
fund balance <i>(confirmed for fy13)</i>		\$6,335,670	TBD
TOTAL REVENUE		\$9,460,589	\$3,177,323
EXPENDITURES			
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION & DEBT SERVICE			
program administration <i>(max 5% of current-yr funds)</i>		(\$148,320)	(\$142,909)
debt service for Kessler Woods <i>(final payment in fy14, allocated to use 100% of budgeted 10% open space reserve + remainder from general reserve)</i>		(\$525,135)	(\$508,500)
debt service for 20 Rogers St. <i>(final payment in fy17, allocated 100% to recreation / general reserve)</i>		(\$306,000)	(\$293,250)
TOTAL Program Administration & Debt Service		(\$979,455)	(\$944,659)
AVAILABLE FUNDS net of program administration & debt service		\$8,481,134	\$2,232,664

City of Newton, Massachusetts		last updated 17 June 2013, A. Ingerson	
Community Preservation Fund		Fiscal 2013	Fiscal 2014
AVAILABLE FUNDS		revenue updated from CP-2 submitted to DoR	revenue from budget approved by Board 20 May 2013
AVAILABLE FUNDS after program administration + debt service		\$8,481,134	\$2,232,664
PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS by Board of Aldermen			
in FISCAL 2013			
Angino Farm Barn - supplemental (<i>historic resources & recreation</i>)		(\$180,000)	
54 Eddy Street (<i>housing</i>)		(\$255,000)	
TOTAL New Appropriations		(\$435,000)	
AVAILABLE FUNDS after current-year new appropriations		\$8,046,134	
CPC RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED to Board of Aldermen			
Newton Homebuyer Assistance Program (<i>housing</i>)		(\$475,000)	
TOTAL Proposals		(\$475,000)	
AVAILABLE FUNDS if currently recommended projects were funded in full		\$7,571,134	
FULL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED to CPC			
Museum Archives - Construction (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$680,552)	
Myrtle Village (<i>housing - previously approved request \$938,063</i>)		(\$1,200,000)	
TOTAL Recommendations		(\$1,880,552)	
AVAILABLE FUNDS if all submitted proposals were funded in full		\$5,690,582	

City of Newton, Massachusetts		last updated 11 July 2013, A. Ingerson
Community Preservation Fund		Fiscal 2013
AVAILABLE FUNDS		from year-end CP-2
EXPENDITURES		
Pre-PROPOSALS SUBMITTED to CPC		
Affordable Housing Trust (<i>housing</i>)		(\$1,500,000)
Allen House (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$1,500,000)
2042-44 Beacon Street/Engine 6 (<i>historic resources, housing</i>)		(\$333,889)
City Archives - Strategic Plan (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$20,000)
City Hall - Veterans' Wing Historic Artifacts (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$19,000)
City Hall - Acoustics & Accessibility (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$675,000)
City Hall - Windows (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$1,093,000)
Farlow Park Pond Restoration (<i>historic resources</i>) CPC staff est. for pond + bridge		(\$650,000)
Historic Burying Grounds 3 (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$410,987)
Needham Street Open Space Plan (<i>open space, recreation</i>)		(\$70,000)
New Art Center (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$250,000)
Newton Highlands Playground (<i>recreation, open space</i>)		(\$240,000)
Waban Hill Reservoir (<i>historic resources, recreation, open space</i>)		(\$1,500,000)
	TOTAL Pre-Proposals	(\$8,261,876)
AVAILABLE FUNDS if all submitted pre-proposals were funded in full		(\$2,571,294)

City of Newton, Massachusetts		last updated 11 July 2013, A. Ingerson
Community Preservation Fund		Fiscal 2013
AVAILABLE FUNDS		from year-end CP-2
EXPENDITURES		
AVAILABLE FUNDS if all submitted pre-proposals were funded in full		(\$2,571,294)
ANTICIPATED PRE-PROPOSALS (mtgs requested w CPC staff or on Parks & Rec priorities list)		(* CPC staff estimates)
<i>NOTE: This list includes no housing projects.</i>		
Bullough's Pond (<i>historic resources, recreation</i>) *		(\$250,000)
Charles River Path(s) (<i>recreation</i>) *		(\$3,000,000)
Crystal Lake Bathhouse (<i>recreation</i>)		(\$5,000,000)
Newton Centre Playground - "The Hut" (J. Walls Rec Ctr) (<i>historic resources, recreation</i>)		(\$1,500,000)
Newton Highlands Playground (<i>construction</i>)		(\$2,000,000)
Newton Upper Falls Playground (<i>recreation</i>)		(\$500,000)
Pellegrini & Stearns Parks (<i>recreation</i>)		(\$1,000,000)
Tennis Courts (<i>recreation</i>)		(\$1,000,000)
WPA Murals (Newton North High School) (<i>historic resources</i>)		(\$36,600)
AVAILABLE FUNDS if everything above were funded in full		(\$16,857,894)

Allocation by Resource					
KEY				open space & recreation combined	
housing	historic	open space	recreation	acquisition	rehabilitation
Target Ranges in CPC Funding Guidelines					
25 - 40%	15-20%	no target	no target	20-30%	15-20%
If All Pending Pre- & Full Proposals Were Funded in Full					
35.0%	60.7%	0.7%	3.6%	5.2%	11.4%
If All Pending & Anticipated Requests Were Funded in Full					
14.9%	30.4%	0.3%	54.4%	2.2%	62.1%

NOTE: No housing projects are included in "anticipated."

Newton's CPA Funding Guidelines

adopted by the Community Preservation Committee,
14 November 2012

- 1. Use community-wide plans to guide funding decisions.**
- 2. Balance the allocation of funds across all eligible resources & allowable uses.**
- 3. Require proven capacity for project management & long-term maintenance.**
- 4. Evaluate results to ensure accountability & improve future projects.**



Angino Farm