

# **STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

Minutes for Thursday, November 21, 2002

## **MEMBERS PRESENT**

J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle J. Michalek, and D. Mitchell

7:00 PM

## **MINUTES**

The Minutes of October 17th, were reviewed and approved as amended by unanimous vote.

## **CPA UPDATE**

Tabled

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

## **DISCUSSION OF NEW INFORMATION**

### **SITE VISIT SUMMARY**

Lane 7+ 8 Violation complaint, site visit showed work to be more than 200 feet from river.

## **UPCOMING PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS**

## **CONTINUATION OF HEARINGS, MEETINGS FOR CLOSURE REVIEW OF FINAL DOCUMENTS AND OTHER ACTION**

2 Determinations for lots 1 and 3 and 1 Order of Conditions for lot 11 of Draper Woods were reviewed, approved, and signed by unanimous vote. All had been approved at the last meeting.

The OoC for Miller for 62 and 64 Goodrich Road was reviewed approved and signed by unanimous vote. The project had been approved at the previous meeting.

The SCC discussed the legal forms submitted by Attorney E. Neal regarding 67 Clarke Road, the land CMG is offering to the town as Conservation Land. The Commission noted that the land had already been reviewed. The SCC had voted to accept the land and request that the BOS do the same. A letter has already been sent requesting that the land be accepted as conservation land under the care control and custody of the SCC. Motion by to D. Barnicle to sign the forms. 2<sup>nd</sup> JM. Discussion, J. Michalek confirmed that the land was being donated, not purchased. J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle confirmed that this was the case. They noted that there was a huge wetland through the property and the land was likely not buildable as shown. Vote – all in favor.

NoI for B. Soper of 10 Whittemore – for pool installation was continued to December 5, at 7:15. B. Soper did not show or submit the final plan.

## **MINOR WALK INS**

### **PUBLIC HEARING – NoI – B. Caron for 124 Clark Road, for single family home construction and related.**

### **PUBLIC HEARING - RDA cont.- 127A Stallion Hill, for discussion relating to opening the land for public use.**

J. Hoffman opened the hearing. Present were,  
Eunice Snay- 159 Stallion Hill Rd.  
Robert Snay- 159 Stallion Hill Rd.  
Mary Lou Porrazzo- 162 Leadmine Rd.  
Roger Duguay- 125 Stallion Hill Rd.  
Lorraine Curboy- 159 Stallion Hill Rd.  
Matthew Kmiecjak- 489 Main St. Apt. 29  
Mike Snay- 266 Mechanic St.  
Ken Abair- 176 Leadmine Rd.

N. Ryder summarized the town's involvement with and recent purchase of the land. She noted that a general maintenance plan had been developed with public trails and features noted. A preliminary environmental evaluation had been conducted. The Commission was holding a public hearing at this time to hear from neighbors, residents and other interested members of the public as to what they would like to see happen with the land. The SCC was also interested in determining from the abutters, what other information they had to offer regarding previous use and suggestions for balancing public use with protection of abutting private property.

Harold Hines- stated that he had helped put the trails in originally based on permission from OSV at the time. He noted that the trails run all the way to Leadmine pond from Stallion Hill Road. Many of the bridges need a lot of maintenance. He stated that he would like to see the trails connect to Shumway Road.

J. Hoffman clarified he was saying he wanted to see the land open to snow mobiles. ??? stated that they were concerned about snowmobiles on trails, speeding and coming across cross-country skier. They were concerned about potential safety problems

H. Hines stated that the hunting was a different story. He was concerned about the safety of hikers. He noted that a group from Palmer comes in and had at one point threatened one neighbor, saying they would kill her when they trespassed on her property and she asked them to leave. There had been no witnesses so the incident had not been reported.

Roger DuGuay – 125 Stallion Hill, said is was premature to discuss maintenance. His concern was with the hunters that come in already and are right behind people's homes. In addition he noted that people were using the access to dump garbage.

The neighbors all noted that since the driveway had been improved, people were going down at 10:00 at night, doing anything they want at all hours.

Ken Abair- stated that he was concerned if people were using the trails for recreational use, then the SCC should eliminate hunting. He felt the SCC needed to restrict hours from sunrise to sunset.

J. Hoffman stated that if a gate was installed, then there would be a responsibility for someone to open and close the gates daily. J. Michalek noted that if the hours are posted and people are there after that, they are illegally trespassing. The SCC can have the police remove them.

