

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes for Thursday, February 15, 2007

7:10 PM: Open Meeting

Members present: David Barnicle (DB) Chairman, Donna Grehl (DG), Ed Goodwin (EG), and Frank Damiano (FD) at 7:25PM

Kelly Kippenberger (KK), Conservation Agent

7:11 PM: CPA and Zoning Study Committee Updates

- EG gives the CPA update, the Committee is looking at two parcels for Habitat for Humanity. He received the topo maps and it looks like the parcels may be wet. The Committee will have to do a site visit.
- DG gives the Zoning Study Committee update, she needs a map showing the Biocore and Zoning overlay.

7:14 PM: Approval of 1/18/07 Minutes

DB states that he has read the minutes in depth and there are no major edits. DG states that she has not reviewed the minutes, EG states that he has. DB recommends holding off on voting to approve the minutes until FD arrives.

7:15 PM: Walk In

1) M. Noyes for tree removal at 26 Tantasqua Shore Road

- No one present for discussion.
- KK states that the property owner submitted a letter request for tree removal on 2/7/07 and proposes to plant shrubs and ferns. Her letter request included photos.
- DB states that Commission members should do a site visit

2) Residents present for observing (see sign in sheet).

- T. Kinlok present, new Town resident at 98 Paradise Lane.
- B. Curboy lives at 2 Cedar Lake Drive present for discussion of Westwood Drive. KK states that the public hearing starts at 8:20pm and the members cannot discuss the project until then.
- B. Curboy questions the letter for 19 Arnold Road violation. He states that it is his son's residence. DB recalls visiting the property and meeting the son. Discussion of the violations noted. KK states that she sent letter to the owners of 19, 29 and 31 Arnold Road and did not hear from 19 Arnold Road. B. Curboy states that the boat has been moved away from the stream, he also states that he is storing some pipes there—not to be used on property. The stream crossing has been in place for 4 years. DB states that rip-rap needs to be added to the stream crossing so it does not erode into the stream. DB states that the owners need to come in and talk to the Commission. (FD enters meeting)

3) Extension Request: DEP 300-506. Turner Lane Subdivision

- K. Rabbitt present for discussion
- DG requests to ask a question regarding Draper Woods prior to discussing Turner Lane. DG questions what is the tar ring around the catch basins in Phase I. K. Rabbitt states that it is a "winter donut" and the purpose is to push the water into the catch basin. It is not a permanent device, only seasonal. DB questions if there are still silt sacks in the catch basins and K. Rabbitt answers yes. DG states that she is glad that the donut berms are not permanent. DB questions the material of the donut berm and K. Rabbitt answers binder material.

- K. Rabbitt states that he is present to discuss Turner Lane and request a 1-year Extension to the Order. He states that he reviewed the Order of Conditions as recommended by the Agent, KK. Homes are built on lots 4 and 6 and all other lots have been blasted. Catch basins and berms are in and there is no erosion of any type. He states that he is hoping that home sales will increase prior to start building the remaining houses.
- K. Rabbitt states that the swales on lots 1 and 2 are not complete and they need to finalize where the driveway will be. The swale work should be done this year. KK states that she believes the swale area was to be replication for a stream bank.
- K. Rabbitt states that the cul-de-sac has been planted with the plants suggested by M. Marcus. EG questions where the stockpiles are in the subdivision. K. Rabbitt answers that the loam pile is on lot 7.
- EG questions if there are any time constraints in the Order of Conditions for completion. KK states that she does not believe so, but it is a strange project where Turner Lane is only a portion of the large project called Whittermore Woods. She states that the Commission denied Whittermore Woods. DG states that she has no idea about the project and was not on the Board at the time of the permitting.
- KK states that there are two DEP File Numbers involved; she is a little confused with how the permitting process occurred. Members recall that only a portion of the project (Turner Lane) was approved.
- EG motions to allow a 1-year extension, DG seconds the motion. Discussion of the motion: KK suggests that the Commission require that the Applicant sit down with her to go over the Order of Conditions one by one and get a true status report of the Order.
- DB includes that he would be in favor of a 3-month extension. Houses were built uphill of the project (Fox Run) and there is a serious amount of water coming down the hill into the Turner Lane area. He would like to look at the project site. DB also adds that the stormwater calculations for Turner Lane may be different since now a lot of water is coming down the hill. EG agrees that the Commission should look at the site.
- Members discuss the difference of issuing a 3-month extension or a 1-year extension. KK states that the Extensions are recorded on the deed. FD questions if Extensions can have conditions. KK states that Extensions can have conditions, and if the permit expires the project could be in violation. However a 3-month extension may not be convenient. By the time the Board signs and issues the Extension, and by the time it is recorded, the Applicant may be back in front of the Commission requesting another Extension since you have to request an Extension at least 30 days prior to expiration.
- K. Rabbitt suggests a 1-year extension and he will walk the site with the Commission prior to April to re-evaluate the project (condition on the Extension).
- FD states that he does not have a problem with giving a 1 year Extension as long as the Commission visits the site. DB agrees, but it is important the Commission visits the site and that the Agent reviews the Order with the Applicant.
- KK reminds the Board that a motion is on the floor and it has been seconded. EG requests to amend his motion of issuing a 1-year Extension to include conditions: Applicant meet with Agent to review conditions prior to April 15 and Conservation members to meet on site in April (after Agent meeting) to determine if the project is in compliance and to look at the hydrology of the property. All in favor: 3/0/1 DG abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 1/18/07: DEP 300-724 for Septic system repair/upgrade and stormwater reroute at 31 Bennetts Road. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing J. Dulka

