

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

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

**Monday, July 18, 2016**

**4:30 PM 2nd Floor Conference Room,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Thomas P. Haynes, Chair  
Thomas Lacey, Vice Chair  
Dr. Brian Reilly  
Janis Manwaring, Councilor  
Sadie Butler (Arrived at 4:32 PM)  
Andrew Madison, Alternate

**Members Not Present:**

Denise Burchsted  
George Hansel, Councilor

**Staff Present:**

Tara Kessler, Planner  
Rhett Lamb, Planning Director

**Others Present:**

Amy Singler, The Nature Conservancy  
Jim O'Brien, The Nature Conservancy  
Barbara Skuly, Ashuelot River Local  
Advisory

**1) Call to Order**

Chair Haynes called the meeting to order at 4:31 PM. He introduced guests, Amy Singler and Jim O'Brien, of The Nature Conservancy.

**2) Minutes- June 20, 2016**

Dr. Reilly made a motion to approve the minutes of June 20, 2016, which was seconded by Councilor Manwaring.

Dr. Reilly noted a change to his name in the minutes. His name should be written as "Dr. Reilly" not "Mr. Reilly." Ms. Singler's name is misspelled as "Singlar" and should be corrected throughout. Additionally, she is referenced as a part of "American Rivers Trust." This should just be "American Rivers."

As suggested by Councilor Manwaring, the Commission agreed that Ms. Butler should be included on the minutes under "others present."

Mr. Lacey presented a clarification to the last four sentences on page seven of 10 in the packet. The passage should read, "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 that 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.”

Mr. Reilly noted an area of possible contradiction on page two of 10 in the second full paragraph and second to last paragraph. Mr. Sisson indicated there is wetland behind the impoundment after earlier replying that the area behind the dam is not wetland. Ms. Kessler will review the recording to better understand the conversation and context. If it is confusing, the statement may be removed from the minutes. Additionally, Chair Haynes noted that on page two of 10, “Mr. Sisson relied no,” should read, “Mr. Sisson replied no.”

The motion to approve the minutes of June 20, 2016 as amended was carried unanimously.

**3) Informational Presentation on Exploring River Restoration Options – Amy Singler & Jim O’Brien, The Nature Conservancy**

Chair Haynes welcomed Ms. Singler and Mr. O’Brien.

Ms. Singler indicated she works with The Nature Conservancy, a Connecticut River Program out of Northampton, MA, and with American Rivers. She said she would present project photos and talk about what dam removal projects look like. She indicated she is aware of the West Street Dam study but she will focus her presentation on dam removal in general.

Ms. Singler continued that anyone who lives in New England knows that dams litter the landscape. They vary in size and form from tall concrete masonry dams to stone dams. Many dams are old and aging. Ms. Singler presented a map of the more than 13,000 dams in New England. Dams are a large reason New England communities are where they are today. Most began as powering mills and were converted to manufacturing. She said no one alive today knows what these sites looked like before the dams.

Ms. Singler stated that dams have major impacts on rivers, principally blocking movement of fish and wildlife up and down stream. This is a particular issue for migratory species. They even impact local species movement within the system. Dams fundamentally alter river habitats creating different ecosystems than were present before the dam. These are all things to take into consideration when talking about dam removal. Dams serve many purposes such as water availability and power generation. There is a legacy of these dams across the country and questions of how to deal with aging infrastructure. The Conservancy works with dam owners when dams have outlived their purposes. She said the benefits of dam removal can be great, when chosen.

Ms. Singler continued providing examples of dam removal projects. The first example was of Black Brook Dam in Manchester, NH. The City owned the dam and small impoundment, which widened the river. During floods approximately 15 years ago, water surpassed the dam, washed out a road, and closed several businesses. The City

decided to remove the dam. Ms. Singler showed what the dam looked like just after removal. She indicated this was a case where not a lot of work was done; some sediment was removed and some landscaping was done in the immediate vicinity.

Ms. Singler proceeded to the second example, a steeper gradient river in Vermont. The dam had already breached and formed a deep scour pool, limiting trout movement. Three dams in total had to be removed by the Connecticut River Watershed Council as there were portions of old dams still behind it. As a steeper gradient river, the dam simply had to be removed and the rock and cobble behind it could just go downstream.

Ms. Singler continued with the third example of a 200 foot wide, reinforced concrete dam that had already breached in a 1995 flood. It was a hydraulic barrier for fish going upstream as well as a drowning hazard. There was not a lot of impoundment behind it so just the infrastructure was removed.

Ms. Singler presented another example of the Mill River in Taunton, MA. The dam came close to failing in 2005. There was concern that if it failed it would detrimentally impact hydraulics at an upstream dam also in poor condition. Riprap had been placed over the dam so water came over the dam and went through the rock; this process would strand fish on the rocks. The dam had created a wider impoundment and formed a high sediment, lake-like pool. The removal design was for work within the immediate vicinity and the rest of the area was allowed to grow up on its own. She indicated that in most impoundments, things (e.g. dead trees) in the water do not break down with time, as it is the back and forth between wet and dry that causes things to break down. Here, the seed bed in the impoundment was just waiting to re-sprout.

Ms. Singler continued with an example just downstream of the previous, The Hopewell Mills Dam on the Mill River in Taunton, MA. She noted at this site there was a large buildup of contaminated sediment due to runoff from a nearby silver factory. A large amount of sediment was removed, almost one foot. At this site there was also approximately 10 acres of channel reconstruction and new bank planting. She indicated most projects just remove the dam and do minimal landscaping; in this case, they landscaped many acres to re-build habitat features.

Ms. Singler provided the final example of the Ed Bills Pond Dam on Eight Mile River in Lyme, CT. It was a five acre stone masonry impoundment with concerning habitats upstream. This site was a combination of passive and active restoration; in some areas the stream was allowed to take its time and its own course, in other areas sediment was removed and banks/habitats were built in. Ms. Singler displayed photos showing the differences between where they seeded and where the habitat was allowed to recover naturally over time.

Ms. Singler welcomed questions about dam removal. Chair Haynes thanked her and asked about the wetland impacts at the last example site. Ms. Singler replied that she believes a lot of that site will be emerging marsh; she believes the habitat type will change with time.

Mr. Madison asked about downstream sediment release impacts. Ms. Singler explained that the amount of sediment removed depends on the circumstance. If it is contaminated, it will likely need to be removed; however, certain amounts could be released if uncontaminated and coarser. She noted that there could be downstream areas that are sediment starved, and releasing sediments can reform banks downstream. Generally, they like to balance the short-term impact with the long-term gain, depending on the species and habitat.

Councilor Manwaring questioned making dam removal decisions when threatened or endangered species are present. Ms. Singler replied that having endangered species on site does not prevent dam removal, it only changes the approach to minimize/mitigate species impacts.

Dr. Reilly questioned the positive or negative impacts of lowering upstream water levels in dam removal. Ms. Singler replied it depends on the project and the site. Lowering water level can improve water quality and welcome new species you would not see otherwise. She provided an example of such a case with sea lampreys. Water level can have different effects on different species and habitats. The hope is that the habitat will diversify.

Chair Haynes asked for examples of maintaining dam infrastructure and adding something like a fish ladder to allow migration. Ms. Singler said fish ladders can be a good alternative when a dam cannot or is chosen not to be removed. The challenge from a river ecology perspective is only allowing movement of one species as opposed to a full suite of species. If there is a target species you are concerned with moving, a fish ladder can be good. She provided an example of successful use of a fish ladder for river herring in Plymouth.

Mr. Lacey asked how far these example dams are from the ocean. Ms. Singler replied that the example in southern CT was in a major tributary; other examples are not as close to the ocean. Mr. Lacey asked if, in any of the examples, there were more dams upstream of the ones removed. Ms. Singler replied yes, at the Zemko Dam on the Eight Mile River. Mr. Lacey asked the reach of these removals. Ms. Singler replied 10 miles of additional habitat. She added that she has not worked on many fish-way projects, but there are cases when it is warranted to maintain the facility.

Chair Haynes asked if there are any examples of dam removals with extensive wetlands like those near West Street Dam. Ms. Singler said she has not worked on a dam removal with a large wetland complex. The example on Mill River in Taunton, MA was an approximately five acre wetland complex; the one in Keene is larger. She indicated a lot of work and research can be done to find out how much the habitats will change after removal; however, there will always be a degree of uncertainty because rivers are dynamic environments. Sometimes the river does all of the work after dam removal; sometimes, man-made work can provide assistance.

Mr. O'Brien indicated he is with the NH branch of The Nature Conservancy and works in communications and government relations. He came to the meeting to better understand the community's questions regarding the West Street Dam. He indicated he is pleased to see the conversation about West Street Dam continuing.

Mr. O'Brien asked the Commission about the next steps. Chair Haynes replied that right now they are not in a hurry to make a decision because West Street Hydro has been granted more time to conduct feasibility studies. Ms. Kessler added that the Commission will be offering a recommendation to City Council but it is the City Council that will make the ultimate decision about the future of the dam. West Street Hydro will be returning to City Council in ten to twelve months to provide an update on their studies/progress. The Commission had recommended dam removal several years ago pending study of the impact on natural communities. The study recently completed by VHB explores this impact. The Commission has not yet issued a recommendation to City Council since this study has been completed.

Ms. Singler added that any time she speaks to a dam owner, whether municipal or private, the one thing she can always say is the space will look different after removal. It is hard to know what the differences will be, and uncertainty can be difficult. Sometimes it is helpful to determine what information you need to make the removal decision and study those pieces. It can become difficult at a certain point, however, if you try to study everything. She recommended determining those decision points and honing in on those. Councilor Manwaring said that is part of her concern. She said when the process started it was clear the City Council was not going to take the dam down because of its history; this is not as clear today, however, as the City Council has changed. Her concern is, if the dam stays, how fish can migrate past it.

Ms. Skuly commented on appearance and usage after dam removal. She cited the dam in West Swanzey and how accessibility to that river for recreation has increased and that it is used more since the dam was removed.

Mr. O'Brien commented that from his standpoint, he is available as a resource to the Commission or City Council if needed in the decision making process.

Dr. Reilly asked where a list of impacts of dam removal can be acquired. Ms. Singler replied there is a publication titled "Ecology of Dam Removal" which is a good resource, despite being a bit outdated. She does not remember if it lists impacts, per se. The dynamics are different in each situation, which makes listing pros and cons difficult. She finds these projects exciting because rivers, habitats, and species adjust the way they need to after removal. It is not as simple as either-or and can be a challenge to determine which is better.

Chair Haynes thanked Ms. Singler and Mr. O'Brien for their participation. Ms. Singler indicated she will be on sabbatical and unavailable for the next few months. Ms. Singler and Mr. O'Brien departed the meeting at 5:22 PM.

**4) Communication and Notifications**

**a. Wetland Utility Maintenance Notification – Eversource Energy L-163  
Transmission Line**

Ms. Kessler directed the Commission to this issue included in the packet. This property is near Goose Pond and the Drummer Hill Preserve. She said the map in the packet shows the route of the easement. No permanent impacts are proposed, only temporary ones. She said the Commission does not have the ability to intervene in this issue, she is only providing this for their information. Chair Haynes asked who follows-up to make sure the impacts truly are just temporary. Ms. Kessler replied that responsibility falls to the NH Department of Environmental Services (NH DES).

**b. Shoreland Permit Application- 690 Marlboro Rd**

Ms. Kessler indicated this permit is also one the Commission cannot intervene on but she is presenting this for their information. The Commission could share any comments or concerns with the NH DES. Ms. Kessler presented a map of the site and indicated it is along the Branch River where Cheshire Oil is located. They propose to replace a 2,790 square foot storage building with one that is approximately 11,000 square feet. They intend to mitigate any impervious surface impacts by replacing a gravel lot with loam; they also plan to pave a portion of the drive that is currently graveled. Ms. Kessler passed the site plan around to the Commission. She indicated this building project will go before the Planning Board in August.

Mr. Lacey asked if the area considered buffer would become more permeable. Ms. Kessler noted the buffer is currently 250 feet and extends from the river. The area closer to the river will be more permeable. They had to identify threatened, rare, or endangered species in the permit application. There are possibly dwarf wedge mussel located in the river, but they do not know definitively.

Councilor Manwaring asked what the Surface Water Protection Ordinance buffer zone is at that property. Mr. Lamb indicated it is located in the industrial zone. Ms. Kessler noted in that case, the buffer is 30 feet.

Chair Haynes thanked Ms. Kessler and accepted the information.

