



COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMISSION AGENDA

February 9, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.

The Community Preservation Committee (CPC) will hold this meeting as a virtual meeting. No in-person meeting will take place at City Hall.

To view and participate in this virtual meeting on your phone, download the “Zoom Cloud Meetings” app in any app store or at www.zoom.us. At the above date and time, click on “Join a Meeting” and enter the following Meeting ID: **85922342658**

To view and participate in this virtual meeting on your computer, at the above date and time, go to www.zoom.us, click “Join a Meeting” and enter the following Meeting ID: **85922342658**

You can also access the meeting online at:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85922342658>

One tap mobile: +13017158592,,85922342658#

Ruthanne Fuller,
Mayor

Barney S. Heath,
Director

Planning & Development
Department
1000 Commonwealth Ave.
Newton, MA 02459

T 617.796.1120
F 617.796.1134

www.newtonma.gov

2021 COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE

Mark Armstrong, Chair
Dan Brody, Vice Chair
Eliza Datta
Byron Dunker
Susan Lunin
Robert Maloney
Jennifer Molinsky
Martin Smargiassi
Judy Weber

Program Website
www.newtonma.gov/cpa

Program Staff
Lara Kritzer,
Community Preservation
Program Manager
lkritzer@newtonma.gov
617-796-1144

PROPOSALS AND PROJECTS

There are no new proposals or pre-proposals for review at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS

- 1) Program and Policies Discussion
 - Review of existing CP Guidelines for funding priorities
 - Review of Recommended Funding Percentages
 - Discussion of whether the CPC should consider guidelines on how ownership and the use of a structure effect eligibility priorities for historic preservation projects
 - Future joint meeting with City Council
- 2) General discussion of program’s current processes and procedures
- 3) Affordable Housing Trust Update and Discussion
- 4) Review of Finances
- 5) Approval of January 12 Minutes

Please note that all time noted above are approximate and discussions may happen earlier or later in the meeting as needed. Pre-meeting packets with additional information on each agenda item are posted on the website before each meeting.

The location of this meeting/event is wheelchair accessible and Reasonable Accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a Reasonable Accommodation, please contact the city of Newton’s ADA/Section 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance (2 weeks for ASL or CART) of the meeting/event: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city’s TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.

Newton Community Preservation Program



Program and Policies Discussion

The idea of reviewing and updating the CPC's project review guidelines has come up several times over the last month – since there are no new proposals or pre-proposals on the list this month, it seemed like a good time to dive in. The Community Preservation Guidelines were established in 2018 – these are included in the meeting packets each month and are included here as well. I have also added a document created in 2017 when the guidelines were last under discussion, that includes the private project review questions that were used by the CPC until 2008 – I thought it would be useful to get a sense of how the CPC had reviewed projects over time while discussing current and future review processes.

The items below are some of the suggested topics that have come up during discussions over the last few months. They are intended to guide the conversation but do not have to be the only areas of the Guidelines or funding process reviewed at this time.

1) Review of existing CP Guidelines for funding priorities

The chart included here comes from the CPC's guidelines – it is not one that is discussed often at meetings, but it is used regularly between meetings to guide applicants on the type of project and the expected funding match. It also came up quite a bit during this week's Finance/ZAP Committee discussion of the Grace Episcopal Church discussion. I am wondering if this still applies, and if so, if there is a clearer way to explain the difference between a public/private project to provide more guidance on future applications.

project categories	CPA appropriateness & funding leverage
special public resources and public-private partnerships: publicly or privately owned assets that benefit all Newton residents & neighborhoods, including housing that is both deed restricted to ensure permanent affordability and proactively marketed to all eligible households	highest priority for CPA funding, with these minimums from other sources: 30% for public projects, 50% for private projects
limited-benefit special public resources: publicly owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods	lower priority for CPA funding, with a target of at least 60% non-CPA funding
core public resources: assets already in public ownership and that the City of Newton would be obligated to rehabilitate even if Newton had not adopted the CPA with one primary exception: CPA funding may be appropriate for the <i>difference</i> between lowest-cost and historically appropriate methods or materials for the rehabilitation of publicly owned historic resources	usually not appropriate for CPA funding,
limited-benefit private resources: privately owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods	not appropriate for CPA funding

2) Review of Recommended Funding Percentages

The table below is also included in the CPC Guidelines and is also intended to serve as a goal for the CPC’s funding allocations over time. I am updating our current spreadsheets and will have information for review at the meeting on where we stand with these goals on a program-wide and annual basis. I think it would be useful after looking at how funds have been used to date to see if these goals are still true for the Committee or if they should be adjusted.

Newton CPA Allocation Targets: Balancing Funds Across Resources	± 5%
affordable housing: development & preservation	35 ±5%
historic resources: all purposes	20 ±5%
open space & recreation land: acquisition	20 ±5%
open space & recreation land: rehabilitation / capital improvements	20 ±5%
total, min. - max.	75-115%

The other question that has been raised about this graph is how it deals with Open Space and Recreation. Most CPA programs, and the Act itself, refer to Open Space projects or Recreation projects – there can certainly be overlap, but there are specific uses assigned to each. Newton’s program has instead divided the projects by use – Acquisition vs. Rehabilitation and Improvements. I’m not sure where this comes from, but I think it would be more straightforward and give us a better sense of how the funding was being spent to look at these by category as we do with Housing and Historic Resources.

3) Discussion of whether the CPC should consider guidelines on how ownership and the use of a structure effect eligibility priorities for historic preservation projects

This question also came up during the Finance/ZAP review of the Grace Tower Restoration project. The existing project categories chart above also touches on this– should the Committee give preference to a project based on how it is owned, and/or should there be additional conditions for projects that are not on publicly owned sites or structures. This is dealt with in the Act with requirements for public benefit and deed restrictions, but several recent discussions have suggested that the Committee might want to have additional conditions and restrictions. A general

For CPC public meeting on February 9, 2021

discussion on the CPC's preferences and policies would be very useful for assisting potential applicants.

4) Future joint meeting with City Council

The CPC Ordinance includes provision in Sec 7.80(d): " The CPC shall meet annually with the city council, separately from review of project funding recommendations and the annual budget, to review the status of the community preservation fund, Newton's community preservation program, and the ordinance."

This is added here as a discussion item to bring everyone up to speed – from what I can tell, this has not been done in recent years but there is no reason that the CPC could not reach out to the Council to re-initiate the process if there are policies or program goals to be discussed and shared.

5) General discussion of program's current processes and procedures

This is added primarily for my own use – I have been working with the Committee for a year now, and thought it would be a good time to discuss how things have been working and if there are any useful changes that I could try. I am interested primarily in how I get information out to all of you – is there a better format for meeting packets? Is everyone ok with electronic or is there still a need for hard copies? And is there additional information that I could be providing to help members review the projects? Some things have already been changed because of the last year's virtual structure, but if there are other things that would be helpful, please let me know.

6) Affordable Housing Trust Update and Discussion

This is a continuation of last month's discussion – I have been working with Planning staff to collect information on how Housing Trusts work in other communities and will put together a very brief presentation on our findings for members to review and discuss, with a focus on how CPC's and Trusts have worked together in other communities.

