

**MINUTES  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
CONFERENCE ROOM "A"**

**3:30 P.M.**

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2013**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman Mary Ann Blanchard;  
Members Allison Tanner, Barbara McMillan, Elissa Hill Stone

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Peter Vandermark, Rich DiPentima, Alternates Shelley Saunders  
and Paul Ambrose

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

.....

**I. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

1. Standard Dredge and Fill Application  
Prescott Park, Marcy Street  
City of Portsmouth, owner  
Assessor Map 104, Lot 1

Bob Snover and Linn Lebel, of Appledore Marine Engineering, Inc. were present to speak to the application.

Ms. Lebel stated that the project was for the replacement of the existing south floating dock. The current one had failed and required repairs every other year. They were proposing to replace the entire system in kind. The current system was concrete pier with timber floats coming off of it, and they would replace the concrete system and have the same mooring blocks that currently existed, but with an increase in the number of mooring blocks because of the new design standards.

Ms. Blanchard asked when the work would begin. Mr. Snover stated that it would be late winter construction so that it would be in place for the spring season. They would start the project around the first of the year and would like it to be completed in April.

Ms. McMillan noted that the replacement dock would be greater in size by 775 square feet and asked if there were more slips. Ms. Lebel stated that there would be the same amount of slips. The standard width was a little wider, as required by the new design standards.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

## II. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. 137 Walker Bungalow Road  
Christine A. Davidson Trust, owner  
Assessor Map 202, Lot 4

Ms. Christine Davidson and Mr. Paul Messier were present to speak to the application.

Ms. Davidson asked the Commission if they had questions about the rain garden or the area where the dry wells would be located. Chairman Miller stated that he had trouble interpreting the map and asked Ms. Davidson if she could go over it and explain what was being added or changed.

Ms. Davidson referred to the map and stated that Walker Bungalow Road was indicated in light orange, and the wetland was the dark blue line to the right of a vernal pond that was beginning to dry up. There were two ponds to the left of it, and that was the wetland area. The buffer area was the turquoise line from which the house could be seen, and the house had always been in the buffer zone. Since they were putting an addition on the back, they proposed to have a rain garden. She hadn't realized at first that they were in the buffer zone in the wetlands, but when she did, she started researching rain gardens and plants and had already bought a few. She discovered that they would have to dig deep and put down the gravel, then sand, then loam. The research material she was reading outlined methods using three layers and loam mixes, and she asked the Commission if they knew what the best way to plant was.

Chairman Miller said that it depended on the condition of the location that they were putting it in and said that there were some good stormwater guides for Vermont, MA and NH. He recommended checking the NH Department of Environmental Services website because they had good resources for storm water management for homeowners. He asked Ms. Davidson to explain what she was hoping to do because he saw two different maps showing the 12' x 42' addition and the deck. Ms. Davidson told him to look at #137 where the rectangle of the ranch house was. To the left of it was a garage that had been added, and in the back was an 11-1/2' x 16' deck. They planned to remove the deck and perhaps use some or part of it, and in that location they would create a family room, an extension for the small master bedroom, and storage space for a laundry area. They had been told to contact the Commission because of the potential for water or snowmelt issues.

Chairman Miller saw that three dry wells with gravel, sand and soil were proposed and asked if the rain garden would be to the right of them. Ms. Davidson said it would and that it would face the house. Chairman Miller asked her to further explain the dry wells. Ms. Davidson stated that there would be three dry wells that would be in the back, and there were already lots of plantings, moss, and pine trees. The rainwater and snow melt would go there. They would also have piping to it from the drip edge of the addition. The rain garden was a bit more complicated, but they had more land there. They were doing the dry wells on the left side because it was expensive to do a rain garden, but there was not much room there. The rain garden would be

ideal on the right side of the house because there was already an area where water sometimes went down, and there were exposed rocks and pebbles. The water would come off the roof, go into the pebbles and then into the rain garden.

