

Conservation Commission Meeting
7/18/13

Commissioners in attendance: Laura Repplier, Carl Scheder, Lillabeth Weis, John Bell
Staff: Steve Pryzemeski, Susan Flint-Vincent

Meeting commenced at: 7:00pm

Discussions: Fish and Wildlife are applying for a multimillion dollar grant, as part of the grant they have to show some amount of land protection they have been involved in over the past couple of years and in the next year. They are looking for the commission to sign a document saying that we won't develop a parcel of land that we oversee for five years or some period of time. It's kind of double-dipping because we already have a conservation restrictions on all of our open space saying that we won't use a parcel of land for other than what it is currently being used for.

Carl: I'm not understanding this. This is already Town Land?

Steve: It is, but it's not protected under the umbrella of the State guidelines, it's owned and managed by the commission, but it doesn't have the extra layer of protection that the state would put on it. It's trying to help out Fish and Game and again, we do work with them once in a while and there are opportunities for some collaboration. My plan is for her (Anne) to come in and answer more detailed questions later.

Lillabeth: Do you know what they are trying to do?

Steve: It's applying for a grant to get money to go and protect more land. So Fish and Wildlife has a lot of land around, they are looking to purchase more land.

Lillabeth: And when they say protect the land, what does that mean?

Steve: Similar to what we do, they purchase the land and don't develop it.

Lillabeth: They can't develop it.

Steve: They can't, correct.

Lillabeth: Could they use it for agriculture?

Steve: Typically they don't. There's other organizations that do more farmland protection, I think they're more wildlife habitat.

Lillabeth: So is there any kind of maintenance?

Steve: On their land?

Lillabeth: If it's protected, does that mean nature is left to take its course? Or if it's open land, it's kept as open land? What does that mean?

Steve: I'm not sure of their management practices as far as their agency.

Lillabeth: So if it's protected its left alone to basically revert to woodland.

Steve: It's not developed, there may be some sort of maintenance as far as they might buy raw land and maintain paths just like we do.

Carl: They may maintain typical trails through, they don't designate them as walking trails, but they may be access roads, many of them are pre-existing.

Steve: Or they may be to access water bodies, for fishing. They do a lot of fish stocking.

Lillabeth: But if it's open land it doesn't necessarily mean it will be kept as open land.

Steve: I don't know how often they purchase open land like that, but she knows the organization much better than I do. It's on the agenda for the next meeting and I wanted to give you a "heads-up", so if you have any major outstanding questions or concerns I can try and work on them to address them before the next meeting. I have more question than I have answers.

Lillabeth: So they're looking for us to say that they can have an extra layer of protection.

Carl: Is there a specific parcel they are looking at?

Steve: Right now they are looking at Driftway Farms, because it meets their requirements.

Carl: And it abuts The Fish and Game and Cranes. We were looking to have the state buy that property, but they backed out of it.

Steve: Exactly. It meets their requirements.

Driftway is up North Street behind Erie Four, down Wells Avenue.

It already has a conservation restriction with Greenbelt and is protected. It can never be built on.

Lillabeth: Is it privately owned still? Or is it town land?

Steve: Conservation restriction owned by the town, purchased two years ago with Community Preservation Committee (CPC) money. We recently purchased a conservation restriction for Wheeler Brook Farm, they paperwork hasn't gone through yet, but we're working on it. We're looking at other town land, but so far Driftway with its 32 acres and its location abutting their property, is the only one that they have been interested in. It's a reasonable fit.

Carl: It abuts a 3500 acre state parcel.

Lillabeth: It sounds like it was originally agricultural land if it was called a farm.

Steve: The reason we came up with that title originally when we were doing our deed work, it was referenced as Driftway Farms 150 years ago, in one of the deeds. It's passed hands 15 times since then. Most of this area was farmed at one point in time, but it's a basically a wood lot right now. Greenbelt came up with the name, they thought it was a catchy name as opposed to whatever the Conservation Commission might come up with. They will be back in.

Steve: We have a few more minutes until our first hearing, the other thing that's going on is that we're working on the Open Space Plan. We've hired a consultant, we're about half-way done with it. I'd like to get it into a final draft before I present it to you, so you don't have to look over multiple drafts. I value your input, but I don't want to waste your time.

Carl: The last one was kind of hurried through late in the game. I'd like to really revisit this and make sure it has what we want in there and make sure it's focused in the direction we want it to go.

I'd like to see this one before the end.

Steve: The thing that we're worrying about this time is that it's technically the Open Space and Recreational Plan, the last one didn't even have that title, the Open Space Plan, even less to do with Recreation.

Laura: It was focused on Recreation.

Steve: Really? Really. The consultants looking at it didn't think it focused much on recreation, but that was their angle. All the documents that I saw said, "Open Space Plan".

Lillabeth: I'd be interested in seeing the draft.

Steve: Okay, I can send the draft, but realize that it is not complete, but it will give you an idea where we're heading.

Laura: What kind of changes are they making? And where did they come from?

Steve: Honestly, I don't know. Most of the changes I'm working on with them are adding parcels, creating the flow charts in the different formats, to what the Open Space state standards are, updating the maps, all of the land-use mapping, the open space mapping, GIS type data updating.

Laura: So there were something like six different objectives and goals that we had stated in there, have they been changed or updated?

Steve: We had a bunch of different surveys done, we had an open public meeting done here about a month ago, there was a whole bunch of phone call interviews with different shareholders, big players in town, GAA, Park and Recreation, the schools to understand what our active recreation situation is and what is missing, what improvements can be made, what's working well. They're using a lot of the information we've gotten from the town and townspeople to get a better feel. One example is, that apparently there's a sizable horse community in Georgetown that I wasn't aware of this and there isn't really anything available for horse riding, so they're going to add a section more related to horses in town. Driftway Farms would be a great area, but we'd have to increase the parking lot accommodate horse trailers to turn around. That's one of the newer things I've noticed on the plan.

Most of its boiler plate, history, what's actually here, it is what it is. I can cut out all the data for the mapping, and just give you the narrative and the objective and stuff like that. I'll just forward it around to everybody. If you want to read it that's fine, if you want to wait, that's fine.

Carl: If the commissioners want to comment at this point they can, if they want to wait until further on downstream, that's fine.

Steve: What's highlighted are all the questions that haven't been answered yet, so you kind of see where we're going with the document. It's interesting, I'm kind of curious to see the outcome. You think you hire a consultant for \$7000. You think you'll get something hugely different, so far it's the history, and they can play with it.

Carl: The Open Space Committee had it for a number of years, trying to get it through and they got to a point and then they kind of stalled out on it. We need to get it to that finished point so we can get it submitted to the state.

Steve: They did 90 plus % of it.

Laura: What happened was we submitted it and it came back from the state with two pages of really detailed amendments that needed to be made to it and that was the last really tough push to get it through. That took a long time.

Steve: ADA Compliance, there was actually a lot of fieldwork involved with doing the ADA compliance was a lot of ADA compliance surveys that needed to be done, and, you guys were so busy with a lot of word documents, so in the end I ended up doing all of the surveys, it was a team effort.

Carl: I'm interested in some of the overlying guiding philosophies, as far as where should we be looking for parcels?

Steve: I'm not sure how they are going to handle that, we've discussed it, we've identified all the areas.

Carl: I don't want to be completely laissez-faire in the process and just say the consultants can handle it and can tell us what to do.

Steve: They've surveyed, they've researched they are the hired guns in this situation. My plan is to let them provide us with a draft and read through it, and get some guidance. They are the experts in open space and recreation, let's get a draft from them. If it's heading the wrong direction. If it's totally different from the commission and the Open Space Committee, we can redirect. Come up with an Open Space plan. I'm giving them a little room to see what they come up with because that's what we're paying the money for.

Carl: You probably have more expertise in Georgetown. We need to make sure that it's truly individualized for Georgetown not boiler plate, that it's customized to Georgetown.

Laura: How long have they been working on it?

Steve: 3-4 months, they are a little more than half-way through we have a fairly aggressive timeline. They are working on it full-time technically. They are the hired consultants, when we did it was all when people had time, everyone was a volunteer. We're holding to a much tighter timeline this time.

Carl: Do you have a date that you've given them?

Steve: We do, I don't have it off the top of my head, but I can forward it along when I send the contract along.

Lillabeth: Is there any focus to have any open town orchards or open grazing land?

Steve: This issue has been brought up at every meeting and if it doesn't show up in the document it will definitely get brought up. We have a lot of, I think, potential areas and this conservation restriction on Wheeler Brook came up in these meetings six months ago before the actual restriction got locked in at Town Meeting, again, that will definitely get captured. That's protection of farmland, which has a lot of value. We definitely are paying attention to that aspect of planning protection.

7:23pm **6 Norino Way (GCC 2013-06; DEP# 161-0761) NOI**

Construction of a 3,900 sq. ft. storage area/ addition to an existing building and underground detention area outside the buffer zone with a discharge outlet in the buffer zone of a BVW.

Carl: There has been a request from applicant to continue this hearing.

Steve: At the last meeting they had 5-7 action items that they needed to investigate, Stormwater, grading issues that they needed to look into, snow removal, the O/M plan. They required the plan to be modified which also needs to be reviewed by the town's 3rd party engineer. They didn't get the plan fully drafted until this week so it didn't have a chance to go to the 3rd party reviewer.

Carl: So they simply are not ready.

Steve: They are not ready.

Carl: That's fine.

John B. Makes a motion to continue the **6 Norino Way (GCC 2013-06; DEP# 161-0761)** NOI hearing until August 15, 2013 at 7:30pm.

Lillabeth: Seconds the motion.

John B.: They requested this on their part.

Steve: They requested on this on their own in writing. They made a formal request to be continued until the next meeting.

The motion passes unanimously to continue until August 15, 2013 at 7:30pm.

John Bell makes a motion to pay the bills: 3 bills

Laura seconds the motion.

Discussion involving the spike in the electricity bills. Workshop in the woods is there this time of year. Steve has offered to track who's at the camp during times of energy spikes.

Carl would like to know what is going on during those energy spikes.

The motion to pay the bills passes unanimously.

CoC for 2 Farm Lane (GCC 1989-15; DEP# 161-0143): Steve worked on this for a while, not a perfect project, but I believe it's reasonable to sign off on at this point given the lack of clarity of minutes in the original approval.

Carl: Do you have any issues with it?

Steve: No, I don't have any issues with this project.

Steve explains to Lillabeth the project process and the certification of compliance.

Workshop in the Woods renew contract:

Laura: We've always talked about raising their rent.

Steve: It's gone up 8-10%, since I've been here. I'd like to get this document done early this year, to work all these things out.

Carl: I want to make sure their insurance policy is still valid because they are incorporated as a non-profit now. I just want to review everything to make sure it's legitimate with their new status.

Steve: What I discovered this is that the contract we've been signing is actually submitted by the Workshop in the Woods folks and has not be reviewed by town council before. So I thought that this year I would have K and P review it, mark it up and change it creating a new template, so all you have to do is change the dollar amount and the dates and having the signatures, so you don't have to reinvent the wheel every year.

23 Parish Road (GCC# 2013-04; DEP# 161-0758) CoC

The Order of Conditions was from a couple of months ago. Basic septic system replacement. Board of Health has signed off that the septic was built appropriately.

61 Pond Street (GCC# 2011-16; DEP#161-0731) CoC

Basic septic system replacement. Same situation.

4 Sage Road (GCC#2013-15; DEP# 161-0747) - CoC

Pool and associated grading.

Steve: I'll check on that property, I need to confirm that, I believe it's different but I won't release this until I'm sure 100% sure what's going on. In-ground pool, with shed and associated grading large mitigated planting with native plants.

Appointments:

Carl: Make sure the Camp (Denison) manager is appointed.

7:33pm 175 Central St. (GCC 2013-10; DEP#161-0763) NOI

Steve: placement of existing septic system, upgrade and renovation of existing building, request from applicant to continue the hearing.

Steve: The last meeting the commission requested 3rd party review be done. The agent has the estimate, applicant is on vacation until next week, and we will wait for the check before we start the 3rd party review.

We're also working with the Board of Health on this one. We tend not to deal with the mechanical components of the septic system, we deal with just the distance of the system related to our protection, which is a 100' set back. We rely on the Board of Health. The Board of Health is really trying to tease apart, "Is the system really going to work

appropriately?" Part of me wanting to wait for the 3rd party review would Should we wait until the Board of Health review goes through? I'd recommend waiting on a decision from the BOH for their approval. There are some questions that I believe have not been answered yet. So we're looking to continue it tonight.

Carl: It's not just a straight replacement system.

John Bell: It's a waterless, no effluent.

Steve: We don't need to get involved in how it works.

Steve: We need to better understand what it really is. The way the document was presented it was a little confusing, there are things going on this property and things going on that property, we approved the other one so that one is off the plate, but we still have to deal with the existing system as it is.

Reasonable scope of work. Investigating the storm water and Looking for continuation until 8/15

Laura: makes a motion to continue Notice of Intent (GCC 2013-10; DEP# 161-0763) 175 Central Street until August 15, 2013 at 7:45pm

John seconded the motion.

The motion to continue passes unanimously.

7:37pm 186 East Main Street (GCC 2012-01; DEP#161-0736)
New soccer field, Skate Board Park and dog park off East Main Street

Lou Mammolette engineer representing Park and Recreation

It has been a little bit of time since I've been before the board, I would like an opportunity to update the board on where this project is.

We've been making adjustments with the planning board and keeping with the scope of the project within the Conservation Commission purview hasn't changed.

Carl: At this point, it's the Park and Rec's intent to press on with this project.

Lou: Yes, as far as I know, that's the plan.

In general to refamiliarize the board, the project is off of East Main Street.

The upper right is the locus map, shows where in town the project is located, lower the right shows the work limits. The project is off of East Main Street behind the New Life Community Church, driveway is the access to the parcel. We will repave what is already paved plus about another 100', then the road will then become a gravel road for the rest of the way through the project.

Carl: Steve, this is going to be another Notice of Intent to look with the Mullen perspective.

Steve: Yes, we're in trouble in general, no discussion needed. Yes, we need to deal with this.

See Sheet C2.0, Sheet 9 This is the layout and materials plan showing the work that is going to be done, coming up the driveway from East Main Street over the peak of the hill, cutting down the grade of the drive down to make a reasonable sidewalk. There will be a lot of pedestrian movement from East Main Street into the back area in two directions, so obviously we need a sidewalk to segregate the pedestrian flow from the vehicles. We don't expect high rates of speed on the roads, I think the limit is 15 mph. The surface drive will be crushed stone so as, not to promote high rates of speed.

The idea of the project was to allow for adequate parking for multiple activities. There will be 100 parking spaces. It's easier to identify parking for longer durations, with games, that are 2 hrs. in duration and then there's another game 20 minutes later, there's a lot of coming and going. On site there's also skateboard park area, a baseball field area, a small dog park area, there's access to the trails, access to spots to go fishing and there's some talk about picnic tables down the road.

The road leading up from East Main Street is all upland area, there's no wetland impact there, and the back side of the hill goes to flat land and back to gravel. The first wetland area you have is on the right-hand side, it is denoted by an A series of flags. There is a real pinch point to get into the site, you're within the 50' buffer to get the road in to access the land, so that's a waiver in and of itself. Past that pinch point there's a gravel road, everything else to be improved is largely outside the 75' buffer with some small exceptions within the 50' area.

Sheet C2.3 shows a small wet area, propose to fill, in the middle of the parking area, at the top of sheet C2.3 shows an area available for replicating at a ratio of 2.5:1. The point is that Park and Rec is more than willing to do what you think is adequate or reasonable. Their feeling is that you are granting us the ability to do this, so in exchange for that, we want to do whatever replication you feel is important.

Carl: In the parking area are you looking at pervious or impervious surfaces?

Lou: Once you get to the back side of hill from that point on everything will be pervious, it's all gravel, including the parking area with the exception of the skateboard park. The skateboard park is shown as a big slab of concrete. We've got some ideas about doing something in the middle of the big slab of concrete, to catch and recharge storm water directly below that, despite that fact that we have a more than adequate size rain garden and swales around it to catch whatever rain water we have.

Steve: So as far as storm water, we're over-designing it.

We're over-designing it, but the cost of constructing a rain garden is relatively reasonable once you mobilize to do a certain task for a little bit more money you can size it to whatever size you want to have. This is not something that is hydrologically connected to a storm water outlet, it is all perking vertically because it's over sand and it is next to adjacent ponds, so any overflow would go to the ponds. It's more than adequately sized. In general it can't rain hard enough intensity-wise for it to overcome the soil's ability to take the water, with the exception of the concrete skateboard park, obviously because it's impervious.

John B: So there's no drains in the gravel system?

Lou: The slopes are relatively flat graded at 1%, we have an outlying area with a stone buffer and a grass-lined channel that carries water over to the rain garden area. This is

different than typical storm water management, because you're not increasing the run-off by making things impervious and you're not channelizing the flow to make it collect all to one point. It's in an area with soils that have a high rate capacity to perc the water vertically. It's a site that kind of works, the town if fortunate in that regard.

Somebody asked me a while back if there's any intention of paving this area. There's a twofold answer to that. One, there doesn't seem to be any push to put more money into it for the purposes of paving this area, without money, the answer is "No", it won't get paved. The second thing is, if it were to be paved, the applicant understands that all bets are off, because now you've changed the scope and they would have to come back and redesign the park with lots of intense storm water management associated with it. Pervious pavement or a grass paved system. Which is honestly expensive and you don't get that much more. Park and Rec wants to see how much activity there is back here, if there's more interest than the town can invest more.

The road continues around and goes around the outside of a baseball field, it goes by an isolated area subjected to flooding, and it was thought to be a vernal pool. Someone in town who is very knowledgeable about vernal pools, found that it was not indeed a vernal pool. We actually modified the layout of baseball field and the dog park to get away from another area that was not originally thought to be a vernal pool, but it is showing signs that it is.

Back outfield with a Dog park in back corner and some more handicap spaces (parking). It's a fenced off area that has a pea stone gravel surface. It's basically a penned in area for people to bring their dogs. Park and rec was really trying to hit every interest group, there was a push to have something related to a dog park. It may not be in the optimal spot, but right now it's in the optimal spot to where it fits today. If the town decided it wanted to move forward and do a wetland crossing to get to additional upland areas, there are several more there. The dog park could always be moved to where the parking lot is, and you might move some of the parking further in so you space the parking out to meet the areas where the different activities will be done.

Carl: My initial concern was how we approach this in terms of phasing. What I didn't want to see, and it depends on funding availability, that we just go in with bulldozers to clear the area, and then decide we do not have enough money be able to finish it. Is it still the intent of the Park and Rec to put the road in, the parking area and approach it in a phased approach?

Lou: I think right now, there is adequate funding for the improvements to the front end to get to the back, to do the parking area to do the skate park. There would probably be a limited amount of money left over to extend the road in, but not necessarily enough to clear the rest of the area for the ball field.

Carl: Because if there isn't money, you're going to have a big dirt area that's going to cause a lot of erosion. I don't want a clear cut site.

Steve: We can condition it, so that doesn't happen. Then commission can condition it so they have to show they have the funds and they are ready to do X, Y and Z before we allow them to start work. We don't need to resolve these issues. There's the issue that we can't really vote on it. They are going to have to withdraw and reapply, and represent the meat of the matter on this project eventually because we can't legally vote on this at this point. It's good to have an update to keep you guys in the loop and you can ask some basic questions, or voice concerns, but we don't really need to get into the details tonight because we can't

close it out tonight. We're looking to continue it, and/or at some point the applicant can withdraw without prejudice and that can be done in writing at another time.

Carl: You can still do the engineering, site planning, etc. and when you're ready to do the work, you can reapply.

Lou: Park and Rec would like to wrap it up. What would you like to see for the replications area? You understand the scope of the project and the impact of the area.

Carl: I'd like to open it up to the newer commissioners to be able to see the site.

Lou: Absolutely! We should wait until the heat breaks because it is pretty brutal out there.

Steve: They can ask to reapply via e-mail, and get on the agenda for August.

John B.: motion to continue 186 East Main Street (GCC 2012-01; DEP#161-0736) to 8/15 at 7:50pm.

Lillabeth: seconds

Motion unanimously carries to continue.

Laura: Steve, because they are so close to the resources, is there a time of year that would be better to do that work?

Steve: The Commission can condition it any way you want, to wait until after vernal pools dry up etc.

8:06pm Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-11; DEP#161-0666) NOI

Complete site remediation under Chapter 21E followed by construction of a 16-unit senior housing representative with associated grading, roadway, septic system, utilities and storm water management structures with portions of the project being within 100' of Bordering Vegetative Wetlands.

Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-12; DEP#161-0661) NOI

Revision on plan to construct a 16-unit senior housing development, with associated grading, roadway, septic system, utilities and storm water management structures, portions of which are proposed within the Buffer Zone to BVW.

Jean Paquin, representative

Carl: We would like an update as to where you folks are, this has been the longest running hearing in Georgetown history, and it's been open since 2000. We'd like to get an understanding of what your intentions are. Most of the clean-up has already been done, but from our perspective there's some things we need to verify to close out the project. I'm not sure if you are able to address that?

Jean: Ritchie got called away, so he sent me. We are planning on continuing.

Carl: Our 3rd party review we would like them to pull together all of the documents and make sure everything is ready to close out. However our funding for 3rd party review has been tapped out, so we're requesting some additional level of funding to assist in the review to close out.

We haven't had any funding for our guy to review for the past 5 years. Our Licensed Site Professional (LSP) cannot talk to your LSP.

Steve: We would like to close this out just as much as you would.

Carl: You don't have to give me an answer this evening, but we would like the process to move forward.

Jean: You can copy me on e-mails at: pagexcavat@aol.com. If you can send me a copy of this, I can talk to Richie about this and let you know.

Carl: That's fine, we just want the communication open, that's been a problem over the years. We need to keep the dialog going as to what your intentions are so we can proceed with this. This has been operating under an enforcement rule for 13 years, because it started off on the wrong foot from the get-go. You would have to withdraw and refile, just so we could legally vote on it, just like the previous case. The state has new requirements that commissioners miss no more than one hearing for them to vote on an issue.

Steve: The Mullen Rule will also apply in this case. We will eventually have to have you withdraw without prejudice and refile when you're ready to move forward. I'll e-mail you with the comments on that and the requirements for the LSP on Monday. I'll cc everyone else on the list. At this point we're looking for a continuation. When would you like to continue this to? September 26 or October 17th? Take your pick.

Jean: I'll take the September 26 hearing date.

John Bell: Motions to continue the **Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-11; DEP#161-0666) NOI and Tidd's Junkyard (GCC 2007-12; DEP#161-0661) NOI** to 9/26 at 8:00 and 8:05pm.

Lillabeth seconded.

Motion unanimously passes for the Tidd's hearings to be continued to September 26, 2013 at 8:00 and 8:05pm.

8:15 pm 24 Pillsbury Lane (GCC# 2013-13) New NOI

Above ground pool and deck construction

Janice Derby (homeowner)

Carl: What are you proposing?

Janice: We would like to build 22' x10' deck and put an 18' diameter above ground pool here. The issue with Conservation Commission is the intermittent stream, associated with this wetland. A portion of the deck is 90' from the wetland. We measured it from the plan.

Steve: It's an older wetland delineation that has expired. It was valid years ago. Close enough for discussion. The wetland delineation map was done on 12/23/2002. It meets the regulations. I have been out to the site. The bank is fairly steep, it is what it is, as far as resources, there's not too much room to move it around. We worked together to get it as far away as possible, but there's not enough room to get it out of our jurisdiction.

Carl: The house is closer than that anyway. If you're going to put a deck on the house this is as far away from the resource area as possible. I'm assuming you're putting footings for the deck? Is it a standard above ground pool? Is there sand at bottom?

Janice: Yes, yup, yes.

Carl: Abutters comments?

Steve: Is making a copy of Janice's plan on Monday.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to approve the NOI for 24 Pillsbury Lane (GCC# 2013-13) not accepting the wetland line dated 12/23/02 with hand modifications for the placement of above ground pool and deck construction.

Carl: I have a comment, do we have a DEP#?

Steve: No, I checked with the DEP and given the distance and the square footage, it was exempt from needing a DEP#.

Laura: Seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

John makes a motion to close the NOI for 24 Pillsbury Lane (GCC# 2013-13)

Laura: Seconds the motion.

Motion for passes unanimously for the NOI to be closed for 24 Pillsbury lane.

8:20 Rear Lisa Lane, 18 Lisa Lane and 44 Searle Street. (GCC# 2013-14; DEP# 161-0765) ANRAD Wetland Delineation

Chris Sparages, principle at Williams and Sparages,
Mary Rimmer, Wetland scientist
Ralph Neola, Artisan Associates

Chris: The subject property is outlined in brown, has 3 different owners, the ANRAD has authorization from each of the owners. It comprises ~ 45 acres, shown on 3 separate parcels on the Assessor's Map #16, parcels 2, 17 & 80.

