



BRIDGEWATER TOWN COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

7:00 p.m.

The meeting will be held virtually via Zoom.

To attend via video, click on the link below:

[Link to Join 10/20/2020 Town Council Meeting](#)

To attend via phone, dial: 1(646) 876-9923

Meeting ID: 977 9872 4753

MEETING AGENDA

Disclosure: Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Bridgewater Town Council will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. There will be no in person attendance permitted. Citizens who wish to tune in to the meeting may do so via Facebook Live.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- a) October 6, 2020

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDENT

- a) Future Town Council Meeting Start Times

C. PROCLAMATIONS

D. CITIZEN OPEN FORUM

E. APPOINTMENTS - *None*

F. HEARINGS

- a) 7:05 p.m.: Petition P-2020-019: Alteration of Premise to Class II Auto Dealer's License – 039 Auto Sales, Inc. 994 Bedford Street

G. LICENSE TRANSACTIONS

H. PRESENTATIONS

- a) Quarterly Update – *Anthony Sulmonte, Finance Director*

I. TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT

- a) Mitchell School Update (*Standing Item*)
- b) COVID-19 Update
- c) McElwain Property Update
- d) Trash Removal at Stiles and Hart Park
- e) Town-Wide Sidewalk Maintenance
- f) Items for Next Meeting:

J. DISCUSSIONS

K. COMMITTEE REPORTS

L. LEGISLATION FOR ACTION

- a) Order O-FY21-017: Transfer Order - CPC Recommendation - Central Square Congregational Church
The Budget & Finance Committee voted 3-0 to recommend this measure at their meeting held 9/21/20. The Finance Committee meet 10/19/20. Their disposition will be provided upon receipt. This measure may be finally voted this evening pending a disposition from Finance Committee.
- b) Order O-FY21-018: Old High School Purchase and Sale Agreement Ratification – Bridgewater, Raynham Regional School District
The Budget & Finance Committee meet 10/19/20 and will provide their disposition to the full Council. The Finance Committee meet 10/19/20. Their disposition will be provided upon receipt. This measure may be finally considered this evening pending the aforementioned committee dispositions.

M. OLD BUSINESS - *None*

N. NEW BUSINESS

- a) Order O-FY21-019: Acceptance of a Grant - Center for Tech and Civic Life COVID-19 Response Grant
(*Town Manager*)
- b) Order O-FY21-020: General Fund Free Cash Allocation to Trust Funds (*Town Manager*)
- c) Order O-FY21-021: Transfer Order - Police Department Capital Items (*Town Manager*)
- d) Order O-FY21-022: Transfer Order - Senior Center Capital Transfer (*Town Manager*)
- e) Order O-FY21-023: Transfer Order - Capital - Complete Streets Engineering (*Town Manager*)

O. CITIZEN COMMENTS

P. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Q. EXECUTIVE SESSION

R. ADJOURNMENT



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-017

Introduced By:	Town Manager
Date Introduced	September 8, 2020
First Reading:	September 8, 2020
Second Reading:	October 20, 2020
Amendments Adopted:	
Third Reading:	
Date Adopted:	
Date Effective:	

Order O-FY21-017

TRANSFER ORDER - CPC RECOMMENDATION - CENTRAL SQUARE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

WHEREAS: The Community Preservation Committee, with a quorum of members present, rendered its recommendation by a vote of 6-1 to the Town Council to fund the proposal from the Central Square Congregational Church at 71 Central Square for the restoration and renovation of the church's steeple. The request and the recommendation are for \$200,000.00 with the terms to be set forth in a grant agreement with the Town of Bridgewater to transfer the requested funds from the Community Preservation Account.

Now, therefore, it is hereby:

ORDERED, pursuant to Section 6-4 (d) of the Town of Bridgewater Charter, that the Town Council of Bridgewater, Massachusetts in Town Council assembled vote to appropriate to the Central Square Congregational Church, located at 71 Central Square, for historic preservation purposes, in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation as required by Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 44B, and which work shall be overseen by a Historic Preservationist, the restoration and renovation of the steeple; and to meet this appropriation, the sum of \$200,000.00 be taken from Community Preservation Historic Reserve and, if necessary, the balance from the Budgeted Reserve Account, as recommended by the Community Preservation Committee in the attached recommendation.

Explanation:

The Community Preservation Committee recommends funding of the Central Square Congregational Church steeple repair as outlined in the attached recommendation.

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
- Budget & Finance Committee - Finance Committee	9/21/20: Vote 3-0 recommend approval. 10/19/20:

ROLL CALL VOTE – REQUIRES MAJORITY OF THOSE PRESENT AND VOTING.



Town of Bridgewater

Community Preservation Committee

1 September 2020

To the Honorable Bridgewater Town Council:

The Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee (CPC) is pleased to send to the Town Council a recommendation for a grant from the Community Preservation Fund.

At its 12 August 2020 meeting, the Community Preservation Committee recommended approval (6-1) of the following application for referral to Council:

Central Square Congregational Church (CSCC) Steeple Restoration and Renovation for \$200,000

The order for Council's consideration of this grant and a summary of the project are attached. Your timely consideration will be greatly appreciated by the community and the CPC. We would welcome the opportunity to answer any questions you may have.

Best regards,

Gina Guasconi
Chairperson, Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

CENTRAL SQUARE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH (CSCC) STEEPLE RESTORATION AND RENOVATION FOR \$200,000

PROJECT GOALS AND ELIGIBILITY

Since 1821, Bridgewater's Central Square Congregational Church (CSCC) (71 Central Square) has been considered "one of the jewels of the Town Center" (Bridgewater Historical Commission). In preparation of the building's 200th anniversary, the CSCC seeks to renovate and preserve the building's exteriors, including its steeple which is "one of the most historically significant components of the church."

Per the CSCC's application, the building has provided, and continues to provide, a functional space for many secular and civic groups and activities, including Bicentennial and Tricentennial community gatherings, Alcoholics Anonymous, the Bridgewater State University Alumni Chamber Choir, Girl Scouts of Eastern Massachusetts, local music recitals and other community groups. In the 1870s, the CSCC's bell was used to alert the community of fires along the outskirts of town until an electric alarm system was adopted in the late 1880s. The bell has also been used to commemorate several important historic events and community-wide festivities, including the Tri-Town Centennial and Bicentennial ceremonies. This building is a contributing structure to the Town's local Town Center Historic District. In 2019, the CSCC hired Brian Pfeiffer, an architectural historian, to complete a detailed conditions assessment of the building which formed the basis for their scope of work.

The CPC determined that this project is eligible for funding under the Historic Preservation category of the Community Preservation Act which allows for the "acquisition, preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of historic resources." The CPA Act, as amended July 2012, defines a historic resource as "a building, structure, vessel, real property, document, or artifact that is listed on the state register of historic places or has been determined by the local historic preservation commission to be significant in the history, archeology, architecture, or culture of a city or town." Further, Community Preservation Funds can be used for improvements to make historic resources functional for their intended use, including improvements to comply with the American Disabilities Act and other building or access codes. On July 22, 2020, the CPC voted (6-0) that it believes the application does not violate the Massachusetts' Constitution's Anti-aid Amendment.

RECOMMENDED FUNDING

On August 12th, 2020 by a vote of 6-1, the Community Preservation Committee recommended that \$200,000 be appropriated to the Town of Bridgewater for improvements and repairs to the steeple as part of Phase I of the Central Square Congregational Church restoration project. The CPC recommended that funds should be appropriated from the historic preservation reserve (324200) of the Community Preservation Fund and may be applied for the uses listed below:

CPA-Funded Uses:

Restoration and preservation improvements to the CSCC steeple as listed in Phase 1 of the project budget (see detailed list)

Sources for Total Project:

- Community Preservation Fund: \$200,000
- CSCC Capital Campaign, public and private donations, and other funding: \$1.348 Million
- Total Project Cost: \$1.548 Million

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS & KEY OUTCOMES

The Community Preservation Committee also recommends appropriating CPA funds for this project with the following conditions to be formalized in an award letter if the Council approves funding:

1. The Recipient must agree to enter into and record a preservation restriction and maintenance agreement in perpetuity to provide assurance that an historic or culturally significant property's intrinsic values will be preserved through subsequent ownership by restricting the demolition or alteration of its significant historic features. The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) must approve the Preservation Restriction for it to be consistent with M.G.L. Chapter 184. The Preservation Restriction shall be recorded at the Registry of Deeds and held by the Town of Bridgewater.
2. Funds will be disbursed to the spending authority of the Central Square Congregational Church, with Barbara Morey, Historical Church Restoration Committee Chair as the project manager.
3. The project manager will provide the CPC with quarterly updates and with a final in-person and written report summarizing the project's planned versus actual expenses, process, and results.
4. Any portion of the Community Preservation Fund grant not used for the purposes stated above will be returned to the Bridgewater Community Preservation Fund.
5. The contractor will have demonstrated expertise and significant experience completing historic preservation work in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards.
6. The contract will be awarded in October 2020 and the project is expected to be completed by December 31, 2022.
7. All maintenance costs will be covered by the Central Square Congregational Church, as outlined a detailed maintenance plan (e.g., inspection frequency [quarterly, annually, etc., key building equipment, and systems inspection/testing frequency, who will conduct the inspections, written inspection report content requirements and any other maintenance items deem relevant by the Town's Facility Manager).

