

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION (SCC)

Minutes for Thursday, November 16, 2006

7:05 PM Open Meeting

Members present: Dave Barnicle (DB) Chairman, Dave Mitchell (DM), Ed Goodwin (EG), Donna Grehl (DG), and Frank Damiano (FD) (FD arrived at 7:22 PM).

Kelly Kippenberger (KK), Conservation Agent

Danielle Garry for minutes

7:05 PM CPA and Zoning Study Committee Updates (tabled)

EG states that the CPC is currently discussing using CPA funds for historic building renovations (Center School Building).

DG states that the committee is currently working on some zoning changes. No changes are directly related to wetland protection. She is going to be looking into the Town of Spencer's Lake District regulations, she believes that Sturbridge should incorporate a Lake District into the Zoning Regulations.

7:12PM Appointment: 12 & 30 Farquhar Road Notice of Intent, DEP 300-720

- H. Blakeley from Bertin Engineering present for discussion
- KK states the Commission voted to close the hearing and re-file the Notice of Intent to include all proposed work, roadway, drainage and house lot information. Bertin Engineering submitted a letter on 11/7/06 requesting to meet with the Commission to discuss the re-filing. KK recommends the allowance of an Amendment to the Notice of Intent and re-open the public hearing (abutter notification and advertisement) under DEP File No. 300-720.
- DB questions how the Certificate of Compliance process will be handled. H.Blakeley states that partial releases may be a possibility.
- KK recommends requiring As Builts for the certificate of compliance process. Members agree.
- EG states that he does not have a problem with the Amendment, as long as the hearing is advertised again.
- DM motions to accept the Amendment as stated in the 11/7/06 letter. EG seconds. All in favor: 4/0.
- KK states that as soon as the paper work is submitted, she will schedule the next available hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP-300-725: Driveway bridge repair/replacement at 18 Stony Brook Drive. Green Hill Engineering representing Kenneth & Denise Champeau

DB opens the Public Hearing at 7:18PM

Present: M. Farrell, Green Hill Engineering

Information Submitted: Green Cards and Newspaper to open the public hearing

Discussion:

- KK states this is the first hearing on the project. The property owner submitted a Letter Request in August 2006 and the Commission agreed that a NOI was needed for the work. The proposed

project includes replacing a driveway bridge over a perennial stream that was damaged in October 2005—the damage did not present until this year. She visited the property on 8/1/06 (photos). The NOI includes an overall bridge repair plan prepared by Green Hill Engineering and bridge detail plans prepared by a Civil Engineer—James Robida. She does not have any issues with the project. She believes that the new bridge will be an improvement to the stream (more stable, eroding banks are present). The most difficult portion of the project will be removing the existing bridge and keeping the bank intact. She shows members photographs and the plans.

- M.Farrell goes over the bridge replacement. He states the footings of the bridge may need to be de-watered through a filter bag since the concrete footings are close to water table. The footings will be installed one side at a time. (FD enters discussion at 7:22PM)
- At this time there is a brief discussion of the construction sequence and materials to be used.
- DM questions how the existing footings are to be removed. M.Farrell states that the machine will work carefully and pull the debris away from the brook. Riprap is to be installed on the banks under the bridge. This is an improvement to what is there now. The bridge will allow more flow from the stream. DB questions the materials of the bridge. M. Farrell states it will be concrete footings with timber bridge. DG questions if the work near the stream will be done by hand, M. Farrell states no.
- Members discuss the span on the bridge. DM states that he is concerned with sediment entering the stream but agrees that the bridge needs to be replaced. DM questions how the sedimentation will be controlled. M. Farrell states that the area under the existing bridge will take 1 day for removal, the debris will be pulled away. The work in total will take one week.
- KK questions access to the house while construction. M. Farrell states that the existing bridge will be placed to allow foot access. The owners have not driven over the bridge for months and have been accessing their house by walking over the bridge.
- EG questions if there is any mowing up to the stream and M.Farrell states yes. EG states that the area near the stream must be restored. The owners should not mow up to the stream.
- DM states that the turbidity in the stream should be monitored. Any excess deposit will have to be removed. DB states that the work should be done when the water is low. M. Farrell states that the work will be done in 2 weeks. The owners have been waiting to do the work, they wanted it done in the summer but the Commission wanted a NOI. The work should be done as soon as possible before the winter and spring.
- KK questions if any vegetation will be removed as a result of the project. M. Farrell states that no root systems will be removed. Members discuss restoration of the bank, eroding must not occur. M. Farrell states the rip rap will be set under the bridge to protect the stream.
- FD states that the engineered plans are done well and the work needs to happen as soon as possible. He makes a motion to approve the work as presented with conditions, DG seconds. All in favor: 5/0. Members review the conditions with M. Farrell: Sedimentation must be controlled, any deposits shall be removed by hand, SCC to be notified of work and KK to monitor the work, no removal of vegetation/root systems and work to be complete within 2 weeks.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 10/5/06: DEP 300-678. 186 New Boston Road, Single Family House and Reclassification of a Stream. Green Hill Engineering representing J. Boutiette

