



CONSERVATION COMMISSION

AGENDA

Monday, January 17, 2023

4:30 PM

Room 22, Parks & Recreation
Center

Commission Members

Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Chair
Councilor Andrew Madison, Vice Chair
Art Walker
Councilor Robert Williams, Ex-Officio
Eloise Clark
Kenneth Bergman

Thomas P. Haynes, Alternate
John Therriault, Alternate
Brian Reilly, Alternate
Lee Stanish, Alternate
Steven Bill, Alternate

1. Call to Order
2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes – December 19, 2022
4. Report- outs
 - 1) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee
 - 2) Outreach
 - 3) Invasive Species
 - 4) Land Conservation
5. Discussion Items:
 - a) Airport proposed wildlife control fence
 - b) Conservation Commission speaking events
 - c) Photo library
 - d) 2023 New Hampshire Drinking Water Festival
6. Scenic Road Public hearing: February 2, 2023 at 7:00 pm
7. New or Other Business
8. Adjourn – Next meeting date: **Tuesday, February 21, 2023**

1 City of Keene
2 New Hampshire

3
4
5 CONSERVATION COMMISSION
6 MEETING MINUTES
7

Monday, December 19, 2022

4:30 PM

Room 22,
Parks & Recreation

Members Present:

Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Chair
Eloise Clark
Councilor Robert Williams
Thomas Haynes, Alternate
Brian Reilly, Alternate
Steven Bill, Alternate (Voting)
John Therriault, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Councilor Andrew Madison, Vice Chair
Art Walker
Ken Bergman
Lee Stanish, Alternate

8 **1) Call to Order**
9

10 Chair Von Plinsky called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.
11

12 **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – November 21, 2022**
13

14 A motion by Mr. Bergman to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2022 meeting was duly
15 seconded by Mr. Reilly and the motion carried unanimously.
16

17 **3) Report-Outs**

18 **A) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Committee**
19

20 Mr. Haynes reported that the Subcommittee did not meet this month due to weather. There was a
21 December 2nd workday at Goose Pond with a group of six volunteers, who logged approximately
22 20' long logs to create a walkway over a wet area; they were not able to lay the boards over the
23 walkway due to weather. The walkway is just past the dam heading east. Mr. Haynes continued
24 that the Subcommittee plans to meet in early January 2023 to discuss plans for the upcoming
25 year. Now that the group has tools available to them, smaller groups can go out for trail
26 maintenance. He said they hope to apply for another grant in 2023 despite the last application
27 being unsuccessful.

28 Mr. Haynes showed two color samples for trail signs for the Commission's feedback. He called
29 them simple but tasteful examples. The Commission preferred the dark green option, which Mr.
30 Bergman said was higher contrast. Discussion ensued as to whether that dark green would blend
31 with the cedar wood as they age. Mr. Therriault noted that the paint would likely need to be
32 updated in five years no matter the color.

33

34 **B) Outreach**

35

36 Mr. Haynes said this workgroup has not met and he continued plugging away at the programs
37 discussed in November. Mr. Haynes mentioned that unfortunately one of the Tap-to-Toilet
38 speakers, Jim Rousmaniere, passed away. Thus, the workgroup would consider other options.

39

40 **C) Invasive Species**

41

42 Councilor Williams reported that there had been no work because of winter. At some point in the
43 new year, he will begin scheduling events again. If any Commissioners have ideas for locations
44 to address invasive species, they should contact Councilor Williams. Specifically, he sought
45 location ideas for the 2023 Garlic Mustard Challenge.

46

47 Ms. Clark reported that she spoke with a member of the Elm City Rotary, which has an initiative
48 to catalogue local volunteers so that when an event arises, volunteers are easier to contact and
49 gather. Ms. Clark thought this could be useful for the invasive species initiative. Councilor
50 Williams agreed that the City could use such a directory, noting that Nature Groupie reaches
51 volunteers throughout New England. The Commission agreed this could also be useful for trail
52 maintenance at Goose Pond. Councilor Williams noted that publicizing is the greatest challenge
53 of these events. Ms. Clark shared the name of a contact from the Rotary, Ryan Owens, who is
54 also the Director of the Monadnock Conservancy.

