**Andrews Community Forest**

Monday, December 19, 2022 – 6 pm – minutes -- Zoom

**Present**: Jesse Crary (chair), Amy Powers, Jim Monahan, Caitlin Littlefield, Nick Neverisky, Daniel Schmidt, Melissa Wolaver, Chase Rosenberg. (Not present: Cecilia Danks)

**Public**: Brad Elliot, Ian Stokes, Bob Low

**A: Roll Call, confirmation of quorum and appointment of minute taker (2 minutes)**

Appointed minute taker: CL

**B: Additions or deletions to the agenda (1 minute)**

None

**C: Discussion of November minutes**

JC: Discussion of revising minutes, following modification requests from Ian Stokes. JC checked in with town, which revealed little precedent for how to proceed with such requests. Intent of the minutes it not to capture conversation verbatim, but certainly we strive to accurately reflect what was discussed.

CR: Sees minutes as summary rather than binding record.

DS: What would process for revision be? Substantial amount of work.

MW: As minute-taker, sought to capture conversation that jumped around considerably, so level of detail varied.

JC: Minutes are not to be a transcript. From governance perspective, key element is capturing what comes out of the discussion especially regards to taking action.

Brad Elliot (via chat): Recordings effectively act as a transcript.

AP: Depends on minute-taker – may be easier for some to just capture all words versus synthesizing/summarizing info on the fly while trying to be present in the meeting. Can we load audio transcript onto website and should we post written comments that people bring to the meetings?

NN: It may be cumbersome for people to request transcript, but how much more cumbersome is it for Josh or Ravi to get us the link each week?

CL: We should follow precedent of what other committees are doing.

AP: Adding only attendee’s comments may be privileging certain people who have the time to attend.

JC: Resolve to discuss comments as a committee if a substantial error is identified or if we misrepresented – we need to give that heightened attention. As usual, we will append comments written into Zoom comments to the minutes, to capture the conversation. Otherwise when written comments are shared with the committee over email, those will be shared with the committee but not published alongside meeting minutes (following convo from last week).

Ian Stokes: Open-meeting law offers guidance bout what ought to be in minutes.

AP: We ought to capture succinct resolution of at close of discussion.

NN: Found VT League of Cities and Towns meeting minutes guidance: Minutes must give a "true indication of the business of the meeting" - which may require supplementing the following statutorily-required elements: members present; active participants at the meeting; motions, proposals, and resolutions made, offered, and considered and what disposition is made of the same; the result of any votes taken; and a record of individual votes if a roll call is taken. 1 V.S.A. § 312(b)(1).

JC: Clearly meant to capture actions.

CR: Supports brief recap at the end of any discussion AP suggested to it’s not additional work for note-taker.

Ian Stokes: Advises it’s chair person or minute taker to recap.

Brad Elliot (via chat): Couldn’t written documents read at a meeting be appended to the minutes?

NN: Amy’s point about equity – can’t just preferentially publish written words from someone who could attend.

DS: Some people may *not* want those posted.

CL: Selectboard does not append every comment that’s read at their meetings

JC: Ian, per these decisions, we want to make sure we allow you to call out any specific issues that you’d like to elevate.

***RECAP:***

* Simplify our minutes to contain votes/resolutions/outcomes only, not detailed notes.
* We will accept minutes modification requests from individuals not on committee and deliberate on them if they surface any errors or inaccuracies. We will remedy as necessary.

**D: Arrowwood report**

DS: Let’s make sure flagging around areas don’t get lost during the winter.

CL: Can get coords from Arrowood.

JC: Take-away from report, there would be some relatively minor re-routing.

AP: Large group of volunteers doing trail-building could trample plants on day-of, independent of re-routing we may do. They advise regularly consultants be contact and have consultants help with re-routing. But how do we make sure the actual trail construction itself is not harmful.

DS: Establish clear needs and directions up front for volunteer groups or whomever we hire – not insurmountable.

Brad Elliot (via chat): Didn’t speak to every ecological impact; don’t interpret as sanctification of trail design. It’s light on methodological detail.

JC: Arrowood will be attending public engagement event at which point they can respond to those specific questions.

Brad Elliot (via chat): What about fine-scaled review in the spring?

MW: Proceeding with wetland assessment – should someone be assigned to reach out to wetland specialist at the state?

DS: Volunteers to be point person for reaching out to wetlands specialist, following existing VYCC processes.

***RECAP:***

* Various follow-up questions for Arrowood will be asked at the public engagement event
* Need to reflag sensitive areas/populations during the winter – CR and JC volunteer
* Contact wetland specialist – DS volunteers
* Contact Arrowood to get any spatial data – CL volunteers

**E: Consideration of public meeting agenda and sub-committee assignments from Melissa Levy**

JM: Has reached out to CHMS as potential space – best option at this point. Need date prior to completing form, however.

JC: Melissa recommends logistics subcommittee, materials subcommittee, marketing subcommittee. Arrowood will attend (confirmed by JM, CL), our VLT rep will attend (confirmed by JC)

MW: Have several hours in budget for extra help from Melissa (eg re: PowerPt development)

Ian Stokes (via chat): recall this is about public input not committee doing all the communication

***RECAP:***

* Sub-committees
  + Logistics and marketing sub-committee: JM, AP, CR – for Feb 23rd Times Ink, deadline is Feb 9th
  + Materials sub-committee: CL (map), DS, MW
  + Content sub-committee: JC, NN (very coarse outline), CD – liaises with Melissa Levy (who has 6 hours budgeted to meet with sub-committees)
* Aim for late March public engagement – Wednesday March 29th or Thursday March 30th
  + Consistent with early-February timeline of RCC to host public forum re: recreational impacts with various experts
* Reach out to key players: Arrowood (JM), Melissa Levy (MW), VLT (JC), wildlife biologist at VT F&W (CL)

**F: Finalization of Management Plan Revisions**

JC: Will get update on two final components that CD (not present) is addressing.

**G: Conservation Commission public dialogue**

DS: RCC will sponsor learning opportunity. Aiming for four speakers to speak to balance of conservation and recreation, specifically within a community forest. Tentative dates in mid-Feb.

**H: Public comment**

Ian Stokes: Reminds us that COP-15 in Montreal and our responsibility to contribute to protecting biodiversity and the role we can play in protecting the 30% of the planet’s land and waters by 2030.

**Adjourn**

Next meeting planned for Monday, January 30, 2023