

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

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

**Monday, April 21, 2025**

**5:00 PM**

**Room 22,  
Recreation Center**

**Members Present:**

Councilor Robert Williams, Vice Chair  
Art Walker  
Barbara Richter  
Gary Flaherty  
Alexander Von Plinsky, IV, Alternate (Voting)  
Ken Bergman, Alternate (Voting)  
John Therriault, Alternate (Voting)

**Staff Present:**

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

**Members Not Present:**

Councilor Andrew Madison, Chair  
Steven Bill  
Katie Kinsella  
Bob Milliken, Alternate  
Thomas Haynes, Alternate

**1) Call to Order**

Vice Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM.

**2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 17, 2025**

Revisions: Mr. Therriault said he was not a voting member.

Mr. Bergman asked about the minutes from the Conservation Commission meeting where the site visit of the 0 Court Street property was discussed, and Mr. Therriault said these were attached to the email from staff and directed him to the November Conservation Commission meeting minutes on the City website.

A motion by Mr. Von Plinsky to adopt the March 17, 2025, minutes was duly seconded by Mr. Walker and the motion carried unanimously.

3) **Planning Board Referral:**

- A) **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.**

Vice Chair Williams welcomed the landowner, Mike Guitard, and his representative from Fieldstone Land Consultants, John Noonan. Mr. Noonan recalled presenting the preliminary project plans to the Commission following a site visit, after which there was also a preliminary hearing with the Planning Board. He recalled that the original plan was for 31 homes based on the Cottage Court Overlay District, with single access off Court Street coming up a cul-de-sac and ending in a hammerhead. Since the preliminary presentation, things changed based on the stormwater design, Alteration of Terrain (AOT) Permit, Shoreland Protection Permit with the NH Department of Environmental Services (DES), and design of utilities to City standards. Due to these various factors, the project reduced to 29 homes. Also was the design of two box culverts, and he showed the locations of both: the first (4' x 6' wide with wing walls on each side) at a very deep crossing closer to Court Street and the second where a trail is protected by a Goose Pond easement and water comes from a pocket wetland and pools. He explained how they had observed those two areas over the past year to be prepared to install the box culverts.

Next, Mr. Noonan showed the 30-foot wetlands buffer on the plans, stating that they tried to keep as many of the structures out of that buffer as possible. Instead of asking for a 10-foot reduced buffer for the whole project area, they sought to impact areas of the 30-foot buffer but not all the way into it, attempting to maintain as much of the 30-foot buffer as possible throughout the project. He said stormwater and grading would come through the 30-foot buffer, but he explained that impoundment of water in the buffer is permitted for stormwater service with a permit from DES, which the applicant was seeking. Mr. Noonan stated that overall, the plans had not changed substantially since the preliminary presentation to the Commission. He described more of the total wetland impacts from crossing it—2,315 square feet of impact to the wetland and 1,365 square feet of impact to the wetland buffer from the structures.

Mr. Noonan showed the Grading and Drainage Plan to handle the stormwater runoff. He described the two manmade gravel wetlands for treating stormwater in the first project phase. He also showed a treatment swale and infiltration trench. Approaching Court Street, the soils improve (in terms of ability to infiltrate water). He showed other treatment swales within the cul-de-sac, stating that eventually the wetland resource would be expanded in the future.

Mr. Therriault asked if the gravel was—in essence—to prevent any weeds from growing there. Mr. Noonan referred to the AOT, stating it would be a pond depression with 3:1 side slopes and stone/gravel on the bottom, holding water and allowing it to travel through to a drain and outlet structure under it. Mr. Therriault asked if the banks of the depression would be planted and Mr. Noonan said yes, the State of NH has a list of requirements for planting.

Mr. Flaherty asked if the project had received its AOT Permit. Mr. Noonan said not yet. They were completing the Planning Board process first to ensure there would not be any layout changes, so that Mr. Guitard could complete his funding applications before proceeding to the DES level.

Ms. Richter asked if there would be a maintenance schedule for the five swales as a part of the Surface Water Protection Ordinance. Mr. Noonan said no, it would be a part of the AOT Permit. Fieldstone Land Consultants would provide Mr. Guitard with a Special Maintenance Plan, specifying when to check each swale, including a log of what details to check (e.g., if they use salt on site, log how much salt). The AOT Permit follows the landowner, so if the property sells, the new landowner must be notified and AOT must be notified. Ms. Richter asked if that covered vegetation too and Mr. Noonan said yes.

