

The meeting was held on Wednesday 16 June 2010 in the Auburndale Community Library at 375 Auburn Street, Auburndale, Massachusetts.

Attending members of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC): Nancy Grissom, Walter Bernheimer, Zack Blake, Leslie Burg, Michael Clarke, Dan Green (arr. 7:15 pm), Thomas Turner, Joel Feinberg.

Program manager Alice Ingerson served as recorder.

Current Committee Chair Nancy Grissom opened the meeting at 7:10 pm.

PROGRAM PLANNING & OUTREACH

Nancy Grissom suggested using the July meeting to focus on planning for the program's tenth anniversary, which would start with the November 2011 anniversary of Newton's CPA adoption vote. The goal would be to brainstorm possible events, prioritizing, estimating costs and planning how events could be organized, who to involve, etc. She asked the other members of the committee to think about ideas for this celebration. Zack Blake asked members to brainstorm a list of people who should be at the events.

The Committee asked Alice Ingerson to research and distribute a list of everyone who has ever served on the CPC, and a chronology of major events in the program's history.

The Committee also asked Ingerson to poll members about their July – August schedules, and work with Nancy Grissom to find a date for one more summer 2010 meeting.

Alice Ingerson gave an update on contacts with the Wellesley CPC. They have not yet been asked to recommend funding for the portion of the Lower Falls Bridge project that lies in Wellesley, but expect to take that up next fall. They are interested in meeting the Newton CPC to talk not only about coordinating consideration of this proposal but also about collaboration in general. Their chair, Jack Morgan, had expressed support for the "Charles River CPA summit" suggested by Alice Ingerson, to bring together CPA communities along the river to talk about joint goals and possible future projects.

PROGRAM & PROJECT MANAGEMENT

FINANCIAL INFORMATION TO REQUEST WITH PROPOSALS

Alice Ingerson summarized her staff memo about establishing clearer expectations for the many public-private partnerships that apply for CP funding, from private nonprofits that rely heavily on public funds to public departments supported by private "friends" groups. (Memo attached at the end of these minutes.)

Wally Bernheimer stated that as a matter of policy such organizations should provide their financials. Private nonprofits have to file financial statements with the attorney general, so these should be easily provided to the CPC. Bernheimer suggested asking for "annual financials as prepared by the organization's auditors," plus the most recently internally generated financial statements. The Committee unanimously endorsed this suggestion, and asked Ingerson to add these requirements to the existing proposal instructions.

Joel Feinberg assumed the goal of requesting this information was not only to show that the sponsoring organization is in reasonable financial shape, but also to help the CPC achieve its goal of leveraging CP funds with other funds. He felt that more financial transparency could help to ensure that CP funding was "but, for" money, meaning that the project would not be done "but for" CP funds. CP funds should really be "last in."

Ingerson noted that in some past projects, CP funds had in fact been "first in," based on the sponsor's argument that they could only raise private matching funds if potential donors saw a prior major commitment of public funds. Wally Bernheimer noted that this might be true, because private funds were easier to raise for some purposes, such as construction, than for others, such as planning.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT & PROPOSAL REVIEW

Alice Ingerson asked Mike Clarke to summarize for the Committee the critical feedback about project management that he had recently received from Margaret Doris, whose nonprofit organization had sponsored several projects in and around Albemarle Park. Doris had shared with Clarke in detail what she saw as the management failures by the Parks and Recreation Dept at several of these projects, some of which were funded several years ago but have not yet been closed out. Clarke wondered when a given sponsor comes in for a new proposal or additional funding, how the CPC could know whether that sponsor had done what they should on past projects.

Ingerson noted that she tried to include any concerns based on past performance in her written evaluations of new proposals for the Committee, and hoped that tonight's discussion would make the reasons for including this information in those evaluations clearer.

She also noted that there have been differing perspectives on some past projects. For the Gath Pool, the nonprofit sponsor and the Parks and Recreation Department disagreed about the type of flooring appropriate for the bathhouse, but some flooring had finally been installed, and the project has been closed out. Similar disagreements had occurred with the Albemarle Park (Albemarle Community Commons) project. City staff paid from the CPC's administrative funds (the CP staff team) had attempted to mediate these disagreements so that project could be completed, but had ended their efforts because they were unsuccessful. The project still has not been completed.

Joel Feinberg noted that many of the problematic projects have been funded to and managed by City departments. He wondered whether the issue was with the private sponsor or the City dept.