DB opens the Public Hearing at 7:37PM

Present: M.Farrell, Green Hill Engineering

Discussion:

- KK states the hearing has been continued for a few months. Revised plans were submitted on 11/15/06 (plan set includes pages 1-4). Changes include relocating the house closer to the stream and further from the Natural Heritage mapped area, two wetland alteration areas at 665 sq ft and 562 sq ft (total 1227), wetland replication area of 1236 sq ft, a bridge over stream—14 ft span. If Commission recalls, this project also includes the reclassification of a stream to intermittent and outstanding Natural Heritage issues. No details on the bridge have been submitted, no wildlife habitat evaluation information in accordance with DEP's Guidance published March 2006. She shows members the plans and states the driveway has been relocated north and out of the wetlands.
- Members discuss the reclassification of the stream. Members show concerns for the beaver activity and the clarity of the photographs.
- M.Farrell states he has come up with a reasonable plan to meet the regulations and feels this is reasonable use of the land-5 acre lot with one house. The stream does dry out, he has taken pictures. The project includes 1:1 replication area. He would like the Commission to consider waiving the 2:1 local replication requirement, there is just no room for a larger replication area without causing more damage. He proposes cleaning the area down stream near the road in lieu of 2:1 replication. There are tires and some other debris that can be removed.
- EG states he would like to visit the site again. He believes that there is a building lot that does not cross the stream and he wants to look at the area where the driveway was relocated.
- DM states that changing the house location is a good idea, away from Natural Heritage. KK states that Natural Heritage will need to review the changes and provide additional comments. The SCC cannot close the hearing process until Natural Heritage is satisfied that the species are protected.
- M. Farrell states that the property has constraints, with the wetlands and the need for private septic system and well
- Members discuss going out on a site walk.
- DB questions to M.Farrell if he would like a continuance and M.Farrell states yes.

Hearing continued to January 4, 2007 at 7:30PM pending site walk.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 10/5/06: DEP 300-711 for 36/38 Goodrich Road, demolition of an existing house and new house construction. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing Frederick Gunn

DB opens the Public Hearing at 7:53PM

Present: F. Gunn

Discussion:

- KK states since the last hearing new information was submitted on 10/31/06 that includes a cover letter (in member boxes), Existing Site Plan dated 1/7/05, revised project plans with no engineering information, Title V Certification dated 7/19/04, and NE Wetland Plants Catalog. Her outstanding concerns are that the plans are not stamped by an Engineer. She spoke with the Building Inspector and he stated that not only the overall plans should be stamped but also the footing details.

