

**MINUTES
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call**

To register in advance for this meeting, click on the link below or copy and paste this into your web browser:

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_rFWsxFoySkWQo-Lss9vRSA

You are required to register in advance to join the meeting over Zoom, a unique meeting ID and password will be provided once you register. Public comments can be emailed in advance to planning@cityofportsmouth.com. For technical assistance, please contact the Planning Department by email (planning@cityofportsmouth.com) or phone (603) 610-7296.

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2020-5, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

3:30 p.m.

May 13, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Steve Miller; Members; Allison Tanner, Barbara McMillan, Adrienne Harrison, Samantha Collins, Jessica Blasko,
MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard; Alternate Joseph O’Neill
ALSO PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 11, 2020

Chairman Miller commented that there was a reference about septic analysis on page 2 that needed to be clarified. The vote on the motion to deny on page 4 should not say unanimous and should be 5-1-0.

Ms. Blasko pointed out a typo in the second sentence. It should be “say” instead of “stay.” Ms. Blasko pointed out a typo on page 2 one of the word “being” should be removed.

Ms. McMillan commented that the reference to storm water on page 5 needed to be clarified.

Ms. Tanner moved to approve the minutes from the March 11, 2020 Conservation Commission Meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Blasko. The motion passed by a 5-1-0 vote. Ms. Collins abstained because she was not at the March meeting.

II. WORK SESSIONS

1. North Mill Pond Trail and Greenway- City of Portsmouth

Richard Houghton, Gary Han, and Bob Uhlig from Halvorson Tighe and Bond Studio, Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond and Mike DeRosa from DeRosa Environmental were present to speak to the project.

Mr. Britz commented that this project has gone through the preliminary design from Market St. to Bartlett St. This is the first step toward the design of the project. It will start with the City owned land behind 3S Artspace and the AC hotel. This area has the most park area of the entire corridor.

Mr. Houghton commented that this was the conceptual design phase for the trail from Market St. to Bartlett St. This focuses on Area 1 from Maplewood Ave. to Market St. Mr. Houghton showed aerial photos of the existing conditions that showed the degraded shoreline, rip rap and swales, and the properties the trail would go through. The current concept would tie into the improvements on Market St. The design will be cognizant of the existing railroad. The proposed greenway would have a boardwalk structure over the existing drainage. The trail would need to go into the 25-foot buffer to make that crossing. The graphic shows the property lines, high tide line, jurisdictional wetland line, and the 25-foot wetland buffer. The current proposed concept is to provide a buffer at the existing parking lot and then a straight path at grade. The path would be 10 feet wide with 2-foot buffers on each side. No other landscaping will be provided in that area. Further along there will be wayfinding connections out to Vaughn St. and the new improvements at the AC Hotel area. There may be opportunity to utilize an existing rail line. The back of that would provide a vegetated buffer that could potentially include a swale to capture stormwater. Curb cuts will be put into the parking lot to help capture storm water. Another raised boardwalk feature would go out over the existing conditions there. The design would not impact any existing electrical towers. There may be an opportunity incorporate historical information about the site. There may be an overflow into the passive lawn area. The design includes a potential future connection to Phase 2. Mike DeRosa and his team looked at the invasive species on the site and the site repair that could be incorporated into the project.

Mr. DeRosa commented that they inventoried the site and it had a lot of the common invasive species. Part of the restoration of the landscape would be to include native plants to replace the invasive species. The intent is to look at it as an ecological restoration project.

Mr. Houghton noted that the site was broken out into various zones with a corresponding planting palette for each zone. Mr. DeRosa added that they looked at the different zones from the mud flats and salt marsh up to the coastal bluff where most of the invasive plants are. The plans will feature plants with pollinator and wildlife benefits to create cover, corridors, nest sites etc.

Chairman Miller commented that the powerlines were a constraint for putting in trees, however, adding in higher shrubs would be good. There should be crosswalks on Market St. to help connect the park across the street to the trail.

Ms. Tanner commented that she liked the planting plan but was concerned about the boardwalk. It comes out too close to the remnants of the old wharf. People may try to step out onto the exposed wood pieces. There should be a railing on that portion to prevent that.

Mr. DeRosa commented that a big part of the project was the living shoreline. The aerial shots showed the existing erosion and loss of coastal resource area. This is an artificial site with bulkheads that are degraded. The plan is to create a living shoreline that will function ecologically and provide a habitat for fisheries and oysters in the intertidal zone. The plan is to incorporate subtidal and intertidal oyster beds. Rockweed has been found to act almost like a canopy in the winter to allow oysters to exist in the intertidal zones. The subtidal oyster beds will feed the intertidal oyster beds to help create a functioning ecosystem. A tide pool habitat will be constructed, and the on-site living rock will be incorporated to create structure to support sediment. The intent is to bring the salt marsh back by infilling the marsh with sediment. It has been done successfully at sites in Boston.

Mr. Houghton commented that the existing commercial building would not be changing. The new path alignment provides opportunities to improve the shoreline. The section that goes along the back side of the AC Hotel will have back of house utility areas that will be screened and incorporated into the storm water recharge. The majority of that path can be right at grade. The grade will be raised in some sections to provide a salt marsh condition. The boardwalk section will be low profile with no guardrails. The parking lot section will be improved and have stormwater management. The peninsula will have a filled area against the bulkhead. There will be another area for retaining storm water on site further down.

Mr. Uhlig commented that the raised boardwalk would be installed on helio-piles which would be low impact.

Ms. Tanner questioned if there were any plans to have any seating along the path. Mr. Houghton responded that it was not shown in this plan, but there are opportunities to incorporate it. There would need to be coordination with the property owners on that. Mr. Britz added that some of the path is on private property, so easements still need to be negotiated for that.

Ms. McMillan questioned what the existing conditions of the park picnic area was and what it would look like after. Mr. Houghton responded that the area is currently heavily covered in invasive plants. The plan would be to remove that and replace it with a native no mow species. It would be an open space people could filter out to on a nice day. Ms. McMillan commented that it would be better to leave that area vegetated and create more of a canopy there. The passive lawn would be harder to maintain. Ms. McMillan questioned if the bulkhead would be located where the existing pilings are. Mr. Houghton responded that they would not be installing new bulkheads but using boulders in that location to provide structure. Mr. DeRosa added that they would use the existing bulkhead as a marker. At most they would install a geo tech membrane or some sort of barrier to help prevent sediment disturbance. Everything would be designed to go on top of the sediment. Mr. Britz commented that the park area is one chance to have a bit of open space because the City owns that part of the trail. It would be a good opportunity for the public to have more open space. Mr. DeRosa added that the open space

would act as a surface flood storage area as well. The concept is to keep runoff waters from getting into traditional stormwater systems and using surface spaces for treatment.

Ms. Tanner recommended using an eco-grass that grows 5 inches tall and flops over. There is no mowing maintenance needed and it tolerates being flooded. Mr. DeRosa responded that the plan is to use coastal red fescue, which does exactly that. It grows 6 inches then flops over. It is drought tolerant and grows in sun and shade. Trees and shrubs will also be incorporated.

Ms. Harrison commented that she was concerned about the two areas where the path came close to the HOTL. Ms. Harrison questioned if they overlaid the sea level rise and storm surge lines for the path. It may make sense to narrow the path or adjust the alignment in some areas. Mr. Britz responded that the path is being designed to be resilient, so it will allow for flooding and will work with it. Ms. Harrison commented that the tide line in the boardwalk area should be accounted for too. Mr. Britz noted that it may make more sense to incorporate a different trail type in those areas.

Ms. Collins questioned if the eco-grass was salt tolerant. Ms. Tanner confirmed that it was. Ms. Collins commented that it would be good to see the boardwalk areas be a little smaller. A couple sections of the path have a lot of buffer upland of the path. It may make more sense to put the buffer on the marsh side of the path. The living shoreline idea is good. Mr. Britz commented that during the site walk they discussed that people may be tempted to walk out to that end point. The thought was to add a boardwalk to allow for the public to access that area and maintain the salt marsh. There will be signage too to warn people to stay on the boardwalk. Mr. Uhlig added that they wanted to provide a variety of experiences for the public. Getting people out closer to the water at certain points will give them different views and experiences.

Chairman Miller commented that there was a park across the water from this where people keep boats, haul them in and out, and lay them on the shore. The applicant will need to consider the possibility that some may approach via boat, and how they will handle that.

Ms. McMillan agreed with Ms. Collins' comment about moving the path more into the upland. Most of the buffers are between the path and the upland. It would be good to incorporate the buffer between path and the water. There are a lot of examples with low vegetation. It would be good to add more of a canopy area while still considering the electrical lines. The boardwalks are really big. Ms. McMillan appreciated the viewing opportunities, but they could be smaller. They are really big and going all the way out in this plan. The shore birds will be impacted by the public going out there. Ms. McMillan commented that the living shoreline and creating a habitat for the oysters is good but questioned if the State permitting for that had been explored for that yet. It would be good to know their comments on that piece.

Ms. Blasko appreciated that people will want to go toward water, but if the boardwalks can be shorter that would be good. This is a big kayak/paddleboard community and they should consider how this shoreline will be protected from boat access. The living shoreline is great.

Mr. Britz noted that the next step will be a public meeting.

III. STATE WETLAND BUREAU APPLICATIONS

1. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
50 Clough Drive (Little Harbour School)
City of Portsmouth, Owner
Assessor Map 206, Lot 20

City Staff Terry Desmarais and Zach Cronin spoke to the application. Mr. Cronin commented that project is to improve water movement in the Clough Dr. area. This final piece is to reconfigure the domestic water and fire service for Little Harbor School. The current configuration is in the back, which is in the 100-foot buffer. The previously disturbed area will need to be excavated to complete the work. All of the work will be in the wetland buffer zone. The entire back of the school is in the 100-foot buffer. The proposed work includes a connection to a hydrant and running a new pipe under the drive to intersect with the existing fire service. After the pipe connects to that point, a 2-inch line will be sleeved through the now abandoned water main which will prevent disturbing more area. There will be two small disturbance sites with the sleeving. In total there is an estimated 650 s.f. of temporary disturbance. All of the disturbance is temporary. All of the excavation will be in the asphalt. The fire hydrant will be a 10' by 5' excavation area. From there a new pipe will run down the asphalt to the other patch where the existing fire service connects. On the right side of the lawn there is a planted vegetated strip and a fence. Beyond the fence is where any wetland plants are. Straw waddles will be placed along the fence to prevent sediment from going into the wetlands.

Ms. McMillan commented that the waddles should be at the lowest point. Mr. Cronin confirmed that the waddles will travel along the fence line of the entire project area to prevent rainwater from carrying debris into the wetland area.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval to the State Wetlands Bureau, seconded by Ms. Blasko. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

2. Standard Dredge and Fill Application (Waterline)
400 Little Harbor Road
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Owner
Assessor Map 203, Lot 8

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering spoke to the application. Mr. Weinrieb commented that the project was for the Carey Cottage, which is owned by The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

Chairman Miller clarified that this presentation was just for the water line project. The septic project is separate and will be a different presentation. Mr. Weinrieb agreed.

Mr. Weinrieb commented that there are two buildings on the ground one is the Carriage House and the other is the Carey Cottage. Permits were acquired to raise the cottage. It is a historic building that had fallen into disrepair. A nonprofit came forward to restore the cottage. There is a small diameter water service and no fire protections today. This application is to provide new

water service to the building. An existing conditions survey was completed to locate where to put in the water line. Mr. Weinrieb worked with DPW and found the general location of the existing water line, which runs through the lawn around the leach field and crosses over the walking path toward Little Harbor Road. That current water line veers along the coastline through some dense vegetation near the water. It pops out at the end of Little Harbor Road. It is very close to the resource area. The proposed service will stay out of the tidal resource. It will start at the Little Harbor Road service connection, go to the west of the ledge outcrop, through the overgrown field, and straight down to the walking path to meet up with the existing water line. That route avoids a lot of area in the 100-foot buffer and avoids mature trees. The project requires a wetland permit because it is within 100 feet of the tidal waters and a CUP is required as well. There will be 7,500 sf of temporary impacts. The area that's lawn today will be restored as lawn. The forested areas and the field area will be left to return naturally. There is some sort of water conveyance from the west side of the walking path to Mill Pond. It appears to be a stone channel that will need to be dug up to put in the water line. It will be restored to keep water running through it.