Ingerson thought the issue was often the relationship between the private sponsor and the funded City dept. She reminded the Committee that when funds are appropriated to the Planning Dept. for grants to private organizations, the disbursement of funds is governed by explicit grant agreements, which work on a reimbursement basis and require CP staff to approve each reimbursement request. When funds are appropriated directly to any other City department, the CPC and its staff have no direct authority or control over the funds.

Ingerson described her attempts from 2007 through 2009 to resolve management problems on older projects by offering extra assistance from staff paid through the Committee's administrative budget. This CPC-paid "CP team" had helped to get many older projects completed. However, because the CP team never had direct authority over most project funds, in some cases the team member Ingerson had assigned to assist with a project was not informed of payments approved by the departmental project manager. In other cases, CP team members were simply unable to resolve longstanding differences between the neighborhood or nonprofit and the City department co-sponsoring a given project. Ingerson recalled her January 2010 memo reporting her decision to discontinue this "remedial management" experiment with the CP team (memo attached).

Ingerson then shared a summary of what she saw as the major causes of project management problems observed during her three years as CPC staff. She noted that these problems were associated primarily with projects initially funded prior to 2007, some of which had still not been completed.

- ◆ unclear or shifting project goals

Some older projects were funded based on proposals that listed desired features or outcomes rather than a full, agreed-upon scope of work, or that used cost estimates based on "special pricing" offered by volunteers or donors rather than on public bidding. Many projects experienced "scope creep," initiated by sponsors who saw the approved proposal, regardless of its level of detail, more as a starting point for planning than as a final scope of work.

In addition, some early projects proposed on City property by nonprofits or neighborhood groups were funded despite the misgivings of the City dept. responsible for the site, though by law the City dept. was the organization funded to carry out the project. Ingerson could not be sure of the reasons for these misgivings, but she thought they sometimes reflected justifiable skepticism -- after many years of annual budget cuts -- about whether the dept. would be funded to maintain the CP-funded improvements adequately, since CP funds cannot be used for maintenance. She

also pointed out that City depts. may not always feel they can express openly these kinds of misgivings about proposals supported strongly by citizens and elected officials.

In some of these cases, conflicting expectations between the private sponsors and the funded City department had significantly delayed project completion.

- ◆ different perspectives on funding deadlines

In the past, some projects that needed additional funds did not request these funds by the annual deadline, and either experienced delays or -- to avoid delays -- authorized additional work before the needed funds were appropriated.

Some City depts. and Aldermen continue to question the annual funding deadline for the CP program. They prefer the practice of requesting and appropriating funds on a rolling basis throughout the year, which the City of Newton has used in the past for other sources of capital funding.

- ◆ legal or regulatory requirements and their associated costs

Private nonprofit sponsors often based their cost estimates on "special pricing" offered by friends or donors, and felt that public bidding and/ or management by City staff had caused unnecessary cost increases and delays. To reduce costs and shorten project schedules, they often requested that public funds be appropriated directly to private nonprofits for work on City property. The City Law Dept. has advised CPC staff that this is not allowable by law.

In some projects, final requirements identified or enforced late in the project by regulatory authorities, such as the Inspectional Services Dept. or Fire Dept., had increased costs or led to delays. Unfortunately, these departments must determine some requirements on site, after work has already begun -- for both private and public projects. They cannot determine all requirements in advance even from final plans, much less from the very general descriptions in proposals.

- ◆ conflicting or overlapping authority & responsibility

On some older projects, management authority was dispersed among several City depts. and nonprofit or volunteer Boards and committees, all of whom could request changes in project scope. This sometimes led to delays or cost increases. Since 2007, the CPC proposal form & process have required sponsors to identify a single, qualified project manager.

In other cases, the reverse was true: when a City dept. was funded to oversee a grant to its own private or nonprofit partner, that dept. had little incentive to ensure that changes in scope requested by the private partner did not lead to delays or create a need for supplemental funding.

- ◆ inadequate staffing, or turnover among staff and contractors

Many City departments currently have a very limited capacity to manage capital projects. When asked to make budget cuts over the past decade or so, many departments have kept the staff who deliver direct, daily services to the public, while cutting staff with the experience and qualifications required either to manage capital projects directly, or to hire and oversee contractors and managers for such projects.

This "capacity gap" is difficult to fill. To date, CP project funding has not been predictable enough to support the restoration of even part-time regular capital staff. Also, it is not clear that CP project funds can be used in this way, and the Board of Aldermen may not support this use even if it is permitted. Yet as Ingerson had noted before, remaining City staff do not always have the time or qualifications to hire and supervise contracted project managers, who definitely could be paid with CP project funds as "soft money."

Finally, turnover among staff or contractors has often caused delays, as new staff were trained for the specific project, or as new contracts had to be drawn up and bid.

- ◆ lack of geographic/interdepartmental coordination

In one part of the city, several simultaneous projects with very similar names were funded from multiple sources and managed by multiple departments, often by hiring the same contractor. Yet

the managers of these projects did not routinely coordinate with one another. As a result, both City project managers and outside contractors sometimes confused these projects, applying decisions or charges for one project to an entirely different project, which then had to be corrected. This geographical overlap led to both delays and cost increases.

Alice Ingerson then summarized the request from the Board of Aldermen's Post Audit and Oversight Committee for the CPC to add a checklist to its proposal form and review process, to ensure that projects obtained all required reviews, approvals, and permits from any City department before the CPC recommended funding to the Board.

Ingerson felt that constructing an all-inclusive checklist would be very difficult. Her quick survey of City department websites had found almost 13 pages of existing checklists, most of which explicitly stated that they might not be complete, and urged applicants to consult staff. Ingerson felt that she neither had nor could efficiently acquire the expertise needed to determine which specific reviews, approvals, or permits on a general checklist were actually required for individual projects.

She then summarized for the Committee her alternative recommendation that the CPC and its staff ask the City's existing interdepartmental Development Review Team to help determine the requirements for individual proposals or projects, at two stages: (1) before forwarding a CPC recommendation to the Board, and (2) before release of funds. (This memo is attached at the end of these minutes.)

The Committee endorsed this approach, and asked Ingerson to ask the Development Review Team if they were willing to provide this assistance. If the answer was yes, Ingerson should forward this proposed response to the Board of Aldermen's Post-Audit and Oversight Committee, and inform the CPC when the item would be discussed, so some CPC members could attend.

Ingerson also recommended the following additional project management strategies.

- ◆ Do not recommend funding for proposals that lack a clear, detailed scope of work, cost estimates verified by some form of competitive bidding, or strong support from the City dept. that must manage the project.
- ◆ During proposal review and recommendation, identify "deal breakers" in project scope: aspects of the project that cannot be changed without CPC or Board approval. Also identify stages within the project that require outside approval before funds will be released for the next stage; for ex., must a final design be approved by the CPC or the Board of Aldermen's Public Facilities Committee before construction work is bid?
- ◆ Rather than fund "remedial management" through the CPC's administrative budget, use project appropriations to all project management by staff or contracted managers, and hold those staff or contracted managers responsible for cost control, schedules, and reporting.
- ◆ Align management responsibility with spending authority, but set up checks & balances.
For example, do not rely on a public department to oversee a grant to its own primary private partner. In such cases, appropriate funds to a different department (probably Planning), to be disbursed on a reimbursement basis to the partnership.
- ◆ Do not allow project work to be bid out until all project sponsors have agreed to a final, detailed scope of work. Require joint planning meetings & written sign-offs at each stage by all sponsors, relevant City depts., and vendors or contractors. Ingerson has already implemented this practice as much as she can, but her authority to require this approach is very limited when funds are appropriated to departments other than Planning..

The Committee then discussed other options, including:

- ◆ dedicating a portion of the CPC's administrative budget to interns or contracted managers, who would be hired by and report directly to the CP Program Manager

Ingerson pointed out that this could be very labor-intensive, unless smaller projects that require similar management skills were grouped together into cost-effective management contracts. Such

grouping is difficult now because the timing of both proposals and funding decisions is unpredictable.

This approach may become feasible, however, once the City develops its new long-term capital plan.

In that case, for example, CP project appropriations might help to fund one or more project manager positions shared with the Community Development Block Grant program. In contrast to the 5 percent limit on CPA funds for program administration, the CDBG program may use up to 20 percent of its total funding for administration, primarily for program and project managers. These staff managers work closely with all departments that receive CDBG project funding. Most CDBG-funded projects have fewer management issues than many CPA-funded projects.

- ◆ phased disbursement of funds, with the funded department required to report results of each phase to the CPC itself before funds can be released for the next phase
- ◆ appropriating funds to the Planning Department to be disbursed on a reimbursement basis as a grant to the funded department, with approval required by the CP Program Manager; and using "retainage" to reinforce accountability until projects are fully completed

Ingerson noted that this approach might be controversial. She therefore recommended that it be used sparingly.

- ◆ consistently using past project management performance as a basis for new CPC funding recommendations, so managers with a record of delays or cost overruns are less likely to receive funding for new projects

Ingerson endorsed this strategy strongly, but noted that it would also be controversial, and required documenting not only project appropriations, but project management and results..

Wally Bernheimer noted that, in years when the Committee had more total funds available than were requested, members might wish to make grants to some possibly problematic projects, so that the program as a whole would still be seen as active and useful.

Dan Green and Nancy Grissom noted that the best way for the Committee to avoid funding problematic projects was to ask tough questions during proposal review. Green felt he had sometimes held back on such questions this year, for the sake of Committee consensus and collegiality. In future, Grissom asked every member to speak his or her mind, so the Committee could work through everyone's questions to reach consensus. She noted that the Board of Aldermen would ask tough questions in any case, and thought the CPC should ask them first, in preparation for the Board part of the proposal review process.

STAFF & COMMITTEE ROLES

Ingerson recalled that at an earlier meeting, she had asked the Committee to evaluate her position and performance. Ingerson also hoped that this process would adjust the work required to fit the Committee's available administrative resources & staff time. Zack Blake had asked for the current staff job description as a basis for that evaluation.

Ingerson found that description needed significant updating. Rather than try to delete tasks from the current staff job description one at a time, Ingerson had proposed "zero-based" job descriptions for both the CPC and its staff, first identifying work the Committee was obligated to do under the Community Preservation Act, then adding back in only the most important additional tasks to reach the level of staff capacity the Committee wished to fund. She then distributed a "zero-based" draft job description for the CPC itself (attached).

Wally Bernheimer asked whether the Board of Aldermen, Mayor and City departments, and nonprofit and neighborhood organizations really did the things Ingerson had listed, and expected assistance from the CPC's staff. Ingerson confirmed that the description reflected her actual experience. She tried not to involve the CPC itself in deciding how to respond to these requests, but simply tried to do the work. For example, she had providing written briefing materials at the Aldermen's request for presentations about the CP Program on NewTV or questions at community forums, just as she

provided staff support for the Board committees that reviewed CPC funding recommendations. She noted that these Board referrals and reports were required by the Newton Board of Aldermen rather than by the CPA itself.

The Committee confirmed that they expected her to help maintain a good working relationship between the CPC itself and the Board of Aldermen generally. In response to a question from Wally Bernheimer, Ingerson agreed that the Board had turned down very few CPC recommendations, partly because the CPC and its staff had devoted significant time to working with the Board. Bernheimer and other members wondered if there might be some way to streamline the Board's part of this process, and thus reduce program costs. Several members suggested that the Board design or designate a single committee to advise it on all CPC recommendations. Ingerson pointed out that this had been the original goal for the Board's Committee on Community Preservation (CCP) -- to substitute for reviews by multiple Board committees. In the end, however, the CCP had become an addition to rather than a substitute for the other committees.

Leslie Burg volunteered to talk informally with Board members about their views on possible streamlining.

Nancy Grissom also asked Wally Bernheimer, Zack Blake, and Dan Green to serve on a subcommittee to review Ingerson's draft job description and staffing needs analysis, and then recommend changes to the Committee as a whole.

OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Ingerson reported that cost estimates had been solicited and one accepted for five temporary site signs acknowledging the use of CP funding at Angino Farm, the Durant-Kenrick Homestead, the Jackson Homestead (Newton History Museum), 192 Lexington Street, and Veteran House. The Committee as a whole delegated to Nancy Grissom, Dan Green, and Zack Blake the responsibility of providing feedback to the designer by email before the signs were manufactured. Dan Green displayed a sample sign. The signs are expected to last at least a year. Grissom said this group had recommended re-designing the program's logo during the 10th anniversary to be used for new, longer-term signs at all appropriate project sites.

Wally Bernheimer moved, and Dan Green seconded, approval of the 28 April 2010 minutes as submitted. Approval was unanimous.

Zack Blake asked about the Committee's request Ingerson consult the Community Preservation Coalition for models of third-party evaluation for the long-term results of CP projects. Ingerson reported that no community had ever done this, but she still felt it would be an appropriate part of the Newton program's 10th anniversary year. She suggested that the League of Women Voters, as a group that had never applied for CP funds but had a strong interest in and familiarity with the program, might be involved in this.