Staff Notes, updated June 2017: The bulk of Newton CPA funds invested in private properties have been used for affordable housing. ... To date, Newton has invested CPA historic preservation funds in 4 private buildings not used for housing: beginning in 2007, \$2.7 million for Historic Newton's Durant-Kenrick Homestead, operated as a museum open to the public; in 2008-09, slightly over \$1 million for Warren House, which includes 21 low-income rental units and is by the Newton Community Development Foundation on a long-term ground lease from the City of Newton; beginning in 2014 \$2.3 million for the Nathaniel Allen House, which the Newton Cultural Alliance is restoring and adapting as a community cultural center; and in 2015, \$72,652 for the New Art Center to incorporate federal historic preservation standards into plans for the renovation of its building, for which the City of Newton holds a right of reversion if it is no longer used as a community arts center.

Until 2008, the CPC used the following guidelines to help it evaluate private historic resources projects, though it did not commit to applying all or even any of these guidelines to every such proposal. Due to length limitations, guidance on this issue is much more limited in the current *Community Preservation Plan*.

Excerpt below is from pp. 11-12 of Newton Community Preservation Program Funding Guidelines, first adopted 16 October 2002 and last revised 12 November 2008.

Questions for Evaluating Requests for CPA Funds to Preserve, Restore or Rehabilitate Privately Owned Historic Properties in the City of Newton

Architectural Significance

- Is the architect notable?
- Is the architectural style distinctive?
- Does the property fit in and contribute to the architectural context of the neighborhood?
- Are there other important architectural features?

Historical/Cultural/Social Significance

- Is the resource on the National Register of Historic Places or the State Historic Register? Is the resource located in a National Register Historic District or a Local Historic District?
- Has it been landmarked by the City of Newton?
- Has it been designated Historic and Preferably Preserved by the Newton Historical Commission?
- Has a survey form been done on the property? If so, what is the level of historical significance attached to the property?
- What role does this resource play in Newton's social or cultural history?

Ownership and Financing

- Who owns the resource? Is ownership likely to change hands? Is ownership nonprofit, religious, private, etc.?
- What are the financial and management capabilities of the owners?
- Is there a demonstrated financial need for this project?
- What other funds will support this project?

Level of Protection

- Is the building protected by a preservation easement or equivalent?
- How will a CPA expenditure be protected in the future?
- What is the potential for loss or destruction of the property?
- Is the applicant willing to accept appropriate historic restrictions?

Necessity and Appropriateness

- Are proposed materials consistent with historic renovation?
- Do building techniques conform to the historic nature of the project?
- Does the proposed work cover essential and important features of the property?

Public Benefit

- To what extent does the public benefit from the historic preservation project?
- Do the owners of the building offer public service or community oriented activities to Newton residents?
- To what extent will the public have access to the building in its entirety and/or to its restored and preserved portions?

Public Support

- What is the level of public support for this project from users, neighbors, professionals, and community leaders?

Newton Community Preservation Program

Finances



- **Currently Available Funds and Approval of the Revised Budget**

Regularly updated on the program website, www.newtonma.gov/cpa, under [Reports and Presentations](#)

I have updated this spreadsheet to reflect that the Jackson Homestead project was approved by City Council on Feb. 1. All other project information remains the same.

- **Community Preservation Plan**

Regularly updated on the program website, www.newtonma.gov/cpa, under [Reports and Presentations](#)

This document has been updated to reflect the existing proposals which have been recommended for funding.

- **Current Project Status**

This list has been updated to show the current status of the CPA projects that have had their funding approved and are currently in-progress.

Newton Community Preservation Fund	Fiscal 2019	Fiscal 2020	Fiscal 2021	REVISED Fiscal 2021
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION FUND CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FUNDS	<i>based on Fy19 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Sept. 2019 revised budget, Fy19 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Spring 2020 approved budget, Pending FY20 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Final FY21 DOR Match, FY20 CP-1 and CP-2</i>
REVENUE				
Local CPA Surcharge (1% of Newton's total property tax levy)	\$3,381,289	\$3,568,921	\$3,658,144	\$3,658,144
State Matching Funds				
<i>Percentage State Match for previous year's certified local revenue</i>	<i>budgeted 8.5%, final 19%</i>	<i>budgeted 11.5%</i>	<i>budgeted 20%, Final 28.6%</i>	<i>28.6% match - final</i>
State Match Budgeted	253,970	\$383,309	\$713,784	\$1,009,206
Unrestricted Fund Balance (additional State Match Received after budget set, listed in following year)	240,424	\$360,816	\$425,445	\$425,445
additional sources:				
Prior Year Ending Fund Balance (unspent funds forwarded from prior year; should not be totaled across years)	12,669,321	\$10,740,419	\$11,683,009	\$11,683,009
Bonds (Webster Woods Acquisition only - Legal Fee bond not yet sold)		\$15,000,000		
Earnings (Premium Received on Bonding)	399,904	\$637,000		
Other (incl. liens) FY19 Return of unspent FTHB funds	805,000			
TOTAL REVENUE	\$17,749,907	\$30,690,465	\$16,480,382	\$16,775,804
EXPENDITURES				
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION & DEBT SERVICE				
Program Administration (max 5% of current-yr new funds)	\$131,574	\$215,456	\$202,845	\$202,845
<i>(fy19 year-end actual; fy20 and fy21 as budgeted - incl. "lagged" state funds in base for % calculation)</i>	<i>confirmed 3.1%</i>	<i>budgeted 5%</i>	<i>budgeted 4%</i>	<i>budgeted 4%</i>
Debt Service for Webster Woods/300 Hammond Pond Parkway	no debt service	no debt service	\$697,699	\$697,699
TOTAL Program Administration & Debt Service	\$131,574	\$215,456	\$900,544	\$900,544
AVAILABLE FUNDS after program administration & debt service	\$17,618,333	\$30,475,009	\$15,579,838	\$15,875,260
PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS by City Council (chronological order)				
In FISCAL 2019 (Chronological Order)				
Jackson Road/Haywood House New Senior Housing (Newton Housing Authority)	\$3,000,000			
300 Hammond Pond Parkway/Webster Woods (City of Newton) - professional services for open space preservation	\$100,000			
Stanton Avenue /Golda Meir House Senior Housing (ICHE)	\$3,250,000			
Grant to Newton Conservators - Conservation Restrictions (Wabasso Street, Rogers Street)	\$30,000			
Allen House (historic resources) - supplemental request (\$2.3 million previously appropriated)	\$600,000			
In Fiscal 2020 (Chronological Order)				
300 Hammond Pond Parkway (Webster Woods), open space acquisition: \$15,000,000 authorized principal for 30-year debt. The first debt service payment is scheduled for Fy21.		\$15,000,000		
300 Hammond Pond Parkway: See above. CPC recommendation to convert \$740,000 for conservation restriction grant and legal, etc. costs from direct funding to 30-year debt is now pending with the Council.		\$740,000		
Riverside Greenway - Pigeon Hill Trail Design (recreation land)		\$50,000		
Newton Housing Authority Acceptance of CAN-DO Portfolio (affordable housing)		\$1,105,000		
COVID-19 Rental Housing Relief Program - Community housing		\$2,000,000		
In Fiscal 2021 (Chronological Order)				
Golda Meir House Expansion/Stanton Ave (2 Life Communities) Affordable Housing funding requested to increase affordability of 60 new senior living units (City Council voted approval 10/5)			\$1,244,857	\$1,244,857
Commonwealth Ave. Carriageway Redesign - Final Design funds requested for new green space, bike, and pedestrian path between -Lyons Field to the Charles River (City Council voted approval 11/2)			\$390,000	\$390,000
Haywood House/Jackson Road Senior Housing Additional Funding - Funding requested to cover additional construction costs (City Council approved funding Dec. 7 2020)			\$77,900	\$77,900
Historic Newton Durant-Kenrick Gutter and Window Repairs - Funding requested under Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation to replace rear façade gutter and restore six damaged windows (City Council Funding approved December 21, 2020)			\$16,884	\$16,884
Historic Newton Jackson Homestead Fence Replacment - Funding requested under Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation to replace fence along Jackson Road (City Council approved funding Feb. 1, 2021)			\$28,990	\$28,990
TOTAL Appropriations (By Year)	\$6,980,000	\$18,895,000	\$1,758,631	\$1,758,631
AVAILABLE FUNDS after new appropriations	\$10,638,333	\$11,580,009	\$13,821,207	\$14,116,629

