

GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

November 23, 2004

Chairman Bruce Clements called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Members Craig Auman, Bruce Easom, Marshall Giguere, and Evan Owen were present. K Corwin arrived at 7:04 p.m., and P. Morrison arrived at 7:06 p.m. Conservation Assistant Barbara Ganem was also present.

There being no changes, and upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to approve the Executive Session minutes of November 9, 2004 as drafted.

(K. Corwin arrived at 7:04 p.m.)

B. Ganem suggested several changes in the minutes, and upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to approve the Open Session minutes of November 9, 2004 as amended.

K. Corwin abstained from the vote.

Members next discussed the Order of Conditions for the Westerns/135 Mill Street.

(P. Morrison arrived at 7:06 p.m.)

Upon a motion by E. Owen, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions as amended for DEP #169-902 for the upgrade of a septic system at 135 Mill Street.

B. Ganem explained that the W. Groton Water Supply District is applying for a state grant to acquire the Blood land on West Main St. adjacent to the Town Forest and have requested a letter of support from the Commission. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by K. Corwin, it was

VOTED: to authorize B. Ganem to send the draft letter of support for the W. Groton Water Supply District's application for a Drinking Water Supply Protection grant.

7:15 p.m. – 13 Common Street Request for Determination of Applicability

Dr. Brad Smith gave a brief rundown of the project which involved the clearing of vegetation from the back portion of their lot with the intention of installing a fence for as yet undetermined livestock. He noted there are tentative plans to install fencing on the south side of the property as well. The plans submitted with the RDA show a dotted line where the fence will be located. He estimated that the fence would be about 40' from the vernal pool on the north side and within 12' on the south side of the vernal pool. C. Auman said that, usually, the Commission prefers to get plans before work is done, particularly for a sensitive site with a vernal pool. He noted that disturbing the 100' buffer zone can remove the tree canopy that is important for maintaining temperatures in the vernal pool and reducing the evaporation rates. The tree canopy also helps maintain the water quality and provides a source of leaves that supports the food chain in the vernal pool. B. Easom clarified the purpose of the two fences as 1) to follow the property boundary on the south side and 2) the other is to keep livestock penned in. He felt that a split rail fence would be more appropriate to

allow the passage of wildlife. He recommended a 100' buffer around the pond.

E. