



CONSERVATION COMMISSION

AGENDA

Monday, April 21, 2025

5:00 PM

Room 22, Recreation Center

Commission Members

Councilor Andrew Madison, Chair
Councilor Robert Williams, Vice Chair
Katie Kinsella (*nominated*)
Art Walker
Barbara Richter
Steven Bill
Gary Flaherty
Bob Milliken, Alternate

Thomas P. Haynes, Alternate
John Therriault, Alternate
Alexander Von Plinsky, Alternate
Kenneth Bergman, Alternate

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 17, 2025

3. Planning Board Referral:

PB-2025-06 – Guitard Homes Cottage Court Development – Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit, Major Site Plan, & Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit – 0 Court St –

Applicant Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC, on behalf of owner Guitard Homes LLC, proposes a Cottage Court Development consisting of 29 single-family units accessed by a private driveway on the undeveloped lot at 0 Court St (TMP #228-016-000). A Surface Water Protection CUP is requested for impacts to the 30' surface water buffer. The parcel is 9.7-ac in size and is located in the Low-Density District.

4. Report-outs:

- a) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee
- b) Invasive Plant Species
- c) Land Conservation / easement monitoring
- d) Pollinator Updates

5. Discussion Items:

- a) Master Plan Update
- b) Outreach
- c) Budget
 - i. Annual ARLAC request
 - ii. CCCD Farm Camp
 - iii. Materials for invasive plant species program

6. New or Other Business

7. Adjourn – Next meeting date: Monday, May 19, 2025

1 **City of Keene**
2 **New Hampshire**

3
4
5 **CONSERVATION COMMISSION**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

Monday, March 17, 2025

5:00 PM

**Room 22,
Recreation Center**

Members Present:

Councilor Andrew Madison, Chair
Councilor Robert Williams, Vice Chair
Gary Flaherty
Ken Bergman (remote; non-Voting)
Steven Bill
Thomas Haynes, Alternate (Voting)
John Therriault, Alternate (Voting)
Bob Milliken, Alternate (Voting)
Alexander Von Plinsky, IV (left at ~5:30 PM)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Art Walker
Barbara Richter

8
9
10 **SITE VISIT: At approximately 4:00 PM, prior to the meeting, a quorum of the**
11 **Conservation Commission conducted a site visit of the properties located at 21 & 57 Route**
12 **9 (TMP#s 215-007-000 & 215-008-000).**

13
14 **1) Call to Order**

15
16 Chair Madison called the meeting to order at 5:11 PM.

17
18 **2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – January 21, 2025**

19
20 A motion by Vice Chair Williams to adopt the minutes of the January 21, 2025, meeting was
21 duly seconded by Mr. Bill and the motion carried unanimously.

22
23 **3) Planning Board Earth Excavation Permit Referral:**

24 **A) PB-2024-20 – 21 & 57 Route 9 – Applicant Granite Engineering LLC, on**
25 **behalf of owner G2 Holdings LLC, proposes to expand the existing gravel pit**
26 **located at 21 & 57 Route 9 (TMP#s 215-007-000 & 215-008-000). A Hillside**
27 **Protection CUP is requested for impacts to steep slopes. Waivers are**
28 **requested from Section 25.3.1.D & Section 25.3.13 of the LDC related to the**

29 **required 250' surface water resource setback and the 5-ac excavation area**
30 **maximum. The parcels are a combined ~109.1-ac in size and are located in**
31 **the Rural District.**
32

33 Mari Brunner, City of Keene Senior Planner, explained that the Conservation Commission
34 receives referrals from the Planning Board for various types of projects, one of which is earth
35 excavation. She said this earth excavation project started when it was initially permitted in 2023.
36 This is a request to expand that operation. When the Planning Board votes to accept applications
37 as complete, it refers them to the Conservation Commission and its role is to advise the Planning
38 Board specifically on the protection of water bodies and water quality in general. The
39 Conservation Commission's comments are sent to the Planning Board to help it make its
40 decision. Ms. Brunner said this project had already been through the Planning Board review
41 process for the first phase that was already underway.
42

43 Now, Ms. Brunner said the applicant was proposing to have multiple phases approved at once. If
44 approved, the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Board for permit renewals
45 when staff and a third party (who staff proposed hiring) would conduct inspections to confirm
46 that the previous phase was completed according to plan. Staff would report out to the Planning
47 Board before the next phase could occur. Mr. Bill asked if there would be inspection and
48 approval after each of the seven proposed phases. Ms. Brunner said yes, those would be called
49 permit renewals with the Planning Board at each phase. She continued, stating that this would be
50 the last time in the process that the Conservation Commission would have a role in reviewing the
51 whole project. Ms. Brunner said the Planning Board had voted to accept this application as
52 complete, hence this referral to the Commission, and there would be a public hearing at the
53 Planning Board meeting on March 24, which she thought would be continued due to the
54 applicant's need for more time to respond to the letter from the third party reviewer, Fieldstone
55 Land Consultants (in the meeting packet). Chair Madison confirmed that the Commission's role
56 was to make recommendations less about whether the Planning Board should approve the
57 application and more about water quality and surface water issues to consider, as well as any
58 recommendations for the remediation plan (e.g., pollinator friendly plantings).
59

60 Chair Madison welcomed Justin Daigneault (of Granite Engineering, LLC, on behalf of the
61 owner, G2 Holdings, LLC) to speak about the subject property in Keene (TMP#s 215-007-000 &
62 215-008-000) and Sullivan (Map 5, lots 46 and 46-1). Mr. Daigneault showed overview plans
63 and explained some of the various phases. The four properties accessed off Route 9 total 300
64 acres. He referred to the existing conditions plan, stating that the applicant purchased the
65 property in 2019. He showed what was permitted in 2022, the access road, the processing
66 equipment area, stockpiles, the sediment retention area, the limit of clearing, and where the site
67 visit occurred. He continued, reviewing the various proposed project periods on the plans. For
68 example, expanding the sedimentation pond in Period 1 (sheet 5). Regarding Period 2, he
69 answered a question from the site visit, stating that the distance between the two pit faces would
70 be approximately 200'. Period 7 is the most northern that would be across the Sullivan town line.
71 Once all the other periods have been reclaimed and completed, Mr. Daigneault said that Period 8

72 would lower the site an additional 40', the last portion of the access road would come down (be
73 lowered) and the final infiltration area would be excavated. Lastly, Mr. Daigneault talked about
74 the reclamation plans; as each period is completed, the City's inspection would occur and the
75 area would be reclaimed before moving on to the next one. He welcomed questions.

76

77 Chair Madison opened the floor to public comments.

78

79 Jim Manley of 67 Tyler Lane, Sullivan, stated that he was the major abutter to this project with
80 approximately one mile of adjacent property line. He asked what year excavation began in Keene
81 and Sullivan. Brenton Cole, P.E., (Granite Engineering, LLC) asked whether the question about
82 Sullivan was relevant to the Keene Conservation Commission. Mr. Manley thought the question
83 was very relevant, stating that both excavations were initiated without permitting from Keene,
84 Sullivan, or the State of NH. Mr. Cole stated that whatever happened in Keene prior to 2023 was
85 rectified through permits received through the City of Keene. Mr. Manley said those were
86 received after the excavation occurred. Mr. Cole said that the applicant would be moving
87 forward with a plan before any work occurred, on the up-and-up, and not going beyond what was
88 permitted in 2023. Mr. Cole reiterated that this meeting was about Keene and not Sullivan, and
89 that whatever happened in 2019 was rectified in 2023 with permits. Mr. Manley felt the past
90 actions cast doubt on the character of the organization and Mr. Cole was sorry he felt that way.
91 Mr. Manley felt it was a major alteration of terrain. He said he spoke with the State of NH
92 Alteration of Terrain (AOT) Bureau, which told Mr. Manley that it asked Granite Engineering
93 some more questions. Mr. Manley asked the status of the response to those questions. Mr. Cole
94 said it was normal for the AOT Bureau to scrutinize the permit application and Granite
95 Engineering was working through the comments as with every project.

