DRAFT

Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
March 4, 2010

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. A quorum was determined to be present for the conduct of business. Susan asked if the Board had any changes or corrections to the February 6, 2010 Minutes. Hearing none, Brent made a motion to accept the Minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Phil and all were in favor.

Susan handed out copies of the ranking document which she had revised since the last meeting and the Board proceeded to discuss related issues. Rich pointed out that there is a fifteen year conservation program with a tax reduction which is not reflected in the current data. He said that there are five, ten and fifteen year ag programs which, at the discretion of the assessor, can give the owner a reduction in town taxes. Pete distinguished between the perpetual easement on which the building rights have been sold permanently and the temporary easement on which the owner has agreed not to develop the property for fifteen years.

Rich felt that the data should be checked because it shows too many properties as being protected. Pete suggested that one of the Board members could sit down with the assessor and check the data. Brent agreed that the Board should verify the status of all the properties which have been given a star to indicate that they are protected. Pete said that a distinction should be made between those properties which have a perpetual easement (which might be indicated by two stars) and those which have a fifteen year easement (which might be indicated by one star). The Board would then be aware of which easements might be ending, leaving the property unprotected. After discussion, Pete volunteered to check the status of the starred properties with the assessor and find out which have a perpetual easement and which have a fifteen year easement.

Susan asked if the Board felt that the methodology which she employed in revising the data gives a ranking which is appropriate. The Board agreed with the approach she had taken and felt that the data did not need further revision. Pete suggested that the data be accompanied by a narrative which would indicate that this is a working document. Soils, of course, will not change; however, other changes may occur. A property may go in or out of an ag district. A farm may cease to be an operating farm, etc. Rich suggested that the document should be reviewed every five years. In discussion, the Board agreed that the document should be updated routinely even though it cannot be changed for three years. It was suggested that a reference date be included. Susan said that the reference date should be the date on which Emma (the student who did the initial work) finished, which would be the end of 2009. Susan added that the document would be accompanied by the parcel ID booklet.

Susan asked if the property owners names should be retained. Phil said that rather than retain the owners names, the tax ID numbers could be added as these never change. Susan said she could research the tax numbers and add them in another column. She said that the good thing about this document is that the data was derived from decisions made by various town committees, e.g. the Open Space Plan, the Scenic Overlay, etc. New information was not created; the Board took

existing information and organized it. Brent stressed that it must remain a working document because some of the categories can change.

Susan asked if someone will be appointed to the Board to take the place of Miriam Latzer. Harry asked if the Board had anyone in mind. He felt that it should be another farmer. Susan suggested that, since most of the farm issues have been resolved, it might be helpful to have someone who is interested in cultural concerns. The Board agreed with Susan and felt that the candidate should be someone with knowledge of local history. They discussed possible candidates and will make contacts before the next meeting.

Susan asked the Board if they could complete the ranking by the next meeting on April 1st. She suggested that if they have further concerns, they should go to the properties in question and get the necessary answers. In the interim, she continued, Pete will check the data regarding the properties identified as having perpetual easements and will distinguish between those having permanent and temporary easements. Susan will add the narrative and will meet with Brent regarding the villages.

Susan said that the only listing of historic sites in Tivoli which she has seen is the listing of buildings of significance in the Landmark District. She said that she asked Michele Greig about this and the listing she gave only included houses in Tivoli Acres and some in Tivoli Gardens. Harry suggested that she contact the Tivoli historian. Brent said that there is relevant material in the Town Hall, but stressed that the sites must be listed in the Historic Register in order to be given consideration.

Susan said that the issue of sharing of funds must be discussed. The Board has talked about having two different pools with 75% being drawn only from ag priorities and 25% from the town with reversion if there were no ag properties proposed for easement. She said that the Board can decide to deliver nothing to the Town until the village data is completed or it can deliver what has been done. If the present document is delivered, the Board needs to explain that this is only part of the document. Harry suggested that the document be submitted with the notation that this is what has been done thus far and there are still some issues which need to be resolved. Pete said that the narrative which will accompany the document should explain how the Board envisions this list working. It should explain the ranking and how a decision would be made if two properties came up at the same time.

The employment of the Intended Use Plan (which Brent had outlined at the last meeting) as a template was discussed. Susan said she would ask Chris Chale to work with the Board regarding the development of a template.

Susan summarized the discussion by saying that Pete will make sure that the protected farmland data is accurate, she and Brent will meet regarding village issues, she will work on a narrative for the next meeting, Brent will make some contacts regarding filling Miriam Latzer's position on the Board, Phil will do the tax numbers and Rich will review the document for errors.

A motion to adjourn was made by Rich and seconded by Phil. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M. The next meeting will be held on April 1, 2010 at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Franklin