

**Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2010**

Members present: Chair Susan Ezrati, Pete Hubbell, Brent Kovalchik, Phil Seymour
Also present: Harry Colgan, TB Liaison
Absent: Rich Biezynski, Robin Logan

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. A quorum was determined to be present for the conduct of business. It was noted that Miriam Latzer is no longer a member of the Board as she declined reappointment. The Board reviewed the January 7, 2010 Minutes. As no changes were suggested, Pete made a motion to accept the Minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Brent and all were in favor.

Susan presented the three spreadsheets on which she has been working. Discussion ensued regarding several corrections which should be made to the data, e.g. repositioning of some of the columns, inclusion of the Ag District column where it had been omitted, etc. Susan said that she will make the appropriate corrections. She explained that the listing of the parcels on the spreadsheet labeled "Base Map" follows the order marked on the map. She said that she added the names of the property owners because the members of the Board are familiar with the properties by owner and could more easily identify them that way. The names can be deleted later. Brent said that the problem with using names is that property might change hands. Susan said that in order to maintain objectivity, names should not be referenced. In order to keep the data current, Pete suggested that the assessor be asked to give the Board a copy of the monthly sales sheets. Brent said that the names of the property owners be reviewed annually.

Harry asked whether or not this was a working document. Susan replied that it is a discussion document. She said that if you compare the category rankings to the raw score rankings, i.e. the total for all the categories, the order does not change materially. Phil noted that a number of the properties are already protected and suggested that a star be placed in the first column to identify such properties. Consensus was reached that this should be done.

Harry said that the Town Board is interested in knowing how much progress has been made by this Board and asked what he can pass on to them. Pete asked if, by the next meeting (and with the revisions just discussed), the Board would feel comfortable saying that this would be the ag property template. Susan added that the villages and non ag town properties have not yet been done. Pete noted that the part on which the Board has been working represents the majority of what has to be done.

Susan said that the Board started with agriculture because it had been identified as the most important factor. If you add village properties, they would all be ranked at the bottom because so much weight is being given to agriculture. At a previous Board meeting Chris Chale, the town attorney, said that it was allowable under the law to allocate a large percentage of funds for agricultural rights and reserve a smaller percentage for cultural and historic preservation. If that smaller percentage were not used, it would revert to the agricultural pool. Brent said that some benefit should accrue to the as villages are they paying into the pool but do not have agricultural land.

Brent said that Chris had also brought up the model used by the Environmental Facilities Corporation in their annual Intended Use Plan. They administer the clean water and the drinking water state revolving funds for the EPA. They identify priority districts. In the course of the year, if none of the properties in these districts come forward, a lower ranked property would have the opportunity to bypass the higher ranked ones. Pete said that the Board should not be waiting for the highest ranked properties to sell. He pointed out that it would be problematic if a lower ranked property came up and there was a potential that the next year a higher ranked property might come up. This could leave the Board without funds to protect the higher ranked property. He suggested that perhaps the Board could canvass the higher ranked property owners and ask if they might be interested in selling in the next five years. If they all said no, the money could be expended on the lower ranked property. If some said they might be interested in selling in the next few years, the Board might not want to fund the lower ranked property. Brent said that the Intended Use Plan had a category for those projects which are interested and ready to go. They are guaranteed funds. They have a limited time to spend the money. If they don't, they are duly warned, the funds go back into the pool and the other properties have a chance. Pete asked if this model had been successful and Brent responded that it has been quite successful. Pete suggested adopting this model. Brent felt that the Board should consult Chris Chale regarding how this model could be adopted.

Phil said that he thought that there would be a partnering and the total cost would not come from the town's funds. Harry agreed and said that the percentage varies, but usually the town pays half and some other entity pays the other half. Scenic Hudson, for example, pays half. After discussion, it was agreed that 25% to 50% could be expected. Phil felt that other town resources might also be used. Pete said that sometimes the farmers themselves make a charitable donation.

Susan asked Harry what he thought about doing two rankings, viz. town agricultural rankings (which have almost been completed) and a second pool which will be village cultural, historical, etc. and town non ag. Brent said that this would allow the properties in the village to get ranked. Harry said that it would be great if it could be done; but it would be very problematic because there are properties which are just not comparable. Susan explained that the Board is only adding up the number of times that the properties have already been flagged in the Open Space Plan.

Susan asked the Board members to review the spreadsheets to see if anything is missing or should be corrected and e-mail their comments to her. She said that she and Brent will meet and design a spreadsheet for the villages. Factors such as gateways, well heads, trails, state and federal wetlands and historic sites will have to be considered. It was decided that the data should be presented to the Village Board as well as the Town Board.

A motion to adjourn was made by Phil and seconded by Susan. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M. The next meeting will be held on March 4, 2010 at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Franklin