

## Town of Huntington Selectboard Public Hearing & Meeting

Monday, November 6, 2017

6:30 pm –Selectboard Public Hearing on Proposed Town Plan Amendments & Regular Meeting  
Community Church Annex

REVISED / DRAFT - UNAPPROVED MINUTES

<b>Agenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public Hearing: Huntington Town Plan Proposed Changes</li> <li>● Public Comment</li> <li>● Town Plan: consideration of public comment &amp; possible vote</li> <li>● Conservation Fund Application from Friends of Gillett Pond &amp; Richmond Land Trust</li> <li>● Finance, Administration &amp; Highway: Warrants; Minutes; Correspondence &amp; communications; General updates; Other /New Business</li> <li>● Capital Plan &amp; General Fund Budget</li> </ul>
<b>Selectboard Attendees</b>	Dori Barton (Chair), Andrew Hendrickson, Roman Livak, Nancy Stoddard
<b>Selectboard Absent:</b>	Dan Rissacher
<b>Staff Present</b>	Barbara Elliott (Town Administrator)
<b>Others Present</b>	Ruth Blodgett, Jim Christiansen, Kathleen Clark, Don Dresser, Bonnie Gordon, Lucinda Hill, Marilyn Hinsdale, Kevin Jenness, Morris Knight, Lonnie Lacallade, Everett Marshall, Darlene Palola, Wright Preston, Heidi Racht, Terry Ryan, Joe Segale, Tim Seymour, Mark Smith, Carol Wildman, Aaron Worthley, Meadow Worthley, Rob Zimmerman
<b>Call to Order</b>	Dori Barton called the meeting to order at 6:36 pm.
<b><i>PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED TOWN PLAN AMENDMENTS</i></b>	
<b>Public Hearing on Proposed Town Plan Amendments</b>	<p><u>WELCOME &amp; PROCESS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Barton welcomed attendees, introduced Selectboard members and presented the process flow for the public hearing.</li> <li>● The meeting purpose was to allow public comments on the proposed update to the Huntington Town Plan. The geographic areas affected include the Village and Neighborhood Districts of Huntington Lower Village and Huntington Center. The two Village Districts are proposed to be expanded, in turn, causing the Neighborhood District(s) to be somewhat smaller. This is a change to Map A (details on Map B and Map C). Copies of the maps and a summary of the changes were available at the hearing and have been available for review at the Town Office and on the Town website (<a href="http://www.huntingtonvt.org">www.huntingtonvt.org</a>).</li> </ul>

<p><b>MOTION – TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING</b> (<i>passed</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Selectboard can vote to adopt the changes or send the plan back to the Huntington Planning Commission (<b>HPC</b>) with a recommendation that additional changes be incorporated.</li> <li>• Everett Marshall, HPC Chair, presented an overview of the process the HPC went through to solicit community input and develop the changes. Marshall then presented an overview of the changes (as outlined in the summary document available as handouts).</li> <li>• Currently the Town Plan identifies 3 Neighborhood Districts (Lower Village, Huntington Center and Hanksville). Within the Lower Village and Huntington Center there are Village Districts.</li> <li>• The proposed plan amendments expand the Village District geographic areas in the Lower Village and Huntington Center. No changes were proposed for Hanksville. The upcoming proposed changes to the Town’s land use regulations allow for greater density in the village districts. Marshall also noted that Village Districts are eligible for additional funding opportunities.</li> <li>• Attendees gathered with Marshall around the proposed maps to review and discuss the proposed changes.</li> <li>• Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greater density is allowed in ground water protection areas.</li> <li>○ Hanksville has no village core identified in the Town Plan and it was proposed that it should in order to reduce the number of non-conforming lots.</li> <li>○ There will be a greater need to address waste water if density in the village districts is increased.</li> <li>○ Rather than using Village Districts and Neighborhood Districts, it might be more acceptable to identify Village 1 as “the core” and Village 2 as the area surrounding Village 1.</li> <li>○ The proposed changes will allow areas of open fields in the current Lower Village and Center to be developed.</li> <li>○ Need to address the issue of water and waste water in the Town Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING:</u> Livak moved and Stoddard seconded that the Public Hearing be closed at 7:02 pm since there were no additional comments. Passed unanimously with 4 members present and voting.</b></li> </ul>
--	---

**REGULAR SELECTBOARD MEETING**

<p><b>CLARIFICATION: Process for Public Comment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Administrator Elliott updated those in attendance on new information about the process for public comment at public meetings.</li> <li>• In an effort to allow additional time for public comment, rather than voting on the Conservation Fund application for the Gillett Pond Dam on the same night as the warned 10/16 public hearing, the Selectboard decided to postpone their vote in order to allow additional time for</li> </ul>
---	---

<p><i>Follow-up: Elliott to clarify public input process on FPF</i></p>	<p>residents to submit written comment. In an attempt to have an equitable extended time for people to have their voices heard and still make a timely decision on the application, a cutoff time for submitting written comment was established by the Selectboard and the warned agenda for the 11/6 meeting noted that the Selectboard would not allow time at that meeting for additional public comment on the Conservation Fund application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Saturday, 11/4, members of the Selectboard were notified that the process established might be in conflict with Vermont’s Open Meeting Laws. After consultation Monday morning (11/6) with an attorney from the Vermont League of Cities and Towns (<b>VLCT</b>), it was learned that it is not legal to disallow public comment on a specific topic at a public meeting – even if time was allocated at a previous meeting for receiving comments on that specific topic.</li> <li>• It was noted that it would not be fair for public comment to be shared at the 11/6 meeting regarding the application since there are other people in Town who would have likely been present if they thought they would have had an opportunity to speak.</li> <li>• The Selectboard requested Elliott clarify the public comment process on Front Porch Forum and apologize for the initial misunderstanding.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Public Comment: Conflict of Interest / Recusal</b></p> <p><i>Follow-up: Elliott to post Conflict of Interest Policy on Town website</i></p>	<p><b><u>Process for Recusal / Conflict of Interest</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question was asked about what the process is for Selectboard members to recuse themselves, especially as it relates to the pending decision on the Conservation Fund application from the Friends of Gillett Pond (<b>FoGP</b>) / Richmond Land Trust (<b>RLT</b>).</li> <li>• Elliott summarized the Town conflict of interest policy and reported on the information she outlined at the 10/16 public hearing about a question that had been raised about a possible perception of a conflict of interest regarding 2 Selectboard members. She summarized information received from the VLCT attorney that the potential concern about conflict of interest should be presented to the Selectboard and public and that they be asked if anyone had any concerns. Elliott disclosed this information at the 10/16 meeting and asked multiple times if anyone had any concerns or questions. No members of the Selectboard or public responded.</li> <li>• Elliott was asked to post the Conflict of Interest Policy on the Town website.</li> <li>• A lengthy discussion ensued regarding what constitutes a conflict of interest versus someone having an opinion regarding a matter. In summary, there were those present who felt there was a direct conflict of interest particularly for Barton, whose husband (Aaron Worthley) is an active volunteer with the FoGP group—especially because maps and data provided by their company, Arrowwood Environmental, appear on the FoGP website; and those who felt that neither the Chair or Vice-Chair (who had previously been a member of the FoGP group) have a</li> </ul>

	<p>conflict of interest regarding the application. Worthley stated that all the work he has done for FoGP has been done as a volunteer, just as he has volunteered his skills, expertise and time to many other community efforts in Huntington and for various Town departments. He also stated there is no financial connection between his company and the FoGP, and that any time or services provided by his company related to the Gillett Pond project have been donated or volunteered.</p>
<p><b>Conservation Fund Application FoGP/RLT for help in replacing Gillett Pond Dam</b></p> <p><b>MOTION – Conservation Fund Decision Postponement (<i>passed</i>)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Handouts were prepared with summaries of oral comments presented at the 10/16 public hearing and of written comments submitted prior to 10/26. Those documents are appended as part of these minutes.</li> <li>• Given the previous discussion about Vermont’s Open meeting Law and the misinformation noted on the Selectboard agenda regarding public comment processes, in order to ensure that all members of the public have the same opportunity to share public comment, Selectboard Chair Barton asked for a motion from the Board to postpone a decision on the Conservation Fund application so an agenda can be posted that does not exclude public comment.</li> <li>• <b><u>MOTION ON CONSERVATION FUND:</u> Livak moved and Stoddard seconded to postpone the Conservation Fund agenda item until the Selectboard’s 11/20/2017 meeting in order to give everyone who may wish to participate in public comment the opportunity to attend the meeting. Passed unanimously with 4 members present and voting.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Huntington Town Plan</b></p> <p><b>MOTION – TO APPROVE TOWN PLAN AMENDMENTS (<i>passed</i>)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Selectboard discussed issues raised during the public hearing regarding the proposed Town Plan map amendments, which included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Livak noted opposition to adopting the plan without an implementation plan and guidelines for water / wastewater.</li> <li>○ Barton noted that there has not been support from townspeople for moving ahead on Stone Environmental’s water/waste water site recommendations. She suggested that in the next Town Plan, a layer be added to maps showing potential water/waste water sites.</li> <li>○ Racht noted that the new Town Plan (which the HPC has begun working on) will incorporate an Official Town Map that will show overlays and establish recommendations for the future.</li> <li>○ Marshall noted that there are opportunities for a governmental entity as well as for a private developer to address water/waste water. He also noted that new technologies will be available that will present additional opportunities for development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>MOTION ON TOWN PLAN:</u> Stoddard moved and Hendrickson seconded that the Selectboard approve the Town Plan amendments as proposed by the Huntington Planning Commission which affect the geographic areas of the Village and Neighborhood Districts of the Huntington Lower Village and Huntington Center. Passed with Barton, Hendrickson and Stoddard in favor and with Livak opposed.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Administration &amp; Finance</b></p>	<p><b><u>Warrants</u></b></p>

<p><b>MOTION – TO APPROVE MINUTES</b> <i>(passed)</i></p> <p><b>MOTION – RELEASE OF ATTORNEY-CLIENT INFORMATION</b> <i>(passed)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 warrants, as presented, were signed by the members present.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MOTION – MINUTES:</b> Hendrickson moved and Stoddard seconded to approve the minutes of October 16, with non-substantive edits. Passed unanimously with 4 members present and voting.</li> </ul> <p><b>MOTION – ATTORNEY-CLIENT INFORMATION:</b> Livak moved and Stoddard seconded to authorize the Town Administrator to release attorney client privileged email correspondence between VLCT Attorney Sarah Jarvis and the Town Administrator on behalf of the Selectboard with regard to the issue of possible conflict of interest related to the Conservation Fund application from the Friends of Gillett Pond and Richmond Land Trust dated Thursday, October 12, 2017 at 1:16pm and 2:31pm, which will fulfill in total the request for records submitted by Brett Lindemuth. Passed unanimously with 4 members present and voting.</p> <p><b>Correspondence &amp; Communications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>State Hearing on Camels Hump State Park – Wednesday, November 15<sup>th</sup> 6-8pm at BPMS.</b> Barton encouraged Selectboard members to attend. Elliott forwarded this announcement to the Camels Hump Road resident email distribution list.</li> </ul> <p><b>Upcoming Calendar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mon. 11/13 – Elliott to send SB budget question summary by 7pm</li> <li>• Wed. 11/15 – SB to send budget edits to Elliott by noon</li> <li>• Wed. 11/15 @ 6-8pm: State Hearing on Camels Hump State Park to be held at BPMS</li> <li>• Thurs. 11/16 – Elliott to send stakeholders Budget feedback from Selectboard by 7pm</li> <li>• Mon. 11/20 @ 7pm: Selectboard Meeting @ Town Office</li> <li>• Mon. 12/4 @ 7pm: Selectboard Meeting @ Town Office</li> <li>• Mon. 12/18 @ 6:30pm: Public Hearing on the Land Use Regulations (combining the Zoning, Subdivision &amp; Flood Hazard Regulations into one comprehensive document), followed by a Selectboard Meeting @ Church Annex</li> </ul>
<p><b>Capital Plan &amp; General Fund Budget</b></p> <p><i>Follow-up: Elliott &amp; SB action items on budget</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elliott will send a summary of open questions and an updated spreadsheet to Selectboard members on Monday evening.</li> <li>• Selectboard members will respond to Elliott by noon Wednesday 11/15.</li> <li>• Elliott will send budget stakeholders the Selectboard’s questions by close of business Thursday 11/16.</li> </ul>
<p><b>MOTION: ADJOURNMENT</b> <i>(passed)</i></p>	<p><b>MOTION:</b> Livak moved and Hendrickson seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 pm. Passed unanimously with 4 members present and voting.</p>

**COMMENTS MADE BY ATTENDEES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING**

**10/16/17 Public Meeting Comments on FoGP / RLT Application for Conservation Funds**

<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>Resident/Group</b>	<b>Oral Comments</b>
\$100,000	**Rob Zimmerman	Application sponsor and presenter at the meeting <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
\$100,000	**Aaron Worthley	Application sponsor and presenter at the meeting <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
\$ 50,000	HCC	½ of balance; reserve funding for TF, dam not in Huntington; also some concern about returning the site to its natural state
\$100,000	Duncan Keir	Fully supports request; pond is unique (which a Town Forest will not be); time constraint; more grant funding avenues are available for forests than for ponds; regarding the question of not in Huntington: this is the reason it was an article at Town Meeting
\$100,000	Jenna Kolowski	HCC had mixed thoughts on returning the area to its natural state vs maintaining the recreational resource
\$ 75,000	Terry Boyle	Raised questions regarding ownership, liability, matching fund, why a weir is being used instead of the historic flat dam; Huntington is half the population of Richmond therefore prefers compromise funding
\$100,000	**Mark Smith	Appreciates emphasis on ecology of the dam; compelling recreation opportunities; historical value; potential for micro-hydro; keep our quirky nature <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
\$ 75,000	Joe Segale	Huntington has ½ tax base of Richmond therefore ½ funding is more appropriate; compromise between the HCC recommendation and the application request
\$100,000	Alison Forrest	Recreation for children & those with physical limitations; other recreation like biking on roads is dangerous; health opportunity; start a regatta; teach kids to swim
\$100,000	**Barb Winters	Appreciates cooperation between the communities of Richmond and Huntington; enhances our communities <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
\$100,000	Aimee Motta	Appreciates simplicity of the recreation opportunity the pond provides; educational opportunities for students
\$100,000	Mark Heath	Appreciates that there are no camps around pond, no motor boats; this is Huntington's pond regardless of where it is located
\$100,000	**Jere Berger	Still leaves 112K in fund for other projects; \$ from Huntington gets leveraged vs just buying a forest <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
	Roman Livak	Questioned assertion that the pond is a natural resource since it was built by people; just because it has been there for 170 years does not make it a natural resource; questioned whether the project actually protects natural resources
\$100,000	Garrett Baxter	Other Town Forest opportunities exist in Huntington; this is a unique resource as a body of flat water
\$100,000	Kathy Kretzer	Concerned that there is a time constraint for raising funds and if we don't save it now it will be gone forever
\$100,000	Robin Low	This is our community and it is our responsibility to take care of the pond for future generations

