

**OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE
FEBRUARY 2, 2006**

**OPEN SPACE BOND
TASK FORCE MEETING
FEBRUARY 2, 2006**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

Present at the meeting were Chair Fred Segal, Vice-Chair Linda Greck and task force members Tom Green, Marie Kaplan, and Don Prichard.

Also in attendance from the Town were Phil Holste and Michael Mungal.

2. OLD BUSINESS

2.1 OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION MATRIX – EXAMPLES, VAN KIRK, MATH IGLER

Mr. Segal distributed copies of the Matrix for the task force members to review.

Mr. Holste made a brief presentation on the Van Kirk and Math Iglar sites. He wanted the board to address the top portion of the matrix in relation to the Van Kirk site as an example. He felt this site covered all four categories – except the goal to “protect natural areas from development” – as the site was not a true natural or wildlife habitat.

The task force discussed whether the site met this goal. Ms. Greck felt the site should score points under this goal. Mr. Prichard felt the goal should not address potential attributes of a property but should be weighed against the property as is. Mr. Mungal felt sites being evaluated should be in the actual decision making stage as this influenced possible grant applications.

Mr. Segal asked for the members’ feedback on the four categories of goals as they related to the Van Kirk site. Mr. Prichard read the definition of a “scenic vista”. Mr. Holste felt the definition for “scenic vista” could be redefined to be less subjective. Ms. Greck felt the site could meet the goal of protecting the quality of water bodies. Further discussion occurred on the use of the matrix.

Mr. Segal stressed that the process should involve looking at the four goals to determine if the site -- in its current state -- met these goals. Discussion occurred on the use of goals with the matrix. Mr. Holste asked the board to review the Van Kirk site and determine which four goals of the bond the site met.

Mr. Holste referred to the first goal: protect the quality of water bodies. With the exception of Ms. Greck, the general consensus was that the site did not meet this goal.

Mr. Holste moved on to the second goal: protect and preserve natural areas and wildlife habitat. The general consensus stated the site met this goal.

OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE

FEBRUARY 2, 2006

Mr. Holste moved on to the third goal: complete the recreational trail system. The general consensus stated the site did not meet this goal.

Mr. Holste moved on to the fourth goal: preserve and improve parks. Mr. Green felt if a site was not a park, the category did not apply.

Mr. Prichard gave an example of how he would approach assigning points to the matrix by working vertically along the criteria.

Don Burgess provided an explanation for an alternate approach to evaluating sites on the matrix.

The task force re-approached the evaluation of the Van Kirk site in relation to the goals on the matrix, working vertically to assign "yes/no" answers to each attribute.

VAN KIRK SITE ATTRIBUTES

1. Connector between existing park, open space, trails and greenways – no
2. Parcel beyond a .5 mile radius from existing park or open space – no.
3. Parcel with a scenic vista – yes.
4. Parcel adjacent to other open space, parks, schools... – yes.
5. Parcel can serve as a trail head for existing or proposed trail system – yes.
6. Parcel with a census tract with population density of 5300+ persons/sq. mile – no.
7. Parcel with a census tract with median income of \$33,352 or less – no.
8. Parcel with a willing seller – yes.
9. Parcel qualifies for matching monies - yes.
10. Parcel is an agricultural site available for PDR – no.
11. Existing development demand for site – yes.
12. Parcel with wildlife habitat and/or corridor – no.
13. Parcel containing or abutting a significant water body or wetland – no.
14. Parcel provides natural drainage, flood storage or erosion control... – yes.
15. Parcel containing a significant native vegetative community or diversity of vegetative communities – no.
16. Parcel existing condition is pristine – no.
17. Parcel 10 acres or larger in size – yes.
18. Parcel with historical/archaeological/geological/educational opportunities – no.
19. Parcel within a well field zone – no.

The Van Kirk site scored 18 points.

[Mr. Green left the meeting at 8:13 p.m.]

MATH IGLER SITE ATTRIBUTES

1. Connector between existing park, open space, trails and greenways – no.
2. Parcel beyond a .5 mile radius from existing park or open space – yes.
3. Parcel with a scenic vista – no.

OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE

FEBRUARY 2, 2006

4. Parcel adjacent to other open space, parks, schools... – yes.
5. Parcel can serve as a trail head for existing or proposed trail system – no.
6. Parcel with a census tract with population density of 5300+ persons/sq. mile – no.
7. Parcel with a census tract with median income of \$33,352 or less – no.
8. Parcel with a willing seller – yes.
9. Parcel qualifies for matching monies - yes.
10. Parcel is an agricultural site available for PDR – no.
11. Existing development demand for site – no.
12. Parcel with wildlife habitat and/or corridor – no.
13. Parcel containing or abutting a significant water body or wetland – no.
14. Parcel provides natural drainage, flood storage or erosion control... – no.
15. Parcel containing a significant native vegetative community or diversity of vegetative communities – no.
16. Parcel existing condition is pristine – no.
17. Parcel 10 acres or larger in size – no.
18. Parcel with historical/archaeological/geological/educational opportunities – yes.
19. Parcel within a wellfield zone – no.

The Math Iglar site scored 13 points.

SUNNY LAKE SITE ATTRIBUTES

1. Connector between existing park, open space, trails and greenways – no.
2. Parcel beyond a .5 mile radius from existing park or open space – no.
3. Parcel with a scenic vista – yes.
4. Parcel adjacent to other open space, parks, schools... – no.
5. Parcel can serve as a trail head for existing or proposed trail system – yes.
6. Parcel with a census tract with population density of 5300+ persons/sq. mile – [skipped for now].
7. Parcel with a census tract with median income of \$33,352 or less – [skipped for now].
8. Parcel with a willing seller – yes.
9. Parcel qualifies for matching monies - yes.
10. Parcel is an agricultural site available for PDR – no.
11. Existing development demand for site – yes.
12. Parcel with wildlife habitat and/or corridor – yes.
13. Parcel containing or abutting a significant water body or wetland – yes.
14. Parcel provides natural drainage, flood storage or erosion control – yes.
15. Parcel containing a significant native vegetative community or diversity of vegetative communities – no.
16. Parcel existing condition is pristine – no.
17. Parcel 10 acres or larger in size – yes.

OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE

FEBRUARY 2, 2006

18. Parcel with historical/archaeological/geological/educational opportunities – yes.
19. Parcel within a wellfield zone – no.

The Sunny Lake site scored 24 points.

FARM PARK SITE ATTRIBUTES

1. Connector between existing park, open space, trails and greenways – no.
2. Parcel beyond a .5 mile radius from existing park or open space – no.
3. Parcel with a scenic vista – yes.
4. Parcel adjacent to other open space, parks, schools... – yes.
5. Parcel can serve as a trail head for existing or proposed trail system – yes.
6. Parcel with a census tract with population density of 5300+ persons/sq. mile – no.
7. Parcel with a census tract with median income of \$33,352 or less – no.
8. Parcel with a willing seller – yes.
9. Parcel qualifies for matching monies – yes.
10. Parcel is an agricultural site available for PDR – no.
11. Existing development demand for site – yes.
12. Parcel with wildlife habitat and/or corridor – yes.
13. Parcel containing or abutting a significant water body or wetland – no.
14. Parcel provides natural drainage, flood storage or erosion control...– yes.
15. Parcel containing a significant native vegetative community or diversity of vegetative communities – no.
16. Parcel existing condition is pristine – no.
17. Parcel 10 acres or larger in size – yes.
18. Parcel with historical/archaeological/geological/educational opportunities – no.
19. Parcel within a wellfield zone – no.

The Farm Park site scored 21 points.

ACTION: Ms. Greck made a motion, seconded by Ms. Kaplan, to re-do the Open Space Acquisition Matrix to follow the format used to score the 4 example sites. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion passed 4-0)

Mr. Segal suggested assigning a minimum threshold of about 10 points. Ms. Greck was reluctant to do this. Mr. Mungal felt a minimum threshold of greater than 10 points would indicate a site that met at least 2 of the 4 goals.

Dr. Pellicane, a resident of the Town, spoke in support of having a community input component in the criteria. Ms. Greck agreed with having a community petition circulated for public input which could give provide an extra boost to bring this before Council. Mr. Mungal stated the Town Council would have to decide on this. Mr. Segal indicated the minimum points would be reflected in the document anyway.

**OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE
FEBRUARY 2, 2006**

Mr. Segal wanted to review the matrix next to clarify whether each attribute met any of the goals. After brief discussion of the list of attributes, the task force determined the goals that each attribute met and agreed to position goals at the bottom of the matrix.

