

MINUTES

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

**1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

3:30 p.m.

December 12, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard;
Members Allison Tanner, Samantha Collins, Adrienne Harrison,
Barbara McMillan; and Alternative Nathalie Morison

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 14, 2018

Ms. McMillan moved to approve the amended minutes from the November 14, 2018 Conservation Commission Meeting, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion Passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

II. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

1. 43 Whidden Street
Thomas L. and Ann D. Taylor, owners
Assessor Map 119 Lot 2

At the request of the applicant, Ms. Tanner moved to **postpone** the application to the February 13, 2019 meeting, seconded by Ms. McMillan. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

2. 105 Bartlett Street
Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, and Boston and Maine Corporation, owners
Assessor Map 157 Lots 1 and 2 and Map 164 Lots 1 and 4

John Chagnon and Steve Riker from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. Applicants Doug Pinciario and Ed Hayes were also present. This application was presented at the November 14, 2018 meeting where the Conservation Commission voted to postpone so that changes to the plan could be made. Mr. Chagnon walked the Commission through the plan revisions. The plans were updated to reflect changes required by the approval process and the DPW. The City

requested that the applicant construct a sidewalk and re-do the first 600 feet of roadway. That was not on the plans in the last application. The impact square footage has been updated to include that and it totals to 54,879 square feet. The locations of the outfalls have been staked. There were some comments that related to the demolition. Sheet CP2 outlines the existing structure and turnstile that will be demolished. Part of the building structure is within the 100-foot buffer, so it is included in the application. The Commission had some questions about the process. Notes have been added to the plan to outline that the removal of the structure will be in compliance with all State regulations and the areas will be filled, leveled, loamed and seeded. That area is pretty flat, so the intention is just to remove the structures and fill the area back in. The plan also shows the access areas. Trees will not be impacted other than the trees that are growing within the structures. Demolition permits will be required. The Commission asked that they add erosion and sediment control devices. Silt socks were added and the placement can be seen on the plan. The Commission talked about the bike path, but that is not part of the application. In the letter they indicated that the City has started that project and there will be a public meeting on December 19, 2018. Buffer plantings were added to the left side of Bartlett St. It will be from the edge of the sidewalk to the pond, and the plans include a buffer planting schedule. They will be planted in 50 foot sections and contain the 40 plants identified in the schedule. Sections 2, 3 and 4 will be planted a little differently because of space. There are ongoing internal discussions about snow removal and storage. Storing snow in the middle of the cul-de-sac could work, but it would depend on the severity of the storm.

Chairman Miller questioned if the sidewalk would be curbed. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it would be.

Mr. Britz commented on the Staff Memo. Mr. Britz appreciated the buffer planting sections, but thought it needed more detail because the slope is so severe. It was important to ensure that what is planted there would survive and support the bank structure. The plan shows the outfall locations, but there is still only one outfall detail. There needs to be a detail for each one on the site because they will all be built a little differently. The actual impact should be monitored after they are installed as well. Mr. Britz liked the infiltration practices proposed in the plan, but wanted to understand the contaminants in the soil before approving them. They need to understand what contaminants might there be and how would they be mobilized by this design. There should be a little more work done to address these items.

Mr. Chagnon noted that they had some confusion about the infiltration piece of the memo. The plan set includes a rain garden in the first island. Mr. Chagnon requested clarification from the Commission about whether or not that was appropriate. The other infiltration practices are sand filters that are contained in a box. They don't use native soil to infiltrate. They are not able to test the site yet because they don't own the property yet. They are asking for a permit to tear down the building once they own the property.

Chairman Miller's main concern was about the building demolition. Rain goes through there now of course, but Chairman Miller was worried about an unintended consequence from disturbing the site. Chairman Miller questioned if there was anyway to test the soil before the demolition happened. Mr. Chagnon noted that it could be a condition of the approval to test the soil around the building before it is demolished. Then if there is any environmental leakage

related to the removal of the building it could be remediated. Chairman Miller wanted to ensure that the soil would be tested before they moved forward with the demolition. Mr. Chagnon responded that would be included in the note about the removal of the building. Chairman Miller commented that the historical use of the building should be accounted for when trying to determine what to test for. Mr. Chagnon noted that this was not the first railroad building to be removed, so there is probably a good body of knowledge on what to test for.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if this would be mixed commercial and residential. Mr. Chagnon responded that the businesses that are there now would remain. Lot 5 will be available for development in accordance with the new zoning. The first step will be to subdivide to create Lot 5. Then they can work to design a project on it.