Recommended Funding	Resident/Group	Oral Comments
\$100,000	**Wally Jenkins	Great natural science opportunity; valuable scenic resource <i>** also submitted written comment</i>
\$100,000	Ken Kretzer	Loves the scenic views
\$100,000	Meadow Worthley	Pond offers great sense of community; opportunity to socialize with people you know and meet new people
	Brett Lindemuth	Stands by comments in FPF (pond is an embolism); if we fund this, then the Town must make more formal recreational opportunities/use of the resource
\$100,000	**Patty Beaupree	<i>** also submitted written comment</i>
<b>NON RESIDENT COMMENTS:</b>		
	Judy Rosovsky / Richmond Conservation Commission	Location of dam is not as important as the pond itself; wetlands are in Huntington; Richmond allocated \$150,000 of their \$263,000 balance of funds; Richmond Conservation Commission believed it is their responsibility to look at applications before them and not at the potential of future applications; there are recreational grants available for town forests but not for ponds
	Wright Preston / Richmond Land Trust	VT Electric Coop was looking at moving poles – and when they made a site visit to the pond they recognized the scenic value of the area and they decided to propose locating the wires underground rather than using poles

#### WRITTEN COMMENT SUMMARY

#### Written Comments Submitted Regarding FoGP / RLT Application for Conservation Funds

as of 10/25/17 @ midnight

Recommended Funding Amt.	Resident/Group (in the order comments were received)	Date	Written Comments
\$ 50,000 6 voted \$50K 2 voted \$100K	Huntington Conservation Commission	09/19/17	Met many criteria, however: 1) it is nearly ½ of the fund balance; 2) more accessible town forest opportunity; 3) physically located in Richmond
No amt specified	Brett Lindemuth	09/25/17	Requests SB due diligence regarding best course of action from list of experts/agencies; project is WELL outside Huntington
\$100,000	Maggie Mae Anderson	10/15/17	Recreation in all seasons; nothing like it within 25 minute drive; enjoy nature; burn fewer fossil fuels to get there; scenic beauty; functionality
\$100,000	Melinda Moulton	10/15/17	Preserve for future generations; community recreation; natural resources provide sanctuary, recreation , peace of mind
\$ 0 (zero)	Kevin Jenness	10/23/17	Project will slow progression of area to its natural state as a wetland; more appropriate to spend money in Huntington and may be needed for town forest on Charlie Smith Road

<b>Recommended Funding Amt.</b>	<b>Resident/Group (in the order comments were received)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
Sufficient funds	Rick Moulton	10/15/17	Support of conservation board with strong commitment of funding; project fits original intent of fund; 4 season recreation; easy access; fund should not hold capital for sake of building financial reserve
\$100,000	Helen Keith	10/15/17	Unique, important, inter-community, grass-roots collaborative effort; enjoys marshy area as it enters fuller pond; it's a wonderland
\$100,000	Jennifer Esser	10/16/17	Conserving ecology of pond and surrounding area; recreational access
\$ 50,000 max, perhaps less	Jim Sadler	10/24/17	Overall budget for dam and 100K request are excessive if not ludicrous; respect for HCC offering a more conservative counter-recommendation and their sound reasoning; it would be a grave mistake if the SB were to (again) override the recommendation of the HCC; questionable long-term value of proposed investment if pond is, in fact, in a state of transformation trending toward swamp or marshland.
\$100,000	Seidl/Goodyear Family Amy, Dan, Celia, Helen	10/16/17	4 season recreation: canoeing, birding, skating, skiing, walking & running the perimeter; exactly what fund is for; spirit of fund's origins
\$100,000	Cheryl & Ben Willoughby	10/16/17	Support for project and its request for Huntington Conservation Fund money
Smaller amount	Margaret Taft	10/16/17	Does not meet criteria; located outside Huntington; questionable that it will leverage additional funds; concern about project cost; why that engineering firm; smaller amount of \$ may be more acceptable to larger population in town; concern about precedent; please proceed carefully
\$100,000	Jeanine Carr	10/17/17	No simply a Richmond resource but a VT resource that should be preserved; excellent opportunity for 2 adjoining towns to work tighter in a productive partnership
Supports but no specific amt	Knox Cummin	10/17/17	Nearby, accessible, beautiful, boat-able, quiet body of water offers so much; allow people the right to have recreation
\$0-50,000	Terry Ryan	10/24/17	Against supporting the effort at all, however if \$ is allocated no more than \$50,000 of the fund should be allowed.
Supports some \$ but \$100,000 is too much	Ruth & Garry Blodgett	10/18/17	Should not use close to ½ funds; if funds awarded, amount should be proportional to population size; Town Meeting vote was to CONSIDER not a guarantee; only 6 parking spaces
\$ 0 (zero)	Mark Wisniowski	10/23/17	Fund is for projects within Huntington; shouldn't use taxpayers money; people objecting to releasing local town tax dollars to fund another town's infrastructure should not be forced to let their tax dollars leave Huntington
\$100,000	Mary Ganzenmuller & family	10/24/17	Writing for their personal use as well as the people who come to our town to fish, kayak, canoe, skate, cross country ski, birding; nothing like our beauty and pristine valley; community gathering point

<b>Recommended Funding Amt.</b>	<b>Resident/Group (in the order comments were received)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
\$100,000	Paula Kelley	10/23/17	Well organized meeting; great & necessary handouts; appreciates skating, observing wildlife & scenic wonder; doesn't have houses surrounding the shoreline; has given \$ to RLT for the pond; fund increases yearly; no other specific projects right now; this project is time sensitive; area to socialize, recreate, share ideas
\$100,000	**Barb Winters	10/24/17	Supports 100K for dam fund <i>** also gave oral public comment</i>
\$25,000	Donna Lewis	10/24/17	Hard time seeing us spend 100K on property not in Huntington; other properties and buildings in Huntington should be first on list to conserve. Pond is nice but it belongs to Richmond.
\$0	Miles Jenness	10/24/17	Spending \$ on a dam is a backwards way to go about conservation. Also, think about what Ken Pillsbury would be saying right now.
\$0	Morris Knight	10/24/17	Not in Huntington; a manmade dam does not meet definition of conservation (preservation, protection or restoration of the natural environment, natural ecosystems, vegetation and wildlife); sets a bad precedent
\$100,000	Ryan Elliott	10/25/17	Great recreational resource; only open body of water nearby; town already has considerable accessible forest (Beane Trail, Long Trail, Camels Hump trails, Hinesburg Town Forest, etc.); ecosystem developed over last 170 years would be disrupted if dam not replaced; not in favor of holding on to funds for projects that have not presented themselves
\$100,000	Debbie Worthley	10/25/17	45 year resident observing the progression of FoGP & RLT; town has obligation to contribute the available \$ because it's an integral part of our natural resources, unique, utilized, in danger of disappearing; used by wide variety of Huntington people; multiple 4-season recreational purposes; that it is only partially in Huntington is a weak argument; makes Huntington unique
\$0	Everett Lewis Jr.	10/24/17	The 2015 article passed to address the issue with the dam replacement with the discretion of the SB and HCC. Tax \$ should be used in our town and not in neighboring towns. Some Huntington residents use the pond for recreation but it is a small majority ( <i>BE note: I know he meant minority because he came in to speak with me.</i> )
\$100,000	**Jere Berger	10/24/17	Many reasons to support it & opposing reasons are weak. 1) 1000s of acres of woods but only 1 body of water; 2) unique flora & fauna habitat; 3) remaining funds are sufficient for a town forest and funds will continue to be allocated; 4) provides numerous activities for residents & guests 4-season. <i>** also gave oral public comment</i>

<b>Recommended Funding Amt.</b>	<b>Resident/Group (in the order comments were received)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
\$100,000	**Rob Zimmerman	10/25/17	Completely in favor of full \$100K <i>**also gave oral public comment</i>
\$100,000	Sandy & Todd Heyman	10/25/17	As residents for over 40 years they have benefited from many uses (skating, fishing, boating, appreciating natural beauty and peacefulness; would like to see tax dollars go to place for generation to enjoy in the years to come.
\$100,000	**Patty Beaupre	10/25/17	Beautiful local spot in so many ways, would be a shame to lose it. <i>**also gave oral public comment</i>
\$100,000	**Mark Smith	10/25/17	Outstanding opportunity to protect resources with enormous social, cultural and environmental impact; recreational resource; is consistent with the goals of the Town Plan; economic benefit by attracting people to Huntington; quality of life <i>**also gave oral public comment</i>
\$0	Caitlin Jenness	10/25/17	\$ for artificial dam that provides no tangible service or utility is extremely fiscally irresponsible; exposes town to future requests; project is contrary to ecological preservation; State study recommended be removed; prevents area from being natural; Gillett Pond not the right opportunity to partner with a neighboring town
\$100,000	**Wally Jenkins	10/25/17	Project clearly meets requirements for CF use; more Huntington than Richmond residents enjoy the beauty on a daily basis; we should be grateful so many Richmond residents support a project that is so beneficial to us; species composition would be different if wetland/string of beaver ponds vs pond – one species less likely to be found in wetland is humans; accessibility; taxpayers are asked to support classrooms, a library, recreation fields→Gillett Pond serves as all 3 <i>**also gave oral public comment</i>
\$100,000	**Aaron Worthley	10/25/17	Argument that a stone dam holding back H2O disqualifies it as a natural resource vs conservation scientists considering all unique assemblages of natural elements as long as they proved particular habitat or environment; excerpt from ANR website; pond is habitat for native nesting waterfowl, turtles, mussels, insects, fish & plants and foraging for eagles, osprey, otter & moose; a natural resource is a resource for things natural regardless if it's been touched by humans <i>**also gave oral public comment</i>
\$50,000	Krystn Perettine	10/25/17	Recently moved to Huntington for its natural beauty such as Gillett Pond & would love to see funds allocated.

<b>Recommended Funding Amt.</b>	<b>Resident/Group (in the order comments were received)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
\$0	Annelies McVoy	10/25/17	Importance of letting the river flow freely and letting nature take its course; ponds coming and going along with their habitat shifts are important for a balanced ecosystem; without dam, it would be prime beaver habitat and still have amphibians, fish, bears & other critters; prefer to see Huntington work with Richmond to fill in part of Huntington Gorge with big boulders to prevent future deaths
\$50,000	Heidi Racht	10/25/17	Supports HCC recommendation; community asset for Richmond, Huntington & Bolton; noted that Richmond Conservation Fund already supported a town forest & they had the \$ available to move quickly on the acquisition of the Andrews property; imperative for SB to support the work of the HCC – the group is so active & is pursuing a vision for a town forest that can be used by residents; keen interest in a town path to connect Lower Village & the Center for bicyclists, runners, pedestrians

**FRONT PORCH FORUM**

<b>Recommended Amount</b>	<b>Resident</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment summary</b>
	Brett Lindemuth	10/15/17	River should be brought back to natural state; the pond is an embolism
	Brenda Waters	10/17/17	Embolism is incorrect term – it would be a thrombus; Brett makes some good points
\$ 0 (zero)	Mark Wisniowski	10/17/17	

<b>Meeting Minutes:</b>	<p>11/06/17– Meeting date</p> <p>11/09/17 – Draft/unapproved minutes distributed and posted on website.</p> <p>11/14/17 – Revised Draft/Unapproved minutes distributed and posted.</p> <p>xx/xx/17 – Final/approved minutes approved</p> <p>xx/xx/17 – Approved minutes to Town Clerk for recording &amp; web posting</p>
-------------------------	---