At 7:40PM, KK states that the representative submitted a request for continuance. (KK reads request received 2/12/07 from Jalbert Engineering and a Memo from the Board of Health dated 2/1/07) Members agree to continue the hearing to 3/15/07 at 7:45PM

7: 42PM Other Business

1. 1/18/07 Minute Approval (Reconvened)

FD states that he reviewed the minutes. EG motions to approve the 1/18/07 minutes as reviewed. FD seconds and all in favor: 3/1 (DG abstained)

2. Discussion of Outdoor Wood Burning Boiler Regulations drafted by the Board of Health.

KK states that the Regulations require a permit from the Board of Health, Building Department and the Conservation Commission. Members discuss a wood burner and the problems with smoke. Members decide that they support the Wood Burning Regulations and think it is a good idea.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 1/18/07: DEP 300-720 for proposed 5-Lot Subdivision at 12 & 30 Farquhar Road. Bertin Engineering Associates, Inc. representing The Spaho Corp.

DB opens the public hearing at 7:50pm

Present: H.Blakeley from Bertin Engineering, Inc.
Abutters

Discussion:

- KK states that at the last hearing, Commission members agreed to want the open space and a Memo went to the Town Administrator on 1/30/07 (Bertin Engineering was copied on the Memo). Last hearing, members starting reviewing different aspects of the project and what are left to review are the mitigation, stormwater system, individual lots, grading and layout.
- KK states that on 2/13/07, a second existing condition plan was submitted per the Tree Warden's request. It shows all the trees within the roadway alignment. Other revised plans submitted include the landscaping plan and detail sheet. On 2/15/07, an open space draft document and a conservation easement document were submitted for review. I recommend that the Commission receives a project presentation and continues the meeting to allow review of the recently submitted documents.
- H. Blakeley reviews the plan showing all trees within the cul-de-sac alignment. All trees over 6-inch DBH are shown, the trees shown in bold are to be removed and the light colored trees to stay.
- H. Blakeley states that the tree removal plan is part of the subdivision regulations. H. Blakeley goes over the revised Landscaping plan and notes that she had a meeting with the Tree Warden and the Town Planner to discuss areas within the 50-foot right-of-way to save trees—on Lots 1, 4 and 5. On Lots 2 and 3 additional trees were added and as a result of the meeting, they will be revising the number of trees. The road to the detention basin will have more trees (sugar maples) per the request of the tree warden. EG questions the meeting with the tree warden and the Town Planner. KK states that it was an informational review of the project with Town staff.
- KK recommends a presentation of the project and outstanding topics to the Commission

- DG requests to talk about tree removal. H. Blakeley states that approximately 189 trees within the roadway will be removed.
- H. Blakeley begins to discuss the mitigation portion of the project: stone placement and plantings at area of detention basin outlet and other swale areas. The stone placement will be habitat mitigation. Wet seed mix in detention basin, a moist seed mix on the basin side slopes and a dry mix on the outer rim of the basin. On the steep slope behind Lots 2 and 3 there will be an erosion control blanket with plantings--ferns, pines and mount laurel.
- KK requests that H. Blakeley describes why mitigation is proposed in the project. H. Blakeley discusses the re-routing of the storm water from Farquhar Road. The stormwater will be entering the stormwater system to be cleaned and then discharge to the wetland. EG questions the draining area
- FD questions the runoff from detention basin service road. H. Blakeley states that it was part of the original calculations
- Discussion of the swale and drain on Lot 3. DG questions who will maintain the drainage.
- EG questions how channeling the water off Farquhar Road is in our favor. FD comments that it is really rerouting the water that ends up in the wetland. KK adds that the water will enter the stormwater system and then be discharged to the wetland that it would eventually meander to. KK adds that the water coming off Farquhar Road dissipates through the woods, and then in some areas there is evidence of erosion and scouring.
- DB comments that there is a lot of cutting and filling. How can the project be engineered to fit the natural topography of the land
- H. Blakeley states that there are regulations for the road to be certain pitches. She would like to drop the elevation of the road (less fill) but then the project would not meet current subdivision control regulations.
- H. Blakeley states that the project does not include any work in the 25ft buffer zone. She believes that it would be a better feature to hand place stones in the 25 ft buffer at the detention basin outlet, but wanted to run it by the Commission. DG questions, what if no stones area added and H. Blakeley states that there would be sheet flow. DB states that stones in the 25-foot buffer is a minor issue that the Commission can review later.
- EG questions the conservation easement. H. Blakeley states that there is no easement, 13+ acres of Open Space and then Lots 4 and 5 have Conservation Restrictions. The conservation restriction wording is the legal template form the EOE. KK states that the Commission members have the documents to review.
- DB requests to move on the grading per Lot. H. Blakeley reviews the Lot 1 plan and states that Lot 1 is relatively flat there is some grading in the rear of the Lot. All grading is outside of the 50-foot buffer zone and grades vary from a 2:1 slope to a 3:1 slope on Lots 2 and 3. There is a lot of cut on Lot 4, the material on Lot 4 will be used on the other lots.
- FD states that he has a problem with building in the 100-ft buffer zone when there is land outside of the buffer. He questions the other members, what is more of the problem, building close to the wetlands or seriously alternating the landscape. FD questions if 4 houses could be done instead of 5. H. Blakeley answers that is not possible; there would be a lawsuit. The project was originally 21 condo units. H. Blakeley also states that the cul-de-sac is the reason for the fill, so 4 lots would not make a difference.
- KK questions if Lots 2 and 3 were one lot, would there be a difference. H. Blakeley states that that would still require the same amount of grading.
- H. Blakeley states that the septic system plans have been submitted to the Board of Health, the Board of Health put a condition on the project that the septic systems are installed but also that piping is installed to be connected in the future (once the moratorium is lifted). H. Blakeley states that once town sewer is made available, the property owners must connect. She also states that

installation of the sewer line is not causing impact to the wetland. If the individual septic systems are removed from project, then there would be less of an impact and less grading.

- KK questions if the sewer permit from the condo project could be taken into account. H. Blakeley states no and that the sewer permit was withdrawn. EG states that the sewer would have had to been looped. EG questions the length of cul-de-sac. H. Blakeley states 500 linear feet
- FD questions town water or well and H. Blakeley answers town water. DG questions if any alternative septic systems were looked into.
- Members review each lot: For Lot 1, grading is outside the 50 ft buffer zone.
- H. Blakeley states that part of mitigation is to recreate stonewalls. KK states that all mitigation should be on the individual lot plans, especially for the homeowner's sake and enforcement. H. Blakeley believes it can be done.
- H. Blakeley states that a majority of the work on Lots 4 & 5 is located outside of 200 ft buffer zone.
- DB states that the Board needs to talk about open space. They need time to review the documents submitted and the meeting should be continued.
- DB questions if any abutters have any questions. T. Kinlok (town resident) questions what is on the property now. DB states that the first part of the cul-de-sac has a house on either side but the majority of the property is undisturbed woods.
- DB asks members for comments on the project prior to next meeting.
- EG comments that he is concerned with the drainage off the street, it should be considered a resource area and that labeling the area was dropped off the plan at some point during the condo project (area previously labeled swale). He does not believe that the water will be cleaned; it will be a reverse in water quality.
- FD states that this area come up during the Rom single-family house lot project, it is a very important point. At the time of Rom's, the Commission agreed that it was a drainage area, but if it is a resource area now, then it should be dealt with. EG states that he is concerned that it will be channelized and piped.
- DG and FD have no concerns at this time.
- DB states that he doesn't think the project is doing anything for the migration patterns of wildlife with the long driveways. He is concerned with the wildlife movement.

Hearing continued to 3/15/07 at 8:00PM pending additional information and review of the Open Space documents. Applicant agrees.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-731: Proposed Single Family House at 70 Westwood Drive. Green Hill Engineering representing Scott Simpson. This NOI replaces DEP File No. 300-672.

DB opens the public hearing at 8:40PM

Present: M. Farrell from Green Hill Engineering, Inc.

New Property Owners (Simpson)

Abutters

Submitted: Newspaper ad to open the hearing (certified mail receipts submitted with filing)

Discussion:

- KK states that this is the first Hearing on the project and that the NOI replaces DEP File No. 300-672. Project includes a single-family house and septic system. Board of Selectman wrote a letter (received 2/6/07) that informed the new property owner that the property has an approval for a

sewer tie-in. In comparison to the plan previously presented to the Commission by the previous property owner, the house is larger and closer to the Lake than originally. Her concerns include moving the house closer to the roadway, thus creating less disturbance. It appears that there are alternatives that exist to the layout of the lot that would result in much less disturbance. The NOI did include an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan which is in the member's boxes for review

- M. Farrell states that if sewer is available then the owner cannot put in private system. FD questions if there is town water or a private well. M. Farrell states a private well.
- DG states that if there is not going to be a private septic, then there is a lot less filling and cutting
- M. Farrell states that the goal is to take advantage of the property and that the new owner wants to live near the water. The project minimizing the lot disturbance, and he believes that the design is an environmentally friendly manner.
- EG questions if M. Farrell came here tonight not knowing about the allowed sewer hook up. M. Farrell answers that he found out about it on Monday. Also, the Board of Health denied the private system based off the Board of Selectman letter.
- EG states that there should be an automatic continuance to re-do the plan. M. Farrell states that regardless of the sewer, he would still like to put the house in that area. M. Farrell states that the owners would like to have lake access. If the house is pushed back, the owners could not see the lake. M. Farrell states that the house has been designed built into the topography.
- EG states that there is a new plan coming so the Board should not review the plan that is not true. M. Farrell states that nothing will really change on the plan since they want to keep the house where it is shown.
- KK questions if the clearing limits will change if no private system. M. Farrell states that the owners would like grass in the area of the septic, so the clearing limits will not change.
- Members agree that the plan reviewed previously (NOI withdrawn) was much less disturbance.
- M. Farrell states that the earthwork is about 470 cubic yards of material to be removed. M. Farrell states that there will be walkouts on both sides of the house and that the deck is at the 50ft buffer zone.
- DG questions what will change with the revised plans. M. Farrell states that he could relocate the well if town sewer. He believes that the project design is a reasonable approach for a lake front lot. The owners should be able to use the Lake, it is a recreational body of water.
- Simpson (owner) states that they have two children and purchased the lot for the water access. The house is in a good location to watch the children in the water. FD states that he understands why they purchased the lot, however it cannot influence the Commission's decision.
- FD states that the Commission needs to find a balance for the owners and protecting the Lake, the house could easily be located outside of the 100 ft buffer zone.
- M. Farrell states that he built the house next door 4 to 5 years ago that had a similar situation. It was developed successfully with a 25-foot undisturbed buffer and the house was set back about 50 to 60 feet from lake. Members inform M. Farrell that they are here to review the current project.
- FD questions the 8% slope regulation; the wetland set backs should start from the top of the slope.
- M. Farrell states that everything will stay in tact on the steep slope. There will be a flat pad of gravel and the house will be built into the hill and minimize the cut and the fill. M. Farrell states that the garage and driveway is outside of the 100 ft buffer.
- DB states that this plan has more disturbance and more work in the buffer zone. M. Farrell states that the stormwater will be clean and infiltrated.
- FD states that in an attempt to balance the need for the development, what about mitigation. He states that the house can be built on the lot with less impact and building the house at the 50-foot buffer may have an impact. FD suggests that the Applicant provide a better buffer for the 50-foot zone

- KK questions the notations on the plan for the 50-foot buffer zone, selective pruning. Will the root systems be removed? M. Farrell states no, that the owners want a view of the water
- DG questions what type of path down to the water. KK states that vegetation clearing will most likely be needed for a path. M. Farrell agrees and states that most likely take down mountain laurel for the path. M. Farrell states that anyone who lives on the lake wants to have the house close to the lake and have access to it.
- FD questions what about longer down the road, what prevents the home owner from clearing
- DB states that the Applicant needs to check the town bylaw for the slope provision and that the Commission needs more time for review
- EG states that the house location should be staked on the property.
- DB states that the 8% slope needs to be evaluated (M. Farrell draws on the plan where the 8% slope is approximately—middle of the house).
- M. Farrell states that he is trying to design the project in an environmental friendly way. The house will be integrated into the land and the cut and fill is minimized. There is reasonable access to the lake and the project strikes a good balance. EG states that the project needs to be consistent with the bylaws. FD states that the Board needs to establish if the 8% slope regulation applies to this project. All members agree that the slope regulation applies.
- DG states that the Lake has hardly any undisturbed land left around it and that the purpose of the lake is not only for recreation. M. Farrell states that Cedar Lake is a result of being dammed. DG states that it is still a resource that needs protection, people have lawns and people cut trees all around the lake and alter the hydrology, which impacts the water quality.
- FD states that the slope regulations need to be considered and there should be some type of mitigation. KK reads from local wetland bylaw regulations (Section 6.1).
- DB questions if any abutters are present. C. Moran (Cedar Lake Assoc) states that the residents were concerned with the private sewer and if there is public sewer tie in then that is a good thing. He questions if the Board would consider allowing payment for the weed treatment to be mitigation. FD the board could vote on it but that will not protect the Lake. KK reminds FD about control of invasive weeds. KK informs the abutters the purpose of the mitigation that FD is speaking about, it would be mitigation for the loss of vegetation and trees, really has nothing to do with the weed treatment.
- B. Curboy states that the property owners want to see the kids play in the water, how will that be done?
- S. Halterman (member of the Board of Selectman and abutter) states that the Board of Selectman authorized and required the hook up of the sewer for this lot. The previous plan that was being reviewed by the Town put the Conservation Commission in a bad spot, meaning that if a private septic system was only allowed then the house had to be closer to the Lake. Therefore, the Selectman allowed a sewer tie-in (even with the monitorium in place) to take away the position of locating the house close to the Lake. The sewer connection was allowed with the intention that the house would be moved closer to the road.
- N. Allen (abutter) would like to make sure that the new project doesn't ruin the lake. The soil is sandy and there is a ridge with bony gravel. His concern with the proposal is when the land is opened up and trees are gone, where will the runoff go. He states that there is a great possibility to see the lake, but to be located over the ridge (steep slope) may cause problems.
- DB confirms that the erosion and sediment control plan contains soil information and the lot is located in an area of Merrimack sandy loam soil type.
- M. Farrell states that the run off will be directed towards Westwood drive and will be funneled down to the road. The runoff of the house will be captured and infiltrated into the ground.
- M. Farrell requests a continuance.

Hearing continued to 3/15/07 at 8:40PM. Revised project plans to be submitted along with a re-evaluation of the Slope Regulation Section 6.1

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-733: Proposed septic system at 258 New Boston Road. Green Hill Engineering representing Joseph Jolin.

DB opens the public hearing at 9:25PM (at time of meeting, no DEP File Number issued)

Present: M. Farrell from Green Hill Engineering, Inc

Submitted: Newspaper ad to open the hearing (certified mail receipts submitted with filing)

Discussion:

- KK states that this is the first hearing and unfortunately, the Board cannot close the hearing since DEP has not issued a file number and comments (received 2/20/07). KK visited property on 2/13/07 and shows the members the photos. KK states that she has no big issues with the septic system repair but wanted to note a couple of things for the board: the area of the new system is already cleared, there is a long trench associated with the connection to the system and the property is very close the Natural Heritage but not in the mapped area.
- DG questions why do they need a new system? M. Farrell states that the existing system is draining slow and it has not been inspected. He states that the leach field is from the late 1950s and he is not sure what is there.
- M. Farrell states that the property is an area of high water table and that is why the system is proposed in the back
- DB questions why is the area already cleared. M. Farrell states that the property owner wanted to get a jump on things, it was an area of some pine trees
- Members have no other questions.
- KK states that the board cannot vote on the project until DEP has provided comments.
- M. Farrell states that he cannot be present at the next hearing, DB states that is fine. As long as the DEP has no major comments, the hearing should close.

