

CPC Meeting 11/7/2006
Minutes
Oak Bluffs Library, 2nd floor conference room

Members Present: Stephen Durkee, Chairman, Harvey Beth, Peter Martell, Mike Marchand, Cheryl Sashin, Joan Hughes

Also Present: Adam Wilson, Administrative Assistant

The meeting began at 10:05 am.

-Adam listed for Committee Members the identities of people who have contacted him about the application for CPA funding.

-Peter asked when the next meeting was. He was told Tuesday the 21st and he stated that he would not be able to attend.

-Harvey talked about what the Island Housing Trust was looking for in funding. He told the committee that the Blinker Road project was \$200k short in completion funding and voted to seek those funds through the CPA. Harvey stated that he is intimately involved with several affordable housing groups and will have to reclude himself from the committee when their applications are reviewed.

-The Committee talked about the different kinds of affordable housing options available to island residents. They talked at length with Harvey about rent subsidized programs.

-Joan talked to the committee about the different community groups working with Friends of Oak Bluffs on an application to redo the fence along Seaview Avenue.

-Committee members talked about making the determination of an application qualifying under the Community Preservation Act. Harvey informed committee members about the Community Preservation Coalition that has information about programs that have been funded that show the wide range of projects that communities determine can be funded through the CPA.

-Adam brought up the subject of FinCom approval for all warrant spending articles. He expressed concerns about the potential differences between the two committees and recommended approvals needed at town meeting in April.

-Joan brought up the point that whenever the FinCom plans on reviewing any spending article involving another town committee or department, that group should be made aware of the date and time the Finance Advisory Committee will be taking up the request and have the chance to explain the reasoning for the expenditure.

Committee members talked about having a better line of communication with the FinCom. Adam, who stated that he is in fact on FinCom and is its Vice Chairman, assured committee members he would make sure the FinCom knew what was going on with the CPC.

-Stephen talked about project funding and the committee deciding on what actual amount a project should receive. Joan and Peter both pointed out that projects have to get enough funding so they can succeed. A vote to only give 50% of requested funds could effectively kill a project altogether.

-Adam brought up the subject of applicants needing to go through the low bid process on funded projects. Committee members talked at length about bidding, prevailing wage law and increasing cost projections. Harvey stated that not all non profit groups and individuals that are recipients of tax funded projects are governed by prevailing wage law. It was felt by committee members that the Collaborative should be asked that question. Adam said he would follow up on the question of how the prevailing wage act affects applicants proposals for project spending.

-Mike spoke to the Committee about accountability. He stated his concerns about a project being voted a substantial amount of money and then what measures are in place for that project's spending to be accounted for. Harvey thought that the CPC has little recourse in knowing how project money actually

gets spent. Applicants will present their proposals in good faith and Committee Members will have to assume that there won't be any misrepresentation when the projects are reviewed for approval and funding. Peter added that with federal and state funding for grants there is an accountability format to make sure the money gets spent properly. Harvey asked if local granting of money has local auditing. The Committee considered if part of the administrative cost to the CPC should include an outsourced auditor.

The question was asked how other communities account for project spending.

-The Committee reviewed the minutes from October 18th. Peter motioned to approve as presented. Harvey Seconded.

The Committee voted 5 – 0 – 1 to approve the minutes from 10/18/06.

-The Committee talked about procedures for reviewing applications. Joan asked that all resubmitted applications be available prior to CPC Meetings. Adam said they would be available at his office. Committee members talked about the review format. By consensus it was agreed that a review of each application by the committee would then have a follow up meeting with the presenter in a public forum fashion to allow for community comment and suggestions.

-There was a discussion by committee members about a time frame for the committee to meet with applicants and getting all information together in time for spending articles to be placed on the warrant. This led to a different discussion about the information sharing the committee would need to coordinate project approvals from both the CPC and FinCom. Harvey suggested a liaison from the CPC to keep members of the FinCom informed. Adam stated that it would be better if the review of all proposed projects was done with FinCom's full committee in the hopes that voting approval would be uniformly the same. Cheryl and Adam both felt that at Town Meeting the recorded endorsements by both committees should reflect a sense of parallel agreement.

-Joan and Peter talked about ways to get town voters more informed about spending warrant articles than just what's printed for Town Meeting.

Committee members agreed that having Adam working with the CPC and being on the FinCom would be greatly beneficial in the effort to communicate between the two committees.

-Adam reported that estimated funding for fiscal year '08 is \$706,869 of which \$368,309 was matched by the state.

Committee Members and Adam discussed percentage amounts that have been allocated to each of the three CPA categories.

-Peter made a motion that on the first application for an underground sprinkler system (Hartford Park), that the committee find a way to determine if it falls under one of the three categories. Joan seconded.

-Joan asked if the project could or should be a DPW project as opposed to falling under either historic preservation or open space/recreation.

-Mike stated that looking at the application for Hartford Park, he feels that the Committee can make a determination whether or not it falls under the category of open space/recreation. Adam added that these types of projects are not part of the department's regular budget and that the only other funding source would be in capital improvements; a process that could take years to implement.

-Committee members discussed at length the fine line between department budgeted projects and supplemental funding the CPA can provide for the same types of improvements for the town.

A question was asked as to what guidelines the CPC should follow in determining proposed project applicability.

-The Committee talked about the Hartford Project and its costs, labor and relative impact to the community. Mike talked about what the neighbors were already doing to maintain the park themselves.

-Joan said that perhaps the neighbors should be co-applicants to the project. There was debate as to whether the Cottagers Group should apply and then have the Parks Department do the work.

-Stephen said he'd do research to find out the applicability of the project in relation to CPA open space/recreation parameters.

-Joan talked about the difference in the proposed Seaview Fencing project where the Town could be responsible for the foundational work and extra funding would be provided for the ornamental look that would go with it.

-Harvey suggested that other towns might be struggling with the same issues. Defining a project's applicability and the financial accountability that goes with it could be issues discussed in an island wide forum that this committee could initiate.

The committee agreed to host a gathering of all CPC's to discuss parameters and fiscal accountability.

-Stephen said he would work on a date for CPC's to meet sometime in December.

Peter withdrew his motion on the question of Hartford Park's applicability, Joan withdrew her second.

Mike asked procedurally if applicants will be allowed to make corrections to their application once it has been submitted. Committee members agreed that there will be follow up once a project is officially proposed. The December 1 deadline is a place marker that will give the committee a chance to see how many proposals have come in and what the dollar amounts add up to.

-The meeting adjourned at 11:20 am.