

**HALFMOON TOWNSHIP OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION BOARD
REGULAR MEETING-MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2014**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ron Hoover called the meeting to order at 7:05pm. Other members present were Patti Hartle, Lorin Nauman, Christine Bracken-Piper and Joe Tylka. Staff present was Amy Smith, OSPB Administrator and Rebekah Seymour, Recording Secretary. No audience was present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. MINUTES

- *MOTION: Joe Tylka moved to approve the meeting minutes of July 2nd, 2014 as submitted; Ms. Bracken-Piper seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.*

4. EASEMENT & APPRAISAL LANGUAGE CONTINUATION

Ms. Smith stated the BOS agreed with OSPB's plan for having a third appraisal if the first two appraisals given for appraised value are far apart but wanted language that stated it would be at their discretion if a third appraisal was needed instead of language that read if amounts were 10% apart, to which the OSPB agreed. Ms. Smith further stated that the BOS agreed with their request to add forecasting model as part of their recommendation.

Ms. Smith overviewed changes to survey language and removal of language that referred to an appraisal since it was discussed in earlier section of ordinance and only a survey would be reimbursed 50% to the landowner. Mr. Hoover questioned why a landowner would need a survey done. Ms. Smith answered that once they submit an application for fee simple or acquisition of development rights a survey must be completed but this was not required for a normal lease application.

Ms. Smith stated that BOS wanted language that read "development rights" within the ordinance to be changed to easements or fee simple acquisitions to be consistent with county language, to which the OSPB agreed.

Ms. Smith stated that no answer was received back from Ms. Yurchak at this moment on what consultant is or does. There was brief discussion on whether the language was placed in ordinance during Wildlife Corridor acquisition. Mr. Hoover suggested that language might have been imported from an earlier section and a definition might be found somewhere else in the ordinance. Mr. Tylka stated that the ordinance implies what the eligible consultant fees are but preferred to wait for an answer from Ms. Yurchak to discuss further the language. Mr. Tylka further stated for Ms. Smith to ask Ms. Yurchak if she felt they should be vague about what type of consultant can be hired or should it be a specific type for a specific service. There was brief discussion on cost sharing for fees and what were eligible costs to be split. Mr. Nauman questioned what a baseline documentation report was as there were no guidelines listed in the ordinance. Mr. Hoover stated that it is listed in the ordinance a checklist for the report can be found within the application. Ms. Smith brought in a copy of the checklist and stated it only says that a baseline documentation report needed to be included. Ms. Bracken-Piper questioned who would submit the report and suggested that Ms. Yurchak also look into what the report is or if it is even needed in the ordinance. There was brief discussion about placement of the language for the baseline documentation report within the ordinance. Ms. Smith brought in the baseline

documentation report from the Wildlife Corridor and stated it was just back ground information on the property (i.e. history, ecological features, Agricultural features). The OSPB requested Ms. Smith to make copies of the report from Wildlife Corridor to review for next meeting, to which Ms. Smith stated she would e-mail scanned copies to the board. Mr. Hoover suggested tabling reviewing the language until they had answers about what baseline documentation report was and what type of consultant was referred to in ordinance, to which the board agreed.

Ms. Smith stated that the BOS desired there be a consequence to the landowner if they are not cooperative about lease inspections to be included in both lease and acquisition language. Mr. Tylka suggested having Ms. Yurchak craft language that is vague so it does not only apply to a specific situation. Mr. Nauman suggested also including that it would be at the landowner's expense to bring the situation into compliance. Mr. Hoover tasked Ms. Smith to review with Ms. Yurchak the new language and a place within current language to place it.

Mr. Tylka requested a language change on Section 163-12(B)(2)(iii) to replace the phrase: "to determine the purposed program's ability to appropriately fund the proposed purchase and maintain payments and lease in perpetuity."

with

"to determine the program's ability to appropriately fund the proposed purchase and maintain all lease payments in perpetuity."

Mr. Tylka also suggested placing an example forecasting model within the ordinance to give a visual of what they were using. The OSPB board agreed with both language change and suggested example to be included.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Nauman commented that on online application for program there was a typo that read need exceed 20 years instead of not to exceed 20 years.

Ms. Smith stated that there was one application in from Ms. Sandy Peters who had applied before but had to resolve a deed issue on the property before reapplying. Ms. Smith stated that Ms. Peters commented there were no mortgages on the property. Mr. Tylka inquired as to the acreage of the property. Ms. Smith answered about 40.25 acres and they would look more into the application in September.

Mr. Hoover stated that he still would like Ms. Liggett to come next meeting to address some questions they had had in a previous meeting.

6. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS

There were no citizen's comments

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07pm.

- ***MOTION: Mr. Tylka moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 pm; Mr. Nauman seconded; Vote 5-0-0; Motion carried.***