



TOWN OF BOW

Conservation Commission

10 Grandview Road, Bow, New Hampshire 03304

Phone (603) 223-3970 Fax (603) 225-2982

Website: www.bownh.gov

Email: conservation@bownh.gov

Bow Conservation Commission

August 22, 2022

Approved Minutes

The regular meeting of the Bow Conservation Commission was held on Monday, August 22, 2022, at 7:00 PM in Room C of the Municipal Office building at 10 Grandview Road. Chair Sandy Crystall called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Members present: Sandy Crystall, Bob Ball, Dik Dagavarian, Alex Grene and Tina Blanks.

Aquarion Well Exploration

At 6 pm, a site walk was held regarding the Aquarion well exploration- Lot 56, Town Forest

Ms. Crystall recused herself (as a resident of the neighborhood served by the water system), and Mr. Ball acted as chair. Mr. Josh Davis of Aquarion Water Company presented and a map of the area was displayed.

Mr. Davis explained -- three existing wells serve the White Rock water community. Wells are burdened, down to 1-2 gallons per minute. Work has been done in the past to deepen them but hasn't improved the production. In 2004, a study was conducted to identify potential sources of water for the system. The system is in dire need of a more secure supply. If there is a leak of a couple of gallons a minute, it can require bulk delivery of water, which is costly.

Mr. Davis described that for the well exploration, Site A is the preferred site with access off of Page Rd. It will require about a 12 ft wide clearing to get through with a drill rig. Plan is to minimize disturbance. Mr. Davis described the path for the pipeline (not shown on the displayed map). If Site A does not produce sufficient water, they would investigate Site B and use that right-of-way. The idea is to do the work in a phased approach. If there is water, they would install a pipeline. If no water is found, they would clear area to check for water at Site B. They are hoping that this will provide a more reliable source for the community. Mr. Davis asked if there are any questions.

Mr. Tom O'Donovan, in the audience, asked where Site B was located. Mr. Davis noted the location on the displayed map. Mr. Ian Hanson from the audience asked about the number of wells that provide water currently. Mr. Davis stated that the three wells are located in the vicinity of the treatment facility. Mr. Ian Hanson, in the audience, asked if the existing wells would continue to operate. Mr. Davis responded that they may be able to take one of the wells offline. There's a new filtration system so there should be no additional treatment needed for an additional source. Mr. Hanson also asked about the distribution system. Mr. Davis noted that they continue to work on it; they have added isolation valves.

Ms. Cindy Klevens, in the audience and with the NH Dept. of Environmental Services (NHDES) Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau, mentioned that the system is a small community water system that is regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The state has enforcement against the system because of the lack of capacity. They have issued deficiencies for the system to have a corrective action plan. NHDES has not increased that enforcement because they are making progress

but it is not acceptable to sustain a community system with bulk water deliveries, which they had to do a couple of years ago. When those deliveries are needed over the winter months water can't be delivered if it is below a certain temperature, which happened in February 2019. The town emergency response was involved because if toilets can't be flushed it creates a sanitary emergency. The system has known for years that additional capacity was needed but this brought everything to a head. There was enforcement by NHDES. Abenaki applied to two funding sources to do this work -- not just the additional well source, it is improvements to the treatment. There are water quality issues in all of Bow, not just these wells. Ms. Klevens described that Abenaki has arsenic and manganese that they are treating. The arsenic standard was lowered from 10 ppb to 5 ppb (that treatment work has been completed). They did work on the storage tanks, and the next step is the wells. The piping needs to be upgraded. Ms. Klevens explained that these are 50 to 60 year old systems that are not any different than many other small community systems in the state that have reached their useful life and need the investment. The additional capacity is badly needed to be able to sustain the community. She offered to answer any other questions.

Mr. O'Donovan asked where the treatment shed and three wells are located and how deep the wells are. The parcel (60-M) was displayed on the screen. Mr. O'Donovan asked what alternatives to the town forest were considered. Mr. Davis responded that they looked at Turee Pond, but there were concerns because they were under the influence of the pond, there is a dump on the other side of the high school, as well as it being very distant from the treatment system and the elevational difference all created operational concerns. Two test wells are there from previous searches, but due to the issues, it was not considered. Property across White Rock Hill Road was looked at a long time ago, but people have since bought the land. The main two alternatives were lot 56 or Turee Pond.

