

Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership Advisory Committee Meeting

March 31, 2015

Berkshire East Ski Lodge, 66 Thunder Mountain Road, Charlemont, MA

Staff: P. Sloan, A. Peteroy, T. Matuszko, B. O'Connor, D. Raimo, M. Praus, E. Coughlin

1. Introductions

T. Matuszko commenced the meeting at 6:00 PM and asked members of the Advisory Committee to introduce themselves.

2. Review and approval of February 11, 2015 Meeting Notes:

K. Hanlon made a motion to approve the meeting notes of February 11, 2015. A. Schwenger seconded the motion. Joe Nowak and Whit Sanford abstained from voting as they did not attend the meeting. The Advisory Committee approved the Meeting Notes.

3. Review and Discussion of Draft Chapter 5 – Municipal Services and Tax Impacts and Draft Chapter 6 – Benefits of Partnership with U.S. Forest Service and the State

P. Sloan reviewed Chapter 5 with the Advisory Committee members. P. Sloan reviewed the effect of certain conservation measures on land values as well as the percentage of reimbursement for PILOT (Payment In Lieu Of Taxes) payments. All towns experience some shortfall in payments from the State. Also presented were Equalized Per Capita Taxable Property Values (EQV) that reflect the condition of a community's finances. Most town budgets rely heavily on residential property taxes and have limited ability to earn revenue from other sources. Possible impacts on municipal services and infrastructure were outlined that could result from increased tourism and forestry. The Advisory Committee members had several questions and comments as follows:

Question: Why is land with a Conservation Restriction assessed at a higher value than land under Chapter 61?

Response: Each town Assessor calculates the value per acre for land under a Conservation Restriction and this value may be different than the Chapter 61 value. For the 13 towns that had MassGIS parcel level data available, land with Conservation Restrictions had higher values than for those under Chapter 61.

Comment: Some towns use the same value for back land or forest land as land that is not developable. Agricultural land is usually assessed at a higher value, because even with a Conservation Restriction, it can produce some form of income.

Question: Were PILOT payment amounts to towns broken down by acreage?

Response: The average valuation per acre varies considerably, with amounts in Monroe being the lowest. Payments per acre to North Adams were the highest. Staff can add this information to the Chapter.

Question: What about the PILOT payments per acre for the town of Hawley?

Response: The average value per acre for the Town of Hawley was \$808/acre with a PILOT payment of approximately \$8.05 per acre. The town might benefit from a minimum PILOT valuation per acre, such as of \$1,000/acre, or a minimum payment such as \$10.00 per acre.

Comment: The Department of Revenue has different land categories and comes up with a value for assigning PILOT payments.

Comment: You will probably come up with different rates if each town Assessor did their own evaluation.

Question: Why is the town of New Ashford's per capita taxable property value higher than many of the towns in the study area? This does not make sense.

Response: Staff will double check on the New Ashford information. For towns with a higher EQV value there is often a valuable facility, such as the Bear Swamp pumped storage hydroelectric facility in Rowe that increases the value per capita.

Comment: It may be that during the first year, taxes for land under a Conservation Restriction may be lower. However, that land will never require the same services as developed land. In many ways land with a Conservation Restriction is a little endowment to the town that will always pay more in taxes than it requires in services.

Question: Is there any leverage the region could place on the State to increase PILOT payments from the State?

Response: There has been much discussion and efforts to improve PILOT payments. Staff decided to emphasize a different approach focusing on an additional revenue source that would make up the payment shortfall and address other municipal services rather than lobbying to change the PILOT system.

Comment: There are a lot of people who have been working to change the PILOT system and regional school transportation, but it is a tough battle with Boston based policy makers.

Comment: The section on increased road maintenance due to forestry activities should be rewritten. It is not fair to single out a use like that. There are so many other uses that increase demands for road services.

Comment: Table 5-1 on page 4. Make it clear that this information does not include State owned property. Staff will revise this table.

Comment: We should be able to change the paradigm in regards to PILOT payments. Rural regions provide ecosystem services to the entire state. Somehow we should be compensated for these benefits. We should begin the arguments to change the PILOT payment system with our counterparts.

Comment: Taking on the PILOT system might be a fruitless battle that will consume much time and energy. A better tactic to take might be to demonstrate the benefits of ecosystem services and get a value based on those.

Comment: Rather than taking on the PILOT system, we should push for a minimum value per acre. Given the wide range of values per acre, this would help some of the communities by providing a base payment for the town.

Comment: On table 5-2. Add a column showing the PILOT payment amount per acre of land. Staff will revise this table.

Comment: The shortfall from PILOT payments was around \$330,000. This is a token amount of money compared to the entirety of the State budget. The next time a State representative is in town, we should find an opportunity to provide them with a briefing statement to help change the PILOT payment system.

Comment: In Berkshire County legislators are aware of the PILOT payment shortfall. However, they do not have the clout to fix this issue. It is a much larger shortfall on a State-wide basis.

T. Matuszko provided the Advisory Committee with a brief overview of Chapter 6, focusing on state programs similar to the Partnership as well as the successes already achieved by the Partnership including funds from the NRCS. The Advisory Committee members had several questions and comments as follows:

Comment: In the section entitled “Conservation of Land for Sustainable Forestry” on Page 16, there are many other programs that should be added including: the Land Grant program, the community forest program, the NAWCA program for forests and wetlands. Additionally, private philanthropy could play a big role. Private individuals could also donate more than any of these programs. Private money will be critical to provide matching dollars to be able to apply to State and Federal programs. Staff will consider including these additional programs.

P. Sloan asked for feedback on whether the Chapter 6 was too long, and if some programs mentioned in the Chapter should be moved to an Appendix.

Comment: Chapter 6 should be shorter, list the programs in a chart and refer to the Appendix for more details. Staff will work to shorten the Chapter and list details of State and Federal programs in an Appendix.

T. Matuszko stated that some of the comments received about Chapter 6 were that it was too focused on securing funding when describing the benefits, however an important goal of the partnership is to bring resources to the project area to accomplish certain goals. T. Matuszko asked for comment.

Question: This is a question of emphasis in the chapter. Is the U.S. Forest Service interested in municipal financial sustainability for the purposes of better or more efficient forest management?

Response: We should make the argument that the U.S. Forest Service should be interested in sustainable communities. You can't have sustainable forests without financially sustainable communities. One of the negative comments regarding the existing National Forests is that they have negatively impacted the financial health of the communities around them. We want to change that to show that you must have sustainable communities to have sustainable forestry.

D. Raimo stated that sustainable communities are included in the mission statement of the U. S. Forest Service.

Comment: Sustainable communities only relates to economic development connected to forestry, but not outright grants to town.

D. Raimo commented that if the project achieved a U.S. Forest Service Special Designation, sustainable communities could be made a priority.

T. Matuszko stated that based on comments, the Chapter has not made the linkage between municipal financial sustainability and sustainable forestry, that you cannot have one without the other. Staff will try to revise the chapter to address this issue.

Question: Has the NRCS money (from the RCCP program) been targeted and budgeted for the Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership towns?

Response: The money will support projects in the 20-town Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership project area as well as 8 other towns.

B. O'Connor stated that his office submitted an application for the HUD Disaster Resiliency Grant that has 3 focus areas in the state including the Deerfield River watershed, Hamden County and an area on the coast. The office will know if they have been awarded grant funds by the late fall. This money could be used for road and infrastructure improvements to increase flooding resiliency.

Question: What about public structures? Would a school building that was flood damaged qualify for funding?

Response: Probably, the grant is for housing and communities and natural resources.

Question: How has the Baker Administration been with respect to supporting funding for the environment?

Response: The Governor has a commitment to increase environmental funding by up to 1% of the State budget. He is facing a serious budget shortfall, but is still committed to this increase.