Hearing continued to 3/1/07 at 7:20PM pending DEP comments

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-729: Proposed single-family house and lot reconfiguration at 116, 118 and 120 Brookfield Road. Bertin Engineering representing Cambridge Properties LLC. (2/1/07 Hearing Continued, not advertised correctly)

DB opens the public hearing at 9:34PM

Present: H. Blakeley from Bertin Engineering

Discussion:

- KK states that this is the first Hearing on the project. The first date of the hearing was not advertised correctly; therefore discussion did not take place. Abutter notification and legal ad was previously submitted on 2/1/07.
- KK states that since NOI submittal, revised plans have been submitted showing sewer connection instead of private system. This NOI includes the re-figuring of lots through an ANR and a new house. There is Natural Heritage across the street and an intermittent stream located on the adjacent property. KK recommends a site visit.

- DG questions the runoff entering the roadway
- EG states that the Commission should take a look at it
- FD questions why the project is three lots. H. Blakeley briefs the members of the ANR.
- DB states that he is against taking water from site and putting it into Route 148 drainage.
- DG agrees that the runoff from driveway needs to be dealt with.
- H. Blakeley states that the driveway will be impervious and they are treating roof runoff
- DB states that a gravel perimeter drain around the house may be a good idea.
- EG states that the real issue is to not allow the water to come off site. Could pave driveway but have collection for the water.
- Members agree that a site walk is needed.

Hearing continued to 3/1/07 at 8:50PM. Applicant representative agrees

9:40 PM OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion of Citizen Leadership Academy: M. Blanchard (resident) questions the Leadership Academy. KK states that the Conservation Commission (herself and DB as Chair) will be doing a 30-minute presentation to those signed up on 3/28/07. It is a joint presentation with Zoning and Planning.
2. Discussion of DEP Superceding Order DEP 300-698 for 118 Clarke Road:
 - E. Neal present representing the Howertons. KK states that she forwarded the members copies of DEP Superceding Order. The Commission has the option of appealing the DEP decision if filed within 10 business days.
 - DB questions if any members want to make a motion to appeal DEP's decision. No members wish to appeal the Superceding Order. It is a consensus of the board to not appeal.
 - KK states that DEP Superceding Order includes 2:1 replication. KK states that after speaking with the DEP, the DEP representative can understand why the Commission denied the project, based off the project history. However, the project and wetland alteration is clearly within the WPA regulations. DEP believes that the Commission's mistake was not to review the alternative analysis submitted at the hearing.
 - DB states that as the chairman of the board, if information is submitted at a hearing, it will not be discussed that meeting. It is unacceptable to receive new information during a hearing. However, he believes that it may have been a mistake of the Commission to take a vote on a project when new information was submitted
 - KK states that the Applicant can continue with the superior court appeal to the bylaw, or can file a new NOI under bylaw only. E. Neal states that G. Pucci is representing the board (Town Counsel) and that he (E. Neal) most likely will file a motion for a summary judgment of the local bylaw verses the WPA since a Superceding Order was issued. The summary judgment would be faster and quicker than filing NOI. E. Neal also states that C. Rizy hired a lawyer, R. Ricker and he spoke with him tonight. FD informs E. Neal that according to recent correspondence from C. Rizy, he was unresponsive to C. Rizy's attorney. E. Neal states that he called him twice and he returned his calls, he recently sent C. Rizy's attorney a package—the driveway agreement is now down to \$15,000.

- EG states that the Commission just wanted a simpler solution other than filling more wetlands. E. Neal states that there was an ANR plan done in 2005 that approved the property adjustment. DB states that the Commission's only business now is the Superceding Order and enforcing it. FD states that he regrets upsetting C. Rzy, he is just trying to protect the wetlands.
3. Discussion of the Town Report:
 - DB questions if all members read the report drafted by KK with her input. DG states that she read the report and it was good. (EG exits meeting)
 - Members review the Town report and make minor edits.
 4. Discussion with new resident: T. Kinlok: questions about wetland regulations.
 5. Discussion of Walker Pond Road FCP:
 - DB states that he and KK walked the property. It is Chapter 61 property and has been logged before. The canopy is strong and there is not a lot of herbaceous vegetation. The goal of the FCP is to open the canopy. There is one stream crossing to be bridged and the logger is to stay close to the existing cart paths.
 - DB states that he reviewed the letter that KK wrote and believes that it is fine. FD motions to approve the FCP Letter, DG seconds. All in favor: 3/0
 6. Discussion of Jaguar Assoc. Host Hotel Event August 10-12 2007:
 - Members fine with the event. FD motions to issue a letter approval, DG seconds. All in favor: 3/0

Meeting adjourn at 10:43PM