

Excerpts - Town of Lansing Planning Board Meeting -December 11, 2017

Chairman Tom Ellis would like to respond to the Tompkins County Planning & Sustainability 239 review letter that was received late on Friday, December 8, 2017.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 239 RESPONSE FROM TOMPKINS COUNTY - COMPLIMENTS - SUGGEST MINOR CHANGES

Chairman Tom Ellis stood up and gave all the Planning Board Members a standing ovation for a job well done for the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Update. The County review gave the Town of Lansing compliments on creating such a comprehensive document. The County was only concerned about two aspects of the Plan. Only two aspects from a document with over 100 pages plus all the Appendixes.

The County offered a few minor modifications that are so simple. The Planning Board members feel it would be in the Towns best interest to recommend making the minor changes to the Town Board and move it forward.

Planning Board Chairman Tom Ellis stated "I think the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Update is ready to be approved after 5 years of review with the Committee with countless public hours and fourteen meetings with the Planning Board each meeting approximately two hours per meeting equating to roughly 196 person hours. That does not include the Town Planner, Joseph Shepard, Code Officer and many others. After all the extensive editing with countless hours of intensive thought and discussion, to do anything but move this Comp Plan forward at this point would be a dis-service to everyone involved over the last 6 years. We have professionals sitting hear that have dealt with planning, we deal with planning year after year, and we have a Professional Planner from the County who reviewed the plan and gave compliments to the Town on creating such a comprehensive document." Chairman Tom Ellis "does not see what we are waiting on or what we are looking for it is ready for prime time."

In response to the 239 review from the County - minor modifications:

- 1. Chaper 4, Future Land Use Sections on Residential - Mixed Use/Moderate Density Areas.** After much discussion about this topic, the Planning Board determined that the County recommended language altered (c) be adopted as proposed. The Planning Board considers every application with regards to traffic impacts and density issues. There was a transportation study included by the Cornell Design Connect and Tompkins County Transportation Council Staff that projects traffic impacts of the by projected development.

Planning Board Recommendation to the Town Board:

1(c) Include in the resolution adopting the Plan a statement that these impacts will be analyzed in detail before any zoning amendments to implement the Plan are adopted.

2. Chapter 3, Sections on Infrastructure and Housing and Neighborhoods

The discussion continues about the Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan and Guy Krogh pointed out the 2017 proposed Lansing Comprehensive Plan update does in fact comply with the Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan. They next reviewed the language and offered the following amendment to change the word "expand" to "enhance" as recommended but exclude the "(not necessarily expand)".

2(a) the word changed to "enhance" and exclude the (not necessarily expand)

a) Modify recommendation I-1A to indicate that the Town will work with NYSEG to **enhance** ~~(not necessarily expand)~~ the electrical and natural gas distribution systems to increase capacities, while encouraging the transition to alternative forms of energy, and

2(b) add "and discuss with" after NYSEG, and change to "all uses in the Town of Lansing"

b) Modify recommendation HN-3B to indicate that the Town will work with NYSEG **and discuss with** the Town of Dryden and Tompkins County on the means of enhancing capacity of natural gas to service **residential or** industrial or commercial uses in the Town of Lansing.

**MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE TOWN BOARD
HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON DECEMBER 20TH AND
TO APPROVE THE 2017 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

Larry Sharpsteen made a motion to RECOMMEND THAT THE TOWN BOARD HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON DECEMBER 20, 2017 AND TO APPROVE THE 2017 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE at 7:42pm. Jerry Caward seconded the motion:

All in Favor - 7

Opposed - 0

Tompkins County
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
and SUSTAINABILITY

121 East Court Street
Ithaca, New York 14850

Katherine Borgella, AICP
Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

Telephone (607) 274-5560

December 8, 2017

Mr. Michael Long, AICP, Planning Consultant
Town of Lansing
Box 186
Lansing, NY 14882

Re: Review Pursuant to §239 -l, -m and -n of the New York State General Municipal Law
Action: Review of Town of Lansing Comprehensive Plan (2017)

Dear Mr. Long:

This letter acknowledges your referral of the proposal identified above for review and comment by the Tompkins County Department of Planning and Sustainability pursuant to §239-l, -m, and -n of the New York State General Municipal Law.

We understand that the preparation of the Town of Lansing Comprehensive Plan (2017) took years of work and countless hours of volunteer time and we would like to extend our compliments to the Town on creating such a comprehensive document. While we have had the opportunity to review earlier drafts and have provided informal comments to Town planning staff as the Plan was revised, we remain concerned about two aspects of the Plan that may have negative inter-community, or county-wide impacts. We therefore are recommending modification of the Plan. As required by GML §239-l, -m, and -n, if the Board does not incorporate these recommendations, such approval will require a vote of a supermajority (meaning a majority plus one) of all members of the decision-making body. We are happy to meet in person or over the phone to discuss these recommendations in more detail if you would like.

The intended purpose of GML §239-l, -m, and -n is to bring pertinent inter-community and countywide matters into consideration in the review of planning, zoning, and development review applications. Therefore, when we review municipal comprehensive plans we try to 1) anticipate impacts to neighboring communities and community resources, such as traffic impacts or impacts to water resources, that may arise if the stated goals and recommendations were implemented, and 2) consider where the proposed plan supports or conflicts with the adopted Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan that was developed for and with all residents of the County.

While we understand that the stated intent of Chapter 3: Goals and Recommendations is to summarize the list of priority issues identified by each of the Comprehensive Planning Committee members and is not intended to create law, policy or regulation, we need to treat that Chapter as the stated policy of the Town of Lansing and consider the potential impacts of implementation of those goals and recommendations.

Recommended Modifications

1) Chapter 4, Future Land Use Sections on Residential – Mixed Use/Moderate Density Areas

We believe that there could be significant impacts to the transportation and infrastructure networks within the Town of Lansing and to the Villages of Lansing and Cayuga Heights if the southern portion of the Town is developed in accordance with the *Proposed Future Land Uses Map*, and therefore those potential impacts need to be analyzed. In particular, we are concerned about the Residential – Mixed Use/Moderate Density Land Use Area. Moderate density is stated in the draft Plan as being similar to that of Village Solars/Village Circle which has approximately 14 dwelling units per acre. Full build-out of the identified areas to that density may result in significant environmental impacts. We have not yet seen Parts 2 and 3 of the SEQR analysis to evaluate these impacts, so have the following recommendations on how to address this concern:

- a) Incorporate an analysis of the impacts of proposed increased development as envisioned in the Plan to the transportation and infrastructure networks within the Town of Lansing and to neighboring municipalities into Parts 2 and 3 of the SEQR review prior to adoption of the Plan, or
- b) Add a section to the Plan that analyzes these impacts, or
- c) Include in the resolution adopting the Plan a statement that these impacts will be analyzed in detail before any zoning amendments to implement the Plan are adopted.

2) Chapter 3, Sections on Infrastructure and Housing and Neighborhoods

We recommend modifying the recommendations in these two sections to reduce reliance specifically on the expansion of natural gas to support growth and instead use more expansive language to allow for other energy solutions. The Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan calls for the community to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at least 80 percent from 2008 levels by 2050, and in order to achieve that goal the County's Energy Roadmap concluded that instead of expanding natural gas use, the community needs to reduce use of natural gas by at least 50 percent from 2008 levels while still undertaking extraordinary efforts to increase efficiency and deploy local renewables. To address these concerns, we specifically recommend the following two modifications:

- a) Modify recommendation I-1A to indicate that the Town will work with NYSEG to enhance (not necessarily expand) the electrical and natural gas distribution systems to increase capacities, while encouraging the transition to alternative forms of energy, and
- b) Modify recommendation HN-3B to indicate that the Town will work with NYSEG, the Town of Dryden and Tompkins County on the means of enhancing capacity of natural gas to serve industrial or commercial uses in the Town of Lansing.

Comments

While not part of our official 239 recommended modifications, we offer the following additional comments on the Plan that the Town may wish to consider:

- For your information, the "Bell Station" land (described on page 40), was established as a Unique Natural Area by the Tompkins County Environmental Management Council in 2017. This is based on on-site field work and identification of rare plant species. Details of this new UNA (UNA-195, *Nut Ridge on Cayuga Lake*) are attached for your information.
- In order to draw a sharp distinction between the purposes and mechanisms for protecting steep slopes versus those for protecting stream corridors, we suggest that CL-2B (page 67) be rewritten as two separate recommendations: one for steep slopes and one for stream corridors.
- In the list of tourism programs identified under Goal T-3 (page 73), we suggest you also include the Cayuga Lake Scenic Byway.
- We shared the Plan's *Highway Map with Potential Future Roads* with the Tompkins County Highway Department and they identified a few specific concerns. Prior to advancing efforts for road

improvements we suggest a more detailed conversation with County Highway, including input on future road improvements and assistance with developing a priority project list or phased plan to tackle all the improvements the Plan envisions.

Please inform us of your decision so that we can make it a part of the record.

Sincerely,



Katherine Borgella, AICP
Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability

cc: Mike Sigler, County Legislator, District 6
Glenn Morey, County Legislator, District 9
Dooley Kiefer, County Legislator, District 10
Deborah Dawson, County Legislator Elect, District 10
Charlie Purcell, Highway Superintendent, Town of Lansing
Jeff Smith, Tompkins County Highway Director

ATTACHMENT

SITE NAME: Nut Ridge on Cayuga Lake
DATA LAST UPDATED: 1/31/2017

SITE CODE: UNA-195
OLD SITE CODE:

LOCATION

Municipality: Lansing

Latitude: 42 37'1.4816"N

USGS Quad: Trumansburg 7.5'

Longitude: 76 38'16.984"W

Tax Parcel Numbers Included in this Site:

Tax parcel data is accurate as of 2014. For up-to-date information on tax parcel descriptions and ownership, contact the Tompkins County Assessment Department. When a UNA covered less than 0.025 ac. of a parcel, the parcel was excluded from this list.

503289-1.-1-16,

SITE AND VEGETATION DESCRIPTION

More than 20 permanent and intermittent streams carve through the sloped property. Three gorges can be found on the property, exposing excellent examples of 3 different rock status assemblages. Mixed deciduous forests contain diverse stands of maple, basswood, and red and white oak, with a healthy understory that appears to have persisted despite deer browsing.

This site has a complex history. A portion of the eastern-most sections of the site appears to once have been farmed. Rusted cattle fencing can be found at many locations through the woods, indicating a history of grazing under the canopy (a practice quite prevalent 50 to 100 years ago). The less-steep portions of forest have been periodically logged, however some of the trees on the property appear to be quite old, indicating that at least a portion of the property has not been farmed in many years.

Currently, a coal-burning peaker power plant built in the 1960s, operates just south of the property.

In the early 1970s, it was the planned site of a nuclear power plant on Cayuga Lake. This project was strongly opposed by a combination of Cornell faculty and local activists. Although a foundation hole was excavated for the power station, it was subsequently filled back in.

In the subsequent 45 years, the site has returned to a natural state.

The flat, lakeside portions of the site have been used for decades, if not centuries by campers and picnicking groups; Native Americans may well have camped and fished from this sheltered site.

Two of the most noteworthy finds require mention here. A large and flourishing population of *Jeffersonia diphylla*, twin-leaf or butterfly-leaf, a NYS Threatened (S2) species population was found in one of the larger ravines. This is the only natural population in Tompkins County and one of the largest in NY, about 1000 plants. It is in shale and limestone talus with mature maple-basswood forest; pristine undisturbed habitat. The other is the pale pea, *Lathyrus ochroleucus*, a locally rare (and NYS Rare, S3) species previously thought to have completely vanished from the Cayuga Lake watershed.

REASONS FOR SELECTION

- Quality example of plant community
- Area of geologic importance
- Birding site
- Diverse flora
- Rare or scarce community types
- Rare or scarce plants
- Wetlands
- Scenic/Aesthetic value
- Recreational value
- Cultural/historic/archeological site
- Important teaching site
- Site of local significance

SPECIAL LAND-USE INFORMATION

Special Land-Use Designations and Features

Water Resources

- Wetlands identified on the National Wetlands Inventory are found on this site.
- A stream runs through this site.

CONSERVATION OF THE SITE

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE

Size (acres): 296.5 **Elevation (ft.):** 390-720 feet **Aspect:** Southwest

Topographic Features

Extremely steep slopes with unusual gorges, rock exposures, and associated water seepages.

Geological Features

Significant exposed outcrop of Tully limestone, upslope of Moscow shale. Variable texture (boulders to silt), usually poorly sorted sand-rich diamict, deposition beneath glacier ice, permeability varies with compaction, thickness variable (1-50 meters).

Soils Present on the Site

Soil characteristics of the site were determined manually and are approximate. In the future, digital soil data will provide more accurate information

Soil Name

Hydric (Wet)

Erodibility

Drainage

Arkport fine sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Non-hydric

Potentially highly erodible

Well drained

Arkport fine sandy loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes

Non-hydric

Highly erodible

Well drained

Genesee silt loam

Non-hydric

Non-highly erodible

Well drained

Slope %

Topographic Position

Flat

Crest

3 to 15

Upper Slope

15 to 25

Mid Slope

Over 25

Lower Slope

Bottom

Hudson silty clay loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Non-hydric	Potentially highly erodible	Well drained to moderately well drained
Hudson-Cayuga silt loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Non-hydric	Highly erodible	Well drained to moderately well drained
Hudson-Cayuga silt loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes, eroded	Non-hydric	Highly erodible	Well drained to moderately well drained
Hudson-Cayuga silt loams, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	Non-hydric	Highly erodible	Well drained to moderately well drained
Hudson-Cayuga silt loams, 12 to 20 percent slopes	Non-hydric	Highly erodible	Well drained to moderately well drained
Ilion silty clay loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Hydric	Potentially highly erodible	Poorly drained
Ovid silt loam, 0 to 6 percent slopes	Potential hydric inclusions	Potentially highly erodible	Moderately well drained to somewhat poorly drained
Rock outcrop	Non-hydric	Not applicable	Not applicable

BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE

General Cover Types

Rock outcrops and gravel banks
 Old fields, meadows
 Old-field forest
 Upland forest
 Plantation or orchard
 Wet meadow
 Aquatic vegetation

Ecological Communities

Detailed information regarding each community type's rareness may be found in Appendix F. For up-to-date information on ecological communities, contact the NY Natural Heritage Program (518-783-3932).

Rarity: (Key: No checkmarks indicate that no communities fall within those categories.)

- Global - At least one community designated as rare or scarce at the global level by The Nature Conservancy is found on this site.
 State - At least one community designated as rare or scarce at the state level by The Nature Conservancy and the New York Natural Heritage Program is found on this site.
 Local - At least one community designated as rare or scarce at the local level by the Tompkins County EMC and the Cornell Plantations is found on this site.

Ecological Communities Inventoried on this Site:

Community Name	Description	Global/State/Local	Rarity
Successional northern hardwoods	A forest with more than 60% canopy cover of trees that occurs on sites that have been cleared or otherwise disturbed. Dominant trees are usually two or more of the following: red maple, white pine, white ash, gray birch, quaking aspen, big-tooth aspen, and, less frequently, sugar maple and white ash. Tree seedlings and saplings may be of more shade tolerant species. Shrubs and ground cover species may be those of old-fields. In abandoned pasturelands apples and hawthorns may be present in the understory.	G5 S5	L4
Rocky headwater stream	The aquatic community of a small to moderate sized rocky stream with a moderate to steep gradient that lacks persistent emergent vegetation. The cold water stream flows over eroded bedrock near the stream origin and contains alternating riffle and pool sections. These streams typically have mosses and algae present, but few larger rooted plants.	G4 S4	L4
Intermittent stream	The aquatic community of a small ephemeral streambed with a moderate to steep gradient where the water flows only during the spring or after a heavy rain. The streambed may be covered with mosses such as Bryhnia novae-angliae.	G4 S4	L4
Summer stratified monomictic lake	The aquatic community of a lake that is so deep that it has only one period of mixing or turnover each year, and one period of stratification, during the summer. Because these lakes usually do not freeze, the water circulates and is isothermal during the winter. Characteristic aquatic macrophytes include pondweeds, horned pondweed, naiad, waterweed, tapegrass, and coontail (Cayuga Lake).	G3G4 S2S3	L2
Inland calcareous lake shore	The gravelly, sandy, or muddy shore of a lake or pond with calcareous water and seasonally fluctuating water levels. The substrate is either saturated or flooded. Vegetative cover may be sparse; the dominant species are herbaceous. Characteristic species include spikerushes, soft rush, bulrushes, water plantain, water stargrass, creeping spearwort, and lake cress.	G4? S3S4	L2L3
Calcareous shoreline outcrop	A community with sparse vegetation that occurs along the shores of lakes and streams on outcrops of calcareous rocks such as limestone and dolomite. Most plants are rooted in rock crevices. Mosses and lichens may be common. Characteristic species include wild columbine, Carex eburnea, C. granularis, silky dogwood, red-osier dogwood, and meadow rue.	G3G4 S3?	L3
Calcareous cliff community	A community with sparse vegetation that occurs on vertical exposures, cliffs, and talus slopes of resistant bedrock such as limestone or dolomite or consolidated materials. There is little soil. Characteristic species include purple cliff brake, bulb fern, early saxifrage, and eastern red cedar.	G4 S3S4	L3

