



## **Waterbury Conservation Commission**

### **Minutes**

**August 8, 2023 Meeting**

**In person and virtual**

Commission attendees: Billy Vigdor, Kelsey Applegate, Joan Beard, Marty Johanson, Meg Baldor

Commissioner Absence: Amy Marshall-Carney, Stacey Lambert

Other municipal government members: Mike Bard (Select Board and Conservation Commission Liaison), Alyssa Johnson (Select Board), Martha Staskus (Planning Commission Chair), Joe Camarata (Waterbury Housing Task Force)

Public: Jens Hilke (presenter), Doug Greeson, Sandy Yusen, John Z, Pegeen Mulhern

- Meeting convened at 6:00 pm
- J. Hilke presented the results of the Community Mapping Exercise
  - J. Hilke summarized the Community Values Mapping process and presented the Community Values Report and Poster. These materials are posted on the Conservation Commission website.
  - J. Hilke pointed out that overlaps exist between the commercial value map and the wilderness value map. In particular, many participants pointed out the Shuttesville Hill Wildlife Corridor. He recommended the town explore this aspect more and investigate how to fully value potentially competing interests.
  - J. Hilke Recommended using the maps for coalition building; when the Conservation Commission seeks to initiate a conservation project, they could refer to the map, consider the people who notated those values, and seek them out as potential partners.
  - B. Vigdor asked about the statistical relevance of the turnout, which was 1% of the town population. J. Hilke pointed out that during the in-person event, the participants for the most part didn't seem to know each other and seemed to come from different backgrounds and social circles, which is unique for his program. He recommended using the data as a starting place to be augmented by other data, not in itself as a basis for policy.
  - M. Staskus observed that the Maps and Posters could be used to analyze the areas that were not prioritized by any group. These could be considered for additional development.
  - The Vermont Conservation Design layer (visible on the Biofinder website) takes in consideration ecologically-important areas



- Several Conservation Commission members as well as other attendees expressed interest in access to each team's raw data as well as weighted data to show how popularly each area was selected for each value. This could help parse the values that are expressed by several residents. J. Hilke warned that weighting the data can show commonalities and differences among groups but not necessarily among each participant, and therefore might not show actual popularity of each response.
  - B. Vigdor requested a map of the Community Values Mapping data overlaid over zoning maps.
  - J. Hilke clarified the maps are intended to reflect current snapshot of the town, not for example a reflection of where people would like to see future commercial development but rather where they value existing commercial areas within the town. Some attendees pointed out that during the exercise it appeared that some participants deviated from that intent.
  - M. Staskus asked if J. Hilke is doing any comparisons for this sort of data town to town or at a state-wide level. J. Hilke said that he is not analyzing state-wide data.
- 
- Meeting adjourned 7:14 pm

Respectfully submitted by Kelsey Applegate Aug 21, 2023