Ms. Stone asked how the roof water would go to the rain garden because it looked like there were two rainspouts going to the wells. Mr. Mercier stated that the back half of the garage drained north to the property line. They were proposing that, after the addition was put on, the back half of the garage and one half of the addition would allow the two drain pipes to come together into the dry well area. The dry well area was approximately one-third of the roof's square footage. Ms. Stone asked what the dry wells were and how deep they were, and how much Mr. Messier knew about the soil conditions. Mr. Messier stated that the whole area had been wetland about 60 years before, when it was filled in and the house was built. The soil conditions were gravel and stone, and the soil dropped off into a marsh. The barrels were plastic with no bottom, and they could take quite a bit of water at one time and hold it until the water drained through the soil. They had found the system on a Federal Government website, and that was how they got the information on how to layer the soils. Ms. Stone verified that one-third of the roof water would go into the dry wells. Mr. Mercier stated that the square foot basis was about 2/3 to the dry well and 1/3 to the rain garden. There was a ledge to the right of the property with a natural hollow between the trees, and they had chosen that area for the rain garden so that they wouldn't have to dig needlessly or damage the trees.

Ms. Blanchard asked who would be doing the rain garden and the dry wells. Mr. Messier stated that they had an excavation expert from Eliot to do the footing for the addition and also the excavation for the wells. They would then build the rain garden and the dry wells. Ms. Blanchard noted that they would have to supplement with gravel and asked how they would store the materials on their property. Mr. Messier stated that the backyard was not marshy and was gravel for about 40 feet, and then it went down. They would need short-term access to the backyard and would not build the rain garden until they did the addition, but they could do the dry wells. When the trench would be dug for the frost wall, it would give them a lot of material for the dry wells, so they were going to combine the two. They would clean out the natural depression to the frost wall, and use some of the material from the frost wall trench as a build-up around the barrels.

Ms. McMillan asked what the slope was from the house down to the wetland. Mr. Messier said the demarcation from the street was fairly flat, but at the demarcation line, it fell off at about 2 feet. He pointed out on the map the house location and where the land fell down, and the point where the fill stopped and the marshy land started. He also showed where the rain garden would be located and the dry wells, the existing home, the addition, and the possible deck as well as the oak trees and the natural depression among them where the dry wells would go. Ms. McMillan asked if it was where the wells and the rain garden would be before the line dropped down. Mr. Messier stated that it was part of the fill, and the natural depression was among the oak trees. The rain garden would be within the fill area. The dry well was a natural depression at the same height as the oak trees, so they could not build up beyond the base of the tree and had to stay at the tree height. There was very little height difference between the two areas, but the dry well area could be a bit lower. Ms. Stone said that she wanted to avoid having one side higher than the other. She asked how they had come up with the numbers 107 and 119. Mr. Messier said

they were from the property line and about 50% of the line went into the water. Ms. Stone asked if the edge of the house would be 60 feet from the wetland after the addition was put in. Mr. Messier said it would be 119 feet from the addition because the lot was 200 feet and if they went to the deck, it would be 107 feet.

Ms. McMillan was concerned about putting an addition on a house and putting in dry wells and the rain garden without knowing the maintenance or how they would be sustained. Ms. Davidson told her that it was straightforward. The research material stated how the water should flow and issues about the gravel, sand and soil. She also had a long list of recommended rain garden plants. Ms. McMillan was thinking beyond that. If they were to sell the house, she asked if there would be something in the deed indicating that the rain garden could not be filled in. Mr. Britz stated that the permit or approval would go into the file. Ms. McMillan suggested that the Commission make a stipulation that as long as the addition stayed in place, the rain garden and dry wells would stay in place as well and be maintained by the property owner. Without putting it in the deed, Mr. Britz didn't know how to ensure that the rain garden would be maintained, and perhaps a deed restriction could be filed with the Registry. He said that he would ask the Planning Board but thought that the stipulation would take care of it.

Ms. Tanner asked if the 72 feet mentioned was from the edge of the deck or the edge of the addition, and asked what the deck's dimensions were. Ms. Messier stated that the 72 feet was at the edge of the building and the deck was 11-1/2' x 16'. They planned to cut it down to 10' x 12'.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval for the application for discussion purposes. Ms. McMillan seconded.