55

56 Mr. Haynes added that he and other volunteers addressed some buckthorn and burning bush near
57 the Goose Pond trailhead. It is an area that volunteers could revisit.

58

59 **D) Land Conservation**

60

61 Chair Von Plinsky was pleased to report that this work group met for the first time in a while.
62 They had a good discussion on a way forward. The Chair said he reached out to the contact at
63 Antioch University New England as to whether the Commission won the CSI proposal project,
64 but he had no response and hoped for one soon. Without the student support, the work group
65 would have to do this research and work themselves to develop a starting point for the land
66 conservation initiatives the group started to formulate.

67

68 Chair Von Plinsky thanked Ms. Clark for sending an email with links to resources from the
69 County Forester, Matt Kelly. He said the work group hopes to review those documents in
70 January. Ms. Clark suggested considering the NH Wildlife Action Plan (WAP), which would

71 answer most questions about whether land is valuable. She mentioned how the WAP can be
72 matched with GIS parcel maps.

73
74 Ms. Clark also reported that the Monadnock Conservancy purchased the Casagrande property of
75 ~250 acres to add to the Maynard forest, which is the northern piece of property right across
76 from Goose Pond and Old Gilsum Road. The Commission agreed that was fantastic news. There
77 is another land holder further down the road. Mr. Bergman mentioned that when looking at the
78 maps, the work groups saw that between RT-10 as it leads to Sullivan, to the left toward the
79 Drummer Hill area, the Monadnock Conservancy also has a large holding. Ms. Clark said that is
80 the Maynard Forest.

81
82 Chair Von Plinsky said the workgroup was still discussing the 30x30 initiative and will be
83 building an argument and momentum behind the idea. Mr. Bergman mentioned a challenge of
84 how the workgroup could come to understand the status of all parcels in Keene and how to
85 prioritize future protections, so the two must match in some sort of action program. Mr. Bergman
86 continued that the City has information the work group would need to find at some point. The
87 Chair noted that being awarded the Antioch project would provide the likely intelligence and
88 drive to sort out some of the details.

89
90 **4) Discussion Items**
91 **A) Airport Proposed Wildlife Control Fence – David Hickling, Airport Director**

92
93 Chair Von Plinsky welcomed the Airport Director, David Hickling, for an update on the
94 proposed wildlife control fence at the Keene Dillant Hopkins Airport. Mr. Hickling said there is
95 no contract in place yet. However, there is a scope of services with McFarland Johnson, the
96 consultants doing the design and construction management of the project. That scope of services
97 was used recently to apply for a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grant, because this is
98 fundable through FAA airport improvement funding. Mr. Hickling continued they are waiting to
99 execute a contract with an engineer pending that grant money. Primarily the scope of services
100 would focus on the first phase of the project, which would entail one-third of the design—i.e.,
101 laying out where the fence would go and getting an environmental assessment. There would also
102 be a wildlife hazard site visit, which is performed by a subconsultant who is a wildlife biologist
103 that specializes in mitigating wildlife hazards at airports. That biologist would spend two or three
104 days observing the wildlife and review the airport processes for deterring wildlife (“harassment”
105 like bird bangers, chasing geese and deer) and then they will recommend what the airport should
106 do in the future to mitigate these issues. The hope is that the wildlife biologist will recommend a
107 fence, because that would help get more funding from the FAA. Mr. Hickling said this scope of
108 services also covers phase 1.b. of the archeological surveys and updating the wetland delineation
109 for the fence area—a preliminary visit indicated that what is there might not match what is
110 mapped in the Master Plan. A large part of the design phase is the National Environmental
111 Policy Act (NEPA) assessment.

