PUBLIC NOTICE
EXETER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The Exeter Conservation Commission will meet in the Nowak Room of the Town Office Building, Exeter on Tuesday, August 11th, 2015 at 7:00 P.M.

Call to Order:
1. Introduction of Members Present
2. Public Comment

Action Items
1. Standard Dredge and Fill for a driveway crossing on Powdermill Road (Map 102, Lot 7).
2. Project Introduction/ Overview by Tuck Realty Corp for Mixed Use Facilities at 80 Epping Road (Map 55, Lot 3)
3. By-laws Review – Articles I-V
4. Zoning Amendment Inquiry from Planning Board Chair
5. Committee Reports
   a. Trails
   b. Outreach
   c. Property Monitoring
6. Approval of Minutes: July 14th, 2015
7. Treasurers Report
   a. Restricted Funds Discussion
8. Correspondence
9. Natural Resources Planner’s Report
10. Other Business

Non Public Session
Non public session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II (d) for the consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property

11. Next Meeting: Date and Agenda Items

Jay Gregoire, Chair
Exeter Conservation Commission
WETLANDS PERMIT APPLICATION

PROPOSED VEHICULAR ACCESS THROUGH WET MEADOW
Powder Mill Road
Exeter, NH

Map 102, Lot 7

Prepared for:
Maverick Development Corp.
P.O. Box 10833
Bedford, NH 03110

July 13, 2015

Prepared by: SCT

RECEIVED
AUG 3 2015
EXETER PLANNING OFFICE

MLS Project: 9718.00
1. REVIEW TIME:
Indicate your Review Time below. Refer to Guidance Document A for instructions.

- Standard Review (Minimum, Minor or Major Impact)
- Expedited Review (Minimum Impact only)

2. PROJECT LOCATION:
Separate applications must be filed with each municipality that jurisdictional impacts will occur in.

ADDRESS: Lot 102-7, Powder Mill Road
TOWN/CITY: Exeter

TAX MAP: 102
BLOCK:
LOT: 7
UNIT:

USGS TOPO MAP WATERBODY NAME: ☒ NA
STREAM WATERSHED SIZE: ☒ NA

LOCATION COORDINATES (If known):
- Latitude/Longitude
- UTM
- State Plane

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Provide a brief description of the project outlining the scope of work. Attach additional sheets as needed to provide a detailed explanation of your project. DO NOT reply “See Attached” in the space provided below.

This project proposes to construct vehicular access through a wet meadow area in order to provide safe and dry all-season access to the buildable area of the lot.

4. RELATED PERMITS, ENFORCEMENT, EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION, SHORELAND, ALTERATION OF TERRAIN, ETC...

Shoreland PBN Pending. Will forward to reviewer upon receipt.

5. NATURAL HERITAGE BUREAU & DESIGNATED RIVERS:
See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for instructions to complete a & b below.


b. ☒ Designated River the project is in ¼ miles of: Exeter River

- date a copy of the application was sent to Local River Advisory Committee: Month: 7 Day: 17 Year: 2015
- NA
6. APPLICANT INFORMATION (Desired permit holder)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.:</th>
<th>TRUST / COMPANY NAME: Maverick Development Corp.</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 10833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOWN/CITY: Bedford</td>
<td>STATE: NH</td>
<td>ZIP CODE: 03110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL or FAX:</td>
<td>PHONE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here: **SCT**. I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically.

7. PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION (If different than applicant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.:</th>
<th>TRUST / COMPANY NAME:</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOWN/CITY:</td>
<td>STATE: NH</td>
<td>ZIP CODE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL or FAX:</td>
<td>PHONE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here: **SCT**. I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically.

8. AUTHORIZED AGENT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.:</th>
<th>TRUST / COMPANY NAME:</th>
<th>COMPANY NAME: Meridian Land Services, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 118</td>
<td>TOWN/CITY: Milford</td>
<td>STATE: NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL or FAX: <a href="mailto:SCTate@meridianlandservices.com">SCTate@meridianlandservices.com</a></td>
<td>PHONE: 673-1441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here: **SCT**. I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically.

9. PROPERTY OWNER SIGNATURE:

See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for clarification of the below statements.

By signing the application, I am certifying that:

1. I authorize the applicant and/or agent indicated on this form to act in my behalf in the processing of this application, and to furnish upon request, supplemental information in support of this permit application.
2. I have reviewed and submitted information & attachments outlined in the Instructions and Required Attachment document.
3. All abutters have been identified in accordance with RSA 482-A:3, I and Env-Wt 100-900.
4. I have read and provided the required information outlined in Env-Wt 302.04 for the applicable project type.
5. I have read and understand Env-Wt 302.03 and have chosen the least impacting alternative.
6. Any structure that I am proposing to repair/replace was either previously permitted by the Wetlands Bureau or would be considered grandfathered per Env-Wt 101.47.
7. I have submitted a Request for Project Review (RPR) Form (www.nh.gov/nhdhr/revew) to the NH State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) at the NH Division of Historical Resources to be reviewed for the presence of historical/ archaeological resources.
8. I authorize DES and the municipal conservation commission to inspect the site of the proposed project.
9. I have reviewed the information being submitted and that to the best of my knowledge the information is true and accurate.
10. I understand that the willful submission of falsified or misrepresented information to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services is a criminal act, which may result in legal action.
11. I am aware that the work I am proposing may require additional state, local or federal permits which I am responsible for obtaining.
12. The mailing addresses I have provided are up to date and appropriate for receipt of DES correspondence. DES will not forward returned mail.

[signature]
Property Owner Signature

[signature]
Steven Farrow
Print name legibly

[signature]
Date

shoreland@des.nh.gov or (603) 271-2147
NHDES Wetlands Bureau, Concord, NH 03303-0095
www.des.nh.gov

Permit Application - Valid until 12/31/15
Page 2 of 4
10. CONSERVATION COMMISSION SIGNATURE

The signature below certifies that the municipal conservation commission has reviewed this application, and:
1. Waives its right to intervene per RSA 482-A:11;
2. Believes that the application and submitted plans accurately represent the proposed project; and
3. Has no objection to permitting the proposed work.

[Signature]

Print name legibly

Date

DIRECTIONS FOR CONSERVATION COMMISSION

1. Expedited review ONLY requires that the conservation commission’s signature is obtained in the space above.
2. The Conservation Commission signature should be obtained prior to the submittal of the original application and four copies to the town/city clerk for mailing to the DES.
3. The Conservation Commission may refuse to sign. If the Conservation Commission does not sign this statement for any reason, the application is not eligible for expedited review and the application will reviewed in the standard review time frame.

11. TOWN / CITY CLERK SIGNATURE

As required by Chapter 482-A.3 (amended 2014), I hereby certify that the applicant has filed four application forms, four detailed plans, and four USGS location maps with the town/city indicated below.

[Signature]

Town/City Clerk Signature

Print name legibly

Town/City

Date

DIRECTIONS FOR TOWN/CITY CLERK:

Per RSA 482-A:3.I

1. For applications where “Expedited Review” is checked on page 1, sign and accept the applications only if the Conservation Commission signature has been received;
2. IMMEDIATELY sign the original application form and four copies in the signature space provided above;
3. Return the signed original application form and attachments to the applicant so that the applicant may submit the application form and attachments to NHDES by mail or hand delivery.
4. IMMEDIATELY distribute a copy of the application with one complete set of attachments to each of the following bodies: the municipal Conservation Commission, the local governing body (Board of Selectmen or Town/City Council), and the Planning Board; and
5. Retain one copy of the application form and one complete set of attachments and make them reasonably accessible for public review.

DIRECTIONS FOR APPLICANT:

1. Submit the original permit application form bearing the signature of the Town/ City Clerk, additional materials, and the application fee to NHDES by mail or hand delivery.
12. IMPACT AREA:
For each jurisdictional area that will be/has been impacted, provide square feet and, if applicable, linear feet of impact
Permanent: impacts that will remain after the project is complete.
Temporary: Impacts not intended to remain (and will be restored to pre-construction conditions) after the project is complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTIONAL AREA</th>
<th>PERMANENT Sq. Ft. / Lin. Ft.</th>
<th>TEMPORARY Sq. Ft. / Lin. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forested wetland</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrub-shrub wetland</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet meadow</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent stream</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial Stream / River</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake / Pond</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank - Intermittent stream</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank - Perennial stream / River</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank - Lake / Pond</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal water</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marsh</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand dune</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime wetland</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime wetland buffer</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Tidal Buffer Zone (TBZ)</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously-developed upland in TBZ</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docking - Lake / Pond</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docking - River</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docking - Tidal Water</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
<td>☐ ATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,550 /</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. APPLICATION FEE: See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for further instruction

☐ Minimum Impact Fee: Flat fee of $200
☒ Minor or Major Impact Fee: Calculate using the below table below

Permanent and Temporary (non-docking) 5,550 sq. ft. X $0.20 = $1,110.00

Temporary (seasonal) docking structure: sq. ft. X $1.00 = $

Permanent docking structure: sq. ft. X $2.00 = $

Projects proposing shoreline structures (including docks) add $200 = $

Total = $1110.00

The Application Fee is the above calculated Total or $200, whichever is greater = $1110.00
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 factors have been considered in the project's design in assessing the impact of the proposed project to areas and environments under the department's jurisdiction. Respond with statements demonstrating:

