

STURBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes for Thursday, April 19, 2007

7:03 PM: Open Meeting

Members present: Dave Barnicle (DB) Chairman, Donna Grehl (DG), Ed Goodwin (EG), Frank Damiano (FD) at 7:08PM, and Dave Mitchell (DM) at 8:17PM.
Laura Hunter for Minutes

Walk Ins

1) 246 Fiske Hill Road (DEP 300-677)

- C. Silvestri (abutter) states that the Fiske Hill project is in violation of all the conditions. He states there are no hay bales, which caused the water to run.
- EG states the culvert under construction is blocked. DB states that the Commission should do a site visit on Saturday morning.
- C. Silvestri states that the driveway should be ten-feet wide with two feet on each side for hay bales but the road seems much larger and a hill has been dug up three feet above the grades. (FD enters the meeting)
- Members discuss the on-going construction and if it is being done correctly. EG questions if “cheap” materials are being used. C. Silvestri responds that the client did not want to spend additional money.
- DB again states there will be a site visit Saturday. FD suggests Sunday.
- DB states they will go to the site with a tape measure and the plans.
- C. Silvestri states that the abutter A. Szumilas is concerned that the project will be completed with no recourse for the violations.
- EG states that there are erosion issues and water issues, the hay bales are under water.
- DB schedules the site visit for Sunday at 8:00AM.

2) Hamilton Road/MA Pike Washout

- C. Moran present for discussion.
- DB states there is paperwork to be signed for an emergency permit allowing the MA Turnpike Authority to remove soil from the detention basin off Hamilton Road (pooled area of stream).
- DG questions which detention area, DB answers and states that the sides of Hamilton Road are armored so they won't wash away.
- Board members sign the emergency permit.
- DB states that the work should not increase silt from entering Cedar Lake.
- DG states there is a beaver dam on the Cedar Lake side of the turnpike.
- C. Moran states there is water running along the MA Pike and washing away the shoulder exposing the guardrail posts.
- DB states the emergency permit is to clear out the area across from the Hamilton Rod and Gun Club.
- C. Moran states the blowout from the MA Pike ends up in Cedar Lake.
- DB states the permit will be sent to the DEP tomorrow (Friday).

3) 246 Fiske Hill Road: DEP 300-677 (continued)

- A. Szumilas present and request to review photographs with the Board. Photos show violations of the Order made from single-family house construction on corner of Fiske Hill Road and Rte. 20 including standing water, washout, and level of the road.
- DB states there will be a site visit on Sunday morning at 8AM.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 3/15/07: DEP 300-724 for septic system repair/upgrade and stormwater reroute at 31 Bennetts Road. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing J. Dulka

DB opens public hearing at 7:21 PM.

**Present: D. Roberts, Jalbert Engineering, Inc
E. Neal, Neal Law Office**

Discussion:

- D. Roberts reviews plans for the proposed septic system upgrade with the board.
- FD asks if there is a pump in the tight tank. D. Roberts responds yes and FD questions where the pump is pumping to. D. Roberts responds that nobody knows. The previous owners who had it installed have passed away.
- DB states tight tank was thought to not work and proof is needed that pump did work. DB also states Jalbert has invoices, which is not proof. D. Roberts states that pumping reports were submitted and that pumping the tank eight times constitutes a Title V failure. DB responds that the Commission has invoices on file, not pumping reports. D. Roberts responds that the invoices constitute pumping reports by the Board of Health and Title V.
- D. Roberts states the pump has been removed. E. Neal states the tight tank is being replaced by a septic system (proposal under Notice of Intent).
- D. Roberts states that the Board of Health has concerns that by removing the pump and sealing the tank may not function as a true "tight tank".
- E. Neal states that the Commission has yet to issue a Certificate of Compliance for the Order of Conditions for the house. EG questions if the plans have changed. E. Neal responds that the plans for the septic system show a circular driveway and that the Agent had concerns with tree removal and that the driveway was not originally circular. He adds that no more trees will be removed and that the "perc" tests done on property dictate that the driveway needs to be circular and located where it is.
- FD asks for a full explanation again of what the client is asking for. D. Roberts responds that when the original house was removed and the new house built there were issues with the driveway. He continues that the client would like to leave the driveway circular and in the current location.
- DG questions if the wet area is considered a natural drainage swale. D. Roberts responds that it is not a swale. DG states that before the house was built the property could have had a stream.
- FD asks the client what exactly they want from the Commission. D. Roberts responds that they are asking for a Certificate of Compliance on the house Order of Conditions, acknowledging that the driveway is circular. He states that the only deviation to the original plan was the length of the driveway.

- FD states at the site visit the driveway was circular. D. Roberts responds the plans are a representation of what is there now and that the stone driveway was a result of a cement truck sinking and getting stuck in the ground. He states gravel was added to provide a stable surface for the truck removal.
- EG states that at a previous hearing, the Commission asked that the wetland be delineated and that an investigation be conducted on the pumping into the lake. D. Roberts responds the wetlands have been delineated. EG asks if the delineation has been approved and D. Roberts responds yes.
- DB states there have been significant lies and falsehoods brought before the Commission; “pipes going nowhere, or somewhere, but nobody knows where”; a story about a contractor dilemma. He adds that when the driveway is corrected, then maybe the Certificate can be issued.
- DB asks if they are selling the house. E. Neal responds the house is sold. DB responds that they need a Certification to sell the house.
- FD states they will not get his vote and wants the driveway put back the way it is supposed to be.
- EG asks about the water running through the property and wants to know where the water was pumped.
- DB states he has confidence that Jalbert can come up with a solution. DG asks if mitigation can be done.
- D. Roberts asks if they can leave the driveway as it is and come up with mitigation elsewhere. EG states it would be okay to leave the driveway where it is and have mitigation elsewhere. DG adds they would need to include plantings.
- DB states the 25-foot buffer zone consists of lawn and that might be a good area for mitigation. EG adds that if the pipe is plugged, there will be no lawn.
- FD asks why the owners are requesting a new septic system. D. Roberts responds that Title V allows for a voluntary upgrade to the system. He continues that the plan is Title V and Board of Health compliant. It is pending Board of Health approval.
- EG states that the swale needs to be corrected and he is concerned with undocumented buried pipes. FD agrees.
- DB states that the Board cannot issue a Certificate of Compliance with the driveway located where it is unless there are significant upgrades made to the property. FD states the property upgrades need to benefit the lake.
- D. Roberts states there will be buffer plantings in the 25-foot buffer zone and a swale will be added to the pipe coming from the swale. DB states that it will have to be proven that the pipe is not the septic pipe. D. Roberts states that the pipe on the plans is an apparent septic pipe and now that tank is sealed there is nothing going to the pipe except groundwater, which is clean.
- E. Neal requests a continuance.
- D. Roberts states that sealing the existing tank is Title V maintenance.
- DB questions if the requested information is clear, D. Roberts responds yes, they need to know about the pipe and plantings to create a swale. DB states the board takes the same position as the state, “no net loss of wetlands”.

Hearing continued to May 3, 2007 at 9:10PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 2/1/07: DEP 300-678 for single family house and reclassification of a stream at 186 New Boston Road. Green Hill Engineering representing J. Boutiette.

DB opens hearing at 7:53PM

Present: M. Farrell, Green Hill Engineering

Discussion:

- M. Farrell states he is waiting for information from Natural Heritage and he is trying to avoid conducting a full habitat assessment study. He continues that Natural Heritage indicated the full assessment is the only way to have it done properly. M. Farrell states his client did not want to pay thousands of dollars for the full assessment.
- DB asks about the details of the stream crossing and when the evaluation would be done. M. Farrell responds that a full evaluation takes 3-4 months and then the information is sent to Natural Heritage. He also states there have been marble salamander and 4 toed salamander spotted.
- M. Farrell states the vernal pools have already been mapped.
- DB states he is willing to accept this information as “new information” and allow a continuance for a few months to allow for the assessment to be conducted.
- M. Farrell states he would like to continue to late August or early September. DB states he needs a firm date for a continuance. M. Farrell requests September.
- EG makes motion to continue to the second meeting in September. DB seconds motion. 4/0 all in favor of continuance.