Newton Community Preservation Fund	Fiscal 2019	Fiscal 2020	Fiscal 2021	REVISED Fiscal 2021
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION FUND CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FUNDS	<i>based on Fy19 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Sept. 2019 revised budget, Fy19 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Spring 2020 approved budget, Pending FY20 CP-1 & CP-2</i>	<i>based on Final FY21 DOR Match, FY20 CP-1 and CP-2</i>
CPC RECOMMENDATIONS pending with City Council (chronological order)				
Grace Episcopal Church Tower Restoration - Funding requested to stabilize and restore historic stone tower, belfry and spire on National Register listed property (Funding Recommended Nov 2020; Full Council Review scheduled 2/16/21)			\$1,433,000	\$1,433,000
Coleman House Senior Housing Preservation (community housing preservation) - Request for funding to complete comprehensive rehabilitation and preservation of existing Coleman House I and II buildings (Recommended for full funding Jan. 12, 2021, City Council Review TBD)			\$4,214,622	\$4,214,622
Covid-19 Rental Housing Relief Program Additional Funding (Community housing support) - Request for \$1.2 million in additional funding to continue program through June 2021. (Recommended 1/12/21; Full Council Review 2/16/21)			\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
TOTAL RECOMMENDATIONS			\$6,847,622	\$6,847,622
AVAILABLE FUNDS if all current recommendations were funded in full			\$6,973,585	\$7,269,007
FULL PROPOSALS UNDER CONSIDERATION by CPC				
Crescent Street (City of Newton) final design & construction: \$1,481,622 housing, \$1,093,378 recreation/ playground [CPC vote on hold per project sponsor request as of 18 June 2018]			\$2,575,000	\$2,575,000
TOTAL PROPOSALS			\$2,575,000	\$2,575,000
AVAILABLE FUNDS if all submitted proposals were funded in full			\$4,398,585	\$4,694,007
PRE-PROPOSALS AND PROJECT UPDATES SUBMITTED to CPC				
City Hall & War Memorial Auditorium Exterior Stairs (historic restoration/rehabilitation) - 12 March 2019 CPC agreed to consider a full proposal for this amount toward initial/conceptual design, if the proposal includes some matching non-CPA funds; total anticipated CPA request incl. construction \$2,332,000			\$68,250	\$68,250
TOTAL PRE-PROPOSALS			\$68,250	\$68,250
AVAILABLE FUNDS if these requests were accepted / funded in full in Fy21			\$4,330,335	\$4,625,757
Note: Unless exceptional needs require otherwise, Newton's CPC aims to maintain a balance of approximately 1 year's new funding (currently ≈ \$4 million), so the program can start each year with about 2 years' worth of funds.				
Newton Community Preservation Fund				
Restricted vs. Unrestricted Available Funds	Housing	Historic Resources	Open Space/ Recreation	New Restricted Reserves (Minimum in each account)
Restricted Accounts by Funding Category				
Fy21 Budget Reserves (10% of Local Surcharge Estimation)	\$401,837	\$462,853	\$0	\$509,279
<i>MUNIS Account Numbers</i>	58C10498 57900C	58B10498 57900B	58A10498 57900D	58A10498 57900
Prior Fund Balances (unspent funds from Fy20 & prior years)	\$431,305	\$557,382	\$409,689	
<i>MUNIS Account Numbers</i>	5820 3599	5810 3599	5840 3599	5840 3599
Restricted Totals	\$833,142	\$1,020,235	\$409,689	
Unrestricted				
Fy21 Budget Reserve			\$1,306,399	
Fund Balance (unspent funds from prior years)			\$9,865,878	
Unrestricted Total			\$11,172,277	
Restricted Funds Total (Housing, Historic Resource, and Open Space)			\$2,263,066	
Total Funds Available			\$13,435,343	



Ruthanne Fuller,
Mayor

Newton, Massachusetts
Community Preservation Committee
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION PLAN

Adopted: April 3, 2018

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

Barney S. Heath
Director of Planning
& Development

Massachusetts' [Community Preservation Act](#) (CPA) provides local and state funds for community housing (affordable housing), historic resources, and land for open space or recreation, within certain constraints:

ALLOWABLE SPENDING PURPOSES under the Community Preservation Act				
RESOURCES → ↓ ACTIVITIES	COMMUNITY HOUSING	HISTORIC RESOURCES	OPEN SPACE	LAND for OUTDOOR RECREATION
ACQUIRE	YES	YES	YES	YES
CREATE	YES	NO	YES	YES
PRESERVE	YES	YES	YES	YES
SUPPORT	YES	NO	NO	NO
REHABILITATE / RESTORE	YES, IF acquired or created with CPA funds	YES	YES, IF acquired or created with CPA funds	YES

The [Guidelines & Forms](#) page of Newton's CPA program website, at www.newtonma.gov/cpa, includes a more detailed [allowable uses of funds](#) chart, with the state statute's full definitions of these eligible resources and activities, as well as Newton-specific proposal instructions and upcoming deadlines. The CPC works with the sponsors of CPA-appropriate proposals to help them meet program requirements.

Like most CPA communities, Newton does not have enough CPA funding for all current and anticipated requests, even those that are both CPA-eligible and CPA-appropriate. The Community Preservation Committee (CPC) uses the following guidelines to decide which projects it will recommend for funding by the City Council.

1. Use Newton's regularly updated community-wide plans to guide funding decisions.

The CPC relies on Newton's *Comprehensive Plan* and other regularly updated community-wide plans to prioritize Newton's CPA-eligible needs. Each funding proposal must cite at least two of these plans, most of which are linked to [Guidelines & Forms](#) at www.newtonma.gov/cpa.

2. Balance funding across all CPA-eligible resources and activities.

The CPA statute requires communities to spend at least 10% of each year's new funds on each of three resources – housing, historic resources, and the combination of open space and land for recreation. Funds may be allocated in the year they are received or retained for future projects. Unless exceptional needs require otherwise, Newton's CPC aims to end each year with a remaining balance of about one year's worth of funds (currently about \$3 million), so the program can respond quickly to unanticipated future opportunities. Unusually expensive projects, such as land acquisition or major capital improvements to public buildings or parks, may also be funded by borrowing – selling bonds that will be repaid from future local CPA revenue.

