

**OPEN SPACE BOND
TASK FORCE MEETING
JANUARY 26, 2006**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

Present at the meeting were Chair Fred Segal, Vice-Chair Linda Greck and task force members Mike Bartlett, George Greb, Tom Green, and Don Prichard.

Also in attendance from the Town were Phillip Holste and Michael Mungal.

2. OLD BUSINESS

2.1 OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION MATRIX

Ms. Greck wanted clarification on whether parcels being considered for acquisition would be judged against the matrix, the criteria document, or by a combination of both tools. Mr. Segal suggested that a point system could be used as a weighting tool in reviewing properties for acquisition. Ms. Greck felt that a feature such as a “scenic vista” was very subjective and felt a breakdown of what constituted a scenic vista was needed. Mr. Segal felt this could be addressed under definitions.

Mr. Green shared Ms. Greck’s concern about the layout of items on the chart and pointed out there was repetition of items 16 and 31. Mr. Holste indicated this was an error. Mr. Segal requested that item 16 be deleted from the Financial Attributes column. Mr. Green stated he was unsure whether item 2 [“the site presents educational opportunities”] belonged under Geographical Attributes. Mr. Segal agreed that this item might need to be moved.

Ms. Greck pointed out that the matrix did not address whether a site had existing funding. Mr. Segal felt this would fit under matching monies.

The task force debated various ways to apply a point and weighting system to the 30 items in each category.

Mr. Greb reminded the task force that the money would be divided among four geographical areas which the Town would have surveyed for available properties. He felt the matrix might become too cumbersome for the task at hand especially where it concerned comparing 2-3 properties representing a small geographical area. He also felt the Town would want to buy the properties it felt were available and best fit their needs rather than wait for a potential seller to approach the Town to sell a property. Mr. Segal stated that the matrix was not necessarily to compare one property with another, but rather was a tool to help the Town find the best properties and meet the different goals and attributes outlined on the matrix.

Mr. Bartlett made a motion, seconded by Mr. Green, to assign a numerical value ranging from 1-3 to each of the 30 attributes and move the discussion to which attributes would get which points. In a voice vote, with Ms. Greck opposed, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 5-1)

The task force decided to take a voice vote on each item.

Mr. Bartlett suggested giving 3-point rating to accessibility. General discussion was held on defining accessibility more precisely.

Ms. Greck wanted to delete items 10 and 11. Mr. Green was concerned about leaving out consideration of the demographic differences within Councilmembers’ districts. Mr. Greb felt

Councilmembers would be sure to consider open space properties in close proximity to higher density areas. Mr. Green pointed out that million dollar homes and mobile homes often occupied the same street in the same district. Mr. Segal asked Mr. Holste if there were areas in Davie where “parcels within a population density of 5,000 plus per square mile,” would or would not apply. Mr. Holste indicated he would investigate this question. Mr. Holste suggested giving density additional consideration in setting criteria.

The task force gave item 10 a 1-point rating.

The task force gave item 11 a 1-point rating.

The task force gave item 7 a 3-point rating.

The task force gave item 4 a 3-point rating.

The task force agreed to combine items 5 and 6 and give it a 2-point rating.

The task force gave item 8 a 2-point rating.

The task force agreed to strike number 9.

The task force agreed to move item 2 into “fiscal attributes”.

The task force discussed whether to remove “affordability” from the matrix. Ms. Greck felt affordability should remain. Mr. Segal suggested keeping affordability along with language staging “sale price is at appraised value or less” in parentheses. After further discussion, the task force decided to remove “affordability” and “feasibility of site development,” from the matrix, and include them elsewhere in the document.

Ms. Greck wanted to remove item 15 from the Financial Attributes category.

The task force agreed to give item 15 a 3-point rating.

Mr. Segal advised that item 13 was “moved down” from financial attributes to physical attributes.

The task force agreed to change language for item 16 to state “parcels that would qualify for matching funds” and give this item 3-point rating.

The task force gave item 17 a 1-point rating.

The task force combined items 19 and 20 and changed language to “add parcels with wetlands or containing or abutting a significant water body” and gave this a 3-point rating.

The task force combined items 22 and 23 and gave this a 3-point rating.

The task force gave item 21 a 1-point rating.

The task force combined items 24 and 25 and gave this a 2-point rating.

The task force combined items 26 and 27 and gave this a 3-point rating.

The task force changed the language for item 28 from: “moving agricultural preservation to purchase the development rights on agricultural sites available for PDR purchase,” moved this item under Financial Attributes and gave this a 3-point rating.

The task force gave item 29, “parcels with existing condition as pristine” a 3-point rating.

The task force gave item 30, “parcels 10 acres or larger”; a 2-point rating.

The task force removed item 13, recreational value, from the criteria.

Mr. Segal asked Mr. Holste if staff could start compiling some definitions based on the 19 categories on the matrix.

Mr. Segal wanted some consideration to be given to language stating that “in order to consider a property, it should have more than a given number of points.” He asked that definitions for the draft document be added to the Agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

3. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Bartlett spoke of difficulties he would have attending meetings on Thursday in light of his coaching schedule. Mr. Segal wanted to continue with the same schedule.

Mr. Mungal suggested going through the exercise of actually scoring a parcel at the next meeting. The task force agreed to look at the Math Iglar and Van Kirk sites.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mr. Bartlett made a motion, seconded by Mr. Pritchard, to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion passed 6-0)

Approved

Chairperson/Committee Member