Ms. Tanner stated that she had issues. She realized that the owners were trying to take care of the storm water with the rain garden and the dry wells, but it seemed impervious to the wetland. There had been no attempt to move anything to the area closest to the left. The deck was 64 feet from the edge of the wetland and seemed too close. The building seemed that it would be too big with the addition and she was concerned that it would be completely in the buffer. Chairman Miller stated that he understood and was torn between something that was historically in place and the petition and protective measures in the Ordinance. He appreciated the applicant's effort and concern to deal with the storm water and learn how to do it. Ms. Davidson stated that the deck could be removed if it was a problem. Ms. Tanner asked if she could place the deck off the end of the house away from the wetland because it would be out of the buffer. Mr. Britz noted that the trees could be in the way. Mr. Messier said the deck was optional.

Ms. McMillan thought it was great that everyone was trying to manage the storm water but the application was missing a design for the dry well and the rain garden. She liked that the plants were included because a lot of people didn't do that and it indicated that the applicant was thinking about it. However, she asked what they would do if the plants were not planted appropriately. Ms. Davidson said they had no plans to hire anyone except the excavator.

Ms. McMillan thought that the Commission could add a stipulation that, upon approval, the applicant supply a cross section or a plan where the dry well and the rain garden would be

located. Ms. Stone stated that she had the same concern, especially about the dry wells, and asked if the applicant had a particular brand in mind. Chairman Miller said that the Commission needed a plan to help them understand it better.

Ms. Tanner asked if anyone had a concern about the proximity to the wetland. Chairman Miller stated that he did, but he was always torn about a historical fill and trying to meet the needs of the homeowner and work with them. There had been a genuine effort to address the water quality concerns. Ms. Blanchard said that she would support the application. It was previous fill, and the mitigation efforts were significant. As long as the Commission had a better understanding of the dry well and the rain garden, it was a significant mitigation, notwithstanding that the addition doubled the size of the house. She stated that she would support it with a stipulation. Ms. Tanner asked what would happen to the excavated material. Mr. Messier said that some of the material for the frost wall would be used in the dry well.

Mr. John Russo, an abutter, told the Commission that he wanted to make sure that what happened would not disrupt his property. There was a stream behind his property that he kept open in case his pond got too high and reached the point where it drained off into the creek. He had been there for 16 years and did not want anything done that would disrupt his natural pond. Chairman Miller asked where his lot was located. Mr. Russo stated that it was to the left of Ms. Davidson's property. Ms. Davidson asked him if he was concerned there would be less water. Mr. Russo said he didn't know because it was the first he had heard of it. His main concern was that his property not be disrupted. Ms. Davidson agreed. Ms. McMillan asked where the stream was located. Mr. Russo said it was about 300 feet from the road and went to Sagamore Creek. Mr. Messier said it was way off the map, another 150 feet beyond the property line.

Ms. McMillan stated that, during construction, there would be a bit of a slope and they would be digging up and stockpiling things, and she asked if any best management practices would be in place, like a silt fence. Mr. Messier stated that he would have a silt fence going from one side of the property to the other, right at the demarcation where the fill stopped and sloped. It would go 100 feet across the back of the property. There would be no trucks or forklifts because the property was too small, but they would have a small excavator. Material would be brought in by a wheelbarrow or a trailer.

Ms. Tanner said the Commission had suggested a few stipulations. Ms. McMillan said she had recommended a stipulation that as long as the addition stayed in place, the rain garden and dry wells would stay in place as well and be maintained by the property owner. Her other recommendation was that they supply a plan to the Planning Board. She thought the Commission should clarify it and include it with the filed permit.

Chairman Miller asked the applicant if she could provide a plan showing the location of the silt fence and stated that he would add it as a stipulation.

The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote with the following stipulations:

- 1) The design plan provided to the Planning Board for their review include a cross section for both the dry well and the rain garden,
- 2) The applicant shall provide an amended plan to the Planning Board showing the location of the silt fence for this project.
- 3) The dry well and the rain garden must remain in place and must be maintained by the current and future property owners.
- 4) The letter of decision from the Planning Board on this Conditional Use Permit Application shall be placed into the City's building permit file.

Chairman Miller also recommended that the applicant check out the resources and continue reading about the rain garden, and talk to the excavator about making sure they dug carefully and did not disrupt the tree roots.

Mr. Messier asked how much time they had to do the work. Mr. Britz told them that they had a year to pull the permit and then another year to start the work, for a total of two years.

B. 130 Aldrich Road  
John P. and Amy L. Sheehan, owners  
Assessor Map 153, Lot 4

Mr. Sheehan stated that he and his wife had bought the property 18 months before and wanted to restore it to what it looked like in the 1920s. The previous owners had put an outbuilding or shed near the wetlands. While the Sheehans were putting on the addition to the house, the excavator had placed a concrete pad underneath the shed, and the Sheehans were notified by the City that the concrete pad should not have been put in. Ms. Sheehan stated that the existing concrete and brick were deteriorating outside the perimeter of the foundation. Mr. Sheehan said that the City stopped the project. They shored it up due to moisture. It was sitting on the concrete pad, and they planned to put it back where it had been before and plant blueberry bushes and fix the torn-up yard.

Ms. Tanner asked if the footprint had increased in size. Mr. Sheehan told her no. All he had done was cut off one shingle because it was rotted. The existing foundation was a hazard and he wanted to put barn board on its exterior. Ms. McMillan asked what the use of the building was before and what the intended use would be. Ms. Sheehan said the building had been used for storing wood. Mr. Sheehan said they wanted to preserve the outbuilding and use it for storage or as a workshop.

Ms. Blanchard stated that the contractor who did the work should have realized that the area was a wetlands area, and if he had known the regulations, it would have saved everyone a lot of heartache and paperwork. Mr. Sheehan said that it would have been easier for him to do it before he had pulled the permit for everything else. Ms. Blanchard thanked him for his effort to make it right.

Ms. Blanchard made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented. Ms. Tanner seconded the motion.

Ms. Stone said that the applicant mentioned that the yard was torn up and asked if it was within the buffer. Mr. Sheehan said no, that it was just grass.

The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

C. 355 FW Hartford Drive  
Paul P. and Deborah B. Fortin Revocable Trust of 2001, owners  
Assessor Map 270, Lot 12

Mr. Fortin stated that he was requesting a Conditional Use permit for an addition to his two-car garage. It was a shed roof-style addition. He had two seasonal vehicles and it had been difficult to find storage for them for the off-season. The area was within the 100-foot buffer zone. He was proposing to utilize 378 square feet off the existing garage, and to compensate for the additional rain runoff, he wanted to put in drainage of crushed stone 2' deep and 1' wide to help minimize the storm water. There would not be a driveway. The garage would be used for storage rather than day-in and day-out use, and he would not get rid of the lawn. Some plantings had been put in the back over the years, including seven large spruce trees and blueberry bushes, that would help mitigate the potential effects to the wetland area in back of the lot.

Ms. Tanner noted that he had a shed roof design with a drip edge and that water would run in the stones. She asked if there was a slope. Mr. Fortin stated that there was no slope, but there was a natural swale off to the side of the property. There was a catch basin area, and the neighbor had a culvert area that was put in where the water drained. A storm drain was located below the grade of the road and was usually dry, but in the spring, the drain clogged with snowmelt and he was always cleaning it out. He wanted to slope the water from draining into the catch basin so that it would permeate the ground instead of runoff and go directly into the catch basin system and much quicker into the storm drain. Ms. Tanner asked if it was crushed stone or gravel, and Mr. Fortin said it was crushed stone. Ms. McMillan asked if it was a permanent structure, and Mr. Fortin stated that it was.

Ms. Tanner asked if the Commission could stipulate that the entryway to the garage not be paved if the applicant sold the home. Mr. Britz stated that it was in the buffer so it should not be done, and he would check with the Planning Board to see if they needed to file it at the Registry. Ms. Blanchard thought that was a good idea because the Commission had an after-the-fact approval experience in the preceding application. People who did the work did not understand the regulations, and the homeowners, who believed they were acting in good faith, then had to deal with the consequences of the after-the-fact approval. The clearer the Commission could make things, the better it would work.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented with the stipulation that the entry to the additional garage not be paved. Ms. McMillan seconded the motion.

Ms. Tanner noted that the area leading to the garage was not paved. Ms. Stone stated that it would be good to get it on file at the registry. Mr. Britz said he would research it.

The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote, with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the entrance to the garage remains lawn area and is not paved in the future.
- 2) The letter of decision from the Planning Board on this Conditional Use Permit Application shall be placed into the City's building permit file.

**D. Off Spinney Road and Middle Road**

Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, owners  
Spinney Road Land Development, LLC, applicant  
Asses 167 & 170, Lots 5 & 24

Ms. Blanchard made a motion to postpone approval of the application as presented to the October meeting. Ms. Stone seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone approval of the application as presented to the October 9, 2013 meeting passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

### **III. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Britz stated that there was an application before TAC for a new site on Pease, and part of it involved a Conditional Use permit. Mark West from West Environmental was on the project and wanted to have a work session to get feedback on how to proceed with the project. Mr. West was late, but Jeff Clifford, the engineer from Altus Engineering was there with Maria Stowell of Pease Development Authority.

Mr. Clifford stated that the project was located at 249 Corporate Drive and pointed out some landmarks. The site would be a subdivision of five acres, carved out of the 2500 acres that was left of the residual parcel. There were houses on the site at one time and they were removed, but pavement still remained. There were ditches along the road and the site. The whole site was graded out and raised up when it was originally built. They want to put a driveway in a small area. One of the ditches had a 25-foot setback. The rest of the site had a 100-foot setback, including the finger of wetland. Due to the Ordinance provision, the area developed previously could be developed only to a certain line. He pointed out all the ditches in the area, the finger of wetland and the property line and where they wanted to put the driveway, which would be centered on the proposed building. They needed a Conditional Use Permit for 2,000 square feet of impact area and were proposing some mitigation. Mr. Clifford said that Mark West, who had just arrived, would address the mitigation.

Mr. West stated that the site had a phenomenal amount of invasive species that included a lot of multiflora rose. Invasive plants circled the existing clearing except for the trees that had been planted a long time ago. The trees had Asian bittersweet. The main part of the mitigation was to see what sort of invasive management they could do in the buffer zone so that it could function



better with the wetlands. The plan was to maintain a few of the larger trees by removing bittersweet and other species and also by cutting and stumping out the multiflora rose, buckthorn and the other invasive species so that they could plant a variety of native species for enhancement.

Mr. West stated that the regulations did not allow any spraying of herbicides in the buffer, so they knew that they had to do it mechanically. They could cut it and plant but it would continue to come back. If they got the roots out, the new species would survive and function. There was multiflora rose everywhere there was grass. Mr. West said it was one of the most invaded sites he had ever seen. He wanted to remove the bittersweet to protect the trees on the site, which were spruce, red maple, and white birch trees that could continue to grow, but everything else was invasive. Ms. Robbie Woodburn had put together a significant planting plan to enhance the buffer, such as native trees and shrubs and dogwoods. Mr. West did not believe that it was a highly functional habitat but it was an emergent marsh with scrub shrubs. His team would not do anything in the wetland, only the buffer, and the invasive species were within the 25-foot buffer. They just wanted to get a feel for what they could and couldn't do.

Ms. Tanner wondered if there were rabbits out there because they liked multiflora rose. Mr. West stated that, based on what he had seen, even if they removed the invasive species up to the buffer, there were still some within the wetland and multiflora rose in the wetland, so they would remove only the shrubs in the places where the grading would take place. He wanted to know if they could cut or stump because cutting alone would be an ongoing maintenance issue. Ms. Tanner stated that she hated oriental bittersweet because it was awful and everywhere. If it was ripped out by the roots by the trees stumps, she was concerned about the trees because the trees were already stressed. Mr. West said that they would just do what was necessary to replant, and they would leave distances around the trees and cut in those areas.

Chairman Miller asked if they would use big machines for mechanical equipment to remove the invasive species. Mr. West said that they could do it with a small backhoe. Chairman Miller said it should be something that was long-term maintenance to keep the bittersweet from returning. Mr. West stated that the property owner would maintain it. He wanted to get it back to a baseline of healthy existing trees on the site. Some were under threat, and more and more of the invasive species were impacting songbirds and wetland migration. The buckthorn gave sugar but no protein, so the migrating birds got the sugar but it hurt them for their migration. It would also enhance the functioning of the habitat.

Chairman Miller stated that he didn't understand the map and asked what would happen outside the line of development. Mr. Clifford said there was some grading and pointed out on the plan that the green area was the wetland line and was out of the line of development. Chairman Miller asked what would then happen between the development line and the buffer line once it was graded and the invasive species was rototilled. Mr. West stated that they had looked into an erosion control seed mix, and it would be seeded with a mix of grasses and wildflowers and could handle moisture. It could also be potentially mowed, depending on the tree line. It might need to be mowed to keep the invasive shrubs from coming up. Most of the landscaping was focused on the front of the site. The rest of it involved bittersweet removal and might not be as intensive as removing all the shrubs because there were thousands of them.

Chairman Miller stated that he walked by the site frequently, and the last time he had walked by, he had thought it was a pretty interesting place for Portsmouth. There were coyotes, and a lot of birds used the area for the shrubs and the wetland behind it. He had been struck with the diversity of species in the wetland, including raptors. He stated that he would like to see, in the outside development line between the development and the buffer, some way of replacing the shrub and habitat value. Mr. West said that there was also crabapple in the area that had fruit the birds could feed on. Restoring the function of existing trees was one way to do it, and they could plant additional wildlife shrubs.

Chairman Miller asked about the storm water drainage from the site. Mr. Clifford stated that all drains went down to a catch basin and then drained out. The wetland was within 45 feet of the line. They would replace the line, and because it was less than 50 feet in the wetland, they could do it as a permit by notification. The road drainage would go to a wet pond where it would be treated, and they would add a rain garden to help take in some of the water.

Ms. Blanchard asked what the building's footprint dimensions were. Mr. Clifford said the total was 37,000 square feet, and the building would be commercial office space. Ms. Tanner asked if they could place pervious pavement anywhere. Mr. Clifford stated that they could not infiltrate on the site and he added that he was a proponent of rain gardens.

Ms. Blanchard noted that coyotes were in the PSNH right-of-way and in a lot of the neighborhoods. She thought the site sounded dreadful and that it would have to be in the hands of people who knew how to remove the invasive species. She dealt with bittersweet on her property and knew that it was tough to get rid of. Mr. West said that it was a full-time job to get rid of invasive species. There was no Japanese knotweed or phragmites on the site, so they were trying to make the site more attractive and mitigate for the driveway by enhancing a nearby ditch. He stated that he would put together a sequence of how it would be done.

Ms. McMillan asked where the drainage was for Hodgson Brook and how it worked. Mr. Clifford showed her on the map. She had concerns because the mowing and maintenance worried her. The existing maintenance at Pease was intense; she had seen the little flags indicating that certain areas had been sprayed, and she wanted a natural succession without invasive species. Mr. West said that it was scheduled landscaping with shrubs and mulch planted extensively. The planting scheme had hundreds of shrubs. Mr. Clifford said they would do the treatment swale and maintain it twice a year.

Chairman Miller said the area presently had some sense of natural quality, especially how it abutted the wetland. His idea of beauty was not lawn. Mr. West said that the more shrubs they planted, the better. They did not plan on going into the wetland. Anywhere they worked in the buffer, they would not reduce the buffer. They would simply remove invasive species or open up around the trees.

Ms. Stone wondered about Chlordane and where it would be. Mr. Clifford stated that he knew it was below the threshold for action.

Ms. McMillan asked if there would be a landscape maintenance plan for landscaping or lessons learned from the invasive species. Mr. West said it would be feasible if the Planning Board or the Commission recommended a condition of a completion report and monitoring a year later.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

At 5:15 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
Acting Conservation Commission Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Conservation Commission meeting on April 9, 2014.