Members: Members: Chairman Carsten Springer, Jason Holder, Allan Hess, Robert Loree, Patty Shogren (alternate member)

Patty Shogren (alternate member) was appointed a voting member for this meeting by chairman Springer.

Absent: David Caillouette

Others in attendance: Kim Farah (BOS Representative), Jacob Dusling (Unitil Energy Systems) and Nick Golon (T.F. Moran, Bedford, NH).

Meeting called to order @ 7:35PM and televised

Pledge of Allegiance was recited: by those present

<u>Minutes</u>: The minutes of the December 3, 2015 minutes were reviewed and amended. A motion to accept the amended minutes was made by Carsten and seconded by Jason. The motion passed with Patty abstaining.

New Business: Jacob Dusling, project manager presented the proposal from Unitil to run a new overhead pole line 2.5 miles down Route 111 from the intersection of Mill Road in Kingston to the intersection of route 111A in Danville. This will tie into a substation off of Mill Road to bring a second supply into Danville. Presently Danville has only one distribution circuit feeding the town. The feed goes out frequently. This project will improve the service to the town. It will bring more reliability to Rt. 111 and 111A. This will allow for a second circuit to Danville and a back up to what is already here. EverSource will tie into the line at the 111, 111A intersection to service Hampstead utilizing the same poles. Alan asked if Kingston Road, Danville will be taken out of the loop. Jacob explained it will remain in service for the local area. It can be put back in service if for example, an accident on 111 shuts down the service it could be put back onto the circuit bringing service to Danville. Alan asked if this will assist North Danville. Jacob explained issues on Kingston Road will no longer affect North Danville. Alan explained he thought North Danville was feed from the North. Jacob explained there may be a small pocket but 95% of North Danville is feed from Kingston Rd area. This line runs up Pleasant Street, up Main Street all the way to Beach Plain Rd. The Unitil Reps meet with the BOS and gave up them update of where they are with State Related issues of a limited access right of way. An exemption from the utilities accommodation manual is required from the Department of Transportation (DOT) for a linear line which will run parallel to route 111. Process with the state was started in October and seems to be moving in a positive direction. He presented an application for a minimum impact expedited wet map to the ConCom for 19 square feet of impact. He noted the impact area on the southern edge of RT 111, 3 feet off the white (side) line. They chose 3 areas to place the poles to minimize environmental impact, accounting for traffic lights, guard rails and a steep incline in the area. This will allow for easier access for maintenance issues. Jason asked about the esthetics of the pole placement suggesting placing the poles behind the tree line. Jacob replied this may be a reliability issue and affect access. Land owners may have to give permission to trim the trees and this can lead to liability issues. Jacob then pointed out on the map where one wetland area is on the Route 111a (Main St) side which is 3

feet right on the fringe of wetlands. They will install a silk sock or fence on the downstream side when they auger the hole and the spoilage will be taken off site. Across 111 there is another 13 square foot area. Carsten explained that the wetlands north of 111 did not exist 35 years ago to the same extent. It was made into wetlands the way the state handled construction of 111. He personally has no issue with this whatsoever. Jacob continued noting the plans include maintenance accessibility from 111. Vegetation will be removed within 15' of the poles. Bobby asked what the poles are made of. Jacob answered they are wooden poles treated with Penta. When asked he explained the life expectancy of a pole in the wetlands is about the same as those not in wet lands. Carsten made a motion to send a letter of recommendation to the planning board supporting their efforts, seconded by Alan. The motion carried unanimously. Secondly they need a signature for the application to the state on the Wetlands Permit Application-Attachment A Minor and Major -20 questions. Carsten noted that the application mentioned shore lands but was assured it was not. Jacob informed him that the application goes to that address. Carsten read aloud the 20 questions for the members and audience. (see attached document) Alan asked how high are the poles. Mr. Golon replied 50', 47' above the ground with 3 aluminum wires above and 1 below. He added that at this point no phone or other communication lines will be added to the poles.. Kim Farah asked if the poles could be moved to another location while pointing to the map. Mr. Golon stated that pole placement has much to do with the position of the traffic lights. Carsten then asked for a motion allowing the chair to sign the permit application. Patty made the motion, seconded by Carsten. Jason again expressed concerns regarding the placement of the lights aesthetically. Carsten asked Alan if he thought the lines could go anywhere else. He noted that because of the voltage going through the lines, this plan was the safest. And he noted at that height they would not be that noticeable. The members voted on the motion which carried unanimously.

<u>Communications:</u> Chairman Springer notified the ConCom that Mr. Dave Knight had sent a Christmas Card to the members thanking them for their service to the town.

Old Business: Carsten updated the members that he met with Mr. Morse (corner of Back Rd./111a) regarding the trimming and/or cutting of trees at the corner of the Sanborn Recreational area across from his property. Mr. Morse had requested in regards to shading his solar panels. Carsten noted that there are 3 sugar maples in that corner of the property that would benefit from thinning out some of the other trees there and is not in favor of topping off the sugar maples. Carsten would like input from Bobby Loree. He then suggested that Mr. Morse speak to Bobby and get an estimate to have him thin out the trees leaving the sugar maples and get a cost estimate from other tree removal services to check the cost and he could decide if the money spent was worth it to him. Carsten noted that the trees that are left will probably grow fuller, faster and be healthier. Carsten emailed Mr. Morse and cc'd the clerk recapping these items.

Carsten then brought back to the table the issue of reimbursing volunteers and ConCom members for the usage of their heavy equipment. The clerk distributed a copy of the minutes of the October 1, 2015 where both a 30% and 50% hourly rate of reimbursement of current rental costs was mentioned but no vote was taken. Carsten made a motion for a 30% reimbursement. There was no second to the motion. The motion died. Carsten then made a motion, seconded by Jason to reimburse anyone in town volunteering heavy equipment at 50% rental fee. Alan reminded the members that reimbursement would be for anybody who brought heavy equipment, not just ConCom members.

Carsten agreed and noted that more town folks are volunteering to help with projects. Patty noted that the motion needed to be specific to read 50% of the equipment rental rate. Carsten noted that compensation was for the machine usage only and not for the operator or fuel usage. Carsten amended the motion to "to reimburse at 50% of the going rate for comparable equipment rental", seconded by Jason. The motion carried unanimously. Carsten asked that Bobby be reimbursed for his hours.

Kim informed the commission that she knows of someone who would be able to hay the field. She will give the info to Carsten.

Patty mentioned Kelly Graphics in Plaistow. They made the sign for the community Center. Carsten noted the wording needs to be finalized for the Sanborn Family Agricultural and Recreational Commons. Alan volunteered to contact Kelly Graphics because he knows the owner. Carsten noted Kelly Graphics does good work. Discussion occurred regarding wording of the sign. Kim mentioned the sign at the Southeast Land Trust on North road and suggested the members check that out as an example for the sign for the parking lot. The clerk suggested approaching the school department for outreach to Whittier to have the students make the sign if the town donates the material. Carsten would like to see what they could do with graphic designs etc. and will enquire with the school department.

Adjournment: At 8:45 PM, Carsten made a motion, seconded by Jason, to go into non-public session under RSA 91-A: 3 II (d), Consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community. A roll call vote was taken: Bobby (yes), Jason (yes) Carsten (yes) Alan (yes) Patty (Yes).

The public meeting was concluded.

Patty made the Motion, seconded by Allan to return to public session. Roll call vote: Carsten - yes, Patty - yes, Jason - yes, Bob - yes, Allan - yes; motion passed.

Patty made the Motion, seconded by Allan to seal the minutes. Roll call vote: Carsten - yes, Patty - yes, Jason - yes, Bob - yes, Allan - yes; motion passed.

Patty made the Motion, seconded by Allan to adjourn; motion passed

MINUTES PREPARED BY MARY ANN DISTEFANO

Amended/Approved on January 21, 2015 by majority of the Commission



WETLANDS PERMIT APPLICATION – ATTACHMENT A MINOR AND MAJOR - 20 QUESTIONS

Water Division/ Wetlands Bureau/ Land Resources Management Check the Status of your application: http://des.nh.gov/onestop



RSA/ Rule: RSA 482-A, Env-Wt 100-900

1. The need for the proposed impact.

the reliability of electrical service in the vicinity of the project area.

Env-Wt 302 04 Requirements for Application Evaluation	
Env-Wt 302.04 Requirements for Application Evaluation -	For any major or minor project, the applicant shall
demonstrate by plan and example that the following facto	is nave been considered in the project's design in
assessing the impact of the proposed project to areas and	d environments under the department's jurisdiction.
Respond with statements demonstrating:	

The project proposes to construct a new electrical pole line within the Route 111 limited access right-of-way (LAROW) between Mill Road in Kingston and Route 111A in Danville. These improvements are proposed in that Unitil's existing distribution circuit serving the Danville area of approximately 2,050 customers is routinely one of the least reliable circuits in their Seacoast system. The electical improvements proposed are intended to improve

2. That the alternative proposed by the applicant is the one with the least impact to wetlands or surface waters on site.

Yes. In order to proved the safe transfer of electrical service from one location to another, utility poles and their associated guy wires (which support the utility poles) must be installed along the corridor at required intervals. Where possible the location of the poles have been shifted to avoid impacts but in some cases, a wetland was too close to the proximity of Route 111 and required the installation of a pole in the wetland. Areas to be disturbed will be stabilized with vegetative cover, which will continue to be trimmed/maintained in accordance with Unitil's

3. The type and classification of the wetlands involved.
PFO1/5F – Palustrine Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous/Dead, Semipermanently Flooded
PFO1E – Palustrine Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Seasonally flooded/saturated
The relationship of the proposed wetlands to be impacted relative to nearby wetlands and surface waters.
The proposed permanent wetland impacts are minimal in area and are limited to the diameter of the poles and supporting gu-wiress
5. The rarity of the wetland, surface water, sand dunes, or tidal buffer zone area.
The wetlands to be impacted are typical of the area and provide varying functions such as Sediment/Toxicant Retention, Nutrient Removal, and Wildlife Habitat.
6. The surface area of the wetlands that will be impacted.
19 SF permanent.

 7. The impact on plants, fish and wildlife including, but not limited to: a. Rare, special concern species; b. State and federally listed threatened and endangered species; c. Species at the extremities of their ranges; d. Migratory fish and wildlife; e. Exemplary natural communities identified by the DRED-NHB; and f. Vernal pools.
Please see the attached letter from the Natural Heritage Bureau which notes no recorded occurance for sensitive species near the project area. The site was also investigated by a TFM Environmental Scientist to confrim no occurance of the federally protected species.
It has been determined by a licensed wetland scientist that no vernal pools are located within the limits of the project area.
The impact of the proposed project on public commerce, navigation and recreation.
The intent of this project to improve eletrical service reliability to region. The project will have no effect on navigation or recreation. It will have a positive effect on public commerce by improving the reliability of electric service for local residences and businesses.
9. The extent to which a project interferes with the aesthetic interests of the general public. For example, where an applicant proposes the construction of a retaining wall on the bank of a lake, the applicant shall be required to indicate the type of material to be used and the effect of the construction of the wall on the view of other users of the lake.
The project does not interfere with the the aesthetic interest of the general public as the project is located within existing NHDOT limited access right-of-way of Route 111, and the area of impact is minimal.

10. The extent to which a project interferes with or obstructs public rights of passage or access. For example, where the applicant proposes to construct a dock in a narrow channel, the applicant shall be required to document the extent to which the dock would block or interfere with the passage through this area.
The project does not interfere with or obstruct public rights of passage or access.
The impact upon abutting owners pursuant to RSA 482-A:11, II. For example, if an applicant is proposing to rip-rap a stream, the applicant shall be required to document the effect of such work on upstream and downstream abutting properties.
There are no impacts upon abutting owners. The project falls within the existing limited access right-of-way of Route 111.
12. The benefit of a project to the health, safety, and well being of the general public.
The project is a benefit to the health, safety and well being of the general public as it will meet the increase power demand of the public and continue to provide reliable service to the area. Areas to be disturbed will be stabilized with vegetative cover, which will coninue to be trimmed/maintained in accordance with Unitil's standards.

13. The impact of a proposed project on quantity or quality of surface and ground water. For example, where an applicant proposes to fill wetlands the applicant shall be required to document the impact of the proposed fill on the amount of drainage entering the site versus the amount of drainage exiting the site and the difference in the quality of water entering and exiting the site.		
There are no anticipated impacts on quantity or quality of surface and ground water due to the project as Best Management Practices (BMPs) are proposed in accordance with the Best Management Practices Manual for Utility Maintenance in and Adjacent to Wetlands and Waterbodies in New Hampshire to mitigate and preserve water quantity and quality.		
14. The potential of a proposed project to cause or increase flooding, erosion, or sedimentation.		
The project is not expected to increase post-development runoff or the potential for increased flooding due to the size of the watersheds relative to the size of the area of proposed permanent wetland impacts. The proposed erosion and sediment control measures will minimize the potential for the project to cause or increase erosion or sedimentation.		
15. The extent to which a project that is located in surface waters reflects or redirects current or wave energy which might cause damage or hazards.		
The project is not located in surface waters.		

wetland and the percentage of that ownership that would be impacted.
There would be no cumulative impact that would results if all parties owning or abutting a portion of the affected wetland were permitted alteration of the wetland similar to this project. Relative to the area of the watersheds, the permanent impact area is minimal.
17. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.
The impact of the project on the values and functions of the total wetland is mitigated with the eletrical pole line installation in that the values and functions of the wetlands will continue to be provided when the project is complete.

an applicant who owns only a portion of a wetland shall document the applicant's percentage of ownership of that

18. The impact upon the value of the sites included in the latest published edition of the National Register of Natural Landmarks, or sites eligible for such publication.	
This site is not listed in the National Register of Natural Landmarks.	
19. The impact upon the value of areas named in acts of congress or presidential proclamations as national rivers, national wilderness areas, national lakeshores, and such areas as may be established under federal, state, or municipal laws for similar and related purposes such as estuarine and marine sanctuaries.	il•
This area has no such designation at the Federal, State or local level.	<u> </u>
20. The degree to which a project redirects water from one watershed to another.	1000 1000 1000 1000
This project will not alter the existing flow path of water within or to another watershed.	