Chairman Miller raised the concern about the outfalls. It says in the plan that they will be above the high tide line. Chairman Miller questioned how they would be constructed and what the potential impact would be during construction and after. Mr. Chagnon responded that they mimicked the design of these outfalls from the ones that were recently installed on Brewster St. There would be a banking that slopes down to the shore. They would be starting above the high tide line and excavating out for the outfall. The head wall will have wing walls, which will create a wide area for the water to disperse before it gets to the pond. Right now it is all combined drainage, and the City requested that the applicants separate out the storm water. Right now there is no treatment.

Ms. Collins noted that the plans originally had a Cape Cod berm proposed near Great Rhythm Brewery. It was suggested that something else should be considered so a plow wouldn't push it right over the edge. Ms. Collins questioned if that point had been addressed at all. Mr. Chagnon responded that it was still showing as a Cape Cod berm on the plans. It could be updated to a concrete Cape Cod berm.

Ms. Harrison noted that the snow storage area outlined for Lot 4 was close to the tide line, and wondered if there were other location options. Chairman Miller requested that Ed Hayes speak on the snow storage in general. Mr. Hayes responded that they have identified an area within the lumberyard that could be available for snow storage. There could be a few other areas in the lumberyard as well. The guys who plow are employees and have been instructed to not plow into the pond. Mr. Hayes has a backhoe and dump trucks available, so the snow can be moved to the lumberyard and the center of the cul-de-sac. There are options. Ms. Harrison noted that would work for right now because all of the lots are under the same ownership. However, in the future if ownership is different, then Lot 4 may not have that option. Mr. Hayes responded that was a good point. There is a shared road maintenance agreement across all 5 lots. Down the road a professional snow removal company could be employed to remove that snow. Mr. Chagnon pointed out that the edge of disturbance for the proposed snow storage on Lot 4 was pavement. It is in close proximity to the pond but has opportunity for infiltration. Mr. Hayes added that he picks up trash along the bank almost everyday, so it is monitored.

Ms. Harrison questioned what would happen if the water went back into the outfall due to an extremely high tide or severe storm. Mr. Chagnon responded that this issue came up in TAC and

they were asked to look at flapper valves. It is a valve that will not allow water to flow back up the pipe.

Chairman Miller appreciated the ongoing effort to figure out better ways to deal with the snow storage. The other concern about the snow removal is maintaining the buffer plantings. It would be good to think about how to protect that as well during snow removal times. Ms. Tanner questioned if there as anyway the snow could be taken off site. Mr. Hayes responded that during significant snowstorms where there is 2 feet or more it would be trucked off site.

Mr. Riker clarified that the intent of the buffer plantings is to install them between the sidewalk edge and the top of the bank. Chairman Miller agreed that was his understanding.

Ms. Tanner noted that monitoring the site for erosion still needed to be addressed. Mr. Chagnon agreed, and also pointed out where the outfall backflow preventers were detailed in the plans.

Chairman Miller requested more information about the rain garden. Mr. Chagnon responded that area was a raised landscaped area, but now it will be depressed to be a rain garden. It is not a huge collection area, but will provide more infiltration.

Mr. Britz questioned if those sand filter areas could be used for infiltration. Mr. Chagnon responded they could not. They would treat surface water. Mr. Britz noted that more infiltration would be good as long as they weren't infiltrating contaminants. Mr. Chagnon responded that there would be more opportunities to do that on Lot 5.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the drainage area the rain garden went into was still curbed. Mr. Chagnon responded that was correct it would collect roof runoff. Ms. McMillan clarified that no runoff from the road would go there. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. Ms. McMillan questioned what the volume of that would be. Mr. Chagnon responded that he would make sure that was included on the plans.

Ms. McMillan noted that there were some letters from the public that were submitted, and questioned if the Commission wanted to talk about that at all. Some of the issues in the letter have already been raised. Chairman Miller agreed that most of the concerns in the letter had been brought up during the meeting. The main thing was to test the soil before the demolition. Ms. McMillan questioned if they wanted to pursue more soil testing beyond the demolition site. Mr. Britz agreed that it made sense to do more testing. Chairman Miller suggested that it could be a condition before construction. Ms. McMillan agreed that it should be a condition, and the applicants would have to comeback if the design had to change based on results.