- F.Gunn states that the SCC wanted to see existing contours that was not seen on the other plans. No existing contours will be changed except in the area of the house. He states that he took the plan and took off the data layers that were confusing the plan, that is why it is not stamped.
- Members discuss the retaining walls and DG states that her overall concern is the potential for erosion into the lake.
- F.Gunn states that under the deck there is rubble and blocks that will be removed. He shows members where the natural rock is and states that if there is exposed rock then there will be no erosion.
- DM questions if the construction sequence was changed. F. Gunn states that he modified it slightly, Phase I will be to install the erosion controls and then establish the footings. The foundation will be built and the slopes will be revegetated--not with grass. He states that the project will take 3 years.
- DM states he has a concern with the depth of the bedrock and the engineering of the retaining walls. He states that the comfort level of the engineering work is not good. He states that test drilling should be done for the retaining walls and footings.
- Members discuss the septic system. DB states that the Title V has expired.
- EG states that the system must meet Title V. He questions if the new house will have more bedrooms. FG states that the system should be upgraded with the new house to protect the Lake.
- DG states her concern with the erosion control is that she is not sure what is under the deck and wants reassurance that the lake will be protected. She questions what trees to come down and F.Gunn states only the trees where the house will be.
- DB states that the plans do not show all the trees to be taken down.
- DM states that he needs to see engineered plans.
- DB questions how much cut and fill and F.Gunn states no cut, only fill with the retaining walls. F.Gunn questions what the Commission is looking for in engineered plans. These plans were already approved by Zoning. F.Gunn states that the Building Inspector approves the footings, why does the Commission care about the details.
- Members explain to F.Gunn their concerns with erosion potential and need to be re-assured that he work will be done correctly. Members express that they have not received all the correct information as requested. The retaining walls are going to be holding back a lot of material, the members need to make sure the walls will function properly.
- DB states that the plans are not detailed enough, there needs to be details like depth of footings and amount of material to be brought in. An Engineer can supply the details on the plans.
- FD motions for the Commission to receive stamped plans from an Engineer for the footings and wall. Plans to be updated to show existing septic system, proposed system and all grading. No one seconds the motion.
- DM states that he is very concerned with the Engineering and the septic system.
- DB explains to F.Gunn the procedure in which the Commission needs adequate information to proceed with hearing the project. He states that the additional information that the Commission is requesting is: Title V for the new house, amount of cubic yards for fill, engineered/stamped plans for the footings, retaining walls etc, tree removal information. DB questions if F. Gunn would like a continuance, F. Gunn agrees.

Hearing continued to January 18, 2007 at 7:30PM pending additional information.

PUBLIC HEARING

AMENDMENT for DEP 300-631: 53 Technology Park Road, changes to storm water drainage. Bertin Engineering, Inc. representing WHM III, LLC.

DB opens the Public Hearing at 8:41PM

Present for discussion: H. Blakeley & M. Loin from Bertin Engineering
B. McClurg

Green cards and Newspaper previously submitted to open hearing

Discussion:

- KK states that this is a request to amend the Order of Conditions. The storm water management system is not functioning properly and the clearing limits changed. Revised plans and revised drainage calculations were submitted. Greg Morse reviewed the revisions and submitted comments on 10/31/06. Since then, revised plans were submitted on 11/13/06 and she has not yet to hear back from Greg Morse if his concerns have been adequately addressed. Jean Bubon, Town Planner submitted a memo on 11/16/06 stating that the changes do not need further site plan review. Her concerns are: no revised operation & maintenance plan for the new storm water structures. Additionally, the applicant has asked the Commission what they prefer for mitigation of clearing within the 25 and 50 foot buffer: 1) money contribution, 2) betterment project or 3) re-planting the 25/50 foot buffers.
- KK shows members the latest plans and photographs from July 2006.
- H.Blakeley states that they plan on removing the existing rip rap from the 25 buffer zone, moving the outlet pipe back to the 50 foot buffer, created a new discharge area and re-vegetated the swale.
- B.McClurg states that he is fine with leaving the riprap. DB states that he prefers to leave the riprap too, there is no reason to disturb the area.
- DM questions how much fill to be put in a detention basin, and H.Blakeley states they need to raise the basin to elevation 98.5 feet to let overspill
- B.McClurg states the ground water comes up to the 98 elevation, so the basin must be raised.
- DG questions if they have planting plans for remediation and KK states the applicant submitted 3 options. Members review the three options for remediation.
- EG states that he would be fine with allowing the area to revegetate naturally. FD agrees and states that boulders should be installed to denote the buffer zone.
- DM questions what the financial contribution would be. B. McClurg estimates about \$3000, that is what it would cost to revegetate the area.
- Members discuss the restoration. DM states that he too believes that stopping the mowing would allow the area to revegetate naturally and that would be a good thing.
- EG motions to approve the changes as submitted. Restoration should be to cease the mowing in the 50-foot buffer zone and boulders should be installed. FD seconds. All in favor: 5/0.
- M.Loin states that the maintenance of the stormwater is on the plan.
- Photographs were submitted by B.McClurg

Hearing closed and amended Order to be issued

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 10/19/06: DEP 300-695. 11 Library Lane, Septic System Repair/Replacement. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing F. Lyford and the property owners (Polk)

DB opens the Public Hearing at 9:00PM

Present: L. Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering

Discussion:

- KK states at the last hearing members requested the plans to be revised to show the erosion control relocation and minimizing tree clearing. Members also requested a letter from the Walker Pond Association acknowledging the tree clearing on property. Revised plans were submitted 10/24/06, letter has not been submitted. The Board of Health approved the project with conditions on 9/27/06.
- L.Jalbert distributes a letter from the Walker Pond Association stating that the Association is aware of the tree removal and that the trees should be replaced. L. Jalbert reviews the areas of the plans where the erosion controls were relocated
- KK reads from the letter and states that two, 3-gal pines are to be planted. She shows members the plans and points out the area of disturbance and where the trees will be planted.
- Members briefly discuss the tree removal. FD states that the tight tank is a much better option for the property.
- FD motions to approve the plans as presented with Special Conditions, DM seconds. All in favor: 5/0.

Hearing closed and approval Order of Conditions to be issued

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 10/19/06: DEP 300-697. Proposed Stoneleigh Woods at 6-8 Chase Road & parts of 9 Chase Road, 183 Charlton Road and 141 & 159 Fiske Hill Road. Waterman Design Associates, Inc. representing Blue & Gold Development Group, Inc.

DB opens the Public Hearing at 9:06PM

Present: W. Belec and P. Thompson from Waterman Design Associates

Discussion:

- KK states that since the last hearing the Applicant has submitted two sketches that revise the outlets of Detention Basin 3 and 4. The splash pads and limit of tree clearing have been relocated outside of the 25-foot buffer. Project has received Site Plan approval from the Planning Board. KK states that she believes the project can be conditioned to protect the wetlands. KK comments that Waterman Design Associates response to her and the Commission's concerns have been done in a timely fashion.
- W.Belec reviews the changes with the Commission members. Previously there was approximately 910 square feet of disturbance within the 25-foot buffer zone at Detention Basin 3A, now there is none. Also, there was approximately 1000 square feet in the 25-foot buffer at Detention Basin 4A, now there is none. The revised sketches have completely eliminated all disturbance from the 25-foot buffer zone. EG states that he is content with the revised sketches. There was no reason to be in the 25-foot buffer.
- DB questions if members have any additional comments, no response. KK states that the Order of Conditions will be lengthy and detailed. She states that she can draft the Order and

FINAL Approved 1/4/07

pull conditions right off the approved documents. KK states that an erosion control monitor will be needed during heavy earth work. Members agree.

- FD motions to approve the plans as presented with Special conditions, DM seconds. All in favor: 5/0.
- W. Belec offers to review the draft order of conditions. KK agrees that would be a good idea, especially the list of approved plans & documents. DB agrees that review of the draft Order is a good idea.
- KK requests consent to issue the Order in more than 21 days from the close of the hearing to allow ample review. W. Belec gives consent.

Hearing closed. Approval Order of Conditions to be issued. Consent to issue the order in more than 21 days is granted.

PUBLIC HEARING

RDA CONTINUED from 10/19/06. SCC 06-15 for 165 Charlton Road, wetland and stream determination. Alton Engineering representing Bill Babineau.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE AND SITE WALK.

KK reads request--Members approve continuance for December 21, 2006 at 8:10PM pending site walk.

9:21PM OTHER BUSINESS

- Minute approval: DB motions to approve the 10/5/06 and 10/19/06 minutes as written and reviewed. DM seconds. All in favor: 5/0.
- KK informs members that she will be attending a Smart Growth Conference on 12/4/06
- DB requests the status of the Leadmine Lane FCP. KK states that the State Forester is working with the property owner for alternatives for the stream crossing. The State Forester does not believe that logging trucks should cross the culvert in Leadmine Lane either.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 10/19/06: DEP 300-719 for 400/420 Route 15 Culvert Repair. Bertin Engineering Associates representing Pilot Travel Centers LLC

DB opens the Public Hearing at 9:24PM.

Present: M. Loin, Bertin Engineering
CJ Wright, Pilot (Construction manager)
C. Harris, Pilot (Store manager)

Discussion:

- KK states since the last hearing, proper abutter notification and legal ad information were submitted. On site meeting with herself, Greg Morse, Pilot Regional Director, Store Manager and M. Loin was held on 11/15/06. Items discussed were continuing the cleaning and

maintenance of the culverts, correcting erosion problems and maintenance of the catch basins on site. KK recommends that Bertin Engineering goes over the status of the culvert cleanout and maintenance procedures.