Newton's allocation targets for CPA funding of the different eligible resources (see next page) are flexible guidelines, not rigid quotas. These targets reflect Newton's past funding patterns, available information about possible future proposals, and feedback the CPC has received through community surveys and public hearings. The targets also reflect cost differences among different types of projects. For example, in Newton projects

website www.newtonma.gov/cpa
contact Lara Kritzer, Community Preservation Program Manager
email lkritzer@newtonma.gov phone 617.796.1144

that involve land acquisition, such as creating new affordable housing or a new conservation area, tend to cost more than projects that preserve or rehabilitate buildings and land already in public ownership.

Newton CPA Allocation Targets: Balancing Funds Across Resources	± 5%
affordable housing: development & preservation	35 ±5%
historic resources: all purposes	20 ±5%
open space & recreation land: acquisition	20 ±5%
open space & recreation land: rehabilitation / capital improvements	20 ±5%
total, min. - max.	75-115%

The final two pages of this *Plan* compare the allocation of current and future funding requests to these targets.

3. Support projects that are CPA-appropriate and that leverage non-CPA funds.

Newton's CPC prioritizes projects that are not only CPA-eligible but also CPA-appropriate, and that leverage the maximum possible funding from other sources. The CPC also recognizes that a project may need a relatively high share of CPA funding in its initial phases (such as design) in order to raise funds primarily from non-CPA sources for its later phases (such as construction).

project categories	CPA appropriateness & funding leverage
special public resources and public-private partnerships: publicly or privately owned assets that benefit all Newton residents & neighborhoods, including housing that is both deed restricted to ensure permanent affordability and proactively marketed to all eligible households	highest priority for CPA funding, with these minimums from other sources: 30% for public projects, 50% for private projects
limited-benefit special public resources: publicly owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods	lower priority for CPA funding, with a target of at least 60% non-CPA funding
core public resources: assets already in public ownership and that the City of Newton would be obligated to rehabilitate even if Newton had not adopted the CPA with one primary exception: CPA funding may be appropriate for the <i>difference</i> between lowest-cost and historically appropriate methods or materials for the rehabilitation of publicly owned historic resources	usually not appropriate for CPA funding,
limited-benefit private resources: privately owned assets that benefit only some Newton residents or neighborhoods	not appropriate for CPA funding

4. Support proposal sponsors with a proven capacity for project management and long-term maintenance.

Newton’s CPC requires each proposal to identify both a qualified, available project manager and a reliable source of non-CPA funding for future maintenance. The CPC also considers each proposal sponsor’s past record of project management and maintenance when reviewing new proposals from that sponsor.

These requirements help Newton to avoid repeating past experiences with projects that took far more time or public funding to complete than originally anticipated or promised, and to comply with the state CPA statute’s prohibition on using CPA funds for maintenance and operations.

5. Evaluate completed projects to ensure accountability & improve future projects.

Once a project is funded, the CPC requires regular progress reports. For all non-City projects, the final release of CPA funds is contingent on presentation of a final in-person and written report to the CPC. City departments are also expected to provide final reports to the CPC on CPA-funded City projects.

The CPC monitors completed projects indefinitely, to evaluate the community’s long-term returns on its CPA investments, and to learn how well – and why – different projects are maintained with non-CPA funds.

Newton Community Preservation Plan

Current & Future Proposals Compared to Available Funds & Allocation Targets					
Total Funded Projects, FY15-FY20 (included debt service)	Affordable Housing	Historic Resources	Open Space	Recreation	
\$37,215,223	\$12,298,224	\$5,295,287	\$15,862,500	\$3,759,122	
Fy15-Fy20 - Percentage of allocation by resource	33%	14%	43%	10%	
CPC target allocations by resource, ± 5%	30%	25%	20%	20%	
Current Proposals or Pre-proposals, with Related Future Proposals (in order of submission to CPC) ✓ = Fy20 appropriation ? = recommended by CPC but not yet funded * = cost revised or estimated by CPC staff					
CIP = City of Newton Capital Improvement Plan. In this plan, for "Priority," lower numbers = higher priorities; for "Urgency," 100 = highest, 1 = lowest.					
Sources & CIP Priority (Urgency) October 2019	Project Title	Affordable Housing	Historic Resources	Open Space	Recreation
CIP 31 (53.7) CPA proposal on hold	70 Crescent Street <i>(in addition to prior CPA funding already incl. in Fy13-18 totals above: \$100,000 for site assessment, Apr. 2016; \$260,000 for feasibility & design, Mar. 2017)</i>	\$1,481,622			\$1,093,378
CIP 66 (39.9) Pre-proposal discussed by CPC	Fy21 City Hall (Front) & War Memorial Exterior Stairs <i>In April 2019 the CPC voted 9-0 to condition any consideration of a full proposal for initial design (\$68,250) on a commitment of matching non-CPA funds. The CPC has not yet agreed to consider a request for final design or construction funding.</i>		\$2,332,000		
Not City Project	Grace Episcopal Church Tower Restoration <i>(Recommended 10/13/20, City Council Review scheduled for 2/16/21)</i>		\$1,244,857		
Not City Project	Coleman House Senior Housing Preservation <i>(Proposal recommended for funding at 1/12/21, City Council Review TBD)</i>	\$4,214,622			
Not on CIP	Covid-19 Emergency Housing Relief Program Additional Funding <i>(Proposal recommended 01/12/21, City Council Review scheduled for 2/16/21)</i>	\$1,200,000			
Current (Pre)Proposals Subtotal (including debt service)					
FY21 Funds only	Webster Wood Debt Service			\$697,699	
\$12,264,178		\$6,896,244	\$3,576,857	\$697,699	\$1,093,378
Percentage of Allocation by Resource		56%	29%	6%	9%
Following amts include current fund balance. For funds available once that balance is spent down, see separate funding forecast.					
FIVE-YEAR FORECAST: Total Available Funds for FY21-FY25 = \$22,936,366					
target allocations. – 5%		\$6,880,910	\$3,440,455	\$3,440,455	\$3,440,455
target allocations + 5%		\$9,174,546	\$5,734,092	\$5,734,092	\$5,734,092
TEN-YEAR FORECAST: Total Available Funds for Fy21-FY30 = \$60,727,016					
target allocations. – 5%		\$18,218,105	\$9,109,052	\$9,109,052	\$9,109,052
target allocations + 5%		\$24,290,806	\$15,181,754	\$15,181,754	\$15,181,754
Cumulative Debt Service for Webster Woods/300 Hammond Pond Parkway land acquisition (30 year debt):					
<i>First Five Years (FY21-FY25):</i>				\$3,474,609	
<i>First Ten Years (FY21-FY30):</i>				\$6,950,872	

Newton Community Preservation Plan

Other Potential Future Proposals (in order by highest CIP ranking for each site)					
Sources & CIP Priority (Urgency) October 2019	Project Title	Affordable Housing	Historic Resources	Open Space	Recreation
CIP 30 (53.8)	Fy21 Crystal Lake Levingston Cove <i>(state</i>				\$700,000
CIP 110, 192, 208 (20.8,	Waban Library		\$428,500		
CIP 112 (33.1)	Gath Pool <i>(replacement)</i>				\$9,200,000
CIP 113 (33.1)	Forte Park <i>(including synthetic turf, which cannot be purchased with CPA funds)</i>				\$2,000,000
CIP 114 (33.0)	Old Cold Spring Park				\$350,000
CIP 118 (32.2)	Upper Falls/Braceland Playground				\$1,675,000
CIP 121, 145 (31.7, 28.5)	Burr Park Fieldhouse		\$474,000		<i>could also be listed here</i>
CIP 124, 176 (30.6, 24.7)	Kennard Estate <i>(Parks & Rec. Dept. HQ)</i>		\$740,000		
CIP 125, 184 (30.5, 22.7)	Crafts Street Stable <i>(DPW)</i>		\$5,000,000		
CIP 126, 161, 211 (15.4, 26.9, 30.4)	Auburndale Library		\$520,000		
CIP 131, 147, 167, 182 (26.0, 29.9, 23.0, 28.4)	Senior Center <i>(existing, use changing)</i>		\$689,000		
CIP 134, 148 (28.2, 29.6)	West Newton Library <i>(Police Annex)</i>		\$450,500		
CIP 137 (29.3)	* City Hall Archives <i>(facilities) CIP lists only \$100,000 for this, but amt at right reflects CPA-funded archives strategic plan.</i>		\$1,500,000		
CIP 141, 166 (26.0, 29.0)	Newton Corner Library <i>(use changing)</i>		\$331,500		
CIP 159 (27.1)	Newton Centre Library <i>(use changing)</i>		\$1,500,000		
CIP 168 (25.7)	Crystal Lake Bathhouse <i>(previously est. full project cost \$8m)</i>				\$5,000,000
CIP 177 (24.7)	City Hall Historic Landscape		\$1,500,000		
CIP 178 (24.4)	Chaffin Park Wall (Fy21) <i>(abutting Farlow Park)</i>		\$200,000		
CIP 180 (23.8)	Nonantum Library		\$204,000		
CIP 181, 204, 207 (23.7, 18.7, 19.2)	Historic Burying Grounds <i>(in addition to ≈ remaining unspent \$84,000 in previously appropriated CPA funds)</i>		\$160,000		
CIP 196, 206 (19.0, 20.7)	Jackson Homestead <i>(basement galleries, doors & windows)</i>		\$342,000		
CIP 202 (20.0)	City Hall Doors & Windows <i>NOTE: Total CPA-eligible projects listed for City Hall, including archives & landscape: \$8,332,000.</i>		\$3,000,000		
CIP 205 (19.2)	Nahanton Park <i>(renovate parking areas, path to Nature Center)</i>				\$150,000
Other Potential Future Proposals Subtotal =					
\$36,114,500		\$0	\$17,039,500	\$0	\$19,075,000
% Allocation by Resource		0%	47%	0%	53%
TOTAL Current (Pre)Proposals + Other Future Proposals =					
\$48,378,678		\$6,896,244	\$20,616,357	\$697,699	\$20,168,378
% Allocation by Resource		14%	43%	1%	42%
CPA Target Allocations by Resource +/-		35% ± 5%	20% ± 5%	20% ± 5%	20% ± 5%
5%, according to guidelines April 2018					

**Community Preservation Act Funds
Current Status of Active Funded Projects**

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Address	Funding Category	CPA Funding Appropriated	Total Expended to Date	CPA Funds Remaining	Notes on Progress
FY18	AUBURN STREET (236) (affordable housing & historic preservation)	236 Auburn Street, Auburndale, MA 02466	Community Housing/Historic Preservation (\$677,700/\$300,000)	\$977,700	\$977,700	\$0	Property sold to Housing Authority along with other CANDO properties - Law Dept. working with NHA attorney to finalize Preservation Restriction
FY21	Commonwealth Avenue Carriageway Redesign	Auburndale - Charles River to Lyons Field	Recreation	\$390,000	\$0	\$390,000	Approved in October 2020
FY20	COVID-19 Emergency Housing Relief Program	Citywide	Community Housing	\$2,000,000	\$1,477,202.18	\$522,797.82	CDBG Funding fully expended. CPA funding from July 1 through October 31 has assisted 93 households – 49 households at or below 30%, 26 between 31% and 50%, 11 between 51% and 65%, and 7 between 66% and 80%. The program was expanded with the CPC's approval from 3 months to 6 months in September and to 8 months in December. Additional Funding Request before City Council for funding through June 2021
FY14	CURVE STREET (12-20), Myrtle Village (housing)	12 and 18-20 Curve Street, West Newton, MA 02465	Community Housing	\$910,179	\$910,179	\$0	Waiting for Final Report - Reached out to Applicants Spring 2020
FY21	Durant-Kenrick Gutter and Window Repairs	286 Waverley Avenue Newton Corner, MA 02458	Historic Resources	\$16,884	\$0	\$16,884	City Council approval received 12/21/20
FY15	HISTORIC BURYING GROUNDS 3, East Parish Burying Ground	Newton Corner, MA 02458	Historic Resources	\$208,700	\$132,502	\$76,198	CPC approved the reallocation of funds to the South Burying Ground fence replacement project in Oct. 2020
FY21	Jackson Homestead Fence Replacement	537 Washington Street, -2458	Historic Resources	\$28,990	\$0	\$28,990	Project approved by City Council Feb. 1
FY19, FY21	JACKSON ROAD Senior Housing (Haywood House)	Jackson Road (behind 83-127 Kennedy Circle), Newton Corner, MA 02458	Community Housing	\$3,077,900	\$0	\$3,077,900	Additional Funding approved at 12/7 Council meeting.
FY18	NEWTON CEMETERY Whipple-Beal Cast Iron Fence	791 Walnut Street, Newton Center, MA 02459	Historic Resources	\$60,000	\$54,000	\$6,000	Final Report Approved; Preservation Restriction under review with MHC
Fy20	NEWTON CONSERVATORS, Conservation Restrictions (Kessler Woods)	200 Vine Street (bordered by La Grange St.), Chestnut Hill, MA 02467	Open Space	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000	On hold pending completion of Conservation Restriction
Fy19	NEWTON CONSERVATORS, Conservation Restrictions (Wabasso Street, Rogers Street)	Wabasso St: 211 Lexington Street/71 Wabasso St., Auburndale, MA 02466 20 Rogers Street, Newton Highlands, MA 02461	Open Space/Recreation (\$7,500/\$22,500)	\$30,000		\$30,000	Grant Agreement in progress - working with Law Dept. to complete review
FY04, FY06, FY09, FY14, FY15	Newton HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE Program, Phases 1-5	Citywide	Community Housing	\$3,209,050	\$2,446,327	\$762,723	CPC approved reallocation of funds to preserve existing homeowner units Sept 2020; Recommendation approved by Finance and ZAP Committees; anticipated to be reviewed by full Council 12/7
Fy20	NEWTON HOUSING AUTHORITY - CAN-DO PORTFOLIO	Citywide	Community Housing	\$1,105,000	\$1,096,790.39	\$8,209.61	Sale of properties completed in January - NHA is expected to request the remaining funds to cover other acquisition expenses (TBD)
Fy20	PIGEON HILL TRAIL (Riverside Greenway) Design	Connecting Evergreen Street to Lasell Boathouse to Charles Street in Auburndale, including two underpasses under Interstate 90	Recreation	\$50,000	\$3,737.93	\$50,000	Design work complete - expect back to CPC in future to reallocate funding to construction work
Fy19, FY21	STANTON AVENUE Senior Housing (Golda Meir House Expansion)	160 Stanton Ave, Auburndale, MA 02466	Community Housing	\$4,494,857	\$0	\$4,494,857	Working with 2Life on grant agreement - 2Life hopes to have all funding closed by April to begin construction
FY15	WABAN HILL RESERVOIR	1170 Common-wealth Avenue (Manet Road & Reservoir Drive), Chestnut Hill, MA 02467	Recreation	\$980,000	\$980,000	\$0	Project complete? Meeting with Parks and Rec next week on final report/status update
Fy20	300 HAMMOND POND PARKWAY / Webster Woods 2 (Land Acquisition)	300 Hammond Pond Parkway, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467	Open Space	\$15,740,000	\$14,618,836	\$1,121,164	Two accounts - purchase funds and legal fees. Remaining funds include legal fees and discount received from bond sale; No Restriction in place at this time.
Project Totals				\$33,294,260.00	\$22,697,274.30	\$10,600,723.63	

