

City of Keene
New Hampshire

CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, June 20, 2016

4:30 PM

2nd Floor Conference Room
City Hall

Members Present:

Thomas Lacey, Vice Chair
Jan Manwaring, Councilor
Denise Burchsted
Brian Reilly

Members Not Present:

Thomas P. Haynes, Chair
George Hansel, Councilor
Andrew Madison, Alt.

Staff Present:

Tara Kessler, Planner

Others Present:

Sadie Butler
Mike Hagan, Cheshire County Shooting Sports
Education Foundation (Departed at 5:00 PM)
Jonathan Sisson, Beaver Tracks, LLC. (Departed
at 5:00 PM)

SITE VISIT: At 3:30 PM, in advance of the meeting, Commission members conducted a site visit for the wetland permit application for Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation at 19 Ferry Brook Road. Commission members present included Vice Chair Thomas Lacey, Brian Reilly, and Jan Manwaring. Others present included Michael Hagan, Jonathan Sisson, Sadie Butler, and Tara Kessler.

1) CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Lacey called the meeting to order at 4:37 PM

2) MINUTES- May 16, 2016 & May 23, 2016

Councilor Manwaring made a motion to accept the minutes of May 16, 2016. The motion was seconded by Dr. Reilly and carried unanimously.

Councilor Manwaring made a motion to accept the minutes of May 23, 2016. The motion was seconded by Ms. Burchsted and carried unanimously.

3) COMMUNICATION AND NOTIFICATIONS

a. Wetland Permit Application- 19 Ferry Brook Road, Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation

Vice Chair Lacey welcomed Ms. Kessler to provide an overview of the wetland permit application. Ms. Kessler explained that the permit application received by the City Clerk's office from Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation (CCSSEF) is for a dam, which was built in 1926 and updated in 1956, to be removed. Ms. Kessler indicated the plans for the dam are not included in the meeting packet but at the meeting for viewing. She indicated that members of the Commission visited the site before the meeting. She welcomed Mr. Hagan, Chair of the Board of Directors for CCSSEF, and Mr. Sisson, of Beaver Tracks, LLC., who prepared the application with the assistance of civil engineer, Erin Darrow.

CC Meeting Minutes
June 20, 2016

Mr. Sisson explained that in 2013, a large storm topped the dam in question, plugged the culvert, and passed through the spillway. The incident was reported to the NH Dam Bureau who had no record of the dam's existence. The Dam Bureau gave the following options for the dam: repair the culvert to maintain its function as a dam, remove the dam entirely to natural stream level, or lower the dam to six feet which removes its status as a jurisdictional dam. The CCSSEF chose to lower the dam below six feet because if they repaired the dam and another storm caused a similar incident, there would be legal repercussions. He indicated a trapezoidal cut will be made in the existing dam creating a 20-foot wide flat bottom. Rip Rap of +/- 24 inches will be placed over the flat bottom and locked in place allowing the stream to flow over it. He indicated the permit is for the aforementioned procedure to lower the dam below the six-foot jurisdiction. He explained that the NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) defines the wetland boundary as beginning at the top of the dam on the lake side and continuing down into the water.

Ms. Burchsted asked if the DES considers water impounded behind the dam as wetland. Mr. Sisson replied no.

Ms. Kessler asked Mr. Sisson if they have an application with the Dam Bureau. Mr. Sisson replied yes.

Mr. Hagan explained the CCSSEF did not know there was a dam on their property, they thought it was built up years ago for fishing. He was informed, after the 2013 storm, of their obligation to maintain the dam. Repairing the dam would cost approximately \$500,000, so the CCSSEF chose to lower the dam back to its semi-natural state. He indicated that this project goes beyond lowering the dam; it will also restore the natural stream. He said they have a grant with the state and Trout Unlimited to try to reinitiate Brook Trout to the area.

Mr. Hagan indicated they have submitted an application to the Dam Bureau and are in the 75-day review period.

Ms. Burchsted asked if there are any imperiled, rare, or exemplary species in the area. Mr. Sisson replied that they went through a review process with the NH Heritage Bureau and no endangered or threatened species were reported, although some have been reported there in the past. He indicated these species are listed in the report and include the wood turtle. Ms. Burchsted asked if turtles use the pond. Mr. Hagan replied there is not much water there and the project will not impact any water area.

