Committee Members in Attendance: Ron Peltier, Rasham Nassar (w. newborn son), Sarah Blossom, Jon Quitslund, Mack Pearl
COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton
Public: Cindy Shea, Charles Schmid, Mike Juneau

Agenda Items 1 & 2: Notes from the meeting on March 21 were approved as distributed. The agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 3: No substantive public comment, but Cindy Shea was noticed, and Jennifer mentioned the big turnout of arborists and others, thanks to Mike and Katy Bigelow, for a meeting in which Christy Carr briefed the audience on the new regulations.

Agenda Item 4: The committee turned to revisions to BIMC 16.18. Jennifer distributed copies of the latest iteration of the Draft, dated April 12, 2018, and a list of “Trouble Spots” with her highlighting, plus two pages pertaining to additional tree retention standards proposed as revisions to BIMC 18.15.010(G). A summary of actions taken on the numbered Trouble Spot items follows.

  #1: Reference to a “no net loss” standard is not needed in .025 Purposes. Further, in .025(I), “limbing” was changed to “pruning.”

  #2: We approved what Jennifer had done, moving a reference to the DNR Forest Practice permit into position as .030(D). In addition, the last sentence in .030(A) was discussed at length, and we decided to let the Planning Commission consider the pros and cons.

  #3: In .040(B), the language will be revised to encourage allowing dead wood to decay in place. .040(F), referring to farmed areas, is to be deleted.

  #4: In .040, the last item (I. Removal of some healthy significant trees) was discussed, and no changes were made.

  #5: With reference to .050(A), we discussed how the retention requirements being added to BIMC 18.15.010 will serve to limit the amount of tree removal that will be permitted.

  #6: The provision .050(C) is to be deleted.

  #7: Two instances of “diseased” [in .050(D)(1) and .050(E)] are to be deleted.

  #8: In .060(B), “or underdeveloped” stays in. In .060(C), we discussed whether the Stewardship Plan described in the CAO would be appropriate absent an ARPA designation, and most of the committee were in favor of consulting with the B I Land Trust to develop guidelines for something different, so the language should be simplified: “Forest Stewardship Plan”. The language proposed by Jennifer in .060(E) and (F) met with no objections.

  #9: With reference to a highlighted sentence in .070(A), Jennifer provided an argument for deleting the sentence, because it would add too much subjectivity to the review of plans and approval of permit applications. In .070(C), the main sentence was cleaned up with removal of the words “relating to.” A few other changes may be made in response to memos from Katy B. and Mike J.

We will meet on April 18th, returning to the regular schedule.

Notes Approved: April 18, 2018