Ms. Tanner noted that one of the letters suggested a sign saying that you could not dump snow or service water. Ms. Tanner wanted to see the cul-de-sac labeled as snow storage, and a note talking about when snow would be trucked off site.

Vice Chairman Blanchard summarized what was discussed. They talked about soil testing before demolition, providing exact detail for each outfall, a little more detail to the plantings should be provided.

Ms. McMillan questioned if they should postpone the application or move it forward to the Planning Board. Mr. Britz noted that there were certainly some revisions that needed to be made and it was up to the Commission if they wanted to see those before the application moved on. Ms. Tanner thought they should postpone. Chairman Miller noted that if they did the Commission needed to be specific about what they wanted to see in the plans.

Ms. Tanner noted that the revisions should include: details of each outfall construction, a note that the soil would be tested for toxicants before the building is demolished, monitoring for erosion around the outfalls on the site, a concrete Cape Cod berm, the cul-de-sac would be marked for snow storage, and the soil testing for where the rain gardens would infiltrate.

Ms. McMillan pointed out that there was no maintenance plan included. Chairman Miller questioned if there was one for the sand filters. Mr. Chagnon responded that there was a note stating they should be maintained based on the manufacturers recommendations.

Ms. Collins was still concerned about the width of the buffer on the pond side of the road, and wanted that on the record.

Ms. Tanner moved to postpone the application to the January 9, 2019 meeting, seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

3. 910 Sagamore Avenue
Carolyn B. McCombe Revocable Trust, Carolyn B. McCombe Trustee, owner
Assessor Map 223 Lot 26A

Susan Faretra from Faretra Septic Design, LLC represented the applicant and spoke to the application. The piece of property is down a dirt drive off the main part of Sagamore Ave. There is an existing 3-bedroom home on .62 acres. The entire lot is in the 100-foot buffer and they need to install a new septic system. The existing septic goes beyond the property line into the abutting property. Ms. McCombe would like to correct that. There is a culvert that goes through the property and empties into the creek. There is some poorly drained soil in the lawn near the creek. The existing system has a 1,000-gallon septic tank, pump chamber and a forced main that goes through the lawn to the leech field. The proposed system would have an advanced treatment tank. The forced main would be moved out of the wetlands into the lawn area and lead to a small effluent disposal area off of the gravel driveway. It will be 75 feet away from surface water, but still within the 100-foot buffer. Excavation will be required to install the new tanks. There will be 607 square feet of temporary disturbance. All of that disturbed area will be turned back into lawn. The leech field will be raised, so it is considered permanent impact. That will be 871 square feet in the Tidal Buffer Zone. There is an additional area of 98 square feet of temporary impact that is in the 100 foot Wetland Buffer. The forced main would be capped and abandoned as well as the leech field. There is no increase in impervious surface. Ms. Faretra outlined an area on the plan that would be left to grow back to its natural state.

Ms. Tanner questioned what was in that area now. Ms. Faretra responded that it was a lawn area that a lot of drainage from neighboring properties passes through. It would be good to let it go back to a natural state because it's the area closest to the creek. Ms. Tanner was concerned that

it may allow for a lot of invasive species to grow in that area. It would be better to plant native wetland plants there intentionally. Ms. Faretra confirmed that would be fine.

Vice Chairman Blanchard requested clarification on the maintenance of the advanced treatment septic system, and questioned if it was part of a contract for the owner to ensure that it was properly maintained. Ms. Faretra confirmed that DES requires a signed maintenance contract in their application submittal. It is tied to the system, so any new owner would be responsible for the maintenance. It will be inspected every two years after the install.

Ms. Harrison clarified that the large pine was the only tree that would be removed for this project. Ms. Faretra confirmed that was correct.

Ms. McMillan clarified that they would be abandoning the existing leech field. Ms. Faretra confirmed that was correct. It's an old stone system. It's not something that will cave in over time. Once it's abandoned any leftover organic matter would just decompose.

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Tanner with the following stipulation:

1. The applicant shall install plantings in the area shown on the plan with a note to "allow lawn area to return to natural state."

