

**5) Minutes of CPC's project discussions (Excerpted from September 15 and October 13 Minutes).**

Provided by Lara Kritzer, CPA Program Manager



Ruthanne Fuller,  
Mayor

## City of Newton, Massachusetts

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

**#458-20**

Telephone

(617) 796-1120

Telefax

(617) 796-1142

TDD/TTY

(617) 796-1089

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

Barney S. Heath

Director

### Community Preservation Committee

#### Excerpted from September 15, 2020 Approved Minutes:

The virtual meeting was held online on Tuesday, September 15, 2020 beginning at 7:00 pm. Community Preservation Committee (CPC) members present included Mark Armstrong, Dan Brody, Byron Dunker, Rick Kronish, Susan Lunin, Robert Maloney, and Jennifer Molinsky. Community Preservation Program Manager Lara Kritzer were also present and served as recorder.

#### Public Hearing on Grace Episcopal Tower Restoration Proposal

Mr. Kronish requested guidance on how the Committee should proceed with this project. It was noted that the Committee had received additional information prior to the meeting. Mr. Armstrong thought that the Applicant's should move forward with their presentation. Mr. Kronish suggested that the applicant be asked to withdraw their proposal and rework it in a way that might meet the objections raised. He did not think that it would be fair to continue the discussion of the existing application at this time. Mr. Brody thought that the Committee should go ahead with the public hearing and allow those present to speak to the project. He stated that he did not think that he would be ready to move forward with any recommendations at this meeting but that that this was an opportunity to learn more about the proposal and thought the Committee should take advantage of it. Mr. Armstrong agreed, and Mr. Kronish asked if the Committee should share the information received with the applicant as he did not think that it would be fair to hold a discussion without sharing it. Mr. Brody stated that he would agree if the Committee was planning to make a decision at this meeting but thought that there would be plenty of time to discuss all of these issues before that happened.

Jean Papalia, chair of the governing board, was present with Austin Stewart and architect Scott Aquilina to present Grace Episcopal's Tower Restoration funding proposal. Their presentation began with a recording of the carillon bells playing "Lift Every Voice and Sing" followed by a summary of the history of the property and its close ties to the community. The applicants noted the rich history of the congregation in the development of Newton Corner and how places of worship were noted to be important to the community in both the 2007 Newton Comprehensive Plan and 2010 Landscape Report. Mr. Stewart suggested that this project could be seen as a test of the community's ability to work together on a project and argued that the preservation of the tower would undeniably serve the public good. He briefly noted the importance of its architect, Alexander Esty, and how Grace Episcopal was one of the best examples of its architectural style. Mr. Stewart explained how other communities had chosen to use their CPA funds for similar purposes and noted that the Eldridge chimes defined the soundscape of the neighborhood which had developed around the church. He also noted that the construction of the church and tower had inspired the donation and design of

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

staff contact Lara Kritzer, Community Preservation Program Manager

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

Farlow Park across the street. An 1878 birds eye view of Newton Corner was included in the presentation, and Mr. Stewart noted both the prominence of Grace Episcopal to the community even then, and how many of the local landmarks in 1878 had since been demolished.

Mr. Stewart stated that Grace Episcopal's congregation had been faithful stewards of the campus and that they have been monitoring the condition of the tower for the last ten years. Last year, they had discovered that the structure was deteriorating much faster than they had anticipated, and that the base of the tower was structurally insufficient to carry the load of the stone structure. Photos of the cracked stones and plans mapping the damage to the tower were presented to explain the extent of the current damage. The tower was now at risk of collapsing and the area surrounding it was roped off and the tower itself inaccessible.

The applicants next reviewed their plans for the stabilization of the structure. They had created the project budget while working with experts in the field and had double checked the cost of the work with Shawmut Construction. Their funding plan proposed to have half of the funding come from CPA funds, with the rest to be raised through fundraising and grants. The applicants noted that CPA funding was the only funding source of this scale available to the project, and Mr. Stewart reiterated that 91 CPA communities had previously funded this type of work.

Ms. Papalia stated that the proposal was about preserving an iconic historic landmark which served as an anchor to Newton Corner. She noted that their congregation was growing and that they had made partnerships with other nonprofits throughout the community. For the last 28 years, the rectory has been rented to Riverside Community Care and the property was a well-used community meeting space, polling location, and concert venue. Ms. Papalia explained that the congregation does not feel that the tower defines what Grace Episcopal is, but that it does define the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Armstrong agreed that Grace Episcopal is a stunning and beautiful building. He noted that it was a big ask despite the leveraging to complete major construction on such a delicate project. Mr. Maloney thanked the applicants for the presentation and stated that he also loved the building but wanted to know what other options were available to the applicants if CPA funding could not be used here. Ms. Papalia stated that the CPA funding was necessary to fix the structure and that they were not sure that they could complete the project without it. Their attorney, Ryan McManus, state that there were no alternative funding sources available to step in on this project. He asked that the applicants be provided with any information on why this could not be funded.

Mr. Maloney asked what the cost would be to remove the tower if all of the funding sources failed. Mr. Aquilina stated that they had estimated that it would cost \$650,000 to remove the tower and noted that they would then need to replace something in that area, so the overall removal and replacement cost was anticipated to be over \$1 million, which they assumed would rest on the congregation alone. Mr. Kronish stated that the funding of religious institutions was an issue but that even without the religious issue, he was concerned with funding private institutions where public use and access is limited. He wanted to know what the public benefit was of the project as the CPC would want to see a public benefit for any non-religious structure in private ownership.

Ms. Papalia stated that they are a public institution with an architecturally significant structure which is an appendage of their main building. She noted that the bells impacted the whole neighborhood and that they were trying to save the tower which was no longer safe. Mr. Aquilina stated that he was a newly appointed member of the Upper Falls Historic District Commission and was concerned with historic preservation in Newton and the level of support for preservation in the community. He explained that there are restrictions requiring preservation but very few sources to help property owners with this work. He noted used to be more funding available but that there were now very few options for helping to preserve these structures. He thought that if CPA funding was going to support historic preservation projects, then he was not sure how it could turn its back on the City's nineteenth century buildings.

Mr. McManus noted that the tower structure was very limited as to its other potential uses and reiterated that the City's churches and religious institutions had been called out for preservation in its planning documents. He also noted that this was a common use for CP funding and that the majority of other CPA communities had done these types of projects. Mr. McManus stated that in the Acton case, the Supreme Judicial Court had confirmed that communities cannot categorically exclude churches from public benefits and that the proposal had included a letter addressing the three-part test required for the Anti-Aid Amendment determination. He noted that every project was different, that funding could not be used for religious imagery or the sanctuary itself but that CPA funding could be used for projects which were entirely historic preservation. He stated that there was no intent to provide aid to the church in this application and that they would be happy to discuss that point further with the Committee, adding that the CPC could not deny funding to the project solely because the property owner is a church.

Mr. Brody asked to discuss the funding in more detail. He asked the applicants to explain the level of detail that they had received for their project commitments. Mr. Stewart responded that they had a verbal commitment for \$450,000 so far and had a good understanding of how much could be raised. Mr. Stewart was fairly confident of the funding numbers and explained how they had developed their plan and understanding of how to finance the project. The National Fund for Sacred Places was reviewing their funding application and they planned to apply to the Mass. Historical Commission (MHC) for two rounds of Mass. Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) grants and for Emergency Funding. Mr. Brody asked if they would have heard back about any of these funding options by October 1. Mr. Stewart stated that they were not sure of the dates at present but expected to hear back before the end of 2020. They had had extensive conversations with the MHC about both of their funding programs as well. Mr. Brody asked about the likelihood of reaching their funding goal and Mr. Stewart answered that they thought it was likely and that they had been encouraged to apply. He noted, however, that at least some of this funding might hinge on the use of CPA funding. In terms of private foundations, they were working with a finance and campaign consultant to help identify these funding sources.

