

**HARVARD CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
MARCH 17, 2011
APPROVED: October 20, 2011**

Vice Chair Wendy Sisson called the meeting to order at 7:04pm in the Town Hall Meeting Room

Members Present: Wendy Sisson, Charlie Gorss, Don Ritchie, Jim Breslauer, and Janet (Jaye) Waldron

Others Present: Liz Allard (LUB Admin), Al Combs (Ag. Advisory Comm.), Neil Gorman (Ross Assoc.), Judy Gustafson, Wendy Gendron (Aquatic Restoration Consulting), Warren Henderson, Lynn Adler, Sally Corrona, Jeff Richards (Transformations), Dan Bourdeau (Geosyntec), Steve Ventresca (Nitsch), Bruce Leicher (BHPWMC) and Bill Johnson (Board of Selectmen)

Review & Discuss Annual Notification of Horse Riding on Harvard Trails

Al Combs, from the Agricultural Advisory Committee, was present to discuss the annual notification of horse riding on Harvard trails. The Commission requested that the notice be placed on the front page of the Town web site. Mr. Combs will check with Candy Fraser and Pam Browning as to the status of the posting at the local barns. Liz Allard will submit the approved policy to the local newspapers as part of the annual notification.

Use of Trails on Conservation Land

Wendy Sisson explained to the members that a resident of the Town is not happy with the use of snowmobiles on Conservation Land and recently took it upon him self to close two of the trails. Liz Allard, along with Tony Shaw of the Harvard Snowmobile Club, reviewed both locations and found that the damage caused to the trails by snowmobiles to be minimal. The resident was contacted and the issues raised by his actions were discussed. A portion of the trail had been re-routed within the Pin Hill area due to flooding, that caused several saplings to be damaged. Wendy Sisson believes the Commission needs a process for ending the snowmobile season. Ms. Allard stated that Mr. Shaw immediately put notice out to the Club that the season was over and that most trails were no longer passable for snowmobiles. Directional and stop signs were still in place because there are others besides the Club members that could be using the trails, so for safety sake the signs remain in place for the time being. Charlie Gorss noted that the Club has a rule that members are not to use the trails with less than 4" of snow cover. Members requested that Mr. Shaw attend a meeting in the near future to discuss an end of season procedure.

Request for a Certificate of Compliance – Fermino, White Lane, DEP#177-267

Liz Allard explained to the members that a Request for a Certificate of Compliance has been submitted for the development of White Land. The Order consisted of drainage and a fire pond that is now on Conservation Land. All work has been completed. Jim

Breslauer made a motion to issue the Certificate of Compliance for DEP#177-267. Charlie Gorss seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Review and Discuss Tree Cutting Policy

Members agreed that the final version of the Tree Cutting Policy is suitable for distribution and should be added to the Commission's page on the Town web site.

Review & Discuss Planning Board Zoning Amendment – Floodplain Bylaw

Liz Allard explained to the members that when Town Counsel reviewed the Floodplain District Bylaw he removed a section entitled "Notification of Watercourse Alteration". Town Counsel's reasoning for this was that the Bylaw can not require only one applicant make notification. Ms. Allard believes that Town Counsel is misinterpreting the intention of the section. The section reads "In a Riverine situation, Director of Public Works shall notify the following....." The intent of the section is to have an official within Town government be the responsible party for notifying certain individuals in event of alteration or relocation of a watercourse rather than being the only entity required to give notice. Jim Breslauer reviewed the language and agreed with Ms. Allard. The members also agreed that it would make sense to have the Commission be the party responsible for notification. Ms. Allard will discuss this further with the Planning Board and the Town Administrator to determine how about getting the section back into the Bylaw for Town meeting.

Continuation of Request for Determination of Applicability Hearing – Bare Hill Rowing Association, Bare Hill Pond, Harvard#0111-02. Opened at 6:27pm

Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing – Richard & Jean McCrosky, 193 Old Littleton, DEP#177-590, Harvard#0111-01. Opened at 7:32

Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing – Transformations, Inc., Stow Road (Map 36 Parcel 85 & 86.1), DEP#177-586, Harvard#1010-01. Opened at 7:46pm

Discuss with Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee Data Review

Wendy Gendron, of Aquatic Restoration Consulting, along with Bruce Leicher from the Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee were present to discuss the monitoring data from Bare Hill Pond that has been submitted over the years as a requirement of the Order of Conditions for the yearly draw down. Ms. Gendron had previously worked for ENSR in 2002 when the Wildlife, Habitat and Vegetative Assessment of Bare Hill Pond was completed by that company. Additionally, Ms. Gendron assisted in the completion of the Quality Assurance Project Plan in September 2004, also prepared by ENSR. Currently, Ms. Gendron has her own firm in addition to working on projects with the Army Corp of Engineers. Ms. Gendron has a degree in Biology and fifteen years of experience.

Ms. Gendron explained the monitoring she has conducted on behalf of the Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee. Watershed sampling has been done as both dry weather sampling and wet weather sampling of the down stream tributary. Samples were

analyzed for total phosphorus, dissolved phosphorus and total suspended solids. In-situ measurements of temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), pH and specific conductance were collected as well.

Dry weather in-lake sampling recorded in-situ water depth profiles measurements of temperature, DO, pH and specific conductance.

Plant surveys were conducted in 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007 and 2010. The five transects established in 1998 are still being used for surveying purposes, with each transect being dived into a series of observation points. A total of 52 points were assessed in 2010. The plant surveys focus on macroscopic fully submerged, floating-leaved, and/or free floating plants. The 2010 data is comparable to the 2007 data.

Jim Breslauer asked Ms. Gendron if it is it her experience that you should do gravity draw downs only from time to time? Ms. Gendron stated that is not a bad practice. As for the idea of one year on and one year off for a draw down, Ms. Gendron believes that weather variation may have the same effect of taking a year off. Bruce Leicher stated that the Committee has had the discussion of whether to take a year off completely or just conduct a gravity draw down. Ms. Gendron stated there has been no documentation to prove one way or another if every other year is productive. Mr. Leicher stated that the one year that Committee only conducted a gravity draw down the weeds returned.

Mr. Breslauer echoed the concern of a resident in regards to the effects of the draw downs on the upstream wetlands. Mr. Leicher stated that the Committee has only done monitoring of the down stream wetland. Ms. Gendron thinks that it is a good question and can not say that such things as an increase in phragmites is a direct result of the draw downs.

Wendy Sisson explained that the Commission wants to know when the year off will be, are the effects of the draw down effective and what are the advantages and disadvantages to the draw down over the years.

Both Ms. Gendron and Mr. Leicher believe that the States Generic Environmental Impact Report has information within it that would be very helpful in addressing the Commissions concerns.

Jaye Waldron asked about the mussels and their exposure to predators. Mr. Leicher stated he has spoken with an expert in regards to mussel, who has stated that if you are finding mussels in the shallow zones then there are in deep zones as well.

Jim Breslauer left the meeting at 10:10pm.

Ms. Gendron does not think she would recommend a year off with no gravity or pump draw down. Mr. Leicher stated that from the Committees view, taking a year off was not from a recreation point of view but rather a variation in the results.

Ms. Gendron is not scheduled for monitoring as previously described for this season, but the Committee could have her take a look at the upper wetlands. Ms. Gendron will look over the data for the amphibians, invasive species and wetlands collected by volunteers and report back to the Commission. It was agreed upon that Committee would return to the Commission in June with results.

Discuss Land Gift on Bolton Road

The Commission had briefly discussed the acceptance of a parcel of land on Bolton Road (Map 22B Parcel 22) at the last meeting, but without a quorum they were unable to make a final decision. Wendy Sisson made a motion for the Commission to accept this parcel at this year Annual Town Meeting, unless the owners can be convinced to give it to the Town as municipal land. Jaye Waldron seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Adjournment

Don Ritchie made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:10pm. Jaye Waldron seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Allard
Land Use Administrator/
Conservation Agent

**Harvard Conservation Commission
Continuation of a Request for Determination of Applicability
Hearing Meeting Minutes
Bare Hill Rowing Association, Bare Hill Pond, Harvard#0111-02
March 17, 2011**

The public hearing was opened at 7:27pm by Vice Chair Wendy Sisson under the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act, Ch. 131 §40 and the Harvard Wetland Bylaw, Chapter 119 of the Code of the Town of Harvard in the Town Hall Meeting Room

Members Present: Wendy Sisson, Charlie Gorss, Don Ritchie, Jim Breslauer, and Janet (Jaye) Waldron

Others Present: Liz Allard (LUB Admin)

This hearing was continued from February 14, 2011 on a Request for Determination of Applicability filed on behalf of the Bare Hill Rowing Association for the breaking up of rocks that are a safety hazard to users within Bare Hill Pond by mechanical methods.

The hearing was continued to allow for the required signature of the application by the Town Administrator on behalf of the Selectmen. The signature has since been obtained.

With no additional comments or questions, Don Ritchie made a motion to close the hearing and issue a Negative 3 Determination of Applicability to include the conditions outlined during the February 14th meeting. Jim Breslauer seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Allard
Land Use Administrator/
Conservation Agent

Harvard Conservation Commission
Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing Meeting Minutes
Richard & Jean McCrosky, 193 Old Littleton Road,
DEP#177-590, Harvard#0111-01
March 17, 2011

The public hearing was opened at 7:32pm by Vice Chair Wendy Sisson under the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act, Ch. 131 §40 and the Harvard Wetland Bylaw, Chapter 119 of the Code of the Town of Harvard in the Town Hall Meeting Room

Members Present: Wendy Sisson, Charlie Gorss, Don Ritchie, Jim Breslauer, and Janet (Jaye) Waldron

Others Present: Liz Allard (LUB Admin) and Neil Gorman (Ross Assoc.)

This hearing was continued from February 14, 2011 on a Notice of Intent filed on behalf of Richard & Jean McCrosky for a sewage disposal upgrade with a portion of the construction within the 100' wetland buffer zone at 193 Old Littleton Road, Harvard.

Neil Gorman, of Ross Associates, was present to represent the applicant. A site walk was conducted with members of the Commission, Mr. Gorman and Jean McCrosky on Monday March 14th. Mr. Gorman submitted a revised plan which shows a vegetative buffer and the permanent markers requested at the February 14th meeting. A planting note has been added to the plan along with that condition that the work is to be done during the dry weather. Comments from Natural Heritage Endangers Species Program have been received, stating that the project will have no adverse impact to the protected wildlife habitat.

Mr. Gorman reminded the Commission that he had previously asked for a waiver to the fees for the disturbance within the buffer zone and the confirmation of the wetland line. Jim Breslauer asked what the amount of disturbance would be to install the force main and the septic tank. Mr. Gorman stated there would be 2,800 square feet of disturbance for that activity.

Liz Allard stated that she had discussed with Dan Wolf, from Ross Associates, the Commission's request for a vegetated buffer and permanent markers. Mr. Wolfe was worried the Commission was removing useable lawn area from the site. Ms. Allard had explained to Mr. Wolfe that the area in and around the back of the house and barn is a very well disturbed area and that the location in question for the vegetated barrier would most likely be wetland if it had not been so disturbed over the years. Ms. Allard stated that there is still plenty of room for any future home owners to have a suitable lawn area.

The Commission stated the permanent markers should be 30 – 35 feet apart, either granite or stone and at a minimum four feet above grade.

With no further questions or comments, Jim Breslauer made a motion to close the hearing and issue an Order of Conditions that include the above mentioned conditions, as well as an adjustment to the fee for disturbance within the buffer zone to be set at \$280.00, but the fee for the review of the delineated wetland is to remain the same. The reduction in the disturbance fee is due to the limited impact of digging the ditch for the pipe within an already disturbed area. Don Ritchie seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Allard
Land Use Administrator/
Conservation Agent

Harvard Conservation Commission
Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing Meeting Minutes
Transformations, Inc., Stow Road (Map 36 Parcels 85 86.1)
DEP#177-586, Harvard#1010-01
March 17, 2011

The public hearing was opened at 7:46pm by Vice Chair Wendy Sisson under the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act, Ch. 131 §40 in the Town Hall Meeting Room

Members Present: Wendy Sisson, Charlie Gorss, Don Ritchie, Jim Breslauer, and Janet (Jaye) Waldron

Others Present: Liz Allard (LUB Admin), Steve Ventresca (Nitsch), Judy Gustafson, Warren Henderson, Lynn Adler, Sally Corrona, Jeff Richards (Transformations) and Dan Bourdeau (Geosyntec)

This hearing was continued from February 14, 2011 on a Notice of Intent filed on behalf of Transformations, Inc. for the construction of a roadway, 17 residential buildings, septic system and public water supply source within the 100' wetland buffer zone on Stow Road (Map 36 Parcels 85 & 86.1), Harvard.

Jeff Richards, of Transformations, Inc. was present along with Dan Bourdeau from Geosyntec. Mr. Richards reviewed the plan refinements since the opening of the hearing in October. Those include the relocation of the structure on lot 1, which has been shifted west, the constructed wetland has been shifted further from Stow Road, a defined construction sequence has been submitted, the management of erosion during construction has been submitted, plantings to be used in the constructed wetland and the rain gardens along with snow storage areas have been added to the plan. The construction sequence indicates that construction would start at Stow Road and work its way in with the roadway up to the 700 foot mark. The sequence takes into consideration that the lower portion of the site has the majority of the stormwater structures and needs to be constructed early in the process.

The stormwater structures on the upper portion of the site are outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, but are being considered as part of the stormwater calculations as they affect the lower wetlands. There are seventeen rain gardens in total that include two bioretention cells. The consulting process between the applicant's representatives and the Commission's consultant is making progress with a final conclusion from Nitsch Engineering in sight.

Mr. Bourdeau commended the Commission for the hiring of an outside consultant to review a project with this type of advanced the design. Mr. Bourdeau stated that the additional viewpoint has improved a very complex project. Mr. Bourdeau stated that initially the plan called for 23 rain gardens, all of which infiltrated, since then they have backed into a very conservative design of determining depth to seasonal high ground water of 30 inches, which a has resulted in about 70% of the rain gardens being lined. Five rain gardens are unlined, therefore they infiltrate stormwater. When lining a rain garden you need to provide an over flow and an under drain that ties into the main line of the system. The infiltrating rain gardens meet the requirements of the State stormwater management criteria. The remaining rain gardens meet the water quality volume as required by the regulations. The whole system drains down to the constructed wetlands. Since meeting with the Commission in November the stormwater management design has been revised to line a number of the rain gardens, increase the performance of the constructed wetlands by re-designing its shape, outlet structure and change in the topography.

Mr. Bourdeau stated there have been several iterations of the review and the design has become more conservative. Mr. Bourdeau wanted to encourage conversation tonight about what we are looking at for the optimal build of the Stormwater system. If we could come away from the meeting with what we really want to target here it would be helpful. The regulations are very tricky, but Mr. Bourdeau wants to make sure we are not losing the big picture of the Low Impact Development (LID) for the stormwater system.

Jim Breslauer stated that he was not sure he understood the last point Mr. Bourdeau made. Mr. Bourdeau stated that the regulations are someone what new and the Department of Environmental Protection leave a lot of the discussion up to the Commission. This Commission has chosen Nitsch Engineering to look at the proposed design with respect to those regulations. Taking a step back and looking at what those regulations are driving toward, LID design and distributing those practices through the water shed. Two big parts of the design are infiltration and water quality volume. Mr. Boudreau further explained that capturing the first half inch of rain; in some cases from on this site, if you are in the wellhead protection area, an inch of rain; you are treating that and a portion is infiltrating. The regulations also put you in a catch twenty-two in that you need a surface separation to ground water, to bedrock and need to be in certain soil conditions. Those requirements are two-fold; one is to make sure that you get proper treatment of the stormwater run off and two that the bioretention cells and rain gardens function properly, because you do not want a bioretention cell to have standing water. Mr. Bourdeau stated it is a tricky thing because you need the separation without comprising the LID design.

Steve Ventresca, of Nitsch Engineering, stated the site takes into account the 2008 stormwater management regulations. Mr. Ventresca stated that in his opinion the design of the constructed wetland is much nicer than that of the typical detention basin. Mr. Ventresca stated that what he is struggling with in the review process is the when he looks at the hydro-cad calculations (pre- and post-site conditions) he continually finds that either the model is incorrect in a few nodes or that final design point does not add up

to each of the nodes. In Nitsch's opinion there is a discrepancy between in the rate of pre- and post conditions.

The applicant has provided swale and outlet details, but Nitsch will need additional information on those structures. Mr. Ventresca stated there is a considerable amount of water coming off the hill at the site and Nitsch feels that more information in general is necessary. Mr. Ventresca stated the applicant needs to supply more detail about catch basins sizing, grates, covers and those types of mundane details that need to be added to the plan. Mr. Ventresca appreciates the LID design the applicant is trying to achieve, but he is still looking for more information. Mr. Ventresca suggested including off site infiltration to determine what is getting to compliance point 2.

Jaye Waldron, stated that the stormwater report stated that there was four feet to ground water and now the report states thirty inches, why the difference? Mr. Richards stated that when doing testing ground water can vary from location to location on a site and they had modeled the calculations on the higher side. The reason Ms. Waldron is asking is because there was some discussion of the location of the septic system on lot 1 and the need of four feet separation to ground water. Mr. Richards stated the four feet will be achieved by raising the height of the systems. Ms. Waldron asked if there is a close distance to bedrock. Mr. Richards does not think that the development area has any bedrock areas; if any they would be on the upper portion of site.

Members requested large scale copies of the plan for their review. It was stated that the details of the proposed constructed wetland are within the stormwater report in sections 5B and 5C.

Ms. Waldron asked about the 70% of rain gardens that would not be infiltrating; that information goes into the model; assuming that at some point that water goes into the constructed wetlands or other places. Mr. Bourdeau stated that the model is conservative for the 2, 10 and 100 year rain event, the infiltration through the rain garden is not modeled; it is more conservative that you are sending more water down stream. Ms. Waldron stated that you are assuming that it is not going to infiltrate? Mr. Bourdeau stated that was correct. The last models assumed ground water at 30 inches with lined rain gardens flowing into the constructed wetlands. The constructed wetland has been redesigned so that the peak discharge for the 2, 10 and the 100 year rain event were less than pre-design.

The constructed wetland design was discussed as to how deep it will be and the level of ground water, which can vary depending on the time of year. It seems to the Commission members that there will always be six to eight feet of water constantly in this structure. Mr. Bourdeau stated that the regulations have not been updated to require the analysis of local events. Jim Breslauer asked if what Mr. Bourdeau is trying to convey is that if there currently is flooding at the level of 260 (elevation) across Stow Road, that will be case post-construction, but it will not be any more than it is currently. Mr. Bourdeau stated that it is hard to say because if that area flooded it would be easy to say that a portion of the wetland is flooded and also the FEMA flood hazards are flooded. Mr. Breslauer stated

that the neighbor's concern is whether the flooding going to be any worse. Mr. Bourdeau stated that he believes that the run off created will be containable above the water level in the constructed wetland just below the berm. Wendy Sisson believes a site visit will be needed, at this time of year the water is at ground level. Not everything that happens is on the FEMA maps.

Ms. Sisson made the point that the State's stormwater manual is based on data from 1900 to 1960, so the information is very outdated and modeling is using conditions that do not exist today. Anyone spending any time on this site or within this area of Stow Road can attest to the flooded conditions that take place there every year regardless of what the floodplain maps indicate. This area receives a lot of water from a large drainage area. Mr. Bourdeau stated that we are talking about a lot of local knowledge that is not captured within the stormwater handbook. Such as the two foot separation to ground water, the manual states you need two feet of separation, we then line the rain gardens, which during the 100 rain event is going to put more water into the wetlands, so the Commission and Nitsch are looking at the regulations and asking for specific information and we are doing that; big picture what we are doing in the long run is send more water to the wetland. Ms. Sisson asked if the manual takes into account the spring flood conditions. Mr. Bourdeau stated that it does if you are looking at seasonal high ground water level for your design, which essentially occurs in the spring. Ms. Sisson asked if that level was taken into consideration when calculating out the constructed wetlands. Mr. Ventresca stated he had not looked at those calculations yet. Mr. Ventresca thinks the elevation may need to be adjusted in the constructed wetland.

Mr. Bourdeau believes there are two different things being discussed here; a 100 year rain event, when you have a seven inch storm that occurs over a twenty-four hour period, and that run off goes to the wetlands, the wetlands in normal optimal conditions would not be flooded, but what you are questioning is outside that 100 year event; a scenario where we have flooding up to elevation 260, that is over Stow Road and then we have a rain event; regardless of a berm the flooding is going to be partly caused by ground water, as well as the other side of the road going up there; 260 is going to flooding regardless if we have a berm there or not. Mr. Bourdeau thinks he needs to refine the statement that this floods up to 260. Ms. Sisson does not think that it floods currently to 260, if that is the level of Stow Road and this has been gone over enough; the point is that we need to establish seasonal high water.

Sally Carrona, of 267 Stow Road, stated that the stormwater manual does not take into consideration the local conditions. Ms. Carrona is concerned about the addition of any water to her property. Adding any level of water to the stream that flows through her property is of great concern to her. Ms. Carrona's house is built on a slab and should flooding occur it would immediately affect living space within her property. Adding any level makes her very concerned.

Warren Henderson, of 265 Stow Road, asked if by lining the rain gardens are you not increasing the amount of water that would be coming down to bioretention cell directly

adjacent to Stow Road. Mr. Richards stated that the rain gardens that are lined will be connected to the constructed wetland and not the bioretention cell at Stow Road.

Judy Gustafson, of 260 Stow Road, asked if the constructed wetland would increase the mosquito breeding. Mr. Richards stated that is not the intent of a constructed wetland. Ms. Gustafson asked about flooding to her basement with water that may come off 256 Stow Road. It was explained that the applicant is not allowed to increase the flow of water from the property. Ms. Gustafson asked if the bus shelter would be within the line of sight. Mr. Richards stated that the shelter is set back from the road and not within the line of sight.

Lynn Adler, of 274 Stow Road, asked why the constructed wetland was being directed toward her land and not Stow Road. Mr. Richards stated that the location for the constructed wetland is at the lowest point on the property, as well as adjacent to the existing wetlands, in which it drains into.

With Nitsch Engineering requesting additional information Jim Breslauer made a motion to continue the hearing to April 7, 2011 at 7:45pm. Don Ritchie seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Allard
Land Use Administrator/
Conservation Agent

DOCUMENTS & OTHER EXHIBITS

Review & Discuss Annual Notification of Horse Riding on Harvard Trails

- POLICIES ON HORSEBACK RIDING ON HARVARD TRAILS

Request for a Certificate of Compliance – Fermino, White Lane, DEP#177-267

- WPA Form 8A Request for Certificate of Compliance, DEP#177-267, undated
- WPA Form 8B Certificate of Compliance, DEP#177-267, dated March 17, 2011

Review and Discuss Tree Cutting Policy

- TOWN OF HARVARD CONSERVATION COMMISSION POLICY FOR CUTTING TREES IN A RESOURCE AREA (WETLAND) OR BUFFER ZONE

Review & Discuss Planning Board Zoning Amendment – Floodplain Bylaw

- Proposed Chapter 125-54 Floodplain District Bylaw

Continuation of Request for Determination of Applicability Hearing – Bare Hill Rowing Association, Bare Hill Pond, Harvard#0111-02

- WPA Form 2 Determination of Applicability, Bare Hill Rowing Association, dated March 17, 2011

Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing – Richard & Jean McCrosky, 193 Old Littleton, DEP#177-590, Harvard#0111-01

- WPA Form 3 Notice of Intent – Richard & Jean McCrosky, 193 Old Littleton Road, dated January 2011
- Sewage Disposal System Plan, designed for Richard & Jean McCrosky, dated 1/18/11

Continuation of a Notice of Intent Hearing – Transformations, Inc., Stow Road (Map 36 Parcel 85 & 86.1), DEP#177-586, Harvard#1010-01

- WPA Form 3 Notice of Intent – Transformations, Inc., Stow Road (Map 36 parcels 85 & 86.1) dated October 2010
- Notice of Intent Plan, Pine Hill Village, Harvard, Mass., dated March 9, 2011

Discuss with Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee Data Review

- “Why Manage?” Handout, undated
- Aquatic Restoration Consulting, LLC report to the Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee, undated
- Photos of the Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management Committee Stormwater Management facilities