DETAILED USES

- Necessary associated general conditions costs including:
 - Temporary Protection and Safety (Entrances)
 - Dumpsters and Debris Disposal
 - Bonds, Insurance, and Warranty (5% of Cost)
 - Equipment Rentals
 - Staging
 - Administration and Associated Work
 - Police Details (not Bridgewater Police due to limitations on usage of CPA funds)
 - Superintendent
 - Permit Costs and other necessary soft costs
- Demolition of steeple's vinyl siding
- Repairs and replacement of deteriorated flush board siding on steeple(10%)
- Repairs and replacement of deteriorated clapboard siding on steeple (30%)
- Repairs to steeple's wood fascia (70%)
- Replacement of steeple's rake boards (10%)
- Preparation and painting of flush-, clapboard, belt course and trim on steeple
- Reconstruction of steeple windows
- Restoration of steeple's replacement wood windows E (6 windows)
- Replace belfry louvers H (4 louvers)
- Apply elastomeric roof coating to zcc steeple panels
- Repairs to weathervane base

- Replacement of clock face
- Necessary structural repairs to the steeple

RA RAWLINS | ASACK LLC.
Attorneys at Law

555 Bedford Street, Suite 1 • Bridgewater, MA 02324 • Phone: 508-470-8888 • Fax: 508-762-1322

Jason M. Rawlins, Esq
Alyssa N. Asack, Esq

Of Counsel to: Carter Deyoung
Hyannis, MA

To: Community Preservation Committee
Michael Dutton, Town Manager

From: Jason M. Rawlins, Esq., Town Attorney

Dated: May 26, 2020

I. Question Presented: If CPC may consider funding the application in its entirety or for any portion thereof relative to the Central Square Congregational Church?

II. Law

A. State Constitution

The Constitution of our state has what is known as the “anti-aid amendment”. Essentially, this section of our state Constitution prohibits the public funding of private enterprises.

Article 18, § 2, as amended by arts. 46 and 103 of the Massachusetts Constitution or the “anti-aid amendment” specifically reads as follows:

“No grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan or credit shall be made or authorized by the [C]ommonwealth or any political subdivision thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any infirmary, hospital, institution, primary or secondary school, or charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and supervision of public officers or public agents authorized by the [C]ommonwealth or federal authority or both, [with exceptions not relevant here]; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society.”

B. No unequivocal ban on the grant of public funds to churches

Despite the language stated above, the United States Supreme Court has held that “excluding a church from a government program solely because it is a church imposes a penalty on the free exercise of religion that must be subjected to the most rigorous scrutiny.”

Based upon that finding, Massachusetts has adopted a three factor test in analyzing whether or not providing public money to the founding, maintaining or aiding of a church, religious denomination or society is a violation of our states “anti-aid amendment”. Our State’s test is as follows:

1. The primary purpose of the funding?;
2. The effect of the funding?; and
3. Whether the funding might trigger the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment?

C. Three Factor Test

1. Is the primary purpose of the funding to aid this particular church rather than to serve the proper purpose of historic preservation?

The first factor to consider as outlined above requires a careful and detailed analysis by the CPC to determine if the purpose here is for historic preservation (possibly requiring the implementation of historic preservation restrictions being placed on the building) or whether it is truly intended to aid this particular church.

2. Whether the effect of the funding is to substantially aid the church?

Case law in Massachusetts makes clear that a grant of public funds does not violate the anti-aid amendment if the assistance it provides to a private institution is merely “minimal” or “remote”.

In evaluating this factor, the CPC should look to both the amount of aid provided and “the degree to which the aid assists [the church] in carrying out [its] essential function.”

In a Massachusetts case whose facts somewhat resemble those of the current Central Square Congregational Church application, *George Caplan v. Town of Acton*, our State’s highest court found that funding the restoration of stained glass windows at a cost of around \$51,237.00 and a Master Plan grant in the amount of \$49,500.00 was “neither minimal nor insignificant”.

Additionally, in that case, our State’s highest Court found:

“More worrisome is the extent to which these grants will assist the church in its ‘essential enterprise’ as an active house of worship. The church was candid in its grant applications, explaining that—faced with declining membership and contributions—it would need the town’s ‘help’ in order to preserve its buildings while also “offering the congregation what draws them to their church....

Here...the grants would help defray planning and restoration costs that the church would otherwise have to shoulder on its own, allowing the money saved to be used to support its core religious activities.”

3. *Whether the funding avoids the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment.*

The anti-aid amendment was proposed in 1853 not to abolish an existing practice of funding religious institutions—no one at the Convention alleged the existence of such a practice—but instead as a preemptive measure to avoid the risks associated with the public financial support of religious institutions.

The specific risks which prompted the revision of the anti-aid amendment in 1917 were as follows:

1. The risk that ‘liberty of conscience’ would be infringed ‘whenever a citizen was taxed to support the religious institutions of others’;
2. The risk that public funding would result in improper government entanglement with religion, undermining the “independence and dignity” of churches; and
3. The risk that the public support of religious institutions would threaten “civic harmony,” making the divisive “questions of religion” a political question.

Again, in *Caplan v. Town of Acton*, our State’s highest Court addressed these “risks” in a similar context to that which is before the CPC with the current Central Square Congregational Church application. The Court made the following findings in that case:

1. First, these grants risk infringing on taxpayers’ liberty of conscience—a risk that was specifically contemplated by the framers of the anti-aid amendment;
2. Second, these grants also present a risk of government entanglement with religion; and
3. Third, the challenged grants also risk threatening “civic harmony,” by making the “question of religion” a political one. The Court stated specifically, “grants for the renovation of churches—using funds that could potentially have been dedicated to open space, soccer fields, low-income housing, or other historic preservation projects, including projects for the renovation of houses of worship of other religious denominations—pose an inevitable risk of making “the irritating question of religion” a politically divisive one in a community, the more so where those grants are for the renovation of a worship space or of a stained glass window with explicit religious imagery.”

III. Answer To Question Presented

Yes, the CPC *may consider* this application in its entirety or for any portion thereof. However, such consideration requires a specific factual evaluation under the multiple factors outlined above. If the CPC's considerations do not pass the detailed tests set forth in this memorandum, then the funding of the project or the specific portions being considered would constitute a violation of our State's "anti-aid amendment" and would not be proper under the law.

Please take note, the current application of the Central Square Congregational Church seems to have many substantive similarities to the *Caplan v. Town of Acton* case. Accordingly, I believe the CPC should utilize this memorandum and that case as a valuable frame of reference in evaluating the current application.

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE

FROM: MICHAEL DUTTON, TOWN MANAGER

SUBJECT: ACTON CASE AND IMPACT ON USE OF CPA FUNDS

DATE: JULY 8, 2018

CC: LARA KRITZER, CONSULTANT; KIM WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT TOWN MANAGER; TONY SULMONTE, FINANCE DIRECTOR

At your last meeting, we had a brief discussion of the Acton case which involved Community Preservation Funds and their use to fund the renovation of stained glass windows in a historically significant church.

The Acton case involved two grants recommended by the Acton CPC and approved by Town Meeting to the Acton Congregational Church. The first grant was to preserve stained glass windows in the main church building. The second grant was for an architectural evaluation of the preservation work required for the church and two other buildings on its property. Both grants were challenged by “ten taxpayers” who filed suit under G.L. c. 40, § 53.

The Massachusetts Constitution has a provision, commonly referred to as the “anti-aid amendment,” which reads:

“No grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of credit shall be made or authorized by the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any . . . charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned.”

In evaluating a grant of public money to any non-profit or religious institution, the Court will consider three factors.

1. Whether the grant is for maintaining or aiding a non-profit or religious organization.
2. Whether the effect of the grants is to substantially aid a non-profit or religious organization (This element almost always will be met).
3. Whether the risks meant to be avoided by the Anti-Aid amendment are implicated by the grant, specifically:
 - Risk that “liberty of conscience” would be infringed;
 - Risk that public funding would result in entanglement with religion; or
 - Risk that the public support of religious institutions would threaten “civic harmony.”

In applying this analysis to the stained glass grant in question, the Court concluded that the grant for the stained glass window restoration was impermissible. Regardless of the purpose of the

grant, the risk of entanglement between religion and government was too great. On the architectural evaluation grant, the court found that further facts are needed to determine whether the architectural evaluation grant was permissible (including what portion of the grant was to be used on the church building itself), but the Court left the clear impression that it would be difficult to overcome the presumption that the grant would be an impermissible entanglement.

The court reiterated several clear principles. First, a grant of public funds to an active church warrants careful [judicial] scrutiny. Second, any use of the funds to support religious imagery or an active place of worship is very likely impermissible, with a very narrow exception “where historical events of great significance occurred in the church.” Third, the grant application will be reviewed closely by the courts. Fourth, any suggestion that the funds are needed to assist the religious mission of the entity will be problematic. Fifth, under a recent United States Supreme Court decision, a grant application may not be rejected on the sole basis that the applicant is a religious organization.

As it applies to the Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee, the following should provide guidance:

1. Nothing prohibits a religious institution from applying for CPC funds, however the application should be very carefully scrutinized through the lense of the Court’s decision;
2. The CPC should determine if the requesting entity or structure is of substantial historical significance;
3. If the funds are being requested to offset cost which would otherwise be incurred by the church, it is highly likely that it is an impermissible grant;
4. Any request for funds to repair/renovate/restore any part of the church which itself carries religious significance (stained glass windows, steeple, etc.) is impermissible.

In short, the Court failed to provide clear guidance to cities and towns which make historic preservation grants to religious institutions. However, based on the reading of the decision, it is likely that funds granted to other churches in Bridgewater in years past would not be so granted today.

As always, please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

MEMORANDUM

July 17, 2020, Revised July 20, 2020

To: Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee (CPC)
From: Anna Callahan, JM Goldson LLC
Re: Central Square Congregational Church Application – Summary of CPC Analysis re: Anti-Aid Amendment Three-Factor Test

I have compiled the **four** responses from CPC members submitted to the CPC in preparation of the CPC's 7/22/20 meeting. The purpose is to summarize CPC members' individual analysis of the Central Square Congregational Church Building application in light of the 3-factor test outlined in the *Caplan et al. v. Town of Acton* case.¹ This memo reflects those opinions and should not be perceived as binding the CPC nor should it be used as legal advice in any way. If specific legal questions arise, the Town Attorney or DOR should be consulted.

1. Key Facts of Central Square Congregational Church Building Application

Applicant: Central Square Congregational Church

Project Name: Central Square Congregational Church Building (71 Central Square)

CPA Category(ies): Historic Preservation

Project Description: Complete restoration of the building's envelope, including repairing the church's steeple, replacing the siding, and making repairs to the brackets and other architectural features of the exterior.

CPA Amount Requested: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

Total Project Cost: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

2. Three-Factor Test Summary of CPC Opinions

- 1. Is the grant for maintaining or aiding a non-profit or religious organization? *What is the primary purpose of the funding? (is it to aid this particular church rather than to serve the proper purpose of historic preservation?)***

Members felt that historic preservation, rather than religion, was the primary motivating purpose of the grant application—but there were still underlying concerns with the applicant being a church. One response, in particular, stated that the application:

“clearly indicates the project is for historical preservation of the building which served and continues to serve many civic functions over its history... [and] thoroughly documents the building's role in the community, then and now since

¹ <https://law.justia.com/cases/massachusetts/supreme-court/2018/sjc-12274.html>

original construction. Nowhere in the application does the church suggest or convey request is to aid the church in its religious mission. However, that may be an interpretation by others."

Another response echoed this feeling:

"The church building, itself, is of civic and architectural importance to the Town of Bridgewater, and the exterior of the building needs significant funding to restore its architectural splendor."

Another interpretation felt that some of the proposed work potentially fell under regular repairs rather than historic preservation.

"I feel much of their application pertains to things that should have been taken care of with general maintenance (ie downspouts, gutters, drainage, loose/missing roof shingles) and/or a result of inferior products previously installed (ie siding and roofing) and are not completely necessary for the purpose of historic renovation."

2. Does the grant substantially aid a non-profit or religious organization? *Whether the effect of the funding is to substantially aid the church?*

Two responses focused on the interpretation of the word "aid" and found that the request would not aid the religious organization to perpetuate its beliefs, other than allowing the Central Square Congregational Church (CSCC) to use their own funds for that purpose.

One response also highlighted the significant civic role that CSCC has played in the community:

"....the Church assumed many necessary and important civic responsibilities during its almost 200 year history and continues to do so today. In the Town of Bridgewater the building serves as much a civic/cultural function as it does religious in contemporary America. "

Other responses focused on the interpretation of "substantially" and felt that the Central Square Congregational Church is asking "for a substantial amount to aid them in their renovations." According to a letter from Town Attorney Jason M. Rawlins (May 20th 2020), "Case law in MA makes it clear that a grant of public funds does not violate the anti-aid amendment if the assistance it provides to a private institution is merely 'minimal' or 'remote.'" A letter Kevin M Plante, Esq., General Counsel to the CSCC echoes this interpretation, "The aid provided in the form of funding must provide 'substantial assistance' to the church to risk violation of the Anti-Aid Amendment."

One response highlighted the \$49,500 grant amount from *Caplan et al. vs Town of Action* case was determined neither "minimal nor insignificant" and that the amount requested by the CSCC is 30 times greater. Another response argued that historic preservation and

restoration projects by nature..."are very costly because of the labor-intensive work that goes into [them]."

3. Are the following risks that are meant to be avoided by the anti-aid amendment implicated by the grant? *Whether the funding avoids the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment?*

- a. Risk of "liberty of conscience" being infringed**
- b. Risk that public funding would lead to entanglement with religion**
- c. Risk that public support of religious institutions would threaten 'civic harmony'**

Three responses felt that funding the project in part or in whole does avoid these risks—but one worried whether funding this application would set a precedent for future requests. One response highlighted that the state has awarded grants to churches and religious institutions to restore their historic buildings—and noted that these have not been politically divisive in the past. Two responses noted that funding this project would help achieve the Town's goals of improving Bridgewater's downtown area. One, in particular., noted that this project would further progress on restoring the Common's "architectural triangle," the Central Square Congregational Church, the Academy Building, and Town Hall building.

3. Conclusions

- Members felt that the primary proposed scope of work was for historic preservation and renovations of a building owned by a religious organization that has served civic functions in the community.
- Although members agreed that funding would not aid the church in its religious purpose, there were concerns that the requested funding amount is "substantial."
- Members felt that funding the project would avoid the risks associated with the public support of religious institutions as outlined in the state's anti-aid amendment.

More information and discussion is likely needed on what elements the CPC may fund to address concerns over the funding amount and the second factor in the three-factor test.

M E M O R A N D U M

August 6, 2020

To: Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee (CPC)
From: Anna Callahan, JM Goldson LLC
Re: Central Square Congregational Church Application – Summary of CPC Analysis re: Funding Eligibility

I have compiled the four responses from CPC members submitted to the CPC in preparation of the CPC's 8/12/20 meeting. The purpose is to summarize CPC members' individual responses for what elements they would fund of the Central Square Congregational Church Building application. This memo reflects those opinions and should not be perceived as binding the CPC nor should it be used as legal advice in any way. If specific legal questions arise, the Town Attorney or DOR should be consulted.

1. Key Facts of Central Square Congregational Church Building Application

Applicant: Central Square Congregational Church

Project Name: Central Square Congregational Church Building (71 Central Square)

CPA Category(ies): Historic Preservation

Project Description: Complete restoration of the building's envelope, including repairing the church's steeple, replacing the siding, and making repairs to the brackets and other architectural features of the exterior.

CPA Amount Requested: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

Total Project Cost: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

2. Funding Eligibility Summary of CPC Opinions

Response A. Response A felt that the majority of elements in the application had merit with a few exceptions.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$1.49 Million**. This includes **all costs EXCEPT Landscape Restoration and Storm Window Replacement** plus associated soft costs, and estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%)

Response B. Response B was primarily concerned with substantial structural repairs of the building and felt that some of the other repair work included was more general maintenance rather than capital improvements.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$178,000**. This only includes costs to **repair/repoint chimney masonry and flashing; restoration of the original wood windows and structural repairs** plus estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%). It does not include soft costs because it is not clear how much is needed to support these elements.

Response C. Response C wanted to focus on the steeple since the CSCC identified it as Phase 1 and the steeple seems to be the part of the building that has the most historical significance. In light of the SJC ruling regarding “substantial aid” in the Acton case, Response C was cautious around the total funding costs and would support spending a maximum of \$100,000 towards the steeple.

Total estimated funding amount (phase 1 plus some add-ons): **\$270,000.**¹ This includes **all costs for Phase 1 (Steeple) EXCEPT Landscape Restoration/General Conditions, Demolition of Vinyl Siding, Demolition of Asphalt Roof Shingles, and Additional Evaluation** plus Phase I permit costs, soft costs, and estimated contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%).

Other elements that Response C said they would potentially fund include:

- restore and repair the arches over the windows so that they are all the same
- repair the wall cladding and trim
- restore interior partition in the choir loft to restore it to the original configuration
- repair the chimney

They thought the following should not be funded with CPA funds:

- Roofing – the application says the roof is both in good shape and “undertermined”
- Siding – The siding appears in relatively good shape per the application and site visit. Response C did agree that the CSCC should develop a long-term plan to expose the original wood.

Response D. Response D prioritized restoration of the original siding and repairs to the chimney.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$231,400**. This includes

- General Condition costs EXCEPT Bonds/Insurance/Warranty, Staging, Police Details, and Landscape Restoration
- Demolition of Vinyl Siding and Sheet Metal Trim on Belt Course and Windows
- Repair and Replacement of Deteriorated Siding and Belt Course
- Repairs to Wood Soffits, Wood Fascia, and Rake Boards
- Prepare/Paint Siding, Belt Course, Wood Soffits, and Wood Fascia
- Repair Chimney, Chimney Flashing, and Weathervane Base
- Plus estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%)

¹ Note to compare all responses on the same footing, this memo uses the estimated costs for the steeple from the most recent CSCC detailed budget. Response C noted that there was an updated cost for the steeple from David Shiebley.

They thought the following should not be funded with CPA funds:

- Police Details
- Landscape Restoration
- Installation of the Chimney Flute
- Vinyl Window costs
- Stained Glass Window Restoration
- Storm Window Replacement
- Installation of attic vent and ventilation.

They also felt that the items under the “Structural Repairs” section were too vague/in need of more detail to determine eligibility. They considered the rest of the elements were D to be questionable eligible.

3. Conclusions

- Members agreed that Landscape Restoration and Storm Window Replacement should not be funded with CPA funds. Most also agreed that Vinyl Window costs and Gutter and Downspout costs should be excluded.
- All responses would consider Chimney Repairs be funded with CPA funds (\$24,250 plus estimated permit, contingency, mobilization, and overhead costs).
- There was mixed opinions on what was the top priority or need for the Congregational Church. The responses included:
 - Structural repairs
 - The steeple
 - Restoration of the original siding
- Total funding packages ranged from \$178,000 up to \$1.49 Million. The median amount between all four responses would be around \$250,000.

More information and discussion is likely needed on what elements are the most important/highest priority or need by the Congregational Church.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee



Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi, Chair
Recreation Commission

Carlton Hunt, Vice-Chair
Citizen at Large

Kevin Mandeville
Open Space Committee

Joan Neumeister
Housing Authority

Jean Guarino
Planning Board

Harry Bailey, Jr.
Conservation Commission

Stephen Rogan
Historical Commission

William Smith
Historic District Commission

-
Affordable Housing Trust

—
Joshua McGraw
Staff Assistant

Meeting Minutes July 22nd, 2020

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:03PM

Members Present: Gina Guasconi, Jean Guarino, Carlton Hunt, Harry Bailey, William Smith, Kevin Mandeville (Arrived 6:18, left at 8:30)

Members Absent: Steven Rogan, Joan Neumeister

Guests Present: Anthony Sulmonte – Finance Director, Laurie Guerrini – Finance Department, Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke – CED Director, James Walsh, Barbara Morey, Terry Reynolds, Rachel Lawson, Eileen Hiney, Gordon Brielisford

Call to order – 6:03PM

Public Comments – No public comment.

Approval of minutes – May 27th, 2020 & June 24th, 2020

Carlton Hunt motioned to approve the minutes from May 27th, 2020, William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to approve the minutes from June 24th, 2020 as amended, William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to amend the minutes to have Rachel Lawson, Gloria Weinreve, and Gordon Brielisford added to the June 24th meeting minutes, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Financial Update

No changes to the financials for the CPC at this time. The tax revenue is expected to be presented at the next meeting to the committee.

Congregational Church Application – Discussion and Vote

Application Analysis Discussion and Vote

The committee reviewed and discussed the comments and questions gathered by Anna Callahan from individual CPC members. Discussion centered around if the funding could be considered aid outside of historical preservation.

William Smith motioned to recommend the application as eligible for CPC funding, Carlton Hunt seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

Funding Eligibility Discussion and Vote

Representatives from the church answered questions from the committee on specific funding on the project. The committee has asked that the church submit a priority list to the CPC detailing work and a breakdown per segment, ie. steeple, roof, doors/windows, they want funded if their application is approved.

The committee will look to review the new breakdown from the church before voting on the funding.

Jean motioned to continue discussion on the application and discuss again on August 12th at 6PM, Carlton Hunt seconded. The motion was approved unanimously

Process Update

Jennifer Burke is still working on the process update and will look to provide the draft to the committee by the next regularly scheduled meeting.

FY21 Discussion for Consultant Work

There has been discussion between Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke, and Gina Guasconi on the scope of work for JM Goldson moving forward. Gina has asked for a reference list on what work would be within the scope for JM Goldson. Anna Callahan has asked that the committee also prioritize the jobs the CPC would like her to participate in.

Old Business

Barstow House

James Walsh has reached out to the realtor that is working on the sale of the house. The two options being presented for the sale are under 40b housing or assisted living housing.

Alden House

Historic New England, Anna Callahan, Gina Guasconi met with the owners of the Alden House. Follow-up information pertaining to the discussion was sent, however, the owners have yet to respond.

Housing Trust

Carlton Hunt motioned to take discussion of the Housing Trust out of order; Jean Guarino seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

There are no updates to the housing trust at this time.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

New Business

Carlton Hunt motioned to continue discussion on remaining items at the next regularly scheduled meeting. William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to adjourn at 8:35PM, William Smith seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Adjourn – 8:35PM

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee



Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi, Chair
Recreation Commission

Carlton Hunt, Vice-Chair
Citizen at Large

Kevin Mandeville
Open Space Committee

Joan Neumeister
Housing Authority

Jean Guarino
Planning Board

Harry Bailey, Jr.
Conservation Commission

Stephen Rogan
Historical Commission

William Smith
Historic District Commission

-
Affordable Housing Trust

—
Joshua McGraw
Staff Assistant

Meeting Minutes August 12th, 2020

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:03PM

Members Present: Gina Guasconi, Jean Guarino, Carlton Hunt, Harry Bailey, William Smith, Steven Rogan, Kevin Mandeville (Arrived 7:50)

Members Absent: Joan Neumeister

Guests Present: Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke – CED Director, James Walsh, Barbara Morey, Terry Reynolds, Janet Hanson, Jason Wagner

Call to order – 6:00PM

Public Comment – No public comment.

Congregational Church (CSCC) Application - Financial Eligibility Discussion and Vote

The chair offered two options for discussion on funding through the CPC and left it up to the committee to motion which option they feel is best for the application. A list of prioritized work was submitted by Barbara Morey and distributed to the committee prior to the meeting. Anna Callahan shared the responses of the CPC members regarding the application that were submitted to her after the last meeting of the CPC. A list of funding precedents in Bridgewater and the Acton cases were shown to the committee. The committee reviewed information provided by William Smith on CPA and CPC funding projects in Braintree and Boston that involved churches. The committee believes the historic significance will outweigh the religious significance of what is funded in the application. The committee thoroughly discussed funding for several elements of the prioritized list provided by the church but ultimately settled on funding the restoration of the steeple at this time.

Carlton Hunt motioned to discuss the elements that should be funded by the CPC, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. Carlton Hunt withdrew his original motion, William Smith seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to consider funding of all the elements that are eligible for historic preservation money. William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Harry Bailey motioned to recommend funding for the steeple, roof, and chimney in the amount of \$130,000, Gina Guasconi seconded the motion. The motion was not approved with a vote of 1 ye and 6 nays.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi motioned to amend the \$130,000 to restricting to the cost of materials and labor and not the soft cost, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. Approved 6 yea and 1 nay.

Kevin Mandeville motioned that the chimney, steeple and door funding be recommended, totaling \$168,717, Carlton Hunt seconded the motion. The motion was not approved with a vote of 1 yea and 6 nays.

Carlton Hunt motioned to continue discussion at the next meeting of the CPC where a final vote will be taken, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. Steven Rogan withdrew his seconding of the motion. Carlton Hunt withdrew the motion.

Carlton Hunt motioned to fund the steeple restoration for \$200,000 against the total cost with the details to be provided by the next meeting, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. The motion was approved with a vote of 6 yea, 1 nay.

Carlton Hunt motioned to adjourn at 9:36PM, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Adjourn – 9:36PM

RA RAWLINS | ASACK LLC.
Attorneys at Law

555 Bedford Street, Suite 1 • Bridgewater, MA 02324 • Phone: 508-470-8888 • Fax: 508-762-1322

Jason M. Rawlins, Esq
Alyssa N. Asack, Esq

Of Counsel to: Carter Deyoung
Hyannis, MA

To: Community Preservation Committee
Michael Dutton, Town Manager

From: Jason M. Rawlins, Esq., Town Attorney

Dated: May 26, 2020

I. Question Presented: If CPC may consider funding the application in its entirety or for any portion thereof relative to the Central Square Congregational Church?

