



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee + (LPAC+)

Thursday, May 11, 2017 Minutes

Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Paul Bergkamp	√	Kurt Klebe	√	Breana Gersen	-
Sam Rudman	√	Sandra Lipsey	√	Becca Casey	√
Tom McKeon, PB representative	√	Ned Kitchel, Council Liaison to LPAC	√	Sarah Boudreau, Conservation Commission	√
Caleb Hemphill, Council Liaison to LMAC	√	Ted Asherman, LMAC	√	Jenny Grimm, Falmouth Land Trust	√
Lucky D'Ascanio, staff	-	Bob Shafto, Open Space Ombudsman	√	Dave Gagnon, LMAC	√
Theo Holtwijk, staff	√	Michael Vance, Falmouth Land Trust	√		

Sam started the meeting at 6:00 PM.

Michael Vance and the committee introduced themselves. Theo explained that Michael is the incoming president of the Falmouth Land Trust (FLT). He reminded the committee that the Council formally provided for only one voting slot for FLT, but that Michael had expressed interest to participate on an ongoing basis.

1. Review of Minutes

The draft minutes of the April 13, 2017 meeting were approved with the correction of Becca's last name. The draft minutes of the April 27, 2017 meeting were approved as written.

2. Continued Discussion of Approach to 2017 Falmouth Open Space Plan

Theo reviewed the handouts he had distributed.

Jenny explained the open space definition memo she had prepared. She said she had questions in her mind and the definition became bigger. She then applied it to Falmouth. She felt the definition still needed work as many issues have come to mind.

Paul explained his 4 categories for Falmouth Outdoors as a way to relate open space to other spaces in Falmouth. He felt that each category met different needs.

Dave commented that the committee should have conversations with people who are not involved in this topic. He liked the distinction between developed and undeveloped open space and that was similar to how Paul thought about it.

Sandra said that what was missing was open space that was already designated as “open space.”

Tom stated that there was designated open space as part of subdivision open space set asides.

Sandra clarifies that she was not talking about public access and not necessarily permanently protected land.

The committee started to discuss the idea of “bucket,” different types of open spaces depending on their characteristics.

Kurt suggested that all buckets should be identified, so that the committee could then place priorities on each one.

Sandra stated that a lot of money had been spent by the Town on designated open space, and that work should be included and retained.

Tom thought that a map that showed what will never be open space should be produced.

Jenny thought that land with a permanent, durable protection was important to identify.

Becca felt that the public perceived open space as broader. She felt that active open space should be considered for the buckets.

Sarah stated that the “open” of open space was problematic. Did it mean “public?”

Sandra stated that in certain instances the permanence of open space is not known in 100 years. She felt that education would be needed and that the plan could serve as a reference document.

Kurt felt that open space should also be looked at economically. If the Town put money behind an open space, then it should be included in the plan.

Sandra commented that land uses could change in the future and that the plan needed to be flexible to deal with that.

Kurt disagreed with that and stated that in the case, for example, of water quality protection, the Town should be duty bound.

Theo suggested that identifying all buckets would be useful, but each can then be dealt with differently, in their own, appropriate way.

Paul wondered what type of plan would be most useful for the Council.

Theo suggested that the 10-year accomplishments report outlined some issues that the Council may want or need help with.

Bob stated that the 100-year vision for Falmouth was that it would not be New Jersey and that issues such as wildlife and water quality protection were important. He felt the group should not deal with parks as that was for PACPAC.

Jenny said that the plan should answer which natural processes do we want to keep intact.

Bob agreed with that and said that open space is a different type of infrastructure.

Kurt said that one question is how do you know when you are done. He noted that there had been little waterfront protection Falmouth.

Tom wondered how much was enough and what was desirable that was left that could be added. He commented that a building boom was coming up and that a lot of data was already available.

Dave cautioned not to get too excited about the prevalence of green on the open space map as a number of properties, such as old schools and pocket parks, were not protected.

Sandra said that it was important to create an inventory to help the Town understand where it is going and why.

Bob said he had a list of properties that the Town was interested in, along with criteria such as seeking more connectivity and assembling large tracks of land.

Jenny wondered how many land types are currently protected and what natural systems, such as bogs, will be important.

Bob stated that sea level rise will have a real impact in Falmouth.

Jenny added that vernal pools and riparian habitats are also important.

Dave added view shed protection.

Michael wondered if the Town had a data set that could be queried. The answer is no.

Ted wondered hypothetically how the Town could decide between acquiring unavailable critical habitat parcels and available, but less interesting parcels.

Ned stated that he loses sleep over properties that the Town does not yet know about. He was looking for a plan that was actionable and had urgency. He said that the Town had been working to build up its acquisitions fund. He felt that a critical role was to not go backwards. He cited the Brown parcel on Foreside Road, which the Town had acquired, but where some people had suggested the Town should sell it.

Sam thought that it would be good to identify what land the Town owned that it should never sell, and why, and what land would be OK for the Town to trade.

Kurt said for that for that the group needed to go to the landscape type approach, but he also recognized that landscapes could change.

Sam said that some things cannot be known in 100 years.

Sandra commented that the plan could still be directional.

Bob stated that when the Town started the open space efforts, circles were drawn on a map. He found that the habitat maps had not been useful. He said there were a finite number of open space properties that met the criteria left, perhaps a few dozen. He said the group had also rejected properties for acquisition.

Kurt felt that the management of private properties may also be a useful topic.

Bob agreed that that was an opportunity.

Jenny wondered if public ownership was always needed, or if an easement could suffice.

Kurt said that a program of “buy-restrict-resell” should be looked at as it was an efficient way of using funds.

Sandra asked what the next steps were.

The group agreed that the open space buckets should be defined and listed and that the topic of open space management and the use of easements should be further discussed.

The group also has a need to see the inventory maps and charts.

Becca had made a diagram of the bucket idea and Sam requested to see a copy of that (see below).

Theo: "Everything is natural" or "Nothing is natural."

BUCKETS:

Designations

- Open, not protected
- Open, temporarily protected
- Open, protected "permanently"

Preserved

- Natural
- Preserved
- Conserved

each. PUBLIC PRIVATE

VISION: do we recommend expanding role of town/ombudsman to work w/ private +

Ned - think about the legacy -

Systems rationale for conservation (not specific locations).

Summary: There are these types of "open space" in town: ... investment in appendix: on acquisition, maintenance, etc. that support the following outcome.

Each Bucket: History & account, current issues, context, Strategic recommendation

The next meeting is scheduled for May 25.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, May 22, 2017