Wetland resources flagged in April of this year and December of last year. There are a couple sections of inland bank along intermittent streams, Bordering Vegetative Wetland, one isolated wetland in the middle of site that has vernal pool characteristics, and have some bordering land that's subject to flooding that has an elevation of 87'. Showed BVW limits and wetlands as well as 100' buffer zones.

Everyone was able to be notified by the green cards.

Mary Rimmer: Property is a large hill that slopes down, the perimeter is surrounded by wooded swamps system. Most likely there are two wetlands that connect off-site. There is a power easement that traverses the site.

We didn't delineate the outside of the resources, we showed the resource exists and an approximate boundary, but not exact. Offsite BVW on left that we're showing and isolated wetland, which turns out to be a vernal pool. We're just requesting confirmation of the resources shown on the plan. Are there any questions about the delineation? We've been out there several times to refresh the flags and we did the vernal pool inspection this spring.

Carl: I would suggest doing a 3rd party review given its size. I'd also suggest a site walk. At this point you don't know how far the resources extend beyond the property line.

Chris: We have looked at all the wetland resources that would impact the site within 200' of the property. They've been walked and flagged by Mary. Once we get to the back, the grade drops off pretty quickly, there was no need to flag the wetland line.

Steve: We'll reference the wetland line, not the property line.

Carl: Is this a national heritage area?

Chris: We've checked it. This is not listed as an area of endangered species or a priority habitat.

Laura: What is the grade of the hill going down towards the wetland?

Chris: 146' goes down to 87' at the flood plain; there is an isolated depression as well.

John B: I definitely believe a site walk is in order.

Carl: Make a motion.

John B: I'd like to make a motion to make a 3rd party review from BSC.

Laura: seconds.

Chris: I have a question.

Carl: I would suggest Gillian Davies do the work. Time line?

Steve: I can do my commission's end of it by Monday morning. This is not good vernal pool season, the 3rd party reviewer will do to the best of their ability. Some abutters have provided information leading us to believe there may be some vernal pools on site. I think it would be reasonable to get the 3rd party reviewer out there to start to see the lines, and access the property, but if we cannot agree, we can continue to the spring given that it's the driest time of the year and is not the best time to be reviewing vernal pools. We do have some evidence from a citizen of pictures of egg masses off-property and some audio of vernal pool species croaking away. That is something we really need to pay attention to.

Unanimously carries for 3rd party review.

Carl: I would recommend posting the 3rd party review if we do a site walk.

John B. makes a motion to have a site walk date TBD after the 3rd party review, close to the public, open to the commissioners, scientists, consultants.

Laura: Seconds the motion.

Chris: The owners thru their attorney respectfully request that they would not like to have any abutters go on the site walk for the ANRAD process. But there will be an opportunity during the Notice of Intent where they would be happy to have folks come on the property.

Carl: Ok. I would like to ask through your office for an authorizations that commissioners can go on the site. We've had some legal issues before with that.

Chris: Absolutely, absolutely.

John B. Amend the motion to say that the site walk is closed to the public only commissioners, scientists, owners of the property and representatives to be allowed on the site walk.

Laura: Seconded the motion

Carl: Motion passes unanimously

Kevin Dunkin: 46 Searle Street, largest abutter. I'm pretty sure there is a second vernal pool to the left right on the border. The abutters know the area better than anyone else in the room.

Carl: That's why we do this process, to hire another specialist, our own consultant to verify what their consultant has said. That's the process.

Steve: You can meet with me early in the week and you can point out to me the specific spot on the map you're concerned with, and I'll make sure every single spot your concerned about gets looked at.

Carl: The applicant has the right to allow or prohibit the public on their property.

Kevin: points out G series flags where the vernal pool is.

Walter Wilkins: 2 Wilkins Place, at the preliminary plan with the Planning Board, the engineer stated that they would be mining materials off the property for the roadway. How close would that be to the wetlands? Will it affect it?

Chris: It is no secret that we have submitted and appeared before the Planning Board applied for an OSRD special permit process for a preliminary plan. Our plan would be to use the material on site for the roadway, but the scope of work is not defined yet.

Carl: That's a whole other hearing process. I don't want to get too wrapped up in that. Here we're just looking at the wetlands and resources. We're trying to minimize the impact. That's what we're here for.

Chris LaPlaca 9 Rosemary Lane,
I'm in the neighborhood across the way. What I'm concerned about the wetlands affected not on this map once that are going to be getting additional water once this building happens. We've had some beavers move in, the terrain that used to be a forest is now a pond with a lot of dead trees. My property is about ready to go under water, so if I get any more water...

Carl: That's why our regulations require developers to look 200' off site at what those resources are just so we get an idea and you can look at the impact. When someone develops, their activity shouldn't affect other folks. We're not discussing storm water management tonight, just existing wetlands. We will end up discussing all of those things but it's kind of premature, but it is a valid concern.

George Comisky Old Jacobs Road. When are you looking to delineate the wetland line?

Steve: Probably the next month.

George: The driest month?

Steve: If there's areas in question, they will be flagged and we can discuss it. If there are areas we can't agree on we can wait until the spring. There's other ways of determining wetland areas other than visible water, soil hydrology, plant material.

Carl: There's a number of indicators, they shouldn't just use one.

Mary: We can do the delineation any time of year based on the criteria that the state has established, which is: 50% or more of wetland plants species present persistent throughout the growing season
Soil indicators within the first 2', color and texture indicative of wetland soils
We should be able to do it anytime.

Carl: However, in the wintertime we do not accept wetland delineations, we have issues with the identifying the wetland lines at that time of year.

Lynn Grosslein: What is the difference between an intermittent stream and a permanent stream?

Mary: A perennial stream is first, one that's noted on a USGS topographic maps; there are perennial streams that are not noted on the USGS topographic maps that would qualify if there is a large enough watershed.

Lynn: Doesn't have to do with the width of the stream, it's just the watershed.

Mary: Yes.

Gary Stead, 48 Searle St, would the peer review have access to their field notes as far as the plant species and the hydric soil information?

Carl: They are going to look at all that information and their own.

Gary: Ok. This falls within the well resource district, does that make it a resource line?

Steve: I don't believe it is.

Gary: One of the original maps we saw with the Planning Board showed that there's a large part in the water resource district.

Carl: We will try and verify that. The 3rd party review will look at everything and give us a report. Many times lines do change based on the 3rd party review.

Steve: I think it's in the water resource district, I don't know if that's what you're thinking of.

Laura: Mary, when you were saying you had evidence of obligate species in that vernal pool. I'm assuming you were you hearing Wood frogs. Did you not hear or see anything in any of the other wetlands?

Mary: I heard fairy shrimp. I didn't personally conduct the vernal pool inspection, but I'll check with the partner I was working with me at the time. We were obviously cautious to only go on the property we had access to. It's possible, so I will check on that. I would like to review any information that's been presented. We would like to nail it down.

Laura: It's the way the plan is presented because you haven't connected the water areas, they look very isolated, and so there would be the potential for more vernal pool areas than you actually identified there. If it's connected to a larger water source, it may disqualify it for a vernal pool status. That's why I'm asking.

Mary: There's a stream system running through there.

Laura: That's not in evidence that I can see from here.

Chris: It's a tough scale because its 45 acres at 100 scale, that's why we multiple shots that blow a lot of it up.

Carl: How big is the vernal pool in terms of sq. ft.? Do you have any idea?

Chris: It's about 4500 sq. ft., 30 x 35'

Lynn: I have been out on that property for 20 years, and we know it very, very, very well. It's as long as this room, and slightly narrower.

Carl: I haven't been to the site is it heavily wooded? Visible standing water in the wetlands?

Mary: Yes, it's heavily wooded and yes there is standing water in the wetlands. It is pretty obvious when you're transitioning from the wetlands to the uplands, there's a very distinct break in the slope and change in the vegetation.

Carl: Any further questions from commissioners.

Chris Comisky Old Jacob's Road: I'd like to make confirm you have received the letter and would you read it for the record?

Steve: Yes, we received it and it was e-mailed to all the commissioners today.

Carl: For the record, the commission did receive a letter from Chris Comisky, dated July 16, 2013.

Dear Chairman Shreder and members of the Commission:

This letter is regarding an ANRAD application and potential Notice of Intent filing off Lisa Lane and Searle Street in Georgetown. My husband and I were contacted by resident abutters of the project to evaluate the ecological significance of the wetland within their property bounds, and to determine whether the wetland at the rear of their property could be considered a vernal pool.

I received training in Vernal Pool Certification from the Mass Audubon Sanctuary in Topsfield in 1999. My experience as a citizen naturalist includes certifying a number of vernal pools and documenting rare species throughout Georgetown to the State Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP). My husband, George is the President of the Parker River Clean Water Association and is involved in documenting the rare species of turtles in the area.

On separate occasions we were invited by Mrs. Donna Duncan of 46 Searle St and abutting neighbors to view the isolated wetland (see attached proximity map) on their property. Our first visit occurred on March 30th. We were drawn instantly to the sound of chorusing wood frogs coming from the wetland in question. Wood Frogs are considered obligate to vernal pools, meaning species that live or breed only in vernal pools. We recorded the sound of the chorus and have enclosed a copy to view and listen to at your discretion.

Our next visit occurred on Saturday May 4th when we were joined by Mrs. Duncan and several neighbors. At the wetland we observed over 40 frog and mole salamander egg masses (new NHESP regulations require the presence of at least 5 egg masses for certification purposes). Mole salamanders, including spotted and blue spotted salamanders, are also obligate species. We have enclosed pictures of the varying egg masses. We also observed numerous facultative species, including bull frogs, green frogs and caddisfly larvae. We did not observe any turtles or rare species during our visit.

Based on our observations and evidence gathered, we consider this to be an active and important vernal pool deserving of protection under the local Georgetown Wetlands Bylaw. We recommend that the Commission do everything in its power to limit intrusion into the surrounding area of this wetland and mitigate so as to not fragment migration/dwelling habitat.

Sincerely,

Christine Comisky.
45 Old Jacobs Road
Georgetown, MA
978-352-7364

Chris: I'm talking about the vernal pool along Searle St.

Steve: The G series and the C series. Would you mind pointing it out on the plan?

Chris: Very active vernal pool going into the property from off property (46 Searle St) into the area where they are thinking about putting a roadway.

Susan Stead 48 Searle St., Why wouldn't that vernal pool be tagged, because it would be within 100' of the proposed roadway?

Steve: They are wetland scientists, it's a judgment call based on their professional experience when they were out there.

Carl: That would be part of the peer review process. We look at all the information, what they provide, 3rd party review and the public it's all part of the process.

Chris S.: Would it be okay to do a site walk after the peer review before the next meeting?
Would it be okay to schedule on Sat August 10th?

Laura: Make a motion to hold a site walk for Rear Lisa Lane (GCC 2013-14; DEP#161-0765)
on Sunday, August 11th at 9:00am.

John seconds.

Motion carries unanimously.

John makes a motion to continue hearing to August 15, 2013 at 7:15pm.

Laura seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Carl: Let's take a 5 minute recess.

Meeting reconvenes at 9:22

64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP#161-0766) NOI

Parking lot improvements, Stormwater management improvements, septic system
improvements and Riverfront Area restoration activities

Chris Spragues, principle at Williams and Spragues
Representative of Georgetown Plaza, Mr. Constantine Scrivanos
Ms. Rosanna Frances (Real Estate Agent)
Mary Rimmer (Wetland Scientist)

Carl: Requests the green cards. Chris Sparages turns them in.

Chris: Complicated project. Existing site, been in town for many years. Map 11A Lot 85,
Property borders East Main St., eastern property boundary is Penn Brook 116,000 sq. ft.
~2.6 acres

Wetland resources: Penn Brook perennial Stream, BVW; much of the site is within the 200'
zone of the riverfront area. Much of the riverfront area is previously developed or disturbed
in some shape or form. The total riverfront area is just over 86,000 sq. ft. About 54,200 sq.
ft. has improvements or disturbances of one type or another.

There's a flood plain associated with the Penn Brook with an elevation of 80 that coincides
with the town's flood plain district, also coincident with the Flood Insurance Rate Map. There
is no proposed activity down in that area. Extending beyond the bank of the perennial
stream is a BVW, and then there's a small area that collects water. It's a former storm water
management area that collected some water back in November of 2012. We've located the
limits of that water, there's a little spill way and some treatment swales that run in a couple of
different directions away from there. The vegetation and the soils are consistent that the
wetland line goes around that now.

The property has a good-sized building with several tenants, the main parking field is out
front of the building, and it has about 62 parking spaces or so. The paved part of the parking
area extends down this paved driveway until you get to about 1:00 behind the building where
it changes to gravel, then it is gravel all around the back and the left-hand side of the building

until you get back out front again into the main parking area where it is paved. Over to the north is the existing leaching area for the septic system. You can see that a portion of it is within the 100' buffer zone. Back in the '90s when this septic field was done, it was outside the 100' buffer zone, but today this is the 100' buffer zone and now a portion of it is within the zone.