Mr. Flaherty asked if there would be any bylines in the verbiage for invasive species. Mr. Noonan referred to an available manual from UNH specifying the invasive species that contractors should look for.

Mr. Bergman asked to see the locations where the two fewer residences would have been located, which Mr. Noonan showed on the plans. Mr. Bergman asked if everything else was adjusted slightly to account for those differences. Mr. Noonan said yes, and he showed where there was a spur road on the plans and to fit a treatment swale there, they eliminated the spur road and put three smaller homes closer to the main roadway. Mr. Bergman pointed to one house that would be very close to a swale and Mr. Noonan said it would be right on the edge of a depression and what Mr. Bergman saw would only be a 2.5' deep basin.

Mr. Von Plinsky thanked the applicants for all their challenging efforts to design around the wetland buffers, which is not easy to do. Mr. Von Plinsky said he was also excited for this project as a whole, and glad it would not negatively affect the trail behind the project that he used regularly. He asked Mr. Noonan to review the process of returning the culvert to its natural state. Mr. Noonan explained that the larger (60' long) box culvert would have concrete headwalls; with that, there would be excavation to separate the native material in the stream bed and concrete footings installed to spread the weight of the precast box culvert (lowered in with a crane). Inside the box culvert, there would be riprap from the bottom of the footings up with fabric above it to keep anything from going into it before the native material is placed back on top. In the end, it should not look any different from the rest of the stream. Mr. Von Plinsky asked if the width of the culverts would be sufficient for wildlife passage beneath the road surface along the stream bed. Mr. Noonan said the total opening would be 6' wide and 4' high

based on the State of NH's requirements for the 100-year storm without overtopping the roadway, which according on the developer's model, would be approximately 5" from the top.

Ms. Brunner listed questions for the developer from Commissioner Steve Bill's email:

1. Was it assumed that water collected in the infiltration basins would percolate into the ground?
  - a. Mr. Noonan showed on the plans where infiltration basins would percolate into the ground. He showed others closer to the wetland that would pool water and slowly drain through the filter material.
2. What material underlies the individual infiltration basins?
  - a. Mr. Noonan said it there would be 3:1 side slopes leading to the bottom of the basin with a treated 1.5"-2" stone.
3. Were test pits available for each of the basins and had percolation tests been performed?
  - a. Mr. Noonan said there were tests across the site at various locations prior to design (31 total). For the locations where the percolation tests were slow, they did not design for infiltration but rather for holding the water and slowly releasing it back out. The test pit logs were included in the Stormwater Management Plan.
4. If the infiltration pit overflows, would it drain into the stream that crosses the property?
  - a. Mr. Noonan said yes, the wetland is the lowest point on the property all the way through. Ultimately, anything reviewed through the State of NH is designed for a 50-year storm and the box culverts for a 100-year storm.
5. Is this site designed to handle drainage that would come from the hill behind the property?
  - a. Mr. Noonan said yes.
6. In an extreme 50-year storm event, what would be the impact of drainage from the hill behind the proposed development drainage?
  - a. Mr. Noonan referred to the overall site plan to show the existing and proposed drainage pattern on the site. He noted that the wetland on the east side of the site was broken up by the trails and showed the locations of existing trail crossings, which are proposed to remain. The water will be directed into infiltration or holding areas; if these were to overtop, they would outflow into a swale that leads to a level spreader that will spread out the water and slow it down before it flows over land into the existing stream. He said safety checks would be in place.

Mr. Von Plinsky asked the ideal timeline for each project phase. Mr. Noonan said starting construction at the end of summer each year would be the target and having one year to complete each space before starting the next phase.

Mr. Bergman noted that this would be a privately managed road, so he asked if there would be a homeowner's association (HOA), or someone hired to handle the main roads. Mr. Guitard thought the HOA would hire someone to do that. Mr. Bergman asked if there was a location planned for depositing snow. Mr. Guitard said there were a few locations possible that he pointed out on the plans.

Vice Chair Williams said he loved this project and asked them to keep doing what they are doing. By developing sites like this, they are protecting undeveloped land on the outskirts of town. He said this is one of the first examples of a Cottage Court style development and asked about their experience using the cottage court overlay. Mr. Noonan thought it helped to get a lot more density on much smaller lots and said not having lot lines hindering how close you can put them together; he cited the houses from the 1800s and early 1900s downtown that are close together with shared driveways, for example. Mr. Guitard added that people will each have their own unit but with a sense of community. Vice Chair Williams asked where the nearest commercial development was, and Ms. Brunner referred to a dentist's offices across the street. Mr. Noonan mentioned Genesis HealthCare next door. He said it was ideal because the development is also close to Cheshire Medical Center.

Vice Chair Williams asked the Commission's action. Ms. Brunner explained that this was a Planning Board referral for a Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit (CUP), the criteria for which are in Article 11 of the City's Land Development Code (LDC). These criteria primarily focus on ensuring that wetland buffer impacts do not negatively impact the water resource's function or quality. The criteria also focus on ensuring no negative impacts to wildlife. The Planning Board relies on the Conservation Commission as content experts for these CUP recommendations. Vice Chair Williams requested recommendations from the Commission.

Mr. Von Plinsky thought it would be a detriment to nitpick the small amount of impact to the buffer and lose units by doing so. He was happy with the plan as laid out and the work that went into trying to minimize the buffer impact.

Vice Chair Williams mentioned disappointment with respect to the Shoreland Protection Act, noting that it is an important law that protects important land, but in this case it is being applied to a small patch of land that is across a street from the river. He thought there should have been an exception in this case.

Mr. Therriault referred to the NH recommendations for riparian plantings. Mr. Therriault recommending leaning toward plants like Joe-Pye weed and milkweed that benefit a wide range of pollinators.

Mr. Von Plinsky made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Ms. Richter. On a vote of 7-0, the Conservation Commission recommends the Planning Board approve application PB-2025-06 with the following recommendation: (1) riparian plantings that will support a wide range of native pollinators, like Joe-Pye weed and milkweed.

Discussion ensued briefly about drainage throughout the project layout, which Mr. Noonan demonstrated on the plans. He showed an old stone box culvert under Court Street and ditches throughout the plans. Mr. Bergman asked if there was a permanent drainage ditch along the Court Street frontage. Mr. Noonan said no and showed where there was more sidewalk and closed drainage. Mr. Bergman asked if there were any restrictions on pesticide or insecticide use

that close to the river. Mr. Noonan said no because the homes would be outside of the Shoreland Protection area and Ms. Brunner said she would check with the Public Works Department about rules. Mr. Bergman asked if there was a storm drain system under the road and Mr. Noonan said yes, showing some other areas on the map south of the development leading to the river.

Mr. Noonan and Mr. Guitard left the meeting.

**4) Report-Outs:**

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

Mr. Walker reported that at the most recent Subcommittee meeting, the group's principal focus was working with the City Engineer, Bryan Ruoff, on the plan for the new bridge at the spillway. The bridge design was finalized using the standard U.S. Forest Service design, and they had chosen abutments. At this point, it was ready for the City Engineer to take the project through the City Council and its Municipal Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Committee process. If approved, then it would be a community fundraising effort.

The Subcommittee's secondary priority was All-Accessible Trailhead, which would likely come off the South Parking Lot. It would be fairly short because it is expensive to build. It would not be paved but there would be some other hardpack surface.

The Subcommittee also discussed the ongoing challenge of unofficial mountain bike trails being created that are unsightly and cause erosion. One of the Subcommittee members is the former president of the New England Mountain Bike Association (NEMBA), who thought it might be kids doing it and discussed creating signs to publicly address the issue. Vice Chair Williams agreed it seemed like a public information issue. Mr. Von Plinsky agreed, adding it might be adults doing it more than kids in his experience, citing a long-running debate on whether it is better to leaf blow or not, stating they do take his advice to not leaf blow. He agreed with some public information points. Ms. Richter added that on Beech Hill and at Robin Hood Park, there were trails zig zagging excessively and while she appreciated the work, she cited the negatives for fragmenting wildlife habitat. She suggested inviting them to the trails onsite for a program to show the impact and why it is best to map trails in a wildlife friendlier way.

Vice Chair Williams wondered if there were guidelines for trails to follow. Ms. Richter referred to the [\*Trails for People and Wildlife\*](#) guidance document from American Trails and said the Commission could share it. She noted that the City owns the land, so ultimately the City should be approving the trails, but she was not sure of the process. Ms. Brunner did not think the City had one at this time. Vice Chair Williams questioned whether the City should have a process in this regard. Mr. Walker inquired about the relationship between NEMBA and the City; did a NEMBA member have permission to be cutting new trails? Mr. Von Plinsky thought there were some NEMBA members doing it, but he also thought there were some former members and, many times, random people not associated with NEMBA chain sawing because they simply wanted to. Those resulted in steep slopes and, when they leaf blow, waterfalls. Vice Chair

Williams wondered if some of the worst trails could be closed somehow, keeping a few open as the important resource for mountain biking that they are. Mr. Bergman referred to the mission statement of the Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee, stating that the Greater Goose Pond Forest was intended to be a natural environment, not a gymnasium. Mr. Walker said there was a general Mission Statement including many things like logging and wildlife, and he thought it was written with the idea of coexisting with recreation. However, there was an aggressive invasion of a particular population. Mr. Bergman said those coming down the trails biking. There was brief mention of motorized vehicles and e-bikes.

The Commission asked the Subcommittee to look into this issue further and Mr. Walker agreed. Mr. Flaherty suggested drafting a letter in preparation if it is ever needed as well as verbiage for signage about not being allowed to cut trails on City land. Mr. Walker cited challenges when the Subcommittee relocated the trail further away from the shoreline to minimize damage because people did not seem to want to adapt. They had to go as far as blocking areas with fallen trees and posting signs explaining why. He said people feel a sense of ownership of these things.

Ms. Brunner showed the 2019 Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Plan Goals and read Goal 2: “The area should provide the citizens of Keene a large woodland area accessible only on foot, ski, peddle bike, horseback, or snowshoe from various points and laced with clearly marked trails and woods roads which lead to the ponds, nature walks and scenic vistas.” She said most of the nine goals are about things like habitat and soil protection. She said it looked like the Plan already provided good guidance. Mr. Bergman asked the specific requirement the City consulted prior to forming and modifying trails. Vice Chair Williams said there would need to be an entire process, with a point source, like the Subcommittee. Mr. Bergman and Mr. Flaherty said it would make sense for an entity like the Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee to be the point source for reports of violations.

## **B) Invasive Plant Species**

Vice Chair Williams reported that while he had not chosen all of the sites for the 2025 season, he wanted to begin scheduling. The first event would be Monday, May 19 at 6:30 PM (immediately after this meeting) at the North Bridge—the stone arch bridge by the VFW. This area right by the Ashuelot River was very overwhelmed with invasives for a long time and the Commission had been working on it for 3–4 years. If cleared of the invasives, the Vice Chair felt it had great potential for swimming.

Vice Chair Williams also reported that the Birch Trees the Commission purchased and planted at Ellis Harrison Park in 2024 were cut down in early 2025 when other surrounding vegetation was cleared by the City. He expected the birches would sprout again, but said it was a lesson to mark such plantings better in the future or cage smaller saplings that could get lost in overgrown vegetation. Ms. Brunner asked if the Parks and Recreation Department was notified that they were planted and Vice Chair Williams said yes.

**C) Land Conservation/Easement Monitoring**

Ms. Brunner was checking the Community Development Department for the notebooks that Ms. LeBlanc returned so Ms. Richter could start annual easement monitoring.

**D) Pollinator Updates**

Mr. Therriault prepared the City's annual report to Bee City USA. There were some questions/answers and a few essay questions, as well as submitting photos. The final report would be compiled and published by Bee City USA in June and Mr. Therriault would provide it to the Commission (he could also provide 2024's). The City's Bee City USA membership status for 2025 was complete.

Vice Chair Williams said he heard something about bee extinction. Mr. Therriault said there was a newspaper article the previous weekend talking about 70% losses in honeybee colonies across the United States because of monoculture farming and migratory issues. He knew that in the Monadnock Region, there was no monoculture agriculture, but there was the same problem with dwindling populations throughout the fall leading to absence—either the colony leaves entirely or leaves behind a cluster so small it cannot survive the winter. He said U.S. Department of Agriculture labs all over the nation were working on those issues, stating that it was more symptomatic than monocultures. He described the study of thousands of samples of live and dead bees, and nectar and pollen, to understand these issues of collapse. He said the good news is that honeybees are very adaptable. Vice Chair Williams asked about the native bees. Mr. Therriault said to assume the native bees are having the same problems. He said we knew about the honeybees because humans were actively managing these problems vs. the underground native bee colonies in our gardens. However, we assume similar physiology and environmental experiences. Vice Chair Williams asked if Bee City USA had anything the Commission should be sharing with the public. Mr. Therriault said there would be advice coming in four to six months.

Ms. Richter asked if Mr. Therriault was still planning pollinator gardens throughout the City. Mr. Therriault said not actively, he supports neighborhoods if they approach him asking for help. Ms. Richter explained that the former Findings building property was razed in 2024. There was nothing there; it was reseeded and there were three trees on the whole lot. She said it would be wonderful to have some pollinator gardens instead of entirely lawn. Discussion ensued about the location and surroundings. Vice Chair Williams noted that some of the street trees the Commission advocated for would be planted on the Findings property. He also thought the Community Gardeners would have some raised (due to toxic soils) plots there. Ms. Richter said the property was large enough to accommodate all of the aforementioned uses.

Mr. Bergman mentioned visiting Airport Director, David Hickling, who expressed frustration that although the Environmental Impact Report prepared by McFarland Johnson after its Environmental Survey in Fall 2024 adopted a broad view of the Environmental Impact of a



wildlife control fence, one reviewer from NH Fish & Game recommended a narrower view that would require placing the fence along Airport Road, which Mr. Hickling, this Commission, and the public did not want. Mr. Hickling was awaiting a decision but had not yet received one. Now, Mr. Bergman said the intent was to advocate a two-phase project, in which Phase 1 would be planning, engineering, and design and Phase 2 would be construction, hopefully in a single year but it could take two. Mr. Hickling reiterated that if forced to put the fence along Airport Road and enclose the wetland within the fence, he would cancel the fence project entirely as it would negate the purpose of keeping wildlife away from the runway. Vice Chair Williams noted there was a lot going on at the Department of Transportation. Mr. Bergman said in the end it would be mostly federal funds, but Mr. Hickling was not particularly concerned about the funding sources. Vice Chair Williams said the Federal Aviation Administration is interesting because it is ultimately paid for by the Commercial Airline Tax, which is a different source of money.

**5) Discussion Items:**

**A) Master Plan Update**

Ms. Brunner directed the Commission to the StoryMap at [www.KeeneMasterPlan.com](http://www.KeeneMasterPlan.com). Ms. Brunner walked the Commission through the various aspects including background, the six Strategic Pillars of the Vision, the Master Plan process, and the goals of each Pillar. At the beginning and end, there were opportunities to “Share Your Feedback” in the two-question StoryMap Survey: (1) Do you think there is anything missing from the Vision Keene Strategic Pillar Goals? and (2) Any other thoughts on the Vision Keene Strategic Pillar Goals? The intent was to get feedback from the broader community, and Ms. Brunner encouraged Commissioners to participate through April 30. There was a large advertising push of the StoryMap Survey through the local newspapers and social media.

City staff would also be at the Master Plan table during the Earth Day event on Railroad Square on Saturday, April 26, giving away free raffle tickets for nice prizes as well as pollinator wildflower seed packets and stickers. The prizes would be drawn at the Future Summit on June 3 (5:00 PM–7:00 PM, Heberton Hall), and you must be present to win the tote filled with a Prime Roast mug (Workforce Pillar), a *Walldogs* book (Economy Pillar), and more for the other four Pillars. There would be seven prizes and winners total. The ultimate goal is getting many participants at the Future Summit, which would be a community celebration to kick-off implementation of the Master Plan and seek feedback on the draft for final edits. There would be catered appetizers to entice participation, and the City was trying to arrange childcare onsite as well so parents could come. Sign-up at [www.KeeneMasterPlan.com](http://www.KeeneMasterPlan.com) for updates.

**B) Outreach**

Mr. Von Plinsky thought the issue of unauthorized trails would be a great outreach opportunity through signage but he wanted it to be effective. If the Greater Goose Pond Forest Stewardship Subcommittee drafted the letter (discussed above), he thought the Commission could work on broader implementation of signage and follow-up to see the reaction and efficacy (like a science

project). He wondered if some outdoor businesses in town might sponsor the sign costs. Mr. Therriault noted that the Public Works Department has its own sign shop if the Commission developed the verbiage. Vice Chair Williams thought that could be something the Commission could work out paying from its budget through the Council process. Mr. Von Plinsky wondered if the Public Works Department had a standard cost for a 12" x 18" sign, for example, so the Commission could determine how many it could afford. Ms. Brunner said she was unsure the Sign Maker had a cost per sign, noting that it was typically built into their operational budget as they replace signs Citywide regularly. Ms. Brunner said she would contact the Sign Maker and ask for guidance on size and content. Mr. Walker wanted to know if the City's signs would have the ability for non-standard fonts size to allow the signs to say more than a typical traffic sign. Vice Chair Williams said it could be simple laminated flyer on a bulletin Board too.

### **C) Budget**

Ms. Brunner said Chair Madison's intention was to discuss what the Commission wanted to spend the remaining budget on before the end of the fiscal year on June 30. Of its \$2,000 budget, the Commission already spent \$950 on NH Association of Conservation Commission annual dues and \$200 on annual Bee City USA membership. Commissioners questioned whether there was also an honorarium approved for either Steven Lamonde or Moosewood Ecological this fiscal year, and Ms. Brunner said it might have been approved but it had definitely not been spent, but she would check. Mr. Von Plinsky noted that this was an attempt to not rush at the end of the fiscal year to decide what to do with the remaining budget as had happened in years past.

#### **i) *Annual ARLAC Request***

Mr. Von Plinsky said the Commission usually fulfilled the Ashuelot River Local Advisory Committee's approximately \$100–150 annual request for local E. coli water monitoring. Ms. Brunner said the request had not come in yet.

#### **ii) *CCCD Farm Camp***

Mr. Von Plinsky pitched the idea of donating \$250 to the Cheshire County Conservation District's Farm Camp Scholarship Fund. He explained that there are several weeklong summer farm camps around the Monadnock Region where kids learn to be farmers, some in Keene like Stonewall Farm and one in Swanzey. The Scholarship Fund is for less fortunate kids to attend camps. He explained that at the last Conservation District meeting he asked and if 20 kids get a scholarship, 18 would be Keene residents. So, Mr. Von Plinsky thought it would be a Keene benefit and fit the Commission's mission.

**iii) *Materials for Invasive Plant Species Program***

Vice Chair Williams said that with remaining funds, he could use tarps. Alternatively, he would purchase shrubs for replacing invasives. He felt confident the birches that were cut would resprout and he did not plan to repurchase them.

He spoke about a potential project this year on the Parks and Recreation campus to remove some of the long-term installations of burning bush. Ms. Richter suggested replacement with pollinator plantings. Ms. Richter asked if the purchases must be made before the end of June or just approved. Ms. Brunner said the expense must be incurred before July starts for it to come out of this year's budget. Ms. Richter asked if there would need to be a pollinator garden plan in place before purchasing plants. Mr. Therriault said they could: (1) purchase and spread native seed mixes, or (2) buy native plants/shrubs that he could plant. Discussion ensued briefly about shrubs that attract pollinators, like one Mr. Therriault was trying to propagate, and butterfly bush.

Vice Chair Williams said the balance of the budget would be considered for plantings, and perhaps some plantings could be split with the Findings property. Mr. Therriault said he would speak with Parks and Recreation about getting a dedicated space there. Ms. Richter also invited him to a monthly informal East Keene group meeting on the Findings property; Parks and Recreation staff attend the meetings as well on the second Saturdays of the month.

**6) New or Other Business**

None presented.

**7) Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: Monday, May 19, 2025**

There being no further business, Vice Chair Williams adjourned the meeting at 6:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Katryna Kibler, Minute Taker  
April 28, 2025

Reviewed and edited by,  
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner