

**COMMUNITY PRESERVATION ACT STUDY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING AGENDA**

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2015**

**6:30 – 8:30 PM, ACTON TOWN HALL, CONFERENCE ROOM 9**

**6:30 – 6:45 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 12/07/15;**

**DISCUSSION RE: FUTURE MEETING DATES**

**6:45 – 8:15 - MEETING WITH STUART SAGINOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COALITION**

**DISCUSSION RE: CPA ISSUES**

**8:15 – 8:30 – DISCUSSION RE: FUTURE COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

**MEETING WITH BRIAN MCMULLAN, ASSESSOR**

**8:30           ADJOURN**

**CPC Minutes – 06/11/15**

Peter reported that the Selectmen at their Monday meeting voted to set up a CPA Study Committee (SC) by September with essentially two “thrusts,” 1) whether to recommend increasing the CPA property tax surcharge, and 2) do a “look back” over the last 12-13 years and evaluate the CPA as it has related to Acton—and possibly decide whether there could be other “tweaks.” Points made in ensuing discussion:

- A “blended CPA” (requiring a Town Meeting vote and a Town ballot, as happened recently in Littleton) is possible. This would allow for other revenues (e.g., housing gift funds, mitigation funds) to be deposited in the CPA account, which then would increase the state match. It was pointed out that a blended CPA would cause accounting challenges for the Town.
- Increasing the set-aside amounts is possible (e.g., instead of the minima 10%, 10%, and 10% for Open Space, Housing, and Historical, it could be 30%, 40%, and 10%).
- The SC would report to the Board of Selectmen (BoS) on the “look back.” It was noted that the BoS could read the CPC’s Annual Reports for this information.
- To justify a CPA tax increase, the SC should develop a “compelling” list of what could be accomplished with the increase—in effect, a plan separate from the Annual Plan. Perhaps this could be achieved by soliciting long-range plans from groups that would use CPA funds.
- For the past year, if the CPA tax would have been 3% instead of 1.5%, Acton’s CPA \$ would have been more than \$1600K instead of \$840K. The state match would have been \$527K instead of \$264K, and there would have been additional state \$ from the 2d and 3d rounds of state funding. The total CPA funding would have increased to about \$2.4M from \$1.1M.