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

III. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
105 Bartlett Street
Clipper Traders, LLC, and Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, Boston and Maine Corporation, owners
Assessor Map 157 Lots 1 and 2 and Map 164 Lots 1 and 4

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to postpone the application to the January 9, 2019 meeting, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

- B. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
910 Sagamore Avenue
Carolyn B. McCombe Revocable Trust, Carolyn B. McCombe Trustee, owner
Assessor Map 223 Lot 26A

Ms. Faretra added into the package the Subservice Bureau request for more information. They need the wetland approval in order to give their approval. Ms. Faretra also added in the review by the Division of Historical Resources. That had come in after the application submittal. There is nothing of interest for them on the site.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau, seconded by Ms. McMillan with the following stipulation:

1. The applicant shall install plantings in the area shown on the plan with a note to “allow lawn area to return to natural state.”

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

Standard Dredge and Fill Application
C. 135 Corporate Drive
Pease Development Authority, owner
Assessor Map 303 Lot 6

Adele Fiorillo with Normandeau Associates and Matt Cardin with Eversource spoke to the application. Typically applications with Eversource are filed with easement deeds instead of property owners' signatures. Ms. Fiorillo was surprised that the application came back requiring property owners' signatures. Ms. Fiorillo has emailed Collis Adams from DES and is confident that they will be allowed to move forward with the easement deeds. This application does have a file number that the Commission can use if they need to correspond with DES on this application at all. The proposal is to add a gravel access way on the Pease Trade Port for two utility poles. The road and one of the utility poles is in the wetland. Ms. Fiorillo met with Michael Mates from the Pease Engineering Department to look at the site. Because this is a utility project, they do not have to go through any of their boards for approvals. The easement documentation is very clear and states that Eversource has the ability to put in access roads where they are needed to access these sites. Ms. Fiorillo spoke with Peter Britz about the application and it was concluded that a CUP was not needed for this project. The gravel access road would come off an existing gravel access road that was put in for Unitil. There would be 224 square feet of wetland impact for the road and 57 square feet of impact for the utility pole. These poles are the cut point for power for the Pease Trade Port, so Eversource needs access to them to better serve the Trade Port. These poles control service for the whole trade port and if there is ever an outage, then Eversource can cut power to isolate the outage. It is a high priority site to maintain reliability. Usually power loss is the result of a storm, so the gravel road would provide safe and reliable access to this site in an emergency.

Ms. Tanner requested clarification on the path layout and questioned why it could not use more of the existing gravel road before angling off to the poles. Mr. Cardin responded that there are two poles in that area, so this layout would provide access to both of them. There would be bucket trucks accessing this area and they need more room to turn. There is also a gas pipeline in the area, so the access road avoids that. The road will be 6 inches of larger crushed stone with smaller crushed stone on top of that.

Ms. Collins questioned if they would have to plow the road in the event of a snowstorm. Mr. Cardin confirmed that was correct. Ms. Collins questioned if it would be plowed as needed, or always plowed to keep the road available. Mr. Cardin responded that it would be plowed only when they needed to get out there. Mr. Cardin was not sure if the parking lot the road would be off of is normally plowed in the winter, so that may need to be adjusted to provide access.

Ms. Tanner questioned if the snow that is plowed could be directed to the area between the two gravel roads instead of toward the wetland. Mr. Cardin confirmed that the majority of it could be plowed to between the roads. Some of it would have to go into the wetland to allow access to the pole.

Mr. Britz questioned if the poles would only be accessed in emergencies or if they needed to be accessed more than that. Mr. Cardin responded that he was unsure what the maintenance was like. It should not be a lot of maintenance. It will mostly be to control the switches to isolate an outage.

Ms. McMillan requested clarification on the after the fact pole switch. Mr. Cardin responded that they had to install two switches. The plan always accounted for two poles, but did not account for one of them to be in the wetlands. Two switches can't be on one pole. Mr. Cardin was not involved in the field decision on where to locate the poles, but would follow up.

