



**Parks & Recreation Commission**  
**645 Pine Street, Front Conference Room & Zoom**

**Minutes**

**June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025 @ 5:30pm**

Commission Present: Lantieri, Boehm, Mobley, Keech, Etter, Johnson and Bergmann

Not Present:

Staff Present: Cindi Wight, Deryk Roach, Erin Moreau, Sophie Sauve, Dan Cahill, Meghan O’Daniel

Other Present: Chapin Spencer, Zandy Wheeler, Sarah Camille Wilson & Chris Russo

The meeting commenced at 5:32pm with Lantieri welcoming everyone. He asked everyone from the public who was in attendance to sign in.

**1. Agenda**

**1.1**

Lantieri asked if someone would make a motion to adopt the agenda for the meeting. Boehm made the motion and Bergmann seconded. Lantieri then asked everyone to take a vote and everyone responded aye. None were opposed, so the agenda was approved.

**2. Consent Agenda**

**2.1 – 2.10**

Lantieri continued that next was the consent agenda and asked if there were any motions regarding that. Mobley moved to approve.

Etter had a question about requesting a change to one.

Wight responded that the item would need to be pulled to discuss as a deliberative item and typically that is determined ahead of the meeting so that all parties can be informed.

Etter thanked her and said he did not want to do that with any of these items.

Lantieri continued looking for someone to second the motion. Boehm seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed, so the consent agenda was approved.

**3. Public Forum**

**3.1**

Lantieri opened the public forum at 5:35pm. There were no comments from the public. Sauve, a BPRW staff member, shared information about the Open Space Plan. She reminded everyone that the survey is open until June 27<sup>th</sup> and encouraged those who haven’t participated to do so and to share it with others. She continued by sharing their outreach efforts – attending NPA meetings, tabling at events and markets. She

explained that it's on the City Planning's page on the website or people could search "Burlington's Open Space Plan".

Keech, a Commissioner, shared a letter from a community member about off-leash dog concerns from Columbia. It read "Dear Ms. Wight, I'm writing to comment on the recommendations for off-leash dogs in Burlington's public spaces. When our daughter was young, we took her to Oakledge Park for a family picnic on the beach. While sitting there, an unleashed dog ran up, grabbed her food and ran away. The dog owner was unconcerned and became belligerent when we asked him to keep his dog on a leash. We are frequent users of North Beach, and have regularly witnessed off-leash dogs urinating and defecating on the beach and in the water, running over people's picnic blankets, running up to strangers and shaking their wet fur on them and begging strangers for food. We have lived in the Old North End for 24 years. Being in a diverse community, I've witnessed members of the New American population show fear, concern, and even terror when approached by dogs countless times. One highly exclusive user group should not take precedence over all other users, including families, people with leash dogs, new Americans, and anyone looking for time to relax and enjoy the outdoors without being harassed. The only people that don't mind an unleashed dog's behavior are the dog owners themselves. Thank you for considering my comments and adding them to the public record. Sincerely, Columbia."

Lantieri thanked Aaron for reading and Columbia for their comment. Seeing no other interest in public forum, he closed it at 5:40pm.

#### **4. Deliberative Agenda**

##### **4.1 Ski Rack Commission change request**

Chapin Spencer, Director of Public Works, started by sharing that they noticed that last month the Commission had approved a concessionaire agreement with Ski Rack and noted that Zandy Wheeler from Ski Rack was also present. He shared that Zandy had made a request to possibly reduce the gross sales commission rate, from 10% to 5%. He continued by noting that DPW is currently managing a number of capital projects in the City at this time, including Great Streets Main Street and the Champlain Parkway, both of which arrive at a shared point – the Pine St. and Main St. intersection, where Zandy's long-term retail operation is located. Spencer continued that DPW has reviewed the request and they have initiated a number of business mitigation strategies to help businesses to help them get through this period – everything from zero-interest loans to additional public parking to amplifying social media campaigns. He closed by sharing that they are in support of the request that Ski Rack has put forward to ask for a reduced concessionaire rate and he opened the floor for questions.