96

97 Mr. Manley continued questioning the applicants, referring to sheet 4 of 22. His understanding
98 was that the perimeter shown represented all of the wells within a one-mile radius of the
99 proposed permit. Mr. Cole said this plan represented many things, including the wells permitted
100 with the NH GIS; it would not include wells without documentation. They utilize meetings to
101 add unknown wells; if someone feels their well is not represented, they can notify Granite
102 Engineering to add it. Granite Engineering will make sure that any well within a one-mile radius
103 that needs testing for blasting or water quality protocols are on this plan. Mr. Manley suggested
104 that there were many individual homeowners within this proposed one-mile radius who did not
105 know about this project and said they should be contacted and told they would be eligible for
106 Keene's and the State of NH's well monitoring protocols. He stated that his home was within the
107 radius, and he had two wells, but his home was not located on the plans. Mr. Manley also asked
108 what the ramifications would be if a home lost access to its water; what indemnification would
109 exist to compensate the homeowner without water? Mr. Cole asked Chair Madison if this line of
110 questioning was relevant to the Conservation Commission, or more so to the Planning Board.
111 Chair Madison said it was not relevant to the Conservation Commission and would be better for
112 the Planning Board, but that he would allow it because it was a public hearing, and it was within
113 the permitted scope of a public hearing.

114

115 The project hydrogeologist, Joel Banaszak (Frontier Geoservices), addressed some of Mr.
116 Manley’s questions about what the ramifications would be for a neighboring property. Mr.
117 Banaszak explained that the applicant would be required to follow the City of Keene’s earth
118 excavation requirements, which include a hydrogeological investigation report and determining
119 whether any aquifers connect to abutting domestic water supply wells. He said none were found
120 in the applicant’s report, calling it a very dry hill. He said they also assessed the relative
121 elevation of the wells, noting that the depths of a lot of the domestic water supply wells in the
122 area are much deeper than this excavation would be because this is on a plateau. Regarding wells
123 that might not be represented on the map, Mr. Banaszak said they were limited by what was
124 available through the State of NH GIS database.

125
126 Mr. Banaszak continued and said that, for offering monitoring and testing of an abutting
127 property, they look at the tax map and even if a parcel does not look particularly developed, they
128 send a letter to the parcel owner offering monitoring because the parcel is within the radius. Mr.
129 Manley asked when those letters are sent. Mr. Banaszak said those letters are sent once project
130 approval is received from the AOT Bureau and the City. Mr. Manley asked if that was according
131 to the law. Mr. Banaszak said yes. As an abutter and in the interest of his neighbors, Mr. Manley
132 thought that it would be good if they were alerted to matters like this, stating that the property
133 owner never had the courtesy—as a neighbor—to reach out to him; he received a notification
134 from the City of Keene about the Planning Board meeting in February.

135
136 Mr. Manley asked if it was correct that the applicant would monitor wells within the radius once
137 everything was approved and done. Mr. Banaszak said yes, they would need to have a plan
138 approved by the AOT Bureau and City to be able to move forward with well monitoring, because
139 the plan would include the protocol for communicating with the public. Mr. Manley said that
140 point would be too late for the general public to comment on their concerns. Mr. Daigneault
141 asked if Mr. Manley was notified of the project enough to be at this meeting. Mr. Manley said he
142 was notified of the Planning Board meeting in February and Ms. Brunner informed him of this
143 meeting; he thought any other abutter in the one-mile radius was likely unaware. Mr. Daigneault
144 said that all abutters would be notified as a part of the March 24 Planning Board public hearing.

145
146 Mr. Manley asked about the Acid Mine Drainage Potential Report prepared by Mr. Banaszak.
147 Mr. Manley thought it looked good with the exception of Wells 7 and 8, which he said were
148 located in Sullivan, and Mr. Banaszak added that they were also outside of this work area. Mr.
149 Manley noted the report said the potential for drainage there was significant. Mr. Banaszak
150 discussed acid mine drainage, stating that methods for prediction are not simple. They assessed
151 the rock for acid producing and acid neutralizing compounds, and there were locations with the
152 potential to create acid. They also looked at metal content, stating that granite quarries do not
153 typically have acid mine drainage problems unless they are historic and operated incorrectly. If
154 they find the potential for acid mine drainage, the next step is to monitor. So, Mr. Banaszak said
155 the report recommended monitoring both groundwater and surface water. They could also
156 mitigate acid mine drainage through actions like increasing the pH to neutral 7 by adding an
157 alkaline compound like lime or limestone. He said acid mine drainage is usually a much larger

158 concern for coal or gold ore mines, not granite quarries, particularly with the mitigation
159 techniques available in New England. He said the applicant was offering a protocol
160 acknowledging that there could be a problem, a way to look to see if the problem shows up, and
161 a way to deal with it if it does. Mr. Manley cited from the report that the acid could leech heavy
162 metals, in particular arsenic and lead into the subsurface.

163

164 Mr. Manley read parts of a letter that he wrote for both the Conservation Commission and
165 Planning Board in objection to this application:

166

167 *I live at 67 Tyler Lane, Sullivan. I purchased my property, consisting of 105 acres and shown on*
168 *Sullivan Tax Map 5, Lot 47, on 16 June 2021. I have two undergraduate and two graduate*
169 *degrees in business administration and also in electrical engineering and I am a 2021 alumni of*
170 *UNH's natural resources steward program.*

171

172 *I am the major abutter to G2 Holdings with over 5,500 feet of adjoining property. I'm*
173 *particularly concerned about the 2,300-plus feet abutment on my southern border.*

174

175 *Moving from the Virginia Beach area, I purchased this mostly wooded property to find quiet*
176 *enjoyment, enjoy the abundant wildlife, and practice homesteading. Wildlife on my property*
177 *includes a sizable herd of deer, bobcat, coyotes, bears, hawks, owls, and the occasional moose.*

178

179 *A rate of quiet enjoyment includes freedom from excessive noise and disruptions from*
180 *surrounding areas such as construction or unreasonable disturbances from neighbors. Blasting*
181 *noise will be a regional environmental issue affecting residents of Keene, Sullivan, and Roxbury.*

182

183 *No blasting schedule has been provided beyond Monday to Friday operations for the next 13*
184 *years, but I'm especially concerned what this is going to do to the wildlife on my property as*
185 *they'll most likely migrate to more peaceful settings.*

186

187 *I'm also concerned about the effects of blasting on my home, the original portion of which was*
188 *built in 1825 using a stone wall foundation. My home is located approximately 2,400 feet from*
189 *the northern edge of planned excavations and well within the one-mile radius depicted on plan*
190 *sheet 4 of 22, which claims to identify all wells for monitoring within a one-mile radius. It is*
191 *wildly incomplete without depiction of wells servicing the private homes within that radius. Also,*
192 *some public wells are identified as inactive, but there is also always the potential for those to*
193 *become active again in the future.*

194

195 *While the supplied documentation talks about monitoring of wells and omits mention of other*
196 *property damage, no mention is made of indemnification from G2 activities. What would happen*
197 *if a well ran dry and or foundations for homes are damaged?*

198

199 *There are two streams which traverse both G2 and my properties. One of these [more westerly]*
200 *originates on my property and was flagged for wetlands, without my permission despite clearly*

201 *visible no trespassing signs. If wetlands were studied, why are there no corresponding reports*
202 *present in the package submitted [and why did he not receive a copy since they went on his*
203 *property without permission].*

204

205 *I'm also genuinely concerned about G2's demonstrated performance of acting first, ask for*
206 *forgiveness. G2 has started logging and mining operations unilaterally in both Keene and*
207 *Sullivan without first obtaining the necessary local, State, and Federal permitting. I'd like to*
208 *hear an explanation from G2 why this was done and know if it was done out of ignorance or just*
209 *plain old disrespect for the law. I'd also like to know what penalties have been levied against G2*
210 *for these transactions. Can we assume that this leopard can indeed change its spots? I'm not so*
211 *sure about that.*

212

213 *In a similar manner, I was assured by G2 employees both at the site and the February 24*
214 *Planning Board meeting that this site would serve only as a transfer station for G2's other*
215 *mining locations. Needless to say, G2 never reached out to me, as I'd like to think a good*
216 *neighbor would, to discuss their plans in advance.*

217

218 *I'm very concerned about the creation of manmade 60-to-70-foot cliffs close to my property and*
219 *the dangers they could pose to children, pets, and wildlife. The plans call for the construction of*
220 *a four-foot fence, but do not specify when this will be constructed or how it will be maintained in*
221 *perpetuity.*

222

223 *Lastly, I'm concerned about the aesthetics of Granite Gorge. Currently this is a beautiful stretch*
224 *of Route 9 when traveling from Concord along Otter Brook and provides a very nice prequel to*
225 *views overlooking Keene, nestled in the valley below. What will the site of a major hillside*
226 *destroyed communicate to future generations about Keene's values?*

227

228 Mr. Manley wondered if 3D visualizations of the view from Route 9 could be generated, citing
229 the very good GIS program at Antioch University New England. He questioned—if the proposed
230 quarry location was visible to the multitude of residents in town—would the Planning Board
231 have a different impression about allowing this activity to move forward? Mr. Manley asked if
232 the applicant would answer his questions about why they initiated operations without permitting
233 or why they did not reach out to him as their major abutter. The applicant declined to comment.

234

235 Mr. Bill asked what storm frequency the applicants were planning for. Mr. Daigneault said 50
236 years, which Mr. Bill said was better than 25 years. Mr. Cole cited the various State of NH storm
237 frequency event categories (2-year, 10-year, 25-year, 50-year; and by volume), noting that all
238 stormwater from this site must be maintained on site. Mr. Bill asked about the nature of the
239 surficial materials (e.g., till, outwash). Mr. Banaszak said it is very gravelly and there might be
240 some till at the very base but everything down to the bedrock is primarily gravel, with high
241 hydraulic conductivity. He said there was not much overburden at this site on the hill (excluding
242 the present-day basin that Mr. Bill mentioned), with the most at one location up to 14' deep. Mr.
243 Bill asked where the water drained at present; would it drain down to the bedrock and then

244 somewhere else? Mr. Banaszak said yes, explaining that the site was unique, exhibiting spring
245 groundwater (very ephemeral) recharge signatures in the overburden that would disappear by
246 June/July because it runs off the hill or evapotranspiration by plants, etc. He said it appears in the
247 test beds but not the boring logs or monitoring well logs.

248
249 Regarding storm frequency events, Mr. Haynes noted that the City was grappling with weather
250 changes and asked if the applicants modeled for a 100-year storm. Mr. Cole said no because it
251 was not required. However, there was already some run-off occurring on site pre-development.
252 So, they were trying to make the site significantly better prepared than the 50-year storm by
253 completely removing whatever is leaving the site and allowing it to infiltrate back in the ground.
254 They could consider the 100-year event; they had comments from the City Engineer to look at
255 some models and Mr. Cole said they could consider the 100-year with the pre-development.

256
257 Vice Chair Williams asked if there was anything the applicants could do about the sight lines to
258 Route 9 in the future, like planting trees to block the view of the cliff face. Mr. Cole thought
259 Route 9 was situated lower, so he thought that vantage point already looked into a set of trees.
260 He also cited a City regulation that would create a setback from Route 9 and explained how the
261 grade would change and level off to where the site visit was. He did not think the cliff face
262 would be visible from Route 9; he said skiers on Granite Gorge might see it. Mr. Manley said the
263 current excavation area was very visible from the Sullivan Store and going down the hill. Vice
264 Chair Williams hoped to see something like a buffer of fast-growing red oaks, for example,
265 which would line the roadway nicely 20–40 years from now. He said it is one of the most
266 attractive and welcoming vistas to Keene, so he wanted to mitigate. Mr. Manley agreed.

267
268 Chair Madison pointed out an ephemeral stream to the east of a collection of buildings at the
269 center of Otter Brook. During high water, he said the stream was falling pretty rapidly but looked
270 like it was cutting into the hillside sharply. Mr. Cole said that was not a part of the project but
271 that there was erosion there that predated the current property owner's purchase. Cody Gordon
272 (G2 Holdings, LLC, applicant), the property owner, said he learned through conversations with
273 the Planning Board that some of what Chair Madison referenced was a result of historic logging
274 (and roads) of the hillside and subsequent flooding around 2005. He said G2 had not done
275 anything to that location but that in theory they would look at it in a future phase. Chair Madison
276 also asked if the retention ponds would be left on site or filled in. Mr. Cole said they would be
277 left on site.

278
279 The Commission continued discussing its recommendations for the Planning Board, agreeing
280 that the Commission's purview was surface water concerns.

281
282 Mr. Bill knew the applicant had described the rock on site as a rusty schist and the potential for
283 acid drainage on site. When crushing that rock and using it on road or water systems, he said
284 they would be taking some of those components and scattering them on the road surface or in the
285 waterway, for which he imagined there were State guidelines. Mr. Bill said he would feel much
286 better about this if he knew what those State limits were and how the applicant's product would

287 fit into those. He said they could control the acid drainage on their site, but not the product once
288 it is scattered around the City and causes problems the City must deal with. So, Mr. Bill wanted
289 some reassurance that he could not glean from the data presented; what was the sulfur content,
290 did they sample the entire well distance and a composite for that? He wanted either additional
291 information from the applicants or further testing.

292

293 The Commission debated whether it could recommend the forest buffer. Mr. Bill said that trees
294 could enhance transpiration and therefore water quality.

295

296 Mr. Flaherty made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Mr. Bill.

297

298 On a vote of 7–0, the Conservation Commission recommended that the Planning Board consider
299 the following for application PB-2024-20:

- 300 ▪ Greater consideration of 100-year storm/flood events in planning.
- 301 ▪ Further study into potential offsite impacts of acid mine drainage.
- 302 ▪ Potential to increase forest buffer with Route 9.
- 303 ▪ Remediation with pollinator friendly plants.

304

305 **4) Report-Outs:**

306 **A) Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee**

307

308 Mr. Haynes reported that the Subcommittee met on March 7 and discussed enlarging the
309 trailhead maps as well as making paper maps available at the trailheads for those who do not
310 visit with their phones. He said he was continuing to put up new trail signs as he completed
311 them, which had been helpful. Most of the March 7 meeting was focused on the new bridge
312 planned at the spillway, which had been designed. The Subcommittee was working with the City
313 Engineer, Bryan Ruoff, who was finalizing the engineering plans (e.g., abutments). The group
314 also started working on the fundraising brochure. They hoped to have the engineering plans and
315 brochure mostly finalized by April, in which case the project might be able to proceed in the fall,
316 though Mr. Haynes said that timing was still unclear.

317

318 **B) Invasive Plant Species**

319

320 Vice Chair Williams said it was still winter, so he expected to start developing a list of areas for
321 the summer invasive species removal events by the April meeting. He welcomed
322 recommendations of sites to consider. Ms. Brunner asked if Vice Chair Williams anticipated
323 requesting anything from the Commission’s budget for invasive species removal this fiscal year.
324 The Vice Chair replied that if funds remained available, he thought it would be a good use and
325 he could think of many places in the City where shrubs would be useful to replace invasive
326 species.

327

328 Mr. Bill mentioned that the Subaru dealership offered him a free tree to plant in his yard and he
329 wondered if they might do something on a City-wide basis too if someone contacted them. Vice

330 Chair Williams mentioned hearing that Eversource was doing something similar, so he said the
331 City should have a street tree planting program in the spring.

332

333 **C) Land Conservation**

334

335 No updates.

336

337 **D) Pollinator Updates**

338

339 Mr. Therriault showed a photo from the Edgewood Neighborhood pollinator garden—an 18-yard
340 diameter circle/2,000-square foot garden around the flagpole. At this time, it was bare, with a
341 small pathway of woodchips. The garden was populated with native plants and low-growing
342 shrubs. Mr. Therriault would report back with new photos in June. They also placed a small sign
343 indicating why they planted native plants and the benefits to pollinators. Mr. Therriault also said
344 that he was working on the City’s annual report to Bee City USA.

345

346 **5) Discussion Items:**

347 **A) Citywide Approach/Strategy For Invasive Species Management**

348

349 This matter was referred to the City Council’s Municipal Services, Facilities, & Infrastructure
350 Standing Committee several months prior, which asked the City Manager to come up with
351 something and report back to it. That had not occurred yet.

352

353 **B) Airport Wildlife Control Fence**

354

355 Mr. Bergman said there was no update from the Airport Director, David Hickling. Mr. Bergman
356 was concerned that part of the project could be tied to funding from the Bipartisan Act of
357 Congress, and he was unsure where that stood with attempts to rollback. He would ask the
358 Airport Director.

359

360 **C) Land Stewardship Updates (Easement Monitoring)**

361

362 No updates.

363

364 **D) NHDOT Route 101 Project**

365

366 No updates.

367

368 **E) Master Plan Update**

369

370 Ms. Brunner reported that the Comprehensive Master Plan Update was entering a busy phase,
371 with June 3 being the date to present the full Master Plan to the public. The online Discussion
372 Boards were still active at www.KeeneMasterPlan.com and the final Task Force meetings were

373 occurring on the Six Strategic Pillars: Livable Housing, Flourishing Environment, Vibrant
374 Neighborhoods, Connected Mobility, Adaptable Workforce, and Thriving Economy. The Master
375 Plan Steering Committee would be reviewing individual chapters of the Master Plan on each
376 Pillar. There would also be an online StoryMap launching early April created with ArcGIS,
377 allowing users to visually explore the pillars and goals. Ms. Brunner said there would also be a
378 decision matrix sent (end of April/early May) to specific groups throughout the City including
379 the membership of all City boards and committees (more than 200 individuals), City staff
380 leadership, and the City Council, among others. The purpose of the matrix is to get specific
381 feedback to help prioritize the goals and strategies developed in the Master Plan. Ms. Brunner
382 would keep the Commission informed of these various aspects but told them about the Future
383 Summit on June 3 at 5:00 PM, at Heberton Hall, Keene Public Library.

384
385 **F) Outreach**

386
387 No updates.

388
389 **6) New or Other Business**

390
391 Mr. Flaherty shared that the [NH Department of Environmental Services Wetlands Bureau](#) was
392 revising its 300 and 500 Series wetland rules; it was still in the review process. He added that as
393 a member, the Northern Soil Scientist Society was trying to push for stricter NH Alteration of
394 Terrain (AOT) regulations for what is accepted into the soil (e.g., a sediment basin). Mr. Flaherty
395 went on to explain how the Society provides professional opinions to engineers to report to the
396 NH AOT.

397
398 Mr. Milliken recalled the Planning Board referral for 19 Ferry Brook Rd at the January 21, 2025,
399 Conservation Commission meeting. At that meeting, Vice Chair Williams asked about lead in
400 the soil from past uses and Otto A. Busher, III, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the
401 Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation, quickly said no. Mr. Milliken wondered
402 if the Commission was able to ask for a water sample, noting that the brook next to that location
403 flows into Otter Brook. Chair Madison said the Commission could always *ask* but does not have
404 the statutory authority to *require*. Mr. Haynes wondered if such testing could be a
405 recommendation to the Planning Board from the Conservation Commission when reviewing an
406 application. Chair Madison said the Conservation Commission has the broad authority to request
407 or recommend, but not to force. So, the Commission could certainly recommend that someone
408 collect water quality samples, for example, within reason. Ms. Brunner said it was a good point,
409 reiterating that the Commission makes recommendations to the Planning Board, which decides
410 whether it agrees with those recommendations and whether to make those conditions of the
411 Planning Board's approval.

412
413 **7) Adjournment**

414
415 There being no further business, Chair Madison adjourned the meeting at 6:19 PM.

416
417 Respectfully submitted by,
418 Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker
419 March 24, 2025
420
421 Reviewed and edited by,
422 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

From: [Sparky Von Plinsky](#)
To: [Mari Brunner](#); [Councilor Andrew Madison](#)
Subject: Agenda Item for April Meeting
Date: Monday, March 31, 2025 12:52:27 PM

Mari & Andrew,

I hope you are both well. I was wondering if I could add something to April's Conservation Commission Agenda. The Cheshire County Conservation District offers local kids a scholarship to attend a local farm camp in the summer. The majority of the kids who attend are from Keene, so I would like to ask the commission if they'd like to donate \$250 to help a kid go to farm camp.

Could we add this to the agenda to see what folks think, please?

Thanks, and have a great week,

Sparky