112

113 Mr. Hickling listed some agencies that would coordinate on this project: NH Department of
114 Environmental Services (DES), NH Floodplain Manager, the Natural Heritage Bureau, NH Fish
115 and Game, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Ashuelot Local Advisory Committee. He said
116 that from the initial site visits, the design would serve to minimize any impacts to wetlands or
117 habitat. The consultants have seen that the location of the fence would have little impact if any.
118 The real issues would be with constructing the fence. Mitigation tools could be used like timber
119 mats or working seasonally.

120
121 Mr. Hickling continued, displaying a map of the airport runways. Specifically, he showed a line
122 running parallel to the runway, demonstrating where the fence is proposed. Initially, the fence
123 was proposed to line Airport Road, but Mr. Hickling agreed with the concern of losing that
124 valuable wildlife watching location that people, especially bird watchers, use daily. He called it a
125 great asset for the community. In addition to protecting that resource, Mr. Hickling did not want
126 the fence along Airport Road because it would enclose wildlife inside the fence and Airport
127 property, defeating the purpose of wildlife management on the runways. Mr. Hickling
128 demonstrated the closest the fence could be to the runways; within a certain distance around the
129 runways, nothing but aviation-related materials are allowed, per the FAA. Having the fence as
130 close to the runway as proposed will require some variances from the FAA because the fence
131 would be within a slope where materials are technically prohibited. There is already precedent
132 for doing so to avoid wetlands at other airports. Early discussions with the FAA have been
133 positive on this matter. Mr. Hickling said the expected wetland impacts would be minimal and
134 would mostly occur during fence construction. He showed one area closer to Airport Road that is
135 popular for wildlife viewing that could be fenced because there needs to be greater distance away
136 from the approach end of the runway. He said there is some topography there that should keep
137 the fence out of the wetland or have minimal impact. He said the outlook was positive for
138 keeping the fence out of wetlands as much as possible. Mr. Hickling showed an overlay of the
139 proposed fence location with the wetlands to demonstrate the potential impacts. There would be
140 some floodplain impact in two locations.

141
142 Mr. Hickling continued discussing funding for the project. He said this is a project for aviation
143 safety, yet the FAA does not consider it a high priority for funding. There is a chance that the
144 FAA would only fund this project over multiple years, at \$150,000 funding annually, that is
145 essentially guaranteed. Anything above that amount is competitive with other airports. He said
146 that perimeter fences for general aviation airports are low on the funding scale, and could result
147 in the FAA only awarding the \$150,000 annually until the multi-million dollar project is
148 complete. However, Mr. Hickling does not want this to be a multi-year project because there
149 would be disturbances to wetlands more than once and by building the fence slowly, wildlife
150 would inevitably remain inside the fence. He will do everything in his power to get the whole
151 fence funded in 2023. He said a letter of support from the Conservation Commission would be
152 helpful.

153
154 Mr. Bergman asked, if the full project were funded in 2023, how long the fence installation
155 would take. Mr. Hickling said the timeline is approximately four or five months. Mr. Bergman

156 suggested avoiding installation during the spring to avoid the onset of avian migration and
157 breeding. Mr. Hickling agreed that winter would be best for this work. Mr. Bergman also asked
158 whether the fence would connect to the fence around the new solar farm and Mr. Hickling
159 replied in the affirmative.

160
161 Mr. Haynes asked whether the first grant would just cover the design, engineering, and biologist,
162 and if another grant would be needed for the actual fence work. Mr. Hickling said yes. He
163 continued that there is a grant application submitted that would be within the \$150,000 threshold.
164 He said they could go over that amount if the scope expands. If it were over by \$50,000, they
165 could probably get discretionary funding to finish the project in 2023. Mr. Hickling estimated
166 that this would be a \$3 million project for both the design and construction. Construction costs
167 are high.

168
169 Mr. Hickling felt he had a good argument for completing the project in one year, but reiterated
170 that it depends on the FAA. He would write to the FAA about the constant wildlife interferences,
171 as would C&S Grocers who use the runway daily, and Monadnock Aviation, which is the fixed
172 base operator. There is also support from a hazardous wildlife study.

173
174 Chair Von Plinsky heard public comment from Dee Robins, who asked if deer were the target
175 animals. Mr. Hickling said yes. Mr. Bergman noted that he shared a photo of deer near the
176 runway in the shared Google Drive. Mr. Hickling said there were also issues with coyotes and
177 foxes.

178
179 Mr. Bergman noted that between the C&S hangar and runway 1432, there is a brook that runs
180 from the Edgewood neighborhood and asked if the fence would cross it. Mr. Hickling said yes it
181 would cross that brook. Mr. Bergman noted that otter often come through there and wondered if
182 there were some treatments to allow them through the fence. Mr. Hickling said the fence could
183 just be built over the water line, so the otter can pass underneath.

184
185 Mr. Therriault noted that Keene is a member of Bee City USA. He asked if the Airport Director
186 was interested in placing approximately one-half dozen native bee habitats around the Airport
187 property. Mr. Therriault said they are approximately the size of a shoe box and are attached to
188 trees or sides of a structure. Mr. Hickling said he was interested and did not think it would be an
189 FAA issue. Mr. Therriault agreed to take the lead working on this with Mr. Hickling. Mr.
190 Therriault said it could be a good Bee City project for next year and that he could work with
191 students to decorate the hives. The Commission agreed this was a good idea.

192
193 If the major funding package is not received, Mr. Bergman asked how Mr. Hickling would
194 proceed. Mr. Hickling replied that this project had been pushed off for some time and he believes
195 it is a liability to not construct the fence soon. Mr. Hickling would keep the Commission
196 apprised of the progress. Mr. Hickling added that as a part of the project scheduled, he arranged
197 for the project consultants to meet twice with both the Keene Conservation Commission and the
198 Swanzey Conservation Commission. There should be an update for the Commission by

199 April/May 2023. Mr. Bergman asked what the biologists would focus on, and Mr. Hickling said
200 mostly mammals and anything else large that could be a hazard to aircraft. Mr. Bergman said
201 that many wildlife watchers could advise on what animals are present in the area.
202

203 Ms. Clark noted that the Ashuelot River Local Advisory Committee, and specifically Barbara
204 Skully, could write a letter of support as well. Ms. Clark would provide the contact information
205 to Mr. Hickling.
206

207 Mr. Reilly asked when a letter of support from the Commission would be needed. Mr. Hickling
208 said sooner than later. Mr. Hickling had spoken this morning with the City Manager about the
209 need to get all of this together and sent off to Senator Shaheen and Representative Kuster. Chair
210 Von Plinsky agreed to coordinate with Mr. Hickling on the proper language for the letter. Mr.
211 Hickling thought that having the Commission review and approve the letter at their January
212 meeting would work well for this timeline. If Mr. Hickling requires the letter sooner, he would
213 be in communication with the Chair and Ms. Brunner. The Commission did not feel the need to
214 make a motion authorizing Chair Von Plinsky to write the letter. Ms. Brunner did note that if a
215 draft letter was sent to the Commission for review before the next meeting, there would be no
216 opportunity to comment on the letter without generating a quorum via email.
217

218 Mr. Bergman wondered whether the NH DES wetland permit should be a primary focus of the
219 letter. Mr. Hickling wanted the letter to be specific to the Conservation Commission and why the
220 group believes the fence is important. A good example would be for the Commission to write
221 about the benefits of completing the project in one year instead of multiple. Mr. Hickling hoped
222 that the letters from each stakeholder group—i.e., Conservation Commission, C&S, etc.—would
223 be unique. Mr. Hickling would reach out to the Chair soon with some talking points that could be
224 included in the letter.
225

226 Mr. Bergman asked if the original Airport Road siting for the fence was out of the question, or
227 whether the Commission needed to advocate keeping it closer to the runway in the letter. Mr.
228 Hickling said it was more so at this point about not having the project span multiple years and
229 the location is not impacted by that. Mr. Haynes said corralling wildlife into the airport is not
230 wanted. The Chair thought it was an easy argument to make for the Commission.
231