Carl: So the wetlands have changed and grown since this was done.

Lillabeth: Or maybe they weren't accurately depicted.

Chris: It's hard to tell which one. When we got the results back I did question Mary about it, and we went out and took a look at it. But it has definitely gotten larger.

Carl: We've seen quite a bit of that.

Chris: Mr. Scrivanos has proposed 4 improvements: 1) Parking lot improvements; 2) Storm water management improvements; 3) Septic improvements and 4) Riverfront restoration improvements

1) Parking lot improvements: remove 2000 sq. ft. of pavement behind the building and put in pervious pavement, until you get outside of the 100' of the BVW and outside the 200' stream buffer.

Carl: How close are you putting the pervious pavement to the resources?

Chris: We're using the existing gravel drive as the limit of the pavement. So we don't extend anymore in that direction. We're also maintaining a one way width, so we've narrowed the area that people can drive over using this pervious pavement. Mr. Scrivanos wants to put employee parking behind the building. In addition Mr. Scrivanos proposes to increase parking from 62 spaces to 98 parking spaces using the septic field for parking a portion of which falls within the buffer zone. Access to the parking on the septic field will be 2-way driveway parking field for employees, to open up the front spaces for customers to eliminate some of the congestion during peak customer hours. There will be a set of stairs to access the parking area. Gravel is a constant maintenance issue, with potholes and ruts. Some of the gravel over the years has washed out towards the wetlands over the years. Pervious pavement hoping to achieve several goals. One of which is to stabilize the area.

2) Pervious pavement - good storm water management, allow for storage of rain water, provides for infiltration through pavement and provides treatment. According to our storm water calculations, show that the area has the ability to handle more than enough water on site. Bio-filter area swale behind the pervious pavement. During larger storm water events, the pervious pavement will overflow into the swale that will be vegetative with a wetland seed mix and high bush blueberry and summer sweet shrubs, so it's an additional level of treatment and retention by the swale-like feature. Relatively flat, but slight grade to the current swale now and water treatment now. The new modifications brings us above 80% treatment of TSS, more than the requisite amount of infiltration, without using formal structures. The ground water is high on the site, 36"-40" beneath the surface of the soil, so there isn't enough room given the height of the water table and the elevation of the building to put catch basins or storage containers.

1. Mr. Scrivanos would like to construct a 6' H stockade fence to limit access and litter to the wetland area. We've noticed dumping that is along the wetland area. Like to have the agent look at the dumping site and talk about what should be removed and

propose a seeding plan whether it's a wetland seed mix or a shrub planting depending on how disturbed the area is, what the best way to restore it is. We hope to limit the access and litter to the wetland area.

Lillabeth: what kind of dumping is it?

Steve: Lawn clippings, and concrete, trash and older stuff too.

Lillabeth: How will they do any maintenance of swale with the fence up?

Chris: There will be a gate for access in the fence.

Proposing to move the leaching area closer to the front of the property, out of the buffer zone. Increasing the leaching area from 1500 gal/day to 2700 gal/day system, allowing Mr. Scrivanos to support a wider variety of tenants. Because we will be exceeding the 2000gal/day limit we are required to have a pressure dosing system, which is more efficient and will extend the life of the septic system.

Carl: This is just for parking for employees, not a throughway or anything of that nature.

Chris: Yes, it's just a dead-end parking on the leaching field and a couple of parking spaces in the back to take advantage of the access points already in the back of the building.

We will be appearing before the zoning board.

Steve: What is the snow management plan? Roof drains are not being directed anywhere but onto the pavement or into erosion areas. It would be nice to improve the Stormwater management. Just a note, the green is disturbed area, but it looks like mowed lawn, visually it's different on property, it's pretty much compacted soil.

Chris: Snow storage is not located on this plan. I'll take some notes on these. There are gravel pads at the bottom of the roof drains, but some just go to the pavement. We've dug test holes they came back pure sand on the textural triangle.

Steve: This is an easy site walk. We can do a week from today.

John: Make a motion for a site walk next Thursday, a week from today, July 25th at 6:30pm

Lillabeth seconds.

Unanimously carried.

Carl: Any abutter questions?

Cynthia Holzapfel, 60 East Main Street: The parking is going onto of the leaching field?

Chris: That's correct.

Cynthia: How high is the leaching field going to be?

Chris: It will be 6' high, about a foot higher than it is now. There will be a brand new concrete retaining wall that is a foot higher than it is now. The parking will have a slight pitch towards the back of the property.

Carl: Has this been before the ZBA and the planning board?

Chris: We'll be appearing September 3rd in front of the ZBA.

Rick Holzapfel: Cindy's husband. I also pump the septic tanks. The kids cut through the back and through trash on our property, now you're going to have it higher and park cars on it, facing our property. We have fence now that has fallen down and they have not fixed it. I don't understand why they don't move the leaching field to the front of the property.

Chris: We're limited where we can put the septic because we have to put it 5' above the seasonal high ground water because the ground water perc so well. We would have to cut off access to the site. We can't slope it gradually enough to have parking spaces and not impact the corner of the building with grading.

Carl: The existing system is not in failure, correct?

Chris: No, it's my understanding that it's operating properly. We have not done a Title V. Mr. Scrivanos would like to entertain new tenants, we will need to increase the flow, this would be part of the improvements.

Rick: Are you planning on keeping the septic tanks in the same place?

Chris: We are in the process of evaluating the tanks, we know that there are some that will need to be replaced.

Rick: So you're going to keep them in the back of the building. When they did the parking lot over the last time, I suggested that they put the tanks in the parking lot, because that back road floods. The septic tanks are underwater sometimes. When the pump fails, I don't get called for 3 days, and the water flows into the brook. I don't think it's smart to not move the tanks. We've had beavers, floods and now we're going to have more water.

Lillabeth: Have you looked at a zero discharge system?

Chris: For waste water? No we have not.

Lillabeth: I think New England Biotech has a Zero Discharge system. There's a few around. I know David Delporta does work with those.

Steve: Why don't you give us some options of moving the tanks?

Carl: You're going to have pavement over them anyway, so why not move them forward?

Chris: Some will be in the grass areas and some will be under pavement. All tanks need to be water proof according to Title V, that's a requirement.

Carl: Occasionally we see them fail. They don't always do what they're supposed to.

Rick: I hit water at 2' in my yard, next door.

Chris: I think it's even closer to the surface in the back of the building.

Rick: Our big problem is having headlights shining over the fence into our yard. But putting a parking lot on top of a leaching field that high up, I just can't...

Chris: One of the things that I think will have to be done, is to put in a fence because it's over 4' according to the building code. I know screening is something that we'll be doing along that property line.

Steve: Regarding Storm water, have you looked at any improvements to the whole site? Roof drains, total pervious pavement, rain gardens? There's a lot of taking in the back, not much mitigation, what's the incentive from an environmental stand point? Where are the improvements back to the environment?

Chris: The improvements include the pervious pavement: storage and treatment of water. - very expensive to install. We've eliminated 2000 sq ft of pavement. The bio-filter is also an improvement, we're able to meet the DEP storm water standards.

Carl: Is this going to resolve the flooding issue?

Chris: We cannot control the flooding of Penn Brook.

Carl: You can, you can do what FEMA suggests and don't build in flood plains, and it costs the government billions of dollars per year.

Chris: I agree with you Mr. Chairman. We know the flood insurance maps tell us the 100 year flood plains. We're not proposing any activity below that elevation. It corresponds with the town's flood maps. We are staying out of resource area with these improvements.

We're not prompting any disturbances below 80'

Steve: I don't think the back catch basin is a functioning system, especially if it hasn't been maintained for the past 20 yrs. You show it as a functioning system, but it doesn't look that different 20' to the left or 20' to the right.

Chris: After Mary hung her flags for the wetlands. We had our field crew come out and do a detailed micro topography of the area. It does do what it's the plan shows. It has a plunge pool, a spillway into a swale that branches out into two dead ends. The swales would fill up before flooding. We thought it made the most sense to design using this system.

Steve: That's not really a formally designed feature, it's a sump with an outflow. It might be fine, but we don't know how much storm water will be able to handle.

Mary: It's not being used in the storm water calculations, it's just an additional feature, just catches sheet flow from site. It was originally constructed in an upland, but it's not that way now.

Chris: The sump and swales are below the wetland line, so our point of comparison is before that. We're not taking credit for designing the area.

Steve: I just wanted to clarify it was already existing and not a newly designed feature.

Sharon Freeman 58 Main Street: Are we allowed to know whose card was returned? I'm concerned about my elderly neighbor on the other side. I want to make sure my neighbor knows about this.

I share a concern with my neighbor about parking on a leaching field that is significantly higher than our properties. Where to we raise those concerns? When should we bring this into the conversation?

Carl: We have to approve a plan like this and so does the Board of Health if they are putting in a new septic system.

Chris: The ZBA and the planning boards. We have to prove that what we are proposing is not any more detrimental to the neighborhood than what is already there. The leaching field will have a little parapet that will serve two functions: 1) so that the cars will stay on the parking lot and not visit the neighbors; 2) to direct the water flow back towards the wetlands.

Sharon: I'm concerned about pedestrian safety! This sounds really, really scary.

Carl: At some point it has to go through public safety review.

Steve: The Planning Board Engineer will do an evaluation for traffic and safety concerns.

Sharon: I understand about the sandy soil, but I think you might want to rethink this.

Rick: Right now the snow gets dumped in my corner, and blocks the side walk. They take away a lot of parking spaces piling snow in the front of the building.

Laura: Where does the water go in the front of the building?

Chris: It goes to a catch basin in the middle of the parking lot. We've been watching it for the past couple of months and while sometimes there's a puddle around it, the catch basin takes it all, it's amazing. That's strictly a function of the soil on the site.

Steve: Do you want to have a 3rd party review?

John B: Is this ready to go forward? It still needs to go before planning.

Chris: We talked to other boards to see who we should go before first. Conservation seemed to make the most sense because of all the wetland issues.

Carl: Can we move the pervious pavement closer to the building? We can gain 5' away from the river. This would create more of a buffer on the other side.

Steve: Maybe all the water to go to a rain garden, so we have a back-up in case it failed. If we can beef it up a little bit. We can have a stronger language that enforces the O/M plan that will fine the owner if they don't get swept.

Laura: 10 years, the pervious pavement works, the last 10 years it won't work, then what?

Steve: Long, long term it will fail eventually. I like the idea of beefing up the other side to be able to handle additional water.

Chris: Take the bio-filter to an elevation 80 for the flood plain, close to the elevation of the wetland line. We know the high ground water is very close to the elevation of the wetland flags.

Laura: I wonder how the choices you make for the wetland plants will determine how effective the bio-filter is.

Chris: It absolutely will. The way we've designed it now is only 2 species and a wetland seed mix. We didn't involve Mary in the plant choices, but we can definitely bounce it off her.

Mary: The herbaceous layer is only growing in the growing season, you want to select other species that have some physical structure during other times of the year, so it can slow down the flow. A lot of time dense grasses can do this with their physical structure even not during the growing season.

Lillabeth: The clethera will take over and the blueberries, might take over because they are so stoloniferous.

Laura: And the grasses and the sedges too.

Mary: That's what the wetland seed mix is mostly comprised of: rushes and sedges and some grasses.

Carl: Any more questions or comments?

Steve: We need to make a motion for a 3rd party review. I might need a week and a half.

John B. I'd like to make a motion to conduct a 3rd party review at 64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP# 161-0766).

Lillabeth seconds the motion.

The motion for a third party review unanimously passes.

Mary: You may not need a 3rd party review for the wetland boundary, it's pretty straight forward and not very long.

Steve: You can save on the paperwork.

Carl: It's an engineering and storm water review.

Laura: Can Steve do the wetland line?

Steve: I don't do the borings every two feet.

Chris: The BVW is at the top of the wetland bank.

Mary: I'd be happy to walk it with you.

Steve: I can take a look at it.

Carl: I'm not as concerned with the bank and the riverfront definition, I'm more concerned with the Stormwater, the flooding the run-off. I want to make sure that we don't have plan that's detrimental to the site. We want something better, not worse.

John B: Makes a motion to continue 64-74 East Main Street (GCC 2013-15; DEP# 161-0766) to August 15, 2013 at 8:10pm

Laura: seconds.

Passes unanimously.

Steve: Please sign OoC you approved tonight.

John B. makes a motion to close the meeting.

Laura seconds it.

Passes unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:32pm.