



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee + (LPAC+)

Thursday, January 25, 2018
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Sam Rudman <i>Chair</i>	-	Ted Asherman <i>LMAC</i>	✓	Michael Vance <i>Falmouth Land Trust</i>	✓
Sandra Lipsey <i>Vice Chair</i>	✓	Paul Bergkamp	-	Jenny Grimm <i>Falmouth Land Trust</i>	✓
Caleb Hemphill <i>Council Chair</i>	-	Sarah Boudreau <i>Conservation Commission</i>	✓	Amanda Stearns <i>Open Space Manager</i>	✓
Claudia King <i>Council Liaison to LPAC</i>	-	Becca Casey	✓	Theo Holtwijk <i>Staff</i>	✓
Aaron Svedlow <i>Council Liaison to LMAC</i>	-	Dave Gagnon <i>LMAC</i>	✓	Lucky D'Ascanio <i>Staff</i>	-
Tom McKeon <i>Planning Board</i>	-	Breana Gersen	✓	Andrew Clark <i>Staff</i>	-

The meeting began at 6:00 PM.

1. Review of draft minutes of the December 14, 2017 meeting

The draft minutes of the December 14, 2017 meeting were accepted as written.

2. Open Space Plan discussion

Theo passed around a draft set of goals and actions that had been prepared by various members. The group discussed each of them.

Goal 1:

Action A: Breana suggested adding a growth-rural distinction to the rubric. Ted acknowledged that the rubric preceded that concept. There was a discussion if the plan should recommend updating the rubric or actually come up with a specific update. Ted thought that the latter would take some time, and Dave was hesitant as well.

Action B: Jenny felt that other incentives should be consider. Sandra was wondering if the action verb, instead of “reevaluate,” “identify.” Jenny explained that the effort is to better understand which tools have been most effective and which ones should be used more. Breana gave the example of succession planning in farming. Sandra was wondering if there was a list of tools available. Jenny said there was a list, and research should be done to see if there were any other tools.

Action C: This action blends private and public spaces. The group agreed that these should be separated. Sandra felt that the action seemed to imply that all such properties should be protected. That is not the case. The group agreed that a list of properties should be prepared with their current level of protection. Breana said that small properties may have protection value for the community in the growth area, versus having wildlife value. Ted mentioned that the notion of the value of protecting small properties has evolved. He suggested that the word “jewel” should not be used any more, but that instead such properties should be described. Becca commented that some of these properties are “front door” properties and are valued for their views, while others are “living room” properties which are valued for how they work. Sandra mentioned that there are places that could easily be connected and made available to more town residents.

Action D: This action focuses on re-education especially of natural resource values. Jenny emphasized that this did not mean that the Town would have to do that. She also suggested adding “resilience” and “adaptation” (i.e. climate change) to the text.

Goal 2:

Becca discussed the diversity of spaces that exist from completely habitat oriented to completely managed recreation land. The catalog idea is to help answer the question if we are providing what is needed in the community. A compatibility assessment will help to determine if certain activities or uses should be moved to different properties.

Goal 3:

Breana stated that the “sufficient” aspect of goal 3 was better suited for goal 1, and her group focused on the “available” aspect. Jenny said that access to the coast was important. Enlarging ley parcels seemed more applicable to the rural area than the growth area. There was a discussion if there should be a percent goal mentioned. Breana said she was no fan of that, and preferred stating a goal for miles of connected trails, or distance of open space to existing homes. Ted felt that the “finish line” for open space protection was always moving. Becca felt that stating a percentage was arbitrary and was hard to visualize. Breana said that the goal should focus more on quality than quantity. Jenny countered that a percentage could be a useful fill-in tool.

Ted felt that the goals could be reorganized along three main topics: neighborhood open spaces, connectivity, and large tracts. Amanda felt that the plan needs constant updating. Jenny thought that an open space goal could be related to population growth. Michael felt that a set of choices should be presented. Sandra suggested that the goal should be rewritten. Ted reiterated that numerics would work against the plan. Jenny suggested an amount of open space per family. Sandra said that as the community grows in population, no additional land is created. Jenny said she was worried the balance would be lost.

Michael suggested to think of a problem that existed in last 10 years and if the plan can make a difference with a numeric threshold. Amanda mentioned walking distance to homes. Ted worried that such a numeric would drive property acquisition where it may not make any sense.

Goal 4: Amanda stated that the first action was aimed at the risk of development of key parcels. The second one targeted a more mindful review of development parcels and how important open space is as part of that. There was discussion on market realities that may not support in-lieu fees to buy more threatened open space elsewhere. Jenny felt that the type of open space targeted should be more prescriptive.

Goal 5: Michael stated that management plans were needed for all properties and that they should also be executed. The idea behind this is that owning property comes with responsibilities. He also emphasized the

importance of relationship building. He noted that there needs to more communication about the management of properties, and that the history of parcels should be acknowledged. Duplication of programs by different entities should be avoided. Jenny felt that the management plans should have clear goals on natural resources, and how to protect them. She felt they should the what, why, how of that as well as what should be done if things do not work out. Michael said the draft deferred on being specific. Breana was wondering if there was enough money available for property management. Michael said that the notion was that that level of funding should be increased. Amanda made a comment regarding the focus on trail sustainability and endowment and management funds.

Goal 6: Sarah said that the section on the message was key, and that coordination of education should be done with the conservation commission. It was noted that there was a lot of conservation pride in Lincoln, MA where realtors clearly saw the value of open space. Dave felt that there were more education efforts in the schools earlier than currently. Becca mentioned the Happy Kids, Healthy Kids program. It was agreed that this section needs some rewriting. Jenny felt that the existing structures should be supported, and that clarity about respective roles was important. Sandra felt that the goal could speak to age-specific actions. She wondered what the expectation is of the sense of improvement, such as use of the trail network, or volunteer engagement. Breana wondered if the QR code signs were part of this effort.

All groups will take the feedback and come back with a second draft to be discussed at the next meeting. Theo noted that it was important to think about which actions should be done as part of the plan and which ones should be recommendations to be done later (i.e. a plan to plan).

3. Next meeting

The next LPAC meeting is scheduled for February 8.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, January 29, 2018.