

## Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 1 of 6

Present: Mike Speltz, Chair and Conservation Commission Representative; Dana Coons, Vice Chair and Planning Board Alternate Representative; Lynn Wiles, Secretary and Planning Board Representative; Art Rugg, Heritage Commission Representative; Bill Manning, Recreation Commission Representative; Marty Srugis, Solid Waste Advisory Committee Representative; Jeff Locke, At-Large Representative; and Tim McKenney, At-Large Representative

5 6 7

1

2

3

4

Also present: John Vogl, GIS Manager; and Jaye Trottier, Administrative Assistant

8 9

Absent: George Herrmann, School Board Representative; John Curran, Budget Representative; Lisa Whittemore, Budget Committee Alternate Representative; and Bob Saur, Londonderry Trailways Representative

11 12 13

14

10

M. Speltz called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM. He asked members for any comments or corrections regarding the minutes of the November 2, 2010 meeting. Seeing none, he entertained a motion to accept the minutes. A. Rugg so moved. D. Coons seconded. The motion was approved, 8-0-0.

15 16 17

18

J. Vogl announced that a webpage has been added to the Town website specifically for the Open Space Task Force. It will be found under "Boards and Commissions" and will include all documents and materials presented at each meeting.

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

He then presented a draft of the OSTF report's first chapter, which serves as an inventory of currently protected open space, sources that funded those acquisitions, the benefits they provide, and monitoring/maintenance efforts to date. T. McKenney observed that the Town Council's charge that created the OSTF should be included in the introduction to the report. An expanded version of the green infrastructure map that was introduced at the first meeting was reviewed (see attached, p. 2). It not only identifies possible links between land already preserved to maximize protection of areas with the best natural resource features, it includes the green infrastructures of Derry, Litchfield, Windham, Bedford and Auburn to illustrate connections beyond the town borders. M. Speltz pointed out that the purpose of the green infrastructure is to take the larger "hubs" of protected space such as the Musquash and Laycock/Kendall Pond Conservation Areas and the Town/School recreation fields and connect them together via "spokes" of further protection. While it can be argued that the conservation value of athletic fields is limited when compared to other types of open space, M. Speltz explained that its pervious surface provides the ability to filter groundwater and therefore protect natural resources. L. Wiles asked if cemeteries should be considered as well. M. Speltz noted that they typically contain interior impervious roads but that it could be investigated. He continued to explain that the spokes act as opportunities for metapopulations of plants, animals, and resources such as water to migrate from one area to another and sustain their overall quantities when individual areas are negatively impacted. D. Coons questioned the need to preserve wildlife corridors in particular, based on the evident adaptability of some species to development. T. McKenney believed it was apparent through data that adaptability was limited to a limited number of species. M. Speltz confirmed that research has shown adaptation to human development does vary. He offered providing information which specifies the amounts of open land each regional species requires to ensure their survival.



## Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 2 of 6

J. Vogl continued by stating that to date, permanently protected space in town amounts to 4,047 (or 15%) of the 26,945 acres in town (pp. 2-3). This includes land either owned or under conservation easement by either the Town or another entity. An additional 4,205 acres in Londonderry are "partially protected," meaning that they are currently conserved (whether they are within utility corridors, areas regulated by State statute or local ordinance, or are used for athletic recreation), but that their conserved status could conceivably change at some future time. While State and local regulations comprise 37% of this partially protected land, the Town's Conservation Overlay District is only enacted once a piece of land is subdivided, making that percentage more potential than actual. In addition, exceptions are regularly granted within the COD buffers via Conditional Use Permits and within wetlands by State Dredge and Fill permits (although D. Coons pointed out that those losses are often mitigated with the protection of other land). Much of the land reserved under the COD buffers is typically a portion of privately owned land within a given subdivision and is therefore never likely to be owned by the Town. J. Vogl explained, however, that along with other forms of partially protected land, the Town has a vested interest in ensuring they are maintained as open space. This will aid in keeping the actual amount as close to the potential as possible. The consensus was that despite the uncertain nature of its status, partially protected land should be included in the OSTF's analysis, particularly since a change in its protection in the near future is highly unlikely. Its inclusion in the report can be accompanied by an explanation of the conditions that keep it from being considered permanently protected. J. Locke asked if the amount of privately owned acreage within the COD could be separated out of the total. J. Vogl said he would add that to the table of protection types.

J. Vogl continued the inventory analysis with a breakdown of the sources of funding for the 2,792 acres owned or managed by the Town (pp. 5-6). The purchase of land or easements by the Town totals 1,976 acres and accounts for 70% of the \$15,266,693 spent to acquire open space since the first purchase of land in the Musquash in 1978. Those direct town payments were often aided by State and Federal grant funds, bargain sales (the sale of land for less than its appraised value for a tax benefit), money appropriated through School and Recreation budgets, and penalties/donations. The remaining 821 acres were conserved without cost to the Town through mitigation or conditions associated with a development project, gifts of land/easements, tax liens, and 2% of sources whose history remain "unknown." J. Vogl noted that the ability of grant funds to maximize acquisitions is reflected by the data showing that \$1 of grant money was utilized for every \$5 of Town money spent on open space. Competition for both State and Federal grants has grown over the years while the number of grants has declined, M. Speltz added. J. Locke asked who prepares the grant applications. Some have been prepared by Planning Department staff, M. Speltz explained, but often the significant amount of work and expertise needed makes it necessary to hire outside sources such as the Rockingham Country Conservation District.

Bond proceeds comprise 60% of the revenues generated for the Open Space Fund since 1997, totaling \$8 million which was approved over five consecutive Town Meetings starting in 2001 (p. 9). In 2006 and 2007, additional bonds were not approved and since that time, none have been placed on the Town Warrant. With the exception of the need to clarify the revenue category defined as "General Fund Revenues to be reimbursed by Cons Comm," the inventory summary shows that conservation efforts over the last 23 years have yielded 8,252 acres of open space at a cost of \$15.27 million, \$10.63 of which



## Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 3 of 6

came from Town funds. The Town owns 1,693 of those acres and holds easements on another 1,104 while the remaining 5,455 acres has been protected by other entities.

88 89 90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

87

Preservation of local heritage in the form of 19.9 acres of permanently protected historic properties can be tied into the conservation of open space (p.10). The two goals mutually benefit one another since the values of historic properties are enhanced by preserving the open viewsheds around them while Londonderry's history and cultural character is one rooted in agriculture. The Historic Properties Preservation Task Force of 2006 compiled a list of 141 homes/sites/structures and 85 barns vetted through specific criteria that determined they warranted protection from demolition and/or development because of their historical relevance. (A. Rugg noted that three of those on the final list have since been removed because of modifications done to the structures). The map generated from the HPPTF's efforts will be included in the final draft of the OSTF report. M. Speltz said the HPPTF's list should be reviewed by the OSTF to see if those structures reside within areas of available open space.

99 100 101

102103

104

105

106107

108

109

110

111112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126127

128

129

130

Benefits of conserved open space were next reviewed with categories used in the 2006 OSTF along with the addition of School/Athletic Fields and Historic sites (p. 10). Within the original four categories, 21% of the 6,639 acres with agriculturally significant soils are currently protected. Forty five percent of the 14,446 acres of water resources and 15,762 acres of unfragmented forest blocks of 50 acres or more have been preserved. Of the 5,371 acres deemed to have scenic views, half have been conserved. To explain the concept of agriculturally significant soils, M. Speltz stated that agricultural soil categories were established by the Natural Resource Conservation Service to reflect a given soil's capability to support agriculture. This is based on such things as how well it is drained, the steepness of its slopes, and the amount of rock, clay, and/or sand it holds. Prime agricultural sources are considered the best and are found in only 6% of NH soils. The next level represents soils of statewide agricultural significance, which are so named because they are the best within a given state based on the conditions and limitations germane to that region. Lastly are soils of local significance that are more specifically suited to a specific area within the state. Given that there are over 26,000 acres of land in Londonderry and the only 6,639 of that acreage is considered best for agriculture, the majority of soils in town are not rated. J. Locke asked if the amount of land in each of those categories (aside from recreational fields) can be separated into those permanently and partially protected. J. Vogl said he would make those determinations and added that various graphics could be added to help illustrate all of the information discussed wherever Task Force sees fit. M. Speltz predicted the data would show that the majority of agricultural soils are permanently protected since wetlands would be the least adaptable to agriculture and most wetlands are under partial protection. Conversely, J. Vogl anticipated that the majority of water resources (including riparian buffers, wellhead protection areas, aguifers and streams) would show to be only partially protected. J. Locke also asked for clarification as to whether the acreage amounts are mutually exclusive between categories. J. Vogl explained that, in fact, they are not because multiple benefits will intersect in different areas. M. Speltz added the importance of identifying those areas of intersection so they can be made a priority since they maximize the use of open space funds. He also suggested adding a category used in the last OSTF known as the "10 to 10 rule," an ideal which seeks to provide enough open space so that every resident will be within a ten minute walk of at least ten acres of open space. L. Wiles asked whether the "unfragmented forest blocks" include structures, which J. Vogl replied they do not and that a buffer of approximately 40 feet was kept between the forest areas and any nearby buildings when identifying those areas. Roads, however, are considered the most



## Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 4 of 6

significant fragmenting feature and therefore that land is not included. This discussion lead to the topic of scenic views and J. Vogl stated the scenic views map created during the 2006 OSTF should be updated with input of the current OSTF members. Because these natural benefits are an inventory of what exists based on the categories used in 2006, M. Speltz encouraged members to add categories during the process. J. Vogl noted that the amount of land currently protected within the green infrastructure would be added to the table of "Benefits Protected."

136137138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

131

132

133

134

135

Stewardship was next discussed, with J. Vogl explaining that the Town is responsible for the management of 1,693 acres of open space it owns and the monitoring of the 1,104 acres within 108 conservation easements (p. 11). The Conservation Commission, aided by Londonderry Trailways and other volunteers, inspects town-owned conservation land and town-held easements. M. Speltz asked J. Vogl to verify whether the 108 easements include: 1) those easements the Town holds executory interest in and ensures is monitored by those who actually own them, and 2) deed restricted properties. Easement monitoring is initiated with a baseline study that documents existing conditions of the land while also confirming and clarifying the boundaries of the easement. That report is then used on an annual basis to ensure maintenance of those conditions so any issues or violations can be addressed. Baselines have been established for 24 properties, nine of which have continued to be monitored regularly. The appendix of stewardship activities was then reviewed (pp 17-19) which outlines the funds expended to date on stewardship, management, and survey costs, as well as the volunteer hours spent on those tasks. It will serve as a guide to estimate per acre values for future stewardship costs. J. Vogl noted the considerable amount of work done by Londonderry Trailways in maintaining, mapping, and adding trails in the Musquash and Kendall Pond Conservation Areas. Stewardship of the five properties that comprise the Historic District is the purview of the Heritage Commission (p.12). The Recreation Department oversees the 77 acres between Nelson Road/LAFA Complex and West Road Fields and the School District is responsible for all school athletic fields along with forested school property.

155156157

158

159

160

161162

163

164

165

166

167

J. Vogl next introduced the members to the list of ten watersheds in Londonderry as identified the 1991 Water Resources Management Plan (p. 14). This will act as the first section of Chapter 2 in the OSTF report entitled "Land Characteristics and Liabilities," and will lead into the issue of Potential Groundwater Hazards. A new Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Southern NH Planning Commission that identifies 134 hazardous waste generators in town, along with 26 above ground and 86 underground storage tanks, two solid waste facilities, and four Superfund sites. J. Vogl noted that he would be investigating similar records provided by the NH Department of Environmental Services to compare and verify the data and find the most updated information. When asked by M. Srugis how long superfund sites are examined, M. Speltz replied that three sites in Londonderry are in the monitoring phase, meaning the activities of removing hazardous materials and contaminated soil have been completed and the groundwater is tested regularly via monitoring wells until existing quality standards are met.

168169170

171

172

173

174

With the inventory of resources examined, M. Speltz turned the attention of the members to their initial step in determining one of the main goals of the OSTF charge, i.e. "How much is enough?" Because many of the values of open space are subjective and difficult to measure, consensus is needed to gain quantifiable information from varying opinions and set parameters. While the values in the 2006 OSTF were largely based on the viewpoints of the members, M. Speltz felt it was important to cast a wider net



## Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 5 of 6

and solicit thoughts from all residents. He suggested disseminating a simple survey to the public via print and internet media that would pose three main questions: 1) What land has scenic value, 2) What land has recreational value and 3) how important are nature's values and benefits? A second survey could seek the willingness of residents to purchase additional open space with Town funds to ensure these values and benefits or even compare its priority amongst other Town expenditures. M. Srugis noted the need to word questions clearly and effectively and to provide an explanation of the goals of the survey.

M. Speltz next asked for suggestions to add to the list of "Nature's Value and Benefits" provided by open space that were specified in OSTF charge. "Community heritage" had been added at the November 4 meeting. B. Manning replied that quality of life is an important value to identify. D. Coons noted the potential variety of ideals inherent in that topic. M. Srugis offered that housing density as discussed during the new Inclusionary Housing ordinance (a/k/a Workforce Housing) discussions would be a worthwhile topic. L. Wiles questioned again whether recreational fields should be included when discussing nature's benefits and values since their purpose is limited to athletic events and their maintenance with the use of fertilizers and pesticides can negatively affect such things as drinking water quality. M. Srugis stated that levels of fertilizer used in the LAFA fields are low and believed that recent testing of the School recreation fields showed the same. M. Speltz acknowledged the need to detail the pros and cons of recreational/athletic fields, (including the town's golf course where fertilizer use is undoubtedly higher), but said that in the broader picture, they still provide the pervious surface that is a part of overall water quality.

Once members make any additions to the list of values and benefits, staff can begin researching how to measure those items and determining their locations in Londonderry. Drinking water quality can be gauged by looking at the land uses surrounding wetlands, along with the amount of impervious surface in close proximity to them. Species diversity as well as connections between plant and animal habitat can be found in data compiled in NH Fish and Game's Wildlife Action Plan and the NH Natural Heritage Bureau. Flood storage can be examined with the use of flood maps from the Federal Emergency Management Agency while climate scientists have provided calculations to predict future precipitation events (regardless of their cause). J. Locke asked J. Vogl if he could obtain figures showing the number of Londonderry residents serviced by well water, Pennichuck water, and Manchester water. M. Srugis asked if it was possible to determine how much more development can be supported by existing groundwater within the Town. M. Speltz replied that he and staff could investigate if an approximation can be made. When these measurements and location of resources are provided at the January meeting, the OSTF can begin to determine what amount of that open space will be needed to provide satisfactory levels of the associated benefits. Rather than producing a specific number, M. Speltz suggested providing a range of how much of that land will be needed to satisfy certain levels and allow residents and Town leaders to determine what point along the spectrum is best for the town and its future needs.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:55 PM. The next meeting will take place on January 6, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

# Londonderry Open Space Task Force Tuesday, December 2, 2010 Page 6 of 6

219 220

221 Jaye Trottier

222 Secretary