

**City of South Portland
OSAC Meeting
February 23, 2021**

Attendance: Dan H, Jeanne F, Tom, Marla, Valerie, Andrew F., Karl, Milan, Chelsea, Hillary B, Jeffrey Ryan (Land Bank Revision Committee), O. Breen (member of the public)

1. Andrew F. **called the meeting to order** at 3:32pm
2. The committee **approved the meeting minutes** from the February 9th, 2021 meeting.
3. **Jeffrey Ryan of the Land Bank Revision Committee** addressed concerns previously raised by OSAC, specifically noting that the LBRC voted for the OSAC to be considered a “recommendation body” alongside the Planning Board to the city of South Portland. In addition, section 18-73A in their revisions included verbiage to state that the **Land Bank Fund may not be used to pay for lease payments for public access to private property**, a concern which had been raised at the previous OSAC meeting.
 - a. This brought up the question of what is likely to happen in the future when lease or easement proposals come to the city. Milan stated that when a “good” proposal was presented to the city, that funds other than Land Bank funds would/could be used, but also that the **city has the right to deduct such amounts from its stated goal of an annual donation to the Land Bank of \$42,000, in essence replacing those “other” funds based on economic conditions or budget constraints.**
 - b. Dan expressed issue about the phrase “**limited term easements**” in this same section 18-73A, suggesting some expiration or time limit to be specifically stated in the document.
 - c. There was also conversation about the expressed limit of **10% of Land Bank funds to be used for maintenance, management, or minor capital improvements not being a standard to which the City Council was obligated to uphold**, making the case for the scenario of the Bank being spent down within a year or two if the City Council voted in such a manner.
 - d. While Milan made the case that the documents prohibit the use of Land Bank funds to offset any shortfalls in the budgets of the Parks and Recreation or other departments, it was pointed out that the City Council can override this prohibition under certain circumstances. **Dan suggested that an upper limit be placed on the percentage of Land Bank funds that could be appropriated by the City Council.**
 - e. **Jeffrey Ryan agreed to bring these issues to the next meeting of the Land Bank Revision Committee.**
4. The committee shared ideas about how to best evaluate the properties on the acquisition list in the most effective and expedient manner. It was decided that while the committee doesn’t need to get the scoring process completed before the City Council decides on the November bond issue in May, it was agreed the evaluation process could be streamlined. **It was agreed that prior to the next OSAC meeting (March 9th) each member would individually score the next 5 properties on the list, sending their tabulations to Karl by the end of the day on March 2nd.** Karl agreed to send out the list of the 5 specific properties to score, along with an updated criteria/category chart to include a narrative, unscored category of “other considerations,” as well as relevant maps. Milan suggested that, as we move forward into

refined assessment, we take into consideration the city’s flood maps as “future impact” tools in our recommendations.

- 5. The committee began to score Old Joe’s Pond and the Sunset Park parcels.
 - a. Old Joe’s Pond has potential as a wetland-funded site, but/and does need considerable rehabilitation. There also was talk of public skating on the pond to be created/restored in the future. The land owner of this property has been found to be uncooperative.
 - b. The Sunset Park parcel has serious development interest, with the parcel already having been deforested to a large degree although access and other issues had not been resolved with the city. There was debate within the committee about the wisdom of looking to secure “responsible development” or try to maintain the parcel as woodland and green space buffer from the noise and toxicity of the nearby highway. There may be potential for wetland protection funds for this site as well, since there is a small stream running through the parcel.
 - c. The scores for the two properties were judged to be:

	<u>Old Joe’s Pond</u>	<u>Sunset Park</u>
Connectivity	8	2
Underserved area	3	7
Adjacency to existing parks	8	1
Heat Island/Tree Canopy	3	7
Equitable Access	5	2
Natural Resources/Habitat	8	4
Size of Parcel	4	6
Outside Funding	7	2
Maintenance	6	7
Transit	7	1
School Proximity	6	1
Climate Change Resiliency	8	7
Variety/Flexibility of Use	4	2

- 6. The issues of contacting property owners and the conversation around funding considerations were tabled until the next OSAC meeting.
- 7. There was no open discussion of any other items.
- 8. There were no participants from the public sector.
- 9. **The next meeting for the OSAC was confirmed: 3:30pm – 5:30pm on March 9th.**
- 10. **Andrew F. adjourned the meeting at 5:30 pm.**