

# DRAFT

## Meeting Notes

Shelburne Natural Resources and Conservation Committee

7:00 PM Wednesday, July 13, 2022

Attendees: Gail, Don, Bob, Jon, Sean, Chandler & Mike (late arrival)

Guests: Jim White & Rowland Davis; Aaron and Michael from

Arrowwood Environmental

- Gail called meeting to order at 7:13pm
- Bob volunteered to be minute taker
- Reviewed and approved the agenda:
- Motion: Jon moved, Chandler 2nd
- Reviewed and approved June 8, 2022 minutes
- Motion: Don moved, Jon 2nd
- Public Comments: Jim White of SAVE thanked the Committee for its efforts and important work.
- Discussion with Arrowwood Environmental:
- Don asked about their experience with South Burlington. Aaron said they we're not directly involved in working their finding's into regulation, but met with the Planning and Conservation Commissions as they decided which habitat blocks to include in the regulatory overlay, but were not familiar with how SoBu got to their decision. They did work with Warren in more depth. Interpretation of science depends on town process.
- Gail asked about billing for follow-up work. Aaron said there would be more cost if it were outside the bounds of the project contract, but calls and e-mails with questions were not a problem.
- Jon, Bob and Chandler were interested in learning more about the next steps in the project.

- Sean asked in that light what Arrowwood needed from the SNRCC such as GIS layers and conservation lands data. Aaron replied that whatever material SNRCC had that we thought would be helpful was welcome, specifically information either outside the public domain or not widely distributed. Aaron said they had a good working relationship with Regional Planning staff and VT FWD.
- Gail clarified the SNRCC goals of regulatory change to better identify lands most suited for conservation and to obtain better information to make recommendations when lands are about to be developed.
- Don emphasized the need to address the impact of development on wildlife as a regulatory goal.
- Sean added that helping to shape the development process with better information is a project goal and asked how best to conserve lands through the planning process. Aaron responded that Act 171 provides statutory guidance and support for this.
- Gail noted that SNRCC has always been responding ~~to~~ to landowners who want to conserve their land, rather than proactively soliciting conservation opportunities. Aaron pointed out that having the data their work will provide will help strengthen conservation funding applications.
- Don asked what input Arrowwood wanted from SNRCC as they set up the prioritization scheme. Aaron said he would follow up with a draft for SNRCC review.
- Jim White offered SAVE's help integrating the project results into the regs via the planning commission when appropriate.
- Aaron asked if the timeline could be extended from 12/31/22 to the end of January 2023. Gail said it was reasonable since the project had to wait until July 1, when the fiscal year began.
- Aaron asked SNRCC to provide any specific land use changes over the past five years which might not be reflected in the available data or could be easily missed.
- Rice Lumber, RR salt shed, Kwiniaska and Gardenside were raised immediately.
- Mike asked about the date of the aerial imagery. Sean noted 2017-18. Bob suggested SNRCC provide a list of changes since the aerial set

was done. Aaron mentioned they would also use Google. He also said they were interested in concentrated oak stands since they are important to the ranking process and referred to a State survey. Also, he wanted to know if wetlands or scrublands are important to SNRCC

- Gail noted that SNRCC would like progress reports as the project moved forward and thanked Aaron and Michael for participating.
- The committee then broke for a group photo to update the Town website. Unfortunately, Christine and Fred were not in attendance.
- Development Review Process: Don then opened discussion in preparation for an upcoming yet unscheduled SNRCC meeting with the Planning Commission asking what issues SNRCC needs to raise with the Commission. Gail said identifying what needs to be protected in a given development project is important. Sean said what is not in the current regulations should be addressed. Bob raised the issue of the timing of SNRCC input and how to make it meaningful. Don noted the lack of feedback from the DRB once SNRCC comments as well as the existing regulatory requirement of SNRCC's participation (Section 600 letter) now being ignored. In summary, the challenge of coordinating SNRCC input officially into the process and the definition of open space are major concerns.
- Rowland Davis cautioned that the hiring of the consultant for future rewriting the FBC zoning regulations was critical and that individual or firm needed to have natural resources experience.
- Development Review – No items requiring SNRCC review.
- SNRCC agreed to send a letter to the Select Board seeking a change in the name of the Open Space Fund to the Open Space Conservation Fund.
- There was only a brief discussion of the Shenk project since Adele was not able to join the meeting via Zoom, but the issue of changes in approved projects, especially those with specific conditions of approval, was cited as an SNRCC concern. Gail would close the loop with Adele and report back to the committee.
- There were no conservation projects pending to require an executive session.

- Under updates and new business Gail spoke of the need for clarification in the appointment process. Mike spoke to the value of signage recognizing Shelburne lands conserved with help from the open space fund. Sean noted the need to consider funding partners and landowners wishes. It was agreed that a close review of funded projects was needed before adding signage to the properties. Bob asked about a potential meeting he had heard seeking SNRCC input of how a local option tax could be utilized.
- Jon made a motion to adjourn at 8:58pm, Chandler 2nd. Motion carried and the meeting was adjourned.