

**MINUTES
CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

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

3:30 P.M.

JUNE 11, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman Mary Ann Blanchard;
Members Allison Tanner, Barbara McMillan; Elissa Hill Stone,
Peter Vandermark, Alternate Kimberly Meuse

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shelley Saunders

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 8, 2014

The approval of minutes was postponed to the July 9, 2014 meeting.

II. STATE WETLAND BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
Brewster Street
City of Portsmouth and Boston & Maine Railroad (Pan Am), owners
Assessor Map 139, Lot 164-4

Mr. Dave Desfosses of the Department of Public Works (DPW), Project Manager Mr. Rene LaBranche from Stantec Consulting Services, wetland scientist Mr. Mike Leach, and mitigation expert Mr. Brian Emerson were present to speak to the application. Mr. Desfosses stated that the project started years before when they installed the Deer Street pumping station at the end of Brewster Street and the rail yard. The current sewer could not handle storm events and the area flooded, so the DPW had been pumping it out into North Mill Pond for the last eight years. They wanted to push a new culvert underneath the rail yard and install a larger drainage system, making it the third drainage outfall for the west end of the City. The ultimate goal was to find a place for the storm water to go other than the sewer system. They were proposing to put in a full storm water drainage system in the area. Along with pushing the pipe under the rail road track, they needed environmental permits because they were in the wetland buffer zone and there would be permanent impacts. They would also mitigate the damage that the fire hose caused.

Mr. Desfosses said that they were also working with Dr. David Burdick, who had done a lot of marsh restoration work. Their drainage design included three water quality units approved by DES. The design would handle five-year and two-year storm events. They had Shoreland, Wetlands, and Army Corps permits. A 4,700 hundred square-foot area of wetland would be impacted, of which 600 square feet would be permanent. There would be temporary impacts to the tidal wetlands, North Mill Pond, and the shoreland buffer area for the project construction.

Chairman Miller asked the location of the concrete end of the pipe. Mr. LaBranche stated that it was below the high tide line and in the marsh area. Chairman Miller noted that the five-year and two-year plans were not very proactive. Mr. LaBranche replied that, due to the limitations of the location, it was the best they could do. Ms. McMillan asked about the apron in the discharge area, and Mr. LaBranche said they had to discharge it at a certain elevation to allow the water to discharge into the pond. Any higher, it would surcharge back onto Brewster Street.

Ms. Tanner asked what they would do when the 50-year or 100-year storm occurred. Mr. LaBranche stated that DES had issued new storm events and increased the requirements by 20%, so they were using new criteria and being more proactive. Vice-Chair Blanchard asked when the project would start and how long it would take to complete. Mr. LaBranche replied that it would take 60 days at the most. The mitigation had to be done in the spring of 2015. Mr. Vandermark asked if there would be storms where they would have to revert to the old method using the hose. Mr. Desfosses agreed and said it was about the hydraulics. A massive pipe was going in, so it was based on calculations. Mr. Vandermark asked if the marsh would be damaged further. Mr. Desfosses stated that there would be no erosion but just discharge.

Chairman Miller asked how the mitigation would be separated between Projects A and B. Mr. Britz said all the mitigation satisfied both projects. Mr. Emerson said the goal of the mitigation plan was to replace the functions and values of the wetlands that were impacted from the drainage. He talked about the existing storm water restoration plan and the 15,000 square feet of mitigation, the restoration zones, and the plans. He noted that there would be three years of post construction monitoring. Ms. Tanner asked what the total area of mitigation would be and was told 15,115 square feet. Ms. McMillan asked who would do the salt marsh restoration long-term stewardship. Mr. Emerson replied that it would be an independent biologist.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan. There was no discussion.

The motion passed by unanimous (7-0) vote.

- B. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
 - End of Daniel Street adjacent to Memorial Bridge
 - City of Portsmouth, owner
 - Assessor Map 105, Lot 3

Mr. Dave Desfosses of DPW was present to speak to the application, which he felt was another worthwhile project that was part of the park built under the Memorial Bridge under existing permits. The park was part of the river walk and was designed by Mr. Duncan Mellor of

Waterfront Engineers designed the park. Part B of the project was the public pier. The park was named Harborwalk Park and the pier was Harborwalk Pier. Mr. Mellor went over the plan view and discussed the timber and pile structures. The deck was elevated one foot above the 100-year flood elevation and 1.4 foot above the adjacent Harborplace Wharf elevation. There was a 10-foot clearance from the footprint of the bridge to their structure due to Homeland Security concerns. The hardwood deck area was 2,294 square feet, which DES considered to be the impact area. There were 10 square feet in the tidal area, 1,793 square feet of hard substrate in the tidal zone, and 768 square feet in the sub-tidal zone. It was not intended for boat docking and would have substantial pipe railings around it, with signage posted to prohibit fishing.

Ms. Tanner asked about the IPE decking material. Mr. Mellor said the IPE material complied with the Federal Rulings of imported tropical hardwood. Ms. McMillan asked about the impervious surface. Mr. Desfosses said that the park would be surrounded by \$15,000 worth of plants by July 4. Ms. McMillan asked if it would provide egress, and Mr. Desfosses said there would be no connection to the water. Mr. Vandermark asked if Harbor Place needed to exit through the park. Mr. Desfosses replied that they would. Mr. Vandermark asked when construction would take place, and Mr. Desfosses said it would be built during the winter and the pier completed the following summer.

Vice-Chair Blanchard moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stone. There was no discussion.

The motion passed by unanimous (7-0) vote.

C. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
US Route 1 Bypass, Sarah Mildred Long Bridge
Assessor Map N/A, Lot N/A

Ms. Vicki Chase of Mr. McFarland Johnson Professional Services and Mr. Bob Landry of NHDOT were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Landry showed the Commission a rendering of the proposed bridge with various views and said the reason for replacing the bridge was because a new bridge would provide a wider berth. Ms. Chase stated that there would be inter-tidal and sub-tidal impacts as well as a small area of freshwater wetland impact. DES would allow them to use a man-made wetland for treatment. The existing bridge had two piers in North Mill Pond, which would be removed and replaced with one pier. Ms. Chase discussed the causeway and the hydraulic study that had been done. Mr. Landry discussed their Contract Management General Contractor (CMGC) process and the construction schedule, with a completion date of summer 2018. Ms. Chase reviewed a summary of the impacts and said they were working on the mitigation aspects with Mr. Burdick involving 82,000 square feet of temporary impacts. Mr. Landry discussed eel grass, mitigation in Cutts Cove and shellfish improvements.

Ms. Tanner asked about the temporary access road from Market Street.. Mr. Landry said the intent was to secure the road and turn it over to the City. Ms. Tanner asked what would happen

to a tidal area near Cutts Cove that was in poor condition. Mr. Landry said they were not proposing to do anything in that area. Chairman Miller suggested restoring the area if more mitigation was needed. Ms. McMillan asked where the eel grass mitigation area was and if eel grass would survive there. Mr. Landry said it was better to have a conservation mixture.

Chairman Miller asked them to go over the public comment period. Ms. Chase stated that the Army Corps public hearing was on June 30 for a 30-day comment period and would be kept open for two additional weeks until mid-August. Mr. Britz said that he had attended the NHDOT meetings where Dr. Dave Burdick and Mr. Greg Moore presented, and he said they were well received. He thought it would be helpful to request that the proposed mitigation be linked directly to the project and offered to write a letter for the Commission.

Ms. McMillan asked about temporary impacts on the causeway and mitigation fees of \$80,000. She knew a cost benefits analysis had been done but thought they must be concerned to add that amount to their mitigation efforts. She asked if they had done an environmental impact analysis using the causeway instead of the trestle for their construction. Ms. Chase said they did not do any forecasting using a geotech style. Ms. McMillan asked about the vegetation, and Ms. Chase said there would be invertebrates and shellfish impacts having to do with an Army Corps permit.

Mr. Britz said that the Commission could attend the public hearing or ask them to come back. Chairman Miller thought it was a big project, and he wanted more time to digest it but did not want to hold it up. He was prepared to do a vote that day for the sake of efficiency. Ms. McMillan asked if they had done anything yet about the storm water impacts. Ms. Chase stated that they would receive an amendment request. Mr. Vandermark suggested postponing the vote so that they could do the types of restoration that Mr. Britz suggested.

Vice-Chair Blanchard moved to continue review of the application at the July 9, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vandermark.

The motion passed by unanimous (7-0) vote.

Ms. Meuse left at this point in the meeting.

D. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
325 Little Harbor Road
Michael R. Clark, owner
Assessor Map 205, Lot 2

Mr. John Lorden of MSC Engineers was present to speak to the application. He stated that the 11.24-acre property was unique and was known as Lady Isle. It was surrounded by the Piscataqua River, and the entire perimeter was within the tidal buffer zone. There were five areas of disturbance. The first one was the failed septic system, which they would replace with a new system and add a pump chamber to pump outside the tidal buffer. The leach field would be abandoned. There would be a temporary construction disturbance of 672 square feet and 113 square feet for the septic tank replacement. The second area of disturbance was the caretaker's

home, which they would remove and fill the hole and seed it. The permanent disturbance would be 1,301 square feet. There would be 1,597 square feet of construction disturbance in a 10-foot area around the building to get construction vehicles in and out. The third area was the guest house, which they would convert to a greenhouse. There would be 1,414 square feet of temporary disturbance and no permanent disturbance. The fourth area was the guest cottage which would be converted to a garden shed, with 765 square feet of temporary construction disturbance within the tidal buffer zone and a small portion in the Shoreland Protection Zone. The fifth area was the guest building that would be replaced with a storage shed of the same footprint, with 340 square feet of temporary disturbance in the tidal buffer zone and 713 square feet of temporary disturbance in the Shoreland Protection Zone. Silt socks were proposed for all downhill construction, which required a Conditional Use Permit. They had filed a Shoreland Permit Application for less than 1,500 square feet within the buffer zone.

Ms. Tanner asked if gas-powered vehicles would be stored in the sheds. Mr. Loring was not sure. Ms. Tanner asked if there would be plantings around the sheds. Mr. Loring said that none were proposed, but the disturbed areas would be restored. Ms. McMillan asked about the demolition construction equipment. Mr. Loring did not know what could be saved. Mr. Vandermark asked if the existing buildings had proposed plumbing, and Mr. Loring thought they would. Mr. Vandermark asked if there were septic systems. Mr. Loring didn't think so because the buildings were so old. Mr. Britz referenced Mr. Corey Coldwell's memo that stated a conservation seed mix would be used for the disturbance areas.

Ms. McMillan moved to recommend approval of the application to the State Wetlands Bureau. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner.

Ms. Tanner was concerned that the gasoline-powered vehicular traffic in the area would be inappropriate because gas and oil near the sensitive areas were destructive, so she added a note of caution about the storage of gas, oil and toxins in the storage shed.

The motion passed with 5 in favor and Vice-Chair Blanchard opposed.

III. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

- A. Off Spinney Road and Middle Road
 Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, owners
 Spinney Road, Assessor Map 167 & 170, Lots 5 & 24
(This item was postponed at the May 14, 2014 meeting to the June 11, 2014 meeting.)

The Commission voted to postpone the application to the July 9, 2014 meeting.

- B. 200 Spaulding Turnpike
 New England Marine & Industrial, Inc., owner
 Subaru of New England, Inc.
 Assessor Plan 237, Lot 56

The Commission voted to postpone the application to the July 9, 2014 meeting.

III. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. 325 Little Harbor Road
Michael R. Clark, owner
Assessor Map 205, Lot 2

Mr. John Lorden of MSC Engineers stated that he had no additional presentation, seeing that he had summarized everything in the previous State Wetland Bureau Permit application. Chairman Miller referred to the five criteria and Mr. Britz's memo and took a minute to review the memo.

Ms. McMillan stated that it didn't seem to be a net improvement to the site, and there would also be some loss of vegetation. She asked if any trees would be cut. Mr. Loring stated that a tree close to the caretaker's cottage may be cut. Ms. McMillan was concerned about the loss of vegetation on the isle and thought the buffers were dismal, and she said it was an opportunity to plant vegetation and plantings to protect the resource. Another issue was the water quality. She felt that plantings should be considered instead of the conservation mix. Chairman Miller said it seemed to be all lawn, and it was ripe for opportunities to improve the buffer and water quality. Ms. Tanner agreed and said it would be nice to see native vegetation instead of just conservation mix, even if it was in the disturbed area and not along the buffer. Chairman Miller noted that there were resources available on the City's website for buffer improvements that could enhance the site. Mr. Loring stated that he was not opposed to additional planting, but it was not part of the proposal at that point. The owner just wanted to get his leach field fixed and take care of other things on the property.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulation:

- 1) That native vegetation is planted in the disturbed areas.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan.

The motion passed with 5 in favor and Vice-Chair Blanchard opposed.

2. Off Brackett Road
Ann Coffey and Janice Stanley, owners
Francis Sullivan, applicant
Assessor Map 206, Lot 17

Attorney Bernie Pelech was present on behalf of the applicant and the property owners, along with the site engineer Mr. Christian Smith of Beale Associates and wetlands scientist Mr. Steve Riker. Attorney Pelech read the purposes of the Ordinance as stated in Article 10, Wetlands Protection, and said the project would improve the quality of surface water, reduce the flow and volume, and would not affect the quality of the wetlands. They would not disturb the wetlands or make changes to them. He showed the plan delineation of the property and noted that there

were no rare animal species on site. Everything would meet State standards. He went through the criteria to demonstrate that the location and the lot were suitable to the use and the location was the most appropriate one. There would be no adverse impact to the wetlands. They would change the driveway to pervious pavement and place a stone drip edge around the home's perimeter. No trees would be cut except for possibly one. They had also presented additional information about the storm water management plan and the drainage calculations. Anyone would need a Conditional Use Permit to build a house on the site.

Mr. Smith stated that he had been commissioned to do the drainage design and analysis, and they did two test holes, one adjacent to the bioretention area and one in the proposed trench for the roof runoff. The 6-foot open stone drip edge ran the length of the structure. They used the Cornell University extreme precipitation tables for rainfall data and did a hard design on the bioretention area as well. The completed area would look like a landscape island with a surface covered with bark mulch and planted with dogwood and winterberry. Mr. Smith discussed estimating groundwater elevations and said all of their features handled 100-year storm events. He talked about the scenarios under each rain storm event, touching on the reduction in overall flow. He had researched the FEMA flood plain, which was elevation 9 on the entire seacoast. The flood plain did not encroach in that location. The final item he researched was about putting a full basement underneath the house's living area, and he stated that it would not have much of an effect with ground water flow because the water would go around it.

Ms. Tanner asked if he had data showing the hydrology of the area. Mr. Smith stated that he did not because he looked at surface hydrology. Chairman Miller asked him to review surface flow on the lot, which he did. Ms. Stone asked what would happen in the basement if the water table was below 25 inches. Mr. Christian said the basement would have a sump pump to discharge water into the bioretention area. Ms. Stone asked if he did the calculations for the ground water. Mr. Smith said they would be ancillary. The basement would get water after a rain event, and even in the 100-year storm event, the elevation of the water in the bioretention pond itself would be 97 feet. The actual surface of the pond was 98.5 feet, with a 6" depressed area.

Vice-Chair Blanchard said she was concerned what the impact would be of cutting the trees down and doing the construction if there was a significant stand of woods behind the proposed location and the applicant moved the house into that back area. Mr. Smith replied that if the house were moved into the upper portion of the lot, it would require larger ponds because forested area would be taken down and replaced with grass, which would lead to a larger post-development flow. One tree would be removed for the house and infiltration trench construction. Vice-Chair Blanchard was concerned about the letter from Durbin Law Office from the Todds, who had requested a postponement so their expert could review the drainage analysis. She asked if Mr. Smith was familiar with the lots that the Todds owned. Attorney Pelech said the Todds' parcels fronted South Street.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion. Mr. Smith asked if it was a public hearing and could be opened up for public comment. Chairman Miller replied that he could open it to someone who had not previously spoken before, seeing it was the third time they had seen the petition.

Mr. Dan Chasen speaking on behalf of the Tucker family, who were the current owners, told the Commission that the Tuckers had listened to comments and had done additional work to allay concerns. The Tuckers house was the first house built on Brackett Road, and they bought the lot as an investment in 1980 and had since paid taxes on a buildable lot. The City built the path from New Castle Avenue to the school and brought in lots of gravel to build up the lot. Then the school was built, which created 2 million square feet of impervious surface within 100 yards of their house. When they heard the concerns from the abutters, they wanted to do the storm water drainage analysis. They would go to the Planning Board for a Conditional Use Permit. Over the passage of time, the zoning had changed and the wetland buffer encroached on their property. He believed the proposal was reasonable because it met the criteria.

Chairman Miller closed the public session and asked for a motion.

Ms. Tanner moved to deny the application for purposes of discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vandermark.

Ms. Tanner said it was clear that there was a lack of understanding about the value of wetland buffers. The reason for the Wetlands Ordinance was to protect aquifers. The Commission didn't understand anything about the hydrology of the area. They were not saying that nothing could be built on the lot, but what was proposed was not acceptable because the entire house was in the buffer. The Commission was charged with protecting the wetlands.

Chairman Miller stated that the alternative was to build the house outside the buffer, which meant a Conditional Use Permit would be needed to cut down the forest and get to the back end. He felt it didn't make sense not to approve the application for that particular lot because the effort had been made to minimize the impact. Vice-Chair Blanchard stated that she would not support the motion to deny. She understood and respected the charge of the Commission, but looking at the project's scope and impact, she appreciated the extra work the applicant had done.

Mr. Vandermark sympathized with the owners but felt that the Commission was being put in a position of making it right for them. Their role was to protect the buffer. Ms. Stone stated that she would support the motion because in her experience, whenever the water table was up in her basement, gallons of water were discharged, so she wasn't convinced.

Chairman Miller stated that they had a motion to fail and needed another motion. Vice-Chair Blanchard moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan.

The motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with conditions **failed** to pass by a vote of 3-3, with Chairman Miller, Vice-Chair Blanchard, and Ms. McMillan voting in favor and Mr. Vandermark, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Tanner voting opposed.

3. 59 Taft Road
Janis Hancock, owner, David Hancock, applicant
Assessor Map 251, Lot 11

The applicant, Mr. Hancock was present to speak to the application. He wanted approval for a deck to service a room that was their 12' x 22' home office. Egress was behind the house and the grade was 42" below the deck surface. As it went north, it sloped and came up to 18" from the deck. They wanted to wrap the deck to the back of the house so they could go into the garage. A portion of the deck was not in the buffer zone. If he were to build the whole deck outside the buffer area, they would have to walk down the stairs and walk up the slope to get to the property. There would be no impact except for the excavation by shovel where the sono tubes would be placed. There would be no landscaping on the back except for grass, and they would landscape with shrubbery in and around the deck.

A Commissioner asked what the vegetation looked like. Mr. Hancock said it was mature woodland to the north. Vice-Chair Blanchard knew the house because she lived near it and was comfortable with the application. Chairman Miller said there could be an issue with water dripping from the drip edge and suggested some gravel to prevent erosion. He added that smaller gravel would work well.

Vice Chair Blanchard made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tanner. There was no discussion. The motion passed with a unanimous 6-0 vote.

4. Commerce Way
Commerce Way, LLC, owner
Assessor Map 215, Lot 1, 1-1

Mr. Patrick Crimmins was present to speak to the presentation. He stated that there were no changes to the project. A private road would be turned over to the City and they had to soften the radius curve that would result in small wetland impact. There were 43 square feet of permanent impact to the wetland and 180 square feet behind the retaining wall construction. The project was within the buffer and would result in buffer improvements. They would remove about 6,000 square feet of impervious area and provide a wetland conservation seed mix. They came up with a design with the DPW where they would deviate from the City standard to provide a 20" sloped granite curb to allow a wildlife passage.

Ms. Tanner asked him how he would treat the invasives from the one area of the wetland. Mr. Crimmins replied that there were detailed instructions in the plan for an 11-step process. Mr. Britz added that it did meet the City's requirements for the road.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan. There was no discussion. The motion passed with a unanimous 6-0 vote.

5. 246 Jones Avenue
Clifton Wentworth, owner, Hebes Scrap Metal, LLC, applicant
Assessor Map 221, Lot 6

The geologist Mr. Steve Rickerich and the engineers Mr. Jay Johonnett and John Ouellette of Ransom Environmental, and Ms. Adele Fiorillo of Normandeau Associates were present to speak to the application. Mr. Rickerich said he had been hired because the project was routed through the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services to clean up historical contamination issues for the Wentworth Scrap Facility. It was an 8.2 acre parcel, and previous conditions were identified that needed to be reported to the DES, including contaminants typical of urban fill. The property had three ponds at one time, and the ponds and wetlands were filled with urban fill from the 1940s until the early 1960s. The fill was primarily sand and gravel mixed in with trace woods, scrap metal and urban renewal debris. They excavated test pits and found the majority of the contamination was in one area, and it was lead. Other locations were outside of the cap. They did a human health risk assessment and determined that the levels were acceptable from the standpoint of worker exposure but exceeded generic remediation standards. The risk assessment established a site-specific standard for lead, which was 742, so the remedial plan called for removing soils that had those contaminant levels or higher under the cap. The risk was human exposure. There were no impacts to groundwater from lead and most of the other contaminants. He discussed the other contaminants that included PCBs and stated that fairly low concentrations were found.

They also had surface standard issues that they would mitigate by placing them under a cap. Rainfall would impinge upon the cap and would be directed to two catch basins. He discussed the infiltration, detention area, and the water flow. Most of the contamination would be in a particular form and not dissolved, and the separator would remove the larger particulates. The plan also had a provision for secondary treatment, if needed.

Vice-Chair Blanchard presumed that Mr. Johonnett was familiar with Mr. Britz's memorandum that talked about the necessity for testing water leaving the site. Mr. Jay said he knew of the memorandum and said there would be a point source discharge that would fall under the EPA regulations. He talked about how often they would sample water events. The average depth of the water table was 5-1/2 feet before it got to pond level, which was around 10 feet. They fell under the AOT permitting requirements of 100,000 square feet.

Mr. Johonnett stated that upon the DES approval of their remedial action plan, they designed the cap system which consisted of 4" of asphalt pavement overlying 4" of gravel and the existing materials. He explained how they reworked the grades to provide a working cap area that the scrap metal activities would be conducted in. The asphalt pavement area would be capped, and the gravel on the north side would meet existing grades.

Mr. Vandermark asked if there were 10,000 square feet on the cap area, and Mr. Johonnett said it was 50,000 feet on the total cap area, roughly an acre. Mr. Vandermark asked if it was the working surface. Mr. Johonnett agreed.

Ms. Tanner asked if there would be old vehicles with gasoline or refrigerants and was told there would not. Chairman Miller asked if the maintenance of the separator was part of the plan and was told that it would be the facility operator's responsibility.

Ms. Fiorillo went over the various permits required, the location of the cap, and potential treatment options. The total buffer impacts were 24,930 square feet and some minor vegetation removal.

Chairman Miller verified that both areas where the soil would be removed were outside the forested area and asked what vegetation existed. He was told it was gravel area, field grass and lawn grass. Ms. McMillan asked how the property would be used during construction if it were shut down and was told that it would have to be worked out because it would be a negotiation between the owner and the facility operator.

Ms. Tanner made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. McMillan. There was no discussion. The motion passed with a unanimous 6-0 vote.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Discussion on PULA study and contiguous parcels to protect

The Commission decided to hold a work session in the near future to discuss the topic.

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 7:10 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 August 13, 2014.