Hearing continued to September 20, 2007 at 7:20PM. CORRECTION: 9/27/07 at 7:30PM

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 3/1/07: DEP 300-732 for proposed single family house and driveway wetland crossing at 130 Brookfield Road. Para Land Surveying, Inc. representing Rearick.

DB opens public hearing at 8:03PM.

Present: R. Para, Para Land Surveying, Inc.

Discussion:

- R. Para states in response to the Agent’s comments from the previous meeting that there is no need for a 401 Water Quality Certificate since the lot is not a subdivision of land. He continues that the wetland flags appear to be present from the site walk in early March. He does not agree with some of the wetland flag locations, a professional did the delineation. R. Para also states there are no vernal pools present.
- DB asks if there is any standing water. R. Para responds there is no standing water anywhere and is not sure if the Agent was able to visit the site.
- DB states they will schedule a site visit.
- R. Para reviews the plans with the board and indicates that on the slope; grass, trees, and high-bush blueberry plants was added to provide wildlife habitat.

- DB asks about waterflow from forest area and where the water is coming from. R. Para responds the surface water is going into a culvert and water may have been present from this past storm on Sunday. He states the sheetflow is from the next property over.
- DB asks if the old stable area is where the sheetflow is coming from. R. Para responds yes, sheetflow comes downhill.
- DB states he wants to make sure the wetland area won't dry up. R. Para responds the sheetflow is temporarily going across the proposed wetland replication area. Members question the existing hydrology. R. Para reviews the plans with the board and demonstrates how the water will flow to the replication area and into the wetland.
- DB states he is unclear on how the water will cross an impervious surface (driveway) and feed into the wetland area. FD states a pre-tension bridge could be built with multiple culverts.
- DG states a rip-rap swale could be put in place to move water to the wetland.
- EG questions the proposed pipe under the driveway and if it will maintain flow. R. Para responds that the pipe will be at grade and it will be easier to construct. EG states that smaller reinforced pipes could be used for the higher elevation on the driveway. R. Para responds that they could be used, but the point source could lead to erosion and that there is only one place where water would normally flow across.
- DG expresses her concerns about drainage and states Natural Heritage lands get a lot of water already. She continues that adding another lot with clearing will add to the water flow in this area.
- DB states the board is strict with applicants that there should be no net loss of wetland and requests the site be worked to ensure there will be no loss. R. Para responds that replication is 2:1, so there is no net loss, but a net gain.
- DB states that the 2:1 is a requirement and that they have to make sure that the replication area succeeds. R. Para states the water will flow across into the wetland.
- DB asks about the slope. R. Para responds the pitch is down 1% and then up to the road at 6.7%.
- DB states there will be a site visit on Sunday. (DM enters the meeting)
- EG asks if the road and house can be marked in the field and R. Para responds that it is already.
- DB schedules the site visit for Sunday at 9AM.
- R. Para requests a continuance.
- DB asks about Natural Heritage. R. Para responds there is an area 300 feet downstream with the mapped rare species. He reviews photos/maps with the board.
- DG states that because the mapped area is downstream from the property, everything will run to it.
- EG makes motion for continuance, DG seconds motion. 4/0 all in favor of continuance.

Hearing continued to May 3, 2007 at 9:30PM.

8:23PM Other Business

4/5/07 Minute Approval

Discussion of the meeting minutes of 4/5/07. DB states that he and DM provided comments to L. Hunter. DM makes a motion to approve the 4/5/07 minutes with the corrections. EG seconds the motion: 4/0/1 (FD abstained)

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 3/15/07: DEP300-731 for proposed single family house at 70 Westwood Drive. Green Hill Engineering representing Scott Simpson. This NOI replaces DEP File No. 300-672.

