

STATE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE
MEETING #7 – FACILITATOR’S SUMMARY
August 14, 2012, 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
Connecticut Forest & Park Association, Middlefield, CT

Members Present: Teri Brown, David Goodson, Jim Govoni, Eric Hammerling, Jane Harris, Mary Hogue, John Jasinski, Leslie Kane, Kevin Kelly, JoAnn Messina, Karl Reichle, Bruce Villwock, Jeffrey Ward. **Members Absent:** Kim Barbieri, Timothy Bockus, Mark Goetz, John Mitchell, John Parry. Alternate: Ken Bullard.

Connecticut Department of Energy and Environment (DEEP) Participants/Ex Officio Members: Chris Donnelly.

Observers: Pam Klomberg **Facilitator:** Bill Logue

Welcome, Introductions and Administrative Issues. The agenda was reviewed¹. The process for finalizing the recommendations was reviewed.

I. Public Listening Sessions and Follow-up Discussion. More than a dozen members attended the two public listening sessions and members shared their impressions of the themes raised in the sessions. Several takeaways were noted:

- The recommendations need to be clearer about the context and differences in vegetation management for urban, suburban and rural settings.
- The ecosystem services benefits of large trees, especially in the urban environment, need to be emphasized as does tree replacement and planting. This is part of best management practices for municipalities.
- Refinement of language on the definition of the roadside forest.
- Addition of language on: management of vines and hazard tree definition.
- Possible additional language on: undergrounding of utilities, roles and responsibilities of private tree owners, and the role of wildlife and biodiversity.

II. Discussion of Draft. Most of the potential changes to the draft were incorporated into the discussion of the public listening sessions. The Task Force agreed that the draft needed to be revised for internal consistency and editing to create a single voice throughout and more graphics to illustrate various points. There was also discussion about how municipal leaders, legislators and the general public may be receptive to different types of emphasis, e.g., academic versus bullet points.

¹ Most documents from the meeting are generally available at:
<http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2697&q=503040>

Possible audiences to send the recommendations were discussed. These included, municipal leaders, public works directors, tree wardens, councils of state government, and nonprofits. In addition, the possibility of having a presentation that Task Force Members could deliver to various audiences was discussed.

The Task Force discussed implementation roles and responsibilities and began the development of a “to do list.”

In closing the Task Force asked Eric Hammerling and Chris Donnelly to add additional language to be submitted by various members based on the day’s discussion, edit and revise the recommendations and circulate a “final” draft prior to the last meeting on August 28.