

Town of Hanson
542 Liberty Street, Hanson, MA 02341

Community Preservation Committee (“CPC”) Subcommittee (“Committee”) Meeting
CPC Application Review Subcommittee
Selectmen’s Meeting Room
Minutes for November 20, 2017

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM. Subcommittee members in attendance were as follows:

Present: Tom Hickey
John Kemmett
Diane Cohen

Absent: None

Ref. material: Current CPC application and pre-application
Draft CPC application and pre-application

Review of Existing CPC Application and Discussion of Possible Changes

Tom referenced the proposed application and pre-application that he has drafted and described his thought process toward revisions as follows:

- 1) Separate the current 15-page application into two documents—an application guidelines document and an application.
- 2) Determine what information that is on the application would be known early on that could be placed on the pre-application.
- 3) Rename the “pre-application” and “application” to “Part A” and “Part B” in order to make it clear to applicants that both need to be completed and the order.
- 4) Present the information that appears on the pre-application the same as on the application cover page for consistency and to minimize applicant confusion.

Members were in agreement of these general revision points.

It was suggested that an FAQ section be added to the website that would serve as the resource to applicants completing the application.

John said that the audit certification section concerning federal funds should be reviewed by Mike McCue to ensure that the correct information is being asked.

Tom asked if the narrative section of the application, items A & B, should be limited to three pages, as drafted, or should it remain open-ended. John felt that it should be left up to the applicant as to how much information they need to provide.

Town of Hanson
542 Liberty Street, Hanson, MA 02341

Some comments were made that the applicant be prompted on the application to clearly articulate the events leading up to the proposed project and its mission. It was felt that this would be helpful to new CPC members who might be reviewing the application at some point in the future.

John made the suggestion that a CPC member point person be designated for a project. Tom agreed but feels it should be discussed with the full committee.

On the budgeting page, Tom said that his draft includes the addition of a column asking a Yes/No question "Are funds guaranteed as of the date of this application." He then asked about adding another Yes/No column that would address extra funding documentation. John remarked that any approval be pending upon the receipt of such documentation.

John commented on the source of other funds, stating that the use of public funds has to be qualified. He added that the committee may require guidance from the Department of Revenue concerning "qualified estimates."

Tom commented on the due diligence of the applicant toward getting quotes, with John stating that the applicant's homework for getting quotes should be addressed on the application, suggesting that a statement such as, "all bids have to be in accordance with ..." be added.

On the subject of volunteers, John suggested that the application include guidelines for determining the dollar value that volunteer workers might represent to a project. Diane commented on the qualifications of volunteers to do the work, with John adding they be required to provide proof of insurance to the CPC. Tom said he will add a section addressing volunteer workers.

Tom said he will modify the draft application documents per the discussed items. As opposed to meeting again before the Dec. 13 CPC meeting, John suggested that the Part A and Part B documents, and not the guidelines, be presented to the full committee for review.

Adjournment:

John made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Diane, and approved 3-0-0.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Shirley Schindler, Clerk