

Community Preservation Committee
Public Meeting of June 14, 2005
9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Elaine Anderson, Chair; William Dougal; Eric Dray; Tim Hazel; Nancy Jacobsen (arrived @ 9:20 a.m.); Stephen Milkewicz; and Winthrop Smith.

Member Absence: Treg Kaeselau

Consultant: Laura Shoefelt, Falmouth Housing Authority

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

Meeting Agenda

Public Statements

There were none.

Vice Chair Nomination

At the last meeting Eric Dray had been nominated as Vice Chairman. Eric Dray declined the nomination since he already has a lot of Board work.

Motion: Eric Dray made a motion nominating Tim Hazel as Vice Chair. William Dougal seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

(Tim Hazel abstained from voting.)

Chairman's Updates:

Laura Shufelt's Invoices.

Elaine Anderson told the committee that they had all voted and approved the fee schedule for Laura Shufelt's services but the Town Manager (KAB) had advised her that there is no need to have an RFP for Laura's services because the invoices are considered intergovernmental services. KAB said as soon as an invoice is submitted he will take it to the Board of Selectmen (BoS) for their approval and Laura's reimbursement.

Treg Kaeselau's Resignation.

Elaine Anderson said that the Recreation Department is looking at a replacement for Treg's spot on the Committee. Treg must resign first to clear the way for another applicant.

Continuing Discussion with Laura Shufelt

A great deal of the meeting was spent on a discussion of the memo dated June 6, 2005 that Laura had sent to the Community Preservation Committee (CPC). Mainly the discussion – with most everyone's input – revolved around how the anticipated funds would be leveraged. Bottom line of memo suggested including a target per unit contribution but went on to say flexibility should be mandated.

Elaine Anderson said that early in this committee they had looked at other communities for information on how they did it and then composite ideas evolved.

Laura countered by saying that “What we have here is cumbersome and involved and we need to streamline the process.” She further suggested that maybe a rolling application? – but - applicants have to be informed that they can’t receive the money until the next town meeting. Next Laura said that the group needs to come to a decision on what form the application should be in.

Elaine said she enjoyed the simplicity of what had been submitted but wondered whether there are standard form, i.e., boilerplate for these applications?

Bill Dougal said he is still having problems with this entire proposal. He feels it doesn’t get to the essence of Provincetown. There are 3 variables in Provincetown and Bill listed them:

1. Limited land;
2. Tremendous demand; and
3. An acute timetable because we are losing a community.

“We have to be proactive in our process and thus we will be more successful. He has not yet seen a developer that has proposed anything on a small scale.” Bill continued by saying, “How many units can we construct when we have economies of scale and given the variables?” He suggested that the group must put out further directives. (At this point in the meeting Nancy Jacobsen arrived) Bill told the group that we need a critical mass of units. We’re not looking for small groups of units. We need more specificity if we are going before the BoS. BoS needs to be made aware of where we are headed and we need further plans.

Tim Hazel said that someone has to come before us from the Housing Authority. “We can’t go out and start looking for properties – that’s not within our purview. Once we get this information out there, then it’s up to people to come to us. Our job is to motivate these people and guide them.” Tim said.

Bill Dougal - responding to Tim – said, “We need to essentially decide our direction. Are we going for new construction? Or what – are we looking for the bigger planning – the most units? – we haven’t even had a philosophical discussion on our direction.

The discussion then became cyclical with everyone offering their own personal opinions.

Next everyone concentrated on the Community Housing goals contained on one of the pages. Some of the goals were eliminated and others received different weights and/or priorities. This section will go back to the drawing board.

The Committee did agree that the money should be leveraged so that Provincetown can get the “most bang for the buck.”

Tim Hazel then said that he would like the community to come first – not development.

Bill Dougal said that we have to be competitive in the marketplace. We have to have a priority for new construction because that will get us to the 10% most quickly.

Again these thoughts went back and forth with no conclusions. Win tried to cite what New York City did with their artists and compare it to Provincetown. He said, “We just need to get the word out.”

Elaine said, “We’re not at odds but just struggling with ways to achieve the same thing.”

Tim added, “We know that brand new is more economical. We really need a blend.”

Win Smith suggested that the Committee needs to talk to banks – and see what they would like. We need to talk to Seamens and discuss what they will do with rehab vs new construction. Win and Tim felt this avenue would offer free advertising for the banks involved. (They’d be crazy to not cooperate with programs was the Committee’s cumulative thought.)

Laura said decisions are almost impossible without projects in front of us.

Tim Hazel said that the group should be challenging people to think of creative ways to solve this issue. Bill Dougal said that we’re dealing with water usage and availability.

Elaine Anderson wondered if ever there were any opportunities for renters to buy property? Win, once again, cited New York experiences, and said that many times instead of an opportunity, it caused rents to be increased.

Tim Hazel told the CPC that they need to let people know “the store is open” for these kinds of things. Eric Dray said that there should be language in the memo that details other options for housing opportunities.

Elaine suggested that perhaps we can let Laura take a second shot at this memo.

Elaine also suggested going over the application later. As long as we are within the letter of the law she would prefer a more simplified form.

Eric Dray said that we need a draft that we’re comfortable with and then we can send it to the different boards that are represented by members of the CPC.

IT WAS DECIDED THAT THE NEXT MEETING WILL HAPPEN ON TUESDAY – JUNE 28TH AT 9:00 A.M.

Approval of May 31st Minutes.

Motion: Eric Dray made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 31, 2005 meeting with only one correction (mtg adjourned at 6 p.m. – not 6 a.m.) The motion was seconded by Nancy Jacobsen and approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Evelyn Gaudiano

E. Rogers Gaudiano

Approved by: _____ on _____
Elaine Anderson, Chair Date