

**City of Keene**  
**New Hampshire**

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, May 15, 2023**

**4:30 PM**

**Room 22,  
Recreation Center**

**Members Present:**

Councilor Andrew Madison, Vice Chair  
Councilor Robert Williams (left early)  
Eloise Clark  
Ken Bergman  
Thomas Haynes, Alternate (Voting)  
John Therriault, Alternate (Voting)  
Steven Bill, Alternate  
Lee Stanish, Alternate  
Deborah LeBlanc, Alternate

**Staff Present:**

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

**Members Not Present:**

Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Chair  
Art Walker  
Brian Reilly, Alternate

**SITE VISIT: At 3:15 PM, before the meeting, Conservation Commission members conducted a site visit of 19 Whitcomb's Mill Road (TMP # 237-018-000).**

**1) Call to Order**

Vice Chair Madison called the meeting to order at 4:38 PM.

**2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – April 17, 2023**

Revision: line 197 should begin with the word "Extension."

A motion by Mr. Bill to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2023 meeting as amended was duly seconded by Mr. Haynes. The motion carried unanimously.

**3) Planning Board Referral – Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit Application SWP-CUP-02-23 – 19 Whitcomb's Mill Road, 9-lot CRD Subdivision**

Vice Chair Madison welcomed the applicant, Jim Phippard of Brickstone Land Consultants, on behalf of the S.R. Henry Trust, which owns this land at 19 Whitcomb's Mill Road. This 12.2-acre tract of land is in the Low Density 1 District. Mr. Phippard proposed a 9-unit Conservation Residential Development (CRD) subdivision. This would include a new 700' City street from Whitcomb's Mill Road that would enter the cul-de-sac. Nine lots would be created, 8 of those would be building lots, and 1 would be 6.8 acres of permanent open space, which is primarily a large 1.9-acre wetland area in the center of the property, as well as the perimeter land strip around the property. A homeowner's association would be responsible for maintaining that open space. Four of the lots would be sized adequately for single-family homes and the other 4 lots would be sized to accommodate up to a duplex. If approved, the lots would be open to sale, and a buyer would not be required to build a duplex even though the site could accommodate it. Mr. Phippard pointed out portions of the wetland buffers that would fall within one of the development lots, which could be impacted by a homeowner building on that lot. He pointed out lot #1, which was a large area suitable for a duplex, but there was a wetland on either side; one intermittent stream takes drainage from the south of the site into the wetland area, and 1 small drainage ditch has an adjacent wetland pocket that would be a part of the open space. He said the other lots would be smaller and would fall primarily in the building setback areas, where an applicant could not build; they could propose to install a shed or gazebo, for example, but that would require an additional Conditional Use Permit (CUP). He said the plan was to keep the site largely undisturbed so that buyers would see the sensitive wetland buffers on the plans; he found that educated home buyers usually respect those areas and recognize that they could have a positive or negative impact on those areas. Mr. Phippard said that both he and the Henry's would work to make sure any buyer understood what they were buying into. Mr. Phippard was present, hoping that the Conservation Commission would recommend to the Planning Board that they should allow the CUP as a part of this CRD.

Mr. Haynes referred to a second 12-inch culvert and asked whether it was too small. Mr. Phippard said it really was not too small, though he had considered changing it. Mr. Phippard referred to a small wetland pocket on the map, which he said was entirely from drainage on site. He added that there was a little bit of runoff from a steep slope next to the Rail Trail. He said there was a wet pocket that discharged water under the gravel road during rain events. Mr. Phippard said he contacted NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) because in order to construct the City street, the developers would need to increase the length of that culvert. DES instructed Mr. Phippard that he did not need a Wetlands Permit because the water discharge was not coming from a stream. Mr. Haynes asked whether there was concern that heavy rain could back up or plug that culvert somehow. Mr. Phippard said no. He pointed out the low point in the roadway where water could back-up and over top the roadway at that location, though Mr. Phippard did not anticipate that based on significant rain events over the past few years. Mr. Phippard noted that when he began his business, the standard was to design for a 25-year storm event (2" of rain). Today, there is technology to predict 25-year storms (5.83" of rain), which he said occur often; it is an average over the 25-year period. He said that this development would allow for up to 30% lot coverage in the development lots, which would not create enough runoff to overtop the road. Mr. Bill asked if 25 years was the design standard. Mr. Phippard said it was

the standard used by the City of Keene. Ultimately, he said it depended on the design, with the standard being a 50-year design for a stormwater pond and 25 years for a culvert under a roadway.

Ms. Clark asked what action the Commission needed to take. Ms. Brunner replied that this was a referral from the Planning Board that was built into their regulations for surface water CUPs that are allowed in NH as innovative land use control. The state allows the City Council to create those regulations and assign them to either the Zoning Board of Adjustment, Planning Board, or the City Council itself to issue the permit. The City has assigned these to the Planning Board. She said that for surface water CUPs, the Council added another referral to the Conservation Commission as the City's experts on water issues. Ms. Clark asked the criteria for reviewing this application. Ms. Brunner replied that the City has surface water CUP criteria in the Zoning regulations. In the application packet, Ms. Brunner believed the applicant provided a narrative response to those criteria that the Planning Board would use when deciding whether to grant the CUP. Some of those criteria involve some knowledge of and best practices for protecting wetlands and surface water resources, which is why the application was referred to the Conservation Commission. The Commission did not need to make a yes/no decision, but rather to make any recommendations to the Planning Board that they should consider using in their approval. For example, in the past the Commission had recommended pollinator friendly plantings when restabilizing an area.

Ms. Clark asked about cutting or removing vegetation up to the banks of these intermittent streams. Ms. Brunner said the Commission could recommend leaving a no-cut buffer, but ultimately it would be up to the Planning Board to decide whether to take that recommendation. Ms. Clark wanted the Commission to recommend a no-cut buffer around the 2 ephemeral streams, maintaining the buffer on the plans that Mr. Phippard displayed. Mr. Haynes said that was the goal, but once those lots sell, there would be no monitoring system to ensure the homeowner's association follows that recommendation. Mr. Phippard said that was correct, 10 years from now a new buyer could do what they want. Mr. Therriault thought that could be built into the deed so whoever bought the lot would have to maintain the buffer or violate the deed. Mr. Phippard noted that the homeowner's association would include up to 12 separate entities. In his experience, he found the homeowner's associations to be more successful at enforcing restrictions like this because they live there. The homeowner's association documents were still being drafted for this development, with detailed restrictions.

Mr. Bergman noted that the wetland buffer would not affect every lot. Mr. Phippard agreed. Mr. Bergman asked if the restrictions would only be included on the deeds for those lots impinging on the buffer, or for all the lots. Mr. Phippard said that if the Planning Board adopted the Conservation Commission's recommendation, then it would become a part of the final approval, meaning it would have to be included in the homeowner's association documents as the group responsible for that open space. There would be a good record of the recommendations, but it was still a matter of enforcement. Mr. Bergman referred to 2 drainage maps that seemed to be prepared sooner than the others; he referred to an apparent catchment basin on lot #7, which he

said was shifted to the front of the development on later maps. Mr. Phippard said there had been approximately 15 versions of the plans he displayed over time. He had been working on this evolving plan with the Henry's for over 2 years, while the City had also been working to finalize their CRD regulations. He thought this development would contribute one solution to the City's housing needs. In terms of clarity of documentation for those other than this Commission, Mr. Bergman thought it would be good to provide final versions of the plans. Mr. Phippard said Ms. Brunner had all of the final plans, which could change again based on the Planning Board's decision. Ms. Brunner said only the final version would be signed by the Planning Board Chair and recorded by the Register of Deeds. Mr. Bergman asked if further studies (e.g., a botanist) of the site were anticipated before the final plans. Mr. Phippard said nothing remained for the final approval.

Ms. Stanish asked why the wetland buffers were included in the lots if there was any concern. Mr. Phippard said it was a balancing act when designing a CRD like this, where 50% of the land must remain as open space and the minimum lot size for a single-family home is 16,000 square feet, which doubles for a duplex. He pointed out details on the map. Mr. Bill asked if the lot owner would own the buffer strips. Mr. Phippard said that was correct, but they would be documented as restricted in the homeowner's association documents and he would make a note on the final plans that would be signed by the Chair of the Planning Board.