Ms. Klevens noted that "groundwater under the influence" is prohibited for small water systems in the state because it requires another level of treatment. Mr. O'Donovan asked follow-up questions -- he asked about the two wells near Turee Pond. Mr. Davis responded that if lot 56 did not work out, they would re-test the wells near Turee Pond to verify that they are under the influence of the pond and identify any contaminants present. Mr. O'Donovan asked about how many people are served by the water system. Mr. Davis answered 96 houses, roughly 250 people. Ms. Sandy Crystall (resident) mentioned that at least one of the wells by Turee Pond had uranium in it. Mr. O'Donovan noted that it is pretty common. Ms. Klevens mentioned that contaminants are fine, but the influence of the surface water would be the issue. Mr. O'Donovan asked Mr. Davis if they were receiving any money from the state for this and how much they were receiving. Mr. Davis mentioned that they are receiving money from the SRF (State revolving fund) and the Trust Fund. Ms. Klevens answered that the total from the Trust Fund is about \$350,000 and the SRF may be another \$300,000 -- the majority is in loans with some grant funds. The community is not eligible for forgiveness. Mr. O'Donovan mentioned that he is from the Bow Drinking Water Protection Committee and comes from the water side of NHDES. He feels very strongly that what they are doing is the right thing but running a 12-foot right-of-way through the middle of a portion of town forest to serve 100 homes does not strike him as a good idea and that Aquarion should have looked at private land much more seriously. Mr. Davis mentioned the issue was protection of the radius as there was a nearby private well that was better than theirs; it crossed their minds to purchase the house. but to get the protective radius would require purchasing three or four houses to get rid of the septic tanks and the proximity of the road was an issue. For lot 56, there is already a logging road so there is not much clearing to do for Site A. From Site A to B, that is currently a walking path. Ms. Klevens mentioned that the clearing would be a temporary impact for the drill rig. Mr. O'Donovan mentioned that there is a right of way needed for the pipe. Ms. Klevens mentioned that there is narrower equipment that has to dig for that. Mr. O'Donovan mentioned that the fairly small town parcel is being dissected in a fairly obtrusive manner. He is supportive of the work that is being done, but not bisecting a town forest. He suggested that perhaps there should be some mitigation for the town forest to offset the impact to that

parcel (such as funds for other town forests). Ms. Crystall added that one of the issues is that Aquarion and Abenaki did not own it "way back when" -- it was relatively recently purchased by Aquarion. Over time, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has said to the owner that work had to be done to identify additional sources of water because it has been an issue for more than 20 years. The company at the time hired Emery and Garrett and did the report and submitted it to the PUC. Ms. Crystall described it as being like homework, the box was checked and it was done and nobody follows up at a later time. When there is another rate increase that the questions about the water supply is asked again. She described that the land was available across the street at approximately the same elevation. She didn't think that anyone went across the street to talk to the landowner.

Ms. Klevens stated that the acquisition by Aquarion was just last year. Before that it was New England Water Services and before that it was a private owner. It was always regulated by the PUC but it had been a small NH company.

Mr. Hanson asked if any additional houses were added in the past 20 years. Ms. Crystall said "one." Ms. Crystall explained that there are about 10 houses that have their own wells. The development was done in three stages. For the first two stages, the town's requirement was for one-acre lots. For the third stage, the lot size requirement was two acres. Some of those two-acre lots have private wells, for pools, etc. Adding private wells on the smaller lots would not be possible.

Mr. Ball mentioned the phasing and asked Ms. Klevens to address the process. She responded by stating that this phase has to include the access line because there is no point in drilling if they can't get the water to the system. It is a one-time approval, you can drill and put the pipeline in -- or not. The environmental review is underway, which includes the review by the Conservation Commission. One of the state requirements is to get local approval in addition to the state agency approval. Once that is completed, any additional local requirements, like the wetland conditional use permit, would need to be done before any clearing or drilling begins. In response to Mr. Ball's question about what needs approval, Ms. Klevens stated that the Conservation Commission would need to be in agreement about the work that need to be done (drilling and water supply access) for Sites A and B. The environmental review is not done in phases, it covers all the possibilities. The hope is that it will be the preferred site. Ms. Klevens confirmed that the drilling would occur after the environmental review is approved, and the environmental review cannot be completed without the town's approval.

