



**LEBANON CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**JANUARY 13, 2022 - 6:30 PM**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL OR**  
**REMOTE VIA VIRTUAL PLATFORM**  
**LEBANONNH.GOV/LIVE**

- 
- 1. Call to Order**
  - 2. Approval of Minutes**
    - A. November 30, 2021
    - B. December 9, 2021
  - 3. Permit Review**
    - A. None
  - 4. Study Items**
    - A. 2022 Goal Setting (45 mins)
    - B. Ticknor Conservation Area - Property Overview & Discussion (30 mins)
  - 5. Committee Reports**
    - A. **Reports from other committees:**
      - Conservation Lands Monitors (Various Members) (10 Minutes)
      - Lebanon Biodiversity Group (D. Lacey) (10 Minutes)
      - Workshops & Educational Opportunities (Various Members) (10 Minutes)
  - 6. Other Business**
  - 7. Future Agenda Items**
  - 8. Open to the Public**
  - 9. Adjournment**

**The order of agenda items is subject to change.**

Meetings are open for in-person and remote attendance. Members of the public that wish to attend remotely may do so by going to [LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://LebanonNH.gov/Live) where you will find instructions on how to enter the meeting. Members of the public will be able to participate and ask questions through the City's virtual platform or by phone. Please note: Should technical difficulties occur during the meeting that disrupts virtual or phone connection(s), the meeting will continue without remote access capabilities.

**Agenda  
Conservation Commission  
January 13, 2022**

**Agenda Item #2A  
Approval of Minutes**

**November 30, 2021**

DRAFT

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Remote Via Microsoft Teams  
LebanonNH.gov/Live  
November 30, 2021  
6:30 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ernst Oidtmann (Chair), Sarah Riley (Vice Chair), Donald Lacey, Barbara Hirai (Alt.), Bruce James, Susan Almy, Chris Johnson,

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Megan Smith (Alt.) Erling Heistad, Darla Bruno (Alt.)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Goodwin (GIS Coordinator)

---

1 **1. CALL TO ORDER – Chair Oidtmann called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM**

2  
3 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None**

4  
5 **3. PERMIT REVIEW**

6 **A. Review and Comment on NHDES Wetland Standard Dredge and Fill Application**  
7 **(Major Impact) associated with the long-term mining of the Lebanon Crushed Stone**  
8 **Quarry, operated by Pike Industries at 335 Plainfield Road in West Lebanon. The**  
9 **existing active quarry, totaling approximately 57 acres, will expand to an overall**  
10 **total size of approximately 250 acres (the continued mining area) as currently**  
11 **approved by AOT Permit AOT-0709B. A total of 110,413 SF (2.53 ac) of wetland**  
12 **located in the continued mining area will be permanently impacted, including 3**  
13 **vernal pools. (30 minutes) - Continued from November 18, 2021 See application**  
14 **information there.**

15 Ms. Almy stated that she is concerned that the project will create a cliff, leading down  
16 approximately 500' in shelves, and that there will be no area left for possible reclamation.

17 It was noted that there is a proposed grading plan for the site and that there will not be a cliff, but  
18 terraced areas in a manner consistent with the Alteration of Terrain (AOT) permit. There is an  
19 area of wetlands in the middle of the property that is proposed to be removed. The finished  
20 condition of the quarry shows a proposed elevation similar to that of Plainfield Road, with  
21 sloping along the sides. The AOT permit requires that the site be stabilized and vegetated as  
22 terracing continues. The long-term process for the site will take place over decades and consists  
23 of removing some land, grading the slopes of the side of the property, digging down to the next  
24 layer, and repeating this process. Another part of the AOT permit requires internal drainage  
25 conditions on the site. The AOT permit looks to minimize offsite changes in drainage and  
26 proposes to keep conditions similar to preexisting conditions in terms of drainage, erosion  
27 controls, sediment, etc.

1 Vice Chair Riley noted that it is difficult to know how the drainage modifications will impact the  
2 wetlands in the area immediately around the site. She stated that there may be value in  
3 reclaiming the site as a habitat for wildlife species.