Ms. Stanish asked how the perimeter open space strips would be delineated from the properties. Mr. Phippard said the Planning Board required setting every corner pin, which were black dots on the plans. If there were questions or issues, a surveyor would go out and flag the lines using ribbons or by marking trees. Ms. Stanish asked if there would be any physical demarcation and Mr. Phippard said no. Mr. Phippard said an earlier version of the plans included a trail down to the brook but he and the owners decided to leave it in its most natural state and protect those most sensitive areas of the property. He proposed 1 foot path that would come outside the wetland buffer and through the trees up to the Rail Trail; this would be subject to an application with the State of NH and paying the annual fees. He noted that walking on Whitcomb's Mill Road could be a little scary with fast traffic and no sidewalks.

Ms. Brunner clarified her understanding of the Land Development Code that 16,000 square feet was required for a duplex. That was just the minimum and there could be a duplex on a 16,000 square foot lot. Mr. Phippard and Ms. Brunner agreed that lot #1 could be smaller in that case. Ms. Brunner said she would follow up with Mr. Phippard to confirm this. If that was true, then Mr. Haynes said lot #1 could completely avoid those buffer areas, which would be great for everyone, and Mr. Phippard agreed.

Mr. Bill said that given the number of wells in this area, he thought there was potential for supply issues. He asked if there were other subdivisions of this size with that many wells. Mr. Phippard replied that he had a 26-unit subdivision in Chesterfield with a similar number of wells. The same well driller assured Mr. Phippard that the aquifer in question for this subdivision was much better. He said the City was looking at another potential well site in this aquifer at the end

of Bent Court. Vice Chair Madison agreed, saying that area is productive. Mr. Phippard said the well driller would look at where the permanent water table is and how much storage that creates in a well and they would recommend the well depth for a single-family home with 3 bedrooms. Mr. Bill asked if the well would go down to bedrock and Mr. Phippard said yes.

Mr. Bergman asked if the well water tests showed any evidence of radon or arsenic. Mr. Phippard said not on this site.

Ms. Brunner noted that maintaining the 50% open space, including a no-cut buffer, would be a part of the homeowner's association's governing documents in a CRD. They could do vegetation management (e.g., removing a tree or invasive species) but they could not clear cut the open space land.

Vice Chair Madison made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault. On a vote of 6-0, the Conservation Commission recommended maintaining the no-cut buffer around the 2 ephemeral streams as shown on the design plans or, if the size of lot #1 could be legally reduced, to keep the duplex out of the buffers. The Conservation Commission also recommended that this no-cut buffer should be codified in the homeowner's association's governing documents.

**4) Report-Outs**

**A) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee**

Mr. Haynes reported that the Subcommittee's last meeting and those for the rest of the summer would be at Goose Pond. Any Commissioners are welcome to join on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of each month at 8:30 AM and Mr. Haynes would send out bulletins indicating where to meet a week in advance (usually the north or south trailhead off East Surry Road). At the last meeting, some people walked around the loop trail and saw some downed timber that they then used to create a boardwalk over a wet area. Others worked on hanging more trail signs that Mr. Haynes created as well as trail maintenance. The Department of Parks and Recreation social media accounts would announce volunteer recruitment so that upcoming workdays (there would be some on the weekends) could be advertised to potential volunteers. Volunteers could also be recruited for trail work with Lew Shelley of SnowHawk LLC; signs would be posted at trailheads alerting users to parts of the trails that might be closed for work. Mr. Haynes asked if the Goose Pond work schedule could be posted to the main Conservation Commission webpage, versus the Goose Pond subpage. Mr. Haynes would work with Ms. Brunner to accomplish this. Mr. Haynes said that in general, volunteers should call the Parks and Recreation Department to sign up for workdays or get on the list for email updates. Ms. Clark, Ms. LeBlanc, Ms. Stanish, and Councilor Williams said they would like it if Ms. Brunner would email them the Subcommittee's agenda packets monthly.

**B) Outreach**

Mr. Haynes said the work group did not meet last month. Sunday, May 28 would be a bird walk with Steve Lamonde from 8:00 AM–10:00 AM (meeting at the south trailhead). While registration was not required, Mr. Haynes said participants could sign up by calling the Parks and Recreation Department.

A motion by Mr. Haynes to pay Steven Lamonde a \$150 honorarium for the May 28, 2023 bird walk at Goose Pond was duly seconded by Mr. Bergman. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Haynes mentioned the Goose Pond Through the Seasons activities. The work group was considering a walk into the area where the solar project was proposed as educational outreach so members of the community could see the area. He wondered if a member of Glenvale Solar or one of their associated scientists could be present to answer questions. He envisioned this as an educational opportunity and not a discussion about being for or against the project. Mr. Bergman supported this idea, noting that it would be nice to understand the condition of that land and the scope of the planned work. Mr. Bergman wondered how such a visit would work with the progression of this project through various City approvals. Mr. Haynes wanted to fit something in sooner than later to fulfill the summer walk.