Mr. Sisson continued, stating that the damming of the river and subsequent deep water pool is what allowed the culvert to rot.

Ms. Burchsted asked Mr. Sisson if they considered adding rounded stone or gravel over the riprap to add stability and make it more suitable habitat. Mr. Sisson replied riprap is required to stabilize the dam in case of another flood and that eventually sediment, silt, and vegetation will collect in the riprap within a few years and appear more natural. Ms. Burchsted asked if they considered kick starting the habitat regeneration process by adding a top coat of gravel. Mr. Sisson indicated there would be stone of various smaller sizes mixed in with the riprap to help fill the voids. He said the Wetland Bureau does not encourage filling because sediment could be washed downstream. Ms. Burchsted said gravel is bigger than soil, and can create a surface that is able to naturalize faster. She indicated that she would like this to happen. Mr. Sisson replied that the engineer called for smaller sizes mixed in to stabilize the riprap. He said the smaller stones would fill in the gaps. He stated he has worked on many stream restoration projects and

there are conditions for what can be put in the stream and the goal is for it to develop as naturally as possible.

With no further questions for Mr. Hagan and Mr. Sisson, Vice Chair Lacey asked Ms. Kessler to review the Commission's charge in this situation. Ms. Kessler indicated the Commission is to review the application based on perceived wetland impact, determine if there are negative impacts, and pass any comments to the state to be included in their review of the application.

Dr. Reilly made a motion to inform the state that the Conservation Commission reviewed the application and the site and have no concerns. Vice Chair Lacey seconded the motion.

Ms. Burchsted put forth an amendment to the motion that the Conservation Commission recommends adding a surface coat of smaller material, such as gravel, above the riprap to aid in habitat restoration. Councilor Manwaring seconded the amendment.

On a vote of 4-0, the Conservation Commission passed a motion to inform the state that the wetland permit application for 19 Ferry Brook Road has been reviewed and the Conservation Commission has no concerns, but recommends adding a surface coat of smaller material, such as gravel, above the riprap to aid in habitat restoration.

Mr. Hagan and Mr. Sisson were thanked for their participation and departed the meeting.

4) CONSERVATION MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Lacey invited Ms. Kessler to provide updates on the Conservation Master Plan.

a. Plan Objectives

Ms. Kessler explained that at the last meeting, the Commission was in agreement about the goals and purpose of the Plan in terms of audience and structure, and ended with discussion on potential partners. She said they agreed the audience of the Plan is broad, covering the entirety of Keene including government, landowners, and the community at large. The Plan is not just a guiding document for the Commission but will identify and direct future priorities for the City's conservation/land planning efforts, and will outline actions and steps for management of parcels of land owned by the City. She stated they discussed the importance of conservation education, developing a network of conservation lands, and identifying and engaging partners early in the process. Ms. Kessler pointed out a list of Plan stakeholders provided by Dr. Ann Shedd that needs to be updated.

Ms. Kessler stated she hopes they can build on the broad goals identified and proceed by developing more concrete objectives and plan structure. She indicated the Commission's intention to research model Plans of other communities that achieve the balance of broader planning with more focused land management goals.

Ms. Butler indicated she had researched Plans of other NH communities via the NH Association of Conservation Commissions (NHACC) website. She said she would send Ms. Kessler a list of those worth looking into further.

Dr. Reilly added that he had also looked into the Plans listed by the NHACC but they are not all up-to-date. He compiled a list of 10 Plans for cities/towns similar in size and population to Keene. He indicated that some cities have unique Conservation Master Plans and others have sections devoted to conservation in the city's Master Plan, all varying in size, detail, and extent.

He presented the Merrimack Biodiversity Conservation Plan, created by Mr. Jeff Littleton, as a positive example. He indicated they share similar goals and objectives. He read the first few paragraphs of Merrimack's Plan verbatim as follows:

“Statement of Purpose

The Biodiversity Conservation Plan has been prepared for the town of Merrimack to provide guidance into the identification and protection of open space for significant natural resources. The Merrimack Conservation Commission (MCC) has stated that the purpose of the plan is to focus on the conservation of wildlife habitats and biological diversity, which promotes informed land use decisions using an ecological perspective. It shall serve as a planning tool for the Merrimack Conservation Commission, Planning Board, Community Development Office, schools, and individuals. To this end, the following general goals of the plan are as follows:

1. To identify priorities for future wildlife habitat and natural community protection initiatives, whereby providing information to be used as the basis for financial planning options;
2. To promote and support the conservation, restoration, and enhancement of ecological integrity and sound management of biological diversity, including populations of rare species, critical wildlife habitats, and significant natural communities;
3. To incorporate meaningful and detailed ecological data into the town Master Plan;
4. To continue to raise awareness of the ecological attributes of Merrimack through community outreach and education;
5. To provide an action plan indicating what should be addressed, by whom, when and how for the next five and ten years.”

The Commission thanked Dr. Reilly for this example. Dr. Reilly stated that the Commission does not need to reinvent the wheel, there are great resources to use as a guide and it would be helpful to have someone like Mr. Littleton attend a Commission meeting. Ms. Burchsted stated before talking to Mr. Littleton, she would prefer communicating with the Chair of the Merrimack Conservation Commission to find out if the Plan has resulted in successful action/lessons learned. Councilor Manwaring mentioned Merrimack is currently having environmental difficulties due to PFOAs in the water from an industrial plastic plant.

Vice Chair Lacey added the Commission needs to take a broad look at land use and wildlife habitat at the same time, beyond the multiple NRIs that have already taken place. He mentioned merging the efforts and knowledge of people like Mr. Littleton and Mr. Dan Sear in this effort. Dr. Reilly agreed with Ms. Burchsted's recommendation to research the actions, which have resulted from the Merrimack Plan first.

Ms. Kessler asked how specific the Merrimack action plan was in the document. Dr. Reilly replied he had not read that closely but there are 10 pages of recommendations. Ms. Kessler asked if there were people identified to take on implementation. Dr. Reilly replied he had not seen that beyond the acknowledgements section.

Dr. Reilly stated that other cities have reached out to their communities to find out what they want out of a Conservation Master Plan. He said generally, when looking at the raw numbers, few people contribute, voice their opinion, or have time to contribute. He questioned what good survey feedback would look like in Keene. Ms. Kessler asked how large of a public engagement component and what information from the public the Commission wants for the document. Ms. Burchsted suggested looking at other communities plans to see what is working and build from there. Vice Chair Lacy said while the public will need to be included, it is premature to do so

now. Vice Chair Lacey said now is the time to collect data to have a direction for where the Plan is headed. Ms. Kessler asked if he was referring to more on-the-ground data as opposed to NRI type data. Vice Chair Lacey agreed that now is the time for things like forestry and timber surveys to gain a broad perspective.

Councilor Manwaring commented that the City would be working on the Babbidge Dam Management Plan this summer and the Woodward dam next year, both being deficient. She noted her surprise that the Commission had not been consulted on the Babbidge Dam. Ms. Kessler commented that the Roaring Brook Watershed Management Plan project was mentioned at the last meeting that the City is in the process of bringing in a consultant. Ms. Kessler questioned how the Commission can get more involved with things directly related to their charge, like the Roaring Brook Watershed. Councilor Manwaring questioned if a forester or someone else can be there while the work is taking place. Vice Chair Lacey said he presumed things like forestry would be a part of the consultant's task. Councilor Manwaring warned against that assumption having seen the consulting budget for both dams is only \$67,000.

Ms. Kessler offered, now that the consultant has been approved by the City Council, to arrange a presentation by Public Works with an update on the dams at a future meeting. She will make Public Works aware of the Commission's interest in being involved.

The discussion continued about the Commission's desire to utilize their budget. Councilor Manwaring suggested waiting until after a presentation by Public Works to decide what to spend on. Vice Chair Lacey suggested perimeter and timber surveys on Stearns Hill, Beech Hill, and Robin Hood Park. Ms. Kessler indicated there is \$72,000-\$75,000 in the Land Use Change Tax Fund, with \$25,000 added each year. She indicated that \$26,500 came out of the budget this year for the West Hill Conservation Easements. She said there are land assessments pending, which cost \$1,900, for lands to be placed in conservation. Another cost in the past year was for the West Street Dam study, which cost approximately \$25,000, \$8,000-\$9,000 of which was contributed by West Street Hydro. Ms. Kessler mentioned the Conservation Master Plan as a way to set goals and prioritize that funding.

b. **Next Steps**

Ms. Kessler indicated a next step is to share the Merrimack Plan with the Commission and to contact the Merrimack Commission. Dr. Reilly indicated that the Merrimack member list was from 2010; however, most of the Conservation Commission's seem to have an updated member list. Ms. Kessler will make that contact.

Vice Chair Lacey stated he spoke several months ago with a member of the Concord Conservation Commission about their ongoing timber management plan. Ms. Burchsted indicated that Concord also has a Conservation Open Space Plan, which few communities have. She said she would like to see plans of towns like Lebanon, Plymouth, and Durham as well. She believes Keene may be similar to those towns because they are also college towns.

Ms. Kessler indicated she will reach out to both Merrimack and Concord. She said once the Commission has consulted with those communities, they will be able to narrow the scope of the Plan, estimate costs, and get a firm idea of who the best consultants would be. She will follow-up with Mr. Littleton to see what this kind of plan could cost.

Ms. Burchsted commented that the Merrimack Plan does not mention greenways or aquatic systems, which the Keene Commission is interested in. She added the Commission should look into other guidance for that kind of planning. Ms. Butler mentioned she did not find greenway

examples in her NH research but found a good example from North Carolina that she will share with Ms. Kessler.

Ms. Kessler stated that the discussion of potential partners will be ongoing.

5) SURFACE WATER PROTECTION ORDINANCE DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Lacey referenced a Commission motion from August 2014 which read: “Commissioner Manwaring made the following motion which was seconded by Mr. Haynes. On a vote of 7-0, the Conservation Commission agreed to pursue amendments to the Surface Water Protection Ordinance specifically around the definition of Beaver Brook and other places classified as tax ditches, and to convene a subcommittee to develop the language.”

Vice Chair Lacey continued by addressing the Comments from City Staff on the Proposed Amendments to the Surface Water Protection Ordinance, which were shared in the meeting packet. He addressed the City Engineer’s question about item number two, which indicates that man-made features are not considered “Surface Waters,” and if that is the case, how are properties that adjoin them not exempt. Vice Chair Lacey indicated that they are exempt. Councilor Manwaring agreed. Vice Chair Lacey continued that land areas are exempt around those features that are not deemed to be surface waters.

Vice Chair Lacey continued with the next comment from the City Engineer, which reads: “Would it be better to define the intended maintenance and vegetation control as permitted *use* (Sec. 102-1486)?” Vice Chair Lacey agreed that is a sensible thing to add, that you are allowed to enter the buffer to maintain and control vegetation.

Vice Chair Lacey continued on to reading the Public Works Directors comments which read: “Starting with Recommendation 1. Changes to Section 102-1482, The Department does not see an issue with the elimination of the language ‘in an undisturbed and natural condition...’ It is not clear if there is any proposal to change language in 102-1481. It appears to be a restatement of the existing language.” Vice Chair Lacey stated that is correct.

Vice Chair Lacey read the next comment from the Public Works Director for Revision 2, Section 102-1485, which reads: “It appears that the proposal is to completely eliminate line item 5, 6, and 7 and then eliminate the list format.” Vice Chair Lacey indicated that is correct.

Vice Chair Lacey continued with the next comment from the Public Works Director for Revision 2, Section 102-1485, which reads: “In the proposed language, I would suggest including the word ‘swale’. Along with streets, roads, and railroad corridors I would recommend adding multi-use trail. So the language would read as follows, ‘Man-made drainage ditches and swales, road/street, railroad corridor, and multi-use trail side ditches and swales...’” Vice Chair Lacey said that is fine with him as it does not change the intent.

Dr. Reilly asked Vice Chair Lacey to send his comments on the document to Ms. Kessler. Vice Chair Lacey agreed.

Vice Chair Lacey continued with the next comment from the Public Works Director for Revision 2, Section 102-1485, which reads: “I would recommend keeping the language for silage pits. This is important because if the intent of the City is to support small farms within the City limits the ability for farmers to make/cure silage is critical.” Vice Chair Lacey stated that he disagrees with that change because agriculture is an allowed use subject to best management practices. If it is not a best management practice, it should not be specifically allowed. He said to specifically

talk about one aspect of practicing agriculture is redundant under exemptions because agriculture is already allowed in general. Ms. Kessler indicated that forestry and agricultural practices are allowed in the buffer as long as they follow best management practices. She asked Vice Chair Lacey if he believes there is harm in having it there. Vice Chair Lacey said yes, it should be removed because it could allow something that is not under best management practices.

