



# Long Range Planning Advisory Committee + (LPAC+)

## Thursday, June 22, 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	-	Andrew Clark, staff	-

Sandra started the meeting at 6:05 PM.

### 1. Review of Minutes

The draft minutes of the May 25, 2017 meeting were tabled as there was no quorum.

### 2. Falmouth Open Space Plan Discussion

Theo reviewed the draft definition of open space, draft scope for the plan, and draft vision statement, along with the comments he had received.

Dave liked the definition as it included developed parks.

Jenny said that one of the recommendations that the committee should deal with is the no net loss of park land.

Dave felt that any possible future disposition of open space should be thoroughly vetted.

Jenny commented that there should be rigorous process dealing with parks and recreation spaces.

Bob said that one of the plan's recommendations that had been discussed was for PACPAC to do a Parks Plan. He said that the 2006 plan never dealt with parks.

Sandra asked how the group wanted to move the draft forward.

Jenny suggested to insert “actively protects” in the vision statement. She also felt that “aquaculture” was too narrow and specific a term. Bob suggested “marine resources.”

Bob asked where the year “2121” came from and if it meant the group would spend next four years developing the plan. Theo explained that he looked for a memorable year that was approximately 100 years from today, to continue the thinking of doing a plan for next 100 or so years.

There was a discussion about “parks that have trails.” Bob mentioned that this would apply to Pine Grove, Underwood, and Community Park.

Sarah suggested “waterfront resources” to substitute “aquaculture.” Bob suggested “aquatic resources.” The group liked that last suggestion.

Jenny was wondering if “culture” should be referenced in the definition. The group decided against that.

Bob commented that trails are part of open space, and he was worried that in 2121 the town will just have parks with trails and no other open spaces. He wondered why parks with trails should be included in the scope. Jenny felt that the forest canopy of these parks was an important resource. The group reaffirmed that a connected trail network was an important part of the plan.

Sandra stated that she felt that any park with trails should be included, and if it did not have any trails that it should be excluded. The group agreed that the scope of the plan as drafted was OK and that parks with trails should be included in the scope of work for the plan.

The group then went to review the definition of open space. Jenny asked what buffer zones were intended to be. Bob and Dave gave various examples, such as buffers from development and from streams. Sandra saw them as transition areas.

Jenny suggested including the word “multitude,” but the group did not like that. No changes were made to the definition.

Sandra suggested that this draft should now be circulated with the rest of the committee as “vetted” or “proposed” so more comments on it could be received.

Jenny was wondering if Highland lake should be part of the scope of the plan. The group decided against that.

Sandra suggested that the rest of LPAC should be requested to respond to the revised draft before the next meeting.

Bob was wondering what the goals of the plan were, and if acquisition was part of the plan.

Sarah felt that a map that compared important natural resources to what is currently protected would show the “gap” and could be very informative.

Dave was wondering if any maps would be included in the report.

Sandra said that she was not ready to articulate any goals as she did have enough information yet. One goal she could imagine was the need to educate and inform the Council concerning open space needs. She felt there might be a goal pertaining to public access, and that adding the growth-rural boundary to any maps would be useful. She recognized that as the town grows more in the growth area, that some open space there will be lost.

Jenny commented that people regard trails on private property as if they are protected, though in many cases they are not. She felt the plan should address that. She wondered where all those trails were.

Bob suggested asking mountain bikers as they appear to be everywhere. He added that there is an extensive snowmobile trail network, but that those trails typically are permitted.

Sandra agreed that “gaps” map would be important, and that the plan’s goal is to enhance the open space experience.

Bob said that a “gap” map already exists. Sandra said that it is important for the committee to become familiar with it, because its charge is to point the Council in the right direction.

Jenny suggested that Bob should hold onto his map, so the committee can think fresh.

Theo reviewed the work products for the next meeting. He will work with Andrew to produce some initial maps. He will take a stab at some possible goals for the committee to ponder and react to. He will seek comments on the revised vision statement.

### **3. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 13.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, June 26, 2017