1. The need for the proposed impact.

The subject parcel, locally identified as lot 102-7, is entirely within the Town of Exeter and is located on the south side of Powder Mill Road (200' of frontage). The lot is an existing lot of record. The parcel is 5.01 acres and Powder Mill Road is the lots only frontage. The parcel is currently vacant, however the property contains adequate site and soils for a septic system and is considered a viable buildable lot. A palustrine emergent wetland separates the Powder Mill ROW from the buildable area of lot 102-7. The wetland extends from one lateral lot line to the other and results in no upland means of accessing the property from the public ROW. This project proposes to install one wetland crossing wide enough to support the passage of cars and trucks on a single lane (12 ft.) access drive. The crossing will utilize minimal fill as well as 12" diam. culverts to maintain hydrologic connectivity during flood and high precipitation events. Culverts will also provide for critter passage.

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

The proposed wetland crossing is proposed in a location and orientation to minimize fill in wetlands to the greatest extent possible. The shortest possible distance from upland to upland was used to develop the centerline of the traveled way. The proposed crossing will also use upland "islands" wherever possible. The proposed fill is to be tapered at a 2:1 slope in order to minimize the amount of fill to be placed within the wetland areas. All fill areas and areas of disturbance are to be bounded by silt fence and/or straw bale barriers in order to protect the surrounding wetland complex. The roadway width of the crossing shall not exceed 20 ft., the fill width shall not exceed 50 ft. The wetland to be crossed does not have standing water for 10 months of the year, is not a stream crossing, does not impact bogs, marshes, sand dunes, tidal wetlands, cedar swamps, undisturbed tidal buffer zone, or salt marsh. The project is not within 100' of a prime wetland and the proposal has not been identified by the Natural Heritage Bureau as having potential impacts to exemplary, rare, or threatened community or species.

3. The type and classification of the wetlands involved.

The wetland area is predominantly a wet/saturated grassland with little to no shrubby or woody vegetation. The wetland classification is a PEM2B or Palustrine, emergent, nonpervent wetland with a saturated water regime. There are small areas where scrub-shrub vegetation dominate however, these areas are small and isolated.
4. The relationship of the proposed wetlands to be impacted relative to nearby wetlands and surface waters.

The wetland area to be impacted is part of a larger wetland complex that is contiguous with the Exeter river. The emergent wetland area extends eastward, roughly parallel with Powder Mill road. The wetland area eventually drains underneath Powder Mill road and terminates in the Exeter River roughly 600 ft. beyond the area of the proposed work.

5. The rarity of the wetland, surface water, sand dunes, or tidal buffer zone area.

This wetland type is commonly occurring in this region of the State. Land use history suggests that this site, like much of New Hampshire was used as a hay field/pasture and was at one point probably forested. The species composition of this wetland area is at least partially due to the prior land use of the parcel.

6. The surface area of the wetlands that will be impacted.

The proposed wetland disturbance area associated with this proposal is 5,550 sq.ft.

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.

The proposal has limited impacts to plants, fish, and wildlife as the disturbance area should be limited to the area within the erosion control boundary. No plant or animal species of special concern were observed during site investigation and the hydrolog regime is not sufficient to support fish or aquatic biota. There were no vernal pools observed within (at least) several hundred feet of the proposed impacts.
8. The impact of the proposed project on public commerce, navigation and recreation.

The wetlands to be impacted are entirely within private property that is not in current use. Therefore, there should be little to no detrimental impact on public commerce, navigation, and recreation.

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.

This project proposes installation of a driveway on a private lot. The aesthetic interests of the general public do not include driveways to service a private lot.

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.

There will be no obstruction to public rights of passage with this proposal. The proposed driveway will be utilized to connect the public right-of-way to the buildable area of the lot. There are no proposed impacts to Powder Mill road, the Exeter river, or public parcels in this proposal.

11. 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 will be no impacts to abutters with this proposal. The proposed culverts will maintain hydrology and connectivity between the bisected wetland areas. There will be no flooding or backwatering up-gradient of the wetland crossing and no accumulation of flow or flooding down-gradient of crossing. The vegetation profile should be unchanged and there should be no down-gradient sedimentation as all areas to be impacted by construction will be bounded with erosion control devices.
12. The benefit of a project to the health, safety, and well being of the general public.

The proposed driveway will provide safe, dry all-season access to the lot. The installation of this driveway will facilitate utility/postal deliveries, access for emergency (fire & ambulance) personnel, and will provide service to Powder Mill road from the buildable area of the lot.

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.