Vice Chair Lacey indicated that for the same reasons, he also disagrees with the next comment from the Public Works Director for Revision 2, Section 102-1485, which reads: "I would make the same comment for the septage and manure lagoons. I would suggest the following language 'Lagoons designed and constructed for the capture and treatment of animal or human waste...'" Vice Chair Lacey stated if it is part of best management practices you can do it. Ms. Kessler questioned if this was again from the perspective of agriculture. Vice Chair Lacey replied yes. He indicated a problem is that some of these uses are in both the prohibited and allowed sections.

Ms. Kessler asked if justification was provided for why septage and manure lagoons were on the list of exemptions. Vice Chair Lacey replied no, he does not remember why that happened. He continued by noting discrepancies regarding agriculture and surface water in the original ordinance. Ms. Kessler indicated she would follow-up with the Public Works Director to clarify why that was included.

Vice Chair Lacey referenced the final comment from the Public Works Director for Revision 2, Section 102-1485, which reads: "I believe that the exemption section does not recognize the urban stormwater/flood water built environment. In particular, the areas within the City where Federal Flood Control funding was obtained and spent constructing concrete channeling protection. A good example is the sections of Beaver Brook between Spring Street to Harrison Street and Water Street to Marlboro Street. I suggest adding the following language to the exemption statement, 'Any area where the body of water has been altered/channelized with concrete or other material for the purpose of bank stabilization or channelization for the movement of stormwater.' Vice Chair Lacey stated that he disagrees with this recommendation because this is a buffer ordinance and not a channel ordinance. Ms. Kessler said she believes the recommendation was only referring to the section of Beaver Brook that has a concrete channel. Vice Chair Lacey disagreed and said the recommendation lists not just concrete but other material. Ms. Burchsted commented that the language referred to anything and Vice Chair Lacey agreed. Ms. Kessler suggested removing the phrase, "other material." Ms. Burchsted asked why concrete should not also be removed. Vice Chair Lacey agreed and stated that even the buffers along the concrete zone still allow things to enter the river.

Ms. Kessler stated as she understands from the Public Works director, downtown there is an issue with the drainage system that cannot be controlled with this ordinance, creating an additional level of difficulty. Vice Chair Lacey indicated that the pipe shed was discussed during the creation of the ordinance because anyone connected to the pipe shed was mainlining run-off into the Brook. Ms. Kessler asked the outcome of that discussion. Vice Chair Lacey replied that when the ordinance was introduced, the buffer zone was 10 feet. It was amended during discussion to 30 feet, with the possible allowance of 10 feet. He indicated the only body of water that could have been talked about in the original discussions, Beaver Brook, was subsequently declared exempt in the implementation of the ordinance. Councilor Manwaring agreed.

Vice Chair Lacey indicated that there is no reason someone should be exempt because they live downtown. He added that even with a lip of concrete preventing lateral flow, the buffer itself guarantees some permeable surface will be serviced by the pipe shed.

Ms. Burchsted commented that she believe the City should say that rivers, whether in concrete or not, need to be protected. She said it is the Commission's role to protect the natural resources in the City.

Councilor Manwaring commented that part of the reason she was concerned is because two properties on Beaver Brook are being called exempt and anything can go there. Ms. Burchsted agreed and indicated this has to be done to protect water quality. Vice Chair Lacey commented that it became less stringent as pollution possibilities became more concentrated. He said that places more likely to cause pollution have smaller buffers, and those less likely to cause pollution have larger buffers. Ms. Kessler commented that the City was trying to preserve headwaters where it could, knowing when you get into downtown it is a challenge. Councilor Manwaring agreed. Vice Chair Lacey stated he is not against buffers, he just wants the same buffers for everyone in the City.

Ms. Kessler asked the Commission if changes are made, is it in a position to move forward. She asked if another set of revisions is necessary before taking it to City Council. Vice Chair Lacey stated it needs re-wording. He stated the Sub-Committee would create a final draft for the next meeting. Ms. Kessler indicated once the final draft is ready, staff will request approval from City Council to make amendments to the Ordinance and to begin the ordinance amendment process.

Vice Chair Lacey stated that his concern is if it will receive disagreement from City Staff at the Council meeting. Ms. Kessler replied that there will be a public workshop with the Joint Planning Board and the Planning Licenses and Development Committee before it goes to City Council. She said it is an opportunity to vote on whether the ordinance is compatible with the Master Plan and then the Planning Licenses and Development Committee votes to have City Council set a public hearing date. Either the Committee or the City Council could amend the ordinance.

Vice Chair Lacey explained discrepancies in the ordinance that prompted the Commission to work to revise it and indicated exemptions will remain unclear until the ordinance is amended.

6) WEST STREET DAM UPDATE

Councilor Manwaring stated that West Street Hydro has requested another 10 months to work with the Dam Bureau and continue the licensing process before providing another update to the City Council. She said they are exploring whether the flashboards will be necessary for the project. She noted that if the flashboards are necessary, they will need to address/study the impacts on the Canadian quillwort and dwarf wedgemussel. She said they did not address in this update how fish would be allowed to move around the dam, if the dam stays.

Ms. Kessler explained that City Council heard brief presentations on the West Street Dam from City staff, VHB, and West Street Hydro at its meeting on June 2, 2016. The City's Public Works Director gave a brief history of the City's work studying the dam since it received a letter of deficiency. She indicated that approximately \$500,000 of improvements are needed for the dam to be made compliant. In 2012, the City agreed to have West Street Hydro investigate converting the dam into a hydropower facility. West Street Hydro is currently working with the Dam Bureau and continuing the federal licensing process. She noted that the Commission is not pressed to issue a recommendation to City Council prior to West Street Hydro's next update before City Council in ten months.

Ms. Kessler indicated she will move forward with inviting Ms. Amy Singler, of the Nature Conservancy and American Rivers, to an upcoming meeting to share information on dam removal

options. Ms. Burchsted requested that Ms. Singler be asked to discuss maintaining riparian wetland connections after dam removal. She is concerned about dam removal undoing the riparian wetland system and would like advice on how to maintain it if the dam were to be removed. Ms. Kessler will talk to Ms. Singler about emphasizing options and success stories of maintaining wetland connections.

Vice Chair Lacey stated the decision will be to remove the dam or not and believes that decision will be independent of West Street Hydro. Councilor Manwaring added that the current City Council is entirely different from the City Council who initially voted in 2012. Vice Chair Lacey indicated the Council will have much more information and research from both sides for the upcoming vote.

Ms. Burchsted said she believes the wetlands are likely more intact than in a classic dam removal scenario, and that the West Street Dam is maintaining the original river elevation, and that the wetlands upstream are more original. Vice Chair Lacey stated the dam was built in the 1700s and has a mitigation function but he is unsure where the trade off to those mitigation functions will be in the City of Keene.

7) NEW OR OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Burchsted suggested contacting the Bicycle Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee (BPPAC) and Pathways of Keene to ensure the Commission does not repeat their work. Ms. Burchsted indicated she spoke with Mr. Chris Brehme about this. Ms. Kessler said she spoke with Mr. Will Schoefmann about BPPAC's work on rail trails and bike pedestrian safety on roads, as well as possible partnership with the Commission. Ms. Kessler will get an update from Mr. Schoefmann and make him aware that the Commission would like to coordinate efforts. There was discussion of overlapping greenways, wildlife corridors, and connecting trails with surrounding towns. Councilor Manwaring said Pathways of Keene is working to make those connections and make trails safer; they are raising money to fund solar lighting for trails.

Ms. Burchsted stated her intention to have her Rivers class of 18 students in the fall tailor their projects to be advisory to the Commission. Vice Chair Lacey and Ms. Kessler mentioned other instances of students involved in Commission efforts and encouraged Ms. Burchsted's intention. The hope for a partnership with KSC was also mentioned.

8) STAFF UPDATES

No staff updates were provided at this time.

9) ADJOURNMENT

The next Conservation Commission meeting will take place Monday, July 18, 2016.

Hearing no further business, Vice Chair Lacey adjourned the meeting at 6:44 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katie Kibler, Minute Taker
June 21, 2016

Reviewed and edited by,
Tara Kessler, Planner
July 8, 2016