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

IV. WORK SESSIONS

1. 70 Pleasant Point Drive
Donna Lyn Tamaroff, owner
Assessor Map 207 Lot 15

Tom Ballestero represented the applicant and spoke to the application. Mr. Ballestero wanted to review the application with the Commission and have them identify if there were any red flags in the concepts. This site was brought to the attention of the NH Coastal Program when the landowner identified some erosion and wanted to put in some structures to stabilize the shoreline. This site has eroding shorelines, heavy underbrush and animals burrowing in the area. There is a rock outcrop to the west and on the east the owners have stairs down to the salt marsh where they keep their kayaks. The low marsh shoreline looks like it is eroding. The proposal for that area is to put in some erosion pins and monitor the area to see how bad it is. The high marsh is right next to a road with a fence and utilities in the right of way. There is a steep bank there, which makes it hard to grow tidal buffer plants. There is an area where it looks like landscapers have put waste materials. There are four treatments proposed. One is cutting the understory about 8-10 feet so the salt marsh can get more sun. They monitored it at Wagon Hill Farm where some trees had been limbed and there has been a 2-4 fold increase in sun on the salt marsh. There are some invasive plants there, but not a lot. All of it is above the high tide line. They don't know the rate of the erosion, but they have seen grazers in the area. This makes it hard for plants to grow. One thought was to build out the marsh line, which would need state agreement as well. A high sill would be needed there. They have not decided if it should be rock, core log or a gradual slope of fill material. Installing a low galvanized fence would keep the snails off of it.

Chairman Miller questioned how high the fence would be. Mr. Ballestero responded that it would be about a foot high. Chairman Miller questioned what the mesh was. Mr. Ballestero responded that it would be a coarse mesh like chicken wire. This would be monitored and inspected over the first year to see how it's working.

Ms. Tanner questioned how they would access that area. Mr. Ballestero responded that there is a stairway on the owners' property that would allow people to walk there. Construction would probably be done off a barge. Ms. Tanner questioned what the house elevation was. Mr. Ballestero responded that it was about 15 feet.

Mr. Ballestero noted that the last treatment would be to lay back the steep bank. This would be done by cutting the upper bank and infilling below. Then plantings would be added above the high water line. There are some species of note already in that area, so those would be moved to another location on the site to be preserved. The replanting would look similar to what was done in Cutt's Cove.

Ms. Morison noted that it was exciting to see that a homeowner wanted to improve the issue without just installing riprap.

Chairman Miller questioned why the snails were an issue in one location and not everywhere. Mr. Ballestero was not sure if they were an issue everywhere or not, but they always see them in that location on the roots.

Mr. Britz questioned what would hold the slope in that is holding the road if they cut the upper bank back. Mr. Ballestero responded that the bank cutting would start 4-5 feet away from the edge of the road and they would work to build a more gradual slope. The goal is to get a slope that is 1:15 or 1:10 to be able to grow plants with solid roots. That will make the bank more stable. Mr. Britz questioned if it was possible they would create erosion in the upper part with this tactic. Mr. Ballestero responded that he did not think so. Mr. Britz questioned if they could really confirm there was a problem in that area. Mr. Ballestero responded that he did not have any data, but could install monitoring devices. The earliest this would be done would be late spring of next year. The most aggressive erosion seems to be right after the heart of winter. There are erosion pins at Wagon Hill and they see 60% of the erosion after the heart of winter in that area. This site can certainly be monitored for however long this Commission and the other Boards see fit.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the property owners were losing any other property in the area other than the section where they would be cutting back the bank. Mr. Ballestero confirmed that was the only place they would be losing property. There are locations in the lawn where sinkholes are opening up which means that the sediment is washing out. That seems to be associated with animals burrowing. If some of the understory is removed, then birds of prey may be able to help that situation.

Chairman Miller questioned if the kayaks launching in that area could be part of the issue. Mr. Ballestero responded that it could be, but they seem to use just one simple path for that. If the restoration moves forward then stepping-stones would be installed to help direct the foot traffic.

Ms. Harrison questioned if the snail fence fails would there be a procedure in place for removing it. Mr. Ballestero responded that there should be an inspection and maintenance period and a decision period where they decide if it should be kept or not.

Ms. McMillan questioned who would actually be doing the work. Mr. Ballestero responded that a landscaper would remove the understory. A local contractor would do the bank and build out the marsh line under their supervision. They would do the planting and the snail fence.

Chairman Miller was still not sure about the snail fence. Mr. Ballestero responded that Cutt's Cove had a big bird problem, so a lot of fencing was installed there. It seems to have made a positive impact. Chairman Miller noted that it was good to see a homeowner taking this approach. Mr. Ballestero agreed and added that it could serve as an example site.

Ms. Tanner clarified that after everything was done there would be monitoring. Mr. Ballestero confirmed that was correct. The monitoring plan would be similar to the Cutt's Cove one.