Mr. Brody asked about the timing of the funding, asking if all of the funding would need to be released at once if the City Council approved the project. Mr. Aquilina stated that if the CPA funding was approved, they had assumed that it would be released in pieces. They hoped to have half of the funding available at the end of this calendar year and would use those funding along with silent contributions, a bridge loan, and MHC funding to get the project started in the spring. Mr. Brody asked about the timeframe for member payments. It was noted that a number of the proposed

funding sources relied on matching funds. Mr. Aquilina thought that a CPA funding commitment could help them to leverage other funding sources. He added that they would need to resolve the future of the tower within the next twelve months, and that a commitment of CPA funding would make everything else possible.

Keith Jones, 109 Vernon Street, stated that he was the president of the Friends of Farlow Park and supported this project. In terms of the question of whether the tower was a public or private resource, he stated that as a photographer he was concerned with aesthetics and thought that there was significant structural beauty in the tower. He was not a member of the church but wanted to make the point that the sculptural beauty of the tower and the sounds of the bells were resources that were shared by everyone in the community. He added that most major cities took care of and supported their major historical and architectural structures.

Jay Walter, 83 Pembroke Street, stated that he was a member of Historic Newton, the Upper Falls Local Historic District Commission, and the Friends of Farlow Park. He thought that Grace Episcopal was an excellent example of nineteenth century ecclesiastical architecture. He noted that the tower was located at the foot of Farlow Park, the restoration of which had been funded with CPA funds and thought that it was clearly an important element of the City and Newton Corner. He also noted that the park was anchored by three churches and that Farlow Park is the oldest park in the City. He stated that historic preservation of the tower had a public benefit in and of itself and he thought that the Community Preservation Act recognized this by including preservation as a potential use. Mr. Walter also questioned the impact on this unique neighborhood of removing the tower.

Councilor Alison Leary stated that this was one of her favorite parks and that she believed that historic preservation was a clear public benefit. She noted that this would be a first for the City if the Committee recommended using public CPA funding for a religious institution. She noted that there were many other demands on the City for CPA funding and suggested that any funding for the project should be restricted to only what is already in the Historic Resource reserve account. Ms. Papalia stated that they were only applying for historic resource funding and noted that they had received 525 signatures on their petition to save the tower. Councilor Leary suggested that only the 10% of CPA funding that is required to be spent on Historic Resource projects should be used for this project and explained her concerns with the amount of funding requested.

Mr. Brody noted that Councilor Leary was correct that 10% of the City's CPA funding was set aside for historic preservation projects but noted that the Committee had a practice of spending more than that on each of the allowed categories. Mr. McManus stated that creating additional requirements for this project because the applicant was a church was legally problematic. Councilor Leary stated that she would like to see a letter from the Law Department addressing the use of CPA funding on religious institutions.

Mr. Brody stated that he would like to continue this discussion to the next meeting in order to provide time for the applicants to submit additional details to answer questions about the funding proposal. He asked that the Applicants put together financial information including a detailed phasing showing what funding would be coming in when. He thought that this information would be necessary in developing any future funding conditions. He also stated that he would like to see more specific information on when funding would be confirmed and for the administration to provide

guidance on the funding of this project, including whether or not the Mayor supports it. Mr. Kronish stated that he also wanted to note the public issue.

The public hearing was closed at this time. The Applicants requested that the discussion be continued to the next meeting to allow time for further discussion. A question was raised about the preservation restriction and what it covered, and the applicant was also asked to provide information on their maintenance budget for the property. Ms. Papalia stated that they did have a financial plan and budget outline that they could provide. Mr. Stewart stated that they could put together the budget numbers specific to the tower, but that in general the congregation spent \$50,000 each year to meet general site preservation requirements.

Mr. McManus asked to clarify that the proposed work was required because of a design flaw rather than any maintenance issues. Mr. Aquilina explained that this was a design flaw issue and that once fixed, was unlikely to happen again. The Applicants also noted that the option to remove the tower from the site was less expensive than the proposed restoration. Mr. Maloney thought that it was helpful to have this information and noted that if the CPC recommended this use of the funding, that the congregation would be saved from spending the funds to remove the tower. Mr. Armstrong thanked the Applicants for the preservation and noted that he believed in this project. Further discussion was continued to the October 13 meeting.

**Excerpted from October 13, 2020 Approved Minutes:**

The virtual meeting was held online on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 beginning at 7:00 pm. Community Preservation Committee (CPC) members present included Mark Armstrong, Dan Brody, Eliza Datta, Byron Dunker, Rick Kronish, Susan Lunin, Robert Maloney, Jennifer Molinsky, and Martin Smargiassi. Community Preservation Program Manager Lara Kritzer were also present and served as recorder.

**Grace Episcopal Tower Restoration Proposal**

Mr. Armstrong stated that the CPC would begin by continuing its discussion on the Grace Episcopal Tower Restoration Proposal which began at the September 15 meeting. He noted that the proposal requests \$1,433,000 in Historic Resource funding to stabilize and restore the existing stone tower. Mr. Armstrong stated that he wanted to begin by clarifying the confusion from the start of the last meeting. He explained that in 2018, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court had ruled on a case involving CPA funding for properties owned by an active religious institution, finding that such funding may be in violation of the state's anti-aid amendment and that each grant required careful scrutiny. He went on to explain that the Massachusetts' Anti-Aid Amendment prohibits the use of public money for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding any charitable or religious organization that is not publicly owned. The 2018 case had established a review process for determining when a project can or cannot receive CPA funding. Because the CPC was aware of this case law, the Committee had requested that the Law Department review the Grace Episcopal Tower Restoration project proposal. As a result of this review, the Law Department has advised the Committee that the proposal as submitted was likely to be found to be in violation of the state's Anti-Aid Amendment. Mr. Armstrong explained that this advice had received at the last minute before the September meeting, and that the Committee had not had a chance to review the information before the public hearing.

Mr. Kronish stated that he was not clear on what the CPC was attempting to do at this time. He asked if the Committee was going to evaluate the Law Department opinion, or if the Committee intended to evaluate the project in light of this information. Mr. Armstrong stated that he did not think that this information changed the CPC's mission or duties and that the Committee must continue to review the merits of the project with the Law Department's information used as part of that review. Mr. Kronish stated that he did not think that he had the capacity to review the project and could not see beyond the legal information provided. He added that he was not sure what the Committee would be accomplishing by continuing this discussion.

Mr. Brody noted from the City's Law Department that the anti-aid amendment may be an issue, and an opinion from Attorney Ryan McManus of Hemenway and Barnes stating that it would not be an issue. He personally planned to evaluate the project on its merits as he did not have a strong feeling that this will become a legal issue. He stated that he did not think that the fact that the CPC had received an opinion was enough to stop this review.

Ms. Lunin stated that she thought there was a lot of merit to this project. She added that just because there is a chance that there may be a future issue does not outweigh those merits. Mr. Maloney thought that it was for others to decide the legal issues that could possibly be involved in the future and that it was the CPC's duty at this time to review the project on its merits. Ms. Molinsky stated

that she had tried to study this issue before the meeting. She had questioned whether amendments to the proposal would address the concerns about the anti-aid amendment issues and wanted a chance to explore this question further.

Mr. Armstrong noted that the Applicants had prepared a presentation to address questions raised at the first meeting and suggested that they move forward with it at this time. Present for the application was Jean Papalia, Leah Gassett, Austin Stewart, and Scott Aquilina. Ms. Gassett and Ms. Papalia presented a history of the church and its historical significance before reviewing the emergency situation of the tower. They explained that the carillon housed in the tower was one of only two human operated chimes in Newton and that there could be no chimes without the stone tower. They reviewed the project's timeline and addressed the questions raised at the last meeting. Their attorney, Ryan McManus, stated that he understood that concerns had been raised about how the anti-aid amendment might impact this project funding. Mr. McManus thought that conducting a legal analysis of the project might not be the best use of the CPC's time and agreed that they should evaluate the project based on its merits and leave any future legal obstacles aside for the time being.

Mr. McManus then reviewed the questions that needed to be addressed for meeting anti-aid amendment questions. The first question was whether the motivating purpose of the funding was to aid a private entity. In the case of the Tower Restoration, he argued that the purpose of the funding was not to aid the church but historic preservation. He thought that this question would only be an issue if the CPC was recommending funding for a reason other than the preservation of an historically significant resource. The second question asked if the grant would have the effect of substantially aiding a private entity. Mr. McManus stated that preserving the tower would cost the congregation at least \$983,000 more than it would cost to remove the tower, and that they would also need to budget \$15,000 annually to maintain the structure in the future once it is stabilized and restored. He stated that the congregation was willing to take on these additional expenses as the stewards of this historic resource but that the results were far from a substantial aid to them. The third question asked whether the grant avoided the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment. Mr. McManus explained this question, noting that this project would only complete the historic preservation of an historically significant structure. He asked the Committee to consider what projects could be funded if this project could not. Mr. McManus noted the many cities and towns which had used CPA funding to complete similar projects and had not had any legal challenges. He added that he did not think that this would be an attractive legal case. Mr. McManus explained that that *Caplan v. Acton* case that had raised these questions had started with the use of CPA funding to restore stained glass windows with religious imagery.

The Applicants noted how this project benefited Newton as a whole and that historic preservation had been affirmed as being supportive of the public good at the local, state and federal levels. These benefits were seen in the act of preservation itself as well as its economic benefits and how these efforts increased neighborhood pride. They noted the references to the importance of this type of preservation work in state and local planning documents as well before reviewing the costs to the community of not funding this work. It was noted that the Newton Corner neighborhood would lose not only the bells and tower structure, but that its demolition would also result in the permanent loss of an important piece of Newton history. The Applicants reviewed the congregations work for the community and reiterated that the requested funding was only for the historic preservation of the tower, after which the congregation would be responsible for all maintenance expenses. It was



noted to be a free-standing structure and the direct benefits to the community of preserving it were also reviewed.

The Applicants noted that Grace Episcopal Church had a long record of community involvement, impacts, and connections. The parish and its members were tied to the creation and restoration of Farlow Park, the Cottage Hospital (now Newton Wellesley Hospital), and the Newton Children's Library. The community supported numerous non-profit organizations including renting their former rectory to Riverside Community Care, creating a new lot on their property to construct a group home for TILL (Towards Independent Living and Learning), and serving as a polling location. The congregation wanted to continue these partnerships and enhance its connections to the City.

Ms. Gassett went on to review the congregation's revenues and their phased plan for the restoration. She explained that they would be launching a capital campaign for the emergency tower restoration work before the end of 2020. They had interviewed 70 members of the congregation to get a sense of what they could expect to raise and had determined that they could reach \$983,000 over three years. She added that they had seen increased levels of interest in the project since the CPA discussion had started. They planned to apply to the Massachusetts Historical Commission for emergency funding as well. They had also learned that they would not be receiving Sacred Places funding this year but were optimistic that they would receive it next year. Ms. Gassett explained that they have gap funding available and that they would start their public funding campaign as soon as they knew the CPA funding decision.

Mr. Aquilina explained that the maintenance budget for the property was \$96,000 per year on average. The congregation planned to set aside \$15,000 annually specifically to the tower in the future to demonstrate their commitment to its maintenance and preservation. They planned to create a reserve budget for repointing and restoring the tower in the future and were developing 25- and 50-year plans for the structure. The 1999 preservation restriction requires the congregation to preserve all exterior elements of the buildings unless there is a public emergency that requires demolition or alteration, and they felt a responsibility to preserve the neighborhood and historic district for future residents.

The Applicants noted that they had reached out to Mayor Fuller about the project but that she had declined to meet with them. They also provided an updated petition supporting the project with over 600 signatures on it. The project had received letters of support from Historic Newton, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the Newton Historical Commission, the Friends of Farlow Park, and other community partners as well as other comments of support. The Applicants stressed that they were looking to partner with the City on this project and that the congregation was not in the historic preservation business. They felt that the Grace Episcopal Church Tower is an historic landmark worthy of preservation and noted that the pre-1907 Historic Resource Survey had rated the building as being of highest significance. The tower could be freely viewed and enjoyed by everyone. The Applicants noted that CPA funding had been used to restore Farlow Park and felt that this project was a natural next step and a further opportunity for the City. They reiterated that the funding would only be used to restore the tower, which could not continue to exist without help from the City through its CPA funds.

Mr. Armstrong opened the discussion to the CPC. He thought that the Applicants had made the argument for the architectural and historical significance of the structure. He thought that it was a beautiful, historically significant element of the building which should be preserved. Ms. Molinsky stated that she would like to make this funding work. She did not personally see the tower as a religious icon but did think that the funding requested was a significant financial amount in any sense. She noted that most CPA funded historic resource projects were below \$400,000 but noted that these projects were also much smaller and thought that this was a significant amount to request for a private property. Ms. Molinsky stated that she would like to know about other options that had been investigated to stabilize the structure which may not have worked out. She also asked the Applicants if they had had an independent assessment of the amount of funding needed for the project, and whether there were any indications of support for the project City-wide.

Mr. Aquilina first addressed the cost of the construction. He explained that he was an architect with 30 years of experience working on historic structures, and that another preservation architect, Larry Bauer, had also worked closely on the project. They had received three estimates for the project from firms which all had a clear understanding of what needed to be done after making multiple visits to the site. These estimates were then sent to Shawmut Construction, which conducted an independent review of the estimates which allowed the congregation to feel comfortable that they had a clear understanding of the costs. Ms. Molinsky asked if there were any alternative engineering plans for the project. Mr. Aquilina stated that they had had the tower looked at by Simpson, Gumpertz and Heger in 2009-2010 and provide suggestions at that time. That review had suggested a more traditional and expensive solution than the one currently proposed. J. Wathne from Structures North was a very skilled engineer which specialized in unusual structures and they felt comfortable with both the proposed solution and its anticipated cost.

Mr. Aquilina agreed that the requested amount was a substantial request but noted that there were applicants in the past that had received more funding than this over the course of numerous separate requests. The current proposal was based on what was needed to restore the tower. He noted that the City had put over \$1.7 million into the Durant Kenrick Homestead, that the Allen House had received over \$2 million overall, and that numerous funding allocations had been made to the Jackson Homestead as well. He agreed that this was a large request but was not sure that it was as much of an outlier as Ms. Molinsky suggested.

Mr. McManus stated that the amount could matter in some legal cases but thought that the unique circumstances of this project made that question irrelevant. Not funding this project would not be saving the congregation funding that could otherwise be used for religious programs. Further, this funding was not an issue because the result of the CPA funding would be an increase in the congregation's commitment to preservation, an undertaking which will add additional expenses and not savings for their budget in the future.

Ms. Gasset also agreed that this was a large amount to request but explained that the catastrophic failure of the tower's interior structure could not be spread out over time. The project had a lot of support from outside of the neighborhood as shown in the petition. Ms. Gasset added that she thought the project would be more attractive to other funding programs once it had the CPA funding commitment behind it. She noted that they were not an historic preservation organization but that they were working to make connections and wanted to build a stronger bond with the City. Mr.

Aquilina agreed and thought that their project would also get more from the Massachusetts Historical Commission as well, hopefully \$50,000 in Emergency funding and \$100,000 in MPPF grant funding. They had looked into Save America's Treasures and the National Trust but neither program had funding at this time. In short, the CPA funding was all that was available at this time.

It was noted that Historic Resource projects would total below \$1.5 million if this project was funded in addition to the Jackson Homestead and Durant Kenrick proposals which would be reviewed in November. It was suggested that the funding for this project could come out of the Historic Resource restricted reserve account, which is currently at \$1.2 million, with additional funding of less than \$300,000 from unrestricted funds or future Historic Resource Reserves. It was also noted that all other known historic preservation projects were City projects, and that the request was in scale with the resource involved. Some members suggested that with this in mind, the project was not overly burdensome. Ms. Molinsky asked about other Historic Resource Projects. Ms. Kritzer reviewed a spreadsheet showing Historic Resource funding in recent years and noted that Historic Resource funding over the life of the program was at 17%.

Mr. Maloney stated that he did not think that it was up to the Committee to determine whether the project passed legal muster. He agreed with the Applicants that the project was not necessarily for a private entity or benefit. He thought that this was the kind of iconic building which gave the municipality its identity and exactly the kind of project which the CPC should be seeing. He thought that these buildings should be preserved and that there were not enough of these projects in the City. Mr. Brody also thought that this was a great project and agreed with Mr. Maloney. He stated that he was persuaded by Mr. McManus that funding might not be challenged. He also noted that the CPC was well below its goal of 20% funding for Historic Preservation projects. He agreed that the request was for a lot of money but that these types of projects often come in large chunks.

Members reviewed the Historic Resource Reserve funds and noted that there was currently \$1,233,270 set aside in that account. Mr. Armstrong suggested that the project be funded only from the Historic Resource Reserve funds. Mr. Brody disagreed, noting that the CPC had set a City goal of 20% of all CPA funding for Historic Resources which included using some general funding towards that goal. He noted that unrestricted funds were used for projects in other categories and thought that those funds would be appropriate here as well.

Mr. Kronish stated that he saw this project in a different way. He felt that the legal opinion could not be dismissed and stated that he could see no way around it. He felt that the Law Department's opinion needed to be a deciding factor for this project. Mr. Smargiassi stated that as the Historic Preservation representative, he was very much in favor of preserving the tower. However, he did think that the funding was too heavily weighted towards City funding. He was concerned that 50% was too high an amount and wondered if loans were a possibility. Ms. Gassett stated that they had considered loans as a funding mechanism but were not willing to jeopardize the future of their congregation for one. They could manage a short-term loan for this work but not a long term one. Mr. Smargiassi stated that he was familiar with these financing issues and reiterated that he would like to see the tower preserved but was concerned with the amount of funding requested.

Mr. Dunker stated that as the Parks and Recreation Commission Representative, he was aware of how many City projects were out there that needed funding. He was concerned with spending such a

large percentage of the funding available on one project. He was also not sure about the public support for this project and thought that there would also be public concerns with the amount of the request. Mr. Aquilina noted that the majority of the CPA funding had been suggested to come out of the Historic Resource Reserve fund and that only \$300,000 or so would come out of the general fund that could be used for other categories.

Ms. Datta thought that the Applicant had made a compelling case and agreed that there needed to be a balance to the funding. She noted that there was room in the historic resource budget to consider this type of project and that a project with a 50% match was within the parameters of the Community Preservation Plan. She had confidence that a vote of support from the City for this project would also lead to support from other funding entities.

Mr. Maloney moved to recommend that \$1,433,000 be allocated to the Grace Episcopal Church Tower Restoration project for the restoration and stabilization of the stone tower to be expended according to the schedule presented at this meeting. Ms. Lunin seconded the motion.

Ms. Molinsky asked if it would be possible to use only the Historic Resource Reserve funds for this project. Ms. Kritzer answered yes that the funding could come entirely from the Historic Resource Reserves by using the current funding amount and FY22 Historic Resource funds as needed. Ms. Molinsky asked if anyone had pause over the funding amount. Mr. Armstrong stated that based on his experience, he did not think that this would be the final cost of the project as unexpected issues often came up during construction. He thought that the total amount could change and that the Applicants could come back, at which time the Committee could decide whether or not additional funding was appropriate. Architect Larry Bauer noted that the project would need to be publicly bid to meet City and State procurements requirements. Ms. Gassett stated that they were coming at this project from the perspective of their partnership with the community. She also thought that the City's partnership on this project would help them to leverage additional funding and was open to continuing this conversation with the community once more information on their funding sources was known.

Mr. Armstrong called for the motion to be voted on by roll call vote. The motion passed by a vote of six to two (Dunker, Kronish) with Mr. Smargiassi abstaining from the vote as he had not been present at the public hearing.