



Londonderry Open Space Task Force

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Page 1 of 3

1 Present: Mike Speltz, Chair and Conservation Commission Representative; Lynn Wiles, Secretary and
2 Planning Board Representative; Bob Saur, Londonderry Trailways Representative; Bill Manning,
3 Recreation Commission Representative; George Herrmann, School Board Representative; Art Rugg,
4 Heritage Commission Representative; Marty Srugis, Solid Waste Advisory Committee Representative;
5 John Curran, Budget Committee Representative; and Lisa Whittemore, Budget Committee Alternate
6 Representative

7
8 Also present: John Vogl, GIS Manager; and Jaye Trottier, Administrative Assistant

9
10 Absent: Dana Coons, Vice Chair and Planning Board Alternate Representative; Jeff Locke, At-Large
11 Representative; Tim McKenney, At-Large Representative, and Stella Tremblay, Legislative Representative

12
13 M. Speltz called the meeting to order at 7:09 PM.

14
15 The main focus of this meeting, M. Speltz explained, was to review the Final Report of the 2010
16 Londonderry Open Space Task Force, both broadly and in detail. He first asked for overview comments
17 about the report. A. Rugg suggested adding an appendix that would include the charge of the Town
18 Council that created the Task Force. He also recommended adding an appendix with a definition and
19 explanation of the Delphi Process that was used in the course of the Task Force's work.

20
21 L. Wiles noted that the question "How much is enough?" was not explicitly answered in the report. M.
22 Srugis offered his estimation. Currently, roughly 30% of the Town is either permanently or partially
23 protected. If all of the land within the green infrastructure were to be preserved, the total would rise to
24 48%. He did not feel that a majority of residents would support that high a percentage, knowing from
25 the survey results that roughly a third are in favor of the Open Space Plan, another third oppose it and
26 the last third are somewhere in the middle. His base estimation reflected the notion of the "thirds," and
27 was therefore 33%. The survey also revealed that water quality and quantity is of chief importance to
28 residents. Therefore, he decided to add on another 5% to his total to provide the ability to conserve
29 those lands that feature aquifers and flood storage. With the additional 5%, he approximated that
30 "enough" would be 38%. M. Speltz noted that the report actually arrives at 39% (p. 32) as it removes
31 the 9% of land that comprise the backyard "no cut zones" and lots under 8 to 20 acres in size. He also
32 stated that 48% could be viewed as an ideal to reach for, knowing that development will occur on some
33 of the properties. Another way to answer the question as to how much is enough, he suggested, is to
34 take all eight resource maps (pp. 41-46) and overlap them since each map uses a metric that identifies
35 the land in town that provides the natural services desired.

36
37 J. Curran asked if the differences between conservation easements and fee purchases could be
38 explained within Chapter 4, "Land Protection Methods." It was decided that adding a table of the pros
39 and cons of each would be the most effective way of distinguishing the two. M. Srugis also asked if an
40 appendix could be added that explains how an easement is valued. L. Whittemore noted the timing of
41 these explanations because of the transaction pending before the Town Council where the purchase of a
42 20-acre easement on map and lot 17-10 is being considered. The consensus was to draft a separate
43 letter to the Council recommending the easement purchase based on the findings of the Task Force so
44 that they would have that information in a timely manner. **M. Srugis made a motion to send a letter to**



Londonderry Open Space Task Force

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Page 2 of 3

45 **the Town Council recommending the purchase of the conservation easement on 17-10. B. Manning**
46 **seconded. The motion was approved, 9-0-0.**

47
48 In terms of specific comments or changes, the following were noted:

- 49
- 50 ○ Page 28, paragraph 4; Use a pie chart instead of text to explain Map 5.2.
 - 51
 - 52 ○ Page 32, paragraph 2; Rewrite the third sentence to be more clear.
 - 53
 - 54 ○ Page 35, Table 5.3; Add an introduction to the table to explain how it was sorted and
55 change the sorting to prioritize by threat rating, followed by resource score, resource
56 score per acre, and resource score per dollar.
 - 57
 - 58 ○ Page 52, paragraph 2; Remove the first “and” from the third sentence.
 - 59
 - 60 ○ Page 63, last paragraph;
 - 61 ● Add “and the School system” to “Use social media tools”
 - 62 ● Add more activities to “bike rides or hikes,” such as cross-country skiing, field
63 days, trail work days, etc.
 - 64 ● Add “and students” after the word “residents.”
 - 65
 - 66 ○ Page 65, paragraph 2; Change sentence to read “Partner with neighboring communities
67 (e.g. Hudson, Litchfield, Derry, etc.).”
 - 68
 - 69 ○ Page 65, paragraph 3; Add “outdoor” to “a hockey rink.”
 - 70
 - 71 ○ Page 65, paragraph 6; split the two sentences into separate bullet points.
 - 72
 - 73 ○ Page 67, Conclusion 6, paragraph 1; Put the second sentence first and rewrite to include
74 the specifics “39%” and “48%” as discussed earlier.
 - 75
 - 76 ○ Reorganize the Conclusions as follows:
 - 77 1. Continuing to protect open spaces
 - 78 2. Developing a comprehensive stewardship plan for all town-owned land
 - 79 3. Protection of water resources
 - 80 4. Education/Outreach
 - 81 5. Recreation on town-owned land
 - 82 6. Land Use regulations/policies
 - 83 7. Funding
 - 84
 - 85 ○ Page 68, paragraph 3; Determine the legality of using Land Use Change Tax monies
86 toward stewardship of conservation land in a non-lapsing fund.
 - 87



Londonderry Open Space Task Force

Thursday, July 7, 2011

Page 3 of 3

88 **M. Speltz entertained a motion to approve the Final Report of the 2010 Londonderry Open Space Task**
89 **Force with the above changes noted. L. Whittemore so moved. M. Srugis seconded. The motion was**
90 **approved, 9-0-0.**

91

92 **A. Rugg made a motion to accept the minutes of the June 2, 2011 meeting as written. G. Herrmann**
93 **seconded. The motion was approved, 8-0-1 with M. Speltz abstaining as he had not attended the**
94 **meeting.**

95

96 **A. Rugg made a motion to adjourn. L. Wiles seconded. The motion was approved, 9-0-0.**

97

98 The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

99

100 Respectfully submitted,

101

102

103

104

105 Jaye Trottier

106 Secretary

DRAFT