Vice Chair Madison was concerned that such a visit could result in the Conservation Commission appearing biased as for or against the project in a setting that could result in a sort of “gang up” on the developers. He said the Commission needed to remain impartial in accordance with NH RSA 91-A. He understood the idea of such a walk but thought it could be problematic. Mr. Haynes understood the concern, but asked how the Commission could educate the public about this project; if not the Commission, whose responsibility would that be? Mr. Bergman said that at this point, the proposal was just on paper, and he could not concretely envision the property, so he would be asked to vote on something without seeing the land.

Ms. Brunner thought the appropriate venue for such a tour would be a publicly noticed Conservation Commission site visit, perhaps with a representative of Glenvale Solar, once the Planning Board refers the application to the Conservation Commission. She noted that a site visit like this could be longer than normal, and it would not have to occur right before a Commission meeting; for example, the Planning Board conducts their site visits 1 week in advance of the hearings. Ms. Brunner did not recommend having this site visit before the Planning Board referral so that it is a formal part of the review process. Mr. Bergman asked if the public could weigh in during a site visit. Vice Chair Madison said it should mostly be questions and answers, but the public would certainly have that opportunity during a site visit. Ms. Brunner also noted that for the NH DES Wetlands Permit, the Conservation Commission could choose to hold a public hearing. During any Commission meeting, the Chair could choose to allow public comment, whereas during a public hearing, public comment is guaranteed. Ms. LeBlanc said she could use a lot more information on these processes and would appreciate it if Ms. Brunner could share more.

Mr. Bill wondered how the solar site would be accessed for a visit. Mr. Haynes thought it made the most sense to walk up Old Gilsum Road. Mr. Bill wondered if the Commission would need permission from the property owner to visit. Mr. Haynes noted that there were biking trails onto the property right now that could be used without the owner's permission, so he thought it would be accessible. Vice Chair Madison thought this discussion was getting too into the weeds at this time. Councilor Williams was concerned, noting that it would be a long walk up Old Gilsum Road and not everyone might be able to do that, so he suggested having one car go to the site as well.

Mr. Haynes confirmed that organizing a walk to the solar site may have to wait for the application. Ms. Brunner's recommendation was to keep that as a part of the formal process. She reiterated that there could be a multi-hour site visit in advance of the Commission's deliberation on the application. Ms. Brunner would confirm with the City Attorney that such a visit should be a part of the formal application process. She echoed Vice Chair Madison's concern that any meeting of the Conservation Commission would need to be publicly noticed 24 hours in advance. Mr. Haynes said members of the Commission wanted more information before the formal application; he said that it could be an educational walk. Ms. Brunner reiterated that she would need to confirm with the City Attorney, and she could reach out to Glenvale Solar to see if they would be interested in participating in a public walk.

Mr. Bergman asked how soon after the permits are referred to the Commission would the various actions need to occur. Ms. Brunner said that as soon as the Community Development Department receives the application, assuming it has the surface water CUP as a part of it, she would notify Chair Von Plinsky to add it to the next Commission agenda and set a site visit. The Planning Board deadline to submit is 6 weeks ahead and the Planning Board meets one week after the Conservation Commission, so there would be a 5-week window for a site visit.

Vice Chair Madison asked for an overview of where this project is in the City process so far. Ms. Brunner said the applicants received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) on May 1 for the size of the proposed array for the two properties, one of which has frontage on RT-10 and the other on Old Gilsum Road (a Class VI Road). She said the proposal was currently waiting on a 30-day period after the ZBA decision, during which any parties aggrieved by the decision could appeal. After those 30 days, she was unsure if the project would go to the City Council next or proceed into the property design. They might need more variances because the conceptual designs showed the development going across the property line, so they would need variances for things like setbacks in that case. The Conservation Commission would also get a referral when the Wetlands Permit application is submitted to NH DES.

Vice Chair Madison said there was not a rush for a site visit right now. Mr. Haynes said there could be a rush if the application comes in during the winter, when a site visit would not be possible, and he suggested that the Commission visit the site now. Mr. Bergman said the land was not posted. Ms. Brunner would talk to the City Attorney and then contact Glenvale Solar.