232 The Commission thanked Mr. Hickling for his time and explanation.
233

234 **B) Conservation Commission Speaking Events**

235

236 Councilor Madison was not present, so the Commission would revisit the Conservation Café idea
237 in 2023.
238
239
240
241

242 **C) Downtown Reconstruction Project**
243

244 Chair Von Plinsky noted a recent article in the Sentinel about the downtown utility and redesign
245 project. He said there is greater than 100-year-old infrastructure under the downtown that must
246 be replaced. The City is taking advantage of that opportunity to consider a redesign of the
247 downtown. He included this on the agenda in case the Commission wanted to make any
248 conservation-related recommendations for the redesign. The Chair's priority was ensuring
249 enough space is left for street trees to have the proper planting conditions, which would allow
250 trees to grow to the size of those on Central Square.

251
252 Ms. Brunner had shared a link to the project website. She noted that these are preliminary design
253 alternatives, from which a stakeholder Committee had made a recent recommendation to City
254 Council. The recommendation included bike lanes at sidewalk grade, a mini roundabout at the
255 head of Central Square (the flagpole would be shifted slightly south), expansion of Central
256 Square by closing the northern leg of the current traffic pattern around the square for added green
257 and event space (the area in front of the church and the Stage would be kept paved for pedestrian
258 traffic), diagonal parking on both sides of Main Street but not in the center median, two lanes of
259 traffic, and tree planting beds a minimum of 8' wide (she thought; trees downtown have had
260 challenges with smaller spaces). This was only a recommendation to City Council, not the design
261 chosen; some City Councilors prefer an alternative design. There would still be several public
262 workshops with the whole City Council to weigh the options.

263
264 Mr. Bill suggested that sufficient bike racks should be included in the downtown. Chair Von
265 Plinsky wanted to focus on conservation-related issues. All Commissioners were welcome to
266 share their personal opinions about the various options in the upcoming public workshops.

267
268 Ms. Clark felt she needed more information before a recommendation. She wondered about the
269 status of downtown trees and the current gazebo, and whether there had been an analysis of trees
270 to remove. The Chair thought only one tree on Central Square would be impacted because it has
271 issues and would be removed regardless of the project. Ms. Brunner said there was a tree
272 inventory as a part of this project to determine what trees are in good, fair, or poor condition and
273 whether they could be saved. Ms. Brunner posted an old downtown tree inventory from many
274 years ago in the shared Google Drive. From the current inventory, she demonstrated the trees
275 with high asset value that are likely to be removed. On the current inventory, Mr. Therriault said
276 it only looked like three healthy and high-value trees were impacting utilities. Ms. Brunner said
277 it depends on the tree location and final design chosen. She noted that many trees on Main Street
278 are currently affected by the Emerald Ash Borer disease, so the Public Works Department is
279 working to remove those before they impact all the surrounding trees.

280
281 Mr. Reilly wondered how much was known about how the current root structures have impacted
282 the underground utilities. Ms. Brunner said for some of the high value trees with roots impacting
283 utilities, the utility would not be removed, but abandoned in place because removing them would
284 damage the root structures of the trees. She said mostly the trees right on the end of pavement

285 above utilities would be impacted. Ms. Brunner noted that the current utilities run everywhere
286 underneath Main Street and demonstrated a map of the utilities to be replaced, with some
287 running diagonally under the street and Central Square; the newest utilities are from the 1920s.
288 There are also gas lines and Eversource utilities, among many others.

289
290 Mr. Bergman touched on the issue of replacing the lost trees with native or non-native tree
291 species. He personally liked ginkgo and another non-native Japanese species. He noted how
292 some native species are subject to diseases, making it a complicated issue. He imagined there
293 would be an incentive to fast growing trees to accomplish shade quickly, such as the locust, for
294 which only the male trees should be planted because the female fruit is rancid.

295
296 Chair Von Plinsky recognized Ms. Robbins, who said that as a resident, she thought it was
297 important to consider possible native species before ornamentals, and to certainly not include
298 Norway maples. The Chair said his research before the meeting focused on trees getting enough
299 space. He understood if 8' was the recommendation. Everything he saw was a 6' radius or 12'
300 wide area. However, Main Street is not limitless. Mr. Bergman said he was interested in there
301 being a wide range of species with a large canopy, which he said would help prevent widespread
302 diseases from taking over. The Chair agreed, noting that the City had been hit hard by tree
303 diseases in the past.

304
305 Ms. Clark made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault: We, the
306 Keene Conservation Commission, move to thank the City for its forethought regarding the
307 downtown reconstruction project. Additionally, due to the tremendous environmental, social, and
308 aesthetic value, we strongly recommend that the final design make significant use of a variety of
309 large canopy street trees and finally that said trees be given every opportunity to thrive in the
310 difficult urban environment by ensuring that each tree be planted with a buffer of radius of at
311 least 6' from any impervious surface.

312
313 Mr. Haynes noted the word "large" included in the motion, wondering how that would be
314 defined and whether large trees would be best in all locations downtown. The Chair thought that
315 was a fair point and delete to change the wording "large canopy."

316
317 Mr. Reilly talked about the proposed radius around the trees, noting that they had not discussed
318 tree height upon planting. He also wondered whether the Commission should specify native
319 trees. On height, the Chair thought it was best to recommend a mixture of small, medium, and
320 large mature trees. The Chair agreed that large trees might not always be best—for example,
321 when close to buildings—but said he was thinking about the presence of the very large trees on
322 Central Square. He continued that native trees are preferred, but noted how few urban trees are
323 hardy enough to withstand. Mr. Bergman noted that pin oaks are a popular choice because of
324 how quickly they mature. Mr. Bergman continued that the center island might be limited enough
325 in size to not accommodate large trees; perhaps there is more space near crosswalks. He said
326 foliage and shade are good things. The Commission agreed that hardy street trees that mature

327 quickly and provide quality shade are preferred. Mr. Bill suggested opportunities to support bees
328 and other pollinators in the locations not suitable for trees.

329
330 Councilor Williams commented that a while ago, the Emerald Ash Borer took out a lot of trees
331 on Main Street. At that time, Councilor Williams had asked the Director of Public Works what
332 those trees would be replaced with and was very satisfied with the answer of Logan trees. The
333 Councilor knew City Staff were paying attention and making good decisions, that they would not
334 choose species like the Bradford pear, and thus he was not inclined to micromanage their
335 choices. Councilor Williams also suggested including some Liberty elms in the Elm City, and
336 Mr. Therriault agreed. Ms. Clark said she had experience with Liberty elms, which she said are
337 not necessarily hardy. Chair Von Plinsky recommended the following language: “a diverse
338 variety of street trees.”

339
340 Mr. Bergman said that the older tree inventory mentioned that many trees were subjected to
341 mowing and weed whacking that damaged the bases of trees. He wondered if there was
342 infrastructure to protect the trees from such damage.

343
344 Chair Von Plinsky said the preliminary design alternatives proposed to maintain a buffer around
345 impervious surfaces, possibly an 8’ radius. Ms. Brunner commented that the Planning Board
346 development standards do not use a radius, but the area of non-compacted native permeable soil
347 around the tree, which is a minimum of 6’ and 3’, with the idea that it could be different
348 distances in different dimension to reach the correct area. The Chair said he was not an arborist
349 but that the Commission could still advocate for trees. He suggested asking for 12’ in the hopes
350 of getting 10’. Ms. Robbins suggested the following phrase: “to maximize the vitality of the
351 tree,” or something indicating to accommodate the trees’ longevity. The Chair worried that might
352 end up defined however someone would want to fit the infrastructure. Councilor Williams said
353 he thought 12’ was big and that there would likely be pushback on that. He suggested shooting
354 for 10’. Mr. Haynes said that in the end, the design for downtown would ultimately dictate this
355 issue. Ultimately, Mr. Haynes said this is about the designers knowing that people want as much
356 space around trees as possible. The Chair hoped to affect the design before they pick the trees.
357 He wondered about a 10’ wide buffer area instead of a 6’ radius. Councilor Williams suggested
358 120 square feet of soil. Ms. Brunner said the Planning Board standard is 300 cubic feet of
359 excavation to be filled with permeable native soil, but she did not know where that number came
360 from. She said that was hard to enforce. Councilor Williams noted that asking for larger
361 excavations would mean higher costs, which would likely not go over well. Ms. Brunner knew
362 that the Zoning regulations for a parking lot island requires an area 8’ wide for trees. The Chair
363 suggested the following: “... that each tree be planted with a buffer of at least 10 feet square.”