Newton Community Preservation Program

Minutes



- January 12, 2021 Draft Meeting Minutes



Ruthanne Fuller,
Mayor

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

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

Barney S. Heath
Director

Community Preservation Committee

MINUTES

January 12, 2021

The virtual meeting was held online on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 beginning at 7:00 pm. Community Preservation Committee (CPC) members present included Mark Armstrong, Dan Brody, Eliza Datta, Byron Dunker, Susan Lunin, Robert Maloney, Jennifer Molinsky, Martin Smargiassi, and Judy Weber. Community Preservation Program Manager Lara Kritzer were also present and served as recorder.

Present for the Planning Board were Peter Doeringer, Sonia Parisca, Kelley Brown, Barney Heath, Kevin McCormick, Jennifer Molinsky, Sudha Maheshwari, and James Robertson.

Mr. Doeringer asked for a motion to open the Planning and Development Board Public Hearing. Ms. Molinsky moved to open the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote. Mr. Maloney then moved to open the Community Preservation Committee's public meeting which also passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROPOSALS AND PROJECTS

Coleman House Senior Housing Preservation Proposal - Joint Public Hearing with the Planning and Development Board

Mr. Armstrong stated that the Planning and Development Board and CPC were meeting jointly to review the proposal from 2Life Communities for funding of the Coleman House Senior Housing Preservation project. The project was introduced by Jeff Sacks, who explained that he was starting his three-year term as chair of 2Life Communities' Board of Directors. He noted that he was a former housing representative member of the CPC and was excited to see the Committee meeting jointly with the Planning Board on this project. He noted that both the Planning Board and CPC had previously supported 2Life Communities with the funding for the Golda Meir project. He appreciated their support for the Coleman House project, explaining that it provided housing for very low and extremely low-income senior households. For over fifty years, 2Life Communities (previously known as Jewish Community Housing for the Elderly) has provided a dynamic and supportive environment for the seniors living in its affordable housing. Mr. Sacks noted the challenges of the current proposal to completely rehabilitate and restore the property with its residents still living there and noted how their team had designed the project to improve accessibility and adaptability within each unit. He ended by noting that the proposal requested \$4.5 million in CPA funding and \$530,000 in CDBG and HOME funding.

Lizbeth Heyer, 2 Life's Chief of Real Estate and Innovation, next gave a presentation on the Coleman House Preservation proposal. She noted that this was an important affordable housing preservation

website www.newtonma.gov/cpa

staff contact Lara Kritzer, Community Preservation Program Manager

email lkritzer@newtonma.gov, *phone* 617.796.1144

opportunity. 2Life Communities is the long-term owner, operator, property manager and service provider for all of its properties and currently manages 1,300 apartments on five campuses. Their residents include 1,600 individuals from thirty different countries. As the owner and operator of the properties, 2Life remains closely involved with the condition of the buildings and needs of the residents. Ms. Heyer noted that 30% to 40% of their residents were nursing home eligible but that only 2% moved to nursing homes annually due to the support and benefits provided to their residents.

Ms. Heyer explained that the Coleman House is adjacent to the Jewish Community Center (JCC) and was built in two parts in the 1980s and 1990s. It was now time for a thirty-year preservation investment in these facilities. She noted that they had onsite resident services in all of their properties with the goal of 100 residents to each resident service coordinator. Ms. Heyer explained that many of the coordinators were bilingual and reviewed the cultural, social, physical, and educational services and benefits that they provided to their residents. Ms. Heyer explained that the buildings also had live-in staff and would continue to after the renovations.

The Coleman House buildings include 146 units available to very low and extremely low-income households, those with incomes well below 50% AMI. Ms. Heyer explained that they were able to supply this affordable housing through a mix of Section 8 and PRAC project-based contracts. The median income for their residents is \$12,000 and the median age is 82. Coleman House residents went between 62-105 in age and come from ten different countries. Ms. Heyer added that 53% of residents needed some level of assistance and that 40% of residents used a cane or walker to get around. Even with the Covid-19 situation, they had worked to engage their residents in the project plans. Residents had provided thoughtful reviews of finishes and were able to review all of the design elements. Ms. Heyer stated that they would pledge to keep the units affordable in perpetuity.

Ms. Heyer went on to describe the work on the units, explained that they would all be adaptable while a certain number would be fully accessible. Adaptable units were based on resident needs to remain in their units over time and included better turning radiuses for walkers and wheelchairs, installing blocking for future grab bars in different locations, and easily removeable cabinets in the kitchen. The project would also include a full life cycle investment for the building envelope and infrastructure as well. They were working to get as close as possible to full electric systems to reach Enterprise Green Community standards. Ms. Heyer noted that it was also important to them that their systems be efficient as they paid for all of the utilities in the buildings. The project also included renovating their village center areas, including redesigning and modernizing their program spaces. Lastly, Ms. Heyer noted how the project met the City's Consolidated Plan goals for affordable housing.

Ms. Heyer stated that they were requesting that local support cover 18% of the project using CDBG, HOME, and CPA funding. The project also anticipated using some Consortium HOME funds as well. The largest share of the costs, approximately \$25 million, would come from 2Life Communities itself as they reinvested equity back into the building. The project costs included \$25 million in construction and \$4 million in soft costs. Because they were using fewer funding sources, their transaction costs were lower, and they planned to have only a modest developer fee. The CPA funding would be dedicated to costs involved with repairs and replacement work on the building envelope and infrastructure. Ms. Heyer estimated that the project included \$10 million in project

costs for building envelope and infrastructure elements. The project proposed to use the HOME funding for construction, and to use the requested CDBG funding to assist with relocation costs for their residents. Ms. Heyer added that this was 2Life's fourth project in an occupied building and that they had a good sense of how to do these now. Their approach was to empty a stack of units, renovate them, and to then relocate the residents from the next stack of to be developed units into the finished units so that residents remained in the same building throughout the process.

Ms. Heyer reviewed the project schedule, explaining that they were ready to proceed and hoped to have the completed construction documents in February. The relocation work was anticipated to begin in March with construction underway in April. Project completion was estimated to be by April 2023. Ms. Heyer also noted that Phase I vaccinations for Covid-19 would begin in the coming week which would help the process. They hoped to finish the first round of shots in January and the second round in February. At present, they were still following all necessary safety protocols.

Mr. Armstrong found it interesting that the CPA funding was considered to be for preservation here, noting that the building and work to be done was very different from the CPC's usual preservation projects. Mr. Doeringer asked what level of Enterprise Green status they were aiming for. Elise Salinger, 2Life's Real Estate Innovation Manager, explained that the status would be equivalent to a silver or gold LEED certification. Mr. Doeringer asked if all of the non-HOME funded units would be affordable in perpetuity. Ms. Salinger answered that all of the units were permanently affordable. Additionally, the HOME units would have restrictions on them which went beyond the minimum requirements for that funding.

Ms. Datta stated that she was a member of the Newton Housing Partnership as well as the CPC and was very supportive of the project. She noted that the Housing Partnership recognized that it is hard to develop and preserve deeply affordable units like the ones at Coleman house. The Partnership had also discussed the adaptability and accessibility of the rehabilitated units and Ms. Datta thought that it was great that 2Life was investing in these improvements. Ms. Datta also appreciated the simplicity of the financial structure of the project and its more predictable schedule.

Ms. Molinsky stated that she worked in aging in housing and noted that 2Life Communities was a national leader in the field. She stated that she was very supportive of the project and thought that the ability to adapt the units should not be underestimated as it would provide a tremendous benefit to residents.

Housing Development Planner Eamon Bencivengo then gave a presentation on the use of the CDBG and HOME funding for the project. He explained that 2Life's request for \$530,000 equaled 1.7% of the project with \$411,898 coming from CDBG funding and \$118,102 from HOME funds. He explained that there was also a small change in the funding since the Planning and Development Board's memo. The HOME funds had been lowered with a placeholder added for May/June when the City would know more about the status of FY22 federal funds. The lower HOME funding amount has been paired with additional CDBG funds. Mr. Bencivengo explained that the results would be the same but that this provided a more conservative approach to using the HOME funds. He added that the project had previously been awarded West Metro HOME Consortium funds and explained that these came from pooled funds from all of the Consortium member communities and were released in regular funding rounds. Mr. Bencivengo stated that the current project met all of the eligibility requirements for this

funding and was highly leveraged. The project addressed many of the City's housing goals with its deeply affordable units for seniors and would be more sustainable, which was a long-term goal of the City. He added that the Housing Partnership had voted last week to recommend full funding to the project and that staff also recommended approval.

Mr. McCormick asked if there was already a permanent affordability restriction on the property. Ms. Heyer answered no, that the affordability was instead guaranteed by their HUD and other housing contracts. Rose White, 2Life Communities' Housing Finance Specialist, stated that the permanent affordability of the property will be tied to the financing and that the property would not have a separate restriction. Mr. Doeringer questioned tying the affordability to the financing, asking whether the affordability would be compromised if the HUD financing ever ended. Ms. White stated that that any affordability restrictions would most likely be renewed with any refinancing of the project. Ms. Berman added that there were restrictions tied in with the city funding including a 20 year or longer restriction for the HOME funded units. Ms. Weber asked how long their contracts were for and Ms. Heyer answered that they had both annual and fifteen-year contracts. Ms. Weber added that the federal government had continued to show support for senior housing and did not show any signs of walking away from it. Ms. Heyer noted that 2Life Communities had been providing affordable senior housing for 55 years and was a stable and well capitalized company that was expanding.

Mr. Maloney noted that the property had been recently refinanced and that the project had long term financing in place that represented a high percentage of the property value. He thought that the proposed funding request was for a good cause.

Mr. Brown asked the applicants how they had determined the appropriate project scope and what had imposed discipline on the project. Ms. Heyer stated that they had begun with a capital needs assessment of the building that evaluated the condition of the building envelope and systems. They had developed the core of the project around a thirty-year usable life scope, then had brought in a contractor to start testing their assumptions by looking into the walls. They then looked at any additional goals which would meet the desired programmatic outcomes. Ms. Heyer stated that their goal at Coleman House was that no one should ever have to leave their units for a nursing home and that 2Life Communities had a passionate commitment to sustainability. They had then set their budget and scope around these goals. Mr. Brown asked about the Consortium HOME funding. It was noted that there had been no other applicants for that funding this round. Mr. Brown asked if there were any other projects that were not being funded due to this project. Ms. Berman answered that there were other projects but that it was hard to qualify for these funds. She noted that the HOME funds required that a project already be pretty far along with the rest of its funding in place. It just happened that this was ready when those other projects were not. She noted that for the HOME Consortium funds, not all applicants wanted to deal with the restrictions and complications that came along with the fund. Mr. Brown asked if there was anyone waiting to use the Newton funds. Ms. Berman answered no, that the only other potential use for the Newton funds was the Armory, adding that this project was a very appropriate and strong use of this funding.

Ms. Parisca stated that this is a wonderful project. She asked if all of the units were assigned or if there was a waiting list for units. Ms. Heyer explained that they were currently holding some units open for relocations but that the buildings were otherwise fully occupied with a 500 person waiting

list. Mr. Armstrong asked if 2Life Communities had any plans for adding new units. Ms. Heyer answered that they were working on a new development for the site, Opus, which would provide middle income housing to those who wished to age in community. 2Life was getting ready to submit their special permit application for the project this spring. Ms. Heyer explained that the construction on Opus was still a few years away and noted the challenges of bringing in services to middle income households which currently only exist in high-end facilities. The project had been difficult to design, but 2Life thought that it would be an overall enhancement to the Coleman House facilities.

Discussion was opened to the public at this time.

Diana Murphy, Chair of the Council on Aging, expressed her support for the project. She noted that Newton was in desperate need of senior housing and that many seniors were remaining in their homes longer than they should because they had no other option. She stated that 2 Life Communities is innovative and had a fantastic track record, and that the Council strongly endorsed this project.

Robin Nasson assisted Constance, an 18 year resident of the community, in voicing her support for the project and organization. Constance stated that 2Life took wonderful care of its residents and offered many programs and services. She did not know where she would be without 2Life and looked forward to the renovations, which she thought had fantastic plans with everything that she could think of to keep residents in their units.

Peter Barrer of Green Newton stated that he was a retired engineer and was very concerned with sustainability. He noted the City's goal of being carbon free by 2050 and was concerned with the proposed project scope. Ms. Selinger clarified and expanded on the project's sustainability plans, explaining that this work would put the property on a clear path to zero carbon in 2050. She discussed with Mr. Barrer their plans for air sealing as well as upgrading systems and insulating the building cavities, adding that the plans had evolved since their original submission and that she was happy to provide additional guidance on their sustainability approach.

Mr. Maloney moved to close the CPC's public hearing on the Coleman House project proposal. Ms. Lunin seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote. Ms. Molinsky then moved to close the Planning and Development Board's public hearing on the Coleman House project funding. Ms. Parisca seconded the motion which also passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Lunin moved to recommend \$4,214,622 in CPA Community Housing funds to the Coleman House Senior Housing Preservation project. Mr. Maloney seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Doeringer moved that the Planning and Development Board recommend approval of the proposed substantial amendment and pre-Commitment of the HOME funds to the Coleman House project. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which also passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Berman presented the City's request for an additional \$1.2 million in Community Housing funds for the Covid-19 Emergency Housing Relief Program. She explained that the additional funding would extend the program through June 2021 and would support both new and existing participants. To date, the program had assisted 221 households, including 6 affordable housing restricted homeowners who needed assistance with their mortgages. The program had started assisting households in July 2020 and 154 of those households, which represented 70% of program participants, still needed assistance at this time as their economic situations had still not improved. Ms. Berman reviewed the number of anticipated participants and funding needed to extend the program for one full year.

At this time, 191 of the 221 program participants have re-enrolled for additional funding, or 86% of all program participants. Ms. Berman stated that this shows there is a continued need for assistance beyond the originally anticipated three months for the majority of its participating households. The program has spent \$1.6 million of the \$2.5 million originally allocated from CPA and CDBG funding sources. The average monthly expense per household was \$1,410, which was significantly less than the City had originally estimated when the program was designed. As a result, there has been additional funding available to extend assistance for a longer period of time with first an extension to six months and then to eight months.

Ms. Berman next presented information on the participating households. While the program is open to any household with an income below 80% AMI, 90% of the participating households had incomes that were below 65% AMI. Over half of the program households, 55%, had incomes below 30% AMI and were considered to be extremely low-income households. Only five participating households lived in Housing Authority units. Ms. Berman reviewed the information on race and ethnicity, noting that the majority of participants were people of color.

Ms. Berman noted that they had come before the CPC several times in the past to make changes to the program. In September, staff had come before the CPC for the first time to request extending the program from three to six months after realizing that households were not seeing any economic improvement. In December, staff came in again to request to extend the program through eight months of assistance. The program was considered to be a housing stabilization program and has been a lifeline to many households who did not otherwise have the means to remain in their Newton units. Ms. Berman explained that the program was currently expected to run out of funding in February 2021. The CDC's eviction moratorium is currently scheduled to end on Jan. 31, and the program expected that many of its participating households would be in danger of homelessness at that time. While this deadline had changed in the past, the City could not expect this to change again.

Ms. Berman stated that the City was requesting additional funding to extend the program through June 2021 to continue to assist economically threatened households. The additional funding would also allow the program to continue to take in new applications through April 2021. Ms. Berman anticipated that this would expand the number of participating households to approximately 285. Metro West Development Corporation (MWDC) will continue to administer the program and to recertify participating households every three months to confirm that they still meet program requirements. Ms. Berman then reviewed those requirements as well as the landlord agreements that were currently in use.

Lastly, Ms. Berman reviewed the programs outreach and marketing. She noted that there had been a big push to get the word out to households over the summer and that they continued to market the program through the Mayor's newsletters and other sources. With the new funds, they planned to initiate a full force marketing campaign for new households. Ms. Berman reviewed how this would be done and explained the ongoing efforts and marketing partners.

Mr. Armstrong asked if this was a request for more funding or to extend the use of the existing funds. Ms. Berman answered that the \$1.2 million requested would be an addition to the existing program. Ms. Molinsky stated that she thought the additional funding made sense and wondered whether there were federal or other funds that could also be made available to the program. Ms. Berman explained that the program was originally funded with \$500,000 from CDBG federal CARES Act funds in addition to the \$2 million in CPA funding. These federal funds needed to be used specifically for programs and services responding to the Covid-19 crisis and included more restrictions and time constraints in comparison to the CPA funds. In response, this program was started using only the CDBG funds which were gone by early September. Ms. Berman went on to explain that there were other resources such as the Emergency Services Grant and Homelessness Prevention programs but that they all had their own nuances. Some programs, such as those run by Second Step and the Brookline Community Health Center, cannot be accessed until the renter has received a notice to quit. The Boston based RAFT and ERMA statewide programs are currently overwhelmed and do not go far enough for households that are in need. Ms. Berman noted that this program was certainly not the only option for assistance but was one of the most robust and easily accessible to Newton residents.

Ms. Weber noted that virtually none of the households have been able to leave the program yet and asked if there would be programs available to them in July when the assistance ended. She also noted that this program provided only rent relief and not assistance with re-employment or other concerns and asked if there was something that the CPC or City should be thinking about doing in March or April for this group. Ms. Berman noted that the rental assistance program was the only one run through the Planning Department, but that CDBG funding did go to other Human Services programs throughout Newton. She added that the City was currently working through its second round of Covid-19 funding which is designated for service providers.

Ms. Weber asked whether the length of the program should be reconsidered. Mr. Heath stated that this program had originally been developed to step into the breach and had already been extended far beyond the original timeframe. He was not sure where the City and community would be in four months and agreed that the program and City staff would continue to regularly meet and evaluate the program. Ms. Weber agreed that the program had been extended for longer than originally planned and explained that her concerns were with what might happen next. Ms. Berman noted that from day one, the program has been assisting those households that were most impacted by the pandemic and those who continue to be negatively impacted. She also noted that the program would continue to evaluate the needs of its participants and would continue to work to keep everyone housed. She added that this is a housing stabilization and preservation program with a goal of keeping everyone in their homes.

The public hearing was opened to public comment at this time.

Mr. Doeringer thought that the question of what Newton has to offer was a good one. He noted that the Planning and Development Board was working to find agencies to work on training and retraining out of work residents prior to the pandemic.

Mr. Armstrong noted that the program had originally planned to assist 300 residents, but that it had planned to assist for a much shorter time frame. Mr. Maloney stated that he thought it was an appropriate use of CPA funding.

Mr. Maloney moved to approve the proposal for \$1.2 million in additional CPA community housing funds to be used in the Covid-19 Emergency Housing Relief Program as requested. Mr. Smargiassi seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous roll call vote.

Discussion of potential plans to establish an Affordable Housing Trust in Newton

Ms. Kritzer explained that several City Council members had docketed an item to consider the creation of an Affordable Housing Trust in Newton. She explained that the City was beginning to look at what this would mean to the project funding and review process, and that she wanted the CPC to be aware of the possibility because CPA funds were often the primary source of funding for Housing Trust projects.

Members briefly discussed the uses of a Housing Trust and raised questions as to how it would impact the CPC funding process. Ms. Lunin expressed concern that giving a set amount of CPA funds reserved for community housing funds to the Trust might preclude large future projects that would otherwise come to the CPC for a portion of the undesignated funds. Ms. Molinsky stated that she had worked with housing trusts in other communities and explained her experiences with them. Ms. Datta noted that this idea had also been raised at the Housing Partnership's recent meeting and that there were a lot of issues and hurdles to be dealt with before a Trust was created. She thought that there was still a lot to learn but that it could be good for Newton if it helped to streamline the process.

Members raised questions about how a Trust would work with the CPA's regular process and the expertise that would be necessary for its success. Ms. Weber wondered if there were any exemplary examples from other communities that the CPC should review. Ms. Kritzer stated that the Massachusetts Housing Partnership had recently held a webinar on this subject and agreed to share the presentation with members after the meeting. Ms. Datta stated that she had attended the webinar and that Trusts were noted to be particularly useful in towns, where it could provide an easier process for developing town land. Members agreed to consider this issue further at a later meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Members briefly reviewed the existing financial information and Ms. Kritzer explained the updates to current projects since the last report.

Members next reviewed the draft minutes of the November 10 and December 8 meetings. Ms. Lunin moved to approve both sets of minutes as revised prior to the meeting. Ms. Weber seconded the motion which passed unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Lunin moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 P.M.