

Sturbridge Conservation Commission

Meeting Agenda

Approved Thursday August 16th, 2018

Thursday, July 19th, 2018

EG called the meeting of the Conservation Commission to order at 6:00 PM.

Quorum check – Confirmed.

Present:

Edward Goodwin; Chair (EG)
David Barnicle (DB)
Steve Halterman (SH)
Steve Chidester (SC)
Paul Zapun (PZ)

Also Present:

Rebecca Gendreau, Conservation Agent (RG); Ashley Piascik, Administrative Assistant (AP); Clarence Snyder, HRG (CS); Kevin Soucie, HRG (CS); Don Taft, HRG, Abutter (DT); Andrew Cormier; Escape Estates Inc., (AC); Andrew & Mariel Houle, Applicant, (AH & MH); Kelly Peck, Resident/Abutter (KP); Leonard Jalbert, Jalbert Engineering (LJ); Scott Morrison, EcoTec Inc. (SM); Steve Bressette, Summit Engineering (SB); Phillip Moreau, RV Management Services (PM); Lara DeRose, Applicant (LD); Kim Procon, Abutter (KP); Mike Procon, Abutter (MP); Jill Roy, Applicant (JR); Bichop & Linda Nawrot, Applicant (BW & LW); Charles Roy, Applicant (CR); Bruce Gran, Applicant (BG); Andrew Baum, Summit Engineering (AB); Stephen Herzog, AMEC (SH); Justin Howard, Applicant (JH); Brian Fahl, Applicant (BF); Barbara & Mark Smith, Applicants (BS & MS); Zachary Gless, Existing Grade Inc. (ZG); Mark Lavigne, Ground Effects (ML).

Committee Updates:

CPA: No meeting updates. Will have one in August.

Trail Committee: Work day Saturday (July 21, 2018) at Heins Farm, developing a parking lot at OSV on Leadmine, which will take several months (30 Plus car and two horse wagon area).

Open Space Committee: None.

Lakes Advisory Committee: Meeting tonight, July 19th, 2018. Water testing will occur next Friday (7/27) and Sunday (7/29).

Public Hearings

6:15 **Request for Determination of Applicability;** 112 Westwood; Wildrgube, D. Addition to a single-family house; Represented by B.C. Custom Homes.

Did not publish a legal ad. Postponed to 8/16 Meeting.

6:30 **Request for Determination of Applicability; 21 Long Avenue; Iwanicki, S.**
Construction of deck on a single-family house.

Submitted proof of legal ad/adutter notification prior to public hearing.

RG presented for the applicant:

- Proposing to put in a small deck addition on a single-family house. Within 50 feet of the lake. There is a down spout coming off of the house with a long pipe heading towards the lake. Discussed redirecting it under his deck and taking some of the gravel out and replacing it with crushed stone. Appears to be in footprint of previous deck and is over existing stairs. Footing from previous deck still in place. Deck will not extend further from house towards lake.
- RG recommendation: Positive #5 that it is subject to local Bylaw and Negative #3 with some minor conditions during construction.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

- DB: Looks like someone took the deck down that was there in the first place.
- DB: Approve of the plan with the conditions.

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SC) to close the public hearing, VOTE: AIF (5-0).

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SH) to approve the applicants modifications as indicated on the plan to their construction, VOTE: AIF, DB, PZ, SH & SC (4-1), EG Abstained.

6:45 **Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation; DEP File#300-1017; Continued from 6/7/18; 14 & 50 Douty Road; P. O'Connell; represented by Bertin Engineering, Inc.; Confirming the extent of wetland resource areas.**

AC present in place of Peter O'Connell:

- RG: 3 proposals have been received for a third party reviewer for the wetland delineation. Board has been provided with proposals. All companies appear to meet requirements and capable of performing the review.

The Board had the following comments, questions, concerns:

- DB voted GZA.
- SH: Any reason?
- DB: Impressed with their presentation in terms of the depth of production they put into their proposal. Felt they had a better understanding of the project variables.
- SH: I am familiar with their work in Springfield, they have done a nice job.
- PZ: All three are capable.
- SC: I am fine with all three as well.
- RG: If for some reason they cannot do it, who would be vote for the second party reviewer?
- EG: LEC

- DB: LEC

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SC) to close the public hearing, VOTE: AIF (5-0).
 --Motion (EG); 2nd (DB) LEC as second place in case GZA cannot move forward, VOTE: AIF (5-0).

Continued to our August 16th, meeting.

7:00 **Notice of Intent; DEP File#300-1018; Continued from 6/7/18; Doudy Road and Stallion Hill Rd.; O'Connell, P.; Represented by Bertin Engineering, Inc.**

AC asked for another continuation to 8/16/18.

--VOTE AIF: (5-0).

7:15 **Notice of Intent; DEP File#300-1020; 64 South Shore Drive; Houle, A.; Proposed site improvements to a single-family home/yard; Represented by Green Hill Engineering.**

Submitted proof of legal ad/abutter notification.

MF represented the Houle's:

- MF gave a brief history of the home and location.
- MF: They would like to remove the wooden retaining wall along the shore front and replace it with natural stones. This will protect the shore from erosion, and keep it stabilized. Additionally, to gain access to the shore during construction, they are proposing to put a temporary path in.
- MF: They have many extraneous walls along the property. They would like to remove these walls and revegetate the slopes. There is a gazebo they would like to remove and a set of stairs that connects to the patio. Remove the steps and replace with steps that would be accessible from the middle of the property. Replace the paver area with a raised, pressure treated deck. This would be an improvement because they would get more infiltration.
- MF: Proposing to dig a trench going across the base of the driveway and fill it with stone. Excess water would collect and be less disturbed. Existing decks they would like to rework. They are proposing to remove/relocate existing shed.
- MF: Additionally they would like to put a paved parking spot (up top of the driveway) to create a few parking spaces, and a pathway that would go down to their existing driveway.

The board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

- RG: Mapped as priority habitat which requires a MEPA filing (This is separate from our review).
- It is steep going down to the water. Some potential concerns, any type of access must be done appropriately.

- EG: If they put some 3-5 inch rip rap down there and use track machines and prior to any work have it inspected by the Conservation before bringing anything in.
 - In regards to the shed, that would be a big excavation and it is within our 25-foot buffer zone. Maybe something that could be of less impact?
 - Cobble is a nice addition; make sure there are no Chapter 91 requirements because it is a great pond.
 - Make sure everything is stabilized.
 - RG: Have a detail for pavers for cobble to be clear not rip-rap.
 - MF: They would prefer to put regular asphalt pavement down.
 - DB: Why concrete pad, why not gravel?
 - MF: Asphalt is a nice surface to park on.
 - AH: Currently, getting up and down the driveway in the winter is dangerous. We wanted to get a parking spot above we could park safely in. Mainly for winter conditions. That is why asphalt would be more stable, long lasting, etc.
 - DB suggested larger work structures.
-
- DB: Moving the shed, why do you have to excavate?
 - MF: Because of the slope and mostly for the convenience of the neighbor.
 - AH: Try to minimize the excavation.
 - MF: Shed is same footprint (10 x 10).
 - AH: Adjacent to the neighboring property, more courtesy to them.
-
- SC: Any trees being removed? MF: No
 - SC: Same footprint, replacement of deck? MF: Yes.
 - EG: Height of existing wall and height of new wall?
 - MF: About three to four feet roughly (Existing). New one will not be a wall.
 - EG: How wide? MF: Same as how many feet tall.
 - EG: What is going to be in the non-structured areas?
 - MF: Revegetate with landscape plants, shrubs (Junipers, Mountain Laurels) and flowers etc. to hold back soil.
 - RG: Benefit putting in erosion control blankets on slope?
 - MF: If they put this trench in and mulch the whole slope heavily, it should be fine.
 - EG: Great plan, consider the shed movement; there is no reason to move it, less damage to the whole area.
 - DB: If that swale dumps any water on the neighbor's property that will be a cause of concern and in violation with state law. Make certain during construction that does not happen.
 - DB: What is going to happen when you take out the walls... how much erosion is going to be created and how deep are they?
 - MF: Guessing down 3 to 4 feet. If they just pull them out, it will be similar to pulling a fence post.
 - DB: Is there a plan for taking them down?
 - DB: There should be some notation on the plan on how it would be removed.

- MF: Could pull it out with an excavator.
- EG: When you start pulling you are only going to get part of it.
- DB: Put something in your plan or the OOC how it is coming out.
- SH: Concerned about erosion coming out, our main concern.
- RG: In regard to the cobble stone, make sure we have a clear understanding of what you are using so we don't end up with a rip rap wall. We don't want to see a rip rap wall there.
- MF: They do not want a rip rap wall.
- SH: What are we going to do about the shed?
- SH: I'm okay with it if you have a way to excavate and put the shed on the opposite side. Protect the lake and the environment. If the footprint is the same, I am okay with it.
- RG: Any trees, tree roots? AH: No.
- EG: How is the bank cut going to be treated?
- MF: Segmented block wall, probably 3 to 4 or 5 feet high.
- EG: Foundation?
- MF: Sauna tubes, just to get it off of the ground. It will give a stable base.

The Public had the following questions, comment, concerns:

- KP (60 South Shore Drive): Concern when the water level is high and the stones, there may be an issue.

--Motion (SH); 2nd (PZ) to close the public hearing, VOTE: AIF (5-0).

--Motion (SH); 2nd (PZ) Make a motion to accept the plan with the revisions discussed. VOTE: AIF (5-0).

Discussion:

- DB: We need to have explanation from engineer relative to some of the detail we have talked about.
- EG: Sauna tubes, changing shed, planting.
- RG: Some type of low flow condition for the work done, at least on the retaining wall. It would be during summer time, since there is no draw down period. We will have to work on a plan for that.
- MF: How far up does the water go?
- AH: Sometimes 8 feet, it depends.
- EG: The water has to be down (Late fall).
- DB: Why don't we ask for a minimum size and minimum diameter of the stone? Varied size stone should be included.
- PZ: Plan needs to tell us how they are going to take everything out.
- Con Com: Agreed with PZ.

Motion (EG); VOTE: AIF (5-0).

RG: Next step, send us a plan.

7:30 **Request for Determination of Applicability; 117 McGilpin; DeRose, C.;** Construction of an attached garage to a single-family house; Represented by Green Hill Engineering.

Submitted proof of legal ad/abutter notification.

EG excused himself from this public hearing and refrained from voting.

- MF: Here today to ask to put up a proposed garage/barn. It is currently in an area that is field/grass. It is within a 100 feet to of a wetland between the road and the property. The topography is flat. They would be excavating and realigning the driveway. The bulk of the work is outside of the buffer zone.
- RG: This is a revised plan from the last plan that you saw (Location of garage was moved back slightly). Most of the work is out of the 100 foot, I advised them to file the RDA based on the minimal work within the buffer zone. It can meet DEP's 99-1 policy to not require a NOI and move forward with an RDA. No concern, maybe if there is excavating to put in erosion controls. I would give this a positive number 5 according to our local Bylaw and a negative number 3 with some conditions during work.

The Board had the following comments, questions, concerns:

- No comments.

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SH) to close the public hearing, VOTE: AIF (4-0).

--Motion (SH); 2nd (DB) accept the positive number 5 and negative number 3, VOTE: AIF (4-0).

7:45 **Notice of Intent; DEP File #300-1021; 30 River Road; RV Management Services.** Proposed redevelopment of an existing campground. Represented by Scott Morrison from EcoTec.

Submitted proof of legal ad/abutter notification.

SM provided an overall project summary including project proposals. Proposals included: redefining of campsites, mitigation and restoration, plantings, building demolition/replacement, additional parking spaces, new building and bathroom facilities, driveway relocation and installation of a dry hydrant in Pine Lake. SM addressed that Mass DEP had some comments, which have been addressed early that day before the meeting. Significant storm water improvement was discussed by SB in further detail.

The Board and Agent had the following comments, questions, concerns:

- EG: Depth? SM: 8 ft
- RG: DEP number issued today , restoration areas making sure we get a plan for them (summary of what is going to go in there) DEP said we need additional information on stormwater (items indicated on DEP File # sheet) before closing the public hearing.

- SM: Looking for test information from infiltration systems.
- SB: DEP spoke about doing a mounding analysis.
- RG: Logs/reporting for us to look at and make sure stormceptors are being done.
- PZ: Leveling the hill? Taking the hill down?
- SB: We did make changes; you can see the first contour... leaves a little bit of room over there. These changes were reflected on the plan.
- SH: Distance of conference center from the edge of the lake?
- SB: Probably 65 feet.
- SH: The stream down from the duck pond, we would like to see a plan, exactly how you are going to restore that bank.
- SM: Pulled back and put into a grass swale, stormceptor on the upper side.
- SM: Only wetland impact, direct wetland impact is that dry hydrant.
- SH: Main concern that you are knocking down trees for the view and extra sites, first statement said same amount of sites.
- PM: Will replant trees.
- PM: Sites are varying in sizes.
- DB: Subsoil?
- SB: Gravel mostly.
- DB: Seeding throughout in a number of different places, indications about what the seed mix is going to be?
- SM: Something that will do well with shade.
- SC: Sloping/trees?
- EG: Knoll was being taken down so that these trailers would have a view of the lake.
- SB: Just going to grade up until the 620.
- SC: Leave some of those mature trees in there when others are being removed
- PM: Wedging what is in the site currently. To try to quantify it. Can reduce that number by 75%.
- PM: I would look at adjusting the sites to save the trees.
- PM: Customize RVs.
- SC: Tremendous amount of tree crowding by main entrance on bank.
- DW: Arborist needed to better define what would be cut there.
- SC: The trees do not look very healthy and we do not normally recommend cutting within the buffer.
- RG: Plant shrubs to have a mixture.
- EG: Hillside marked and defined so I can see it before a tree gets cut and agree to it before a tree gets cut.
- EG: How long would it take to get those marked?
- PM: A week.

Site visit to be scheduled when sites and trees are marked. Continuation to the next meeting with OOC drafted by Conservation Agent, RG. VOTE: AIF (5-0).

8:00 **Request for Amendment to Order of Conditions; DEP#300-1007;** George Vinton Road; BWC Origination 8 LLC; Seeking approval of additional tree-cutting beyond that permitted and performed at the project site to date; represented by Amec Foster Wheeler.

*Submitted proof of legal ad/abutter notification.
StH gave a summary of the continued project.*

StH: The request for amendment which presents a revised proposal to cut trees that are currently shading two arrays (Area 2A and Area 2B). For each array, there is a corridor between the existing wetlands and the existing arrays. Proposing to cut all trees between the 25 foot buffer. Company hired a certified arborist for their insights. Proposing to look at the trees that are hard woods and pines. Continued to explain suggestions from the arborist.

The Board had the following comments, questions, concerns:

SC: This is much better. Your comment about topping and girdling the tree is for both 2A and 2B, correct? StH; Yes.

SC: We are creating additional habitat features, this appeals to me more. There will be additional replanting of low story shrubs? StH: Yes and will grow at most 20 ft.

DB: Relative barrier between retail and site lines?

SC: All will be replanted.

DB: I would like there to be more variety/height.

StH: Arborist suggested that some of the hardwood trees could be drop crotched pruned.

EG: Use of herbicides? StH: None. Cut the trees and girdle and there will be no need.

EG: How do we get a commitment for plantings? What level/density?

StH: Specified on the plan under the area 2A and 2B.

EG: What size?

StH: Standard is 18-24 inch in height.

--Motion (SH); 2nd (DB) to close the public hearing, VOTE: AIF (5-0).

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SH) approve the plan as amended and put in the OOC the comments that the representative made. VOTE: AIF (DB, SH, PZ & SC) (4-1) *EG opposed.*

Letter Permits

- Tree Removal Permit Application: 13 Old Hamilton Rd., Harabedian, J.
VOTE: AIF (5-0).
- Tree Removal Permit Application: 188 Lake Rd., Roy, C.
VOTE: AIF (5-0).
- Tree Removal Permit Application: 76 South Shore Drive, Mimeault R.
VOTE: AIF (5-0).
- Tree Removal Permit Application: 6 Tantasqua Shore Drive., Montross, C.
VOTE: AIF (5-0).
- Tree Removal Permit Application: 258 Big Alum Rd., Wheaton, B.
VOTE: AIF (5-0).
- Tree Removal Permit Application: 190 Lake Rd., Lombardi, D.

VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- Tree Removal Permit Application: 94 Paradise Lane., Peppel, A.

VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- Tree Removal Permit Application: 212 Hemlock Path., Norris, R.

VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- Wetland Bylaw Permit Application: 9 Vinton Rd., Fahl, B.

RG presented the plan, the pool company already put up erosion controls and I checked. Work is outside of the 100 ft buffer zone and within existing permitted lawn. Area is flat.

VOTE: AIF (5-0).

Minor Changes to Orders of Conditions

- DEP #300-1009; 186 Lake Road; Smith, M.
 - MS: Requested for run off from roof of the proposed porch to go into the culvec versus constructing the rain garden as shown on the plan. Proposing to put in more than the three bushes to compensate for rain garden plants.
 - Further dialogue about tree removal of dead trees and treatment of trees were discussed.

--New plan will be resubmitted that addresses elimination of the rain garden and tree removals.

Old Business

- 32 Tantasqua Shore; Restoration Plan for Unpermitted Vegetation Removal
RG: Site visit: Some replanting was done. Installed native plantings on hillside. Also observed, new steps installed since last site visit on bank into the lake. Put steps in without permission and not clear if temporary dock was permitted. May have additional work planned (house addition and stairs down hillside). Needs to file a NOI for all work completed and proposed.
--VOTE: AIF of Cease and Desist (5-0).
- DEP #300-972; 3 Ladd Road; Briggs, R.
RG issued a letter requesting information, status, etc. RG received contact with the property owner. Was informed planting has not been done, however, stonewall was moved. Owner was thinking of planting trees. RG told the owner that they must follow the permit and plan. If any changes, owner needs to come forth to Conservation. Regular follow up will be continued.
- DEP #300-0914; 187 Lake Road; Roy, C.
JR will plant the two additional trees. RG will conduct a site visit once the two trees are planted and then we will move forward with issuance of COC.
- DEP #300-0799; 88 Westwood Drive; Nawrot, B.
LJ and BN presented the current request for COC which was missing the blueberry bushes/rain garden and a tree. LJ will re-submit a revised plan that does not include the blueberry bushes/rain garden and include the tree and request for a new COC, in relation to the new plan submission.

--LJ requested for a continuance to 8/16 meeting, VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- DEP#300-953; 272 Big Alum Road; Howard, J.
RG gave a brief history of the original OOC. Some members of the Conservation Commission were able to conduct a site visit prior to the meeting. RG presented photographs to the rest of the Commissioners that were unable to make it to the site visit. The project site has changed drastically from what was originally approved. Trees were taken down and work was done that was not approved in the original OOC. There was also no pre-construction meeting to go over the existing OOC. ML gave a brief description of why his company moved forward, disregarding the written OOC.

RG: Noted to go through the Chapter 91 license through DEP.

--VOTE: AIF to put an enforcement order on the project (5-0).

New Business

- Special Use Form; Hamilton Rod & Gun Club; Use a portion of Plimpton Forest as in past years for the MA Outdoor Exposition.

CS introduced the President and former President. Asked for permission to use a portion of Plimpton forest (by the circle crescent on the North/East side of the stone wall on Plimpton Forest) for the MA Outdoor Mountain Bike venue.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

EG: No cutting? CS: No.

EG: Date? CS: September 22nd-23rd

RG: Opacum and Natural Heritage approved.

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SC) to approve the use of land. VOTE: AIF (5-0).

Informal discussion #1(CS):

CS: Sturbridge Tourist Association helps to fund annual Big Moe event. Has been successful in the past to get town funding. Hamilton club is concerned with pond treatment of the third pond, which is essentially the Northern section of Plimpton. Have the CC consider more treatments of the pond. Estimate price would be about \$1,000. Next year, will apply for the STA grant and put that money towards the pond treatment. Consider expanding the treatment of the third pond based on funding from the STA.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

RG: There would need to be an amendment for it.

DB: Amendment or minor modification?

SC: Look at the WPA as to why we are treating the lake.

Informal discussion #2 (CS):

CS: Concern with beaver dam/beavers and flooding located on Southern portion of Plimpton Property.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

SH: What gets flooded because that is the key to consider if you can move beavers or not.

SH: Issue with beavers is that if there is damage to property, that is something we would address. We need to know the impact. That is what you need to bring forward.

DB: In order to get a permit to trap for the beavers, you must go to the board of health, and prove it is safety issue.

RG: He is asking if we want to help or trap on our property. To help control the population. The concern is that the WPA and Conservation Property is the town property.

EG: We should touch base with Opacum to see where they stand on it and take a site visit after we get a report.

Informal discussion #3(CS):

CS: Appropriate forum of revisiting hunting North of Old Holden Rd.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

RG: I do not think that is in the Conservation Restriction.

EG: Talk to Parks and Rec and the town Selectmen.

RG: Will look into where it came from.

Informal discussion #4(CS):

CS: Connect Plimpton Property Bike Trail with Hamilton.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

DB: Will bring this discussion to the Trails Committee for discussion.

- Reorganization of the Board
 - VOTE: AIF to keep the same Chair, DB, SC, PZ, EG (4-1) Abstained SH.
 - VOTE: AIF to keep the same Vice Chair, DB, SC, PZ, EG (4-1) Abstained SH.
 - Proposed parking lot expansion on Hein's property
 - RG: Received a request from trails committee to expand the parking lot. No approvals needed from Opacum (is not part of Heins CR).
 - RG: I do not anticipate any concerns. Maybe they could put erosion controls.
 - DB: There isn't anything that is being protected. There are a lot of real woods on both sides and the back, and there is Leadmine road in the front. It drops off through the woods, until about ¼ mile down, before coming close to the first resource area.
 - DB: Because you have all of that material available right there, I do not see there would be any reason for erosion controls.
 - DB: Approval because of our Care Custody and Control.
- Motion (SC); 2nd (EG) to approve the parking lot expansion. VOTE: AIF (5-0).
Approved.

- Mass DOT Highway Division: Cedar Meadow Brook (Sturbridge Main Street/Route 20)
 - RG: Culvert replacement under Main Street Route 20 right by Yankee Peddler. Mass DOT is planning on replacing that structure because it was damaged during hurricane Irene. It will be relocated. It is exempt from WPA our review. Army Corps did issue their general permit and water quality permit was issued as well. They asked us a little bit about looking at the design. It is going from a three-sided box culvert to a four-sided box culvert. I did ask why they couldn't do a three sided box culvert. The reason is because it would have required a lot more excavation if it was a three-sided box culvert to build up the base.
 - RG: Showed an image of how it looks now. The new plan is going to go up the road and come down, not at a 90 degree turn, but close. The reason for this is because it is busy on Main Street and there are concerns with traffic, etc. A three-sided culvert would have required more structure and road closure.
 - DB: Overall length? RG: 269 feet
 - EG: We do not have a decision with this at this time.
 - RG: Probably see construction of this next year.

Signatures

Request for Certificate of Compliance (COC)

- DEP#300-466; 3 Meadow View Lane; Bercume, R.
RG: I recommend we sign this partial COC for this lot.
--Motion (DB); 2nd (SH) to approve. VOTE: AIF (5-0). *Signed.*
- DEP#300-466; 1 Meadow View Lane; Bercume, R. *Signed.*
RG: I recommend we sign this partial COC for this lot.
--Motion (DB); 2nd (PZ) to approve. VOTE: AIF (5-0). *Signed.*
- DEP#300-451; 63 Beach Ave; Cane, D.
RG: Older project that resulted in an enforcement order. There was an COC request when the property was being sold and a concrete patio was discovered. An Enforcement Order(EO) was issued and the current owners did the work to take out concrete and put a pervious patio down and planted shrub and pachysandra beds. I would recommend signing the COC.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

DB: Concrete pad was put in place illegally. We as the Commission had it removed.
--Motion (DB); 2nd (SH) to approve. VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- DEP#300-922; 136 Lake Road; Gran, B.

EG: We talked about the rain garden which is on the plan and not constructed and the pipe was not there. They put their own swale on the side of the house. Now we have two swales, which are about 3-4 feet apart. The swale they made seems to be working well. I don't know the exact location of the other swale but it is not what was on the plan.

The Board had the following questions, comments, concerns:

DB: One of the reasons we are changing all of the deviations that were done two years ago, is so it will be lived in more frequently. The driveway will get more use. What is that going to do relative to now with the erosion we see heading towards the lake?

RG: Could they put a berm right here? EG: There is a berm.

EG: This is a temporary situation.

EG: I did not see anything going into the lake while I was there.

DB: We have to correct what is not there, by having it installed and proving it is a valuable asset or having it taken off.

DB: Can we put an X on the raingarden and get it signed indicate saying it is not there

RG: Referred to DEP on other project, recommended that we can check off it is complete, and then check off what is not completed.

Signed off that the COC is complete, however checked off that there is no rain garden

--VOTE: AIF (5-0).

- DEP#300-943; 140 Lake Road; Radner, J. (*Duplicate*) *Signed*.

Informal Discussion:

- Heal Inc. has been permitted to start work. They started construction.
- Ladd Rd., expansion of a driveway going off of Ladd Rd. Conservation Agent issued a letter this week and conducted a site visit.
- 38-40 Burgess School Rd., had major erosion, washout and run off issues due to recent storm. Would like to clean up and temporarily stabilize and put some erosion controls up and grade back all deposited soils and relocate. DB recommended waiting until drawdown in two months to remove sediment with equipment. However, swale at the top should still be put in. Issued Emergency Authorization for temporary work, however will need to come back with NOI for long term.

Approval of minutes: June 7th, 2018 and June 21st, 2018

--Motion (DB); 2nd (SC) to pass the minutes for June 7th and June 21st.

--VOTE: AIF (5-0). *Approved*.

Adjourn at 10:51 PM.