Boehm thanked Ski Rack for coming back and asked about where the 10% originally came from.

Wight answered that it was from matching percentages across the board. And continued by sharing that this would just be for 2025 with the assumption and hope that most of the work will be done by next year.

Chapin confirmed that he expects this to be a 1 year request, not an ongoing one.

Zandy Wheeler chimed in that he had put forward an additional request to the Commission that it be a 12 month agreement starting now, instead of a 2025 calendar year request since it's already June.

Etter asked when bike rental typically start for the season.

Wheeler answered that it depends on the year but typically from April through September.

Lantieri confirmed that the request would be for through the end of June 2026.

Mobley chimed in that yes it would be changing from a calendar year to 12 months in the motion.

Lantieri asked if there were any actions that Commissioners would like to make.

Bergmann made a motion to approve the 12 months from 10% to 5%.

Etter seconded.

All were in favor, none opposed, so the request was approved.

#### **4.2 Conservation Legacy Fund request**

Dan Cahill, BPRW's Land Steward, began by sharing that this is a Legacy Fund request that was brought to the Conservation Board last month. It is a request that builds on the project cost of us conserving the rivers and the marina, a project that was done in 2018, to conserve a really critical parcel right at the bike path bridge over the Winooski River. Nick Warner and the Winooski Valley Park District have put together a proposal to help protect this conservation area that the City has invested in partnership with other entities to preserve and conserve. One piece to note is that the language in the resolutions that guide the Conservation Legacy Fund give the advisory language that the funding available for project cost or acquisition should not exceed 40%, and this project is under that threshold.

Nick Warner, the Executive Director of the Winooski Valley Park District, began by sharing that this project was triggered by the flooding and extreme erosion over the past two years. He continued that as a conserved area, the solution is not just bringing in truckloads of materials. He shared that the solution is really a mix of solutions where we can best mimic natural conditions but also recognize that we need to deal with the erosion. He felt that this needed to be an engineered solution and that it needed to be done in concert with the City, so they went out to bid on a consultant and they hired Watershed Consulting and they actually attended the Conservation Board meeting to answer any technical questions. He continued that they have not started work yet, so they have been hired on the condition that WVPD receives the funding to pay them. Their role would be to build a profile for what to do with that whole stretch and to work with the City because it is a complex little strip. He said they have looked at other funding sources, but felt this was their best bet to be able to get this project done in a timely fashion. He then offered to answer any questions Commissioners might have. Lantieri asked if any of the Commissioners had questions.

Etter inquired about the pressing need to prevent the erosion – whether it was to ensure the integrity of the bridge or something else.

Warner answered that it is a combination of water quality, sedimentation and habitat and a lot of other things going on. He shared that they estimate they have lost about 20,000 square feet of material into the river, and it is continuing. He continued that

another reason they are concerned is that the path of the river creates an eddy right in front of Derway and Mays, where especially high water causes a circular pattern that carves away the shoreline and there is a neighborhood nearby that has concerns if the river continues on this path. It's really quite an epic loss of material and a significant issue.

Etter asked if there has been a study done on if there is a place where it will reshape the shoreline so that the eddy goes away and a different shape of the shoreline will happen and result in less erosion? So it naturally resolves itself. He continued by wondering if we are committing ourselves to a continuing fight or if there is space, would the river just move itself in a way so that it would erode less.

Warner responded that because it is a floodplain, the goal is to come up with a solution that would allow the area to flood and also have some resistance to erosion. He shared that they're looking at the whole site because of this and it is complex which is why they need the engineers.

Keach chimed in that he was looking at this in terms of what this Commission has voted for in the past and what kind of service this is going to provide. He continued that this eddy is exposing the back side of the foot bridge, which is City property, and as soon as it gets out of control it is the City's problem too. He said that he was looking at the funds requested and that compared to approving a \$7,000 request for benches at Calahan, this is just a little more money and you cannot even compare the payout of the two. He closed by sharing that he feels this is such a small request with such a huge payout.

Lantieri said that it sounded like this was completely within the goals of the Conservation Legacy Fund and doesn't exceed the 40% Dan mentioned. He then asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Commissioners.

No one did so Lantieri asked if there was a motion from anyone.

Boehm made a motion to approve. Bergmann seconded.

All were in favor, none opposed so the motion was approved.

#### **4.3 Appendix D Section 2 and 5**

Wight shared screen so that everyone could follow along and introduced Erin Moreau, BPRW Harbor Master.

Moreau began by explaining that Section 2 pertains to the marinas – both at Perkins Pier and the Boathouse. She continued that what they found when reviewing it was that it talked about boaters in general, but there are really two classifications of boaters, transient and seasonal, and sometimes there are different restriction or qualifications associated with each. She continued that we enter into more full agreements with our seasonal boaters, so they dove into the language in the ordinance for those a little bit more. She shared that one of the main things they wanted to clarify was that there is no subletting, which has been an issue. She continued that this means people cannot go online and sell their slip for a day and BPRW has more authority in regards to that. Moreau shared that a lot of what was in the ordinance in the past was more general in regards to parks, so we updated this to define who staff is.

Vetter asked about a switch from 8pm to 7pm for transient vessels presumed to be staying overnight.

Moreau confirmed and shared that it is actually more like 5pm, which is what designates evening from day, and so what this means is that you can stay out here on the hook until 7pm free of charge, but we will start charging you overnight at 7pm. We did this because we want it to be daylight throughout the entire season when this happens, and 8pm puts us into twilight later on in the season.

Moreau continued that a lot of the new language and changes are from the contract that all seasonal boaters sign, but this is taking it to the next level.

Etter asked about the section referencing that the owner shall give the City advanced notice of commencement and duration of such vacancies saying that it doesn't say how long the vacancy has to be, and suggest that that is added.

Moreau answered in agreement, saying that she would update it to say "over 48 hours".

Etter asked if it was common practice for boaters to let Marina staff know when they are leaving the harbor.

Moreau answered that this is pretty typical, but mostly from larger boats that are overnighting. She continued that Perkins Pier is all small crafts, most of which do not have an enclosed cabin, so this mostly happens with the Boathouse and is a fairly normal marina habit for safety reasons. She shared that her staff will check in with a boat if they haven't notified them that they are overnighting somewhere else to make sure that they are okay. She continued that most boaters let them know when they will just be gone for a bit, gone for a week or anywhere in between.

Keech asked if this was a verbal practice or is there a way to track and capture this.

Moreau responded that they use a software called Dockwa. Boaters can e-mail or come to the front counter and staff will input information about a slip in here, like how long the boaters will be away for, which helps security and evening staff know which spots will be empty, and if a boat is missing that should not be, they are reaching out to check in.

Etter asked about the changes to the insurance requirement and what kind of things that would cover.

Moreau responded that they are not putting the amount in the Ordinance because it fluctuates so much but that the agreement will reflect the current amount annually. She continued that this would cover things like damage to the dock with their vessel, damaging power pedestals, if their boat sinks in the harbor, leaks and breaches and the list goes on.

Mobley asked for clarification about the clause regarding boater behavior.

Moreau responded that this is all currently in the boater agreement, but they wanted to add it in here to really reinforce it and take it to the next level.

Wight continued on with Section 5, Park Closings. She shared that there were some updates to park names and some parks added.

Moreau shared an update about parking – changing the language from "permits" to "fees" because of the installation of kiosks across the City.

Moreau continued that one of the biggest changes was to the North Beach section – clarifying the season and that motor vehicles are excluded from the beach parking lot "from dusk to dawn" – so no overnight parking there, which she is hoping will help with some problematic activity that happens at night sometimes.

Wight pointed out the addition about the gate being closed overnight and in the off season. She continued that some people have shared frustrations about this but the reality is that it is remote and we do not have staff down there in the off-season, and no plowing in the winter and lots of mud in the spring.

Lantieri asked if someone would like to move to approve the recommended changes to Appendix D, Sections 2 and 5 with the amendments as outlined in this meeting.

Mobley made a motion to approve, Keech seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed.

#### **4.4 Appendix D Section 7**

Lantieri began by sharing that he, Boehm and Wight created this memo by taking a step back, thinking about the timeline and what were actually things that needed to be done and looking at each of the components involved.

Wight added on that this was intended to help folks understand the separation of Appendix D versus the policy. She continued that there are a lot of things in the policy that will be more nimble to change as compared to what is in Appendix D since there is more time and effort to change ordinances and so having details in the policy is better.

Boehm clarified that right now there is not a policy currently, but that today the group is reviewing the Appendix D section 7 language that will help to create the policy. She continued that what they are suggesting the group talk about today are – getting an answer to any questions about liability from the City attorney, and just like we have been doing, look at the draft changes and vote on that.

Lantieri agreed and added that the next step will be outlining and filling out the policy from there in the coming months.

Boehm chimed in that the policy would then be controlled by the Parks Commission, not City Council, like the ordinance.

Keech wanted to make sure the group talked about this before any editing happened and also brought up that the Commission has been up against a similar topic in the past – smoking areas, about whether they were going to be happening or not. He continued by sharing a quote that he found written by the Parks Department in opposition to City Council imposing non-smoking areas in their parks. He said that this department did not want that to occur, but City Council imposed it, so they had a statement about their opposition it and he said it runs perfectly parallel to what the Commission is dealing with right now. He asked for permission to read the quote so that it was on the record.

Lantieri allowed him to read it.

Keech read “The rights of a non-smoker must always come before the privileges of a smoker in a community setting. That has been the national standard for close to 40 years now, ever since the government won its lawsuit against the tobacco companies. How can Burlington be any different? In all of the conversations we had with Commissioners from cities and other towns, no one mentioned protecting the rights of a smoker in a park. Instead, they focused on the purpose of a public park. We're all citizens of all ages would be able to enjoy clean air with beautiful views surrounded by natural landscape and a wholesome recreational activities.” He continued by saying that this runs perfectly parallel to this dog argument – whose rights are we talking about, whose park is it. He finished by sharing that he just wanted to put that out there and

that this is a statement from this Department and now, in terms of this topic, the viewpoint is essentially flipped. He closed by saying that this does not make any sense to him.

Lantieri thanked him for sharing and asked if anyone else had any other questions or thoughts before they started.

Etter asked about the e-mail they received from Amy Mayer.

Wight answered that she is our risk person at the City attorney's office.

Keech asked what their ultimate take on this was and shared that he read it as "don't do it".

Wight responded that Amy's comment was that she feels that formalizing it in places where people are already informally doing it actually lowers risk because there are rules and signage, so the direction is not "don't do it" at this time. She continued that she does not feel that it's the Commission's responsibility to worry about the liability piece of this.

Keech responded that the first bullet point is that all visitors use the park at their own risk, which he thinks is a pretty damning first statement. He continued that another thing he thinks needs to be pointed out is that parks should be physically separate from the general public. It shouldn't be located around playgrounds, which are being proposed. Sports fields, which are being proposed. Public pathways, which are being proposed. Or schools, not proposed. Or, he said he would like to include beaches, which are being proposed. He shared that the direction of this document defies the idea of having unfenced off-leash areas.

Boehm shared that she felt it would be helpful for everyone to look at this section of Appendix D is that we can come back to these pieces, but it can us orient what we are really talking about in this one place. She asked if everyone was okay with starting that process.

There was general agreement.

Lantieri shared that the basis of this originally came from the Task Force recommendations and then we modified and edited as we saw fit.

Wight said that the first section, A, just defines that there has to be an off-leash dog policy as approved by the Parks Commission and that any modifications need to be approved by the Parks Commission. She continued that if there are off-leash areas, that they are stated in the policy, with the exception of fenced dog parks, which shall be established by ordinance because they are more permanent.

Keech shared that he looked at this and feels that until they make a decision about fenced areas and unfenced areas that it is difficult to look at this. He continued by saying that if we are going to say no to unfenced areas, that should basically say the OLDPA shall govern actions within dog parks. Except that permanent fenced dog parks shall be established by ordinance. He continued by asking what these opportunities that they are talking about are. And said that until we define what the intentions are as a group, how are we going to edit this?

Boehm responded that that was a fair question and said that the other way to do it would be to develop the policy first, but that there would still need to be a framework or context that they were fitting into. She continued that if the group looks at this and

agrees that this is what we think we would fit it into, then they would work on the policy which would be the same process – going through it like this.

Wight added that Appendix D Section 7 won't go to City Council until the policy is also done.

Etter suggested modifying the wording of A to make it a bit more flexible, less like we are compelling ourselves to have off-leash dog opportunities that are not permanent fenced dog parks. He thought changing the wording to read something like "there might not be any, but if there are they will be in the OLDP".

Wight mentioned the edit from "guardian" to "owner".

Etter suggested changing the word "shall" to "may" in section B because it is more flexible rather than compelling the Commission to make policy that they haven't decided they are going to make. He continued that the first sentence in section B is enough and the second two sentences could be removed entirely.

Mobley stated that she felt that the third sentence should be kept in.

Etter agreed.

There was a discussion on the difference between "shall" and "may" and which was more appropriate for this section. Ultimately the group decided "may" gives some flexibility.

Etter jumped ahead to number two but noted that it was relevant to B. He wanted to make it clear that dogs must be leashed in all parks at all times except for the locations under number one and number two.

Keech shared that he had to strike two completely because it is essentially off-leash non-fenced, and looked for confirmation.

Etter responded that if there are off-leash dog areas they will be listed in the OLDP.

Keech said that if we just write off-leash areas, because if you go into a fenced area you can take your dog off-leash.

Wight clarified that not any fenced in area, like tennis courts.

Boehm confirmed that the law is that dogs need to be on-leash at all times in the City, so that is the default and does not need to be stated in Appendix D.

Wight said that it is stated that this group is the only one that has the authority to establish areas where dogs can be off-leash.

Etter shared that he wanted to make sure it was very clear that these are the only areas where dogs are allowed to be off-leash.

Lantieri suggested that could go in either this section or A.

Boehm commented that the first sentence in B is essentially a very long way of saying what Etter was getting at.

Wight said this could be used as a space to capture intent and people could wordsmith via e-mail later. The group then wordsmithed a few spots together while Wight noted the changes in the document.

Bergmann noted a change in the titles of the areas with fenced off-leash areas.

Keech asked about funding for the Oakledge dog park and if that was all that was left to get it built, confirming that it had been approved already.

Wight answered that it is that coupled with staff capacity.

Lantieri confirmed that this process, however, is what establishes it and allows it be there.

Etter asked why bullet 3 was struck and what is in Article 2, Section 517

Wight answered that it was about the funds to implement it should be made available from the fees and the CAO does not want funds to dictate where the money goes. She continued that that is noting a change the Task Force wanted to make but did not make it through the Ordinance Committee.

Wight continued with letter C saying that the Department would definitely want to be held to number one.

Etter asked if the Department had any concerns with number two, the targeted campaigns.

Wight answered that she would be okay if that was taken off.

Boehm shared that for context, one of the things the smaller group talked about and put in the timeline was that as the Commission begins having conversations with Cindid's successor that they may have some insights for what is feasible from their perspective.

Johnson noted that along with the annual targeted campaign to educate the community, it would be good to also have a space for feedback on these potential off-leash areas annually.

There was general agreement that this would be a good addition to the policy.

Keech specifically noted that cats remaining indoors made the ordinance, so it felt hypocritical to not include this in the ordinance as well as the policy.

Mobley offered that a line could be included here along the lines of "if created, the Parks Commission will evaluate on a regular basis".

The group agreed.

Keech asked about the word "opportunities" in letter C number one, and what that meant if we were not going to ultimately provide off-leash, non-fenced areas.

Wight suggested changing that word to "areas".

Keech felt that sufficed.

Keech continued that he felt 4 needed a lot of work. He continued that the word "supervised" can mean different things to different parents in different settings, like when unleashed dogs are around. He feels that if there are going to be unfenced off-leash dog areas, things like no glass containers and no food is not realistic. He continued through the list asking how this would work if there were unfenced areas. He concluded by saying that depending on how the Commission defines what an area is, whether that is fenced or unfenced, it is a big deal.

Others read number 4 as being only in fenced off-leash dog areas.

Boehm shared that it is good to take into account what is being said, but to also fit the ordinance and the policy together with this in mind. She continued that she feels the spirit of this is not just limited to the fenced areas and number 4.

Etter said that he understood what Keech was saying and used the under 12 years old example.

Lantieri said that if there is an established off-leash, unfenced area, it would make sense to not allow unsupervised children in that area.

Keech shared a personal story about his daughter being bitten by an off-leash dog in a leashed area with her mother right next to her, which is why he made the point that supervision within these areas would be completely different with unleashed dogs around.

Etter suggested that number 4 would be worth re-visiting depending on how things go during the unfenced discussion.

Wight noted that in the document.

Etter shared that he was not a huge fan of the idea of restorative justice processes because with the law there are set boundaries but restorative practices feelings tend to be involved. He continued that he would like to see section E, number 3 go away.

Keech agreed. He noted that he has gone through a restorative justice program and it was great, but it was over a stolen bike, compared to potentially things like medical bills, human health issues, being involved here if someone is hurt.

Mobley chimed in that a lot of what the group is talking about in regards to this is conflict between people who have different values around dogs in their space. She continued that because of this having a restorative justice piece makes sense because so much of this is going to come down to the way people engage and have conversations with one another. She shared that given how polarized some of this conversation feels, she believes that there does need to be something built in that gives people the opportunity to build bridges in that process.

Etter stated that this then begs the questions of under what circumstances, which may be for the City attorney to decide.

Keech referenced the Rangers visiting and sharing their difficulties with enforcement and how if the unfenced piece was going to occur that those difficulties would remain. He shared that he was curious about section E, number 1 and asked if anyone had ever been removed because of this?

Wight noted that there is a volunteer group at the Starr Farm Dog Park who might have some insight.

Lantieri asked if the Rangers have ever ejected someone from a park for any sort of violation.

Wight responded that yes people have been trespassed people from parks.

Lantieri suggested that some of the difficulties may be stemming from the fact that the policy does not exist yet, so there is nothing to point to.

Etter asked if Park Rangers can issue fines for dogs off-leash as per the Ordinance that already exists, or just police.

Wight responded that Park Rangers have been added to that section so yes they do have the authority to ticket for off-leash dogs in City parks.

Boehm noted that part of it may be a capacity issue for the rangers.

Lantieri circled back to the restorative justice piece of the conversation.

Mobley said that she was fine with having the wording say "may include a restorative justice process" since it leaves it open but not required.

The group agreed.

Etter asked for clarification about whether or not anything in this document would prohibit people who were interested in accelerating the building of fenced areas from donating.

Wight said no.

As the group wrapped up the discussion, Boehm reminded everyone that the original goal was to vote on this section and asked if people were feeling like maybe that was not the right approach right now because they still needed to fit the ordinance and the policy together more.

There was general agreement.

Lantieri asked someone to make a motion to table the vote on Appendix D section 7 until further notice, at least until the August meeting.

Etter made the motion to table, Keech seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.

Lantieri asked commissioners to take a look at all of the documents between now and the August meeting in the hopes that the group can come back and be able to start working towards some consensus or at least a compromise.

#### **4.5 Review Commission Report**

Lantieri opened by sharing that Cindi worked this up for the Commission and that it is basically a review of all of the action items that they had throughout the year. He continued by letting everyone know additions can be made before the final draft is complete or the group can approve it at this meeting and then all sign it.

Keech shared that he thought it was a great encapsulation of everything that has been happening. But, he continued, that he did have one plea to everyone that for the future, that Pennies for Parks be used for more obscure and unique things that are not necessarily incorporated with existing plans.

Wight responded that one recommendation she could make to the Commission is that you as Commissioners have access to your own parts of the community so you can help talk up Pennies for Parks to spread the word about the opportunity.

Lantieri continued that it is a great way for projects to come through via a community-driven accelerators for plans that maybe do not have the funds allocated for them.

Mobely asked for clarification that it is not the role of Commissioners to solicit more diverse requests, but just to spread the word that it exists.

Keech answered that in the past the Department goes through and then presents the Commission with some and then we approve them.

Wight chimed in that in the past few years, every request that has been made has been funded and she encouraged Commissioners to remind people that it is an opportunity.

Lantieri shared that it is not a responsibility but more of an opportunity for an engagement.

Mobely asked for clarification that if she encourages someone to apply and then she is voting on it, if that would be a conflict of interest.

The group consensus was that it would only be a conflict of interest if it was something that directly benefitted a Commissioner personally, which would be rare if it ever even happened.

Boehm said that if there were ever concern, a Commissioner could recuse themselves from a vote.

The Commissioners thanked Cindi for putting this report together.

Mobley noted that her name is “Katie” not “Kate”.

No other changes were requested, so Cindi asked the Commissioners to sign it electronically when it comes through.

## **5. Standing Items**

### **5.1 Parks Foundation**

Lantieri shared that there was a meeting of the Parks Foundation last week and that they are, from a campaign perspective, in the same place where they are about to launch a campaign to the public. He continued that they have spent a lot of time working on the back end of things, administratively, and they just got a new board as well.

Wight shared that the new chair is Kelly, who is also the Executive Director of Rock Point.

Lantieri continued that they are at a point where they are starting to move their goals forward, which is exciting.

## **6. Director’s Report**

### **6.1 Monthly Parks Commission Update**

Wight shared a few things out from the report including that there is a new concessionaire at Oakledge, which is exciting. She continued by noting the new lighted harbor buoys, which have been getting really positive feedback – even from the Coastguard. She also mentioned the Sustainability Academy’s Trout Parade, which was very cute. She continued that Pomeroy Park is out to bid, which will be the kickoff for the Parks Foundation public campaign. She ended by sharing that the Zero North Ave grant will be taken on by City staff, which she is relieved about.

Lantieri thanked Wight for her report and for all of the ones that have come before this one.

The rest of the group echoed that sentiment.

Wight shared her gratefulness for working with everyone in the Commission over the years.

## **7. Commissioner’s Items & Volunteer Hours**

Lantieri started by thanking Wight for her service, especially for her willingness to always be on the front line with staff. He specifically noted when she was driving the bus to bring people to and from the cold weather shelter.

Lantieri continued by giving VJ Comai, the City Arborist, a shout out about his willingness to dive in and get things done – like the planters on Champlain Street.

Wight shared that Comai was the one to switch a lot of annual plantings to perennials, which saved the City money and is also more ecologically and climate friendly.

Keech went next and began by bringing up the e-mail everyone received about the bike park at Leddy and mentioned that maybe it should be a discussion item at a future meeting. He continued by bringing up the sailing center and their proposal to expand into the Urban Reserve because it is going to involve fill which is a violation of the Urban Reserve plan and the Commission should have a voice in what is going on there. He closed by sharing that he received an e-mail from someone about amplified sound in Calahan Park, who was looking for verification that the request was approved.

Wight told Keech to forward the e-mail to her.

Bergmann said that he did not have any hours to report and thanked Wight for her professionalism and reasonableness and willingness to do what is best for the citizens of Burlington and that she would be hard to replace.

Johnson shared that they attended a garden work day at the Calahan community garden. They echoed the thankfulness for all of Wight's work with the Commission and the City and that she will be missed.

Mobley did not have any hours to report, and shared that she was sad her and Wight's time together was short, but that it is great to think about the lasting legacy that she will have on Burlington and the Department.

Etter did not have any hours to report, but also thanked Wight for her service and said that the enthusiasm of people who come to the meetings and join the Commission is a testimony to her leadership.

Boehm shared that she had 1 hour of volunteering to report for planning with Lantieri and Wight and said that it has been a joy getting to know Wight and that every staff member who comes in is so incredibly competent and knowledgeable and hardworking and thoughtful and she feels that from Wight and her leadership.

## **8. Adjournment**

### **8.1 Motion to adjourn**

Lantieri asked someone to make a motion to adjourn.

Etter made a motion, Bergmann seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.