

City of Keene
New Hampshire

CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, April 17, 2023

4:30 PM

**Room 22,
Recreation Center**

Members Present:

Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Chair
Councilor Robert Williams (Arrived at 4:47 PM)
Eloise Clark
Ken Bergman
Thomas Haynes, Alternate (via Zoom)
Lee Stanish, Alternate (Arrived at 4:48 PM)
Brian Reilly, Alternate
Steven Bill, Alternate
John Therriault, Alternate
Deborah LeBlanc, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Amanda Palmeira, Assistant City Attorney

Members Not Present:

Councilor Andrew Madison, Vice Chair
Art Walker

1) Call to Order

Chair Von Plinsky called the meeting to order at 4:31 PM and thanked Vice Chair Madison for leading the meeting last month. Roll call ensued. Mr. Haynes was participating remotely, and he was alone at his location.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 20, 2023

Revisions: Line 368–369, change “April 30” to “March 30.” There was Commission consensus to not change the line marked “information garbled.” There was also consensus to not change line 89 that stated, “when construction begins” because the next line stated, “after all permitting is complete.”

A motion by Mr. Bergman to adopt the March 20, 2023 meeting minutes as amended was duly seconded by Mr. Bill and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bergman noted that the handouts provided by the presenter at the last meeting were not available to him while he participated remotely. He asked how to get that information. Ms.

Brunner said she could provide a hard copy of those handouts from the last meeting. In general, she said could upload such handouts to the Commission's Google Drive. The Chair and Mr. Bergman agreed that would be helpful.

3) Report-Outs

A) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee

Mr. Haynes said there was not much to report as the Subcommittee had an upcoming meeting on April 21. He noted that the Subcommittee had started installing new signs around the pond. He said that members of the Subcommittee met with the Director of Parks, Recreation, and Facilities—Andy Bohannon—to talk about the contractor's application for maintenance work around Goose Pond. Mr. Bill noted that the Subcommittee approved the contract to move through the City process, and added that there was only the one applicant, so it should be simpler. He said the Subcommittee was also working to complete maps to post and be available to the public. The group would continue discussing how to get volunteers involved for trail maintenance and other work needed.

Mr. Therriault asked if the Subcommittee had considered contacting Boy Scout troops for volunteers. Mr. Bill replied that the Subcommittee had been led to believe that the Boy Scouts were in various stages of being inactive right now. Mr. Therriault said that a lot of the upper steps in Boy Scouts require community service projects and trail maintenance would be good.

B) Outreach

Ms. Clark reported that she was prepared for the May 10 children's NH Drinking Water Festival. She had prepared a lot of educational materials and would gather the other necessary materials. Mr. Haynes would be helping Ms. Clark during the event. Groups of children—up to 15 at a time—would cycle through the station for a short lesson and then a hands-on portion in 15-minute intervals from 9:00 AM–3:00 PM. The focus would be on what Ms. Clark calls “muck monsters,” and specifically aquatic insects.

C) Invasive Species

Councilor Williams was not present yet, but Chair Von Plinsky noted that the Councilor had sent an email with a rough schedule of events for this year. The next event would be Monday, May 8 from 6:30 PM–8:00 PM at the Stone Arch Bridge. The Commission assumed it was the bridge off Court Street because there was a rained-out event there last year. Ms. Clark noted how many invasives are present at that location. Chair Von Plinsky would get more information from Councilor Williams so that Ms. Brunner could publicize the event on the Community Development Department social media. The Chair said there was also an event planned for June 19 from 6:30 PM–8:00 PM at the Ellis-Harrison Park.

D) Land Conservation

Chair Von Plinsky reported that the group had not met in the last month.

4) Potential Land Purchase: Route 9/Washington St. Ext. (TMP#s 229-006-000 & 218-042-000)

Chair Von Plinsky discussed this potential land acquisition. He recalled that last year, Hull Forest Products outbid the City for two parcels off Beaver Brook and harvested the timber from the parcels. Now, Hull Forest Products wanted to sell the land and asked if the City was interested. Chair Von Plinsky said he was personally interested in the City seeking to acquire these parcels, but he wanted to hear from the Commission.

Mr. Bergman asked if both parcels were along the Washington Street extension or whether both parcels were on either side of RT-9. Chair Von Plinsky said there was a steep parcel along Old Concord Road and another parcel on the other side of RT-9. Mr. Bergman asked if the timber harvest was completed, and the Chair replied in the affirmative. Chair Von Plinsky said the owner, Sam Hull, seemed interested in selling to the City. Mr. Bergman wondered whether anyone had a chance to look at the parcel north of RT-9. No one had seen it since the harvest.

Mr. Therriault thought the parcel south of RT-9 was important because Beaver Brook runs through it and Beaver Brook Falls is near it. Chair Von Plinsky said the Brook does not run through that parcel but is off to the side of it. Mr. Therriault asked, if that southern portion was City land, whether it would provide access to the Brook. The Chair said this acquisition would not afford access to the Brook but said owning that southern parcel would impact the Brook in terms of the wholistic feeling of that space. Mr. Therriault recalled that the northern parcel was important because of its proximity to Goose Pond. Chair Von Plinsky agreed, noting that it provides a pretty sizeable buffer for Drummer Hill and Goose Pond from RT-9, which was the argument for acquiring the land the first time.

Councilor Williams arrived.

Ms. Brunner said that the northern parcel is also valuable in that it abuts land the City owns already at 0 Old Gilsum Road (TMP# 218-038-000). She displayed a map of the area that highlighted the different parcels. Mr. Bergman noted that the Monadnock Conservancy also has an easement on land in that area. Ms. Clark agreed but said all of those parcels are not contiguous.

Ms. Stanish arrived.

The Commission discussed how to make an appropriate motion or recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Brunner said that if the Chair wrote a letter to the City Council with the recommendation, it could be seen by the Council sooner on April 20. Whereas if the

Commission just made a motion to be reflected in the meeting minutes, the matter would not be seen by the City Council until their May 4 meeting. Ms. Brunner recalled that this Commission has the authority to purchase land with prior approval from the City Council. She said the Council supported pursuing this acquisition last year so she did not see a reason they would not this time.

A motion by Mr. Bill was duly seconded by Mr. Therriault to allow the Conservation Commission Chair, Sparky Von Plinsky, IV, to write a letter urging the City Council to grant the Conservation Commission permission to acquire the two parcels from Hull Forest Products. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Haynes asked if the Land Use Change Tax Fund would be used to purchase the properties and Chair Von Plinsky said yes.

Mr. Bergman wondered whether it would be prudent to have someone look at the land to ensure that erosion was not exacerbated by the logging, for example, and to have a sense of how selective the logging was. He thought it would be in the long-term interest of the City to acquire the properties. No one on the Commission had visited the parcels since timber was harvested. Mr. Bill thought there could be a careful analysis of the parcels based on how much the City wanted to pay for them. Ms. Clark wondered if it was known what Hull Forest Products was asking for the parcels. Ms. Brunner said she asked and they replied, "Let us know what you're offering." So, she reached out to the City Assessor who had not replied yet. She knew that Hull Forest Products paid more than the assessed value for the parcels and she said now the assessed value was higher, but from the perspective of someone looking to log the parcels, it was worth a lot less. Discussion ensued about what the assessed value was before the logging, but no one knew. The City Assessor discouraged paying the same amount for the parcels that Hull Forest Products did. Chair Von Plinsky recalled that it is the City who does the negotiating, not the Commission. He still thought the Commission could use its expertise to be helpful in determining the current value of the land. Mr. Reilly noted that there were steep slopes on the southern parcel, making it undevelopable, which he said should theoretically lower the property value. Chair Von Plinsky agreed.

Mr. Bergman recalled that the representative of Hull Forest Products who visited the Commission last time talked about putting a wind farm on a plot, but Mr. Bergman was unsure if it was one of these two parcels or an adjacent one. There was consensus among the Commission that it was mentioned for the northern parcel. Mr. Bergman wondered if that plan was abandoned. Chair Von Plinsky said that the recent emails were from Sam Hull, the company's owner, and the Chair thought that the previous representative was just throwing out ideas. The Chair did not think a wind farm was on the owner's radar.

Mr. Bill asked if there was any urgency, and Chair Von Plinsky did not think so.

The motion carried unanimously.

