

Public Meeting
Natural Resources and Conservation Committee
Meeting Remotely held by Zoom platform: see details below
7:00 PM Wednesday February 9, 2022

Attendees: Fred Morgan, Robert Paquin, Don Rendall, Gail Albert, Chandler Noyes, Christine Haines, Mike Schramm, Sean MacFaden

Agenda & Notes:

- Call SNRCC meeting to Order: 7:00 –
 - Called to order 7pm.
- Identify minute taker - 7:01 -7:02
 - Jon Cocina
- Amendments to the Agenda
 - Gail – discuss SNRCC meeting schedule change
- Review and Approve Agenda – 7:02 -7:03
 - Bob moved, Chandler seconded
- Review and approve minutes of Aug 18, 2021 7:03 – 7:04
 - Will review and approve at next meeting
- Public Comment (for items not on agenda) 7:05-7:10
 - No public participants
- SNRCC Meeting Schedule (new item)
 - Jon – 1st or 3rd Thursday
 - Chandler – flexible
 - Bob open most Thursdays
 - Fred – 1st Thursday
 - Christine – 1st or 3rd Thursday
 - Sean – flexible – commented if a second meeting would help
 - Mike – flexible on Thursdays most of the time
 - Don – 1st Thursday
 - Gail – fine with either Thursday
 - 2 meetings – Is it feasible
 - Chandler – that would mean that people miss more meetings. Meetings would need to be shorter. Could always cancel meetings if unneeded.
 - Bob – hesitant to commit to 2 meetings. Play a second meeting by ear.
 - Gail also likes having one set meeting and adding as needed.
 - Gail moved to make our meeting 1st Thursday of each month with adding a second meeting if so required. We can ask for staff reports and projects to be issued to us as soon as they come in.
 - **Motion was then canceled and Gail will instead follow up with Adele to push the Town to move filing deadlines given that the committee can only meet once per month on the first Thursday of the month. It has**

become clear that even with changing meeting dates, we can't meet the deadlines proposed by the Town.

- Bob commented that the committee is trying to accommodate all the changes, but the Town needs to do the same.
- We will revisit the conversation at the next meeting.
- Development Review –7:11-7:25
 - February 16 – Shelburne Shipyards, continued review from the January 19th DRB meeting
 - Committee revisited comments from the last meeting. Adele has specified that we must submit comments on the night of 2/9.
 - Gail went to the DRB meeting for the presentation. Lots of concerns from neighbors related to wetland, traffic, building demolition, and road safety.
 - A report has been submitted to the Town (40 pages) – raising issues because an act 250 permit has not been issued. Plans may put development 2-feet into high-water mark for Lake Champlain. New impervious surfaces will add to runoff.
 - Don – Confirmed all traffic would now come through the wetland.
 - New SNRCC comments
 - Regulation 2110.36 – Committee would like to ensure that proposal meets standards for wetland, floodplain, lakeshore, etc.
 - Regulation 1760 – Removal of vegetation from the wetland.
 - Are there plans regarding waste management and contamination risks?
 - Motion – Committee has several concerns, most notably that it is unclear if Local & State authorities have approved this project to ensure it complies with all necessary laws and regulations. The committee wants to ensure that proper permits have been secured. Is that true? The committee has additional questions outlined at the last meeting including:
 - What is the impact of the expansion on septic and runoff?
 - Has work started without proper permitting.
 - We will add the additional questions from the last meeting as well.
 - Jon makes the motion and Christine seconded. All in favor.

- SUB 21-01 / BLA 21-03 / SP 22-01 4309 & 4385 Shelburne Road – Preliminary Plan for two lot subdivision and site plan approval for hockey academy. Comments due by Feb 8
 - Committee has no new comments on this project.
 - March 2 – SUB 22-01 913 Falls Road, Sketch Plan review of proposed 7 unit PUD comments due by Feb 17 See Gravelin documents attached
 - Does the proximity to the LaPlatte River present concerns.
 - Is there too much of a slope – 15% or more?
 - Mike - Is there potential for adding the back part of the lot to the Park? Could there be public access?
 - Sean – Does the last unit sit too far on the slope? Could there be greater clustering? Are they proposing to develop on steep slopes.
 - Request that as few trees as possible are disturbed.
 - If Northern section is not added to the Park, then we request no disturbance beyond potential public access.
 - If we request access, we are not asking for parking.
 - Ensure that all development follows the Shelburne Falls Historic District regulations.
 - Motion Jon, Bob 2nd
 - Discussion about best approach to make sure the land is permanently conserved. Best approach? We would like to discuss this with the developer.
 - Chandler amendment to the motion – The Committee moves to discuss permanent conservation options with the developer, requests providing public pedestrian access to the property without requiring parking, minimal disturbance of trees, and would like to see further clustering of units in order to further to avoid steep slopes.
 - All voted yes. – 9 people
 -
- Work on RFP for consultant study 7:26-7:40
 - Priorities for this project? Result should help to drive new regulation. Findings could also apply to conservation prioritization.
 - Sean – We should focus on habitat. We should not narrow things down to singular species. We should be looking more holistically.
 - Potentially have the consultant propose a methodology that would help to promote conservation in a town like Shelburne?
 - We should provide a budget. (probably around \$15K)
 - Need to start draft RFP – Jon will start a document.
- Discuss having Jens Hilke of Fish&Wildlife Department run a community values mapping effort 7:41-7:59

- Process for engaging the community to identify locations in a town to identify areas in town that are valuable for various reasons (fishing, working lands, recreation, etc.)
- Process will ultimately highlights areas of highest “value.”
- Potentially valuable for the Planning Commission as they consider new regulations.
- This could supplement the potential project with the Council of Rural Development well.
- Group agrees that more information is better and it allows us to engage more people in talking about conservation priorities.
- Might need to pull money from the budget available to town committees.
- Discuss how to utilize additional volunteer time & effort 8:00-8:15
 - Might be able to tap into volunteers to assist with the community values exercise.
 - Don moved that SNRCC will move forward with mapping process and will engage with volunteers to bring it to life. Bob seconded. All in favor.
 - Will seek RFP support.
- Discuss possible grant application for Laplatte vegetation needs 8:16-8:25
 - Given the Feb 11th deadline, maybe more effective to look into budget cycle and to see what upcoming opportunities look like.
- Don present regs overview on regulations that work for us 8:26-8:55
 - What regs should we focus on when providing comments?
 - Don shared a document of notes that covered Zoning & Districts. Article XIX of regulations is a more important sections. Notes on 1930, key statements in 1930.2 and 1930.3. Article VI Subdivision Requirements 600 Preliminary Plan identifies our comments as part of process and required. Section 800 provides more concrete language we should use.
 - Don will send notes to the committee for review.
- NRCC Strategic Planning, continued 8:56-9:25
 - How is the committee doing under the new environment. Opening conversation about scheduling showcases the issues. We continue to be told to be “patient.” There’s still a lot that needs to get figured out.
 - We need to make sure the committee can be effective.
 - The mobilization of Jim’s committee showcases the need to do more and to find ways to have a greater voice.
- Exec Session for Conservation projects - no topics
- Updates/New Business 9:26-9:30
- Adjourn – 9:30, or upon completion of discussion
 - Don moved, Bob seconded, All in favor.