Vice Chair Madison still urged caution about acting outside the formal process for such contentious projects. Mr. Haynes reiterated that the visit would be for outreach and education, not about taking a side; he had seen letters to the editor in the Sentinel about concerns for Goose Pond because of this project.

### **C) Invasive Species**

Councilor Williams reported that the first event of this season was on May 8. He said it was poorly attended and he was unsure if it was not advertised well enough. Despite the low turnout, he said the group did some good work on Japanese barberry. He is experimenting with a new way to get rid of invasives other than bagging them and taking them to the landfill. Right now, the Japanese barberry was piled under a tarp to die off. He hoped for more turnout at the next event on June 19, right after the Conservation Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Madison asked if any tools/materials were needed (e.g., trowels, gloves, tarps). He said the Commission's budget was reasonable enough to be able to cover some things like gloves. Councilor Williams said gloves and tarps would be helpful and the Commission could discuss more next month.

Ms. LeBlanc asked what sort of educational outreach there was about invasive species for Keene property owners. Councilor Williams said it was a good question. Recently, Ms. Brunner referred a resident with questions about Japanese knotweed to Councilor Williams, who visited the residents, made some recommendations, and referred them to Healthy Home Habitats. Mr. Bill thought it might be worth getting some information in the Sentinel. Councilor Williams said he only had so much time to contribute to more advertising; he often shares images and information about invasives on Facebook. There was more attendance at these events than when they first began. Ms. Brunner suggested a short piece in the Monadnock Shopper News, which is free versus the Sentinel. Councilor Williams also advertises on bulletin boards and has a mailing list of past volunteers. Vice Chair Madison noted that it was getting harder to advertise on Facebook.

Mr. Bill recalled Andy Bohannon, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Facilities, stating that his Department had some gloves and other materials available for use. Councilor Williams would check with Mr. Bohannon before the next event. He recommended bringing gloves and shovels for the June 19 knotweed event. Eventually, Councilor Williams also suggested using some of the Commission's budget for native seeds and plants to help fill areas cleared of invasives. Mr. Bergman mentioned an area with a lot of knotweed on Whitcomb's Mill Road before Arch Street.

### **D) Land Conservation**

Chair Von Plinsky was not present to report.



5) **Discussion Items:**

A) **Keene Meadow Solar Station Project Update**

Also discussed earlier on the agenda under “Outreach.”

Mr. Haynes recalled that at the last meeting, the Commission discussed being better prepared if Glenvale Solar was invited back to present more information. Vice Chair Madison thought it was best to wait to take any action until Ms. Brunner talked to the City Attorney.

Ms. LeBlanc asked, if the area proposed is so important, why they could not choose a less impactful site. Vice Chair Madison said that it is private property and the Conservation Commission has no jurisdiction. Ms. Brunner and Vice Chair Madison said it would be reasonable to ask the applicant why they chose that site. Still, Vice Chair Madison reminded that the Conservation Commission has not authority to demand anything on private property.

Ms. Brunner reiterated that the Commission would be asked to formally comment on all surface waters (including vernal pools and intermittent streams) for the City’s surface water CUP and the NH Wetlands Permit. The CUP criteria do include wildlife habitat. In the past, she thought the Commission had also made recommendations about invasive species management and pollinator habitat, which were not strictly related to water resources. As individuals, Conservation Commissioners have the right as citizens to comment during public hearings throughout the application process—ZBA, Planning Board, and Council. Still, Commissioners would be asked to weigh-in on these formal aspects, and she cautioned against the conflict of forming an opinion publicly before the Commission votes.

Mr. Bergman asked if the Commission could request specific information from the applicant to address issues within the Commission’s purview that the applicants might not have studied yet. Mr. Bergman specifically mentioned invertebrates in these northern forests and the possibility of salamanders migrating to vernal pools. He also cited studies on the impact of forest clearing on this huge source of invertebrate biomass. Ms. Brunner said she could ask the question, but the Conservation Commission could not require that study. The Commission could recommend a study like that to the Planning Board, but it would have to relate to one of their standards. She noted that there had been tactics in the past asking for a lot of studies to try to stop projects, which the courts do not like. Mr. Bergman said most of the Planning Board had likely not heard of some of these issues that are important to ecologists. Vice Chair Madison said this project would remain on future agendas for updates.