- M.Loin states he submitted a document that included a timeline of the culvert clean out and the monitoring. He shows the members photographs of the new culvert and the left over gravel within the new pipes. He strongly believes that the old pipe remaining is in good condition. The gravel that exists in the stream bed is from the installation of the new pipes.
- M. Loin states that at this point, the best thing would be to flush the pipes. He recommends a second silt boom, a small pump and a fire hose to flush the pipe. CJ Wright states he would like to flush the pipe so that no other damage can occur. M. Loin states that the water from the pond will be pumped and used for the flush.
- DG questions if flushing of pipes have ever been done before and CJ Wright states yes.
- DM states he would like to see a gage at the pipe outlet to monitor the sediment once the culverts are flushed. M.Loin states that he thinks that is a good idea too, that way you know if there is a problem. The gage could be placed right at the end of the pipe.
- CJ Wright states that Pilot will dedicate one person to clean up the site and do preventative maintenance. He apologizes for the lack of communication from Pilot so far.
- DB questions what happened to the 6 to 8 yards of gravel already removed and M.Loin states it was hauled off site
- DM states that he has no problem with the flushing, but really wants to see a gage installed to monitor the sediment. Members agree and discuss what type of gage. DM states that the Store Manager could monitor the gage and submit the reports to the Commission--it would take minimal effort. CJ Wright agrees.
- KK states that the Regional Director, Rob Thorsen is aware of the other erosion issues on property--at the pond outlet etc. She states that the Order will need to have special conditions relating to the additional work to needed to fix the damaged areas as discussed on the site walk. Members agree. FD states that Pilot is responsible for making sure the property is in good condition and that the wetlands are protected.
- DM states that M. Loin should notify KK of the flush out. M. Loin states that they are in no rush, the booms are in place. DM motions to issue an Order of Conditions allowing the flush out and monitoring. Special Conditions are to be added to address the other issues, FD seconds. All in favor: 5/0.
- CJ Wright states he is not opposed of putting a chain linked fence to keep the public away from the area of the existing pipe for safety reasons.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-723. Proposed house addition at 32 Hamilton Road. Heritage Design Group representing L. Conley

DB opens the Public Hearing at 9:54PM.

Present: A. Gaudette, Heritage Design Group

Information Submitted: Green Cards and Newspaper Ad to open the hearing

Discussion:

- KK states this is the first hearing on the project. Project consists of paving an existing gravel

driveway within the 25-ft buffer zone and a new garage within the 50-ft buffer zone. Property appears to be relatively flat by the photographs submitted with the NOI. Members review the plans.

- A. Gaudette goes over the plan with the members and gives a brief summary of the property: about 4 acres in size, there is an existing shed and deck, private well, and the septic system is located to the east of the house. The house was built in 1992 and it is located about 29 feet from the wetland and the shed is about 12 feet from the wetland. The property owners would like to add on a garage and small addition. The driveway cannot go on the east side of the house due to the septic system.
- A. Gaudette states that the garage and addition is located outside of the 50-foot buffer zone but the driveway is within the 50-foot buffer zone in an area of lawn. They would like to pave the driveway, however stay in the same footprint of the existing dirt driveway. A 3 inch stone swale is proposed at the edge of the driveway to protect the wetlands, slow down the runoff and collect any solids. A. Gaudette states that paving the driveway would be an improvement, the dirt driveway is not stable.
- FD questions if it is possible to use pervious pavers and A. Gaudette states he can discuss it with home owner.
- DG states water will end up in wetland if you pave the driveway and A. Gaudette states it is designed with a berm to capture the water.
- DM states that he has a concern with converting lawn to impervious area
- FD states the house is in a good location but his only concern is paving the driveway in the 25-foot buffer, he would suggest using the pavers to minimize impacts.
- DB states that one of the commission's main concerns is to prevent run off into the wetlands. This project includes work in the 25 and 50-foot local buffer zones.
- EG states he wants to go out on a site walk.
- Members agree that a site walk is necessary and request that the four corners of house and edge of work on the driveway side to be marked.

Hearing continued to December 21, 2006 at 8:25PM pending site walk. Applicant agrees

10:17PM OTHER BUSINESS

1) Discussion of 18 Cedar Lake Drive ENFORCEMENT ORDER

- L. Jalbert of Jalbert Engineering present for discussion
- KK states no new Information has been submitted yet. Jalbert Engineering has been contracted to file the NOI. Commission requested a NOI to be filed or something in writing by an Engineer by today 11/16/06 in order to avoid fines.
- L. Jalbert shows members the draft plans of the property from the recent survey and reads letter to SCC. He states that the NOI will be filed by 11/22/06, and he is requesting the Commission to allow putting in concrete block foundation now prior to the NOI approval. L. Jalbert states that no additional earth disturbance will be done with the closure of the basement. There is a slab already in place and with the winter weather coming, the owner wishes to close the building.
- L. Jalbert states that concrete blocks will be used to enclose the basement. KK states that the Building Inspector issued an Enforcement Order because the foundation/basement work was done without a permit. L. Jalbert states that the additional work will be reviewed in the NOI.

FINAL Approved 1/4/07

- EG questions where is the septic and L.Jalbert states there is an under ground connection to the town sewer.
- DB states that he has a problem with allowing certain tasks to be done without a permit. The property is in violation and he thinks the Commission should not allow anything. DM disagrees and states that the owner should be allowed to close the basement if there is no excavation. DM questions if the basement footprint has expanded, L. Jalbert states no.
- EG states that the property should be cleaned up first. The debris and soil piles should be removed before allowing anything. There should be no backfilling or excavation allowed. Members agree to allow the closing of the basement as long as there is no excavation. All other project components will be addressed in the NOI process. KK reminds L. Jalbert that the NOI must go to Natural Heritage.
- DM states that the NOI should be filed as stated, by 11/22/06
- DM motions to accept the request of closing of the foundation only once an NOI is filed by November 22, 2006 as long as there is no earth work. Present construction debris to be taken off site, additional hay bales are to be installed immediately, EG seconds. All in favor: 5/0. DB states that the hay bales should be done by Saturday for a site visit
- DB states that if the NOI is not filed by 11/22/06 then fines will start. Members agree.

DM leaves meeting at 10:40PM

2) Discussion of Revised Plans submitted for 101 Cricket Drive, DEP 300-646

- E. Paquette and L. Jalbert present for discussion
- KK states prior to approving the changes, members wanted to visit the property. She visited the property yesterday: house and garage are already constructed. The property had a lot of trash and debris. She contacted E. Paquette to clean the property. The plans showing the revisions include changing the location of the driveway and grading. She shows members the plans and photographs.
- E.Paquette states the proposed retaining wall will be eliminated; a drain in the driveway will stay
- KK states that E.Paquette cleaned up the debris today.
- E.Paquette states the house is the same footprint. The length and width are the same. They are changing the location of the driveway because they are changing the garage.
- EG motions to accept the change with letter approval, FD seconds. All in favor; 4/0.
- Discussion continues of the removal of the retaining wall, grading the slope and putting in a lawn.
- KK states that revised plans should be submitted showing the changes and eliminate the old data. Members agree. KK states that the revised plans need to be submitted to the DEP and she will write the letter once the revised plans are submitted.

3) Discussion of Rom's Lots 2 and 3 off Farquhar Road (SCC 05-29 and 05-30)

- KK states the applicant is requesting to revise the clearing limits by approximately 15-feet. Both lots have a negative determination. She has no issues with approving the changes. She shows members the plans and states that the builder has been cooperative with Conservation.
- Members discuss the removal of additional trees. KK states that it is outside the 100-ft buffer
- DB states he does not see a problem.
- EG motions to approve the additional clearing with a letter, FD seconds. All in favor; 3/1 (DG opposes)

4) Discussion of DPW Agreement for McGilpin Road work.

- KK states she wants to discuss the agreement that was submitted to the members for review. She states that the members should vote to accept and send to Greg Morse.
- DB states he has no problem.
- KK reads members comments from emails.
- Members discuss the area of which the widening of the road will be. EG recommends that KK looks at the areas to be widened
- EG motions to approve letter as written, DG seconds. All in favor; 4/0.

11:05PM - Meeting adjourned