[D R A F T]

DURHAM CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Monday, October 27, 2025
DURHAM TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dwight Trueblood (Chair); Neil Slepian (Vice-Chair); Darrell Ford (Town Council Rep); Jacob Cragg; Nick Lanzer; Anne Lightbody, Rob Sullivan (Planning Board Rep); Alternates: Steve Moyer and Ben Phelps

MEMBERS ABSENT: Alternate John Nachilly

ALSO PRESENT: Town Planner Michael Behrendt and Land Stewardship Coordinator Veronique Ludington

I. Call to Order

Chair Trueblood called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. He said after the first 15 minutes of Commission business, he will turn the meeting over briefly to Town Planner Michael Behrendt who will explain the process for reviewing the draft ordinance.

He and Vice-Chair Neil Slepian will then give a 15 to 20-minute Power Point presentation to provide some context as to why the Commission has drafted a new ordinance. Then the floor will be open for comments and questions. If there is time remaining, Conservation members will talk briefly about next steps.

II. Land Acknowledgement Statement

Chair Trueblood read the Land Acknowledgement Statement adopted by the town.

III. Roll Call and Seating of Alternates

Roll call attendance was taken.

IV. Approval of Agenda

Chair Trueblood MOVED to approve the agenda as presented; SECONDED by Ms. Lightbody; APPROVED unanimously by a show of hands, 7-0, Motion carries.

V. Public Comments:

The Chair explained this item is for comments (limited to five minutes) regarding anything not on the agenda.

Durham Resident **Julian Smith** said he has owned property in Durham since he began teaching at UNH in 1965. He and his wife imported some beavers onto their property in the late 1960s. He spoke about the negative impacts of the removal of Mill Pond Dam on the beaver population and also said it will cost the town more to maintain the land than it would to repair the dam.

VI. Land Stewardship Update

Land Stewardship Coordinator Veronique Ludington reported October was a good month, with more than 110 volunteer hours. Volunteers worked at the Pike Property, removing all fencing detrimental to wildlife passage and also pulled invasives. Thanks to this work, the meadow can now be accessed by a tractor for mowing.

She thanked a group of scouts from Troop 154 for their work pulling invasives at Longmarsh Preserve. The Women's UNH Lacrosse team will continue the work at Longmarsh in the next few weeks and a group of 70 middle school students are scheduled to work on invasives at Thompson Forest.

She started monitoring of conservation easements, which has to be done by the end of the year. Vice-Chair Neil Slepian is helping and she'll be training other volunteers.

UNH Capstone students are working on the Bio Blitz. They are planning a scavenger hunt and other activities and now preparing for a presentation at the library on December 3rd, in conjunction with representatives from UNH Cooperative Extension and Seacoast Science Center.

The Land Stewardship Subcommittee is continuing its work on kiosks and signs. The historical heritage part of the group will be headed by Carolyn Singer. They are working on a mapping update and following up on the accessibility study that was commissioned by the town. They will be working with Northeast Passage in the next few weeks to help enact goals from the study.

Ms. Ludington is preparing goals for next year, with an eye toward what is possible given their manpower. They expect to identify potential grant opportunities this winter.

VII. WSOD Public Information Session

Town Planner Michael Behrendt explained the process to bring an ordinance forward: He said any Committee or Commission can propose an ordinance; once developed, it then

goes to the Planning Board, which owns it and can do whatever they wish: reject it; make changes or adopt as is. At least one public hearing needs to be held and then it gets passed on to Town Council.

After tonight's hearing, an official draft of the ordinance will go to the Planning Board, which will probably not be able to review it until March [2026]. It could take months for review and then it will be sent to Town Council. The same happens at TC – they will own it, make changes, reject or adopt it. They also need to hold at least one public hearing.

He clarified two items on the matrix regarding the buffers on p. 4: tidal wetlands should show as 125 feet, not 100. In terms of tidal wetlands and tidal waters, it shows current buffers at 125 feet and proposed new buffers at 330-feet. He said one resident claims the interpretation of the current ordinance is incorrect and the buffer is actually 250-feet. To Mr. Behrendt's knowledge, it's been implemented at 125 feet, but this will be clarified with the Town Administrator.

Chair Dwight Trueblood and Vice-Chair Neil Slepian then gave a Power Point presentation [starting at 18:22 on D-CAT video] to explain the process and reasoning behind the proposed ordinance. Key topics covered included:

- Mission of the Commission,
  (To manage and protect the natural resources of the town)
- Why SPOD and WCOD Ordinances are Being Updated
- Purpose of the New Ordinance
- Who Was Involved in Process
- Resources Used
- WSOD and the Natural Resources Master Plan
- State of Our Estuaries 2023 Report
  (Compiled by Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership - PREP)
- Purposes of a Buffer
- Comparison of Durham's Proposed Buffers with other NH towns on Bay
- Google Earth images of buffers on both tidal and non-tidal waters, as proposed
- Permitted Uses within WSOD, as proposed
  (Permitted Use A; B and Conditional Use)
- Single Family Homes in the Buffer
  (Permitted as Conditional Use, with a 150-foot setback.

Chair Trueblood noted Durham is proposing a wider buffer than other area towns, due to PREP's assertion that Great Bay is at great risk, particularly from climate change and sea level rise. For inland waterways, Durham is also proposing a larger buffer depending on the type of wetland.

He then explained the purpose and procedure for the Open Forum time, saying the Commission is interested in hearing questions, comments and concerns. Comments will be limited to five minutes each. He emphasized they do not wish to debate the ordinance tonight, but rather want to hear ideas about how to improve it.

Mr. Behrendt will help the Commission to develop a Frequently Asked Questions document based on tonight's forum, which will be posted on the town website. Residents may also email Mr. Behrendt if their questions aren't addressed.

Open Forum

Jim Lawson, has owned property on the Oyster River for 20 years and said he didn't know there would be a five-minute restriction and asked residents if they were willing to cede some of their time to him. *Chair Trueblood said there is no ceding of time, but there may be time for a second round of comments*.

Mr. Lawson clarified that Town Council cannot change the ordinance; they can only approve or reject it after a Public Hearing. Changes need to be made at the Planning Board level. He said the proposed ordinance will not improve Great Bay's health and will have a significant impact on many property owners. Durham currently has the most restrictive shoreland ordinance in the Great Bay community. Exeter has a 300-foot buffer but allows far more activities, including the use of low nitrogen fertilizers whereas Durham allows no fertilizers. The real challenge to Great Bay is rooted to sources of pollution that don't originate on Durham's shoreland, but rather throughout the watershed. UNH estimates two-thirds of nitrogen comes from these non-point sources.

Mr. Lawson said Durham's wastewater plant is permitted to discharge 21,000 lb. of organic nitrogen every year. Dover, Exeter and Epping cause far more challenges for the Bay. The proposed ordinance won't make a tangible difference on the health of the Bay or Estuary since property owners on the Bay don't contribute substantively to the nitrogen and phosphorus.

He believes homeowners should be able to put in gardens; do modest landscaping and vegetation management. This proposal is denying their property rights. Structures that meet the setback should not have to go through the Conditional Use process, in his view.

Julian Smith, 3 Chesley Drive, bought his home specifically to be on College Brook, which will become a creek once the dam is removed. As a current member of the Planning Board, he will be paying very close attention. The ordinance is "one-size fits all" and an unnecessary overreach, even though well-intentioned. He asked the Chair to poll the audience for who is wary of the proposed ordinance, which showed unofficially to be a majority in attendance. He hopes the Planning Board will make some good

changes and recommendations that will provide opportunities for property owners who treasure their access and views of wetlands.

Frank Graf (sp?) said he and his wife live on the tidal portion of Crommet Creek. Their property undergoes yearly inspection to enforce the Conservation Easement put in place in 1989. They've strictly adhered to details of the easement, including no fertilizers. Mowing is done as specified. Crommet Creek area is vital for wildlife, including open fields within the basin. The ordinance, as he understands, would disallow mowing and would be in violation of their easement to take care of the fields.

Mike Lerman, 20 Cedar Point Road, said the back of their home is about 60-feet from the reference line. He continued reading from Mr. Lawson's notes. He said Mr. Lawson's third point was: allowing the Planning Board to require restoration of all or a portion of a 150-feet naturalized vegetation buffer as a condition of any approval is too broad and ill-defined. Such action, if not directly related to approval, would likely be a taking of property. Fourth, the ordinance should allow limited application of slow-release nitrogen fertilizers up to within 100-feet of the reference line. This is more stringent than State regulations and consistent with research and best practices. Mr. Lawson further stated the ordinance needs significant revision before being forwarded to the Planning Board. Any restrictions on use should be clearly defined and not subject to interpretation by future commissions or boards. He recommended review by the town attorney and noted the proposal lacks input from 170 Great Bay property owners. [Conclusion of Mr. Lawson's remarks.]

Mr. Lerman then posed several questions of his own: How many shorefront property owners did the Commission talk to for their observations? Was there input from DPW regarding stormwater drainage issues into the Bay? If any part of a property is within 150-feet, does that mean the entire property is subject to the ordinance? He suggested establishing a communication group of shoreland property owners and said regular inspection of septic pumps would be a practical start.

Ben Bulkley, 569 Bay Road, commented it appears five out of six interconnected communities around the Bay are not adopting the standards. He doesn't believe the Commission is addressing multiple point sources. This is an opportunity to enlist other communities in conservation efforts. He encouraged the Commission to look at the very real impacts to homeowners and real estate development and asked them to examine the expected results of "going it alone" vs. working as part of an interconnected community around the Bay.

Julia Rogers, 21 Deer Meadow, works professionally in resilience and sustainability, most recently as president of Green Solutions. She said the proposed 330-foot conservation overlay, while well-intentioned, goes far beyond what science supports.

Decades of research show the most meaningful ecological benefits occur within the first 50 to 160-feet of shoreline. That's where vegetation filters runoff, traps sediment and supports wildlife. Beyond that range, benefits taper off sharply.

Under this proposal, homeowners would face new barriers in enjoying and managing their properties -- some of which she enumerated. Comparable shoreline overlays across NH typically range from 75 to 150-feet. Adopting a 330-foot setback that limits use and raises real estate carrying costs, would reduce the value of regulated parcels. She asked to see a fiscal model that shows how declining waterfront property values would impact non-waterfront tax bills. She believes the town should focus on performance not distance; encourage restoration, reward low-impact design, and partner with property owners.

The ordinance should integrate with the town's Oyster River Watershed Plan, which talks about combining non-point source control measures with upgrades at the wastewater treatment plant. She proposes: Adopting a data-backed, tiered buffer system; Aligning with state and regional science; Setting the core buffer limits between 100 to 150-feet that aligns with NH-DES and Great Bay studies. If high-risk sites exist, expand restrictions in a targeted fashion; Enact a land management, resilience, and restoration exemption; Integrate septic and stormwater best management practices; Create a homeowner partnership program; Show the data demonstrating fiscal responsibility. She offered to help support the process, to share data, and practical approaches.

> *Commissioner Robert Sullivan commented there's a lot of information being shared and he encouraged individuals to email the Commission with their comments, as well. He asked residents if there's an issue with the combination [of the two overlay districts] or if their main concern is the setback distance.*

Karen Walker, 99 Durham Point Road, who owns frontage on the Oyster River with over 50 acres in current use, expressed concern about the combination of the two ordinances. She said there's no data showing how the changes would address climate change and noted that any ordinance claiming to do so should account for elevation. She described the proposal as selective, if not punitive, because it treats property owners differently based on location rather than ecological factors such as wildlife corridors.

Ms. Walker stated there is no mapping along the Oyster River showing that extended buffers would protect wildlife and asserted that the corridors do not run parallel to the river. She added that under the proposal, she could not install ground-based solar without a variance while others in town could, and that new activity limits could reduce property values, amounting to a taking.

She also argued that shoreland and wetlands cannot be combined without first defining "shoreland," which has not been done. Further, she maintained that property owners cannot be required to map wetlands on land they do not own. *[Mr. Sullivan clarified that the proposal does not require mapping but requests it.]*

Malcolm McNeill, 44 Colony Cover Road, has a J.D. and has been doing this work statewide for about 40 years. His experience shows this would be a rare acceleration of the buffer. Typically, it's done gradually. He asked if there is a substantial difference in effect between the present buffer and new one proposed. Did the Commission consider financial effects to property owners within the buffer? Have they received input from NH-DES, as required under their regulations? He thinks the 330-foot buffer is punitive and excessive. It's overreach and is taking away rights of property owners to enjoy their entire property.

Chair Trueblood replied to one of Mr. McNeill's questions, noting the Commission reached out to NH-DES and were told they don't review individual town ordinances.

Vi McNeil, 44 Colony Cover Road, thanked the Commission for their work and said it makes sense to combine the two ordinances. She taught fundamentals of real estate at UNH. One fundamental was the right to quiet enjoyment of property. She fears the 330-foot buffer is a significant overreach. A home is a costly investment, with an expectation it will appreciate in value. Taking 330-feet eliminates many of their rights and seems punitive, when compared with the rest of the state. The owners are the most vested in having clean water. There's not a huge difference in water protection between 160 to 330-feet; but there's a tremendous difference to landowners. She asked the Commission to consider not just the wildlife, but the people.

Don Golini, 557 Bay Road, asked about section 175-61. He thinks it has limitations on mowing existing lawns and ground cover. How should property owners interpret that in terms of maintaining their views?

It was clarified by the Commission that the term "lawn" refers to grass and not broadly to any ground cover that's green. Mr. Behrendt read from portions of the draft ordinance pertaining to new activities in the buffer and how existing activities will be affected.

Mr. Gilini said if a homeowner has been maintaining a meadow for years and is no longer allowed to do that – is the intention to not allow people to maintain their views? In a brief back and forth exchange with Mr. Behrendt, he said he can read the ordinance but he's

not sure how to interpret it. *Mr. Behrendt replied the meadow he referred to would be considered ground cover and "ground cover shall be left intact and not mowed." (p.6)*

Walter Cheney, 575 Bay Road, was a prior chair of Conservation Commission and former member of Planning Board. He's lived on a waterfront property with a view for 87 years. Now the Commission is proposing to grow trees and obstruct views. Instead of building on the water, homeowners have built back many, many feet. There needs to be a lot more input and negotiations. He wants to know what's at stake in the town of Durham. In Newmarket, Crommet Creek is protected 100 percent, to his knowledge. The Commission should be aware of what's buildable. Many people have restricted their land so it can never be developed. He's aware of three miles of waterfront that can never be developed in Durham.

Robert Reine, 269 Durham Point Road, said there are five homes in his development with tiny ¾ acre parcels, each with 100 feet on the water. All of their properties would be included in the 330-feet. He asked the Commission to show by a raise of hands how many live on the waterfront and are directly affected. Three members raised their hands. In his view, it seems like there wasn't much landowner input.

Barrett Miles, 9 Mathes Cove Road, said he doesn't have a waterfront parcel but has an ephemeral stream, between 20 to 60-feet from his house. Half of his lot is kept in a natural state. The way he reads the ordinance, he wouldn't be able to maintain the small section of lawn behind his house. He'd need to go before Planning, Zoning and Conservation if he wanted to build a small structure like a shed. The proposed ordinance eliminates a lot of the usage of his yard. He urged the Commission to conduct a stronger review of the setbacks.

> *Responding to Mr. Miles, Chair Trueblood said he could possibly get Permitted Use B for a shed. The review process ensures any disturbance in the buffer will be restored and construction impact will be minimal. He said Durham doesn't have a good map of all ephemeral vernal pools and streams. One reason is they're not allowed onto people's properties to map them.*

Alan (speaker full name and address unintelligible) -- shared a large picture of his neighborhood, which includes five homes on the Bay. All homes are at least 30-feet from the high tide line. There's very little drainage that comes off his property into the Bay. No fertilizer is used, but it gets mowed. A 330-foot barrier will affect a field under state conservation, co-owned by five homeowners. The field is habitat for wildlife, including bees, butterflies, and recently bears. The ordinance will affect property values if they aren't allowed to maintain their properties. He mentioned other property owners on Route 4 who wouldn't be allowed to maintain their lawns.

Cheryl Sheinlein, 8 Willow Creek Road, also owns a lot next door at 10 Willow Creek. She said setting a 330-foot setback without taking elevation into account is basic math. Most of her property will be put in the setback. They're taxed highly and the rest of Durham is dumping wastewater near the Bay. She said we all want Great Bay to be healthy but there has to be better ways than blanketing everyone with rules, saddling them with taxes, and letting the rest of the town use the Bay however they want. Runoff from Route 4 could be an issue. She doesn't think the 170 houses are causing the problems with Great Bay; she thinks this is punitive.

Tom Daly, Piscataqua Road, said he and his wife Erin have developed a number of stormwater management best practices. They removed underground tanks that could have contributed to contamination of the Bay. They've removed invasives and recently had their permeable driveway vacuumed so stormwater could permeate. He quoted from author Simon Sinoch who says, "If you want to bring community members along with you, you have to start with the 'why.'" He said he doesn't understand *why* this is being proposed. He'd like to see projected benefits (over one to ten years, e.g.) that might result from the proposed ordinance. One data point he'd like to see is a history of violations. Mr. Daly is concerned with the highly subjective language around reparative buffers. It's unclear what the performance standards and timeline would be. He questioned what the policy would be around accessory structures, which have been discussed by the town. He said they are here to do the right thing, but it's unclear what that is. He encourages the Commission to start with the "why."

Fred Bramante, 587 Bay Road, said he bought his land in 1982. Today his tax bill is approaching what he paid for the land. His home is about 200-feet from the water. He's considering building a tiny house on his property, about 40-feet closer to the Bay, and isn't sure if he'd be allowed to do that. He asked if the Commission considered how many waterfront homes in Durham would not be allowed to be where they are under the new ordinance. If others have plans for their property that would add to the tax base – it's going to push tax burden to everyone else. He thinks elevation should play a role in what they do.

David Doe (?), 61 Bay Road, said he and his wife Karen will be building a house there shortly. One thing missing in the discussion is the impact to children and dogs, particularly in regard to ticks. It's concerning to him as a grandfather. He thinks [the town] needs to consult an entomologist.

Rob Wade, 16 Mathes Cove, said he (and others) are opposed to the town coming in and spreading toxic herbicides in standing water near the road, within 10-feet of his property, where his children, dog, and deer walk. He asked why the town is allowed to do this when they all have wells. The standing water then goes down into the Oyster River,

where he grabs oysters off Durham Point. He said the ordinance allows the town to continue to do that.

In response to Mr. Wade's comments, Vice-Chair Slepian said the Land Stewardship Subcommittee will discuss the spreading of herbicides in the Mathes Cove neighborhood at its meeting on November 12th. He invited those interested to attend the 8:30 a.m. meeting.

Barrett Miles came forward and said a neighbor representative received an email that seemed to imply the Subcommittee would make a decision, whether neighbors are in attendance or not. It's difficult for working people to attend an 8:30 a.m. meeting. Mr. Slepian said their neighbor is welcome to attend, since she's a representative of the whole community. Mr. Wade asked if they would hold on making a decision to a time when they could all be present and Mr. Slepian responded he will need to consult with the Subcommittee on that.

Chris Daly, 551 Bay Road, pointed out the Nature Conservancy building on Bay Road in Newmarket mows right down to the water once a year with a brush hog. He's not sure why Durham residents can't do that. Across the bay, there's a golf course that's mowing as well. In addition, Tidewater has lawn right down to the Bay. He asked why they are looking at these restrictions while claiming Durham is following standards of other towns.

Mike Lerman, Cedar Point Road, came forward a second time. He read *Buffers on the Bay* and saw reference to another document that reviewed how buffers are established. It's not hard science, but an amalgam of data from numerous studies. None of the buffer numbers are exact science. He thinks the Commission should share that document with the town. When you try to apply principles learned in a small, controlled environment into the real world, there are a lot of variables. There are no real hard numbers that say 68-feet is bad or 98-feet is better. He urged the Commission to look more closely at the second document.

Julia Rogers, 21 Deer Meadow, spoke a second time and mentioned the subjectivity of data being used. It's in their documents they must maintain the meadow which provides infinite wildlife benefits as an important passageway. The proposed ordinance negates that and claims only forest matters. It's very valuable to be specific about site restrictions depending on where the site is and what its value is. The Commission needs to define the purpose for a particular site.

Karen Walker, speaking for a second time, asked if the town maps to be released will show lot lines so they can see how specific lots would be affected by the changes.

Mr. Behrendt replied the town's GIS specialist will put together maps (with some constraints) which should show all tidal areas with shoreline and different buffers (existing and proposed), along with lot lines. The same information will be provided for some perennial streams.

Ms. Walker suggested they provide a wildlife corridor overlay as well –in order to treat everyone equally. She asked if the Conservation Commission had considered the town's stormwater regulations and state statutes. She pointed out if you have the required 200-feet of shoreland with a 330-foot buffer, more than an acre would be restricted. She also questioned section 175.64 which says you can build a single-family house with a Conditional Use permit if it's at least 150-feet from the reference line, whereas 175.65 says if you want to put a new house on a vacant lot in existence in 1976, then you need a Special Exception. She asked why there are two different approaches.

In answer to her last question, Mr. Behrendt said 175.65 is a special provision already in the current ordinance that indicates an unusual situation where there's a lot of record but there's not enough room to locate a house outside the buffer. It's an allowance to seek a special exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Section 175.64 allows a single-family house to be built within 150-feet of the reference line, if the stipulations for a Conditional Use permit are met.

Julian Smith came forward again and said he and his wife bought five acres of pasture with a 19th century barn. When he stopped ditching the swale that went down the center of the pasture, a former neighbor was disturbed, saying beavers would move in. He noted he had already brought in beavers, who were thriving. The wetlands have expanded thanks to the beavers. One of the best ways to protect shoreline and wetlands is to have it in the hands of responsible adults.

Chair Trueblood said they'd reached the end of the time for the Public Information Session and thanked all residents for attending. [A five-minute break was taken.] The Chair then opened up the meeting to thoughts or comments from Commission members regarding next steps.

Commission Discussion on Next Steps

Mr. Moyer said he previously expressed concern that the Commission was not ready for public comment, because they had not talked as a group about feedback from the Planning Board and residents. He thought they didn't think through how to pitch [the ordinance] and make their case.

Mr. Lanzer agreed, adding they should take time to digest the comments and realize they didn't address whether residents could mow a meadow within an easement, for example. They didn't address how certain habitats can be valuable to wildlife and may have

unintentionally discouraged residents from perpetuating valuable habitat. He said the Commission's mandate is to protect the environment, not to consider the financial impacts. He advocates for reviewing public comments from the point of view of their mandate. Elevation was brought up a long time ago and should be re-considered.

Chair Trueblood commented it was challenging to take an adaptive approach to buffers when the ordinance process doesn't seem amenable to that since everyone has to be treated equally. Mr. Lanzer agreed but said it should also be grounded in science to avoid appearing arbitrary or punitive. Buffers can be very different, based on elevation alone.

Ms. Lightbody said putting together a FAQ document, as planned, would be excellent. She advocated to include the "why" in the FAQs. She thinks the public should hear more about their thinking and the justification used when drafting the ordinance. Tonight's presentation was a start but didn't reach everyone in town.

Mr. Lanzer said there was resentment expressed that the Commission didn't invite more public comment before releasing the draft. The people most affected wanted their voices heard and this may have been their first chance.

Chair Trueblood suggested they set aside a significant amount of time to discuss next steps at their November meeting. He would like to table further discussion for now.

Vice-Chair Slepian suggested they decide in advance what they want to talk about in November. He'd like to see the FAQs categorized into five or six key points. He noted strong public reactions, particularly about whether the proposed 330-foot buffer would have any real positive effect. He suggested a small working group could help focus discussion for the next meeting.

Mr. Sullivan asked if behavioral restrictions within the buffer had changed substantially or if only the size of the buffer had changed. Mr. Behrendt said there are new restrictions under Permitted Use B and Conditional Uses, which he would quantify as "moderate." He said it comes across as more restrictive.

Mr. Sullivan said people expressed they want to be able to mow their lawns, preserve their views, and build other structures. Mr. Behrendt said existing properties are partially grandfathered, but mowing isn't one of the activities allowed. The other objection raised was the review process required for new construction or modifications. Stipulations for a new house are not changing substantially.

The Chair asked about forming a small working group but received limited response, aside from Vice-Chair Slepian volunteering. Mr. Behrendt offered to draft the initial FAQs for Commission review.

Vice-Chair Slepian said a lot of people questioned the science behind the draft ordinance and he thinks they need to revisit it to be sure it's solid. The Chair said there are a lot of studies, but no definitive buffer guidelines.

After further discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Behrendt will prepare an FAQ with several dozen questions based on public comments. The Chair said the meeting minutes, which should be ready in about two weeks, may help the process.

VIII. Review of Minutes: September 29, 2025

Mr. Sullivan MOVED to approve the minutes of the September 29,2025 meeting as presented; SECONDED by Mr. Cragg, APPROVED, 6-0-1, with Chair Trueblood abstaining because he was not in attendance.

IX. Other Business

Mr. Cragg reported that *Friday Update* blurbs for November were distributed and Commissioners are invited to comment this week. He said Ms. Lightbody raised a question about whether they want to shift the topic for November to include information on the WSOD proposal. Members should let him know if there are educational pieces that should be moved up to December or ahead of when the Planning Board takes up the ordinance in March.

X. Roundtable

Mr. Moyer said Town Council discussion on the dam removal funding was very instructive. The funding passed and he found public comments to be insightful. He thinks the Commission should learn from these types of discussions.

XI. ***Chair Trueblood MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 p.m.; SECONDED by Mr. Lanzer, APPROVED unanimously.***

Respectfully submitted,
Lucie Bryar, Minutes Taker
Town of Durham Conservation Commission