

**Hooksett Conservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
May 7, 2008**

Call Meeting to Order: 7:06 pm

Attendance: Steve Couture member, Cindy Robertson member, James Walter member, David Ross Town Council Rep, David Hess member, Tim Johnson chair excused, Daniel Pike member excused

Approval of Minutes: James Walter motioned to approve the minutes from the April 2, 2008 meeting with corrections seconded by Cindy Robertson voted unanimously

Public Input: none

Appointments:

Beaver Brook Subdivision – James Danish, Keach & Nordstrom

Attorney Michael on behalf of Beaver Brook – We have encompassed all of your suggestions along with all of the states suggestions. There was some stuff the state wanted inputted into the easement language. I believe we have now embraced all of the various comments. We have done our best to encompass it all. This plan mirrors the easement that we have discussed.

Steve Couture – I just wanted to state that you have done your best to address our concerns.

James Walter motioned to accept the conservation easement for the Beaver Brook Subdivision and send it to legal counsel for review, upon review and acceptance by the Planning Board the commission will move to the town council for acceptance. Cindy Robertson seconded voted unanimously.

University Heights – Forestry Management Plan – Jeff Burd

Jeff Burd 3A Development – We were here last month I brought Allen Oxford our licensed forester with us tonight and I have reviewed the comments by Stantec. However you would like to address the concerns we will and move forward.

David Ross – Issues regarding marking the wetlands I would like to know where we stand with that.

Steve Couture – The intent is to meet the content of the conservation easement with regards to forest management and timber harvesting. I think that is an important distinction. How do we ensure that the areas that are not supposed to be infringed upon will not?

Jeff Burd – I just want to say one thing the intent of the easement document was and still is that we have always wanted to harvest the timber out there. I think that we can address this tonight. I am under the assumption that this board is not opposed to us going out there to harvest some timber.

Steve Couture – As long as it follows the intention of the easement itself.

Allen Oxford – When 3A development contacted me to review their plan to harvest the marketable timber. They wanted to create the least impacted area would be along with avoiding the wetlands and taking under advisement the rest of the forest area. Their objective is to cut trees and generate income. Briefly touching upon timber mapping for a forestry harvest. There are not many wetland crossings on this property. We do need to file a notification and document where the wetlands are located. We should have a 50 foot basal buffer. 3A has the fortune of working with a good forestry company. We could go out and label the buffer but with this company they know where these boundaries are.

Cindy Robertson – If it would not be difficult to mark the wetlands and the buffers. Could you do this?

Allen Oxford – If Jeff Burd is in agreement with this then I do not think it would be that difficult. I don't know if it necessary to go around all of it but I do not think it would be difficult.

Jeff Burd – I would rather have him mark out his boundaries rather than mark out the wetland boundaries. I would rather have Allen out on site with the Lemires instead of being in the office.

Steve Couture – I think we want the same thing we want everything clearly defined in the documentation and also having someone in the field.

David Ross – I believe the concern for marking is that you do not go beyond the marker. That you know exactly where the markings are. I think that is a fair option instead delineating the entire wetlands.

Allen Oxford – There is no law that says you can not harvest in a wetland soil. I just want to be clear. The way this property lays out is this is an upland sight.

Rene LaBranche Stantec – The person who reviewed this was Steve Pellitier he is a licensed forester along with Dan Tatem and me. One question we had is you have scheduled times that you have for cutting.

Allen Oxford – summer is when we are looking to cut. I did not see any area that has to be done in frozen conditions.

Rene LaBranche – I do not think they need to modify the entire plan but because we have specific items that need to be addresses we would like to see in writing a plan to address our comments. They do not necessary have to write a completely new plan but a letter stating what exactly they are going to do. Item #5 –How this plan should be carries out in regards to the forestry. My understanding is that these types of cutting can enhance a forest and we would like to see how this cut will do that. Before the actual cut takes place I think the commission or the town should be able to walk it with you so that they know exactly what will be cut. We do feel you should put it in a letter form.

Steve Couture – 50% basal area in a 50 foot buffer. I would actually recommend 100 feet no disturbance. There is a good amount of data that harvesting in a 50 foot area can damage the aquatic life in the wetlands. If the goal is just for timber harvest then the plan is fine but that is not what is recommended here. Distinction between the timber notifications that crossings do not go through the most scrutiny. I wanted to see what would be used to go over the wetland crossing.

Jeff Burd – There is one wetland on the westerly end of the project that may have more wild life would you be applying the same restriction on a woodland wetland?

Steve Couture – Yes, I would

Allen Oxford – The point that was made in regard to wildlife and future recreation stating that they were not in the plan were I found numerous procedures regarding cutting the trees would enhance the area. This was harvested 20 years ago for white pines. In terms of wildlife pines are least beneficial. Removing this older white pine canopy would provide light. The trail laid out takes an area that would not normally be walked on now it becomes beneficial. In terms of wetlands I had a lot of beverage in regards to wetlands. I think a lot of the concerns that this gentleman

Rene LaBranche – In the end will it have a net improvement or will it hurt the easement.

Allen – I think if you take all things into account I think this would be a beneficial cut.

Rene – We would like to see it in writing.

Steve Couture – So we would like to see how it would be beneficial in writing.

Allen Oxford – A letter could be added to this.

Steve Couture – It does talk about recreation and habitat management in pieces but I think that a summary would bring it all together. I think that trails are something that we want. But when I see these logging scale trails it looks like random trails.

Allen Oxford – This is a beneficial by product. We are looking at good quality trails. Every trail is not in there. The problem with connecting these trails wee could be impacting steeper slopes and wetter land.

Rene Labranche – When you are walking this with the foresters you could find areas that you could connect the trails. If the opportunity is there maybe you could punch it through.

Allen Oxford – Yes we have done that and could possible do that with this project.

Jeff Burd – I believe MS&G will have abutting conservation land I am not sure what they are doing.

Steve Couture – What I am seeing is that this crosses the woods road and making the connection as part of this project. That would be the recreation portion.

Allen Oxford - I would have actually preferred not to use this woods road. I did not recommend using them.

James Walter – Will the animals have free rain to come through from the other easement area on the abutting project?

Allen Oxford – Yes they will.

Steve Couture – Is that in this plan?

Allen Oxford – I believe it is. The cutting is going to have a positive effect on this area. The primary timber harvest is the white pine and I think this is betterment to the property.

Steve Couture – Wild Life management needs to be stated more clearly.

Allen Oxford – Future timber production would be on a smaller level.

James Walter – Will you be willing to take us on a walk through?

Jeff Burd – Yes absolutely

Steve Couture – I think we have had a good discussion and areas that need to be addressed. In addition to making an amendment of the plan would be a good way to move forward.

Jeff Burd – So we will answer the items addressed by Stantec and put it in written form. Can we schedule a site walk? I would like to send this to DES.

Steve Couture – Prior to approving we would like to see the responses.

Jeff Burd – We have addressed your concerns.

Steve Couture – The issue is we want something in writing that we can approve and we do not have that. We have to have the plan in writing. Do we want to have a site walk before our next meeting? May 31, 2008 at 8am at the end of college Park Drive at the cul-de-sac.

12 Sunrise Blvd – Standard Dredge & Fill – Jason Brzezowski, CLD Engineering

Ken Rhodes, CLD Engineers – This property has a bank erosion problem. The last 2 springs have been difficult on the water banks. They are proposing a stabilization of the embankment. They will also do their best to maintain as many trees as they can at the top of the embankment. There would be ready rock fabrication for stabilization. At the same time it must be noted that Marcel had a dock structure that must be formally permitted by DES. This will also be occurring. The primary goal here is to stabilize the embankment and attempt to save as many of the trees at the top of the embankment as possible.

Steve Couture – Basically what we are looking at is a 10 foot high wall?

Ken Rhodes – It would range from 6 to 12 feet.

Steve Couture – What type of vegetation will you be planting?

Ken Rhodes – There will be no rip rap.

Steve Couture – Do you have a vegetation plan for this project?

Ken Rhodes – We will be putting one together

Steve Couture – I feel that this is a good plan and just to give us so more detail on the vegetation.

Austin Woods Subdivision – Mike Lambert, ECM, Inc

James Coughlin – We are proposing a conservation subdivision comprising 126 acres. We also are doing a joint application with Marcel Labonville. We have access from South Bow with an outlet on Mountain View. This application will involve a lot line adjustment, Lot consolidation. The current residential listing is low residential. We are proposing 36 lots with 72 acres of open space with 52 acres of roadway. There is a town piece of land over here. Pike industries abut over here. We are trying to incorporate all of these areas to create a trail system.

Steve Couture – Is this on the current or forthcoming conservation subdivision?

James Coughlin – It is on the proposed one. We are trying to provide some trail system. In the baseline study we will do a habitat study along with roadway impact. Our focus is we have 6 impact areas. Then the ZBA would like to have a joint walk. Some of the features, this is Mary Ann road there is an old cemetery, an old stone foundation and an old animal pound. We have put a 20 ft buffer. Over the last two weeks we redesigned the

areas that were of concern to them. We have done some roadway changes. We have eliminated any wetlands impact. The stonewalls are also indicated on this plan along with trails that are in existence. Over here is 880 square foot crossing that we do have a permit for. They are recommending that we do a loop over here that would be a less impact. We will have some cisterns and retentions but none will be in the wetlands impact. We are proposing underground utilities. There will be six wetland crossings. There is one on Marcel LaBonville property.

Mike Lambert – I am an environmental scientist. Primarily it is a heavily wood site that is convoluted with wetlands. There are significant features. I was excited about working with the new conservation cluster subdivision. This area here is just a perfect area for roadway. This area over here is just filled with habitat and this is the area where we will be suggesting the conservation easement. Originally there was a road design that was problematic because it was effective the 40 buffer. That was one of our objectives so we lowered the road. Another area was if we tried to avoid this area over here has a stone fort on it so we are avoiding that but unfortunately we will be impacting the wetlands. Upstream of this area there is an area of water that is impounded with silt. I was pleased when everyone agreed to move the roadway. The other area that is worth talking about is the upper wetland that has already been permitted. I met with the DES representative and we discussed that if we went above the isolated wetland it would not be as large of an impact. So we proposed a curve in the crossing. Hooksett has recently approved permeable sub grade material.

Steve Couture – How many areas of easement are we talking about?

Mike Lambert – 72 acres are set aside for the conservation easement. We are fine tuning all of the impacts .This is a work in progress. It is currently 17,000-18,000 wetland impact.

Commission Reports:

1. **Open Space Subcommittee** –
2. **Kiwanis Trails Initiative** – They got there funding.
3. **Cost of Community Services** – James Walter motioned to expend \$125 for printing Steve Couture seconded voted unanimously
4. **SNHPC Deed Research** – Currently underway

Correspondence:

All correspondence was reviewed

Other:

1. **Vernal Pool Survey** - This is something that we do not have a handle on. We will get three quotes and move forward after that.

2. **4-H Bear Camp – Ratify Vote** – James Walter motioned to expend \$825 to send three students to 4-H bear camp Cindy Robertson seconded voted unanimously.
3. **Draft Meeting Schedule 2008-2009** – Cindy Robertson motioned no July Meeting James Walter voted unanimously.
4. **Appraisals for Merrimack River & Hooksett Village Projects** – Steve Couture motioned to expend \$4500 the appraisals to be completed by McManus & Knault regarding Merrimack River & Hooksett Village Projects to be paid out of the current use funds Cindy Robertson voted unanimously.

Non Public – RSA 91-A: 3, II, d

David Hess motioned to enter into non public seconded by Cindy Robertson voted unanimously.

David Ross motioned to exit non public seconded by David Hess voted unanimously

Adjournment: James Walter motioned to adjourn at 9:40pm seconded by Cindy Robertson voted unanimously