

## Don Meals comments on Open Space Addendum

p. 6 Is the word “combat” the right one here? Much of what the addendum presents relates more to resilience and mitigation, not just fighting

p. 7-8 Rather see footnotes/citations of original work, not Digger stories

p. 9 Second “sentence” beginning “From the smallest planting....” is not a complete sentence

p. 9 Paragraph on sprawl is kind of a non-sequitur and the point is arguable. Should Burlington promote/accept higher development density in an attempt to reduce sprawl, while having no say in development in surrounding towns that is proceeding rapidly? Effective regional planning would be nice, but not currently effective.

p. 10 - provide citation for “Oxford’s NB Solutions Institute”  
- While important in themselves, I don’t think womens’ empowerment and youth employment are really useful metrics for the success of NBCS, at least not in terms of measuring improvements in ghg emissions, forest preservation, wetland protection, flood resilience, etc.

p. 11 Like to see the full page of NBCS definitions much earlier in the report

p. 13 and elsewhere the word “data” is plural, e.g. should say “...data were reviewed...”

p. 14 OS graphic – is the 42% tree canopy coverage for all of Burlington or just open space? I see that it is specified later in the text, but should be clarified here

re: agriculture and gardens – community gardens are far from the only individual gardens in the city. I have a 500 ft<sup>2</sup> garden in my back yard and so do many of my neighbors. I’ll wager that if you add up all the individual gardens in my neighborhood, the total square footage would be greater than the nearest community garden site (Calahan Park). Should at least acknowledge that better and amplify the benefits of all gardens, not just community gardens.

p. 26 In discussing protection of trees, you need to note the importance of tree health in the urban environment. The implication of the current narrative that tree-cutting should basically be prohibited is not appropriate. This will promote an attitude of “don’t ever cut trees” which is simplistic, dangerous, and wrong. See City Hall Park controversy.

p. 37 re: TNC stat claiming that mowing lawns releases close to half of soil carbon. This seems highly suspect, unless it includes the emissions involved in mowing. Even so, it needs to be better documented

Also, the report is pretty thin on recommendations to improve the situation on lawns/turf. Include less frequent mowing? Higher cut? Electric mowers?

p. 40 re: green infrastructure. Pretty thin on what individuals can do. Also need to note that City regulations need to be more friendly to individual GI actions. For example, I put in an

expensive pervious paver driveway to replace asphalt and got no acknowledgment from the City, much less any decrease in my stormwater fee or bonus on lot coverage after I reduced the impervious cover on my lot by 20%.

Re: implementation recommendations

1.2 Requiring strict replacement of all cut trees is not practical nor is it always acceptable

1.5 What does “better understand” deer issues mean? Should be a recommendation for something specific

2.11 Converting greenbelts to food gardens may not always be a good idea – risk of soil contamination, salt and other road chemicals, sight distance from driveways to roads

3.9 Already have state shoreline regulations and City overlay – how is what you propose different?

5.4 City does not have a strong program for promoting pervious surfaces on existing private property. At least there should be a lot-coverage bonus if a property owner reduces their impervious cover significantly. Also, DPW needs to be educated on how to maintain and restore an installation if they disturb it.

5.14 re: the median on Main St. thru UVM – various plantings have been attempted before and have failed each time. Why should expect different?