364
365 Mr. Bergman asked if the number of trees to be replaced depends on the design plan chosen. Ms.
366 Brunner referred to a tree inventory presented to the Commission and stated that all marked in
367 yellow would be removed soon because they are dying or spreading disease. Ms. Brunner
368 thought that those marked in green along sidewalks were the most likely to be saved. She was

369 unsure about the trees in the center median. She reiterated that a lot depends on the final design
370 but that the planning team is trying to save as many trees as possible.

371
372 Mr. Therriault mentioned that pollinator friendly trees do not make good street trees; they either
373 cover too widely or are not salt hardy. He suggested leaving that choice to the experts. Councilor
374 Williams said his concern for pollinators was less about trees and more about the large areas
375 covered with dark mulch and just a few plantings. The Councilor thought the Commission could
376 have pollinator influence with lower box planters.

377
378 Ms. Clark made the following amended motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault:
379 We, the Keene Conservation Commission, move to thank the City for its forethought regarding
380 the downtown reconstruction project. Additionally, due to the tremendous environmental, social,
381 and aesthetic value, we strongly recommend that the final design make significant use of a
382 diverse variety of street trees and finally that said trees be given every opportunity to thrive in
383 the difficult urban environment by ensuring that each tree be planted with a buffer of at least 100
384 square feet. The motion carried unanimously.

385
386 Chair Von Plinsky again encouraged all Commissioners to participate in the public workshops
387 on this issue. Councilor Williams suggested that each Commissioner speak with one of the two
388 City Councilors from their Ward or one of the five at-large Councilors about any concerns.

389
390 **D) Downtown Tree Inventory**

391
392 With all the work planned for the downtown, Chair Von Plinsky thought it was best to table this
393 item for now, pending a Commissioner indicating they want to take the lead on this. Otherwise,
394 he thought it was prudent to wait to see how the downtown plans evolve.

395
396 **E) Photo Library**

397
398 Chair Von Plinsky recalled this conversation from last month on how to share photos from site
399 visits, etc. The Chair looked at the possibilities for a Flickr account and a free one would hold
400 1,000 photos before there is a need to pay. He thought that was one of the best choices because
401 the Google drive would fill the allotted memory very quickly. Flickr Pro costs \$70/year. The
402 Chair suggested trying the free Flickr to start. The Chair also mentioned the possibility to add a
403 folder to the Library's Flickr account, which is in collaboration with the Historical Society.
404 Councilor Williams liked that idea versus using a third part commercial server. Mr. Bergman
405 mentioned that he is a Flickr Pro user, and he was unsure it was possible for multiple people as a
406 part of an organization to manage the account; he thought it was only for individual access. He
407 agreed that there could be a separate album on the Library's account for the Commission.
408 Otherwise, they could try the free Flickr and create albums for each site visited. Chair Von
409 Plinsky would contact the Library account holder for more information and report back at the
410 next meeting. Councilor Williams asked to be CC-ed on that email because he is the City
411 Council liaison to the Library Board of Trustees.

412

413 **5) Adoption of 2023 Meeting Schedule**

414

415 Meetings occur the third Monday of every month, except January and February, when the
416 Commission meets the Tuesday after the third Monday of the month because of holidays. A
417 motion by Mr. Therriault to adopt the 2023 meeting schedule was duly seconded by Mr.
418 Bergman and the motion carried unanimously.