Comment: Based on past experiences with the Conte Wildlife Refuge and the American Heritage Rivers Designation for the Connecticut, funding became available and instead of working together, communities and organizations competed with one another. There is not yet an institution related to the Partnership that would guide the towns and keep members working in the same direction. Such an institution would allow ongoing, on the ground, local coordination with the state and federal agencies so that there would be a real system for conservation and development goals that would also allow the Partnership to adapt through time. There should be some structure for the local communities to work together consistently and in an organized way.

T. Matuszko stated that the project staff team has talked a lot of what they have termed "governance", but nothing has been formalized. Perhaps the Advisory Committee would transform into that governance group that would help to guide decision making. P. Sloan stated that this governance structure requires more discussion and that the staff team was looking for feedback regarding town's interest in pursuing a Special Designation. If communities wanted to pursue a Special Designation, this would trigger drafting legislation and making a decision about a governance structure and how the Partnership could be sustained in the long run. The staff team was waiting for the recommendation of the Advisory Committee before talking with each town about the Special Designation. If the towns want

to pursue a Special Designation, then the Advisory Committee can work with the staff to craft legislation and figure out the governance and funding structure.

4. Discussion of Potential Special Designation for the 20-town Region

D. Raimo discussed the unique features of other Federal Special Designation areas and how they apply to the goals of the Mohawk Trail Woodland Partnership. The Advisory Committee had several questions and comments as follows:

Question: In these models, were there any programs targeted towards improving forestry-based businesses?

Response: The Special Designations are entities not programs, so the entities could choose to spend funds toward forestry if they wanted to. The New Mexico Collaborative Forestry Program was not a designation, but a grant program that required collaboration for funding and funded many forestry projects with success.

Question: What is the most recent Federal Special Designation area?

Response: The most recent Special Designation is the Valles Caldera Preserve which began in 1997. The New Mexico collaborative forestry program, while not a special designation, is even more recent.

Question: Are these Special Designation areas comparable in terms of being rural areas?

Response: The Pinelands and Conte Refuge areas are very rural.

Question: Were the National Heritage Areas designation looked at for applicability to the Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership Project?

Response: Yes, these areas were looked at.

Comment: If you want to get funding in the future beyond initial levels, you have to be close to Congressional representatives, show successes like job creation related to the mission of the project, and have something like a "friends group." A few years ago, the friends of the Conte refuge were able to secure all the Land and Water Conservation funds for that year for the Conte Refuge because they were close to Congressional representatives. There has to be a group of people dedicated to establishing and maintaining a track record for the project.

Comment: Congressional delegations are important at the Federal level for appropriations. In Idaho, Cecil Andrus and Frank Church had a lot of clout in helping to establish the Sawtooth NRA. Also, appropriations change based on what party is in power. When Democrats are in power, the emphasis is on saving land. When Republicans are in power, there is more emphasis on mineral resources and timber. There needs to be lobbying power to convince Congress of what we want to do and that isn't always easy.

Question: What percentage of funding in each of the Special Designation areas was private vs. public?

Response: Staff is beginning to research this and hopes to create a business plan.

Question: What money for economic development will come back to the communities themselves?

Response: The initial capitalization would help to provide funding for projects but could also help to make up for PILOT Payment shortfalls and potential impacts on municipal services from an increase in tourism. The amount of funding for CR's or for municipal payments would depend on the initial level of funding. The point of this exercise was to illustrate that there are many models other than a traditional National Forest Service designation. If the U.S. Forest Service was a sponsor or partner, they could help us make Congressional connections to pursue funding to try out this new model in a rural area such as ours.

5. Review and Discussion of Draft Chapter 7 - Framework and Draft Chapter 8 – Projects and Recommendations.

P. Sloan reviewed Chapter 7 Framework and asked for comments.

Comment: Anything subject to appropriation won't work. A new model is a good idea. Getting money up front is important for Conservation Restrictions and for actual capital improvements. For example, the Mohawk Trail school district is looking to switch to renewable wood heat to replace oil heating. Take a chunk of that initial appropriation and designate it as such. That way the towns can see that even if the funding stops or the organization is absorbed by another agency, it will have benefited with some real capital. Maybe these are road dollars or other things that can help the towns understand that a new approach can make sense. As far as the interpretive center goes, it is time to break the traditional "Visitor Center" model. A better approach is to get people out to see how something actually works. A working model is needed, such as a working mill or area of forest land where there is active management or how local forests can provide supplies for a pellet manufacturing facility. We don't need more pavement or rooftops, we need to start moving in a certain direction relative to carbon sequestration and sustainable forestry. It would be a real cool model for this area.

P. Sloan commented that the Visitor/Education/Technical Resource Center would not be a standard Visitor Center. Public and Advisory Committee member comments have made it clear that people want to focus on the educational aspects of sustainable forestry and ecosystem services, provide an opportunity for research and development on climate change resiliency or new wood products, as well as provide a marketing center for wood products and artisans. The Center could also provide traditional visitor services.

Comment: Conservation Restrictions should not be permanent. We cannot envision the future. A conservation restriction is a one-time shot of money. The CRs should have a time limit of up to 30 years. Families have different needs and may need money from the property in the future. We are trying to build a wood products industry. Start-up funds for young people are not available. We should try to find start-up money for young people

P. Sloan commented that we could possibly set up a loan fund that would be used to help wood-based businesses or grants if there were enough funding. If families do not want to pursue a permanent conservation restriction, there are alternate programs like the farm viability program that uses temporary restrictions (e.g. 10 years), and perhaps a comparable program can be established for forests. The draft CR has been made to be very flexible, allowing for different uses if the land has multiple owners over time.

Comment: It would be helpful to have a discussion about priorities in the project.

Comment: We do not know where funding is going to come from in the future. Do we want to seek a Federal designation if money is going to dry up in the future?

P. Sloan commented that towns have made it clear that the designation should reflect the importance of forestry and ecology in the region and not result in Federal land ownership or additional regulations. If the Partnership and region is able to secure an initial capitalization for the program it will take a regional organization and the towns to manage the program to make it sustainable in the long run. Creating a structure that would also allow for the donation of funds from private sources such as foundations is also possible.

Comment: Points about term easements are valid. For some people, easements are not really what they want to do. However, capital from the CR can be used for silviculture to create in 100 years an incredibly valuable forest that will generate income over time. Term easements given in the 80's on forest land resulted in the land being over harvested and developed once the easement expired. The idea of a term easement is fine, but a long term permanent easement is where the money is and it can help a lot of landowners.

Comment: Job creation is extremely important. Job creation and economic development and tourism might be attractive to other agencies. There is great potential for job creation in some of these industries.

Comment: We should get capital money up front. Job creation should focus on a range of job levels, not just low levels and should bring other people into the area as well.

Comment: I think we need a program that helps landowners no matter what their interests are, not just Conservation Restrictions.

Comment: We have to learn how to generate public benefits through whatever management we do. To get the public to support us, we have to show them how we are benefitting them.

Comment: We have to be careful what we wish for. Economic development might destroy forests. We have to make sure what we end up with is compatible with our goals.

Comment: We need a flexible management structure. We should explore venture capital as a funding source.

P. Sloan asked for comments on whether Committee members thought towns should consider seeking a Special Designation.

Question: If we said no, would we be done?

Response: If the Committee decided not to recommend pursuing a Special Designation, we would meet with the towns to present the Plan and let them know that the Committee recommends that we not pursue a Special Designation. We would finalize the plan and would likely just pursue the projects that have already received funding. We would not craft legislation or try to figure out a governance structures.

T. Matuszko reiterated that the potential Federal funding could be flexible, and that there are new models with similar features to what we are proposing that have worked in other parts of the country. T. Matuszko asked each Committee member to state whether they would like to move forward with seeking a Federal Special Designation.

Art Schwenger: We should move forward. Developing a new model is extraordinary and worth the effort even if it does not work out in the long run. At this point, there are many possibilities for success, in part or in whole.

Kyle Hanlon: This far along, I am comfortable with moving forward, but we need to distill our priorities down to a half a page when we go public. Our natural resources are valuable to us and we need to convey that importance succinctly to the public. We need to get down to 2 or 3 priorities. We must focus or we will never be able to sell this idea.

Joe Nowak: I don't really know what this is going to look like and it's hard for me to ascertain that when I come to these meetings. I wonder about the path that will get us there. It will have to go through the selectmen and a town meeting. What I fear is that we have 20 communities involved and if we do not show a type of solidarity – if we only get 3 towns that are interested and the other 17 are against it, the Feds won't look too well on us, that the idea we are trying to bring to the forefront isn't really liked by the communities. I don't know if it's all or none, but there has to be a good percentage of communities that want to get involved in this. There are differing needs in communities, things may work in some communities that don't work in others. Getting from point A to point B, there are so many off roads. We should move forward - why not?

Walt Quist: I think we should definitely move forward. I think you have an idea of the comments that an average town will have. They are reflective of all the comments I have heard. I have worked in land acquisition for 35 years and heard the concerns at Town Meetings. Very few times did concerns about Federal involvement and ownership come to fruition. But I do think that we have an idea about how the towns in general feel, and some of the cautions, and we should move forward.

Mark Phelps: In my opinion moving forward means that we focus on the individual and focus on the marketplace, and how those individuals react to the marketplace and what motivates them, what's going to motivate the next generation and the generation after that. And so I think we need to be market oriented. I don't want to see us relying on the government. We have to rely on ourselves and not look to Washington. Yes, we will look to Boston and say we are a poor area. Massachusetts needs to recognize that and step up to the plate. They have people working in public office who can help us. I would like to keep it in house in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Without getting involved with the Feds, I think we can do it. I would like to see capital come from the private marketplace. If we are going to be successful, we have to be successful in the marketplace. We are trying to build a wood products industry, and that means we must be successful in the marketplace.

Jim Perry: There are so many great things in here and I want to see them continue not one at a time, but managed by a partnership. Whether that is a Commonwealth partnership or a Federal one, whatever can pull this together and make this function over time. Federal partnership is fine. We should keep pursuing this, there are many benefits to landowners.

Larry Flaccus: We should definitely keep pursuing. My biggest concern is the presentation to the public and the public forums. How this is presented is a critical element.

Jeff Neipp: I am willing to move forward, but I am leery of building a partnership with the Federal government. I would rather build a private partnership. I am fine with State involvement because it is closer. There are too many unknowns with Federal involvement.

Keith Ross: Yes, we should move forward.

Greg Cox: I go along with Jay's comment about priorities. This thing is too vague to go to my Town Meeting. It would never survive in my Town Meeting. We need to put numbers on things and a draft budget. The numbers will say what our priorities are and we can debate whether these are right. Without this, the idea is too vague to consider.

T. Matuszko asked for a nod of heads as to whether the committee should have an additional meeting about priorities before moving on to regional and community meetings. The overall response was yes to an additional meeting.

Whit Sanford: I am for proceeding with a Special Designation for a variety of reasons. I have seen it work in other areas. It brings communities together. It provides energy and a reason to work together.

Jeff Hutchins: I do not represent any town, but we are in favor of moving forward with the process. We have made tremendous progress, but it has taken a lot of time. I would hate to see this brought to Town Meetings before it is ready.

T. Matuszko asked for all committee members to e-mail him or P. Sloan with comments about what would be needed before the idea of the Mohawk Trail Woodlands could be brought to Town Meetings.

Comment: Committee members should develop solutions and ideas, not just submit complaints or bullet point comments.

T. Matuszko then continued asking each Committee member as to whether the Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership should move forward with seeking a Federal Special Designation.

Doug Bruce: Yes, we should move forward.

Arthur Pantermehl Jr.: It's a loaded question as to yes or no. As far as Federal involvement, I would not be for it. I do not like the finalization of a Federal label. If the money is gone, the government will still have the designation. I think we should pursue this at the State, private and local level. That is what I would submit to my Select Board. Federal grant money would be fine if it helps us locally, but I am not in favor of the Federal designation.

Jay Healy: We talked this afternoon about a "Sapphire" grant for a pellet plant. The government will pay 75% with a four and a half year payback. I don't care if it's the State or the Federal government. The Sapphire grant doesn't mean we will be under the thumb of the State. I think we should go ahead, but I think we need to be a little more clear about what we are doing and more strategic and frame it properly so we don't get killed at Town Meeting with the Federal designation aspect. If we can clarify it and know what we are selling to the Selectmen we should take a look at it.

Scott Sylvester: We have spent a considerable amount of time on the framework. We have a unique opportunity here that I would hate to see us waste. We should definitely go forward. Whether funding is federal, state, or private, it doesn't matter. We have been clear that we want local control and if we don't have local control this will not work for us. We are a unique region and we have unique needs and we have an opportunity to meet a lot of those needs.

Cheryl Dukes: Yes, we should go forward.

Dicken Crane: Since I was a small child, I have a problem taking things literally. When this process started it was referred to as an informational session, but it was really a bunch of questions for us to answer to address a problem. I don't want to go to a Select Board meeting saying we are going to present something, but really we are going to be asking them a bunch of questions. I think we have to be up front that we are creating a proposal and we haven't gotten it completed yet. We are presenting this, and if the towns are in agreement we can move forward, but without the towns being in agreement, we do not have a proposal to present. I think it's important that the towns understand that if they go along, they will not necessarily get money. We have to make it clear that we are making a proposal to get money. It must be clear that this is a two-step process, it is a proposal that might work or might not. The towns will bring up many other issues. I think we have to accept that the towns will have other input. Let's be real with the towns up front that this plan might change. Then the whole thing needs to be put into a package to sell to the Federal government. When this whole process started, I was under the impression that there was already a proposal. It turned out that it was an opportunity to create a proposal. We have to make it clear that this is a work in progress. Realistically, this is not going to sail through every Town Meeting exactly the way it is. There will likely be many good ideas that come out of Town Meetings and what we end up submitting will be slightly different from this. We are the steering committee, but we are not God. They are going to have input and we will have to take that into account. We need buy-in from the towns but also take their suggestions. Yes, we should proceed.

Audience Member: I think it's a good idea to proceed, but we should be careful what we wish for. Make sure everything is compatible with what has been set as a priority.

Ron Coler: I think there are some good points to this proposal, and perhaps it is doable, but the finish line is a bit further away. Some of the concerns that have been raised here, like the reach of the Federal government, is a key concern. Somehow in a preamble you have to address that. Some of the other things relative to term easements, maybe a portion, or 10% could be term easements. This will help to create a winnable project. It is important for towns to listen to their liaison, the success will come down to how well you listen to everyone in this group, because that is what you will hear on the Town Meeting floor, time after time.

P. Sloan concluded by agreeing that this will a two-step process. The towns must weigh in on the idea before legislation is crafted to get buy-in from State and Federal legislators. The group must work to establish its priorities and a draft budget that shows allocations between different goals of municipal stability, land conservation and economic development so folks have an idea of what the direction is and how the private sector could be involved.

Comment: With the whole broadband situation, the idea of governance came up at the last minute and it threw a cog in the wheel. I can understand your strategy on governance, but you will have to have a really good answer for that because every Town Meeting will ask about that.

T. Matuszko reiterated that the governance structure could include a representative from every town, other organizations, and the state agencies – probably similar to what is on the Advisory Committee now.

Question: Is there a ball park figure of a budget for the 20-towns? What is the timeframe for bringing this to the towns for Town Meeting? We talk about 20 towns here. We have a hard time getting four towns together to decide on a school budget. I don't know what will happen when we have 20 towns and we start arguing about a Federal budget for Conservation Restrictions. A few years ago we had a partnership grant for a 1,500 acre Conservation Restriction. I don't think people realize the amount of time that public officials spent on that. The time that went into it was unbelievable. You better be ready.

Response: For regional meetings, we are hoping to go out in late May or early June to present the Plan and draft proposal. Based on feedback from those meetings we will fine tune the proposal into a final draft to bring to each town Select Board in the Fall. We will ask each town representative from the Advisory Committee to come with us to the Select Board to give their recommendations. We will find out how the towns want to proceed.

Question: Would you like to see something on a warrant?

Response: We are not likely ready for warrants. The next step is to meet with Select Boards. We also need to figure out a budget and a governance structure. That level of detail can be brought to Town Meeting. The towns will not want to vote on something without clear details.

Comment: If you go in front of the Select Boards, have an idea about budget. Include the Finance Committee. Unless the Finance Committee and the Select Board work together this will not be successful.

P. Sloan concluded by saying that the next meeting will focus on (1) setting priorities and (2) a general budget including the different categories of programs that could be funded if capital was raised as well as the relationship with a possible federal agency like the Forest Service.

Ryan Aylesworth: I think all the viewpoints have been expressed. This idea is not quite ready for prime time probably, but I am impressed with the group discussion and I think is definitely worthwhile. It's a unique opportunity and it should be taken advantage of.

T. Matuszko and P. Sloan thanked the group for their time and input on the project. B. O'Connor notified the group about reimbursement grants from the state for Open Space and Recreation Plan development.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 12 or Tuesday, May 19, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 8:39pm.

SIGN IN SHEET

Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership Project March 31, 2015

First Name	Last Name	Town/ Organization	E-mail Address	Initial Here
Hank	Art	Williamstown		
Doug	Bruce	Berkshire Natural Resource Council		DB
Tom	Brule	Florida		
Greg	Cox	Hawley		GAC
Dicken	Crane	Windsor		JDC
Cheryl	Dukes	Buckland		CD
Larry	Flaccus	Shelburne		LF
Kyle	Hanlon	BRPC North Adams		Kyle
Jay	Healy	Charlemont		Jay
Jeff	Hutchins	MFA		JH
Fred	Jajko	Cheshire		
Drew	Jones	HooRWA		
Stacy	Kontrabecki	Buckland - Alternate		
Dan	LaBonte	Savoy		
Carl	McKinney	Clarksburg		
Jim	Moore	Conway		
Jeff	Neipp	Leyden		JN
Joe	Nowak	Adams		JN
Arthur	Pantermehl, Jr	Ashfield		AP
Jim	Perry	Deerfield River Watershed Association		JP
Mark	Phelps	New Ashford		MAP
Walt	Quist	Rowe		WQ
Keith	Ross	MA Society of Foresters		KR
Whit	Sanford	Shelburne - Alternate		WS
Art	Schwenger	Heath		AS
Scott	Sylvester	Colrain		SS
Mary	Vilbon	Shelburne Falls Areas Business Association		
Gisela	Walker	Franklin Regional Planning Board		
		Berkshire County Business Representative		
		Monroe Select Board		
Alyssa	Larose	FRCOG		
Peggy	Sloan	FRCOG	PS	
Mary	Praus	FRCOG	MP	
Thomas	Matuszko	BRPC	TM	
Eammon	Coughlin	BRPC	EC	
Wendy	Ferris	Franklin Land Trust		
Rich	Hubbard	Franklin Land Trust		
Alain	Peteroy	Franklin Land Trust	✓	
Robert	O'Connor	EOEEA	RO	
Deirdre	Raimo	Forest Service Liaison	DR	
Ron	Coler	Ashfield SB	RC	
Ryan	Ayleworth	WTPLA	RY	