

**Approved
Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
September 3, 2009**

The meeting was opened at 8:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Susan Ezrati, Rich Biezynski, Robin Logan, Pete Hubbell and Brent Kovalchik. Miriam Latzer and Phil Seymour were absent.

A quorum was determined to be present for the conduct of business. The Board reviewed the August 13, 2009 minutes. Pete made a motion to approve the minutes. Phil seconded the motion and all members present voted in favor.

Pete said that the monitoring plan needs a clause for cost sharing and he offered to take care of that and forward it to everyone. It was agreed that if everyone accepts the clause, the plan can be approved via e-mail. The map was discussed and Robin offered to obtain color copies.

Susan said that she was in receipt of the inventory detailing. Pete asked if, as the Board prioritizes the parcels, it can be ascertained how much of the land base is agricultural. Susan said that this might be a fine screen and there is a broader screen which must first be delineated. She asked if the group was going to determine which are the top twenty parcels and then review those for issues. Rich felt that this process would be too complicated. Pete said that if someone wants to pick out the top twenty parcels, they can go to the NRCS site.

Robin said that she had read through a few parcels which showed varying acreage. Susan said that sites 1A and B are two different tax parcels with the same ownership. Pete said that where the acreage is different in different columns, you have different sites. Susan said that the parcels were ordered contiguously.

Susan said that the Board should be trying to determine the overall importance of the property to the Village. It would be much easier to rank prime soils by size; however, the Board should include all criteria which would be of interest to the Town of Red Hook. To do this effectively, the Board must consider contiguous properties.

The Open Space Plan said that agriculture was the priority for these funds. Rich said that the only reason the ranking matters is if two people apply at the same time and a choice has to be made as to who will get the money. He added that it would take an inordinate amount of time for the Board to prioritize all the parcels. Pete also felt that prioritizing all the parcels would be too much work. If two people come in at the same time, an evaluation can be made on the basis of the established criteria.

Susan said that Sue Crane had sent her an e-mail and said she needed to know how the Board is prioritizing these properties. She said that she had told Sue that the Board has the inventory is going to consider how to prioritize. The most important factors, she continued, are acreage, prime soils and the number of yeses. Robin favored not doing any rankings now, but rather doing individual assessments as people come in.

Susan said that Board has to go back to the purpose of the plan. It has accomplished the first three items and is now faced with item number four, viz. the establishment of priorities. Rich felt that this has already been done as the Board has established a set of priorities, although it has not set

priorities for each parcel. Brent noted that the Board was charged with setting priorities which are “as specific as practicable.” Susan responded that this discussion suggests that the Board is done. In this case, she questioned how the Town Board would react if several people were to come in at the same time. Robin said that the issues should then be returned to this Board and a site review and assessment should be done. Susan felt that this approach was very reactive and stated that if the Board has a vision of the Village, it should be proactive and make a list. Without a larger vision, the money may not be spent judiciously.

Pete felt that the prioritization cannot be done at the time of application. Robin noted that things are changing continuously. She also said that each property is important and stressed the need to keep our farms and agricultural land. How, she asked, can you compare a property that has great soil but is vacant with a farm which has poorer soil but is productive? Susan stated that the Board needs at least a narrative as to how the criteria are to be used. A narrative, she said, can specify how the criteria are to be interpreted/applied.

Pete suggested that the Board rank the list of criteria, with agricultural soils being number one. Susan suggested a grouping rather than a ranking, along with a narrative which delineates the process. Brent said that the aquifer is the town’s most important asset. After extensive discussion, the Board agreed upon the following ranked groupings.

- A. Agricultural Qualities:
 - In Agricultural District 20
 - Operating Farm
 - Agricultural Soils
 - Aquifer
- B. Water Resources
 - Ecological Area
 - State/Federal Wetlands
 - Lake, Stream or Pond
 - Forested Lands
- C. Village Planning Issues
 - Green Belt
 - Trails
 - Designated Scenic Road
 - Designated Scenic District
 - SASS
 - Scenic Corridor Overlay
- D. Register/Landmark District
 - National/State Register
 - National Landmark District.

It was decided that Susan would outline the narrative.

A motion to adjourn was made by Susan and seconded by Brent.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Franklin