419

420 **6) New or Other Business**

421

422 Mr. Reilly wondered if there were any changes to Commission membership in 2023. Ms.
423 Brunner noted that a new alternate member was approved recently—Lee Stanish.
424 Commissioners recalled that an alternate was supposed to be moved to a regular membership
425 but that it had not happened despite many requests. They agreed that Mr. Bill’s membership
426 should change. Ms. Brunner would take this request to the Mayor so the recommendation could
427 go through the proper City process.

428

429 Chair Von Plinsky mentioned that Eversource would be trimming trees again on scenic roads.
430 This requires a quorum of the Conservation Commission to be present at a joint public hearing
431 with the City Council on February 2, 2023 at 7:00 PM. Both Councilors Williams and Madison
432 count toward that quorum, and the Chair plans to attend, and he would coordinate with others
433 to be present.

434

435 Mr. Haynes mentioned emails from the NH Association of Conservation Commissions about a
436 wetlands training session. It is a seven-part series, with the first five via Zoom and the last two
437 in the field through June 2023. If Commissioners are interested, Mr. Haynes thought it could be
438 helpful for the wetlands applications this Commission reviews.

439

440 **7) Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023**

441

442 There being no further business, Chair Von Plinsky adjourned the meeting at 5:58 PM.

443

444 Respectfully submitted by,
445 Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker
446 December 27, 2022

447

448 Reviewed and edited by,
449 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner



25th Annual New Hampshire Drinking Water Festival

Wednesday, May 10, 2017
312 Washington Street, Keene, NH
9:00 am – 2:00 pm

Presented by the
N.H. Drinking Water Coalition

The overarching goal of the Drinking Water Coalition is to educate New Hampshire's youth about water and to encourage them to explore and understand the issues facing our shared water resources.

Water Activity Presenter/Exhibitor Registration Form

Please return this registration form **before March 1, 2017**, to:

Mail: ATTN: Lara Hooper
Drinking Water & Groundwater Bureau, NHDES
29 Hazen Drive PO BOX 95
Concord, NH 03301

Phone: (603) 271-4071

Email: lara.hooper@des.nh.gov

Contact Person & Organization: _____

Address: _____

E-mail: _____ Phone: _____

A) Yes, my organization would like to conduct a **hands-on 20 minute water-related activity, demonstration or game** for 4th grade classes scheduled throughout the day. I understand that presentations will begin at approximately 9:00 a.m. and continue until approximately 2:00 p.m. * **Each group will have 10-13 students. If your activity can handle more than one group, please let us know in question 5 below.**

OR

B) Yes, my organization would like to have an **exhibit table or display** that provides students and teachers with important information on water or water related resources. (This setup is in a tent or room and is similar to a conference display hall where people stop if their interest is caught. There are no groups.) Our display will be staffed by someone from my organization for the day.

C) Yes, my organization would like to **provide staff** to help with the day. We can provide _____ individuals to assist with activities* or other tasks (these individuals are in addition to any staff that will be manning activities or exhibits for your organization).

*The N.H. Project WET (Water Education for Teachers) program has suggestions for activities. If you are interested in learning about these options, please contact Lara Hooper at lara.hooper@des.nh.gov or (603) 271-4071.

PLEASE SEE PAGE 2

- 1) What is the title of your presentation?**

- 2) What water topic(s) will your presentation or exhibit cover?**

- 3) Give a brief description of your display or presentation, including whether it will include a hands-on component for the students (students are in 4th grade):**

- 4) Please write two questions that will help students understand key lessons from your activity. (Questions will be provided to teachers in advance of the event.)**

- 5) If you selected option A above, how many groups of students can your activity work with at a time? Each group is 10-13 students.**

- 6) List any special needs you have for your activity or presentation (i.e. access to water, electricity, tables, tent, how much space):**

- 7) Will you have a handout, brochure or sample lesson for the teachers or students?**
 No Yes

- 8) How many people will be staffing your activity or display? If this changes, please let us know.**

We're looking forward to seeing you at the Festival!