5) **Discussion Items:**

A) Airport Proposed Wildlife Control Fence Update

Mr. Bergman said he emailed the Airport Director, David Hickling, but had not received a reply. Mr. Bergman said he would call or visit the Airport Director because budgeting or planning could be occurring, and the Commission should remain informed.

B) Conservation Commission Speaking Events

Vice Chair Madison was not present, but the Chair said he saw in the minutes that something was in the works with Mr. Therriault. Mr. Therriault said the Vice Chair spoke with him about an event on pollinator protection in June. Mr. Therriault agreed to be the speaker, but he did not think a venue had been determined yet.

C) 2023 NH Drinking Water Festival

Discussed earlier in the meeting under “Outreach.”

D) Wantastiquet-Monadnock Trail Coalition – Request for Keene Conservation Commission Member Representative

Chair Von Plinsky recalled having a meeting with the Chair of the Chesterfield Conservation Commission, Lynne Borofsky, who invited the Keene Conservation Commission to send a representative to the next Wantastiquet-Monadnock Trail Coalition meeting. The Chair recalled that the Wantastiquet-Monadnock Trail extends essentially from the VT border to Mount Monadnock through Keene. He said the Coalition meets once or twice annually and they invited a Commissioner to attend on Tuesday, April 25 at 4:30 PM at the new Antioch University New England location in the plaza next to Ashuelot River Park where the Bank and Elm City Bagels used to be. Ms. LeBlanc agreed to attend. The Chair thanked her for offering. The [project website](#) includes more information about the Coalition’s efforts, such as the goal to have compostable toilets along the trail. The Coalition wants this Commission’s voice to be present in these efforts. Mr. Bill asked where the Wantastiquet-Monadnock Trail goes through Keene, and Ms. Clark replied that the trail follows Rail Trail.

E) Educational Resources for Invasive Species Removal

Chair Von Plinsky recalled that the Commission discussed ways to help residents feel that they can tackle invasive species. He said that Ms. Brunner found a NH guide to upland invasive species that could be a handout to property owners who want more information. Councilor Williams said there is a lot of good information available from the University of NH Cooperative Extension. The Councilor questioned how to get that information to property owners. He said it might be useful to have the handouts available at Green Up Keene and at the Library. Chair Von

Plinsky added that there are also digital versions of handouts like this one that could be shared with the public. The Chair said he talked with Ms. Brunner about using the Conservation Commission's website to share more information like this or other topics. Ms. Clark asked if the Commission had its own dedicated website now and noted that it used to be under the Community Development Department's webpage. Ms. Brunner said it is still under the Community Development Department but that the Commission has its own webpage and Ms. Brunner can also share information like this on the Community Development Department's social media. Chair Von Plinsky said this was another way to think about how the Commission could interact with the public moving forward.

Councilor Williams returned to the invasive species event schedule as he missed the opportunity earlier in the meeting. He suggested having more events after these Commission meetings as a great way to get more people to attend. Mr. Bergman asked which Stone Arch Bridge would be visited for the May event. Councilor Williams confirmed it would be the northern bridge off Court Street. The Councilor said that location had a lot of buckthorn and Japanese barberry. He noted that weekends had not been successful for these events, so he mostly scheduled events on Monday evenings before dark. He moved the May event up one week because there would be a meeting on the downtown infrastructure project on May 15. He said some events later in the season might be at an earlier hour so the work could continue into October. Chair Von Plinsky asked if the June 19 date would be a City holiday for Juneteenth. Ms. Brunner said the City does not close for Juneteenth. Councilor Williams said the intention was to have the June event after the Conservation Commission meeting, which usually does not last two hours. Ms. Clark pointed out that it should be "Woodland" Cemetery, which is often mistakenly written as "Woodlawn."

F) Keene Meadow Solar Installation

Chair Von Plinsky reported that he had a conversation with City Attorney, Tom Mullins, who discussed something very important the Commission needs to keep in mind. The Chair said he would keep the conversation at this meeting focused solely on process and would not get into the details of this particular solar installation. The City Attorney advised that the Conservation Commission is a quasi-regulatory body, which must avoid prejudging any issue in any way because the Commission will have input later in these processes for things like NH Wetland Permits. Thus, it is not ideal for the Commission to be on record as for or against something in advance of making such recommendations to the State of NH, as legal issues often come down to optics. He said that going forward, this could remain on the agenda so the Commission stays up-to-date, like it does for the airport fence. Still, Chair Von Plinsky urged the Commission to be careful regardless of personal feelings about the installation and to remember the Commission's quasi-regulatory impact on this whole process.

Ms. Brunner explained the process for, and the Commission's role in, a project like this one. Under NH State Statute, Conservation Commissions have a role in reviewing NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) Wetland Permit applications. So, anytime someone in the City of Keene seeks to impact a wetland, the Wetland Permit would be referred to the Conservation

Commission. The Commission has 14 days from the time the permit is received and signed by the City Clerk to make its recommendation to NH DES in a motion. While the Commission does not make the final decision on these permits, it could opt to hold a public hearing on any of these permits, though that has typically not been the course of action. Generally, the Commission makes its recommendations in a letter to NH DES.

Ms. Brunner continued explaining the Conservation Commission's role specific to the City of Keene, which chose to go above and beyond the NH regulations for surface waters. The City has a Surface Water Protection Overlay that is 75' in the Rural, Agricultural, and Conservation Districts, and 30' everywhere else in the City. Certain activities within that overlay require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the Planning Board (PB), which refers CUP applications to the Conservation Commission for input on water resources. Ms. Brunner recalled from the last meeting that this proposed solar development would be approximately 240 acres and therefore goes beyond the 20 acres allowed in City Zoning. The applicant's first step would be to apply for a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). This variance is needed for property owners wanting to do something not allowed within the Zoning regulations. Ms. Brunner explained that there are 5 specific criteria set by the State of NH that applicants must meet to receive a variance.

If a variance was received from the ZBA, one of the applicant's next steps would be to receive permission to build along a Class VI road—Old Gilsum Road. In NH, there is a unique category of Class VI roadways, which are still public rights-of-way, but are not maintained by the City. The State of NH says that development along Class VI roads should be discouraged. So, to receive a Building Permit for this solar development, the applicant would need permission from the legislative body—the City Council—for life/safety reasons because emergency services might not be able to access a development on a Class VI road.

Ultimately, Ms. Brunner said that if the applicant receives authorization for the issuance of a building permit from the City Council, then the applicant would proceed through a process with the Planning Board (PB). First, they would need site plan approval, which is required for any commercial or multifamily development, or developments that meet a certain threshold. This site plan review would be to ensure the project meets all 14 of the City's development standards listed in Article 20 of the Land Development Code dealing with: drainage, runoff, sedimentation and erosion control, traffic generation, access, landscaping, screening, and lighting, etc. In addition, because this project could impact wetlands or the surface water buffer, the applicant would also need a CUP for surface water protection, for which the Conservation Commission would make a recommendation to the PB. Additionally, if the applicant planned to impact more than 20,000 square feet of precautionary slopes (between 15–25% grade), they would also need a hillside protection CUP from the PB. Finally, this applicant would need a solar CUP from the PB. All of the site plan review and CUPs could be concurrent before the PB. The PB would not be able to act on a surface water CUP until the Conservation Commission reviews it and makes a recommendation to them.

If the applicant received all of these approvals that Ms. Brunner listed, their next step would be to get a Building Permit. Once construction commences and the Building Permit is issued, there would be regular site visits from City Staff to ensure the construction is in compliance with all of the approvals. At the beginning of the project, Staff would look at installation of sedimentation and erosion control measures. Toward the end of the project, Staff would visit to ensure the site matches what on the plans. Due to the Building Permit, there would also be intermediary site visits to ensure the applicant meets all of the necessary life/safety codes and building/ fire/ electrical codes.

Ms. Clark asked where the Alteration of Terrain Permit would fit in. Ms. Brunner said that because more than 5 acres would be disturbed, the applicant would need an Alteration of Terrain Permit from the State of NH. The Planning Board usually requires copies of these permits for any application and the Community Development Department keeps those copies on file.

Mr. Bergman recalled that the March 2023 meeting's minutes stated that because the proposed solar project is over 20 acres, the developer would apply for a variance at the ZBA's April 3 meeting. He asked if that meeting occurred. Ms. Brunner reported that the project was initially on the ZBA's schedule but due to an error in the public notice, the hearing was postponed to May in accordance with State law. Mr. Bergman recalled that the amphibian crossings in Keene were commencing for the season. He also recalled the project's wetland biologist stating last month that they would be monitoring vernal pools this spring. Mr. Bergman wondered whether the City regulates vernal pools differently than the NH laws. Ms. Brunner replied that City includes vernal pools, intermittent streams, and basically everything else in the Surface Water Protection Ordinance. Ms. Brunner said the City requires staying at least 75' away from vernal pools for certain activities and many activities within that 75' would require a CUP. Mr. Bergman noted that some parts of New England, like MA, have good vernal pool protections. He asked if Keene has stringent rules in comparison. For vernal pools, Ms. Brunner said yes. The City would require a plan stamped by a wetland scientist licensed in the State of NH that shows the delineations of all vernal pools, wetlands, and the buffers around them. City Staff review those plans to ensure nothing is happening within those buffers or that they are getting the CUP if needed. Mr. Bergman wondered if the applicant needed to disclose those monitoring results—like for vernal pool monitoring that could be ongoing this spring. Ms. Brunner said the City does not typically require that as a part of the surface water CUP application, but it is something the PB could ask for.

Mr. Haynes asked whether the Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee could have a voice in a process like this. Ms. Brunner replied that the Subcommittee is a body of the Conservation Commission and would not get referrals from the PB or NH DES. However, Subcommittee members could attend Conservation Commission meetings and participate when these applications are reviewed. Mr. Haynes noted how the Subcommittee has a different focus regarding recreation and overall use of land as stewards, so he wondered whether the Subcommittee could make other recommendations through the Commission. Ms. Brunner said those points could be raised in discussion but the Conservation Commission's authority in these

referrals is specifically regarding protection of water bodies. The Subcommittee could discuss impacts to recreation trails with the applicant but that is not what the Commission would be asked to comment on.

Chair Von Plinsky asked if there would be an avenue in this process for something like recreation to be a focus more officially, rather than a member of the public just presenting an issue with the trails to the Commission. Ms. Brunner said there is no built-in referral for impacts to recreation areas, but any citizen of Keene or abutter could come to any public hearing during this overall process to ask questions or raise concerns. She said that when the development team was present in March, they seemed open to discussing those issues. They also expressed a willingness to mitigate recreation impacts when the Director of Parks, Recreation, and Facilities—Andy Bohannon—asked.

Mr. Bill said that this Commission does not have input until another group requests its input. Ms. Brunner said that was correct. She said the matter could certainly remain on the agenda to get updates. Still, until this project is before the Commission for a referral, this body and individual members of this body should refrain from forming/sharing opinions until the applicants or others are able to present to the Commission. Mr. Bill said that the vernal pools on this property are shaded currently and would be no longer if all the trees are cut, which would present a clear impact. He asked if the Commission cannot talk about that until the next step in the process happens. Chair Von Plinsky replied that he would like to invite the developer to another meeting for a design-focused conversation, in which the Commission does not form opinions but provides input before the official referrals. Ms. Brunner thought that would be fine as long as it is an informational conversation, with the Commission asking questions and sharing general input. Ms. Brunner would reach out to the developer to gauge their interest in that opportunity.

Ms. LeBlanc asked when the public would be notified to come and hear about this project. Ms. Brunner said that the ZBA and PB public hearings would have notice in the newspaper and mailed to surrounding abutters. For this Commission, it would only be listed on the agenda unless there was an official public hearing, which Ms. Brunner imagined would also include a notice in the newspaper. During a normal meeting like this one, it is up to the Chair to allow public comment, whereas a formal public hearing requires allowing public comment.

On a cautionary note, Mr. Bergman said that the history of the development of Monadnock Marketplace would show unparalleled examples of the risks of making public statements or judgements prior to hearings and testimony. He said it was a profound issue with a lot of money at stake. Chair Von Plinsky agreed that was important to keep in mind.

There was consensus to invite the developer back for a discussion on issues such as vernal pools and erosion while the project is still in the design phase. Chair Von Plinsky reiterated that it would be important to keep the discussion focused on topics within the Commission's purview.

Mr. Reilly asked whether the ZBA has any discretion or whether projects are preempted if they do not meet the 5 criteria outlined by the State of NH. Ms. Brunner replied that there is some judgement involved in the ZBA determining whether it meets those 5 criteria. The ZBA is supposed to make their decisions based on whether applications meet those criteria and not on whether a lot of people are for or against it. She said the hardest criterion to meet is the applicant proving a hardship. She added that the ZBA must make a finding—or vote—on each criterion, and an applicant must meet all 5 to get the variance.

Mr. Haynes said he liked the idea of inviting the developer back. He said it might be prudent for the Commission to discuss the key issues among themselves, so everyone is on the same page before the developer visits. The Chair said that was a good idea. Chair Von Plinsky suggested that the Commission have a careful discussion in May and invite the developers back in early summer. All agreed that would help to make sure that the Commission stays on topic when talking to the developer. Mr. Bergman asked whether there were semantics to employ in these discussions to ensure the Commission is careful and remains impartial/neutral. Mr. Reilly thought it was just a matter of asking questions about the developer's direction. Chair Von Plinsky said that he thought they could develop some questions together at the next meeting.

6) Discussion on Agricultural Land Conservation and Food Security – Rowland Russell

Chair Von Plinsky welcomed Rowland Russell to speak about agricultural land conservation and food security. Mr. Russell's career is in environmental studies, and he holds degrees from Antioch University Seattle and New England. Mr. Russell is also a member of the Friends of Public Art, he was on the Walldogs Executive Committee, is on the Board of the Cheshire County Historical Society, and serves on the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Path Advisory Committee. He also has a role coordinating volunteer activities at the Monadnock View Cemetery community garden, where there are 4 dedicated pollinator plots.

Mr. Russell recalled that in 2007, the Cities for Climate Protection wrote the Climate Adaptation Plan, which was the first mention of food security in the City that he saw. He said the Climate Adaptation Plan focused on climate change's effect on conservation of agricultural land, as well as meeting the needs of people who need food the most. He said that the Plan had re-emerged over the years in various different committees' functions. He imagined the Plan would have been in the hands of the Agricultural Commission if it had not been disbanded; Mr. Russell recalled that the Conservation Commission was supposed to absorb some of those duties. He said that in speaking with Mayor Hansel and Ms. Brunner, they developed an idea for the Energy and Climate Committee (ECC), which sort of took over for Cities for Climate Protection. Mr. Russell said that the plan was for the ECC to sponsor a work group focusing on food security. He said there were still some processes in the works for the ECC to assign members to its various work groups. He said there are many players interested in having a role in this. To that end, Mr. Russell suggested a series of three focus groups on: 1) residential needs (including expansion of community gardens called for in the 2007 Plan and incentives for residents to change lawns to

vegetable or pollinator gardens), 2) organizational needs (Community Kitchen, Hundred Nights, Southwest Community Services, etc., that need the food), and 3) farms (including retention of existing farmland, renewal of former farmland, and identification of potential farmland; also, climate change adaptation). For example, the Community Kitchen struggled getting the vegetable donations it needed last year; there are 6 dedicated plots at the Community Garden. Each of these 3 proposed work groups would meet 3 times throughout the year, in addition to 3 meetings with all work groups together to deal with overall issues, like how to increase food production in the region—the Climate Adaptation Plan called for the region to produce 20% of its own food and the region is not there yet. Mr. Russell invited members of the Conservation Commission interested in food security and farming to attend these work group meetings and weigh-in. He imagined a lot of research and analysis coming out of these focus groups that would go to the ECC, which would formulate recommendations to the City. Ultimately, he hoped those recommendations would be considered as a part of the next master plan.

Chair Von Plinsky asked when this would ideally start over the course of the next year. Mr. Russell replied that it would probably commence this summer and asked Ms. Brunner the timeline to hear back from the ECC. Ms. Brunner replied that at the ECC retreat the previous week, the ECC determined workgroups but had yet to determine who would serve on each. Still, she said the ECC supported participating. Mr. Russell noted that he already had 2 volunteers for the overarching group for all 12 meetings. He wanted a sense from the ECC before scheduling focus groups. It made sense to him to start with agriculture in terms of the ECC's perspective on how climate change is affecting farmers and how we all get our food.

7) **New or Other Business**

None was reported.

8) **Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: May 15, 2023**

There being no further business, Chair Von Plinsky adjourned the meeting at 5:44 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katelyna Kibler, Minute Taker
April 18, 2023

Reviewed and edited by,
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner