

# MINUTES FOR SELECTBOARD MEETING

## Wednesday, November 9, 2022

### **Attendees:**

#### **Select Board Members:**

Jared Cadwell (Jared), Chuck Martel (Chuck), Michael Jordan (Mike) (via Zoom)

**Town Clerk/Select Board Assistant:** Patti Lewis

**Minutes Taker:** Eve Silverman

**Boyce Hill Steering Committee:** Lisa Koitzch, Pete Colgan, Sally Dwyer, Woody Dugan, Corrie Miller, Amy Sheldon (Landslide Natural Resource Planning) (via Zoom), Karrie Thomas

**Guests:** Tony Italiano (MRVTV), Ben Bridgewater, Wendy Bridgewater, Jonathan Shea, Freddie Graves, Patty Paisley, Brad Long, Janet Sailor (by Zoom), Darlene McCormick (by Zoom), Patty Markley

1. **Meeting called to order at 6pm.**
2. **Approve Selectboard Minutes, Budget Work Session of October 25, 2022**
  - a. *Motion to approve meeting minutes from October 25, 2022 by Chuck, seconded by Jared. All in favor, none opposed. Minutes approved.*
3. **Approve Selectboard Meeting Minutes of October 25, 2022**
  - a. *Motion to approve meeting minutes from October 25, 2022 by Chuck, seconded by Jared. All in favor, Mike abstains, none opposed. Minutes approved.*
4. **Public Comments:** no comments
5. **Boyce Hill Steering Committee Update.**
  - a. Peter Colgan presented the update (attached)
  - b. Woody stated that he is excited that the mow area/views proposed resemble those at the time when Town took over the property
  - c. Karrie Thomas: viewpoints are not arbitrary; they represent a lot of thought. Mike: it would be nice to see a viewpoint lower down on the road. Karrie- we are including these viewpoints to consider but not all are marked on the map. Corrie: we felt it was important to protect the springs/waterway which carry sediment, so we didn't want to cut in that area, but view will be retained above the Sailor spring.
  - d. Jared/Mike shared their prepared thoughts/feedback. When we walk the property on Tuesday we can discuss more.
    - i. Most questionnaire respondents said view was most important. Give view and aesthetics priority in all decisions made about land.
    - ii. Views make this property unique. It is an upland former farm meadow, few left in state. This aspect needs protection. Maximize views up down and across.
    - iii. Allow cutting in all zones to protect upward and downward views.
    - iv. Maximize views from all points along the main trail as it goes uphill (ie at serpentine turn in the road where views could be opened up).
    - v. There is 200' of riparian buffer on either side of stream that runs down western border. We could maintain trail up the length of the stone wall to the woodland up top. Many enjoy the wall, would like to see it more accessible.
    - vi. Do vernal pools and seeps each require full 50' buffer?
    - vii. Drainage ditch should be managed differently to prevent high growth that would block cross lot view (already the trees are an impediment).
    - viii. All stream beds are heavily vegetated, why would they need such an extensive buffer?
    - ix. We want to clean around stone walls and foundations to expose/share their history; stop any further deterioration to access them.

- x. Re: mowing in general: are there areas that can be mowed more often and still offer bird nesting habitat (vs not mowing at all). Can mowing be expanded to further protect views?
- xi. Pond: how can we be respectful of neighbor issues while mowing the top of the berm (e.g., better signage?)
- xii. Apple orchard: should area beneath the trees be mowed? The Sailors presented an idea about a path, we'd like that to be included/considered.
- xiii. Customizing mowing zones: suggest allowing flexibility to meet diverse desires (vs an all or nothing approach to mowing)
- xiv. Have we recruited every possible volunteer with handsaws and pruners? Lisa: we have received an outpouring of offers of help. Have a database of 40 people.
- e. Jared: 50' buffers is what VLT recommends; we are not convinced that it needs to be more than that. Chuck: in some cases, 50' may not even be required. Karrie: can we be a little more open minded/no absolutes -- do we lose something important by managing it differently (for example, if a 100' buffer that is managed to protect a view but might add benefit for reducing erosion/protecting habitat, we should consider that). Mike: consider the converse, if less than 50' it might be worth considering if it provides a benefit to the public. Chuck: 50' is our starting point for a discussion.
- f. Corrie: Proud of how we are trying to maximize of the values.
- g. Patty Markley: love birds there, let it stay long in the summer, do one cut in the fall.
- h. Freddie Graves: apple trees/pruning, you could get someone to run a class there. Key word is "pastoral", we can't forget that.
- i. Ben Bridgewater: in last 2 years, this has become public dog walking park. When you have dogs, we know what that does to wildlife. Before, all wildlife was there; I don't see that we'll have that again while there are dogs. Agree with riparian buffers on natural waterways. Now the area is becoming part of the forest, it isn't the meadow it once was. Hit the vegetation hard once and then decide. The view down is what we've lost. Mike: the view looking down is what makes the property so incredible. Karrie: if you look at the viewshed analysis, it preserves the majority of the up and down property view.
- j. Wendy Bridgewater- if we mowed along the stone walls on the western boundary, it would still preserve the buffer on the stream. That field is one of the best places to ski in the spring, sled, snowshoe. The view is spectacular and you're out of the wind. Can make a trail up there without disrupting the stream. Also, would be great to have the trails, like the road, mowed a couple of times in the summer.
- k. Patty Pasley: I sense some tension; can we speak to where this is coming from? Pete: our approach is to balance where we can optimize the view and still protect the natural features and do it in a sustainable way. Can't make everyone happy but I think we're on the same page.
- l. Mike: we took the property over based on how it was, as a benefit for the town of Fayston. We can't just reforest it. We accepted it as a property with views for the people to enjoy. Not acceptable to return it to forest. Corrie: that is not the perspective that everyone shares.
- m. Lisa: our steering committee has worked very hard for the last 2 ½ years, if it is the SB idea that we should have kept it exactly the way it was when we received it, then we have wasted time.
- n. Brad: thank you to the committee who has worked so hard this past 2 ½ years.
- o. Jared: Meeting at BHTF is 3pm, Tuesday the 15<sup>th</sup>. Open to the public.
- p. Janet: I'm the closest abutter. For the lower section, I'd like to be part of a group of people that manages that section in the best way (hand cutting, selective mowing). Want to create an easy way for skiers etc. to get back to the parking lot without going through our yard.

6. **Skatium:** no representative from Skatium present.
  - a. Mike: you can purchase a structure with 15-year life span for \$60k that would cover the whole thing. So, its unappealing to pay \$20K for someone to study it.

(Jared leaves)

7. **Ewald Access Permit.** Permit to allow for the logging road (logging for Big Basin Trust) to have access to Center Fayston Road.
  - a. Chuck: We are in favor of permitting the curb cut. Conditions:
    - i. \$25 permit fee
    - ii. A map showing location of curb cut
  - b. Chuck: *motion to approve the cub cut with receipt of \$25 and map, Mike 2nds, all in favor, none opposed. Motion is approved.*
  - c. Work will probably start 11/10

8. **ARPA Funds.**
  - a. Chuck: we need to have a meeting to decide to distribute funds to folks who have requested and to discuss our own needs for 2023

9. **Read Mail/Sign Warrants** (Chuck). Warrant signed, no mail

10. **Meeting adjourned:**

- a. *Mike: Motion to adjourn; Chuck: second. All in favor, none opposed. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.*