Mr. O'Donovan asked Ms. Crystall if there are wetlands on the site. She responded yes, today Josh sent a map that the shows work in the buffer -- and at the top of the map (site B), it shows a wetland crossing and may be a stream, which could have other considerations from NHDES in terms of a wetlands permit. Ms. Crystall asked Mr. Davis about the access by Site B and could one side of the wetland/stream be accessed from the road in the development (not shown on the provided map). Ms. Crystall suggested that the map should show all the parcels around it. There may be opportunity for less impact and maybe even not require a wetland permit.

Mr. Dagavarian asked about the location of the access area and to identify on the displayed map where the access is located. Ms. Klevens noted that in the earlier evaluation, the right-of-way access was not feasible due to the terrain (some boulders). Ms. Crystall displayed the town parcel map that shows the lot 56, the right of way and stream. Mr. Davis described the drill rig paths that they considered.

Ms. Crystall asked if they cleared the path from site A to site B, how much of that area could be restored after the drilling. Mr. Davis noted that all of the area cleared could be restored as they would not be putting anything in that area. Ms. Crystall mentioned the issue of creating openings and people making trails in cleared areas. Mr. Ball asked about the location of the pipeline access from Site B. Mr. Davis mentioned that it would be north of the right-of-way. They would follow existing trails. Mr. Dagavarian noted that they would be cutting through the wetlands one way or the other.

Mr. O'Donovan noted that it looked like Site A was near a vernal pool and asked if there would be a monitoring requirement. Ms. Crystall responded that there could be. She noted that she has been there and the hydroperiod may be too short for it to be used routinely as a vernal pool. It is fairly shallow and the water doesn't last very long. She was there several times in 2021. It could be monitored but you would not want to poke a hole in it, it may be a perched water table, if you wanted to measure the water elevation, although there may be other ways to measure water elevation.

Mr. Davis mentioned that it sounds like he needs to come back with additional information, clarify more things, get the pipeline delineated, more conclusive reasons about the accesses evaluated and have that considered for a future vote. Mr. Ball and Mr. Dagavarian agreed with that approach since it is the full approval that was needed. Mr. Ball noted that per the town regulations a Wetland conditional use permit is required for activities that make any changes to the water table. They would have to go before the Planning Board for a wetland CUP. In response to a question from Mr. Davis, the town approval would be needed for the environmental review to be finalized.

Mr. Ball noted that he understands the need. He also mentioned the issue of the timing as the access agreement expires in November. Mr. Davis asked about whether a conditional approval is something that is possible. Mr. Ball responded that we can't approve something that requires the Planning Board approval. When he comes back to another meeting with more information, the Commission can review it.

Ms. Crystall noted that the wetlands shown on the plan were those proposed for impacts, while all the wetlands should be shown. To get a wetland permit all the wetlands will need to be shown, including the stream, to demonstrate the least impacting alternative.

Mr. Ball mentioned capacity -- at what point do the neighbors learn about what happens to the aquifer and wells in the area. Ms. Klevens mentioned that is part of the state's well permitting process, when they do the pumping test, they limit the capacity of the amount that is pumped depending on the impact. Private wells within the 1,000-foot radius are monitored for water levels. If there were any impacts, they would have to scale back how much they can pump.

Mr. Ball asked if there is a public hearing to tell that to all abutters. Ms. Klevens responded that there is a notification requirement to those in that radius. The environmental review has a public comment period of 30 days. That is not issued to residents but published in the newspaper one day.

Mr. O'Donovan asked Ms. Crystall how many lots are going in for the Page Road subdivision? Ms. Crystall answered 17.