4 It was noted that part of the AOT permit application involves coordination with Fish & Game  
5 and the Heritage Bureau.

6 Ms. Hirai stated that the areas to the north and south of this site may need to be protected if  
7 surface and groundwaters are going to be directed onsite.

8 In response to a question from Ms. Almy, the applicant noted that the processed water from the  
9 site is diverted onto nearby parcel 128-11.

10 Mr. Goodwin noted that it is likely that other groups are reviewing some of these items, such as  
11 the AOT permit, so that the Commission may not need to delve as deeply into it. He explained  
12 that three areas of importance for the Commission are which wetlands on site are being  
13 impacted, why these impacts cannot be avoided, and what the applicant is planning to do to  
14 mitigate these impacts.

15 In response to a question from the Commission, Brendan Quigley, Wetland Scientist of Gove  
16 Environmental Services, Inc., explained that there will be a requirement for a public hearing as  
17 part of this process. It is yet unclear if this public hearing will be held remotely, or at an office in  
18 Concord.

19 Ms. Hirai pointed out that a City parcel directly to the east of the site includes a small area of  
20 land that is owned by the Conservation Commission. There may be a small vernal pool in this  
21 area. She asked about potential impacts to the vernal pool due to potential drainage changes on  
22 site. Mr. Quigley explained that there is long-term monitoring proposed pre- and post-  
23 construction for this project to make sure there are no impacts and, if impacts are discovered,  
24 there is compensatory mitigation for these items.

25 Vice Chair Riley expressed concern regarding submitting comments on the site to DES without  
26 ever having seen the site.

27 It was noted that two of the wetlands on site are being avoided, as part of the mitigation plan.  
28 These wetlands will also be monitored long-term, as part of the monitoring plan. The  
29 Commission could make a condition to require that these two wetlands be avoided and are  
30 monitored long-term to maximize the protection of the wetlands functions and values. This  
31 would be a comment submitted to DES that could carry weight as part of the permitting process.

32 In response to a question from Chair Oidtmann, Mr. Quigley stated that the timing for the public  
33 hearing will depend on the process of comment and response on the application. It is possible  
34 that the public hearing would take place in February.

35 Chair Oidtmann stated that the Commission would like to recommend long-term monitoring of  
36 the wetlands on site, possible reclamation of the wetlands, that impacts to the two wetlands on

the eastern side of the site be avoided, an investigation as to if the 50' buffer is adequate, and to examine the hydrological impact of the project to the whole surrounding area.

Vice Chair Riley suggested some possible conditions, including: 1) avoid impacts to the two wetlands on the eastern side of the site, 2) check if long-term monitoring is adequate for this project, 3) examine if the 50' buffer is adequate, 4) look into concerns regarding the wetlands and vernal pools on adjacent parcels, 5) examine if the site could be managed for wildlife due to the potential value of quarry sites for amphibian and reptile species, 6) to see if the reclamation plan can be modified to include wetland and wildlife habitats on the site, 7) examine hydrological impacts from the project to the conservation parcel on the City's land directly to the east of the site, 8) examine impacts of the largescale project on the hydrology of the surrounding landscape, 9) check with DES regarding how to protect surrounding wetland ecosystems.

Mr. Quigley explained that avoidance of certain wetlands and minimizing impacts to surrounding areas are at the core of the permitting requirements.

The Commission discussed that a similar project completed by Pike Industries in Hooksett had a three-pronged approach for mitigation, including a compensatory mitigation payment, the preservation of a 140-acre parcel and management of 1.4 acres of turtle habitat, and a one-time stewardship payment to the Hooksett Conservation Commission.

Mr. Quigley noted that this project placed land into an existing conservation parcel. It is preferred that a regional land trust be the steward for this type of preservation. There is also preference to use in lieu fees, instead of creating new wetlands on sites for mitigation.

Mr. Quigley explained that between each 50' raised terrace area is a space of approximately 75'.

It was noted that the process from here involves the Commission submitting comments to the DES, which will be processed and then passed along to the applicant.

Vice Chair Riley stated that she would like it to be noted to DES that Commissioners have not yet been on site to see the area. Also, that while internal drainage is a requirement of the project, it may not be of a benefit to the integrity of offsite wetlands. Possible connectivity between the terraces or examining the impact of the terraces on wildlife access, was also mentioned.

**Mr. Lacey *MOVED* to recommend to DES the approval of the application for the Lebanon Crushed Stone Quarry, operated by Pike Industries at 335 Plainfield Road in West Lebanon. The existing active quarry, totaling approximately 57 acres, will expand to an overall total size of approximately 250 acres (the continued mining area) as currently approved by AOT Permit AOT-0709B. A total of 110,413 SF (2.53 ac) of wetland located in the continued mining area will be permanently impacted, including 3 vernal pools, with the following conditions of approval:**

- 1) to avoid impacts to the two wetlands on the eastern side of the site,**
- 2) to examine if long-term monitoring is adequate for this project,**
- 3) to examine if the 50' buffer is adequate,**

1 4) to look into concerns regarding the wetlands and vernal pools on adjacent parcels,  
2 5) to examine if the site could be managed for wildlife due to the potential value of quarry  
3 sites for amphibian and reptile species,  
4 6) to see if the reclamation plan can be modified to include wetland and wildlife habitats on  
5 the site,  
6 7) to examine hydrogeological impacts from the project to the conservation parcel on the  
7 City's land directly to the east of the site,  
8 8) to examine impacts of the largescale project on the hydrogeology of the surrounding  
9 landscape,  
10 9) to check with DES regarding how to protect surrounding wetland ecosystems  
11 To also note to DES that Commissioners have not yet been on site to see the area; that,  
12 while internal drainage is a requirement of the project, it may not be of a benefit to the  
13 integrity of offsite wetlands; to examine possible connectivity between the terraces or  
14 examine the impact of the terraces on wildlife access; and to site the NH Wildlife Action  
15 Plan which shows highly ranked habitat for wildlife in the vicinity of this site.  
16 *Seconded by Mr. James.*

17 *\* The Vote on the MOTION was approved (6-0).*

18 In response to a question from the Commission, it was explained that the applicant proposed  
19 placing the southern portion of the property into a conservation easement and enhancing the  
20 wetlands there, but the Army Corp of Engineers and EPA did not agree with the proposal.

#### 21 4. STUDY ITEMS

##### 22 A. LOST Fund – Balance Update and pending CU penalties (30 minutes)- Continued 23 from November 18, 2021 - See information there

24 Mr. Goodwin explained that parcels created in individual ownership that are less than 10 acres  
25 are placed into current use. There are triggers that take a property out of current use and the  
26 Assessor is responsible for keeping track of this. The Assessor then applies a formula to say what  
27 the value of the land would be, and which percent is owed as a penalty. There are a number of  
28 property owners that disagree with this assessment, and contest is through a certain process. The  
29 total committed fund balance for the LOST Fund, as of September 30, 2021, is approximately  
30 \$794,124.33.

31  
32 The Commission discussed possibly creating a list of properties in Town that it would like to see  
33 purchased over the years. It was noted that there was previous agreement to not use these funds  
34 for acquisitions, but to use them for stewardship. The City Council must still approve any  
35 potential purchases made with money from this Fund.

#### 37 5. OTHER BUSINESS

##### 38 A. Review of 2022 Meeting Calendar - continued from November 18, 2021 see 39 information there

40 This was not addressed during this meeting.

#### 41 6. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

42

1 This was not addressed during this meeting.

2

3 **7. ADJOURNMENT:**

4

5 **The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 PM.**

6

7

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 Kristan Patenaude

10 Recording Secretary

**Agenda  
Conservation Commission  
January 13, 2022**

**Agenda Item #2B  
Approval of Minutes**

**December 9, 2021**

DRAFT

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Remote Via Microsoft Teams  
[LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://lebanonnh.gov/live)  
December 9, 2021  
6:30 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ernst Oidtmann (Chair), Sarah Riley (Vice Chair), Erling Heistad, Donald Lacey, Barbara Hirai (Alt.), Bruce James, Chris Johnson, Susan Almy