Ms. Tanner commented that she was concerned about leaving the field and forest to naturalize. There are a lot of invasive plants and they will just repopulate. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the site is so full of invasive plants that there is no way to control them. The plan is to just let it be. Removing the invasive plants in that corridor is not practical because of the surrounding invasive plants in that area. Ms. Tanner commented that there should be some sort of control in the areas that will be cleared. Mr. Weinrieb responded that there was no way to do that without dealing with the entire parcel. The invasive plants will take over whatever is planted within a year or two. The whole site is loaded with invasive plants. Only a small area of the site is in the buffer. Ms. Tanner commented that something should definitely be planted there. Mr. Weinrieb responded that most of it is already lawn and that will be replaced in kind. A wildlife mix can be planted but there is no way to prevent invasive plants from coming in.

Ms. McMillan questioned if they would be cutting down trees. Mr. Weinrieb responded just a lower value cherry tree.

Chairman Miller requested more information on the connection between the fresh and saltwater. They should make sure to not change the freshwater wetland. They should evaluate if there is any wildlife value to leaving it daylighted and connecting the salt and fresh water without refilling it with rock. Mr. Weinrieb responded that there may be value. There was a significant elevation change, so the fresh water is high compared to the saltwater. It is a stable ecosystem and the goal is to keep the hydrology the same. The plan is to stay in a narrow area to avoid touching the wetland and put it back in the same manner.

Mr. Weinrieb commented that the cottage was constructed in the late 1880s and is going through major renovations to make it available to the public. It needs domestic and fire water service. There will be no permanent impacts. There is no alternative location for the proposed activity. Portions of the Carey Cottage are in the 100-foot buffer and a significant part of the lot is wetland. The proposed route tries to avoid the wetland as much as possible to minimize impacts. The only other viable route would be going down the driveway, which would be more expensive and require the road to be reconstructed. The majority of that work would still be in the buffer.

There will be no adverse impact on the wetland functions and value. It will not alter the functions and value of the site. The landscape will be restored. The alteration of the vegetated state will only be to the extent necessary. The water line was designed to avoid mature trees. The proposal will remove a lower value cherry tree. The proposal has the least adverse impacts. The proposed design is as far away as possible from the jurisdiction area. Any impacted area in the vegetated buffer will be returned to its natural state.

Ms. McMillan moved to recommend approval to the State Wetlands Bureau, seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

IV. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

1. 400 Little Harbor Road (Waterline)
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Owner
Assessor Map 203, Lot 8

Ms. Harrison moved to recommend **approval** of the *Conditional Use Permit to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Blasko with the following stipulation:*

1. *Where excavation for the waterline occurs in the wetland buffer a conservation seed mix shall be planted, with the exception of areas in the buffer of existing lawn and a gravel path that crosses the waterline. Both of those areas shall be restored in kind.*

The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

2. 400 Little Harbor Road (Septic)
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Owner
Assessor Map 203, Lot 8

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering spoke to the application. This property is owned by The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. It is a 30-acre parcel with two buildings on the parcel the Carey Cottage and a carriage house. The carriage house is in the southwest corner of the site and has been used more recently as a storage area. It has a septic system. The Gundalow Company has been conducting classes there, and they want to start using it more regularly. The existing septic system was built and maintained by the previous owner. They did a detailed existing conditions survey to identify the wetland system. It is mostly on the abutting property but does come onto this property too. The site falls under the criteria of an inland wetland buffer. The septic system leach field will be 86 feet at the closest point to the wetland and the tank will be 60 feet from the wetland. They both meet or exceed the State septic permit requirement. No waivers are required from DES. The new 1,200-gallon septic tank will pump up to a 760-sf leach field. There will be 2,200 sf of permanent disturbance. That includes building the system and the grading around it. The rest of the disturbance will be temporary. The area is primarily lawn and will be revegetated as lawn. There is a lot of wetland, ledge outcrop, and also deed restrictions on the property. This location is the only area they can work in. There is no alternate location outside of the buffer. It can't go in the parking lot because of

the grade and there is a ledge outcrop. No trees will be removed. There will be no adverse impact to the wetland functions and value. The project will not alter the wetland. The new septic will be an improvement to the existing one. There is no impervious surface proposed and the site will be returned to grass. The septic has been located as far out of the buffer as possible. The disturbance in the areas of construction has minimized as much as possible.

Ms. McMillan moved to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

3. Borthwick Avenue and Islington Street
Borthwick Forest, LLC, Owner
Assessor Map 241, Lot 25

Mr. Britz commented that the Planning Board sent this application back to the Conservation Commission so they could provide any input for what the applicant should consider. The expansion is out of the buffer, but a stipulation of the Planning Board approval was that it had to go back to the Conservation Commission for input.

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke on behalf the project. The Commission previously saw this project and approved it in the spring of 2017. Last year the applicant submitted an amended site plan for the project. The previous plan included a 4-story building with basement level parking. Since the approval the applicant decided the basement would be fitted out for tenant use instead of parking. The displacement of that parking and the additional square footage of the building resulted in a need for more parking. There is a light shaded area on the plan that was a reserve parking area if it was needed. The project requires 268 spaces. The new plan is to provide 274 parking spaces using that reserve area. They need this parking expansion and are looking to build it. The Planning Board stipulated that this needed to come back in front of the Conservation Commission to present the change with the 56 additional spaces. The island between will have a rain garden to detain and treat runoff from the additional pavement. It is outside of the buffer and approved by the Planning Board. The storm water management was designed and approved by TAC and is in compliance with NHDES.

Ms. Tanner requested clarification that no trees along the edge of the parking area would be removed. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that limit of clearing will be just to the edge of the new pavement. They will leave existing vegetation between the path and the parking lot. Ms. Tanner questioned how much impervious surface was being added. Mr. Crimmins responded that it would be 20,000 sf of additional impervious surface. It will be treated by a rain garden and any overflow will go to the gravel wetland. Ms. Tanner questioned if it could be a porous surface. Mr. Crimmins responded that it could not because the bedrock is really high in that area.

Ms. McMillan requested clarification that the trees between the other roadway and the new parking will remain. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was the intent. There is a line around the parking area that shows the approximate limit of clearing. Ms. McMillan questioned if this was part of the application the Conservation Commission saw originally. Mr. Crimmins responded that they saw the application before, but it included work required in the buffer area near the roadway side of the project and pathway. The original building was 50,000 sf and had basement

parking. Now the parking requirement has increased and there is displaced parking. The stipulation of the Planning Board approval was to present this change to the Commission when they were prepared to build it.

Chairman Miller questioned if this reserve parking area was on the previous CUP application Mr. Crimmins responded it was not.

Ms. McMillan questioned if they were voting on this. Mr. Britz responded that there was no action required. The Commission can make a recommendation or provide input to the applicant if they want. The Planning Board wanted the Commission to have a chance to weigh in on it before it was built. Chairman Miller questioned if the Planning Board would take action depending on what they say. Mr. Britz responded that they would not. This is approved and this was a stipulation.

Ms. Tanner requested clarification that the edge of the walkway will be treed all the way around and the area above the parking will be treed out to the road. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct.

Ms. McMillan commented that she appreciated that the Planning Board sent the application back. When the Commission reviewed the plan the applicant had put the parking under the building and that was appreciated because it was creating less impervious surface. The additional parking won't drain to the wetland, but it is still more impervious surface and impact. If the Commission were voting on this today Ms. McMillan would say no because that was not part of the original approval. Ms. Tanner agreed with Ms. McMillan's comments.

Chairman Miller also agreed. The parking in the basement was a positive and there were a lot compromises made on the project. It is nice to weigh in but also meaningless because it is approved. Chairman Miller commented that he would vote no on this now if he could because it's a sensitive site. This plan is not what the Commission voted on before and Chairman Miller would vote no on it now. Ms. Harrison agreed and noted that this was a lot more impervious surface than what they originally saw and voted on. It is unfortunate to not have a voice in this moving forward. Ms. Harrison commented that she would not be in favor of this plan. Mr. Britz commented that he understood their concerns. This change is all out of buffer and has been approved.

Chairman Miller noted that there two more items on the agenda and called for a motion to take Item 5 before Item 4 because Item 5 is a smaller and less complicated application.

Ms. Tanner moved to review Item 5 before Item 4, seconded by Ms. Blasko. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

4. 105 Bartlett Street
Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware & Lumber, LLC, and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owners
Assessor Map 157, Lots 1 and 2, Map 164, Lots 1, 2, and 4-2

Mr. Britz noted that they have to end meeting by 6 p.m. and suggested that the Commission postpone the 105 Bartlett St. application to next month when there is more time to review it.

Ms. Tanner moved to postpone the Conditional Use Permit to the June 10, 2020 meeting, seconded by Ms. McMillan. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

5. 375 F.W. Hartford Drive
Nikolas J. Uhlir Revocable Trust & Jennifer A. Uhlir Revocable Trust, Owners
Assessor Map 270, Lot 14

Nik Uhlir spoke to the application. The proposal is to put a shed in the backyard. Mr. Uhlir showed them a picture of the house and backyard. There is a more rugged area behind the lawn. Mr. Uhlir worked with the Commission before to construct a backyard. They removed some trees and constructed a large rain garden in the backyard. The proposal is to put in a 100-200 sf shed in the northwest corner of the grass area. It will meet the setback requirements. The shed will be a standard rectangle or square building with 10-14-foot sides, and it will be 11-12 feet in height. It will be installed on helicon piles to minimize disturbance to the ground. There will be a fascia board around the base and crushed gravel under the shed. The shed is outside of the wetland but is inside the 100-foot wetland buffer. The shed will be in the existing grassed area within buffer. It should have little to no impact on the functions and values of the wetland. It won't increase runoff and is positioned in the only logical location that is the furthest away from the wetland. The shed can't against the back of the home because there is a liquid propane tank there. That is the only location the tank can go to comply with code.

Ms. Tanner commented that in the application Mr. Uhlir suggested adding plantings in the lawn area behind the rain garden. It would be appreciated if plants were added in that area, but not behind the shed. There are a number of native dogwood and blueberry bushes that can fill in that area nicely. Mr. Uhlir confirmed that they would be added. They have been adding native plants over the years to build up a nice barrier.

Ms. McMillan questioned where the runoff from the roof would go. It would be best to do a crushed stone drip edge to give some filtration. A rain barrel could be good but if it overflows, then there is a concentrated flow. Mr. Uhlir responded that they would put in a crushed stone base.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Collins with the following stipulations:

1. *The applicant shall install a crushed stone drip edge around the perimeter of the shed.*
2. *Additional plantings shall be placed in the area between the wetland buffer and rain garden.*

The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Chairman

Chairman Miller commented that there has been discussion going on and questioned if Ms. McMillan had any news to report. Ms. McMillan responded that she had not heard back yet.

Chairman Miller commented that he has had a discussion with Ms. Collins about her becoming Vice Chairman. Vice Chairman Blanchard has resigned from the Commission.

Mr. Britz noted that they typically have more time. The Commission can continue the way they are. Another option is to nominate someone for Chairman and Vice Chairman. If there are no nominations, then they can vote meeting by meeting to decide who will fill the role for each meeting. The Commission is short both alternate positions.

B. Vice Chairman

Ms. Harrison moved to appoint member Samantha Collins as the Conservation Commission Vice Chairman, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

Ms. Collins commented that they can discuss the Chairman role at the next meeting, and she can run the June meeting if needed.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Tanner moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:03 p.m., seconded by Ms. McMillan. The motion passed unanimously by a 6-0 vote.

Respectfully Submitted by,
Becky Frey,
Acting Recording Secretary