DB opens public hearing at 8:30PM

Present: M. Farrell, Green Hill Engineering

S. Simpson, Owner

Discussion:

- M. Farrell states that since the last meeting there have been concerns with the septic system. He states he spoke with J. Malloy and this property must be hooked up to town sewer according to a town bylaw.
- FD states that now this property will be hooked up to town sewer.
- M. Farrell states that there is an addition of “Nantucket Stairs: or “Gayhead Steps” to the lakefront.
- FD asks if the house has been moved back. M. Farrell responds no, the house is in the same place.
- M. Farrell submits plans of retaining wall and cross-section of house per the Agent’s request. He reviews these plans with the board and explains where the grade will be removed to create a plateau for the house.
- FD states the setback needs to start at the top of the slope and buffer zones may need to move. DB states that is a planning board issue.
- FD states it has to be applied to the house for construction, the proper buffer zones should be shown.
- DM states the plans address the request for a cross section but do not address the issue of decapitating a hill to build a house. M. Farrell states the property owner has rights to build the house. DM states selective clearing will offer a view of the lake.
- M. Farrell states the foundation is 10 feet away from the slope and the deck is 3-4 feet away. DM states this is not a change from the last plans.
- DB states there is no movement on either side about the placement of the house.
- EG would like the deck and the house marked for a site visit. M. Farrell states it is a reasonable request by the property owner to place the house where he has a view of the lake. DM states there is still lake access with the stairs and there will most likely be an addition of a dock.
- M. Farrell states if the house is moved back and the hill left, the hill will block the view of the lake. He continues that the house could be placed at the top of the hill, but by putting the house as planned fits into the existing topography.
- DB states that if the house is moved back towards the road there is less disturbance and which complies with the Wetland Protection Act. M. Farrell responds that the slope to the lake is undisturbed.

- DM states the hill creates a natural berm and if the top of the hill is removed there will be an impact on the lake.
- M. Farrell states the property owner wants to build the house where he wants on his property.
- FD states the house does not need to be on Westwood Drive, but the board asked for the house to be moved which was not done.
- EG reads from the Wetland Local Bylaws (8% Slope Provision: Chapter 6.1). M. Farrell states the bylaw was written with WalMart sized project is mind as a protection for resource areas.
- DM states a project does not have to be WalMart sized to have an impact on the lake. M. Farrell suggests there is no way to know how a single family house will adversely affect the lake. DM states that moving the house back will give more distance to affecting the lake with erodable soil. M. Farrell states that if the bylaw is followed, the house would need to be in the middle of Westwood Drive.
- DG states the bylaw does not need to be followed strictly as it is a guideline.
- FD states the house should be moved. M. Farrell requests some guidance from the board.
- DB states it is not the responsibility of the board to define or guide on where to build, they asked the house to be moved and it has not been moved.
- DM would also like to visit the site when it is marked.
- EG asks if the markings would be clear with the hill intact. M. Farrell responds it will be clear.
- DB states there will be a site visit on Sunday.
- M. Farrell asks for a continuance. EG makes motion for continuance, DG seconds motion. 5/0 in favor of continuance.

Hearing continued to May 17, 2007 at 7:30PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-735. Proposed property improvements at 102 Gladding Lane, related to DEP 300-505. Jalbert Engineering, Inc. representing G. Pelski.

DB opens public hearing at 8:55PM.

Present: D. Roberts, Jalbert Engineering, Inc.

Submitted: Newspaper ad/abutter cards to open the hearing and a check and letter

Discussion:

- DB reads the Agent's comments regarding new NOI.
- D. Roberts states the stairs were not shown on the approved plan, and a door was built there.
- EG asks if stairs are on the plan now. DM states that even if there is a door shown on the plans, stairs cannot be assumed.
- D. Roberts reviews existing structure plans with board.
- DB asks how many bedrooms. D. Roberts responds three bedrooms. DB then asks if the proposed septic is for three bedrooms. D. Roberts responds that original septic was for a

three bedroom house. D. Roberts responds that the change was due to the house being assessed as a four bedroom.

- D. Roberts states that Ms. Pelski is expecting her first child and also has a home office.
- DB states the house is a large house and that is why the septic needs to be upgraded.
- D. Roberts reviews plans from 2002 of original house and states the plans were approved and the Order of Conditions was issued. DB states the original plan showed no stairs and was stamped by a certified engineer, so there should be no stairs. D. Roberts states that if there is a door on the plans, by law there must be an egress.
- DM states the stairs should have been shown on the plan. He then asks about the 50-foot buffer. D. Roberts shows the buffer on the new set of plans.
- D. Roberts reviews the proposed drainage system that was never installed and a garage that was never installed. He states the homeowner felt they could improve upon the existing drainage by placing a catch basin on the property. He continues that the new system is better and not as costly.
- D. Roberts states the original Order of Conditions expired in April, 2006 and the property owner wanted to continue but did not extend the permit. A new application was submitted that included finishing the work and the new septic system work (existing system failed Title V).
- DM asks about the nature of the Title V failure. D. Roberts responds the area was saturated. DM states the original design is about 20 years old.
- DG asks about vernal pools. D. Roberts states there are no vernal pools present.
- D. Roberts submits a new set of plans with “existing conditions” of the property. DB asks if he means “as-built”. D. Roberts states he uses the term “existing conditions”.
- DM asks to review old plans. DM asks if there is a dock on-site.
- FD states the stairs are very convenient to the dock. Members discuss the stairs and the revised plans
- DB states they will schedule a site visit for Sunday.
- EG states that he would like it noted there was a signed contract that was never carried out.
- D. Roberts reviews proposed plans with board. FD states there is now a patio proposed next to the stairs. He adds that there are a lot of new patios proposed
- D. Roberts states the drainage system has been revised and the stormceptor plans will be submitted to the Board of Health. EG asks why this wasn’t done last time. D. Roberts states he cannot vouch for why it wasn’t done and explains that once construction starts, he is out of the picture.
- DB asks D. Roberts to explain all changes on the plans. D. Roberts states they have added a stormceptor for drainage instead of the vortechnic unit. DG states that it has to be maintained. D. Roberts responds they will have to submit a maintenance plan. DB asks what happens to existing system. D. Roberts responds it was not installed
- D. Roberts outlines proposed garage and rip-rap outlet.
- DG asks if there is drainage around the house. D. Roberts states no. DB asks if there are roof gutters in place. D. Roberts responds yes. DM asks if rain getters release to the ground level. D. Roberts responds yes. DB states that the house is large and surrounded by trees so the gutters will clog with leaves and the homeowner will not be able to maintain the gutters so the house should be surrounded by gravel.

- DB asks if system can be moved back from the 50-foot buffer zone. D. Roberts responds no due to ledge. He continues that the owners have a proposed planting plan created by the Nature Conservatory for mitigation.
- DB asks why the patio is within the 50-foot buffer zone. D. Roberts responds that is where the owner wants it.
- D. Roberts states the area does have natural buffers to the Lake, but the homeowner is proposing to create buffered areas. He continues that the owner is buying several surrounding parcels that will remain undeveloped.
- DG asks if any hay bales in place. DB states they will review the area on Sunday.

Hearing continued to May 17, 2007 at 7:50PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI for DEP 300-TBA: Proposed 4-lot subdivision at 271 Cedar Street. Coler and Colantonio, Inc. representing Khan Brothers Realty

DB opens the public hearing at 9:15PM.

Present: D. Harris, Coler and Colantonio, Inc.