II. Law

A. State Constitution

The Constitution of our state has what is known as the “anti-aid amendment”. Essentially, this section of our state Constitution prohibits the public funding of private enterprises.

Article 18, § 2, as amended by arts. 46 and 103 of the Massachusetts Constitution or the “anti-aid amendment” specifically reads as follows:

“No grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan or credit shall be made or authorized by the [C]ommonwealth or any political subdivision thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any infirmity, hospital, institution, primary or secondary school, or charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and supervision of public officers or public agents authorized by the [C]ommonwealth or federal authority or both, [with exceptions not relevant here]; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society.”

B. No unequivocal ban on the grant of public funds to churches

Despite the language stated above, the United States Supreme Court has held that “excluding a church from a government program solely because it is a church imposes a penalty on the free exercise of religion that must be subjected to the most rigorous scrutiny.”

Based upon that finding, Massachusetts has adopted a three factor test in analyzing whether or not providing public money to the founding, maintaining or aiding of a church, religious denomination or society is a violation of our states “anti-aid amendment”. Our State’s test is as follows:

1. The primary purpose of the funding?;
2. The effect of the funding?; and
3. Whether the funding might trigger the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment?

C. Three Factor Test

1. Is the primary purpose of the funding to aid this particular church rather than to serve the proper purpose of historic preservation?

The first factor to consider as outlined above requires a careful and detailed analysis by the CPC to determine if the purpose here is for historic preservation (possibly requiring the implementation of historic preservation restrictions being placed on the building) or whether it is truly intended to aid this particular church.

2. Whether the effect of the funding is to substantially aid the church?

Case law in Massachusetts makes clear that a grant of public funds does not violate the anti-aid amendment if the assistance it provides to a private institution is merely “minimal” or “remote”.

In evaluating this factor, the CPC should look to both the amount of aid provided and “the degree to which the aid assists [the church] in carrying out [its] essential function.”

In a Massachusetts case whose facts somewhat resemble those of the current Central Square Congregational Church application, *George Caplan v. Town of Acton*, our State’s highest court found that funding the restoration of stained glass windows at a cost of around \$51,237.00 and a Master Plan grant in the amount of \$49,500.00 was “neither minimal nor insignificant”.

Additionally, in that case, our State’s highest Court found:

“More worrisome is the extent to which these grants will assist the church in its ‘essential enterprise’ as an active house of worship. The church was candid in its grant applications, explaining that—faced with declining membership and contributions—it would need the town’s ‘help’ in order to preserve its buildings while also “offering the congregation what draws them to their church....

Here...the grants would help defray planning and restoration costs that the church would otherwise have to shoulder on its own, allowing the money saved to be used to support its core religious activities.”

3. *Whether the funding avoids the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment.*

The anti-aid amendment was proposed in 1853 not to abolish an existing practice of funding religious institutions—no one at the Convention alleged the existence of such a practice—but instead as a preemptive measure to avoid the risks associated with the public financial support of religious institutions.

The specific risks which prompted the revision of the anti-aid amendment in 1917 were as follows:

1. The risk that ‘liberty of conscience’ would be infringed ‘whenever a citizen was taxed to support the religious institutions of others’;
2. The risk that public funding would result in improper government entanglement with religion, undermining the “independence and dignity” of churches; and
3. The risk that the public support of religious institutions would threaten “civic harmony,” making the divisive “questions of religion” a political question.

Again, in *Caplan v. Town of Acton*, our State’s highest Court addressed these “risks” in a similar context to that which is before the CPC with the current Central Square Congregational Church application. The Court made the following findings in that case:

1. First, these grants risk infringing on taxpayers’ liberty of conscience—a risk that was specifically contemplated by the framers of the anti-aid amendment;
2. Second, these grants also present a risk of government entanglement with religion; and
3. Third, the challenged grants also risk threatening “civic harmony,” by making the “question of religion” a political one. The Court stated specifically, “grants for the renovation of churches—using funds that could potentially have been dedicated to open space, soccer fields, low-income housing, or other historic preservation projects, including projects for the renovation of houses of worship of other religious denominations—pose an inevitable risk of making “the irritating question of religion” a politically divisive one in a community, the more so where those grants are for the renovation of a worship space or of a stained glass window with explicit religious imagery.”

III. Answer To Question Presented

Yes, the CPC *may consider* this application in its entirety or for any portion thereof. However, such consideration requires a specific factual evaluation under the multiple factors outlined above. If the CPC's considerations do not pass the detailed tests set forth in this memorandum, then the funding of the project or the specific portions being considered would constitute a violation of our State's "anti-aid amendment" and would not be proper under the law.

Please take note, the current application of the Central Square Congregational Church seems to have many substantive similarities to the *Caplan v. Town of Acton* case. Accordingly, I believe the CPC should utilize this memorandum and that case as a valuable frame of reference in evaluating the current application.

M E M O R A N D U M

July 17, 2020, Revised July 20, 2020

To: Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee (CPC)
From: Anna Callahan, JM Goldson LLC
Re: Central Square Congregational Church Application – Summary of CPC Analysis re: Anti-Aid Amendment Three-Factor Test

I have compiled the **four** responses from CPC members submitted to the CPC in preparation of the CPC's 7/22/20 meeting. The purpose is to summarize CPC members' individual analysis of the Central Square Congregational Church Building application in light of the 3-factor test outlined in the *Caplan et al. v. Town of Acton* case.¹ This memo reflects those opinions and should not be perceived as binding the CPC nor should it be used as legal advice in any way. If specific legal questions arise, the Town Attorney or DOR should be consulted.

1. Key Facts of Central Square Congregational Church Building Application

Applicant: Central Square Congregational Church

Project Name: Central Square Congregational Church Building (71 Central Square)

CPA Category(ies): Historic Preservation

Project Description: Complete restoration of the building's envelope, including repairing the church's steeple, replacing the siding, and making repairs to the brackets and other architectural features of the exterior.

CPA Amount Requested: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

Total Project Cost: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

2. Three-Factor Test Summary of CPC Opinions

- 1. Is the grant for maintaining or aiding a non-profit or religious organization? *What is the primary purpose of the funding? (is it to aid this particular church rather than to serve the proper purpose of historic preservation?)***

Members felt that historic preservation, rather than religion, was the primary motivating purpose of the grant application—but there were still underlying concerns with the applicant being a church. One response, in particular, stated that the application:

“clearly indicates the project is for historical preservation of the building which served and continues to serve many civic functions over its history... [and] thoroughly documents the building's role in the community, then and now since

¹ <https://law.justia.com/cases/massachusetts/supreme-court/2018/sjc-12274.html>

original construction. Nowhere in the application does the church suggest or convey request is to aid the church in its religious mission. However, that may be an interpretation by others.”

Another response echoed this feeling:

“The church building, itself, is of civic and architectural importance to the Town of Bridgewater, and the exterior of the building needs significant funding to restore its architectural splendor.”

Another interpretation felt that some of the proposed work potentially fell under regular repairs rather than historic preservation.

“I feel much of their application pertains to things that should have been taken care of with general maintenance (ie downspouts, gutters, drainage, loose/missing roof shingles) and/or a result of inferior products previously installed (ie siding and roofing) and are not completely necessary for the purpose of historic renovation.”

2. Does the grant substantially aid a non-profit or religious organization? *Whether the effect of the funding is to substantially aid the church?*

Two responses focused on the interpretation of the word “aid” and found that the request would not aid the religious organization to perpetuate its beliefs, other than allowing the Central Square Congregational Church (CSCC) to use their own funds for that purpose.

One response also highlighted the significant civic role that CSCC has played in the community:

“....the Church assumed many necessary and important civic responsibilities during its almost 200 year history and continues to do so today. In the Town of Bridgewater the building serves as much a civic/cultural function as it does religious in contemporary America. ”

Other responses focused on the interpretation of “substantially” and felt that the Central Square Congregational Church is asking “for a substantial amount to aid them in their renovations.” According to a letter from Town Attorney Jason M. Rawlins (May 20th 2020), “Case law in MA makes it clear that a grant of public funds does not violate the anti-aid amendment if the assistance it provides to a private institution is merely 'minimal' or 'remote.'” A letter Kevin M Plante, Esq., General Counsel to the CSCC echoes this interpretation, “The aid provided in the form of funding must provide 'substantial assistance' to the church to risk violation of the Anti-Aid Amendment.”

One response highlighted the \$49,500 grant amount from *Caplan et al. vs Town of Action* case was determined neither “minimal nor insignificant” and that the amount requested by the CSCC is 30 times greater. Another response argued that historic preservation and

restoration projects by nature..."are very costly because of the labor-intensive work that goes into [them]."

3. Are the following risks that are meant to be avoided by the anti-aid amendment implicated by the grant? *Whether the funding avoids the risks that prompted the passage of the anti-aid amendment?*

- a. Risk of "liberty of conscience" being infringed**
- b. Risk that public funding would lead to entanglement with religion**
- c. Risk that public support of religious institutions would threaten 'civic harmony'**

Three responses felt that funding the project in part or in whole does avoid these risks—but one worried whether funding this application would set a precedent for future requests. One response highlighted that the state has awarded grants to churches and religious institutions to restore their historic buildings—and noted that these have not been politically divisive in the past. Two responses noted that funding this project would help achieve the Town's goals of improving Bridgewater's downtown area. One, in particular., noted that this project would further progress on restoring the Common's "architectural triangle," the Central Square Congregational Church, the Academy Building, and Town Hall building.

3. Conclusions

- Members felt that the primary proposed scope of work was for historic preservation and renovations of a building owned by a religious organization that has served civic functions in the community.
- Although members agreed that funding would not aid the church in its religious purpose, there were concerns that the requested funding amount is "substantial."
- Members felt that funding the project would avoid the risks associated with the public support of religious institutions as outlined in the state's anti-aid amendment.

More information and discussion is likely needed on what elements the CPC may fund to address concerns over the funding amount and the second factor in the three-factor test.

M E M O R A N D U M

August 6, 2020

To: Bridgewater Community Preservation Committee (CPC)
From: Anna Callahan, JM Goldson LLC
Re: Central Square Congregational Church Application – Summary of CPC Analysis re: Funding Eligibility

I have compiled the four responses from CPC members submitted to the CPC in preparation of the CPC's 8/12/20 meeting. The purpose is to summarize CPC members' individual responses for what elements they would fund of the Central Square Congregational Church Building application. This memo reflects those opinions and should not be perceived as binding the CPC nor should it be used as legal advice in any way. If specific legal questions arise, the Town Attorney or DOR should be consulted.

1. Key Facts of Central Square Congregational Church Building Application

Applicant: Central Square Congregational Church

Project Name: Central Square Congregational Church Building (71 Central Square)

CPA Category(ies): Historic Preservation

Project Description: Complete restoration of the building's envelope, including repairing the church's steeple, replacing the siding, and making repairs to the brackets and other architectural features of the exterior.

CPA Amount Requested: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

Total Project Cost: \$1.55 Million (\$1,548,753.88)

2. Funding Eligibility Summary of CPC Opinions

Response A. Response A felt that the majority of elements in the application had merit with a few exceptions.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$1.49 Million**. This includes **all costs EXCEPT Landscape Restoration and Storm Window Replacement** plus associated soft costs, and estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%)

Response B. Response B was primarily concerned with substantial structural repairs of the building and felt that some of the other repair work included was more general maintenance rather than capital improvements.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$178,000**. This only includes costs to **repair/repoint chimney masonry and flashing; restoration of the original wood windows and structural repairs** plus estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%). It does not include soft costs because it is not clear how much is needed to support these elements.

Response C. Response C wanted to focus on the steeple since the CSCC identified it as Phase 1 and the steeple seems to be the part of the building that has the most historical significance. In light of the SJC ruling regarding “substantial aid” in the Acton case, Response C was cautious around the total funding costs and would support spending a maximum of \$100,000 towards the steeple.

Total estimated funding amount (phase 1 plus some add-ons): **\$270,000.**¹ This includes **all costs for Phase 1 (Steeple) EXCEPT Landscape Restoration/General Conditions, Demolition of Vinyl Siding, Demolition of Asphalt Roof Shingles, and Additional Evaluation** plus Phase I permit costs, soft costs, and estimated contingency (15%), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%).

Other elements that Response C said they would potentially fund include:

- restore and repair the arches over the windows so that they are all the same
- repair the wall cladding and trim
- restore interior partition in the choir loft to restore it to the original configuration
- repair the chimney

They thought the following should not be funded with CPA funds:

- Roofing – the application says the roof is both in good shape and “undertermined”
- Siding – The siding appears in relatively good shape per the application and site visit. Response C did agree that the CSCC should develop a long-term plan to expose the original wood.

Response D. Response D prioritized restoration of the original siding and repairs to the chimney.

Total estimated funding amount (unphased): **\$231,400**. This includes

- General Condition costs EXCEPT Bonds/Insurance/Warranty, Staging, Police Details, and Landscape Restoration
- Demolition of Vinyl Siding and Sheet Metal Trim on Belt Course and Windows
- Repair and Replacement of Deteriorated Siding and Belt Course
- Repairs to Wood Soffits, Wood Fascia, and Rake Boards
- Prepare/Paint Siding, Belt Course, Wood Soffits, and Wood Fascia
- Repair Chimney, Chimney Flashing, and Weathervane Base
- Plus estimated permit costs (\$16/\$1000), mobilization (5%), and overhead costs (15%)

¹ Note to compare all responses on the same footing, this memo uses the estimated costs for the steeple from the most recent CSCC detailed budget. Response C noted that there was an updated cost for the steeple from David Shiebley.

They thought the following should not be funded with CPA funds:

- Police Details
- Landscape Restoration
- Installation of the Chimney Flute
- Vinyl Window costs
- Stained Glass Window Restoration
- Storm Window Replacement
- Installation of attic vent and ventilation.

They also felt that the items under the “Structural Repairs” section were too vague/in need of more detail to determine eligibility. They considered the rest of the elements were D to be questionable eligible.

3. Conclusions

- Members agreed that Landscape Restoration and Storm Window Replacement should not be funded with CPA funds. Most also agreed that Vinyl Window costs and Gutter and Downspout costs should be excluded.
- All responses would consider Chimney Repairs be funded with CPA funds (\$24,250 plus estimated permit, contingency, mobilization, and overhead costs).
- There was mixed opinions on what was the top priority or need for the Congregational Church. The responses included:
 - Structural repairs
 - The steeple
 - Restoration of the original siding
- Total funding packages ranged from \$178,000 up to \$1.49 Million. The median amount between all four responses would be around \$250,000.

More information and discussion is likely needed on what elements are the most important/highest priority or need by the Congregational Church.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee



Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi, Chair
Recreation Commission

Carlton Hunt, Vice-Chair
Citizen at Large

Kevin Mandeville
Open Space Committee

Joan Neumeister
Housing Authority

Jean Guarino
Planning Board

Harry Bailey, Jr.
Conservation Commission

Stephen Rogan
Historical Commission

William Smith
Historic District Commission

-
Affordable Housing Trust

—
Joshua McGraw
Staff Assistant

Meeting Minutes July 22nd, 2020

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:03PM

Members Present: Gina Guasconi, Jean Guarino, Carlton Hunt, Harry Bailey, William Smith, Kevin Mandeville (Arrived 6:18, left at 8:30)

Members Absent: Steven Rogan, Joan Neumeister

Guests Present: Anthony Sulmonte – Finance Director, Laurie Guerrini – Finance Department, Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke – CED Director, James Walsh, Barbara Morey, Terry Reynolds, Rachel Lawson, Eileen Hiney, Gordon Brielisford

Call to order – 6:03PM

Public Comments – No public comment.

Approval of minutes – May 27th, 2020 & June 24th, 2020

Carlton Hunt motioned to approve the minutes from May 27th, 2020, William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to approve the minutes from June 24th, 2020 as amended, William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to amend the minutes to have Rachel Lawson, Gloria Weinreve, and Gordon Brielisford added to the June 24th meeting minutes, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Financial Update

No changes to the financials for the CPC at this time. The tax revenue is expected to be presented at the next meeting to the committee.

Congregational Church Application – Discussion and Vote

Application Analysis Discussion and Vote

The committee reviewed and discussed the comments and questions gathered by Anna Callahan from individual CPC members. Discussion centered around if the funding could be considered aid outside of historical preservation.

William Smith motioned to recommend the application as eligible for CPC funding, Carlton Hunt seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

Funding Eligibility Discussion and Vote

Representatives from the church answered questions from the committee on specific funding on the project. The committee has asked that the church submit a priority list to the CPC detailing work and a breakdown per segment, ie. steeple, roof, doors/windows, they want funded if their application is approved.

The committee will look to review the new breakdown from the church before voting on the funding.

Jean motioned to continue discussion on the application and discuss again on August 12th at 6PM, Carlton Hunt seconded. The motion was approved unanimously

Process Update

Jennifer Burke is still working on the process update and will look to provide the draft to the committee by the next regularly scheduled meeting.

FY21 Discussion for Consultant Work

There has been discussion between Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke, and Gina Guasconi on the scope of work for JM Goldson moving forward. Gina has asked for a reference list on what work would be within the scope for JM Goldson. Anna Callahan has asked that the committee also prioritize the jobs the CPC would like her to participate in.

Old Business

Barstow House

James Walsh has reached out to the realtor that is working on the sale of the house. The two options being presented for the sale are under 40b housing or assisted living housing.

Alden House

Historic New England, Anna Callahan, Gina Guasconi met with the owners of the Alden House. Follow-up information pertaining to the discussion was sent, however, the owners have yet to respond.

Housing Trust

Carlton Hunt motioned to take discussion of the Housing Trust out of order; Jean Guarino seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

There are no updates to the housing trust at this time.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

New Business

Carlton Hunt motioned to continue discussion on remaining items at the next regularly scheduled meeting. William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to adjourn at 8:35PM, William Smith seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Adjourn – 8:35PM

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

Meeting Minutes August 12th, 2020



Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi, Chair
Recreation Commission

Carlton Hunt, Vice-Chair
Citizen at Large

Kevin Mandeville
Open Space Committee

Joan Neumeister
Housing Authority

Jean Guarino
Planning Board

Harry Bailey, Jr.
Conservation Commission

Stephen Rogan
Historical Commission

William Smith
Historic District Commission

-
Affordable Housing Trust

—
Joshua McGraw
Staff Assistant

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:03PM

Members Present: Gina Guasconi, Jean Guarino, Carlton Hunt, Harry Bailey, William Smith, Steven Rogan, Kevin Mandeville (Arrived 7:50)

Members Absent: Joan Neumeister

Guests Present: Anna Callahan, Jennifer Burke – CED Director, James Walsh, Barbara Morey, Terry Reynolds, Janet Hanson, Jason Wagner

Call to order – 6:00PM

Public Comment – No public comment.

Congregational Church (CSCC) Application - Financial Eligibility Discussion and Vote

The chair offered two options for discussion on funding through the CPC and left it up to the committee to motion which option they feel is best for the application. A list of prioritized work was submitted by Barbara Morey and distributed to the committee prior to the meeting. Anna Callahan shared the responses of the CPC members regarding the application that were submitted to her after the last meeting of the CPC. A list of funding precedents in Bridgewater and the Acton cases were shown to the committee. The committee reviewed information provided by William Smith on CPA and CPC funding projects in Braintree and Boston that involved churches. The committee believes the historic significance will outweigh the religious significance of what is funded in the application. The committee thoroughly discussed funding for several elements of the prioritized list provided by the church but ultimately settled on funding the restoration of the steeple at this time.

Carlton Hunt motioned to discuss the elements that should be funded by the CPC, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. Carlton Hunt withdrew his original motion, William Smith seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Carlton Hunt motioned to consider funding of all the elements that are eligible for historic preservation money. William Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Harry Bailey motioned to recommend funding for the steeple, roof, and chimney in the amount of \$130,000, Gina Guasconi seconded the motion. The motion was not approved with a vote of 1 ye and 6 nays.

Town of Bridgewater, Massachusetts

Community Preservation Committee

Gina Guasconi motioned to amend the \$130,000 to restricting to the cost of materials and labor and not the soft cost, Harry Bailey seconded the motion. Approved 6 yea and 1 nay.

Kevin Mandeville motioned that the chimney, steeple and door funding be recommended, totaling \$168,717, Carlton Hunt seconded the motion. The motion was not approved with a vote of 1 yea and 6 nays.

Carlton Hunt motioned to continue discussion at the next meeting of the CPC where a final vote will be taken, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. Steven Rogan withdrew his seconding of the motion. Carlton Hunt withdrew the motion.

Carlton Hunt motioned to fund the steeple restoration for \$200,000 against the total cost with the details to be provided by the next meeting, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. The motion was approved with a vote of 6 yea, 1 nay.

Carlton Hunt motioned to adjourn at 9:36PM, Steven Rogan seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Adjourn – 9:36PM



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-018

Introduced By:	Town Manager
Date Introduced	October 6, 2020
First Reading:	October 6, 2020
Second Reading:	October 20, 2020
Amendments Adopted:	
Third Reading:	
Date Adopted:	
Date Effective:	

Order O-FY21-018

OLD HIGH SCHOOL PURCHASE AND SALE AGREEMENT RATIFICATION - BRIDGEWATER, RAYNHAM REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

ORDERED, in accordance with section 4-2 of the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter, that the Town Council assembled vote to ratify the negotiated agreement governing the terms and conditions of the purchase of property and improvements known as the Old High School (166 Mt. Prospect Street).

Explanation: The Town Manager has negotiated an agreement with the Town of Raynham and the Regional School District. An affirmative vote of the Council will approve the agreement as presented. A subsequent transfer request will fund the appropriation thereof.

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
- Budget & Finance Committee - Finance Committee	10/19/20: 10/19/20:

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN AND AMONG THE MEMBER TOWNS OF THE
BRIDGEWATER-RAYNHAM REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE
BRIDGEWATER-RAYNHAM REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

This Agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into this ____ day of October 2020, by and between the Town of Bridgewater, a body politic and corporate located in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with an address of Academy Building, 66 Central Square, Bridgewater, MA 02324 (hereinafter “Bridgewater”), the Town of Raynham, a body politic and corporate located in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with an address of 558 South Main Street, Raynham, MA 02767 (hereinafter “Raynham”), and the Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District (hereinafter “District”), a body politic and corporate, having an address of 166 Mount Prospect Street, Bridgewater, MA 02324, which joins in this Agreement for purposes of acknowledging the direction of its Member Towns and agreeing to carry out the conveyances required hereunder.

RECITALS

Whereas, in 1958 the Town of Bridgewater adopted an Order of Taking, and paid certain financial awards, for over 20 acres of land in Bridgewater bordered by Centre Street, Mount Prospect Street, Union Street, and Pleasant Street. Such Order of Taking is recorded at the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds at Book 2618, Page 349 (hereinafter “Taken Land”); Whereas, by Deed dated June 14, 1960, the Town of Bridgewater, by and through its Board of Selectmen, conveyed the Taken Land to the Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District (hereinafter “District”). See Deed recorded at the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds at Book 2786, Page 263.

Whereas, by Deed dated August 10, 1960, just over 3 acres of land located on the easterly side of Centre Street in Bridgewater was conveyed to the District. See Deed recorded at the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds at Book 2794, Page 435.

Whereas, the Member Towns, through the District, built a high school on said land that served the District and its Member Towns for nearly 50 years (the Taken Land, the 3 +/- acres, and the high school building are hereinafter collectively referred to as “Old High School”);

Whereas, the Regional School District built a new high school on land located on the westerly side of Center Street, northerly of Swift Ave, and easterly of North Street in Bridgewater (“New High School Property”);

Whereas, shortly after construction of the New High School, which was completed in 2007, Bridgewater made improvements to the Old High School that totaled over Seven Million Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,300,000), has used the Old High School as a Middle School, and has been responsible for all costs and expenses related to the Old High School. The District uses the premises as District Offices;

Whereas, the Regional School District Agreement does not address any compensation to be paid from one Member Town to another or to the District upon transfer of premises among the parties;

Whereas, Bridgewater and Raynham have sought to reach agreement among themselves and with the Bridgewater-Raynham School District as to the transfer of the Old High School to Bridgewater and consideration to be paid to Raynham, either directly or indirectly, including the formation of a Committee and multiple meetings;

Whereas, the parties seek to avoid the expense and uncertainty of litigation; and

Whereas, the parties have agreed on terms and conditions that will allow for the transfer of the Old High School from the Bridgewater-Raynham School District to Bridgewater and consideration to be paid directly to the Town of Raynham by Bridgewater;

NOW THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are acknowledged by the undersigned for themselves, their successors and assigns, agree as follows:

1. Recitals. The contents of the recitals set forth above are incorporate herein.
2. Payments. Bridgewater shall pay to the Town of Raynham consideration in the amount of Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000) to be paid as follows: For seven (7) years commencing with Fiscal Year 2021, the Town of Bridgewater shall pay to the Town of Raynham by July 15 of each year the amount of Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$70,000). Thereafter, for five (5) years commencing with Fiscal Year 2028, the Town of Bridgewater shall pay to the Town of Raynham by July 15 of each year the amount of Forty-Two Thousand Dollars (\$42,000) Nothing in this agreement shall prohibit the early payment of any outstanding sum.
3. Conveyances. The District shall convey to Bridgewater by Quitclaim Deed(s), conveying clear and marketable title, on or before the thirtieth (30th) day following the final execution of this Agreement all the property and improvements thereon known as the Old High School.
 - a. Included in the conveyance as part of said premises are the buildings, structures, and improvements now thereon, and the fixtures belonging to the District and used in connection therewith.
 - b. The District represents and warrants to Bridgewater that, to the best of the District's knowledge, information and belief; (a) there are no underground fuel storage tanks on the Premises; (b) chlordane has not been used as a pesticide on the Premises; (c) there has been no release of any "hazardous materials," "hazardous substances" or "oil" on, from or near the Premises; (d) there is no litigation or proceedings, pending or threatened, against or relating to the Premises; (e) the Premises and the present uses thereon are not in violation of the provisions of any covenant, municipal, county, state or federal codes, ordinances, statutes, by-laws, rules or regulations relating to zoning, building, environmental, land use, wetlands or health matters, including, but not limited to any violations of MGL c. 21E, nor has the District received any notice from any municipal,

county, state or federal agency asserting or alleging that the Premises may be in violation of the same. The provisions of this paragraph shall survive the delivery of the deed called for herein.

4. Security Agreement. Within thirty days of the signing of this agreement, the Town of Bridgewater agrees to execute a mutually acceptable security agreement which shall secure performance under this agreement.

5. Full and final resolution. This Agreement constitutes full and final agreement of Bridgewater, Raynham, and the District on all issues relating to the Old High School and each party releases the others from any and all claims related thereto.

6. Assignment. No party to this Agreement shall assign or transfer any of its rights or interests in or to this Agreement, or delegate any of its obligations hereunder, without the prior written consent of all the other parties.

7. Amendment. This Agreement may be amended only by a writing signed on behalf of Bridgewater, Raynham, and the District duly authorized thereunto.

8. Severability. If any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of appropriate jurisdiction to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable, or if any such term is so held when applied to any particular circumstance, such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability shall not affect any other provision of this Agreement, or affect the application of such provision to any other circumstances, and the remaining provisions hereof shall not be affected and shall remain in full force and effect.

9. Governing Law. This Agreement shall be governed by, construed, and enforced in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

10. Headings. The paragraph headings herein are for convenience only, are no part of this Agreement and shall not affect the interpretation of this Agreement.

11. Notices. Any notice permitted or required hereunder to be given or served on any party shall be in writing signed in the name of or on behalf of the party giving or serving the same. Notice shall be deemed to have been received at the time of actual receipt of any hand delivery or three (3) business days after the date of any properly addressed notice sent by mail as set forth below:

Town of Bridgewater:

Town of Bridgewater
Town Manager
66 Central Square
Bridgewater, MA 02324

Town of Raynham:

Town of Raynham
Town Administrator
558 South Main Street
Raynham, MA 02767

Bridgewater-Raynham School District:

Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District
Superintendent
166 Mt. Prospect Street
Bridgewater, MA 02324

or to their successors.

12. Complete Agreement. This Agreement constitutes the entire Agreement between the Municipalities concerning the subject matter hereof, superseding all prior agreements and understandings. There are no other agreements or understandings between or among the parties concerning the subject matter hereof. Each party acknowledges that it has not relied on any representations by any other party or by anyone acting or purporting to act for such other party or for whose actions the other party is responsible, other than the express, written representations set forth herein.

WITNESS OUR HANDS AND SEALS as of the first date written above.

Town of Bridgewater:

Michael Dutton, Town Manager

Town of Raynham:

Patricia Riley, Chair, Board of Selectmen

Joseph Pacheco, Vice Chair, Board of Selectmen

Richard Schiavo, Clerk, Board of Selectmen

ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY BRIDGEWATER RAYNHAM SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Bridgewater-Raynham Regional School District, by its duly elected School Committee, hereby acknowledges the agreements of its Member Towns set forth above and agrees to carry out such terms and conditions.

Michael Dolan, Chair, School Committee

Rachel King, Vice Chair, School Committee Member

Lilian Holbrook, School Committee Member

Anthony Ghelfi, School Committee Member

Kevin Moreira, School Committee Member

Richard Florence, School Committee Member

Susan Prewandowski, School Committee Member

Jason Hammond, School Committee Member



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-019

Introduced By: Town Manager
Date Introduced: October 20, 2020
First Reading: October 20, 2020
Second Reading:
Amendments Adopted:
Third Reading:
Date Adopted:
Date Effective:

Order O-FY21-019

ACCEPTANCE OF A GRANT - CENTER FOR TECH AND CIVIC LIFE COVID-19 RESPONSE GRANT

WHEREAS: Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 44, §53A, states as follows:

"An officer ... of any city or town ... may accept grants or gifts of funds from ... from the commonwealth ... or an agency thereof, ... and may expend such funds for the purposes of such grant or gift ... with the approval of the city manager and city council..." and

WHEREAS: The Town of Bridgewater has received a Private Non-profit grant from the Center for Tech and Civic Life (CTCL), therefore, in accordance with Chapter 44, §53A of the Massachusetts General Laws, the Town Council votes to take the following action:

ORDERED that the Town Council of Bridgewater, Massachusetts in Town Council assembled vote to accept the reimbursement of \$12,972.00 from CTCL, in accordance with stated purpose thereof.

Explanation:

In accordance with the "public purpose of planning & operationalizing safe & secure election administration"

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
•	•



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-020

Introduced By: Town Manager
Date Introduced: October 20, 2020
First Reading: October 20, 2020
Second Reading:
Amendments Adopted:
Third Reading:
Date Adopted:
Date Effective:

Order O-FY21-020

GENERAL FUND FREE CASH ALLOCATION TO TRUST FUNDS

ORDERED, in accordance with the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter, that the Town Council assembled vote to make the following transfers.

Source of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
GF UNDESIGNATED	09905990-596120	TRANSFER OUT TO TRUST	\$ 2,205,366.00
Total:			\$ 2,205,366.00
Use of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
GF STABILIZATION TRUST FUND	80054-497000	TRANSFER FROM GF	\$ 1,560,000.00
CAPITAL STABILIZATION TRUST FUND	80104-497000	TRANSFER FROM GF	\$ 400,000.00
OPEB STABILIZATION TRUST FUND	80114-497000	TRANSFER FROM GF	\$ 100,000.00
EMPLOYEE LIABILITY TRUST FUND	80044-497000	TRANSFER FROM GF	\$ 145,366.00
Total			\$ 2,205,366.00

Explanation:

Recommended allocation of the General Fund Undesignated Fund Balance (Certified Free Cash) to the established Trust Funds as noted above.

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
•	•



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-021

Introduced By: Town Manager
Date Introduced: October 20, 2020
First Reading: October 20, 2020
Second Reading:
Amendments Adopted:
Third Reading:
Date Adopted:
Date Effective:

Order O-FY21-021

TRANSFER ORDER - POLICE DEPARTMENT CAPITAL ITEMS

ORDERED, in accordance with of the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter, that the Town Council assembled vote to approve the following transfer.

Source of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
Capital Stabilization	80105-596010	TRANSF FROM CAP STABIL	\$ 44,416.00

Total:			\$ 44,416.00
--------	--	--	--------------

Use of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
Police Capital Outbuilding	TBA	POLICE OUTBUILDING	\$ 32,000.00
Police Capital Equipment	TBA	POLICE EQUIPMENT	\$ 12,416.00

Total			\$ 44,416.00
-------	--	--	--------------

Explanation:

Police Chief requests funding of Priority Capital Equipment

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
•	•



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-022

Introduced By: Town Manager
Date Introduced: October 20, 2020
First Reading: October 20, 2020
Second Reading:
Amendments Adopted:
Third Reading:
Date Adopted:
Date Effective:

Order O-FY21-022

TRANSFER ORDER - SENIOR CENTER CAPITAL TRANSFER

ORDERED, in accordance with the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter, that the Town Council assembled vote to approve the following transfer.

Source of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
SENIOR CTR CAPITAL	80125-596010	TRANSFER TO GF CAPITAL	\$ 2,000.00

Total:	\$ 2,000.00
--------	-------------

Use of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
General Fund Capital	TBA	SENIOR COA PROJECT	\$ 2,000.00

Total	\$ 2,000.00
-------	-------------

Explanation:

Additional Funds necessary to complete site improvements completed in June with \$20,000 state earmarked grant

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
•	•



Bridgewater Town Council

In Town Council, Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Council Order: O-FY21-023

Introduced By: Town Manager
Date Introduced: October 20, 2020
First Reading: October 20, 2020
Second Reading:
Amendments Adopted:
Third Reading:
Date Adopted:
Date Effective:

Order O-FY21-023

TRANSFER ORDER - CAPITAL - COMPLETE STREETS ENGINEERING

ORDERED, in accordance with the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter, that the Town Council assembled vote to approve the following transfer.

Source of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
CAPITAL STABILIZATION	80105-596010	TRANSFER TO GF CAPITAL	\$ 8,955.00

Total:	\$ 8,955.00
--------	-------------

Use of Funds	Account No.	GL Account Description	Amount
General Fund Capital	10123219-530001	TRANSPORT ENGINEER	\$ 8,955.00

Total	\$ 8,955.00
-------	-------------

Explanation:

Town Manager -Transportation Engineering additional work - Complete Streets Green International \$8,955.00

Committee Referrals and Dispositions:

Referral(s)	Disposition(s)
•	•