Ms. McMillan questioned if they were only cutting back one part of the site because it was a tight space. Mr. Ballestero confirmed that was correct. Mr. Ballestero noted that he would email information about the erosion pins to the Commission. Chairman Miller agreed that would be helpful.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. McMillan attended the meeting hosted by Jay Diener for the Conservation Commission Round Table. They had Tracy Degan from Natural Resource Services or Rockingham County Conservation District. She talked about their services for municipalities. Ms. McMillan passed out a flier and noted that one thing they may be helpful with would be a stewardship with the PULA study. They will be doing some training in other towns about what to do with their lands. A lot of it has to do with agriculture, but they also talk about other things that are more in line with what this Commission has been talking about.

Mr. Britz noted that they were hired contractor Steve Whitman for the open space plan. There is a stewardship component, and they will be talking about what opportunities should be included for the open space plan.

Ms. McMillan noted that UNH Extension has a program called Green Grass for Clear Water. The program includes a flier and training for landscapers on water quality. Ms. McMillan passed out the flier and noted that it provides education to help prevent people from overwatering and over fertilizing their lawns. There is also a bag clip included in the pack because research shows that most people just want to empty their whole fertilizer bag in one use. The thought at Jay Diener's meeting was the Conservation Commission's could be a conduit to get this information out to the public. Ms. McMillan questioned if it was appropriate to hand out this kit if an applicant came in and the Commission thought it was pertinent.

Chairman Miller questioned what the other towns were doing with the kits. Ms. McMillan noted that Rye goes out to every site and provides them with the kit at that visit. There is a card in

there that asks the person to fill out a survey. Chairman Miller questioned how much a bag cost. Ms. McMillan responded that they could have a certain amount of them for free. Beyond that they would cost around \$7-\$10.

Ms. Tanner noted that she did not want to promote using fertilizer because generally the applicants coming in were in areas it should not be used. Ms. McMillan agreed and noted that there were alternatives to using fertilizer listed on the card. They could also add in the regulations for Portsmouth to be clear about where it should and should not be used. Ms. Tanner agreed that it might be useful to have an educational tool to give people.

Mr. Britz noted they should be careful about sending a message promoting fertilizer. Ms. McMillan noted that it was something to think about. Mr. Britz confirmed that he would follow up to see if there was an issue about giving anything away to applicants.

Ms. Tanner noted that an information brochure would be helpful. It could provide tips and point to resources for further information. Ms. McMillan noted that the program had a more comprehensive flier that she could bring next time for the Commission to look at.

Ms. Tanner proposed contacting landowners that abut conservation areas identified in their studies to see if they were interested in being a steward. They may feel more ownership to that land and it would be helpful to have them monitoring it. Mr. Britz agreed that was a good idea. There have been some issues in the past with getting monitors, so that may be a good strategy.

Mr. Britz reminded the Commission that there was a meeting on December 19, 2018 for the North Mill Pond trail. It is the first public meeting. Their project is dependent on buying the property and then they can do the next step. Once the sale goes through they can begin the trail design. There is opportunity to produce better trail design and shoreline work along the project route.

Chairman Miller questioned if it would be just an informational meeting. Mr. Britz responded that it would be an opening meeting to talk about concepts and design of the trail. They will look at the route and what could be done along the way. Ms. Tanner questioned if that would encompass the Frank Jones area along Hodgson Brook. Mr. Britz responded that was a separate project. They will be coming back to the Commission soon with a changed design that takes some of the storm water treatment out of the buffer. The open space plan will probably come to the Commission for a work session as well.

Chairman Miller questioned what the open space plan was. Mr. Britz responded that it was a plan to look at all the open space in the City and look at what they can do for more stewardship and access. The goal is to build out a more comprehensive plan. Ms. McMillan questioned if that was in connection with the PULA properties. Mr. Britz responded that they were a prominent feature of the plan because that is the open space. However, this plan would look at how the City could utilize and manage the properties. Ms. Tanner questioned if it included looking at areas they should target acquiring. Mr. Britz responded that it would be looking at that as well as what types of areas they should be looking for.

Mr. Britz noted that the North Mill Pond Trail project would go to the salt pile for now, but the goal is to have it go all the way to Market St. Chairman Miller clarified that the park would be in the gateway area. Mr. Britz confirmed that was correct. There will be a path through the buffer area in Cutt's Cove.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 5: 50 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rebecca Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Conservation Commission