N. Khan, owner

Submitted: Newspaper ad/abutter cards to open the hearing

Discussion:

- D. Harris reviews presentation board of a proposed 4-lot subdivision at 271 Cedar Street. He states the 10-acre parcel for the subdivision connects to an 80-acre parcel located in between Cedar Street and Arnold Road and abuts Brookfield.
- FD questions where the cart path is located and D. Harris points out the cart path on the presentation board. EG asks about crossing over the perennial stream. D. Harris states there is one crossing over the stream and it is 200 feet from closest vernal pool. The current plan only has a wetland crossing.
- DG asks if wetland flags were done last year. D. Harris responds that yes, topography maps and wetland flags were done at the same time. DG asks if the flags are still present. D. Harris responds some could be there, but they are a year old.
- D. Harris states there was a condition on the adjoining single-family house property for replication/restoration to be done. The current impact of the wetland (in violation) was 300 sq ft, the roadway will have an additional 2500 sq ft of wetland fill and 5100 sq ft of replication is proposed. He continues that the Agent recommended duplicating plantings.
- D. Harris states the proposed roadway is 850 ft long and 22 ft wide. FD asks if this requires an island at the entrance. D. Harris states they were asked to look at that. FD states that if there is an island required it will further impact area to be disturbed. D. Harris responds that an island would only cause the roadway to widen to 30 ft and would not have any more impact on the area.
- DB states there is a town bylaw limiting cul-de-sac roadways to 500 ft. D. Harris responds they will seek a waiver from the planning board on the length of the road for the cul-de-sac.

- EG asks about the setback from the road and lot lines. D. Harris states it is 50 ft from the right of way. DB asks D. Harris to show the set back from the midpoint of the roadway. D. Harris states it is 30 ft.
- EG asks about town set back for roadway. D. Harris states the edge of the roadway to the edge of the boundary is 20 ft.
- D. Harris restates the replication plan and states it is part of the roadway and there will be an addition of a catch basin for storm water retention which will run to the perennial stream.
- DB asks about the proposed TSS removal. D. Harris responds 80%. DB states this is barely making the minimum requirement and asks DM if the requirement is in fact 80%. DM responds yes. DB states there is no margin for error with the system at 80%.
- DG asks about the number of acres for the total project. D. Harris states it is an 80-acre parcel with connecting points to Arnold Road. DG then asks about the wetland alteration for the entire project. D. Harris responds they are in the process of looking at the entire project but are still in the preliminary stages. DG states she has concern with the alteration associated with this piece of the project. D. Harris states they are still in the preliminary stages. DG asks how much water is on the rest of the land. D. Harris responds that at the next meeting he will bring an overview of the entire proposed project.
- DB asks if there is an access point for the remaining 80-acre parcel from Arnold Road. D. Harris states there is access to Arnold Road and they are looking for dual access to the property from both Arnold Road and Cedar Street.
- DM asks if there has been an alternatives analysis to minimize wetland alteration. He then asks if the driveway shown on the plan is the existing driveway for the corner ANR lot.
- DB states the planning board will have difficulty with the roadway being so close to the abutter's property if the road will lead to an additional 50 houses. He continues that if the project is approved it might lead to a self-imposed hardship with respect to the location of the roadway.
- FD states he feels they are being upfront with what might be coming later.
- EG asks if the well locations are on the plans. D. Harris responds yes. DB asks if all properties are having private septic systems. D. Harris responds yes. EG asks how well the land "perc-ed" overall. D. Harris states they have had some success with the 4-lot subdivision and some success in the northern part of the remaining lot but the southern portion is not "perc-ing" well.
- EG questions the zoning of the parcel and D. Harris responds it is suburban residential zoned.
- Members discuss the proposed lay out and the proposed crossings. Members show concern for approving the crossing locations and then it may change pending planning and/or house lot reconfiguration for the back portion. DM states he would like the Agent to review the plans.
- DG asks about the size of the lots. D. Harris states the lots are 1-1.5 acres.
- FD states he would like to see the bigger picture and asks D. Harris to do an impact analysis. D. Harris states they have a preference to move the existing crossing and restore the area.

- DM asks what they would do with the retention basin. D. Harris responds it would be moved. EG states he would like to see the existing crossing for the perennial stream to be used. D. Harris responds he would like to present all the possibilities and get as much feedback from the board as possible. He continues that the intention is to connect the cul-de-sac to Arnold Road and is looking for feedback before presenting to the planning board.
- FD states that for the single house and the 4-lot subdivision the roadway could stay as proposed, but for a larger 40+ lot subdivision, the roadway may need to be moved. DB states that might impact the 4 houses.
- DG asks D. Harris when they are meeting with the planning board. D. Harris responds there is no schedule time yet.

Hearing continued to May 17, 2007 at 8:10PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI CONTINUED from 4/5/07: DEP 300-720 for proposed 5-lot subdivision at 12 & 30 Farquhar Road. Bertin Engineering Associates, Inc. representing The Spaho Corp.

DB opens public hearing at 10:07PM.

No one present

- DB states he received a request in writing from H. Blakeley from Bertin Engineering requesting a continuance on the hearing to allow time for the Agent to review new information.
- EG makes motion to continue. DM seconds motion. All in favor 5/0 for continuance.

Hearing continued to May 3, 2007 at 8:50PM.

10:09PM OTHER BUSINESS

1. Hamilton Road & Gun Club Presentation
 - S. Marsdan, abutters and Club members present for discussion no gravel operations.
 - S. Marsdan states the proposed work will be outside of the buffer zones. He continues that there has been shot fall into a wetland location. DB asks what shot fall is. S. Marsdan responds it is lead shot.
 - S. Marsdan states they would like to remove the shot fall area from the wetland location and the Gun Club has been looking at funding for the project. He continues that there is gravel on the site, which is a natural resource. He states there has been some removal for the MA Pike and that there is only 4-5 ft of strata available. He also states there is an alternative site with 40 ft of gravel and no water present.
 - S. Marsdan states there is a plan for the gravel removal and relocation of the shot fall area. He discusses spread patterns of the shot fall. DM asks if there is an alternative to

using lead. D. Marsdan responds that lead is still preferred and all sanctioned events require the use of lead.

- S. Marsdan asks if he will need to file an Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD) and requests an on-site visit.
- DM asks about the amount of fill and states the removal of gravel may lead to sedimentation going into Cedar Lake. S. Marsdan responds they will maintain a berm around the evacuation area. DM states fine silt may still be problematic. S. Marsdan responds that all trucks will be moving away from the water and a gravel wash will be used. DM states they could have gravel pads in place and have silt filtration with washing stations.
- DB asks the board if an ANRAD should be initiated. No board members feel it is necessary.
- DB asks if there will be clean up of lead shot from the existing site. S. Marsdan responds the area would need to be scoured to remove the lead shot and would not be feasible as lead is inert and the DEP would require the area to be kept at a Ph level of 7. S. Marsdan then reviews the preliminary plans with the board.
- DM asks if there is a way to make lead shot removal more reasonable with the new system. S. Marsdan responds the site cannot be abandoned and that a shot must be fired there at least once a year for the site to remain in active status.
- EG asks what will be done with the gravel. S. Marsdan responds that if sorting can be done on-site, the gravel is more valuable.
- DB asks if there has been any thought given to increasing traffic on an “already mangled” road. S. Marsdan responds the road will be repaired after the project is complete.
- DB asks if there are any questions from abutters.
- DG states she would like the Agent’s input. S. Marsdan states he would like to conduct a site walk with the Agent and that the intention of the Gun Club is for the project to be in the best interest of all involved parties.

2. Sturbridge Host Hotel

- DB reads from letter stating the sand replenishment program was only half completed last year.
- All members of board agree the sand replenishment program can continue (letter permit).

3. Planning Board Joint Meeting

- Brief discussion about joint meeting with Planning Board on 4/24/07 at 6:30PM.

4. 19 Long Avenue Tree Removal

- DB states a letter was received from arborist John Sequin regarding the tree removal at 19 Long Avenue and reads the letter.

- DM states he is having difficulty in overruling an arborist's recommendation for tree removal.
- DB states the letter will become part of the file and also has some difficulty with the overruling an arborist.

Public Meeting adjourned at 10:54PM