



Community Preservation Committee

Wednesday, July 22nd, 2026

Virtual Meeting

Microsoft Teams

6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

1. Roll call

Joel Nice called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM

Present: Peter Frey (PF), Wayne Griffith (WG), Joel Nice (JN), Andrew Lafleur (AL), Bob Manseau (BM), Joe Fahey (JF), Jonathan Sherwood (JS)

Absent: Suzanne Egan (SE), Craige Hird (CH), Jay Williamson (JW)

2. Administrative

Minutes of June 24th, 2026

Motion by Bob Manseau to approve CPC meeting minutes of June 24th, 2026, seconded by Wayne Griffith. Vote: 5-0-2, Peter Frey and Jonathan Sherwood abstained due to not being present at the meeting.

3. Community Preservation Plan

Review of Draft

Andrew Lafleur commented the introductory section is a bit lengthy and may not be concise enough for some readers.

Joel Nice asked about Suzanne's input for what is required for legal language

Bob Manseau stated the audience is the public who may need more information and not know as much about the committee. Request to put page numbers on the draft.

Howard Snyder informed that after tonight, the content will be entered into a draft template and will be asking for images from the committee to put into the plan.

Wayne Griffith suggested some pictures could be used from the presentations given to the committee by stakeholder groups and asked for clarification about criteria for what images could be included.

Jonathan Sherwood asked about information for disbursement mechanisms so people understand how to access the funds.

Joel Nice stated there is some vague language in a later section about prepayment and other mechanisms.

Howard Snyder responded that the process is described in section 5.

The committee collectively discussed that a table of contents would be included in the final draft.

Joe Fahey discussed in Section 1 after the table – “CPA projects must follow ... and prevailing wage.” has further exceptions and is not always required for projects to use prevailing wage. Suggestion to include clarification and links to the Community Preservation Coalition guidelines.

Bob Manseau suggested this section could be put in as an appendix.

Wayne Griffith asked about section 3 – community housing. There had been a vote to remove item 4 from “goals and objectives” but it does not seem to have been removed. Discussion continued about what was voted on and already removed. WG suggested the committee consider removing this language as well.

Motion from Bob Manseau, 2nd by Joe Fahey to adopt the language presented on the current draft. Motion passed 4-2-1

The committee continued discussion about section 7 appendices.

Andrew Laflaue pointed out that appendix B is empty.

Joe Fahey provided collection of housing related documents to HS for adding to the appendix.

Howard Snyder confirmed that he has these resources and will include them going forward. Extended additional invitation for any additional documentation that members want to submit to be added to the plan.

Bob Manseau asked about appendix C and I – historic resources and federal standards have different language. Not sure where each information came from. These are both federal standards from the department of the interior. What would best serve the public? Discussion concluded that these two sections are probably redundant and could be consolidated.

Howard Snyder mentioned links for hard copies will be available for people to review. Confirmed that open gov can be used for integration of application process.

Andrew Lafleur pointed out typographical error at the bottom of the eligibility form where it states “project is on City on property”.

Andrew Lafleur asked about stating a timeline applicants can expect a response to eligibility form submissions.

Howard Snyder pointed out the open question on the eligibility form about whether it should be highly recommended or required. Discussion continued. Howard suggested, if it would be highly recommended, language be included on the project application form as a disclaimer that project may be disqualified if eligibility form is not completed.

Jonathan Sherwood suggested having clear timelines on documentation for applicants to understand the process timeline.

Jonathan Sherwood departed at 6:50 PM

The committee had a discussion about process timelines. Peter Frey proposed similar process to NBPT using 2nd Friday in December at noon. The committee decided to make the eligibility form highly recommended.

The committee discussed about how applicants will be informed which meeting they will attend for their application. This will be a rolling process. Order of applications will determine which meetings they present at. There was a discussion about time limitations for presentation and Q&A.

Joe Fahey asked about if online application is required.

Andrew Lafleur asked about next meeting and public hearing. Public hearing will be scheduled at a later date so there is proper notification and advertisement.

4. Next Meeting Date

Next meeting of the CPC is to be determined and will be announced. The next regularly scheduled meeting is August 26, 2026

5. Adjournment

MOTION to adjourn by Peter Frey.

Second: Wayne Griffith

No discussion

Vote: 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.