Dan Green nominated, and Mike Clarke seconded, the slate of Nancy Grissom as chair and Wally Bernheimer as vice chair for fiscal 2011. This slate was elected unanimously. The Committee thanked Grissom and Bernheimer for being willing to serve a second year.

Grissom said having a year of experience would be very helpful in her second year. Bernheimer suggested that the Committee's traditional one-year terms for officers might be less than ideal. Ingerson felt that one-year terms had worked in the past because the chairmanship rotated among all members in rough seniority order, with each member spending a year as vice-chair before becoming chair. For the most recent 4 years, however, the vice-chair had declined to become chair, so perhaps it was time to consider a new system.

The Committee adjourned by unanimous vote at 8:45 pm.

ATTACHMENTS (in order of mention in these minutes)

- ◆ 4 June 2010 staff memo on public-private partnerships
- ◆ 4 June 2010 staff memo on Board request for expanded CPC proposal form/review process
- ◆ 13 January 2010 staff memo on options for funding program & project management
- ◆ 13 June 2010 staff-drafted "job description" for the CPC

*CONTACT: Alice E. Ingerson, Community Preservation Program Manager,
aingerson@newtonma.gov, 617.796.1144*

DATE: 4 June 2010

TO: Community Preservation Committee

FROM: Alice Ingerson

ABOUT: **clarifying expectations for public-private partnerships**

One of your current funding priorities is to increase the “leverage” of CP funding by requiring projects to tap other sources, including private funds. To assist in implementing this, I’d like to set the following clear, consistent standards for the financial background information that must accompany proposals:

1. latest operating budget, with basic breakdown of public and private sources & uses
2. latest annual audit, with basic breakdown of public and private sources & uses
3. NOT including information in any form that might reveal the identity of individual private donors, or the amounts of their donations

A summary of 1. and 2. might be adequate, but I’d prefer not to spend time arguing with sponsors about what they must include or may exclude from their “summaries.”

Goals of this policy:

- treat all sponsors equally
- help the CPC & Board of Aldermen assess sponsors’ overall financial capacity
- foster transparency & satisfy requirements of public records law, while also
- preserving the confidentiality needed to raise funds from individual donors

BACKGROUND

In the past year, some sponsors provided the information above without being asked; some provided it only after being asked (either by the CPC or by the Board of Aldermen); and some did not provide it even when asked.

This variation led to complaints of unfair treatment. In addition, some sponsors complained when CPC- or Board- requested information about private resources was treated as a public document (posted on the CPC website as supplemental proposal information, or on the Board of Aldermen’s website as part of a meeting packet). Clear, consistent standards would reduce these complaints.

Finally, this is not a minor issue. A surprisingly high proportion of proposal sponsors (perhaps the majority) combine public and private funding, though their legal form varies:

- A. a formal public-private partnership (Historic Newton is a partnership between the Jackson Homestead as a City dept. and the private nonprofit Newton Historical Society)
- B. private entity leasing or licensed to operate a public property (Newton Community Development Foundation at Warren House, Newton Community Farm at ` Angino Farm)
- C. private group that raises funds for a City dept., sites or programs (Friends of the Newton Free Library, Crystal Lake Conservancy)
- D. private nonprofit that does fundraises but depends significantly on public funding (CAN-DO)

DATE: 4 June 2010
TO: **Community Preservation Committee**
FROM: Alice Ingerson
ABOUT: **recommended response to Board of Aldermen request for expanded CPC proposal form/review process** – related to project mgmt

Sections below:

- A. Board request for expanded CPC proposal form/review process
- B. CPC current practice – project managers, permits, & timelines
- C. recommended CPC response to Board request – route proposals & projects through an expanded version of the City’s existing Development Review Team

A. Board request for expanded CPC proposal form/review process

Date: Thu 3 Jun 16:53:18 EDT 2010
From: "Danielle Delaney" ddelaney@newtonma.gov
Re: Post Audit Committee request to CPC

Hi Alice, Here is an excerpt from the final Post Audit report [from their 25 May 2010 meeting]. Danielle [Numbering added by Alice for reference]

[At the conclusion of the discussion about management of the CP-funded project for Brigham House,] Ald. Sangiolo made the motion recommending that

1. CPC projects have a project manager and
2. that they create a checklist including each department who should be involved.

Ald. Johnson requested when this item is discussed again that the following department heads be invited to attend: Public Buildings, Parks & Recreation, Inspectional Services, Engineering and Fire Departments in order to solve this problem [of project cost overruns] and prevent it from happening again.

Ald. Johnson made the motion to hold this item pending [receipt of the] requested information from Ms. Ingerson. Chairman Swiston hopes to hear this item again in September with department heads attending.

The Committee voted in favor 5-0, Ald. Shapiro not voting.

B. CPC current practice – project managers, permits, & timeline

1. Our proposal form already requires proposal sponsors to identify a single project manager, who will track project funds and respond to all CPC and Board requests for project updates.

Before we added this requirement in 2008, it was often difficult to know who was actually managing a particular project; that responsibility often seemed to be divided among several people.

See also the excerpt below from my January 2010 memo to you about our experiment with “remedial management” for problematic projects. By late 2009, I felt we had done all the good we could in this way (and in a few cases, probably more harm than good). So I ended the experiment.

2. Our current proposal form already requires proposal sponsors to obtain all required permits and approvals (our instructions include an illustrative, though not exhaustive, list); and to submit a timeline identifying for each project phase: other organizations or agencies that must assist – including by providing permits; approximate start and end dates; and approximate cost. The instructions also note that “if your project is funded, CP staff will work with you to add missing elements” to the timeline.

After funds are appropriated, the CP team and I now suggest to each project manager City departments and other stakeholders to invite to a “project kickoff meeting,” and to involve in approving scopes of work, setting deadlines, and reviewing results at each phase of the project. This

*CONTACT: Alice E. Ingerson, Community Preservation Program Manager,
aingerson@newtonma.gov, 617.796.1144*

teamwork approach seems to be working reasonably well so far (certainly better than “remedial management”).

However, no one on the CP team – least of all me – knows which City departments should be involved in each and every CP-funded project, especially since this changes as regulations & ordinances change. I tried to compile from the City website a list of all possible permits and approvals a project might need, & ended up with 13 single-spaced pages plus several notes saying “other permits or approvals may be required; please consult staff” in each division or department.

C. recommended CPC response to Board – route proposals & projects through the City’s Development Review Team (DRT), expanded to include other City departments as needed

Most problematic projects have involved construction. Most City departments with regulatory authority over construction already meet as the Development Review Team (DRT) to review and advise private projects. The DRT includes: Chief Planner, Chief Zoning Code Official, City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, Environmental Planner, Preservation Planner, Transportation Planner, Police Dept. Traffic Bureau Representative, Assistant Fire Chief for Operations. For our purposes, I’d add at least the Inspectional Services Department (ISD) to this list.

We should ask this expanded DRT if they would comment on pp. 1 (summary) and 3 (timeline) of each proposal form at the two stages below. We should use their time wisely by asking them to review only proposals that the CPC is ready to recommend, rather than all proposals submitted. If the DRT accepts our request, they may add more depts. to this routing list, or suggest reviewing some proposals in face-to-face meetings with the proposal sponsor/project manager. Note that the DRT already reviews all housing proposals in this way; despite their other problems, our housing projects have had relatively few issues with project management and completion.

a. after the CPC votes to recommend a proposal, but before sending the recommendation to the Board

At this stage, we should ask the expanded DRT simply to add any missing City departments to the submitted draft timeline.

We should then attach the corrected timeline to the CPC recommendation. If the corrections appear to increase project costs, the CPC can consult with the proposal sponsor in deciding whether to revise the recommended funding, or simply to cancel its recommendation.

b. after funds are appropriated, but before they are released

At this stage, we should ask the expanded DRT to help the project mgr correct the project timeline further, by specifying what each dept. that responded in **a.** should do for the project, and when.

This may need to happen several more times during each project. But at least the project manager will start with a customized list of departments to consult, and we can check back periodically with those departments to see if that consultation has happened.