R DuGuay stated that he did call the police about the noise. He noted that the police could remove people causing a disturbance whether the land was posted for hours of use or not.

D. Barnicle thanked the neighbors for attending and stated that the SCC and neighbors would likely be faced with many new issues. The land had only been accessible previously by foot but now car access was being given. He agreed that the SCC needed to limit disturbance to neighbors.

R. DuGuay stated that work was already in progress, controls and uses should be enforced. D. Barnicle noted that he was ahead of the public hearing process and noted that was why the SCC wanted to speak with the neighbors to determine what uses and times would be reasonable.

The neighbors discussed the various possible uses such as hunting, hiking, snowmobiling, and cross-country skiing. There were various opinions as to what should be allowed and what hours of operation would be reasonable.

E. Snay noted that if the entryway work was done, it was poorly done. The entry is now deep muck and hard to get through. N. Ryder noted that grading was in progress, but G. Morse had noted that a stone base may need to be put in place to stabilize the driveway further. Guardrails will also need to be installed prior to opening the land officially.

J. Hoffman stated that all perspectives have merit, the SCC needs to hear them all. He noted that any restrictions for outsiders would have to apply to residents also. He suggested initiating sound or noise restrictions instead of time restrictions. He asked N. Ryder to check with the Police Department and noted that if it was requested, they will patrol the area.

The neighbors discussed the need for restrictions for hunters and some hikers, noting that there had been a great deal of trespassing on private property in the previous years. D. Barnicle noted that the public was not always courteous. He noted that the town did not own the property until the past summer. He stated that the SCC would work to make good situation for all involved.

E. Snay noted that the bridges had to be rebuilt to handle snowmobiles and walkers. They would need to be sturdy and at ground level.

J. Hoffman asked for a show of hands for those in favor of eliminating hunting or snowmobiling. Four neighbors wanted to eliminate hunting, no one wanted to stop snowmobiles.

J. Hoffman asked if any hot buttons had not yet been brought up that the SCC should be aware of. No

N. Ryder noted that a sign noting that use was at the users own risk was being made and should be installed shortly. Two signs were being made, a small front sign saying enter and use at your own risk. A larger, similar sign will be installed at the parking area.

H. Hines asked if the trails at this time would be open for snowmobilers and cross-country skiers. He stated that he organized a group to go out yearly and would be willing to pull the branches off the trails and maintain them, but only if he was going to be allowed to use them. J. Hoffman asked for a vote from the SCC if trails would remain open as they had been. The SCC unanimously agreed that the use would remain unchanged until formal discussion had been finalized. The neighbors were welcome to use the trails as they had and were definitely welcome to clean the trails if they wished.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any other issues.

K. Abair stated that Stallion Hill Road was very narrow. He stated that 4-5 parking spaces would not likely be enough. He was concerned that people would start parking on Stallion Hill Road. He requested that no parking signs be posted on Stallion Hill.

M. Kmizek stated that the best solution would be to install property signs informing users that this was multiple use land. The signs would let hunters know that there would be hikers and snowmobilers and would limit hunting. Most hunters wanted quiet spots. If everyone knows what uses are allowed then they can expect to see other people and will be respectful of others.

The public hearing is continued to Dec. 5<sup>th</sup>@ 8:30 for further discussion from abutters.

### **PUBLIC HEARING- RDA- Harrington Memorial Hospital 118 Main Street**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing, present was T. Keenan

N. Ryder noted that the site plan had still not been submitted, the hearing would have to be continued so interested abutters could review the proposal. The project could be outlined to the SCC. T. Keenan submitted the plan and stated that the proposal was to expand the existing building onto parking and pavement area. The building expansion would be 18 by 22 feet and would be facing the Dunkin Donuts shop.

J. Hoffman reviewed the erosion control. He noted that the addition would be laying on a slab foundation, no digging would be required, and all work was above grade.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any further questions. No. He stated that providing all information was in, he had no objections.

D. Barnicle stated that he would need to take a site visit to confirm the location and details.

D. Mitchell asked for the hay bales to be wrapped all the way to the existing building.

T. Keenan reviewed the plan and noted that there would be some removal of parking area. The SCC reviewed the location. There is no soil excavation planned, only removal of some pavement which will be replaced with a slab foundation.