All impacted surface water will be removed of silts through the use of erosion control devices. There is to be no impact to groundwater as the proposed driveway grade will be raised above grade. None of the grading intends to intercept SHWT. There will be no significant difference in water quality exiting the site following completion of construction.

14. The potential of a proposed project to cause or increase flooding, erosion, or sedimentation.

There is little potential to increase flooding, erosion, or sedimentation as the increase in runoff will be negligible (impervious asphalt vs. saturated soil), the proposed culverts are intended to maintain up-gradient/down-gradient hydrology, and the area to be impacted will be surrounded by silt fence and/or straw bale barriers.

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.

This project is not located in or around surface waters, therefore, there will be no reflection or redirection of wave energy.
16. The cumulative impact that would result if all parties owning or abutting a portion of the affected wetland or wetland complex were also permitted alterations to the wetland proportional to the extent of their property rights. For example, an applicant who owns only a portion of a wetland shall document the applicant's percentage of ownership of that wetland and the percentage of that ownership that would be impacted.

Only a small percentage of the wetland complex is to be disturbed in this proposal. The vast majority of wetland area on the property is to be protected from the impact areas and will be hydrologically connected. The total delineated wetland area of the parcel is 59,750 sq.ft. The proposal will impact approximately 9.3% of the wetland area (5,550 sq.ft.)

17. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.

Due to the size of the impact area and relatively low functional value of the impacted wetland there will be little to no loss in the functions and values of the Exter River watershed. There are no proposed impacts to he water quality or quantity within this proposal.

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.

There are no natural landmarks within the vicinity of this project.
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.

There are no Federal, State, or locally protected areas similar to this within the vicinity. The Great Bay Estuary is not to be impacted by this proposal.

20. The degree to which a project redirects water from one watershed to another.

The will be no redirection of water from one watershed to another with this proposal.
In order for the Corps of Engineers to properly evaluate your application, applicants must submit the following information along with the DES Wetlands Bureau application or permit notification forms. Some projects may require more information. For a more comprehensive checklist, go to www.nae.usace.army.mil/regulatory, “Forms/Publications” and then “Application and Plan Guideline Checklist.” Check with the Corps at (978) 318-8832 for project-specific requirements. For your convenience, this Appendix B is also attached to the State of New Hampshire DES Wetlands Bureau application and Permit by Notification forms.

All Projects:

• Corps application form (ENG Form 4345) as appropriate.
• Photographs of wetland/waterway to be impacted.
• Purpose of the project.
• Legible, reproducible black and white (no color) plans no larger than 11”x17” with bar scale. Provide locus map and plan views of the entire property.
• Typical cross-section views of all wetland and waterway fill areas and wetland replication areas.
• In navigable waters, show mean low water (MLW) and mean high water (MHW) elevations. Show the high tide line (HTL) elevations when fill is involved. In other waters, show ordinary high water (OHW) elevation.
• On each plan, show the following for the project:
  • Vertical datum and the NAVD 1988 equivalent with the vertical units as U.S. feet. Don’t use local datum. In coastal waters this may be mean higher high water (MHHW), mean high water (MHW), mean low water (MLW), mean lower low water (MLLW) or other tidal datum with the vertical units as U.S. feet. MLLW and MHHW are preferred. Provide the correction factor detailing how the vertical datum (e.g., MLLW) was derived using the latest National Tidal Datum Epoch for that area, typically 1983-2001.
  • Horizontal state plane coordinates in U.S. survey feet based on the [insert state grid system] for the [insert state] [insert zone] NAD 83.
• Show project limits with existing and proposed conditions.
• Limits of any Federal Navigation Project in the vicinity of the project area and horizontal State Plane Coordinates in U.S. survey feet for the limits of the proposed work closest to the Federal Navigation Project;
• Volume, type, and source of fill material to be discharged into waters and wetlands, including the area(s) (in square feet or acres) of fill in wetlands, below the ordinary high water in inland waters and below the high tide line in coastal waters.
• Delineation of all waterways and wetlands on the project site, including vernal pools:
• Use Federal delineation methods and include Corps wetland delineation data sheets. See GC 2; Endnotes 1, 6, 7 and 15 in Appendix A; and www.nmnoa.noaa.gov/hcd for eelgrass survey guidance.
• Appendix A, (e) Moorings, contains eelgrass survey requirements for the placement of moorings.
• For activities involving discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., include a statement describing how impacts to waters of the U.S. are to be avoided and minimized, and either a statement describing how impacts to waters of the U.S. are to be compensated for (or a conceptual or detailed mitigation plan) or a statement explaining why compensatory mitigation should not be required for the proposed impacts. Please contact the Corps for guidance.
New Hampshire Programmatic General Permit (PGP)
Appendix B - Corps Secondary Impacts Checklist
(for inland wetland/waterway fill projects in New Hampshire)

1. Attach any explanations to this checklist. Lack of information could delay a Corps permit determination.
2. All references to “work” include all work associated with the project construction and operation. Work includes filling, clearing, flooding, draining, excavation, dozing, stumping, etc.
3. See PGP, GC 5, regarding single and complete projects.
4. Contact the Corps at (978) 318-8832 with any questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Impaired Waters</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Will any work occur within 1 mile upstream in the watershed of an impaired water? See <a href="http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/section401/impaired_waters.htm">http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/section401/impaired_waters.htm</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Wetlands</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are there streams, brooks, rivers, ponds, or lakes within 200 feet of any proposed work?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are there proposed impacts to SAS, shellfish beds, special wetlands and vernal pools (see PGP, GC 26 and Appendix A)? Applicants may obtain information from the NH Department of Resources and Economic Development Natural Heritage Bureau (NHB) website, <a href="http://www.nhnaturalheritage.org">www.nhnaturalheritage.org</a>, specifically the book Natural Community Systems of New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 If wetland crossings are proposed, are they adequately designed to maintain hydrology, sediment transport &amp; wildlife passage?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Would the project remove part or all of a riparian buffer? (Riparian buffers are lands adjacent to streams where vegetation is strongly influenced by the presence of water. They are often thin lines of vegetation containing native grasses, flowers, shrubs and/or trees that line the stream banks. They are also called vegetated buffer zones.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The overall project site is more than 40 acres.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 What is the size of the existing impervious surface area?</td>
<td>0 SQ.FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 What is the size of the proposed impervious surface area?</td>
<td>7,250 SQ.FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 What is the % of the impervious area (new and existing) to the overall project site?</td>
<td>0% --&gt; 3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Wildlife</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Has the NHB determined that there are known occurrences of rare species, exemplary natural communities, Federal and State threatened and endangered species and habitat, in the vicinity of the proposed project? (All projects require a NHB determination.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 Would work occur in any area identified as either “Highest Ranked Habitat in N.H.” or “Highest Ranked Habitat in Ecological Region”? (These areas are colored magenta and green, respectively, on NH Fish and Game’s map, “2010 Highest Ranked Wildlife Habitat by Ecological Condition.”) Map information can be found at:
- Data Mapper: www.granit.unh.edu.
- GIS: www.granit.unh.edu/data/downloadfreedata/category/databycategory.html. | X |
3.3 Would the project impact more than 20 acres of an undeveloped land block (upland, wetland/waterway) on the entire project site and/or on an adjoining property(s)?  

| | X |

3.4 Does the project propose more than a 10-lot residential subdivision, or a commercial or industrial development?  

| | X |

3.5 Are stream crossings designed in accordance with the PGP, GC 21?  

| | NA |

### 4. Flooding/Floodplain Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Is the proposed project within the 100-year floodplain of an adjacent river or stream?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 If 4.1 is yes, will compensatory flood storage be provided if the project results in a loss of flood storage?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Historic/Archaeological Resources

For a minor or major impact project - a copy of the Request for Project Review (RPR) Form (www.nh.gov/nhdhr/review) shall be sent to the NH Division of Historical Resources as required on Page 5 of the PGP**  

| | X |

---

*Although this checklist utilizes state information, its submittal to the Corps is a Federal requirement.

**If project is not within Federal jurisdiction, coordination with NH DHR is not required under Federal law.
To: Spencer Tate  
PO Box 118  
Milford, NH 03055

From: NH Natural Heritage Bureau

Re: Review by NH Natural Heritage Bureau of request dated 7/13/2015

NHB File ID: NHB15-2323  
Applicant: Spencer Tate

Location: Tax Map(s)/Lot(s): 102-7  
Exeter

Project Description: Project proposes to install a driveway to provide safe and dry access to the buildable area of the lot.

The NH Natural Heritage database has been checked for records of rare species and exemplary natural communities near the area mapped below. The species considered include those listed as Threatened or Endangered by either the state of New Hampshire or the federal government. We currently have no recorded occurrences for sensitive species near this project area.

A negative result (no record in our database) does not mean that a sensitive species is not present. Our data can only tell you of known occurrences, based on information gathered by qualified biologists and reported to our office. However, many areas have never been surveyed, or have only been surveyed for certain species. An on-site survey would provide better information on what species and communities are indeed present.

This report is valid through 7/12/2016.
MAP OF PROJECT BOUNDARIES FOR NHB FILE ID: NHB15-2323
List of Abutters
Map 102 Lot 7
Exeter, New Hampshire

102-B
DEBORAH MARSTON
45 GILES ROAD
EAST KINGSTON, NH 03827

101-6-1
BERKE FAMILY TRUST
108 KINGSTON ROAD
EXETER, NH 03833

102-006
TOWN OF EXETER
10 FRONT STREET
EXETER, NH 03833
July 13, 2015

RE: Wetlands Permit application
Maverick Development Corp.
Lot 102-7
Exeter, NH

Dear Abutter:

In compliance with RSA 482-A, Dredge and Fill in Wetlands, as an abutter you are hereby notified that Maverick Development Corp. has applied to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Wetlands Bureau for a wetlands permit in conjunction with creating a wetland crossing to gain access to buildable area on their property.

Plans are on file at this office. If you have any questions or comments concerning this application, please contact Spencer Tate at Meridian Land Services, Inc. 673-1441.

If you have any comments relative to this submission, please send them to:

State of New Hampshire - D.E.S.
Wetlands Bureau
P. O. Box 95
Concord, New Hampshire 03302-0095

Sincerely,
MERIDIAN LAND SERVICES, INC.

Spencer C. Tate
Apprentice Wetland Scientist

H:\MLS_WP\09718
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Fee</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Postage &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JONES & BEACH ENGINEERS, INC.
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

85 Portsmouth Avenue
PO Box 219
Stratham, NH 03885
Telephone: 603-772-4746
Fax: 603-772-0227

PO Box 484
Alton, NH 03809
E-mail: jbe@jonesandbeach.com

Date: 7/31/2015
Company: Town of Exeter
Attn: Conservation Commission
10 Front Street
Exeter, NH 03833

JBE Project No: 14101
RE: 80 Epping Road
Exeter, NH

Delivery Type: Delivery

We are sending you ☑ Attached ☐ Under separate cover via the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPIES</th>
<th>DOC. DATE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rev. 7/31/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copies of reduced-size (11”x17”) Plan Sheet No. OV1, OV2, C5, C6 &amp; P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rev. 7/31/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copies of full-size Plan Sheet No. OV1, OV2, C5, C6 &amp; P1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THESE ARE TRANSMITTED as checked below:

☑ For approval ☑ For your use ☑ As requested ☑ For review/comment

COMMENTS:

We respectfully request placement on the Conservation Commission Agenda for August 11, 2015. Please call with any questions you may have. Thank you very much for your time.

---

RECEIVED

JUL 31 2015

EXETER PLANNING OFFICE

Signed:
JONES & BEACH ENGINEERS, INC.

Jonathan S. Ring
President

CC: Mike Garrepy, Tuck Realty Corp. (1 full-size copy of plan sheets via US Mail)
    Jim Gove, CWS, CSS, Gove Environmental Services, Inc. (1 full-size copy of plan sheets via US Mail)
    Jeff Hyland, ASLA, CLARB, Ironwood design group, LLC (1 full-size copy of plan sheets via US Mail)
BY-LAWS

OF

THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

OF EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
Article I Name and Location

The name of this (voluntary, non-profit,) organization shall be the Exeter Conservation Commission (hereafter called The Commission). The principal office of The Commission shall be located at The Exeter Town Office Building, 10 Front Street, Exeter, New Hampshire.

Article II
Authority

Established in March 1965 by a vote at Exeter Town Meeting, the Commission derives its authority from State Law RSA 36-A and from the Town of Exeter Ordinances. Nothing in these by-laws is intended to conflict with these.

Article III
Purposes

1. To ensure the conservation and proper utilization of the natural resources and the protection of watershed resources of the Town of Exeter.
2. To advise other Town boards on conservation and natural resource matters.
3. To acquire land for fee (full title) or through conservation easement for conservation purposes and to receive gifts of money or property in the name of the Town. This may include water resources. The Commission will then manage these areas.
4. To manage duly authorized town forests.
5. To conduct research into local land and water natural resources to ascertain their value for conservation purposes.
6. To keep the public informed as to actions taken and lands available for public use through maps, signs, charts, plans and pamphlets.
7. To intervene when appropriate within 10 days of a dredge and fill of wetlands application, and to investigate and report its findings and recommendations within 40 days to the NH Wetlands Board.(RSA 483A)
8. To receive copies of sand and gravel excavation permit applications and make necessary comments and recommendations to the proper board.(RSA 155-E)
9. To monitor yearly open space and conservation lands, including easements.
10. To sponsor activities which foster conservation education.
11. To assist in the Town’s Master Plan up-date.
12. To attend workshops, informational meetings and conferences so that the Commission is adequately informed about conservation issues.
Article IV
Membership

1. Eligibility and Appointment of Members

A. The Commission shall consist of not less than seven regular and five alternate members, appointed by the Board of Selectmen.
B. Terms of the members shall be for three years and be so arranged that approximately one-third of the members’ terms expire yearly.
C. Members may serve no more than two consecutive three-year terms.
D. The balance of an un-expired term shall be filled by the Selectmen.
E. Alternate members may take an active part in the meetings, but may vote only to obtain a quorum.
F. New members shall register with the Town Clerk and sign appropriate papers.

2. Election of Officers

A. Officers for the Commission shall be elected each May for a term of one year.
B. Officers may serve consecutive terms.

3. Absenteeism

A. Members are expected to attend all monthly meetings unless the Chair is notified in advance.
B. Unexcused absence from four meetings may result in a letter being sent to the regular member or alternate in question. If no reply is forthcoming in a reasonable amount of time (usually one month), the member will be requested to submit his or her resignation, and the Selectmen will be so notified to select a replacement.

Article V
Responsibilities of Offices

1. Chairperson

A. It shall be the duty of the Chair, or his/her designate, to notify in advance all members of the Commission of any scheduled meeting. The Chair is also responsible for preparing agenda for the meeting listing issues to be discussed.
B. The Chair shall run the meeting and assign the floor to those speakers who request it.
C. The Chair may take part in any discussions relative to the business at hand and will rule on any disputes that arise during debates.

D. The Chair will have a vote only in case of a deadlock or in the event that said vote would constitute a quorum necessary to expedite the business at hand.

2. **Vice-Chairperson**
   A. The Vice-Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Commission in the absence of the Chair and shall perform all duties and have all powers of the Chair in case of temporary absence or incapacity of the Chair.

3. **Secretary**
   A. In the absence of administrative staff, the Secretary shall keep an accurate record of the meetings and other proceedings of the Commission.
   B. In accordance with RSA 91-A:2, a typed copy of the minutes shall be made available for public inspection not more than 5 business days after the meeting, and completed within 144 hours of the meeting and a copy brought to the Town Clerk's Office.
   C. In the absence of administrative staff, the Secretary shall be responsible for correspondence designated by the Commission.

4. **Treasurer**
   A. The Treasurer insures all monies received by the Commission is accounted for and deposited into The Commission’s bank account and disbursed from that account only with proper authorization by official vote of The Commission shall keep an accurate record of the finances of the Commission and pay all obligations levied against it when approved by the Commission and ordered by the Chair.
   B. The Treasurer shall report on the status of the Commissions monies at meetings of the Commission not less than quarterly at each meeting and file a copy of that report with the Planning Department Chair, the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Town of Exeter.
   C. The Treasurer shall also prepare an annual financial report and file a copy of that report with the Chair, the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Town of Exeter.
Call to Order

The meeting convened at 7:25 pm in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Offices on the above date.

1. **Members Present**: Ginny Raub, Don Briselden, Pete Richardson, Alyson Eberhardt, Carlos Guindon, STAFF PRESENT: Kristin Murphy (Natural Resource Planner), Sarah McGraw (Recording Secretary)

2. **Public Comment**: None

Action Items

1. **Morrissette Interpretive Trail, Passive Recreation interpretation**

   Tim Foret, teacher at Great Bay Charter School, expressed his interest in integrating his curriculum with bringing students out into the Morrissette property. Mr. Foret is a science teacher and would like to introduce the students to some interpretive trails. Mr. Foret mentioned that there is new development next to the School's building with upgraded stormwater requirements that he would like to bring to the school.

Commission Comments

   Ms. Raub said she welcomed the idea. Ms. Eberhardt asked what grades he teaches. Mr. Foret said he teaches grades 9-12. Ms. Eberhardt commented she would like the commission to have space to weigh in on the ideas Mr. Foret inquired about bringing his students out onto the property. Mr. Guindon suggested letting the students know about the type of easement on the property. Ms. Murphy added it should be known that the property was owned by the school at one point and was then used for offsite mitigation. Mr. Foret said he would like the students to adopt stewardship practices. Mr. Briselden asked about the disc golf idea that was mentioned in the email description. Mr. Foret said that he had looked at other disc golf courses in the area and thought the property could use the disc golf course as a way to attract students and also use as an educational tool. He said he was not sure if the use is considered passive. Mr. Foret said for about 18 holes, 34 acres is needed but 8 holes could fit on to the Morrissette property. Ms. Raub asked about any conflict that could occur with the course. Mr. Foret replied there could be interpretive signage at each site on the course.
Public Comment:

Don Clement, Exeter Resident commented that when he was on the Conservation Commission when the new high school was built, he had lobbied to preserve the 36 acres. He said that the property has a unique ecosystem and thought that a disc golf course would take away from the original vision. Mr. Clement agreed that continued use of the property for education is an acceptable use but only used as passive recreation.

Mr. Guindon agreed that he thought the disc golf course was beyond use of the property but that educational use is appropriate.

Mr. Foret said that with such a large space, it would give a sense of privacy which may lead to neglect. The disc golf course may help with taking responsibility for taking care of the property. Ms. Eberhardt said she was not sure if disc golf is a legal use of the property but welcomes the idea for another property. Ms. Eberhardt also said that one idea for curriculum would be conduct a long term study of the ecosystem. Ms. Murphy added that experimenting with mowing frequency could also be part of a study of the diversity of the habitats. SOAK New Hampshire is looking to give funding to sites who wish to add green infrastructure to sites.

Mr. Foret agreed to create a proposal with the indented curriculum for the coming year.

2. Restricted Funds

Ms. Murphy suggested tabling the discussion until chair Jay Gregoire is present at the meeting.

3. Bylaws

Ms. Murphy commented that treasurer and secretary could be combined to one position. In Article 6 instead of a list of different committees there could be room for ad hoc committees. Ms. Raub said she would like to see a clarification of membership. Ms. Raub went through a few more sections of the bylaws. Mr. Guindon suggested a work session for the next meeting dedicated to bylaw.

4. Lease with Historic Society for Storage of Artifacts at Raynes Barn

Ms. Murphy said that after reviewing with legal counsel, a lease is finished for storage of Historic Society items in the Raynes barn. The agreement allows the Conservation Commission to open the barn to the public while storing historic artifacts. Mr. Briselden asked if the items were the responsibility of the Historic Society. Ms. Murphy gave the example of Stuart Farm, where a barn is leased for storage of hay. Mr. Briselden moved to forward the lease to the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Eberhard asked how would the large object be kept safe from visitors to the barn. Ms. Murphy said that the items are to be kept in a section of the barn that is not
These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent Exeter Conservation Commission meeting visible to the general public. *Mr. Richardson seconded the motion from Mr. Briselden. VOTE: Unanimous*

5. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Trails:**
      Ms. Murphy reported that remnants of a campsite were found at the McDonald property. She said a date for cleanup will be set and noted that the site was not found on the typical route. Ms. Murphy added that a blazing weekend is in the works and that the Oakland’s trails are all painted red. She suggested an adopt- a- trail program. Mr. Guindon said that a portion of the field at the McDonald property needs to be mowed. Ms. Eberhardt volunteered her push mower for the job.
   b. **Outreach**
      Ms. Murphy talked about the posters for the Henderson-Swasey trail race. Ms. Raub mentioned a thanks should be given to Eastern Lantern for giving up part of their parking lot for the event in past races. Ms. Murphy said the race organizers had sent $400 to the Conservation Commission and suggested a thank you presentation at a Board of Selectmen meeting as well as a formal letter.
   c. **Property Monitoring**
      Ms. Murphy reported that the Chamberlin Parcel did was not required to be monitored and the Smith Parcel was required.

6. **Approval of minutes:** Ms. Raub made some suggested edits. Mr. Richardson moved to approve the minutes of June 9, 2015, second by Ms. Eberhardt. VOTE: Unanimous

7. **Natural Resource Planner’s Report and Correspondence**
   Ms. Murphy reported that the PREP Assessment grant had been awarded to Exeter for fertilizer setbacks from wetlands with help from the Citizens group for Responsible Growth. A kick off meeting will be the first week of August. Ms. Murphy also reported that the 80 Epping Road project will be at the Planning Board meeting in August and at the Conservation Commission meeting on August 11, 2015. A joint site walk is in the works for the first week of September.

8. **Other Business**
   Ms. Raub asked if the Conservation Commission would like to be a SELT member for another year for $100.
   
   *Mr. Richardson moved to expend $100 dollars to renew membership with SELT, second by Ms. Eberhardt. VOTE Unanimous*
Ms. Raub reported that a letter was received from LCHIP thanking the Commission for taking care of the Raynes property which came with a $400 check.

The Exeter Chamber of Commerce is holding Fall Fest on August 22, 2015 at 10 am. There was discussion about having a table at the event. Some Commission members would be out of town and the members present at the meeting did not want to volunteer others until they knew their commitment. Ms. Murphy would send out an email asking if other members were interested.

Ms. Raub noted a letter from the Mason Conservation Commission asking for signatures to oppose the Kinder-Morgan Pipeline that would travel across the southern tier of New Hampshire. The Commission decided if members wanted to read the letter and sign as solo signatories but not as the commission as a whole.

9. **Next Meeting:** August 11, 2015

Ms. Raub added there is an event hosted by the New Hampshire Timberland Owners on July 27, 2015 in Hillsborough.

*Mr. Richardson moved to adjourn the meeting, second by Ms. Eberhardt. VOTE: Unanimous*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah McGraw, Recording Secretary