**5) Conservation Master Plan Continued Discussion**

Chair Haynes asked Ms. Kessler to guide the discussion as he was not at the last meeting. Ms. Kessler indicated she had two updates. First, she spoke with a city planner in Concord about their timber management activities. The Concord Planning Department hired a forestry consultant 20-30 years ago to create a Forestry Management Plan for 4,100 acres of City owned land. The Conservation Commission oversees this Plan and works with a forestry consultant, Ron Klemarczyk of FORECO LLC, to implement its recommendations on an annual basis. The plan outlines what harvests should take place each year and has a scope of approximately 20 years. Each year Mr. Klemarczyk

proposes what he will do and gets approval from the Commission to work on particular stands. The location of this work may depend on other projects taking place such as trail work, etc. Concord averages \$10,000 per year in revenue from active management and harvest. This revenue goes toward specific City chosen projects. The city planner indicated it has been working well. The plan was last updated in 2009 and is evaluated approximately every two years.

Mr. Lacey asked how many acres Keene has compared to Concord. Ms. Kessler indicated the City owns approximately 2,500 acres just in the Roaring Brook Watershed. She had asked the Concord city planner if they have an Open Space Plan. They indicated it is a part of their Master Plan but they are in the process of rewriting it independent of the Master Plan through a contract with Moosewood Ecological. They want to establish guidelines/priorities for deciding how to use revenue received from the forest harvests and other sources. Part of their contract with Moosewood is creation of a GIS database for future decision making. Ms. Kessler indicated she is interested to learn more about that part of their scope of work with Moosewood. Their contract with Moosewood is approximately \$30,000. Councilor Manwaring asked if the Keene GIS project is already doing something like that with City owned lands. Ms. Kessler replied no, the current GIS program is not doing that; this would be more of a tool for the Conservation Commission and City to use for decision-making. She said this is tied to setting future conservation priorities, future acquisition of land, and how to use the Land Use Change Tax Fund.

Ms. Kessler continued providing an update on Merrimack's Biological Diversity and Conservation Plan. She spoke with Tim Tenhave, the current chair of the Merrimack Conservation Commission. He indicated they have been under significant development pressure for the last decade. Merrimack currently has \$1 million in their Land Use Change Tax Fund. They use their Plan consistently as a guiding document and as a tool for making decisions on how to use funds in the Land Use Change Tax Fund. The Plan identifies conservation priority focus areas, and the Commission is focused on procuring conservation easements on and purchasing land in some of these high priority areas. He indicated the Plan is a document they can turn to and share with decision-making bodies to explain the importance of conserving certain lands. The document was also helpful to them when trying to advocate against and research the impacts of the proposed Northeast Gas Pipeline.

Ms. Kessler indicated she asked Mr. Tenhave what they would change if there were to do the Plan over again. He indicated that the Plan does not have concrete action items for education, communication, and outreach. He feels this is the area that could have a significant impact. Ms. Kessler directed the Commission to [www.merrimackoutdoors.org](http://www.merrimackoutdoors.org) where the plan is available. She said they are doing a lot with their community that Keene could possibly be inspired from such as trail maps, kiosks, community engagement, and online GIS interfaces/engagement.

Mr. Lacey indicated they also have some sort of forest management program that appears to be ongoing. He said their Plan seems to be inclusive. Ms. Kessler indicated she did not talk to Mr. Tenhave specifically about the active forest management plan. Mr. Lacey

suggested speaking with him about general management activities. The Commission members thanked Ms. Kessler for her report.

Chair Haynes asked the Commission members what comes next. Dr. Reilly suggested inviting Mr. Littleton to give a proposal of what he could do for the Commission. Mr. Lacey replied he does not think they are quite there yet. Chair Haynes added he is unsure if they are organized enough yet to give him enough information. Mr. Lacey indicated a lot of what was done in Merrimack has been done in bits and pieces. He said the Commission may ultimately use Mr. Littleton's help but he does not want him to have to redo things. Ms. Kessler asked Mr. Lacey if he was indicating not to reinvent the wheel and not re-do work already done in NRIs. She said it would be good to go back and refer to the recommendations in those reports. Mr. Lacey replied the towns they are discussing already had some sort of management plan; he is not lobbying that a biological approach is better than a forestry approach. He suggested gathering information in addition to the NRI biodiversity information and eventually incorporating someone like Mr. Littleton.

Ms. Kessler indicated that others who have worked with Mr. Littleton said his strength was building a team of people who can address areas he is not as skilled in. She said perhaps if they pursue a timber harvest, the assessment could be folded into his phase of developing this plan.

Chair Haynes asked Dr. Reilly if he had anyone else in mind other than Mr. Littleton. Dr. Reilly indicated Mr. Littleton is just one individual who has done this type of work they have heard positive feedback about. He questioned how they will know when they are ready enough to bring someone like him in. Specifically, what can the Commission do to be ready for him? Perhaps bringing Mr. Littleton in can help understand what the Commission needs to do moving forward. He feels they are slowing down and wants to keep the ball moving forward.

Councilor Manwaring commented that at the last meeting they discussed the Merrimack Plan not including greenways or aquatic systems. She indicated it was unfortunate Ms. Burchsted and Councilor Hansel were not at the meeting to comment. She said she is not opposed to having a forester come to a meeting to see what they could do, however, she does not necessarily feel they are ready. She continued, noting there are pieces they do not have a handle on yet. Chair Haynes said he feels they have energy but do not know what to do with it. He said it might be good to have someone come in and give them structure to know how to proceed with their own research.

Ms. Kessler commented that they had momentum at the last meeting by having another plan to look at. She said they are trying to continue developing what the Keene plan will look like. The Commission agreed on the main goals of the plan at the last meetings – prioritization of long-range conservation planning and addressing land management activities. Moving forward, they need to determine specific objectives and look at similar community's plans. She suggested looking at those other plans to see if they are tools to replicate or to identify what is missing from them that are needed in Keene. Mr. Lacey indicated he hopes they can start collecting basic forestry data to describe what forest



exists. Councilor Manwaring asked if it is worth having a forester come speak to the Commission about what they would do. Chair Haynes asked if the Commission needs more time to review the Merrimack Plan. Everyone agreed yes, they do. Chair Haynes asked everyone to go through the Merrimack Plan thoroughly before the next meeting and make a list of likes/dislikes and items that could be added to Commission priorities. Ms. Kessler indicated she would acquire the conservation plan scope of work produced by the City of Concord.

Chair Haynes suggested inviting Steve Roberge to help guide the commission on forestry. Mr. Lacey indicated running perimeters seems important. Councilor Manwaring asked Mr. Lacey to write everything down for them that he thinks they need to do. She said having Mr. Roberge come to speak could be helpful. Ms. Kessler asked what they would bring him in to talk about. Chair Haynes indicated he could speak to some forestry components they want to address. He wants to make sure they keep moving forward and that forestry management is in the plan moving forward. Mr. Lacey said it is good to see that Concord is generating \$10,000 per year in revenue toward conservation efforts.

Chair Haynes questioned if the Commission can continue trying to do this themselves or if they need help. Mr. Madison agreed they need help. He said he has worked with Mr. Roberge on other projects and he could be a good resource. Ms. Butler said typically they need an idea of what they want the objectives/outcomes of the plan to be before bringing someone in so the consultant can recommend how to achieve those objectives. She indicated having someone come in before the objectives are outlined feels like working backward. Mr. Lacey stated having that information will guide what some of those objectives and possibilities are. He said some objectives may be unrealistic but they cannot know that until resources have been assessed.

Dr. Reilly said Mr. Roberge is well versed in both timber harvest and wildlife habitat. He thinks Mr. Roberge could help the Commission think about and develop goals. Chair Haynes indicated that would be helpful; he asked if he can be contacted to meet with the Commission. Ms. Kessler said they will need to check Mr. Roberge's availability and if he feels he can offer the knowledge they are seeking. She said it would be more high level based on the work he does and what he knows is occurring in other communities. Ms. Kessler asked for clarification on what she would be asking of Mr. Roberge. Are they trying to get a better sense of forest management generally? Ms. Butler replied forest management can mean many different things; she said it sounds like they want someone to do a cruise of all forested land the City owns to have an idea of what the forest communities look like. The Commission members agreed yes, they need to know what forest there is.

Ms. Kessler indicated she had an update on the Roaring Brook Watershed Management Plan. The City is finalizing a contract with VHB to begin work on the Watershed Management Plan. The focus will be on water quality, security (e.g. securing the perimeter of the forest), and forestry. She said there is a forestry component to the Watershed Management Plan which will allow the development of a timber management

plan. She stated it sounds as though what the Commission has been discussing regarding a timber cruise/management are tasks currently being addressed by the Watershed Management Plan for this area of land. She said one of the consultants on the Watershed Plan is a forestry consultant. The Watershed Management Plan work should begin this fall. She said that plan could serve as a model for the Commission. Chair Haynes indicated as the Watershed Plan focuses on forestry as it pertains to water, their efforts/goals may be different than those of the Commission. Mr. Lacey commented they have discussed this forestry topic multiple times; he said they will need to start somewhere. Dr. Reilly said in terms of getting things moving, despite their focus on water, it could be a fine example. Mr. Lacey indicated if there is a timber cruise being conducted in the Watershed, the Commission should be included, have access to any information produced, and have some influence as well. Ms. Kessler indicated she spoke with Donna Hanscom, who indicated a working group will be formed to oversee the project and they are interested in bringing someone on from the Commission. She said she will discuss that with Chair Haynes.

Chair Haynes commented that what is difficult moving forward, is that he is unclear on what needs to be done because he is not a forester. He said someone like Mr. Roberge could help the layperson to better understand. Mr. Madison agreed. Ms. Butler said if everyone is on board with a timber cruise, they need someone to go out and do it so the results can be used to determine objectives. Chair Haynes asked if they were just talking about a timber cruise at Goose Pond. Mr. Lacey added there are also Stearns Hill, Robin Hood, Beech Hill, and others. Councilor Manwaring said it is necessary to begin somewhere. Mr. Lacey indicated it can all be done at once but they can start with Goose Pond. Mr. Lacey asked if the staff have perimeter maps the forester could use. Mr. Lamb indicated maps can be provided for reasonable distances but will require some compilation.

Chair Haynes asked that for next meeting a list of properties be created so the Commission knows where they want to perform the timber cruise. Ms. Butler, Mr. Madison, and Councilor Manwaring agreed. Chair Haynes asked Mr. Lacey if they could make a working group for that. Mr. Lacey indicated he is unable to before the next meeting. He thought they had an inventory of City owned land already. Ms. Kessler replied they do. Councilor Manwaring indicated that is not the issue. Ms. Butler added that the Commission needs to choose which parcels to have inventoried. Dr. Reilly added having a forester like Mr. Roberge come in would be useful to in order to perform the inventory with specific goals and questions in mind. Mr. Lamb added that while Mr. Roberge may not perform the timber cruise, he could guide the approach and help the Commission to understand the process and develop priorities. Mr. Lacey indicated it is more precise to call this a forestry inventory than a timber cruise. Ms. Kessler said the goal of the data is to inform future plans for those parcels. Mr. Lamb suggested looking at examples from other towns to see their initial steps. Ms. Kessler and Mr. Lamb will speak with Mr. Roberge.

**6) Surface Water Protection Ordinance – Proposed Amendments Continued Discussion**

Chair Haynes asked where this matter stands. Mr. Lacey indicated the minutes accurately describe the issues and proposed changes. Councilor Manwaring indicated she thought they would have a new draft to review at the meeting. Ms. Kessler indicated the proposed changes were on the last page of the meeting packet. She said there was one new addition not discussed – number three, with regard to section 146 permitted uses, adding maintenance and vegetative control of the buffer. Mr. Lacey indicated the City Engineer proposed that be added.

Chair Haynes asked if they were ready to approve these changes. Councilor Manwaring said she would like to see the changes within the document itself instead of the proposed changes standing alone. Ms. Kessler indicated she could draft an amended version of the ordinance with the changes highlighted for the next meeting.

**7) New or Other Business**

Ms. Kessler indicated Ms. Butler is officially a Commission member.

**8) Staff Updates**

No updates were provided at this time.

**9) Adjournment – Next Meeting Date Monday, August 15, 2016**

The next Conservation Commission meeting will take place Monday, August 15, 2016 at 4:30 PM.

Hearing no further business, Chair Haynes adjourned the meeting at 6:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Katie Kibler, Minute Taker

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