D. Mitchell asked D. Barnicle to check on the location of the catch basins during his site check.

The project is continued to Dec. 5, at 7:15 PM. If there is no abutter objection, the hearing will likely be closed.

#### **Public Hearing- Nol amendment- 126 Clarke Road. DEP 300-416**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing. Present were, Nelson Cabral of Wetlands Environmental Testing and George Chianis of Nextel.

G. Chianis stated that an Order of Conditions had been issued in January of 2001. When the project went to the Town Planner, they realized that the approved tower site was outside the overlay district. The engineers went back and redesigned the project and have come back with an amendment request. D. Mitchell asked how far out from the wetland the tower was proposed. N. Cabral stated that the proposed location has been moved 370 feet south, he showed where the old tower was where the new proposed site is on the plan. The old location was 100 feet from BVW, the proposed location is 160 feet from the other end of the same BVW. The location is also at a higher elevation. The applicant's request was to either reopen the hearing, or to amend it as being within the original scope of review. They noted that no work is closer to wetlands or resource areas than was proposed in the initial order.

J. Hoffman stated that the SCC needed to decide if the proposed change is significant enough to reopen the public hearing. D. Mitchell asked if the access road would change at all. N. Cabral said it would not. He noted that they would be adding some access drive but there would be no new impacts. D. Barnicle clarified that the access road would be no closer to wetland than previously approved. D. Barnicle asked if they would be adding roadway within the buffer. G. Chianis stated that to conform to the overlay did not require impact to wetlands. N. Cabral stated that the overlay maps originally given to the applicant were not accurate. The area shown was not the exact area approved.

D. Barnicle asked if the road would be paved or gravel. G. Chianis stated it would be gravel.

D. Mitchell noted that there had been concern with the entrance and asked if there would be any change to the proposed versa lock wall at the entrance. J. Hoffman questioned if the same erosion controls were proposed. N. Cabral stated that all the same design measures would apply

as originally agreed to. D. Mitchell asked for the erosion control details to be reviewed for clarification. N. Cabral noted the hatched outside area on either side of the driveway were erosion control. D. Mitchell asked for the catch basins to be reviewed. Done.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any further questions. No. D. Barnicle – motion to not require a new public hearing and to accept the amended plans. 2<sup>nd</sup> D. Mitchell. Vote all in favor.

**PUBLIC HEARING - RDA- 225 Brookfield Road, lots 1 ,2, and 3 single family home lots and related.**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing, present was M. Farrell

N. Ryder stated that the hearing would have to be continued, the filing was not complete as no abutter notification cards were submitted. The SCC discussed storm water phase II. As the disturbed area would cover more than 1 acre, compliance was now required. No untreated stormwater or sediments could leave the site. The plans will need to be revised to show that nothing will leave the site.

M. Farrell outlined the project location, the perennial brook, BVW, and buffer. He noted that the stream source was runoff and an isolated wetland with culvert under Brookfield Road.

J. Hoffman asked if anything was proposed with in the first 100-foot buffer. M. Farrell outlined the ACE easement and noted that no habitable structures would be allowed without approval of ACE. He stated that the flood elevation at maximum hold back of Long Pond would be 656 feet.

D. Mitchell asked why the ACE easement cuts off so sharply. M. Farrell explained that the easement predated the Mass Pike and was needed for flood control.

D. Barnicle asked where the flood controls for Long Pond were. J. Michalek clarified that M. Farrell had stated that a culvert connects the northern part of Long Pond to the Southern under Champoux Road. M. Farrell agreed and stated that if ACE holds back all flow, the water would peak at a high level of approximately 20 feet above the gates on Champeaux Road. The SCC and M. Farrell discussed the purpose of the Champoux Road gates for usual yearly flooding safety.

J. Hoffman and M. Farrell discussed existing water flow. J. Hoffman confirmed that the project would not be diverting water from wetlands.

D. Mitchell asked if the property would connect to town water and sewer. Yes.

The SCC noted that a letter should go out to M. Lev and the Planning Board regarding Phase II requirements.

D. Mitchell and D. Barnicle will conduct a site visit. The size lots are 1 acre each.

J. Hoffman confirmed that limit of back yard disturbance. He asked M. Farrell to define disturbance. M. Farrell stated it meant land clearing, tree cutting, and excavation. D. Barnicle asked if the plan reflected current site conditions and whether it had orienting points for the Commissioner to work from on site. M. Farrell said they were included and outlined stonewalls, blue double flags at the edge of the brook, and blue numbered flags at the wetland edge.

J. Hoffman and D. Mitchell asked N. Ryder to determine what needs to be done for phase II and put it into the OoC

D. Barnicle asked the SCC to review the buffer strip and culvert further. He noted that the plan is to channelize the stream through the yard as opposed to flowing it through an open channel. D. Barnicle noted that he was opposed to channeling water. He noted that the applicant was essentially taking water and directing it to the next property. M. Farrell said that would not be the case, the water will go along the route of the natural swale and be directed back to the wetland. D. Barnicle stated that he was opposed to channelizing water. M. Farrell said he could leave the pipe open but it would leave an open swale in the front yard. He stated it would run to the same existing swale and down the side of the property in the same manner it does now. He felt that channelizing the flow added protection down stream by not allowing normal yard chemicals etc into the water source. D. Barnicle asked if the proposed channel was concrete or pipe.

The hearing is continued to 12/5 @ 9:10 PM.

**PUBLIC HEARING- 3 RDA's cont.- Kurt Courtemache for 143 McGilpin for single family homes and related.**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing, present were Dan Carlson and M. Farrell.

The SCC reviewed the plan submitted. M. Farrell noted that there were no wetlands on any of the parcels or within 200 feet of the limits of work. D. Barnicle stated that the SCC should not take action until Marin Realty fulfills their promise to permanently protect the remainder of the property. N. Ryder noted that this project also needs to meet phase II due to more than 1 acre of disturbance.

J. Michalek stated that the Planning Board should be the stormwater review board since all properties in town come before them. The SCC discussed jurisdiction. N. Ryder noted that the only person who reviewed all projects was M. Lev. The SCC agreed that any projects within SCC jurisdiction would also be reviewed for phase II stormwater.

J. Hoffman requested that N. Ryder set up a training session for all town boards and committees (Jim, BOS, PB DPW, BOH, SCC, BI and the town engineer) with a DEP stormwater representative to discuss exactly what each board should be doing to prepare for phase II.

M. Farrell noted that the applicant was eager to close and was not in the buffer. He noted that the SCC could require trap rock in the first 25 feet of driveway to keep sediments out of road.

D. Carlson noted that McGilpin was an unimproved road with many new homes. He stated that drainage will be problem. The SCC discussed the lot topography and the use of haybales along the roadway to control erosion onto McGilpin. The SCC discussed the option of using the 25-foot wetland buffer concept as an alternative to the use of haybales. The applicant/owner would have the option of using either an uninterrupted hay bale line along between any work areas and roadways or neighboring property or keeping a 25-foot wide, undisturbed buffer. M. Farrell said he was in agreement with the option. The owner/applicant could chose an option.

D. Barnicle stated that if erosion and sediments were observed leaving site, the SCC has right and obligation to require additional erosion controls. M. Farrell said he understood.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any further questions. No.

J. Hoffman stated that the SCC then needed to consider D. Barnicle's request that the SCC hold any decision until a promise made by a non-landowner be kept. He asked the Commissioners to discuss and decide if they felt the SCC had the right to hold up a permit for a non-SCC issue. J. Hoffman stated that in his opinion it was a town, BOS and PB issue. J. Michalek agreed with J. Hoffman. J. Hoffmam noted that while he sympathized with D. Barnicle's point, he felt the SCC's options were limited. He said he was not sure SCC had the legal authority to hold a permit. D. Mitchell agreed with J. Hoffman.

The SCC approved the project with storm water phase II controls. In favor, J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek, and D. Mitchell. Abstaining D. Barnicle.

### **PUBLIC HEARING - 6 Nol's continued for lots 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, and 14 of Draper Woods**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing, present were M. Marcus and W. Swiacki.

M. Marcus briefly outlined the phase I project area. He reviewed the overall lot layout and then outlined each remaining lot in the application to show what efforts had been made to revise the proposal to keep impacts and work area further away from wetlands.

Lot 2 – was 93' away, is now 100'. M. Marcus noted the maximum limit of clearing on the plans and noted the erosion control varies in distance to resource area along the lot.