ACTION: Mr. Prichard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Greck to delete attributes 6 and 7 from the matrix. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 4-0)

ACTION: Mr. Segal made a motion, seconded by Ms. Kaplan, to approve the Matrix (Exhibit A) as is with goals meeting column totals. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 4-0)

Mr. Segal asked if the any member wished to add anything further to the definitions. Ms. Greck suggested that members contact Mr. Holste if they had anything to add to definitions. The group briefly reviewed definitions provided by Mr. Holste.

3. NEW BUSINESS

3.1 OPEN SPACE BOND CRITERIA DRAFT DOCUMENT – DEFINITIONS

Mr. Prichard made a motion, seconded by Ms. Kaplan, to table item 3.1 to the next week. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 4-0)

4. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Holste indicated he would have everything ready to go but did not recommend a public hearing until March 1.

Mr. Burgess indicated his additional comments were stated on the handout he provided to the task force. Ms. Greck thanked Mr. Burgess for his input and recommendations. The members agreed and commended Mr. Burgess for his contribution to the task force's efforts.

Mr. Segal indicated he would not be present on the last Thursday of the month.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Ms. Greck made a motion, seconded by Mr. Prichard, to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion passed 4-0)

Approved

Chairperson/Committee Member

OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE
FEBRUARY 2, 2006

Exhibit A: Revised Matrix Based Upon February 2, 2006 Board Meeting

OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION MATRIX	POINT VALUE	VAN KIRK	MATH IGLER	S. JAY LAKE	FARM PARK	GOAL(S) MET
0-3 POINT SCALE						
GEOGRAPHICAL (DEMOGRAPHICAL) - 5						
1. CONNECTOR BETWEEN EXISTING PARK, OPEN SPACE, TRAILS AND GREENWAYS	3	0	0	0	0	3, 4
2. PARCELS BEYOND .5 MILE RADIUS FROM EXISTING PARK OR OPEN SPACE	3	0	3	0	0	4
3. PARCELS WITH A SCENIC VISTA	2	2	0	2	2	2
4. PARCELS ADJACENT TO OTHER OPEN SPACE, PARKS, SCHOOLS, TRAILS, AND GREENWAYS	2	2	2	0	2	2, 3, 4
5. PARCELS THAT CAN SERVE AS A TRAILHEAD FOR EXISTING OR PROPOSED TRAIL SYSTEM	2	2	0	2	2	2, 3, 4
FINANCIAL - 4						
6. PARCELS WITH A WILLING SELLER	3	3	3	3	3	
7. PARCELS WHICH MAY QUALIFY FOR MATCHING MONIES	3	3	3	3	3	
8. AGRICULTURAL SITES AVAILABLE FOR PIDR	3	0	0	0	0	2
9. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT DEMAND FOR SITE	1	1	0	1	1	
PHYSICAL - 8						
10. PARCELS WITH A WILDLIFE HABITAT AND/OR CORRIDOR	3	0	0	3	3	2
11. PARCELS CONTAINING OR ADJUTING A SIGNIFICANT WATER BODY OR SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS	3	0	0	3	0	1, 2
12. PARCELS THAT PROVIDE NATURAL DRAINAGE, FLOOD STORAGE AND/OR EROSION CONTROL - WATER RECHARGE	3	3	0	3	3	1, 2
13. PARCELS CONTAINING A SIGNIFICANT NATIVE VEGETATIVE COMMUNITY OR A DIVERSITY OF VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES, UNIQUE NATIVE OR HISTORICAL PLANT SPECIES	3	0	0	0	0	2
14. PARCELS EXISTING CONDITION IS PRISTINE	3	0	0	0	0	2
15. PARCELS ARE 10 ACRES OR LARGER IN SIZE	2	2	0	2	2	1, 2, 4
16. PARCELS WITH HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL/GEOLOGICAL SITES/EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	2	0	2	2	0	2, 4
17. PARCELS WITHIN A WELLFIELD ZONE	1	0	0	0	0	1, 4
TOTAL SCORE	42	18	13	24	21	

GOALS

1. PROTECTS THE QUALITY OF WATER BODIES
2. PRESERVES AND PROTECTS NATURAL AREAS AND WILDLIFE HABITAT FROM DEVELOPMENT
3. COMPLETES THE RECREATIONAL TRAIL
4. PRESERVES AND IMPROVES PARKS

SITE BANKINGS

- SUNNY LAKE
- FARM PARK
- VAN KIRK
- MATH IGLER