

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Community Preservation Committee
MINUTES OF THE June 26th, 2023 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

Members Present:

Nancy Heller, Chair
David Lescohier, Vice-Chair
Clara Batchelor
John Spiers
Samuel Burrington
Blair Hines
Mini Kolluri
Joanne Sullivan

Members Absent:

Jenny Raitt

Staff: Tina McCarthy

Ms. Heller called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM.

Meeting Minutes:

none

Public Comment for items not on the agenda:

none

CPA Plan Update- Report and discussion of results from the CPA community engagement efforts. Review of draft Community Preservation Plan goals.

Jennifer Goldson introduced the process to date, and explained the initial draft plan. Laura Smead reinforced that the plan was in draft form, and asked for comments from the Committee within one week. She reviewed the schedule and confirmed that the application process would be worked out after the public hearing on the draft plan.

Ms. Smead reviewed responses received through the community engagement efforts: Community Survey and the Charette. Over 800 community members participated in these two opportunities. She highlighted the strong interest of participants in projects that support the Town's climate resilience and sustainability goals, as well as diversity, equity and inclusion goals.

Ms. Smead went on to review the specific category goals outlined in the plan, and clarified that they were not listed in any priority order. She explained the structure of the draft plan, as the profiles of previous Town planning activities and community engagement was integrated into the chapters. She and Ms. Goldson clarified project eligibility in the open space category at the Committee's request. Detailed information on the community engagement results was not reviewed, but Ms. Smead pointed out the location of this information in the plan appendix.

47 Mr. Spiers asked what groups were not well represented (renters, and those under 18, for example)
48 in the engagement and wondered if any adjustment or further engagement with these groups would
49 be needed. Ms. Smead agreed on the demographic skew across race, income, age and ownership
50 status. Mr. Spiers was concerned that there were no “surprises” in the results; that is, the results were
51 shaped by the same group of people already actively participating in Town government. Ms. Smead
52 reviewed the suggestions included in the Public Engagement and Outreach Plan, and recommended
53 that the Committee keep these issues in mind for the future, using the list to find ways to reach
54 underserved communities. She expected that Community Engagement would be an ongoing task for
55 the Committee.

56
57 Ms. McCarthy asked whether the consultants had any data on the language translation survey
58 versions, whether those links brought in any responses. Ms. Smead did not believe any had been
59 received, but agreed to follow up. Ms. Heller emphasized that the results were important, as it would
60 shape how the Committee would conduct engagement going forward. Committee members reviewed
61 the engagement efforts with the school community.

62
63 Mr. Spiers asked if there were any friction points between the categories that came up through the
64 engagement. He thought the Committee should be aware of these as they move toward funding
65 projects. Ms. Smead noticed competition between community housing and open space, but she
66 emphasized the success other communities had in integrating both these categories in the same
67 project.

68
69 **Public Comment:**
70
71 None. Ms. Heller explained further opportunities to give comments on the draft plan at the upcoming
72 public hearing.

73
74 **Administrative Account Funds-** Discussion and vote on CPAC staffing level in FY ‘24

75
76 Ms. McCarthy shared resources on staff responsibilities and staffing levels of different CPA
77 programs in the state. Ms. Heller thought a full-time staff person would be required once applications
78 started coming in. Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Lescohier agreed. Ms. Heller explained the process that
79 would be required to upgrade the part time staff position to a full-time position.

80
81 Ms. McCarthy shared a budget for the Administrative Account in FY ’23 and the estimates for FY
82 ’24 if a full-time staff person were hired. Ms. Heller asked for a vote on the proposed budget with
83 the full-time staff person. Mr. Spiers asked to look at the job description when it became available.
84 Ms. Brewton suggested the “undesignated” funds be shifted to the “consultant” category, for greatest
85 flexibility in spending.

86
87 Mr. Lescohier moved to approve the shift from part time to full time staff position for FY ’24 and
88 approve the Administrative Account budget as shown, in total \$177, 500 with the undesignated funds
89 moved to consultant contract category. Ms. Sullivan seconded the motion.

90
91 **Samuel Burrington- yes; Clara Batchelor- yes; John Spiers- yes; David Lescohier- yes; Blair**
92 **Hines- yes; Nancy Heller- yes; Mini Kolluri- yes; Joanne Sullivan- yes.**

93
94

95 **Other Business:**

96

97 Ms. McCarthy reminded the Committee about the table at the farmer's market on June 29th and
98 July 6th.

99

100 The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

101