

DRAFT
Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board
Meeting Notes
April 1, 2010

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

As a quorum was not present, the Minutes of the March 4, 2010 meeting could not be approved. Those present decided to have an informal meeting, to be documented by notes rather than Minutes.

The group assembled started with comments about a draft memorandum on the ranking process that had been prepared. Rich expressed a concern about what would happen if, for example, five applications were received at the same time. Let us assume, he said, that there are three which are ranked in the first group and two in group three. If there is only enough money to pay the first three, the two lower ranked properties would be next in line. If, the next year, there is an application from someone in group one, how should that be handled? The lower ranked properties have now been waiting for one or more years. Should they be paid because they have been waiting, even though they are lower ranked?

Susan referred to the process which is use by the Dept. of Agriculture for EFC funds. They use a ranking which is determined by a point system. What tends to happen, she said, is that if you are top ranked and you are not ready to get the money, the line starts to move down and the money is spent for people who are ready. Those who are not ready retain their points and can only be considered the next year. Rich said that, in theory, group six would never have an opportunity because there are too many properties ahead of them. Susan said that it would be possible to move forward in the ranking, but only if no one is ahead of you. Harry said that points could be given for the time factor, i.e. when the application was made. Perhaps a point could be given for every year that the property owner must wait. Susan suggested that if a property is on the list and cannot be paid for a year, it could be bumped up a category, e.g. from group 4 to group 3.

Susan brought up the question of contiguous properties. The Board has discussed this issue, but has not included it in the ranking system. If a property comes in which is contiguous to a property in a higher group or is between two high ranked properties, it might be placed in the higher group. She said that she would come up with some language related to this issue for the next meeting.

Rich said that he had spoken with Pete Hubbell at the Ag meeting and Pete had met with the assessor. He said that he had reviewed the data to check which properties are really protected. He went over the list and several corrections were made to the data.

Susan concluded the meeting by saying that for the next meeting she would make the corrections to the data and develop language to deal with the contingencies which had been discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M. The next meeting will be held on May 6, 2010 at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Franklin