Mr. Ball asked about the aquifer and any hazardous waste concerns. Ms. Klevens responded that it is part of the state well siting, the potential contamination survey. Mr. Ball asked about tabling this until next month. Mr. Davis described the list of needed items: Site A, Site B, both pipelines, what they are impacting and why the routes were chosen and alternatives.

Mr. Ball asked if a month was enough and Mr. Davis said it will have to be.

Mr. O'Donovan asked about getting information about potential mitigation for the impacts to bisect the parcel. Ms. Crystall mentioned restoration of route in from Page Road. Mr. O'Donovan asked about how often they would need to get to the wells. Mr. Davis responded a utility truck to perform maintenance vs. equipment for fracking later.

Ms. Klevens mentioned that all the costs have to be justified to the PUC and this is one of the highest (cost) water utilities in the state, close to \$2,000. Any costs put into the system are borne by the ratepayers. Ms. Klevens noted that there's a bigger picture -- the town's Planning Board approvals. Why did they approve this one and the one across the street. If we box this system in without enough water, what are the alternatives? Driving the community to private wells would not be a good

outcome. The municipal system could construct pipelines to the schools and this development is in the proximity. The cost to bring water line from Route 3A into town is prohibitive and not likely in the near-term future.

Mr. Ball asked about funds going into this project. Could any mitigation money come out of the grants. Ms. Klevens responded the money they have is to do the improvements -- they have done the treatment and the storage tanks, now they are doing the well and will be doing the piping improvements. If there is any leftover, which there may not be, they would likely need additional funding. Mr. Grene suggested that it would be nice to see potential mitigation planning at the same time as this and how much information we can reasonably demand and can be pulled together and how accurate it will be, for four weeks from now.

Mr. Davis gave a brief summary of what he believed needed to be addressed based on the discussion and comments, address Sites A, B, mitigation efforts to offset the proposed work and provide info on proposed life cycle like 50 years-- how this lot will handle the footprint.

Mr. Ball noted also a better look at the lot in terms of the wetlands locations, Mr. Grene noted addressing the least impactful way to site the work. Ms. Crystall noted that for a wetlands permit he will have to do that.

Ms. Crystall returned to run the remainder of the meeting at 7:52 pm.

Coastal Forest Products – Map 45 Block 2, Lot 173. Proposed expansion project and potential wetlands mitigation.

Nick Golon presented and provided apologies for the Coastal Forest Products (CFP) representative not being present.

Mr. Golon handed out a map of the concept. Ms. Crystall displayed the parcel in from the Town's online GIS. Mr. Golon also provided a single hard copy of the pre-application report for NHDES. Ms. Crystall asked if the Commission could get a digital copy and Mr. Golon indicated that we could.

Mr. Golon described the CFP Site is on 652 River Road, 200,000 SF building. The storage needs have changed -- now some materials are stored inside and others are stored outside. They need more environmentally safe area and not subject to the weather -- thus need for expansion. It will provide improved safety for employees in paved stockyard palleted areas.

Mr. Golon explained that a focus of the project is to expand the use of the rail spur on site. It has the dual benefit of being the most cost-effective way to bring materials to the site as well as benefits to the carbon footprint due to the removal of trucks from the road.

Mr. Golon described the site, existing maintenance fuel shed, and the area for proposed work is toward the north part of the site, where there is an elevational difference of 60 feet., which they need to maintain a common elevation with the expansion. At the NW part of site, there is an existing wetland area hillside and "naturalized wetland" was created when excavated since the 1960s. He described the surface water features and wetlands (including a vernal pool) and origins of them. The larger wetland, area where they are expecting the impacts, and peripheral impacts to the ephemeral stream. The goal is to recreate the functional elements of the wetland -- toxicant removal, flood storage, although they can't recreate the wildlife habitat, also concern for rare and endangered species. The NHB DataCheck revealed eastern hog-nosed snake, black racer, New England cottontail, Blanding's turtle.

Mr. Golon described the original plan that was plan presented to NHDES -- similar to the plan he provided at the meeting -- but had greater impacts. They had proposed a paved access road which has been removed from the revised proposed plan. Fish and Game had concerns. The revised plan removed the access drive and also added stormwater treatment for the currently untreated SW part of

the site. The existing wetland will be left in its natural state. They will restore the vegetation by the ephemeral streams to minimize them washing out. He briefly described the onsite stormwater management and described the paved stockyard area that will drain into forebays or bioretention areas to mimic existing wetland functions to be impacted.