<i>DATE:</i>	13 January 2010
<i>TO:</i>	Community Preservation Committee
<i>FROM:</i>	Alice Ingerson
<i>ABOUT:</i>	options for funding program & project management

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

FROM ADMIN BUDGET, includes:

- mtg support, planning, evaluation, outreach -- almost entirely Alice
- proposal review (funding eligibility, recommended funding conditions) -- Law Dept.** and Alice with help from interdepartmental CP team (Planning staff in community development, preservation, & conservation, plus CPA Engineer in Public Works**)
- conflict of interest, public mtgs & records law, litigation, etc. -- mostly Law Dept.**
- legislation & policy (tracking CPA ltrs from Dept of Revenue, legislative amendments, etc.) -- mostly CP Coalition, covered by our dues

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

FROM ADMIN BUDGET -- Alice, with help from CP team; all work billed by the hr and approved by Alice

1. to date, "remedial," with mixed record -- Used to "unstick" past projects for which appropriations did not cover management time. Has worked well in some cases but failed in others, because we've taken mgmt responsibility without spending or supervisory authority. All we can really do is jawbone, or volunteer for work orig. assigned to others (who must welcome and accept our help).
2. for future, align mgmt responsibility with spending authority -- Appropriate funds to Planning director, who can then delegate mgmt to Alice & CP Team. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program works this way, though CPC funds are more constrained (CDBG can spend up to 20% on admin., CPC is limited to 5% of a declining total, due to declining state match).

FROM PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS -- grant recipients

3. for non-City projects, working fairly well -- governed by explicit grant agreements and managed on a reimbursement basis, with Alice and CP team approving invoices
4. for City projects, still not working well -- Since 2008, mgmt funding has been included in most project appropriations.** But amounts are often small, and timing doesn't align with City's budget process, so depts. still cannot "staff up" for these projects. Future options:
 - 4a. fund programs rather than single projects -- If both the work and the CP funding could be predicted farther in advance, they could be integrated into the City's new, multi-year capital budget/ staffing plan (coming in fiscal 2012?). To keep funds available for other projects, and avoid crossing the line into "maintenance" or "regular operating costs," set limits on multi-year commitments to City projects?
 - 4b. fund mgmt consultants rather than City staff -- Costs more than 4a., and things can still get "stuck" because staff still have to handle RFPs, bidding, contracts, & invoices. But worth trying?

DRAFT* COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE JOB DESCRIPTION *DRAFT

MINIMUM MANDATES for all CPA Communities

Community Preservation Committee

1. Study the needs, possibilities and resources of the city regarding community preservation, by consulting with existing municipal boards, and by holding one or more public informational hearings.
2. Make recommendations to the Board of Aldermen, including anticipated costs and suggested funding mechanisms, either to fund specific projects or to set funds aside for future spending.
3. Keep full, accurate, and public records of all recommendations and actions taken based on those recommendations, including revenue, appropriations, expenditures, and real property interests acquired, disposed of or improved.

Local Legislature (*Town Meeting, City Council, etc.*)

1. Approve appropriations from the CP Fund, and additional appropriations as appropriate, to carry out the recommendations of the CPC.

Local Executive (*Selectmen, Town Manager or Treasurer, Mayor, etc.*)

2. Keep public records of revenue, appropriations, and expenditures.

ADDITIONAL COMMITMENTS Made by Newton's Program

*Although they are intended as ways of satisfying the mandates above,
Newton would still be in compliance with the Act if it trimmed back any of these.*

Community Preservation Committee

1. Manage program budget.
2. Develop, publish & periodically revise funding priorities, proposal requirements, & proposal review process.
3. Review & recommend proposals for funding.
4. Assist both City depts. and nonprofits with proposal development & presentations.
5. Accompany recommended proposals throughout the Board of Aldermen's review process.
6. Monitor all project budgets; oversee & support the management of all funded projects.
7. Publicize, educate, & advocate for Newton's program and the CPA in general, in part by publishing major proposal/project documents and regular project/program reports.
8. Evaluate funded projects and the program as a whole.

Board of Aldermen (*Local Legislature*)

1. Review & approve/reject each CPC funding recommendation through the formal legislative process of committee referrals & reports.
2. Make occasional presentations about Newton's CP program.
3. Evaluate funded projects and the program as a whole.

Mayor & City Departments (*Local Executive*)

1. Provide legal services to the CPC: eligibility review of all proposals; draft & execute deed restrictions, contracts, grant agreements, etc. (Law Dept.)
2. Develop & present proposals that involve City property.
3. Manage & publicize funded projects.
4. Maintain completed projects with regular City funds.

Nonprofit & Neighborhood Organizations (*incl. League of Women Voters as CP Program observer*)

1. Develop & present funding proposals (independently, or as co-sponsor for City projects).
2. Manage & publicize funded projects (independently, or as part of a team for City projects).
3. Maintain completed projects with non-CPA funds.
4. Evaluate funded projects and the program as a whole.