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Megan Smith (Alt.), Darla Bruno (Alt.)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Goodwin (GIS Coordinator)

---

1 **1. CALL TO ORDER – Chair Oidtmann called the meeting to order at 6:45 PM**

2  
3 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 18, 2021**

4  
5 There was discussion regarding the process for reviewing meeting minutes. Mr. James suggested  
6 that the Commission go back to the original method it used to review minutes, in which the  
7 Commission received minutes from the Recording Secretary, reviewed the draft minutes during a  
8 meeting, and sent any edits back to the Recording Secretary.

9  
10 Ms. Riley noted that she has been listening back to each meeting in her pre-edit of the draft  
11 minutes from the Recording Secretary. If items have been left off that she believes should have  
12 been included, she adds them into her pre-edited set of minutes.

13  
14 Mr. James stated that the process is becoming very confusing. He again suggested going back to  
15 the way draft minutes were processed in the past and try to limit discussion time on minutes  
16 during the meeting to 15 minutes.

17  
18 Mr. Lacey suggested that the pre-edits completed by Ms. Riley be limited only to misspellings or  
19 punctuation edits. Ms. Riley noted that she has no interest in completing the pre-edit this way, as  
20 she would then be completing multiple rounds of edits. Mr. Lacey suggested that other edits  
21 suggested by Ms. Riley can be broached by the Commission during a meeting.

22  
23 Ms. Almy explained that she believes it is impolite to have people's names or land parcels  
24 misspelled in the minutes.

25  
26 Mr. Goodwin agreed that the pre-edit should not touch anything but typos or misspellings. He  
27 recommended going back to the original process the Commission used for reviewing minutes.  
28 The Commission can give the Recording Secretary any misspelling or grammar edits at the end  
29 of each meeting for incorporation to the draft minutes.

Chair Oidtmann agreed with going back to the old system for reviewing minutes. Commissioners can write down comments on the minutes, and these can be reviewed during a meeting in a timely fashion.

Ms. Riley noted that she believes it is important to capture things that might be skipped or misunderstood by the Recording Secretary. She suggested that 1-2 Commissioners be involved in picking up small things that are missed and sending them to the Recording Secretary after a meeting.

Amendments:

- Add to page 4, line 28: "...that caused him to mention that he would like to see members of the hunting community on the Commission, along the lines of the natural resource benefits of groups like Trout Unlimited and Ducks Unlimited;"
- Page 1, line 11: Change "?" to "Mr. Lacey"
- Page 1, line 12: Delete **"I can't find the recording of this part of the meeting to double check what was actually said, but I think the wording of the motion was different. Tim or Mark might have it."**
- Page 4, line 21: Change "?" to "Ms. Riley"
- Page 1, line 2: To amend the paragraph to read: "Chair Oidtmann complimented the Commission on all the work it's done the last few years. He explained that two cyclists he recently encountered on the Rail Trail also passed along their thanks to the Commission. He clarified his recommendations for actions during a meeting for new members. Chair Oidtmann explained that Commissioners should not interrupt speakers during presentations, but instead make notes during the presentation in order to ask precise questions at the end of the presentation. Commissioners should raise hands so that the Chair knows who wishes to speak."

Mr. Goodwin expressed his desire for accurate minutes but also noted that the Recording Secretary is not a stenographer.

Ms. Riley stated that permit reviews by the Commission should have additional details included, as accuracy of the draft minutes for these items are very important.

**Mr. Heistad MOVED to approve the November 18, 2021 minutes, as amended.  
Seconded by Mr. Lacey.**

**\* The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0-0).**

Ms. Almy thanked Ms. Riley for her work on the pre-edits of the draft minutes.

In response to a question from Mr. Heistad, Mr. Goodwin explained that the video recordings of Commission meetings are likely stored for somewhere between 10-20 years. There are State regulations that dictate how long recordings of meetings need to be stored for.

The Commission reviewed the motion and associated conditions from its November 30, 2021, meeting regarding: **the NHDES Wetland Standard Dredge and Fill Application (Major Impact) associated with the long-term mining of the Lebanon Crushed Stone Quarry, operated by Pike Industries at 335 Plainfield Road in West Lebanon. The existing active quarry, totaling approximately 57 acres, will expand to an overall total size of approximately 250 acres (the continued mining area) as currently approved by AOT Permit AOT-0709B. A total of 110,413 SF (2.53 ac) of wetland located in the continued mining area will be permanently impacted, including 3 vernal pools.**

Mr. Goodwin noted that the two draft versions of the minutes, originally written by the Recording Secretary Kristan Patenaude and edited by Ms. Riley, do not match well. He believes Ms. Riley's more accurately reflect what was said during the meeting, and the Commission reviewed her draft motion and conditions to be sent to DES.

- 1) *The Lebanon Conservation Commission has not been allowed on the site and thus has not been able to observe these wetlands firsthand. Because the impacted wetlands are scattered across such a large active quarry site, a visit would need to be guided. Since the scope of impacts likely extends beyond the subject parcel, a site visit would only paint a small part of the picture.*

The Commission discussed the wording of the first condition. Mr. Goodwin explained that the Commission should be specific in each condition as to the concern and request. The Commission rewrote the first condition to read:

- 1-revised) *As the Lebanon Conservation Commission has not been allowed on the site and thus has not been able to observe these wetlands firsthand, and because the impacted wetlands are scattered across such a large active quarry site, and since the scope of impacts likely extends beyond the subject parcel, a site visit by a DES staff member is strongly encouraged.*

- 2) *Because of the large scope and duration of this project, we were relieved to hear from Mr. Quigley that DES will hold a Public Hearing but are concerned about the ability of local residents to participate in a hearing in Concord.*

The Commission discussed that it would like local residents to be able to participate in the public hearing process. The Commission rewrote the second condition to read:

- 2-revised) *Because of the large scope and duration of this project, the Commission was relieved to hear from Mr. Quigley that DES will hold a Public Hearing but are concerned about the ability of local residents to participate in a hearing in Concord. Due to this concern, the Commission encourages DES to hold the public hearing in Lebanon or, if this is not possible, that the meeting be able to be accessed remotely for public comment.*

- 3) *The Lebanon Conservation Commission requests that DES examine the impacts to the two eastern wetlands that are being avoided by the applicant. Specifically,*
  - a. *The applicant proposes long-term monitoring of these wetlands, but we are concerned that a 50-ft buffer is inadequate to protect the functions and values of these wetlands. Also, these two wetlands appear to extend off the subject parcel.*
  - b. *A portion of the city-owned land to the east of the project (city parcel 159-4) is conservation land. Please consider how the proposed project will affect the*

hydrology and ecology of this conservation area (located in the southwestern quadrant of the city parcel).

The Commission agreed that the wording of the third condition is appropriate.

- 4)
- We are concerned about the impacts of this large-scale project on the groundwater and surface water hydrology of the surrounding landscape. Our understanding is that internal draining is a condition of the AoT permit, but this might not be beneficial to the integrity of off-site wetlands. The hydrologic and ecologic integrities of nearby wetland ecosystems, including the Martin Brook complex, the Hall Road wetlands, the Trues Brook Road wetlands, as well as the Corpella/Cranberry Pond wetlands, need to be protected. Many of these wetlands are rated “high-value wetlands” by the City or are listed as Significant Ecological Areas in the Lebanon Natural Resource Inventory.*

The Commission changed the wording of the first sentence of the fourth condition to read:  
“The Lebanon Conservation Commission requests that DES examine...”

- 5)
- The City’s Natural Resource Inventory states “The continued attraction of Trues Brook will rest upon the careful monitoring of upstream effects from the roadway and nearby development. In spite of some scattered concerns, the water quality still remains very high.” I request that DES investigate how the massive alteration of terrain will impact surrounding high value wetlands and waterways, including Trues Brook.*

The Commission changed the wording of the third sentence of the fifth condition to read:  
“The Lebanon Conservation Commission requests that...”

- 6)
- There is an opportunity to create valuable wildlife and wetland habitat instead of performing traditional reclamation at this site. We recommend that DES Wetlands Bureau coordinates with the AoT Division and NH F&G to examine how the site could eventually be managed for wildlife habitat given the value of quarry sites for reptile and amphibian species, among others, as per Litvaitis, John. (2018). “Managing reclaimed san and gravel mines – are we overlooking a solution to a critical habitat need?” The Wildlife Professional. 12. 36-40.*

The Commission agreed with the draft wording for the sixth condition as written.

- 7)
- Please look into impacts of the eventual contours on wildlife passage and access.*

The Commission changed the wording of the seventh conditions to read:

“The Lebanon Conservation Commission requests that DES examine impacts of the eventual contours/terracing on wildlife passage and access.”

- 8)
- We request that DES have the applicant reexamine local mitigation options – The Lebanon Conservation Commission was not directly involved in the search for local mitigation opportunities and that is unfortunate. There are so many high-value wetlands located in this corner of Lebanon, and they are likely interconnected. These are identified on the NH Wildlife Action Plan maps as well as the City’s Natural Resource Inventory. At both of the Conservation Commission meetings at which this permit was discussed, the applicant explained their attempts to find local mitigation solutions, but that the criteria imposed by the Army Corps of Engineers, in particular with respect to vernal pool mitigation, were very strict. Perhaps a combination approach where some local*

1           *mitigation and/or land protection occurs in addition to an in-lieu fee payment to the ARM*  
2           *Fund could be worked out.*

3 The Commission agreed to change the word “strict” in the eighth condition to the word “rigid.”

4  
5           9) *We encourage eventual permanent protection of the parcel for use as wildlife habitat.*  
6 The Commission agreed with the draft wording of the ninth condition.

7  
8 In response to a question from Ms. Almy, Mr. Goodwin explained that the Commission could  
9 ask that DES share with them the date for the public hearing, once known.

### 10 11 **3. PERMIT REVIEW**

#### 12 **A. None**

### 13 14 **4. STUDY ITEMS**

#### 15 **A. Zeev Darer Conservation Property – Property Overview & Discussion**

16 Mr. Goodwin reviewed the history of the Zeev Darer property. It was gifted from Henrique  
17 Darer, with the request that it be named for his wife and that it remains as protected open space,  
18 with a potential limited use of a catwalk/boardwalk, if the Conservation Commission desired.  
19 The area is mostly made up of highly valued wetlands, leaving it without much possibility for  
20 development.

21 Ms. Riley noted that there is a potential link between the Zeev Darer property and the nearby  
22 Timberwoods parcel. There is a parcel to the west of the Zeev Darer property (Matt Brown’s lot),  
23 which has been overtaken by beavers, that lies between these two conserved parcels.

24 Mr. Goodwin noted that there is also the nearby Nicole Cormen Nature Preserve, located just up  
25 Route 120. He explained that it is unclear yet what will be done with the parcel located across  
26 the street, which contains F.W. Webb, and the Treetops units. He noted that Zeev Darer is  
27 located within a major wildlife corridor, with a travel route stretching from the Nicole Cormen  
28 Nature Preserve to Hanover. He explained that it is unclear if Matt Brown would be able to use  
29 his property as a mitigation option, due to DES criteria.

30 Ms. Hirai noted that, at a future meeting, she would like the Commission to discuss how to sit  
31 down with landowners to review options available for donating land or an easement to the Town.

32 Ms. Riley explained that she circulated a couple of videos which show the value in Conservation  
33 Commissions sitting with landowners to create relationships and plant the seed for possible  
34 future land/easement donation.

35 Ms. Almy suggested that, at a future meeting, the Commission hear from someone at the Army  
36 Corp of Engineers and/or DES regarding their mitigation criteria.

37 Ms. Riley asked about a possible site visit to Zeev Darer.

38 Ms. Hirai stated that there is some trash in an area of the site that should be cleaned up.

#### 39 **B. 2021 Year Summary Review – Open Discussion**

Mr. Goodwin updated the Commission on a number of items it completed during 2021 including approval review of approximately 6-7 wetland permit applications, the Two Rivers project, being part of the zoning amendment process, an overhaul of the Commission's website, connecting with educators and the Linking Land Alliance, the Boston Lot Bog Bridge project, etc.

Ms. Riley noted that the Durham City Manager puts links in the monthly report to what all agencies in Town are currently doing. Mr. Goodwin explained that updates about the Commission could be included in the Leb e-News newsletter.

Ms. Riley suggested that the Commission could hold a hike/property of the month.

Mr. Heistad noted that the Commission also worked on the Open Space Plan this year.

Ms. Hirai noted that it is difficult to know how many volunteer hours were contributed to Commission projects this year. It would be nice to be able to track this and review it over time.

Mr. Goodwin stated that he believes the Commission saw more volunteers and stewards involved this year than any other.

It was noted that the Commission's monthly reports to the City Council are to inform audiences about what the group is doing; this year in summary review is just for the Commissioners.

Ms. Almy suggested that the Commission do more with schoolteachers and outdoor education.

## **5. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Reports from other committees:**

#### **--Conservation Lands Monitors (Various Members)**

Ms. Hirai explained that she went out to the Two Rivers Conservation Area and cut down a tree. There are still two homeless sites on the Conservation Area. She contacted Lynne Goodwin about this, who told her that it would be appropriate to hand out cards to anyone she saw with some Human Service options. It may not be readily known if the people have relocated, in an effort to then clean up the sites.

There was discussion regarding holding a monthly cleanup date at Two Rivers, or simply holding one annually/biannually.

Ms. Hirai suggested that the Commission could also explore ideas regarding legacy trees around Town and how to deal with the emerald ash borer.

#### **--Lebanon Biodiversity Group (D. Lacey)**

Mr. Lacey stated that Matt Tarr, of UNH Cooperative Extension recently visited Baker's Crossing to discuss how to manage the field. Mr. Lacey explained that Mr. Tarr suggested not mowing the field at all and only treating invasives in the wooded area of the property. There are a number of unique habitats in this area, such as goldenrods and grasslands, that should be left for wildlife cover and food. Mr. Tarr also noted that the Commission should be careful not to disrupt the landscape with any invasive treatment. There was also discussion about creating a loop trail along the edge of the wood line, instead of through the field. Invasive treatment could be focused on the southern portion of this property.

Ms. Riley noted that the Commission could also look into placing birdboxes in the field to attract bird species. The Commission should also be aware that box turtles may be located right near the trail, for future mowing.

Mr. Lacey stated that he has never seen the existing bat boxes used. Mr. Tarr is happy to come back and walk other properties in Town. This does not cost the Commission anything.

#### **--Workshops & Educational Opportunities (Various Members)**

None at this time.

### **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Riley explained that the Board of Assessor's met today at 12pm, regarding Land Use Change Tax (LUCT) funds for 401 Mt Support Road.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the bill for this parcel has been submitted. The owners now have 90 days to appeal the assessor's bill. If the owner does not appeal within the 90 days, the Commission should see LUCT funds come through at a future date.

In response to a question from Mr. Heistad, Mr. Goodwin noted that the Assessor's Department does not need to notify the Commission that bills have been sent out.

Ms. Riley asked if there could be a list of all parcels in Town that would be large enough to flag the Commission in case of the potential for future LUCT funds. Mr. Goodwin explained that there is a team of Department Heads that generally comments on properties that may be developed. Properties that are in current use would generally be noted during this process.

Ms. Riley explained that Suellen Balestra did not renew her alternate status on the Commission but is happy to help on projects or as the group needs.

Mr. Goodwin explained that Ms. Balestra was one of the most experienced Commission members. She provided countless volunteer hours to the City. The City usually sends out a proclamation when a senior volunteer ends his/her time on a Commission, but this has, unfortunately, fallen by the wayside due to COVID-19. He has been meaning to reach out to Ms. Balestra.

### **7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

### **8. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

### **9. ADJOURNMENT:**

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristan Patenaude  
Recording Secretary