Successional old field	A meadow on sites cleared, plowed, and then abandoned. The ragweed type occurs on fields 1 to 3 years after last cultivation; ragweed, daisy, Queen Anne's lace, crab grass, golden foxtail, and chickweed are common. The goldenrod subtype occurs 3 - 15 years after last cultivation. Dominant species are perennial composites: goldenrods and asters. Other herbs include timothy, orchard grass, smooth brome, bluegrasses, quackgrass, sweet vernal grass, evening primrose, old-field cinquefoil, wild strawberry, and hawkweeds. Shrubs and trees represent less than 50% cover but include gray dogwood, arrowwood, raspberries, blackberries, sumac, red maple and white pine.	G4	S4	L4
Successional shrubland	A shrubland with at least 50% cover of shrubs that occurs on agricultural fields 10 - 25 years after abandonment, following other disturbance, and especially on sites with restricted drainage. Characteristic shrubs include gray dogwood, raspberries, hawthorn, serviceberries, chokecherry, sumac, nannyberry, arrowwood and buckthorn. Herbs are those of old-fields. Seedlings of white pine, red maple and white ash are usually present.	G4	S4	L4
Successional red cedar woodland	A woodland community that commonly occurs on abandoned agricultural fields and pastures, particularly on fertile, calcareous soils, on slopes along the lakes and, occasionally, on well drained soils of alluvial valleys. The dominant tree is usually red cedar. Gray birch, hawthorn, buckthorn, white ash, and black walnut are common associates. Shrubs and ground layers are similar to that of successional old field.	G5	S5	L3
Appalachian oak-hickory forest	A hardwood forest with more than 60% canopy cover of trees that occurs on well-drained sites, usually on flat hilltops, upper slopes, or south and west facing slopes. Dominant trees include one or more of red oak, white oak, and black oak. Mixed with oaks, are one or more of pignut, shagbark, and sweet pignut hickory. Common associates are white ash, red maple, and hop hornbeam. Small trees include flowering dogwood, witch hazel, shadbush, and choke cherry. Shrubs and groundlayer flora are diverse. Shrubs include maple-leaved viburnum, blueberries, red raspberry, gray dogwood, and beaked hazelnut.	G4G5	S4	L4
Beech-maple mesic forest	A hardwood forest with sugar maple and beech co-dominant. Found on moist, well-drained soils, on north and east facing slopes, and on gently sloping hilltops of any aspect, this ecological community type rarely occurs in ravines. Common associates are basswood, American elm, white ash, yellow birch, hop hornbeam, and red maple. Characteristic species in the sub-canopy are musclewood, striped maple, witch hazel, hobblebush, and alternate-leaved dogwood. There typically are few herbs and shrubs, but tree seedlings may be abundant. There are many spring ephemerals.	G4	S4	L4
Maple-basswood rich mesic forest	A hardwood forest that typically occurs on fertile, moist, well-drained soils. It is often associated with limestone or deep glacial gravels. Dominant trees are sugar maple, basswood, and white ash. Common associates are bitternut hickory, tulip tree, musclewood, alternate-leaved dogwood, and witch hazel. The shrub layer is sparse. Spring wildflowers are usually abundant. Characteristic species are trillium, white baneberry, spring beauty, toothwort, trout lily, and bloodroot.	G4	S2S3	L3
Hemlock-northern hardwood forest	A forest that typically occurs on lower slopes of ravines, on cool, mid-elevation slopes, and at the edges of drainage divide swamps. Hemlock is a co-dominant species with one to three others: beech, sugar maple, red maple, black cherry, white pine, yellow birch, black birch, red oak, and basswood. Shrubs have low abundance, but striped maple may be present. Herbs characteristic of northern and montane areas are common.	G4G5	S4	L4
Hardwood plantation	A planted stand of commercial trees species, usually for timber purposes. Usually a monoculture, but they may be mixed stands with two or more species. Species typically planted include red oak, black cherry, white oak, black walnut, hybrid poplars, and black locust.	G5	S3	L2L3
Wetland headwater stream	The aquatic community of a small, swampy brook with a low gradient, slow flow rate, and cool to cold water that flows through a fen, swamp or marsh near the stream origin. Springs may be present. The substrate is clay, gravel or sand, with silt, muck, peat, or marl deposits along the shore. Characteristic plants include watercress, Chara. Persistent emergent vegetation is lacking.	G4	S4	L4

Plant Species

Although substantial effort was made to identify significant plant species on this site, it is possible that additional rare or scarce species exist that do not show up in this report. A field check is always recommended prior to modifying the landscape. Detailed information regarding each species' rareness and status may be found in Appendix D. For up-to-date information on species, contact the NY Natural Heritage Program (518-783-3932).

Rarity (Key: No checkmarks indicate that no species fall within those categories.)

- Global - At least one plant species designated as rare or scarce at the global level by The Nature Conservancy is found on this site.
- State - At least one plant species designated as rare or scarce at the state level by The Nature Conservancy and the New York Natural Heritage Program is found on this site.
- Local - At least one plant species designated as rare or scarce at the local level by the Tompkins County EMC and the Cornell Plantations is found on this site.

Legal Status:

- Federal - At least one plant species designated as threatened or endangered by the U.S. Department of the Interior is found on this site.
- State - At least one plant species designated in New York State as endangered, threatened, rare or exploitably vulnerable is found on this site.

Significant Plant Species Inventoried on this Site:

Scientific Name	Common Name	Global/State/Local Rarity	Local Comments	State Legal Status
Ranunculus allegheniensis	Allegheny crowfoot	L2	Rare	None
Celastrus scandens	American bittersweet	L4		Exploitably vulnerable
Staphylea trifolia	bladderhut	L3	Scarce	None

<i>Menispermum canadense</i>	Canada moonseed			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Viburnum rafinesquianum</i>	downy arrowwood			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Myosotis verna</i>	early or white scorpion-grass, spring forget-me-not			L3	Scarce	Unprotected
<i>Phryma leptostachya</i>	lopseed			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Ceanothus americanus</i>	New Jersey tea			L4		None
<i>Physocarpus opulifolius</i>	ninebark			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Lathyrus ochroleucus</i>	pale wild pea	G4G5	S3	L2H	Rare, not seen recently	Rare
<i>Rosa carolina</i>	pasture rose			L4		None
<i>Hieracium venosum</i>	rattlesnake-weed			L4		None
<i>Carex rosea</i>	sedge			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Carex digitalis</i>	slender woodland sedge			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Ulmus rubra</i>	slippery elm			L4		None
<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>	snowberry			L3	Scarce	None
<i>Jeffersonia diphylla</i>	twingleaf	G5	S2	L2	Rare	Rare
<i>Carex willdenowii</i>	Willdenow's sedge	G5	S1	L2	Rare	Rare
<i>Taenidia integerrima</i>	yellow pimpernel			L4		None

Animal Species

Some UNAs contain much more information on animal species than others based on the availability of data. A field check is always recommended prior to modifying the landscape. Detailed information regarding each species' rareness and status may be found in Appendix E. For up-to-date information on species, contact the NY Natural Heritage Program (www.nynhp.org/).

Animal Description:

Rarity: (Key: No checkmarks indicate that no species fall within those categories.)

- Global - At least one animal species designated as rare or scarce at the global level by The Nature Conservancy is found on this site.
 State - At least one animal species designated as rare or scarce at the state level by The Nature Conservancy and the New York Natural Heritage Program is found on this site.

Legal Status:

- Federal - At least one animal species designated as threatened or endangered by the U.S. Department of the Interior is found on this site.
 State - At least one animal species designated by NYS as threatened or endangered is found on this site.

Animal Species Inventoried on this Site:

<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Global/State Rarity</u>	<u>Federal/State</u>		<u>Comments</u>
			<u>Legal Status</u>	<u>Legal Status</u>	
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Golden Eagle	G5	SHB, S1N	MBTA SE	
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Northern Harrier	G5	S3B, S3N	MBTA ST	PIF Species of Concern, Threatened
<i>Vermivora cyanoptera</i>	Blue-winged warbler				
<i>Empidonax traillii</i>	Willow Flycatcher	G5	S5	MBTA SUn	Audubon Watch List



UNA-195 Bell Station

Tompkins County Environmental Management Council
Inventory of Unique Natural Areas in Tompkins County.
Last Updated 2014

UNA boundaries were delineated by field biologists based on a review of air photographs, digital GIS base map data (roads, building footprints, 20 foot contours and streams) and field visits. UNA boundaries are approximate and should be used for general planning purposes only. As a practical matter the County does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the information portrayed. The end use of this map agrees to accept the data "as is" with full knowledge that errors and omissions may exist, and to hold harmless the County for any damages that may result from an inappropriate use of this map.



- Revised Unique Natural Areas
- Other Unique Natural Areas
- Municipal Boundaries



Town of Lansing Comprehensive Plan Milestones

Comprehensive Plan Committee – R12-166 Appointed Aug 15, 2012 –
Kathy Miller – Chairman with Jonathan Kanter, AICP- Planner

- **Vision Statement** – draft 12/12/2012
- **SWOT Analysis** – draft 12/12/2012
- **Parks, Recreation and Pathways** – draft 1/29/2014
- **Land Use and Development** – draft 3/5/2014
- **Hamlets & Town Center** – draft 9/11/2013
- **Demographic Update** – draft 11/18/2013
- **Revised Gas Drill Comp Plan** – draft 3/10/2014
- **Community Survey** – Cornell University Survey Institute – 3/12/2014
 - Survey begun 3/1/2013
 - Code Book 8/13/2013 summary
 - Power Point 12/18/2013, 3/12/2014, and 12/13/2014

Public Informational Update Meeting – April 9, 2014. (J. Kanter)

- **Comprehensive Plan Committee –**
Kathy Miller, Chair with Michael Long, AICP Planner begun - 10/8/2014
Held 14 monthly Public Meetings. 10/8/2014 - 12/16/2015
 - **Transportation Issue Assessment and Best Practices Guide** –
Cornell Design Connect Studio Project – Dec 2014.
 - **Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan** – Public Hearing
7/15/2015 and 9/16/2016. Town Board adopts the Ag Plan Resolution
15-101 on Sept 16, 2015 and establishes an Ag committee.
 - **Draft Comprehensive Plan Update Plan** components circulated to
new committee members 10/14/2015 – continued edits and revisions
 - **Form Based Code** – Cornell University Design Connect studio –
12/15/2015.
 - **Maps section** – with assistance of Tompkins County Planning.
- **Comprehensive Plan Committee – Town Board new members Jan 4, 2016**
Held 14 Public Meetings and committee sessions (1/13/2016 - 12/14/2016).
 - Connie Wilcox, Chair with additional members appointed.

- **Comprehensive Plan Update** – Issued draft July 10, 2016.
- **Public Input / Comment Meeting** held July 18, 2016.
- **Public Hearing** opened Aug 10, 2016 –comments till Aug 31, 2016.
- **Comprehensive Plan Update - Final 9/14/2016**
 - “Future Land Use Map – Revised Sept. 2016”
- **Town Board accepts Comprehensive Plan Committee Report** – and refers to the Planning Board for review and comments and dissolves the Comprehensive Plan committee (8/15/2012 - 9/21/2016).
 - Resolution 9/21/2016 accepts Comp Plan update forwards.
 - Refers the Comprehensive Plan Update to the Planning Board for review and Comments.
 - Town Board requests a Public Informational Meeting – held 8/30/2017.
- **Planning Board to review the Proposed Comprehensive Plan** and recommend additional changes / input. (8/21/2016-12/11/2017).
 - Planning Board holds 22 Public meetings to discuss the Comp Plan.
 - Tompkins Co. 239 Preliminary Review Comments letter dated 11/14/2016 and 9/1/2017.
 - Revised “Future Land Use Map” – May 2017
 - Planning Board - Final Draft Version 7/10/2017.
 - Public Hearing – 10/20/2017.
 - Planning Board Final Recommended - 2017 Comprehensive Plan Update with Future Land Use Map changes. 11/13/2017.
 - Planning Board recommends 239 amendments to final 12/11/2017.
- **Town Board -**
 - Resolution 17-154 Setting Public Hearing on December 20, 2017 Upon Final Draft Comprehensive Plan – 11/15/2017.
 - Tompkins Co. 239 Review Letter 12/8/2017.
 - Town Board completes the SEQRA Review and issues determination.
 - Town adopts the updated Comprehensive Plan Update – TBD.