D. Mitchell asked if the erosion control was shown on the right adjacent to lot 1. M. Marcus noted that was the stockpile area.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any questions. None. Lot 2 was approved by majority vote. In favor – J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek and D. Mitchell.

Lot 4- was set back 63' from the wetland, is now moved back to 70'. M. Marcus noted that on all the other lots, he was able to comply with the 25' minimum set back. On this lot, however at flag c-14, the grading comes within 10' of wetland to grade the back of the basin. M. Marcus noted that the basin discharge grading would have to be within the 25-foot buffer. M. Marcus noted that if he moved the house toward either side, he would run into sideline set backs or the



DPW easement. He stated that 70' is the maximum he can push the area of disturbance. W. Swiacki stated that no additional grading for the lots, would be any closer to the wetlands, than grading for the already approved infrastructure.

J. Hoffman stated that the point was clear. He noted that the only reason, the project was within the 25 feet was because the Commission missed it on the plan or it would not have been allowed. The SCC unanimously agreed. D. Barnicle stated that seeing 5'-10' of fill across the lot surprised him. He did not realize that 10' fill would change the grade across the lot and adjacent to the wetland. He stated that the SCC made a big mistake, it would not happen again.

Lot 5 – M. Marcus noted the disturbance was 33' is now 51' from the wetland. He noted that the lot itself was pulled back. The minimum limit of clearing is 5' from the BVW.

Back to lot 4. The SCC asked N. Ryder to pull the plans with the setback for this area. N. Ryder stated that the 5 and 10 foot setback was shown on the approved plan but the special conditions in the OoC, which supercedes the final plan, clearly state that there is to be no disturbance within the 25 foot buffer.

Lot 4 and 5 - M. Marcus stated that he would work on pulling back all work within 25 feet of wetland areas and would submit planting plans to re-vegetate any disturbed buffer area. W. Swiacki noted that the area was for a detention basin with a 3:1 slope. He noted that there were not really any other options. D. Barnicle noted that in looking at revising the two lots, the SCC preferred grassy or vegetated slopes as opposed to rock slopes. D. Mitchell noted that he would also prefer a steeper slope break such as 3:1. M. Marcus summarized that the Commissioners were requesting, grassed slopes, 3:1 as a rule and keeping out of the 25' buffer. Correct.

M. Marcus noted that the issue is not with the homes on lots 4 and 5, the issue is with tightening up the buffer for the detention basin. He asked the SCC to approve the home location and add any conditions they needed regarding the buffer. The SCC discussed the issue and agreed the permit could be issued with conditions protecting the 25-foot buffer.

J. Hoffman asked if there were any questions.

J. Michalek stated he was concerned with the disturbance being so close to the wetland, with no barrier to prevent dumping leaves and other debris in the 25' buffer. D. Barnicle stated that the potential damage was limited as the lots were so tiny and would be nearly cleared. D. Mitchell agreed with D. Barnicle and noted that in the past the boulders had been used to prevent disturbances to sensitive wetland areas such as vernal pools. He noted that a boulder barrier would create an unnecessary hardship. J. Hoffman noted that adding grass actually limited the overall disturbance, the project was already disturbing the balance by decreasing leaves naturally dropped from trees.

Lots 4 and 5 was approved with condition that there be no work of any kind within the 25 foot buffer. The applicant would have to rearrange the detention basin plans and bring them back as an amendment. Approved with conditions by majority vote. In favor – J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek and D. Mitchell. .

Lot 13 – disturbance was 75’ is now 100’ from BVW. J. Hoffman noted that seemed to be a reasonable balance. Approved by majority vote. In favor – J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek and D. Mitchell.

Lot 14 - was angled so the house was about 34’, is now 50’. M. Marcus said he changed the configuration of the house. He noted that almost the entire lot was in the 100’ buffer. J. Hoffman asked if there were any questions. None. Approved by majority vote. In favor – J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek and D. Mitchell.

Lot 12 - was 88’ from the BVW is now 102’. M. Marcus noted that there will be slight grading changes. D. Mitchell asked why the grade lumps up behind each house. M. Marcus said he was trying to give more back yard. J. Hoffman asked if there were any questions. None. Approved by majority vote. In favor – J. Hoffman, D. Barnicle, J. Michalek and D. Mitchell.

W. Swiacki noted that the trails were a unique feature on the property. He asked that as the property was developed would the SCC like to be consulted on the trail areas. The SCC unanimously stated yes, as the area was within 25 feet of the wetlands in most cases, the area was jurisdictional. A Notice of Intent may be required for creating trails if that is planned.

**PUBLIC HEARING - Nol amendment- Scott Sanderson. DEP 300-475.**

J. Hoffman opened the hearing, present was S. Sanderson.

S. Sanderson said he went to the Planning Board for final approval and was told that he needed to comply with the 30’ set back. He noted that he had gone to M. Lev and was told that since it was a private road he did not need to worry about the street line setback. L. Adams and the Planning Board had said no, the 30’ setback is from private roads also.

S. Sanderson said to accomplish this he reduced the footprint by 400’ to get out of the setback and to get under the 15% lot coverage. He noted that he understood the 25-foot no touch zone and would not disturb that area but due to zoning regulations he would have to move closer to the 25-foot buffer. He noted that he had already planted trees on lot where it was open grass. He is planning on adding appropriate vegetation to the edge areas. Hay bales will be used around the house until it is removed, then the hay bales will be pulled back in line to accommodate the 25-foot buffer. D. Barnicle asked what the % increase of new proposed amended home vs. the existing home is. 70%. S. Sanderson stated that there was an increase in non-porous area, but the set back was greater. He noted that there was also a decrease in coverage from the last approved plan. The SCC discussed the trade off and agreed that due to the zoning requirements they would agree to the change with conditions, but in general preferred the greatest distance possible from the resource area. S. Sanderson said he understood and was asking for some leeway so he could work with the ZBA and the builder and turn the house slightly if necessary.

D. Barnicle asked where the roof run off chambers would be located. S. Sanderson said they would be similar to the original plan.

The hearing is continued to 12/5 at 7:15 to review the final revised, amended plans.

**PUBLIC HEARING – continued for Wetland bylaw regulations, discussion, review, and adoption.**

J. Hoffman opened the public hearing. No one other than the Commission was present.

N. Ryder noted that the hearing had been continued to accommodate additional time for public comment. There had been no new comments or correspondence regarding the regulations.

The Commission discussed the final draft and voted to adopt the regulations with the understanding that a Quarterly review would be held to discuss changes and modifications.

Motion – D. Barnicle, 2<sup>nd</sup> – D. Mitchell, vote – all in favor.

**PUBLIC HEARING – New foresting application review, foresting policy and regulation review.**

There were no new submitted applications.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**SITE VISITS SCHEDULED**

Caron 278 Cedar Street..

Recheck 33 Mountain Brook.

118 Main Street, submitted site plan check.

225 Brookfield, submitted site plan check.

**OLD BUSINESS**

The SCC received a \$2600 donation from B. Moss for wetland creation mitigation as agreed to at the public hearing. The Commissioners discussed the wording for the account to clearly define the use of the donation. The funds are to be deposited in an Educational fund to be used for creating wetland for educational purpose and for demonstration projects.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

The warrant for erosion control related to stormwater phase II were discussed. Additional review was tabled due to the late hour.

The warrant for revisions to the wetland bylaw for housekeeping based on revisions to the MACC recommended model was discussed. Additional review was tabled.

N. Ryder contacted the insurance company regarding insurance for the Conservation properties. As long as there are no structures on the property, the land is covered under the existing town policy. If any structures are built they need to be documented with photographs and submitted to the insurance company for individual listing. The insurance agent recommended walking each

property once a month to document conditions and take note of any repairs or cleanups that needed to be conducted. If this is done, there should be no problem showing reasonable care and monitoring.

N. Ryder also contacted J. Bard of Kopelman and Paige regarding recording the land on the property title. Information is being forwarded to make sure this is accomplished.

The SCC reviewed the town meeting budget related warrant articles. The Commission discussed at length the job description update. A meeting with J. Malloy will be requested to discuss the needed changes. Copies of the documents were sent home for further review. Additional discussion will take place on 12/19 if any is needed.

N. Ryder noted to the Commission that a forest stewardship trail exists on land owned by Quabbin Reservoir. She had recently walked it. She noted that it was very similar to tentative plans for part of the Leadmine Road property and recommended that the SCC take time to walk the trail and see if something similar would work for Sturbridge Conservation Lands.

### **LETTER PERMITS**

### **CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE**

Motion to close at 12:15 AM on Friday, November 22. Approved by unanimous vote and a huge sigh of relief.