Mr. Golon described the proposal as phased. The first phase is the paved stockyard, accounts for just over 13 acres. Phase 2 is a little less than 100,000 sf building (reduced from 125,000 due to wetland impacts). Additional future phases include trailer storage, and maintenance building among other components. The largest element is making sure that where the stockyard is added is conducive to use of the rail spur. 100 linear feet of rail will be added.

Mr. Golon noted that because the impact is a little over 78,000 SF (1.8 ac), over the 10,000 SF threshold, mitigation will be required. They reviewed the information on our website relative to the inventory of sites to protect in town and cross referenced that with sites that are available for sale. They are hoping in addition to get feedback on the project, further discussion on mitigation opportunities. If there are parcels that the town has been looking to conserve, they want to work with the commission to acquire that for conservation. Relative to the impact, the need is for a minimum of 20 acres, could be a much larger parcel and they conserve one element of it.

Mr. Golon noted that they wanted to get the Commission's feedback on the project, the large wetland impact, and the functions, draft wildlife habitat assessment. They used the recently completed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI), unfragmented lands map, conservation focus areas map, and focused on areas closest to the project. Ms. Crystall mentioned that as the NRI was being done, the conservation focus areas were developed. Some parcels that the Commission has been interested in, but reaching multiple owners has been a challenge. The commission has not been aggressive in reaching out since the NRI was completed.

Mr. Golon, stated that they are offering to assist with such activity. In-lieu fee is a potential option but they have to exhaust other resources first. The site has some wetlands that have been disturbed and will be restored and are looking for offsite land protection.

Ms. Crystall mentioned lining up parcels that match the functions and values that are lost. Mr. Golon mentioned that they looked at the resources list relative to the functions and values. Relative to the functions they are losing, the correlation to the land the Commission is looking to conserve is well addressed. The one element to address is where endangered species are on a given parcel, those known to locate in the vicinity.

Mr. Golon asked, since the project's impacts will generate a sizeable area and large-enough in-lieu fee, do they pay the \$400,000 to write a check (to the ARM fund) or find a 20 - 40 acre parcel to conserve here for 1.8 ac of wetland impact?

Mr. Ball asked about the need for the property to be "in the vicinity" Mr. Golon responded, it has to be in the same watershed. Mr. Golon mentioned that they looked at those properties in the vicinity, closest to the project location. Conservation Focus Area (CFA) 14 is just off the far (west) side of I-93. Mr. Ball asked if it would be an easement or outright purchase. Mr. Golon responded that it could be either. The CFA 14 is labeled as "adjacent to Robinson Rd" which is adjacent to existing conservation land on the east side of Robinson Road. There are multiple parcels within the area. Mr. Golon asked if canvassing the areas of 7, 15 and 16, can he have their real estate agents focus their efforts on those areas.

Other parcels were discussed and Ms. Crystall mentioned taking some time to look more closely at parcels. She noted that the CFAs took into account Natural Heritage Bureau data (rare species) when they were created.

Mr. Golon mentioned that they have two parcels to start with. This is not going to be a short process. Their expectation is that an application would likely be forthcoming to the town in the next month or so and also the state. Mr. Golon described the timeline. They expect to submit application in the next 30-45 days in terms of the wetlands permit. They will note that they are working with us for conservation land. He will use some of the guidance discussed this evening. He wanted ensure that they are transparent. Ms. Crystall asked about the timing between the town's site plan review and Wetlands CUP relative to the state permits. Mr. Golon answered that they are trying to run everything parallel.

Mr. Golon asked if he can send updated information or questions to Ms. Crystall. Ms. Crystall indicated that an additional Conservation Commission meeting can be scheduled in between the regular schedule if there is a topic that needs review.

Application #408-22- Nancy Stern-Paulenka & Steven Paulenka

Eric Mitchell, agent for the Paulenka Wetland CUP, presented on this project.

