

City of Keene
New Hampshire

CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, December 19, 2022

4:30 PM

**Room 22,
Parks & Recreation**

Members Present:

Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Chair
Eloise Clark
Councilor Robert Williams
Ken Bergman
Thomas Haynes, Alternate
Brian Reilly, Alternate
Steven Bill, Alternate (Voting)
John Therriault, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Councilor Andrew Madison, Vice Chair
Art Walker
Lee Stanish, Alternate

1) Call to Order

Chair Von Plinsky called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – November 21, 2022

A motion by Mr. Bergman to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2022 meeting was duly seconded by Mr. Reilly and the motion carried unanimously.

3) Report-Outs

A) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Committee

Mr. Haynes reported that the Subcommittee did not meet this month due to weather. There was a December 2nd workday at Goose Pond with a group of six volunteers, who carried approximately 20' long logs to create a walkway over a wet area; they were not able to lay the boards over the walkway due to weather. The walkway is just past the dam heading east. Mr. Haynes continued that the Subcommittee plans to meet in early January 2023 to discuss plans for the upcoming year. Now that the group has tools available to them, smaller groups can go out for trail

maintenance. He said they hope to apply for another grant in 2023 despite the last application being unsuccessful.

Mr. Haynes showed two color samples for trail signs for the Commission's feedback. He called them simple but tasteful examples. The Commission preferred the dark green option, which Mr. Bergman said was higher contrast. Discussion ensued as to whether that dark green would blend with the cedar wood as they age. Mr. Therriault noted that the paint would likely need to be updated in five years no matter the color.

B) Outreach

Mr. Haynes said this workgroup has not met and he continued plugging away at the programs discussed in November. Mr. Haynes mentioned that unfortunately one of the Tap-to-Toilet speakers, Jim Rousmaniere, passed away. Thus, the workgroup would consider other options.

C) Invasive Species

Councilor Williams reported that there had been no work because of winter. At some point in the new year, he will begin scheduling events again. If any Commissioners have ideas for locations to address invasive species, they should contact Councilor Williams. Specifically, he sought location ideas for the 2023 Garlic Mustard Challenge.

Ms. Clark reported that she spoke with a member of the Elm City Rotary, which has an initiative to catalogue local volunteers so that when an event arises, volunteers are easier to contact and gather. Ms. Clark thought this could be useful for the invasive species initiative. Councilor Williams agreed that the City could use such a directory, noting that Nature Groupie reaches volunteers throughout New England. The Commission agreed this could also be useful for trail maintenance at Goose Pond. Councilor Williams noted that publicizing is the greatest challenge of these events. Ms. Clark shared the name of a contact from the Rotary, Ryan Owens, who is also the Director of the Monadnock Conservancy.

Mr. Haynes added that he and other volunteers addressed some buckthorn and burning bush near the Goose Pond trailhead. It is an area that volunteers could revisit.

D) Land Conservation

Chair Von Plinsky was pleased to report that this work group met for the first time in a while. They had a good discussion on a way forward. The Chair said he reached out to the contact at Antioch University New England as to whether the Commission won the CSI proposal project, but he had no response and hoped for one soon. Without the student support, the work group would have to do this research and work themselves to develop a starting point for the land conservation initiatives the group started to formulate.

Chair Von Plinsky thanked Ms. Clark for sending an email with links to resources from the County Forester, Matt Kelly. He said the work group hopes to review those documents in January. Ms. Clark suggested considering the NH Wildlife Action Plan (WAP), which would answer most questions about whether land is valuable. She mentioned how the WAP can be matched with GIS parcel maps.

Ms. Clark also reported that the Monadnock Conservancy purchased the Casagrande property of ~250 acres to add to the Maynard forest, which is the northern piece of property right across from Goose Pond and Old Gilsum Road. The Commission agreed that was fantastic news. There is another land holder further down the road. Mr. Bergman mentioned that when looking at the maps, the work groups saw that between RT-10 as it leads to Sullivan, to the left toward the Drummer Hill area, the Monadnock Conservancy also has a large holding. Ms. Clark said that is the Maynard Forest.

Chair Von Plinsky said the workgroup was still discussing the 30x30 initiative and will be building an argument and momentum behind the idea. Mr. Bergman mentioned a challenge of how the workgroup could come to understand the status of all parcels in Keene and how to prioritize future protections, so the two must match in some sort of action program. Mr. Bergman continued that the City has information the work group would need to find at some point. The Chair noted that being awarded the Antioch project would provide the likely intelligence and drive to sort out some of the details.

4) Discussion Items

A) Airport Proposed Wildlife Control Fence – David Hickling, Airport Director

Chair Von Plinsky welcomed the Airport Director, David Hickling, for an update on the proposed wildlife control fence at the Keene Dillant Hopkins Airport. Mr. Hickling said there is no contract in place yet. However, there is a scope of services with McFarland Johnson, the consultants doing the design and construction management of the project. That scope of services was used recently to apply for a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grant, because this is fundable through FAA airport improvement funding. Mr. Hickling continued they are waiting to execute a contract with an engineer pending that grant money. Primarily the scope of services would focus on the first phase of the project, which would entail one-third of the design—i.e., laying out where the fence would go and getting an environmental assessment. There would also be a wildlife hazard site visit, which is performed by a subconsultant who is a wildlife biologist that specializes in mitigating wildlife hazards at airports. That biologist would spend two or three days observing the wildlife and review the airport processes for deterring wildlife (“harassment” like bird bangers, chasing geese and deer) and then they will recommend what the airport should do in the future to mitigate these issues. The hope is that the wildlife biologist will recommend a fence, because that would help get more funding from the FAA. Mr. Hickling said this scope of services also covers phase 1.b. of the archeological surveys and updating the wetland delineation for the fence area—a preliminary visit indicated that what is there might not match what is

mapped in the Master Plan. A large part of the design phase is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) assessment.

Mr. Hickling listed some agencies that would coordinate on this project: NH Department of Environmental Services (DES), NH Floodplain Manager, the Natural Heritage Bureau, NH Fish and Game, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Ashuelot Local Advisory Committee. He said that from the initial site visits, the design would serve to minimize any impacts to wetlands or habitat. The consultants have seen that the location of the fence would have little impact if any. The real issues would be with constructing the fence. Mitigation tools could be used like timber mats or working seasonally.

Mr. Hickling continued, displaying a map of the airport runways. Specifically, he showed a line running parallel to the runway, demonstrating where the fence is proposed. Initially, the fence was proposed to line Airport Road, but Mr. Hickling agreed with the concern of losing that valuable wildlife watching location that people, especially bird watchers, use daily. He called it a great asset for the community. In addition to protecting that resource, Mr. Hickling did not want the fence along Airport Road because it would enclose wildlife inside the fence and Airport property, defeating the purpose of wildlife management on the runways. Mr. Hickling demonstrated the closest the fence could be to the runways; within a certain distance around the runways, nothing but aviation-related materials are allowed, per the FAA. Having the fence as close to the runway as proposed will require some variances from the FAA because the fence would be within a slope where materials are technically prohibited. There is already precedent for doing so to avoid wetlands at other airports. Early discussions with the FAA have been positive on this matter. Mr. Hickling said the expected wetland impacts would be minimal and would mostly occur during fence construction. He showed one area closer to Airport Road that is popular for wildlife viewing that could be fenced because there needs to be greater distance away from the approach end of the runway. He said there is some topography there that should keep the fence out of the wetland or have minimal impact. He said the outlook was positive for keeping the fence out of wetlands as much as possible. Mr. Hickling showed an overlay of the proposed fence location with the wetlands to demonstrate the potential impacts. There would be some floodplain impact in two locations.

Mr. Hickling continued discussing funding for the project. He said this is a project for aviation safety, yet the FAA does not consider it a high priority for funding. There is a chance that the FAA would only fund this project over multiple years, at \$150,000 funding annually, that is essentially guaranteed. Anything above that amount is competitive with other airports. He said that perimeter fences for general aviation airports are low on the funding scale, and could result in the FAA only awarding the \$150,000 annually until the multi-million dollar project is complete. However, Mr. Hickling does not want this to be a multi-year project because there would be disturbances to wetlands more than once and by building the fence slowly, wildlife would inevitably remain inside the fence. He will do everything in his power to get the whole fence funded in 2023. He said a letter of support from the Conservation Commission would be helpful.

Mr. Bergman asked, if the full project were funded in 2023, how long the fence installation would take. Mr. Hickling said the timeline is approximately four or five months. Mr. Bergman suggested avoiding installation during the spring to avoid the onset of avian migration and breeding. Mr. Hickling agreed that winter would be best for this work. Mr. Bergman also asked whether the fence would connect to the fence around the new solar farm and Mr. Hickling replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Haynes asked whether the first grant would just cover the design, engineering, and biologist, and if another grant would be needed for the actual fence work. Mr. Hickling said yes. He continued that there is a grant application submitted that would be within the \$150,000 threshold. He said they could go over that amount if the scope expands. If it were over by \$50,000, they could probably get discretionary funding to finish the project in 2023. Mr. Hickling estimated that this would be a \$3 million project for both the design and construction. Construction costs are high.

Mr. Hickling felt he had a good argument for completing the project in one year, but reiterated that it depends on the FAA. He would write to the FAA about the constant wildlife interferences, as would C&S Grocers who use the runway daily, and Monadnock Aviation, which is the fixed base operator. There is also support from a hazardous wildlife study.

Chair Von Plinsky heard public comment from Dee Robins, who asked if deer were the target animals. Mr. Hickling said yes. Mr. Bergman noted that he shared a photo of deer near the runway in the shared Google Drive. Mr. Hickling said there were also issues with coyotes and foxes.

Mr. Bergman noted that between the C&S hangar and runway 1432, there is a brook that runs from the Edgewood neighborhood and asked if the fence would cross it. Mr. Hickling said yes it would cross that brook. Mr. Bergman noted that otter often come through there and wondered if there were some treatments to allow them through the fence. Mr. Hickling said the fence could just be built over the water line, so the otter can pass underneath.

Mr. Therriault noted that Keene is a member of Bee City USA. He asked if the Airport Director was interested in placing approximately one-half dozen native bee habitats around the Airport property. Mr. Therriault said they are approximately the size of a shoe box and are attached to trees or sides of a structure. Mr. Hickling said he was interested and did not think it would be an FAA issue. Mr. Therriault agreed to take the lead working on this with Mr. Hickling. Mr. Therriault said it could be a good Bee City project for next year and that he could work with students to decorate the hives. The Commission agreed this was a good idea.

If the major funding package is not received, Mr. Bergman asked how Mr. Hickling would proceed. Mr. Hickling replied that this project had been pushed off for some time and he believes it is a liability to not construct the fence soon. Mr. Hickling would keep the Commission

apprised of the progress. Mr. Hickling added that as a part of the project scheduled, he arranged for the project consultants to meet twice with both the Keene Conservation Commission and the Swanzey Conservation Commission. There should be an update for the Commission by April/May 2023. Mr. Bergman asked what the biologists would focus on, and Mr. Hickling said mostly mammals and anything else large that could be a hazard to aircraft. Mr. Bergman said that many wildlife watchers could advise on what animals are present in the area.

Ms. Clark noted that the Ashuelot River Local Advisory Committee, and specifically Barbara Skully, could write a letter of support as well. Ms. Clark would provide the contact information to Mr. Hickling.

Mr. Reilly asked when a letter of support from the Commission would be needed. Mr. Hickling said sooner than later. Mr. Hickling had spoken this morning with the City Manager about the need to get all of this together and sent off to Senator Shaheen and Representative Kuster. Chair Von Plinsky agreed to coordinate with Mr. Hickling on the proper language for the letter. Mr. Hickling thought that having the Commission review and approve the letter at their January meeting would work well for this timeline. If Mr. Hickling requires the letter sooner, he would be in communication with the Chair and Ms. Brunner. The Commission did not feel the need to make a motion authorizing Chair Von Plinsky to write the letter. Ms. Brunner did note that if a draft letter was sent to the Commission for review before the next meeting, there would be no opportunity to comment on the letter without generating a quorum via email.

Mr. Bergman wondered whether the NH DES wetland permit should be a primary focus of the letter. Mr. Hickling wanted the letter to be specific to the Conservation Commission and why the group believes the fence is important. A good example would be for the Commission to write about the benefits of completing the project in one year instead of multiple. Mr. Hickling hoped that the letters from each stakeholder group—i.e., Conservation Commission, C&S, etc.—would be unique. Mr. Hickling would reach out to the Chair soon with some talking points that could be included in the letter.

Mr. Bergman asked if the original Airport Road siting for the fence was out of the question, or whether the Commission needed to advocate keeping it closer to the runway in the letter. Mr. Hickling said it was more so at this point about not having the project span multiple years and the location is not impacted by that. Mr. Haynes said corralling wildlife into the airport is not wanted. The Chair thought it was an easy argument to make for the Commission.

The Commission thanked Mr. Hickling for his time and explanation.

B) Conservation Commission Speaking Events

Councilor Madison was not present, so the Commission would revisit the Conservation Café idea in 2023.

C) Downtown Reconstruction Project

Chair Von Plinsky noted a recent article in the Sentinel about the downtown utility and redesign project. He said there is greater than 100-year-old infrastructure under the downtown that must be replaced. The City is taking advantage of that opportunity to consider a redesign of the downtown. He included this on the agenda in case the Commission wanted to make any conservation-related recommendations for the redesign. The Chair's priority was ensuring enough space is left for street trees to have the proper planting conditions, which would allow trees to grow to the size of those on Central Square.

Ms. Brunner had shared a link to the project website. She noted that these are preliminary design alternatives, from which a stakeholder Committee had made a recent recommendation to City Council. The recommendation included bike lanes at sidewalk grade, a mini roundabout at the head of Central Square (the flagpole would be shifted slightly south), expansion of Central Square by closing the northern leg of the current traffic pattern around the square for added green and event space (the area in front of the church and the Stage would be kept paved for pedestrian traffic), diagonal parking on both sides of Main Street but not in the center median, two lanes of traffic, and tree planting beds a minimum of 8' wide (she thought; trees downtown have had challenges with smaller spaces). This was only a recommendation to City Council, not the design chosen; some City Councilors prefer an alternative design. There would still be several public workshops with the whole City Council to weigh the options.

Mr. Bill suggested that sufficient bike racks should be included in the downtown. Chair Von Plinsky wanted to focus on conservation-related issues. All Commissioners were welcome to share their personal opinions about the various options in the upcoming public workshops.

Ms. Clark felt she needed more information before a recommendation. She wondered about the status of downtown trees and the current gazebo, and whether there had been an analysis of trees to remove. The Chair thought only one tree on Central Square would be impacted because it has issues and would be removed regardless of the project. Ms. Brunner said there was a tree inventory as a part of this project to determine what trees are in good, fair, or poor condition and whether they could be saved. Ms. Brunner posted an old downtown tree inventory from many years ago in the shared Google Drive. From the current inventory, she demonstrated the trees with high asset value that are likely to be removed. On the current inventory, Mr. Therriault said it only looked like three healthy and high-value trees were impacting utilities. Ms. Brunner said it depends on the tree location and final design chosen. She noted that many trees on Main Street are currently affected by the Emerald Ash Borer disease, so the Public Works Department is working to remove those before they impact all the surrounding trees.

Mr. Reilly wondered how much was known about how the current root structures have impacted the underground utilities. Ms. Brunner said for some of the high value trees with roots impacting utilities, the utility would not be removed, but abandoned in place because removing them would damage the root structures of the trees. She said mostly the trees right on the end of pavement

above utilities would be impacted. Ms. Brunner noted that the current utilities run everywhere underneath Main Street and demonstrated a map of the utilities to be replaced, with some running diagonally under the street and Central Square; the newest utilities are from the 1920s. There are also gas lines and Eversource utilities, among many others.

Mr. Bergman touched on the issue of replacing the lost trees with native or non-native tree species. He personally liked ginkgo and another non-native Japanese species. He noted how some native species are subject to diseases, making it a complicated issue. He imagined there would be an incentive to fast growing trees to accomplish shade quickly, such as the locust, for which only the male trees should be planted because the female fruit is rancid.

Chair Von Plinsky recognized Ms. Robbins, who said that as a resident, she thought it was important to consider possible native species before ornamentals, and to certainly not include Norway maples. The Chair said his research before the meeting focused on trees getting enough space. He understood if 8' was the recommendation. Everything he saw was a 6' radius or 12' wide area. However, Main Street is not limitless. Mr. Bergman said he was interested in there being a wide range of species with a large canopy, which he said would help prevent widespread diseases from taking over. The Chair agreed, noting that the City had been hit hard by tree diseases in the past.

Ms. Clark made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault: We, the Keene Conservation Commission, move to thank the City for its forethought regarding the downtown reconstruction project. Additionally, due to the tremendous environmental, social, and aesthetic value, we strongly recommend that the final design make significant use of a variety of large canopy street trees and finally that said trees be given every opportunity to thrive in the difficult urban environment by ensuring that each tree be planted with a buffer of radius of at least 6' from any impervious surface.

Mr. Haynes noted the word "large" included in the motion, wondering how that would be defined and whether large trees would be best in all locations downtown. The Chair thought that was a fair point and delete to change the wording "large canopy."

Mr. Reilly talked about the proposed radius around the trees, noting that they had not discussed tree height upon planting. He also wondered whether the Commission should specify native trees. On height, the Chair thought it was best to recommend a mixture of small, medium, and large mature trees. The Chair agreed that large trees might not always be best—for example, when close to buildings—but said he was thinking about the presence of the very large trees on Central Square. He continued that native trees are preferred, but noted how few urban trees are hardy enough to withstand. Mr. Bergman noted that pin oaks are a popular choice because of how quickly they mature. Mr. Bergman continued that the center island might be limited enough in size to not accommodate large trees; perhaps there is more space near crosswalks. He said foliage and shade are good things. The Commission agreed that hardy street trees that mature

quickly and provide quality shade are preferred. Mr. Bill suggested opportunities to support bees and other pollinators in the locations not suitable for trees.

Councilor Williams commented that a while ago, the Emerald Ash Borer took out a lot of trees on Main Street. At that time, Councilor Williams had asked the Director of Public Works what those trees would be replaced with and was very satisfied with the answer of Logan trees. The Councilor knew City Staff were paying attention and making good decisions, that they would not choose species like the Bradford pear, and thus he was not inclined to micromanage their choices. Councilor Williams also suggested including some Liberty elms in the Elm City, and Mr. Therriault agreed. Ms. Clark said she had experience with Liberty elms, which she said are not necessarily hardy. Chair Von Plinsky recommended the following language: “a diverse variety of street trees.”

Mr. Bergman said that the older tree inventory mentioned that many trees were subjected to mowing and weed whacking that damaged the bases of trees. He wondered if there was infrastructure to protect the trees from such damage.

Chair Von Plinsky said the preliminary design alternatives proposed to maintain a buffer around impervious surfaces, possibly an 8’ radius. Ms. Brunner commented that the Planning Board development standards do not use a radius, but the area of non-compacted native permeable soil around the tree, which is a minimum of 6’ and 3’, with the idea that it could be different distances in different dimension to reach the correct area. The Chair said he was not an arborist but that the Commission could still advocate for trees. He suggested asking for 12’ in the hopes of getting 10’. Ms. Robbins suggested the following phrase: “to maximize the vitality of the tree,” or something indicating to accommodate the trees’ longevity. The Chair worried that might end up defined however someone would want to fit the infrastructure. Councilor Williams said he thought 12’ was big and that there would likely be pushback on that. He suggested shooting for 10’. Mr. Haynes said that in the end, the design for downtown would ultimately dictate this issue. Ultimately, Mr. Haynes said this is about the designers knowing that people want as much space around trees as possible. The Chair hoped to affect the design before they pick the trees. He wondered about a 10’ wide buffer area instead of a 6’ radius. Councilor Williams suggested 120 square feet of soil. Ms. Brunner said the Planning Board standard is 300 cubic feet of excavation to be filled with permeable native soil, but she did not know where that number came from. She said that was hard to enforce. Councilor Williams noted that asking for larger excavations would mean higher costs, which would likely not go over well. Ms. Brunner knew that the Zoning regulations for a parking lot island requires an area 8’ wide for trees. The Chair suggested the following: “... that each tree be planted with a buffer of at least 10 feet square.”

Mr. Bergman asked if the number of trees to be replaced depends on the design plan chosen. Ms. Brunner referred to a tree inventory presented to the Commission and stated that all marked in yellow would be removed soon because they are dying or spreading disease. Ms. Brunner thought that those marked in green along sidewalks were the most likely to be saved. She was

unsure about the trees in the center median. She reiterated that a lot depends on the final design but that the planning team is trying to save as many trees as possible.

Mr. Therriault mentioned that pollinator friendly trees do not make good street trees; they either cover too widely or are not salt hardy. He suggested leaving that choice to the experts. Councilor Williams said his concern for pollinators was less about trees and more about the large areas covered with dark mulch and just a few plantings. The Councilor thought the Commission could have pollinator influence with lower box planters.

Ms. Clark made the following amended motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault: We, the Keene Conservation Commission, move to thank the City for its forethought regarding the downtown reconstruction project. Additionally, due to the tremendous environmental, social, and aesthetic value, we strongly recommend that the final design make significant use of a diverse variety of street trees and finally that said trees be given every opportunity to thrive in the difficult urban environment by ensuring that each tree be planted with a buffer of at least 100 square feet. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Von Plinsky again encouraged all Commissioners to participate in the public workshops on this issue. Councilor Williams suggested that each Commissioner speak with one of the two City Councilors from their Ward or one of the five at-large Councilors about any concerns.

D) Downtown Tree Inventory

With all the work planned for the downtown, Chair Von Plinsky thought it was best to table this item for now, pending a Commissioner indicating they want to take the lead on this. Otherwise, he thought it was prudent to wait to see how the downtown plans evolve.

E) Photo Library

Chair Von Plinsky recalled this conversation from last month on how to share photos from site visits, etc. The Chair looked at the possibilities for a Flickr account and a free one would hold 1,000 photos before there is a need to pay. He thought that was one of the best choices because the Google drive would fill the allotted memory very quickly. Flickr Pro costs \$70/year. The Chair suggested trying the free Flickr to start. The Chair also mentioned the possibility to add a folder to the Library's Flickr account, which is in collaboration with the Historical Society. Councilor Williams liked that idea versus using a third part commercial server. Mr. Bergman mentioned that he is a Flickr Pro user, and he was unsure it was possible for multiple people as a part of an organization to manage the account; he thought it was only for individual access. He agreed that there could be a separate album on the Library's account for the Commission. Otherwise, they could try the free Flickr and create albums for each site visited. Chair Von Plinsky would contact the Library account holder for more information and report back at the next meeting. Councilor Williams asked to be CC-ed on that email because he is the City Council liaison to the Library Board of Trustees.

5) **Adoption of 2023 Meeting Schedule**

Meetings occur the third Monday of every month, except January and February, when the Commission meets the Tuesday after the third Monday of the month because of holidays. A motion by Mr. Therriault to adopt the 2023 meeting schedule was duly seconded by Mr. Bergman and the motion carried unanimously.

6) **New or Other Business**

Mr. Reilly wondered if there were any changes to Commission membership in 2023. Ms. Brunner noted that a new alternate member was approved recently—Lee Stanish. Commissioners recalled that an alternate was supposed to be moved to a regular membership but that it had not happened despite many requests. They agreed that Mr. Bill’s membership should change. Ms. Brunner would take this request to the Mayor so the recommendation could go through the proper City process.

Chair Von Plinsky mentioned that Eversource would be trimming trees again on scenic roads. This requires a quorum of the Conservation Commission to be present at a joint public hearing with the City Council on February 2, 2023 at 7:00 PM. Both Councilors Williams and Madison count toward that quorum, and the Chair plans to attend, and he would coordinate with others to be present.

Mr. Haynes mentioned emails from the NH Association of Conservation Commissions about a wetlands training session. It is a seven-part series, with the first five via Zoom and the last two in the field through June 2023. If Commissioners are interested, Mr. Haynes thought it could be helpful for the wetlands applications this Commission reviews.

7) **Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023**

There being no further business, Chair Von Plinsky adjourned the meeting at 5:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katrinya Kibler, Minute Taker
December 27, 2022

Reviewed and edited by,
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner