

**Hooksett Conservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
December 4, 2012**

Call Meeting to Order: 6:00pm

Attendance: Steve Couture chair, Jim Walter –member excused, Cindy Robertson, vice-chair, Phil Fitanides alt-member, John Turbyne member, Frank Kotowski, Planning Board Rep, Todd Lizotte Town Council Rep, Jocarol Woodburn member excused, David Hess member

Public Input: none

Meeting Minutes: November 13, 2012, Tabled until next meeting

Appointments:

Webster Woods – Slope Repair – Jim Gove – Gove Environmental

Jim Gove – We are here tonight to present the plan we are currently working on with regards to the wetland issues associated with the erosion issues. We have a plan change based upon what was originally presented to the Planning Board. I want to tell you a little about the history as to why it was changed. We had a meeting at DES on Nov 29, 2012, where findings were presented. I will call the top area north branch and bottom part the south branch. In essence as we look at this plan at the top of the North Branch this is the area where we have knocked down the top part and it has been covered with erosion stone. What we have been trying to do is divert the water. We look very carefully in the south branch and we do not have a channel in this area and the only time we see water flowing it is during a large storm event. What we do have is a lot of ground water seepage. As we looked through this we found there is a lack of any stream restoration. We were also told we don't have much of a chance of wetland habitation.

Steve Hebert – The area in the north branch has been stabilized. The base of the channels were just eroding away. There has been talk of continuing the rip rap to the base of the “y” and we have also installed under drains. We would like to put in under drains all the way to the base of the Y as well as install stone. This plunge pool would work as a stone check dam. The water would flow into it and then seep into the stone. It would also buffer the velocity of the flows as well as take care of groundwater by under drains.

Jim Gove – This is the line area that has been collecting all of the flows. Once you drill down you see the layers of storm deposition and basically what it is, is a rapidly forming of a flood plain. The wetlands are buried about 4 feet down. We need to get down in this area to be allowed to do some restoration. There is actually an area where an old road was put in and an old pipe is there. We would run the down along the lowest slope by the hill so we could bring equipment in. This channel is pretty well defined now. We need to stabilize it. At this point we still have the issue of the pipe that is 4 feet below. We will be raising the pipe above the wetland. That will become a storm water storage area as well as being restored to a wetland.

How does this differ? One the first plan we had a variety of plunge pools and bio-retention areas where all of these trees would be cut. In essence what this does is it retains all of the trees on these slopes. We still have additional work to on the stream stabilization and size. If you have any input to DES about the new plan that would be great.

John Turbyne – What is the difference between a plunge pool and a retention pool?

Steve Hebert – In retention detention water flows in and Plunge pool disipates the velocity.

Steve Couture – This is an amendment of an existing permit they will need to submit this to DES. Say you move forward with this project when will you begin?

Jim Gove – We have a mandate by the Planning Board that this must be complete by May 1. We will be out on site as long as the winter is light as soon as we receive our approvals.

Steve Couture – Downstream outlet what is the existing outlet?

Steve Hebert – That is a wetland it will be emptying into downstream.

Steve Couture – The riser concept I am concerned about the maintenance issues?

Steve Hebert – We need to do the gravel roadway anyways to get equipment down there and the roadway would stay for access to maintain. It will require maintenance.

Frank Kotowski – Dan Tatem do you have any coments?

Dan Tatem – We were unaware of the meeting with DES but as long as the wetlands board is fine with this we are as well. The original design was to fill these and cut the trees. We asked that there is Geotech review to ensure that this plan will work and the slopes will be stable.

Steve Hebert – This is why this is an engineered design so that we are back here in two years trying to figure out why this failed.

Jim Gove – I expect there to be a condition placed on this as replacement.

Phil Fitanides – What type of storm event is this designed for?

Steve Hebert – This is designed for a 50 year but it will be tested for 100 year event.

Jim Gove – What is happening is at the top of the south branch you do not see the water seeping out as you go half way down you can then see it seeping out.

John Turbyne – Who will be doing the maintenance on this 10 years down the road? The condo association or the town?

Jim Gove – I believe it will be the condo association who will own all of this and it will there responsibility.

Don Ingalls – 4 Hickory Court – I personally like the revised plan in that the southern slope will not be receiving water. We do have some condition behind our building that will be addressed and silt fence that was installed has collapsed and the soil has been eroded under nether. We have generally lost some land and we would like it restored.

Steve Hebert – When we do this work we would be installing the silt fence temporary.

David Hess motioned to support the concept as presented this evening seconded by Phil Fitanides voted unanimously

Commission Reports:

1. **Pinnacle Park** – JohnTurbyne – I walked it with the student from the Conservation Reservation Association and if we want to this it comes with a bill. I believe the bill was \$10,000 with a six man crew to layout the trails. He made some good suggestions. Where we put a summit trail it will need to be fixed as soon as we can. I have spoken with John Pieroni and he will be looking for someone with a GIS to map the existing trails. If I don't hear from John I will speak with Harold Murray. I tried to get in touch with the Eagle Scout and he will give me some dates to try to get together.
2. **Merrimack Riverfront Project – David Hess** – The parcel issue is continuing to be worked on. Barbara Brown signed the amended P&S for \$115,000. Southern problem is being worked on and in the proposal he will give us an easement along the railroad bed and he wants in turn the riverfront area. In exchange for giving him a quit claim deed between 18 and 19 he would give us the a quitclaim deed for 14 and we would give him ROW to the Merrimack River. Steve Couture motion to authorize David Hess to negotiate as described seconded by Todd Lizotte voted unanimously
3. **Clay Pond II – Easement Approval** – This was approved through Town Council and we are sending the document to Holly Green at DES and then she will send the check for \$66,500. Todd Lizotte – With regards to forest management plans in regards to logging, how would this be intergrated in? We were talking about this at the town council and whose responsibility it is.
Steve Couture – There is a few ways to look at it and maybe talk with other towns and see what happens.
4. **Quimby Mountain – Easement Approval** – Approved through Town Council and this is going to governor and council at their next meeting.
5. **Hinnim Pond Project** – Dan Kern – This was approved and we are seeing if the town has any interest in this project. The town would have an executory interest in this behind Fish & Game. If you look just under where is says Manchester Water Works it is about 470 acres. This will be open to the public there is a skidoo trail that is open to the public and will continue to be open. We are also still looking at properties in the area. We are looking for new sources money to preserve in this area.
Dan Kern - We would not come back until after the first of the year with more information once we have it.

6. **Walgreens Property** – Beaver dams have been knocked down and they are continuing to be monitored.

Other:

1. **Invoices** – n/a
2. **Possible Land Acquisition** – Dan Kern – Tom and Nancy Barrett have been speaking with Phil Auger regarding their property on Goffstown Rd. This would be to acquire a conservation easement donation on the property. Approximately 20 acres and the interesting thing is it was an old farm and it has prime farm soils. You can see Quimby Mountain to the northwest. We figured it would cost about \$12,000. What we would be seeking the conservation commission pay for the transaction costs for this project.

Tom Barrett – We were hoping this would be the catalyst for the land next to it as it was a completing farm as well.

Steve Couture – When I walked the property there is an old connector road it has a beautiful stone wall with maple trees the top. It is nice to walk it.

David Hess – Tom are you and Nancy going to include the portion across the road in the easement as well. This would be the frontage on the Lougere Property.

Tom Barrett – I would have to see the appraisals on the property and then make our decision.

Steve Couture – The other thing I wanted to mention is this is unique. This would be a donated easement and we would only be paying transaction fees. This is different type of transaction then we have dealt with in the past.

Dan Kern – From our perspective most of the towns that we work in we usually get a lot of support for these as you are getting a lot for the amount of money that is spent. I do believe the highlight is the agricultural soils.

John Turbyne – This is worth doing. This is a scenic road and it is a beautiful piece of property.

David Hess – Have you done any type of sketching as to what you would like to put into the easement donation?

Tom Barrett – We are think about 4 acres around the house and the pond.

David Hess – The concept would include frontage on Goffstown Rd correct?

Dan Kern – Yes that is usually how it is done.

Steve Couture – Conceptually what would be our next step if we chose to move forward?

Dan Kern – You would vote and we would meet with the owners and begin the process. In regards to public access what would your requirements be? The property is so small so what would you be requiring?

Steve Couture – There is not a policy on this type of thing. You do have the preservation of a piece of land on a Scenic Road and

David Hess – I think we need to have a conversation about public access and I really would like to see at least a conceptual of what the donation would be.

Tom Barrett – From a public access point I have allowed hunters that I know on the lower portion.

Steve Couture – Dan, do you think you could get some references from other towns as to what they do?

Dan Kern – I can get you a listing of towns that we work with and let you know what they do.

Tom Barrett – I think if you can make some advances now with the property across the street now would be the time.

3. **ARM Grant Fund Discussion** – Steve Couture – For me I think we should take \$150,000 for land conservation or we could do \$100,000 for land conservation and \$50,000 for restoration.

John Turbyne – Do we have money to restore the ATV park?

Steve Couture – No there is not enough money to do that at all.

David Hess – I would like to have this for the land purchase so that we can close this project.

Consensus of the commission is to accept the total \$150,000 for land conservation.

4. **Transfer of Development Rights** – Steve Couture - Draft economic development plan and with that document there is a place where you can put development where you want it and open space where you want it. I spoke with Community Development to see if the conservation commission could be involved in that and I believe Jo Ann will be putting a grant proposal together. I ask her to reference the open space in the master plan. I believe there is a model ordinance in Dover and possibly SNHPC may as well. This would be an ordinance which would involve the Planning Board as well as the Conservation Commission. This could be a win win for both the town and the developer. Steve will do some research on this.
5. **Proposed Wording Change to Wetlands Ordinance** – This is an improvement to the existing ordinance. They are meeting on January 14, 2012 at 6pm. I just wanted to ensure we were all in agreement with this proposed language.

Correspondence:

All correspondence was reviewed

Other: n/a

Non-public under RSA 91-A: 3, II d

none

Adjournment – John Turbyne motioned to adjourn meeting at David Hess seconded voted unanimously