Ms. Crystall mentioned that she was not able to attend the Planning Board meeting and the streaming was not available. She asked if the Planning Board took action on it. Mr. Mitchell replied that they did. Mr. Mitchell reviewed information about the project and the site walk on August 13.

Mr. Mitchell described that the Planning Board reviewed the information and granted the Wetland CUP. He came because he was on the agenda. He had shown up the evening the Commission's meeting had been cancelled. He is present if there is any additional input needed. The Planning Board granted the CUP based on the plan submitted. He mentioned that the area next to the small wetland has been a woods road for many years. Raleigh Tobine had owned the property for many years. In 2019, after the house was subdivided from the rest of the property, they upgraded the roadway that was there, added reclaimed pavement and replaced culvert that was in the area where the 12-inch culvert had been replaced. No additional changes to the road are planned except for the construction of the house at the top of the hill.

Mr. O'Donovan asked about the issue raised by Planning Board member Adam Sandahl at the site walk, that a temporary forestry road was converted into a driveway and asked if that was that permissible in terms of a wetland permit.

Ms. Crystall responded that it was that situation that resulted in the need for the Wetland CUP, as it was a change in use. She mentioned that the culvert appeared to be installed for drainage and wasn't a wetland culvert. There are times when a cross culvert is installed to address the drainage coming off the hill, there may not be any channel. She believed that was the situation. By installing a forestry road, and subsequently converting it, there is the potential for getting around the permitting requirement (but no wetland crossing was present at the Paulenka site).

Ms. Crystall shared that after the site walk, she did some research with GIS/ georeferencing the plan and aerial imagery, as there were no stakes by the lower pond that showed the wetland boundary. The aerial image seemed to show that the road was about 90 feet from the pond to the road. Given the buffer is 75 feet and extended just short of the road, the delineation on the plan would indicate that about 20 feet of vegetation beyond the pond is wetland. She had raised the question of the wetland delineation in the area of the pond, so that was addressed.

Ms. Crystall noted that she had been curious about the agricultural pond farther up the hill, because it is likely not an agricultural pond anymore. The pond seems to take water off the hillside, but the way it was built, it didn't seem to have any access to use the water for agricultural use. The zoning ordinance does have an exemption for buffers on agricultural ponds, but the pond doesn't seem to be in use.

Mr. Mitchell mentioned that there is a trail to the berm of the pond. Ms. Crystall mentioned that all three members of the Conservation Commission that attended the site walk had taken that trail to view the pond (which was dry). Mr. Mitchell mentioned that Raleigh Tobine had built/used the pond for agricultural purposes. Mr. Mitchell noted that it does not hold much water now, but was still identified as a wetland.

Ms. Crystall asked if there were any questions about the site/ wetland CUP, and there was no response. She apologized for the cancellation and his attempt to attend the meeting last week.

Potential land conservation

Ms. Crystall invited guest, Ian Hanson, to speak regarding potential land conservation. Ms. Crystall mentioned that Ian was interested in protecting the land and what the options and process may be. His family owns land (three lots that total about 20 acres) on Birchdale Rd. Ms. Crystall displayed the Bow parcel maps. The parcels are near the location where Mr. Ball has sampled in White Brook. At least one parcel abuts town conservation land. He wanted to see what the options are. Ms. Crystall noted that much of the area is within prime wetlands and there is the requirement for 50% upland for NHDES land conservation mitigation options. Ms. Crystall asked about preference for donation vs. purchase. The front lot, which has a small upland area, the preference is for purchase. Ms. Crystall displayed the flood map layer over the parcels, which indicates a large part of the parcel. Mr. Hanson is interested in having the land be protected for the future.

Ms. Crystall describe the process for the town to acquire land and place an easement on it. There has been no survey on the property to Mr. Hanson's knowledge. This would be required for any acquisition.

Ms. Crystall suggested that he seek information from the Natural Heritage Bureau via the DataCheck report to learn of any rare species documented in the area. As a landowner the review is free of charge. Mr. Hanson will follow up to submit the request for the review.

Mr. Ball asked if he was considering an easement and if that would satisfy his goal. There was some discussion and the option of an easement to Bow Open Space was also a possibility that would satisfy his interest in long-term protection. Mr. Hanson mentioned his appreciation of the land -- and the Turee Island area.

Mr. Ball noted the Commission has started monitoring White Brook. NH Fish and Game has done fish shocking and there are native brook trout present. Mr. Hanson mentioned that he is a fly fisherman and he can appreciate their value. He was interested in being "on the Commission's radar."

Turee Pond- VLAP and White Brook VRAP

Mr. Ball reviewed the sampling work. The VLAP sampling was completed for Turee Pond. Not all the data have been received and reviewed. They sampled during three sessions over the summer, including during the NHDES biologist's visit when she sampled the phytoplankton. The conductivity data -- looking the chloride at the sites-- are looking the same. White Rock Road culvert continues to be elevated. The one site that continues to be significantly elevated is the inflow to the town pond. Mr. Ball mentioned that an additional sampling site was added at the outlet of Turee Pond which Mr. Dagavarian has accessed with his kayak.

Ms. Crystall reviewed the phosphorus data locations for the higher readings. NHDES will produce the annual report and provide summary information to us. Ms. Crystall asked if Mr. Ball would have the NHDES reports and Fish and Game bathymetry map printed and laminated and bring in the receipt.

Mr. Ball mentioned the three measurements done on White Brook using the VRAP protocols (Volunteer River Assessment Program). Most of the measurements are done in the field; five

parameters are measured: turbidity, pH, DO, specific conductivity, and temperature. The data goes into the state database. Eight White Book sites were sampled three times. Phosphorus samples were taken at all the sites in one round. In July and August, he sampled phosphorus at the two downstream sites, Birchdale Rd and Branch Londonderry Rd. Ms. Crystall mentioned that the monitoring of White Brook came out of the Turkey River Watershed Restoration Plan, as White Brook eventually flows into the Turkey River and there was limited data on the inlets. The focus is on nutrients, which is why the phosphorus is being sampled. Ms. Crystall recognized Mr. Ball 's work sampling.

Invasive Species Grant

Ms. Crystall mentioned that it is time to apply for the invasive species grant. There has been no milfoil in the pond since the second treatment last year, as confirmed by Mr. Ball and Mr. Dagavarian. Mr. Ball noted that the water elevation in the pond is way down due to the drought.

Ms. Crystall noted the concerns about the *Phragmites* (Common reed) growing along some of the shoreline and the beaver that is cutting stems and leaving the cut stems, which grow roots and get rooted in the ground. Ms. Crystall found a piece near the Turee Bog.

Robertson Trail

Ms. Crystall noted that for the two culverts that need to be replaced, the town forester, Ron Klemarczyk's proposed quote included using smaller plastic culverts for replacement, rather than the same size (18 inch) corrugated metal culverts. For NHDES permitting, replace in-kind or better is needed. Mr. Grene asked about the lifespan of the metal culverts. Ms. Crystall responded that the current ones have likely been there for more than 20 years. The cost of the 18 inch corrugated metal culverts was quoted as \$810.50 each, which would add \$1,621.00 to the cost of the Robertson Trail rehabilitation. Ms. Blanks asked about the difference between the plastic and metal ones. Ms. Crystall answered that Mr. Klemarczyk had noted that the plastic culverts require more fill on top for support. Some people like the plastic because they don't rust. They are smooth and the water runs through them quickly, which can create problems of erosion. Wildlife have trouble navigating through them. The corrugated metal are better, unless a large concrete one is in order.

Mr. Klemarczyk's original quote did not include the cost of the two replacement ones (because he was going to use available pipes at no charge).

Mr. Dagavarian made a motion to authorize the funds (\$1,621) for the two metal corrugated culverts, Mr. Grene duly seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Culvert approaches for grants

Ms. Crystall mentioned Mr. Ball's raising the issue of the poor culvert on Londonderry Branch Tpk, which we now know the Class 6 road has been designated an emergency lane (thus allowing the town to spend funds to maintain its safety).

Ms. Crystall mentioned that with the culvert replacement options, we need to look at which will be the best for getting us funding. NHDES looks at how many more miles are unobstructed stream are opened by the culvert improvement. Some of the culverts we have discussed could be important, but if it opens up only a short distance, it may be better to look at improving another one that may be able to result in grant money from the ARM Fund from NHDES.

Ms. Crystall shared information about a former Nature Conservancy staff person, now working independently, who has done such work. She spoke with Pete Steckler of Northeast Conservation Services about doing some work to identify culverts and come up with a strategy for the best approach, prioritize our culverts for which to focus on. Some of the culverts are identified as being an issue in the town's hazard mitigation plan, such as the culvert on White Rock Hill Rd, which has

flooded and carries a stream into Turee Pond, so opening it up for fish would also provide the benefit of reducing sediment in the system and reduce nutrients.

Ms. Crystall mentioned that by hiring him to do some work that will help us identify culverts for replacement. We envision coordinating with Tim Sweeney and Lee Kimball -- especially with the infrastructure money that is available let's try to make sure we get it and it addresses wildlife and aquatic organism passage and water quality.

Mr. Ball mentioned that the Commission needs professional help to get traction on this because staff have not enough time to do this and write the grants to get the funds. Ms. Crystall mentioned that Mr. Steckler had been on the Site Selection Committee for the ARM Fund grants. He is familiar with the process and how that works. His fee is \$125/hour for doing a strategy -- would be about \$4,000 for a week's work, which should be able to propel us forward, if members support this, I will speak with Tim and Lee to find out about better coordinating and let them know that we are interested in doing this. Mr. Ball indicated that it would be well worth the money to do this.

Ms. Crystall mentioned her discussion with Mr. Steckler and he asked about the Commission providing a draft scope of work to start off. Mr. Ball discussed spending up to \$4,000. Ms. Crystall described some of the process for a contract; need to confirm who can sign. Mr. Ball asked, what is needed to get it moving. Ms. Crystall mentioned that we need to decide what the end product will look like in terms of usability. Mr. Ball is interested in seeing that someone can carry this through to write the grant(s), since there is no support from the town for writing the grants. Mr. Ball noted that the value to the town would be larger than \$4,000 if this work results in get some grants.

Ms. Crystall had mentioned that Mr. Steckler suggested that it would be good to get money, like \$50,000 in the CIP (Capital Investment Plan) that could be match for other funds that are coming in, or there may be a small amount of engineering by the town engineer to support a grant application. Budget season is underway now. Mr. Ball asked about the timing for the infrastructure money, it is likely pretty fast moving.

Mr. Grene made a motion to investigate further on this effort. Mr. Ball duly seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

DHL warehouse - F&G - easement on land

This is for the project that has come before the Conservation Commission (and a site walk was done). The packet has the conservation easement language for an acre and a half of land adjacent to a stream, as required by NH Fish and Game.

Logging Salvage

One of the great things that Ron did relative to the Eversource clearing of its right of way. The logs are left as they are the property of the landowner. The landowners may have been notified but it wasn't the Conservation Commission. Ron got a logger go in a check the clearings on town property. The pine was bug infested but the oak was in good condition. We will be getting a check for about \$2,800 net proceeds from that effort. Ms. Crystall thanked Ron for taking the initiative.

Upcoming annual meeting with Chairs

Ms. Crystall mentioned the annual meeting of the chairs with the Select Board and provide a summary of the year's effort. Ms. Crystall will put together the information in draft. She will also submit the written version to the Select Board.

Mr. Ball mentioned that maybe the first issue on the annual report is to get administrative support for the Commission. Ms. Crystall mentioned that a support person has been hired for the Planning Board.

The Commission need support not only for the minutes but to assemble and post the minutes and packet and any other items for its web page.

The June 13, 2022 minutes were reviewed. *Ms. Blanks made a motion to approve the minutes, duly seconded by Mr. Dagavarian, motion passed, 3-0 with 2 abstentions.*

The July 18, 2022 minutes were reviewed. *Mr. Grene made a motion to approve the minutes, duly seconded by Mr. Ball, Motion passed unanimously.*

Mr. Grene made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Ball. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.