B) **Potential Land Purchase Update (RT-9/Washington Street Extension Properties)**

Vice Chair Madison said this matter appeared before the City Council on May 4 and the Finance, Organization, and Personnel (FOP) Committee on May 11. The FOP Committee recommended that the City purchase the parcels for no more than the original purchase price approved. The

City Council approved, and now it was in the hands of the City Manager to negotiate with Hull Forest Products using the Land Use Change Tax Fund. Vice Chair Madison said it did not look like they clear cut the whole properties as they were seeking timber specifically for arts and crafts supplies. He still thought the properties would serve their primary function of flood and erosion control.

**C) Airport Proposed Wildlife Control Fence Update**

Vice Chair Madison said the City Council approved the City Manager moving forward with a scope of work. Ms. Brunner had sent out a project update from the Airport Director. Mr. Bergman said the Airport Director's communication referred to a figure that would show where the assessment activities would occur, but he did not find that in the memo. Ms. Brunner would send that figure to the Commission. Mr. Bergman said it would also be good for the Commission to know when the biologist would be on site because the wildlife watchers on Airport Road could provide information. Ms. Brunner said those dates were not decided yet, but they would probably visit in late June/July. She said that 2 presentations before the Keene Conservation Commission were built into the project, but the Swanzey Conservation Commission had the ultimate jurisdiction.

**D) Conservation Commission Speaking Events**

Vice Chair Madison had no update. Mr. Therriault said the Keene City Republican Committee asked for a presentation about the Conservation Commission at their June meeting. Chair Von Plinsky would do that presentation.

**E) 2023 NH Drinking Water Festival**

Ms. Clark reported that there were a lot of presenters (approximately 2 dozen) at the Drinking Water Festival, from hydrologists, to biologists, to dam keepers. The event was at the Recreation Center and presenters were stationed throughout. Ms. Clark and Mr. Haynes presented "muck monsters" and specifically the macroinvertebrates at the bottom of the Robin Hood Park pond. Ms. Clark said that approximately 300 kids participated, though not all passed by her station. She and Mr. Haynes saw 5 groups of 10–12 kids. She said the groups had good energy and she enjoyed teaching again. Mr. Haynes thanked Ms. Clark for spearheading the activity. Vice Chair Madison noted that he just judged the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Science Fair, which included some kids from Keene. Mr. Haynes noted that he created a "Conservation Commission" sign that could be displayed at the Commission's events and Ms. Clark said it was nicely engraved; Mr. Haynes would bring it to the next meeting or share a photo.

**F) Wantastiquet-Monadnock Trail Coalition Request for Keene Conservation Commission Member Representative**

Ms. LeBlanc recalled that she volunteered to attend the Coalition's meeting, which she said was a well-attended (e.g., Monadnock Conservancy), enlightening, and good experience. She said everyone worked well together. Lynne Borofsky, Chair of the Chesterfield Conservation Commission, requested that the Keene Conservation Commission build a privy for the trail. Ms. Brunner had not heard from Ms. Borofsky about that yet, but it might have gone through someone else at the City. Ms. Brunner would look into it and talk to Chair Von Plinsky.

**G) Educational Resources for Invasive Species Removal**

Councilor Williams left the meeting early so there was no report.

**6) Correspondence: ARLAC Letter Regarding the Ashuelot River Monitoring Program Dated April 24, 2023**

Ms. Brunner said this was the annual \$125 request from the Ashuelot River Local Advisory Committee (ARLAC) for their yearly e-coli sampling. Volunteers were welcome to join the season that would begin on May 23 (even if they missed the May 11 training). Ms. Clark recalled that the Commission had often donated more than \$125 because its budget expires on June 30. Ms. Brunner advised authorizing the funds at this meeting, as an action at the June meeting likely would not be processed before the end of the fiscal year.

A motion by Ms. Clark to donate \$150 to the Ashuelot River Local Advisory Committee for their annual e-coli testing was duly seconded by Mr. Haynes. The motion carried unanimously.

**7) New or Other Business**

No new business was reported.

**8) Adjournment – Next Meeting: Monday, June 19, 2023**

There being no further business, Vice Chair Madison adjourned the meeting at 6:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Katrinya Kibler, Minute Taker  
May 22, 2023

Reviewed and edited by,  
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner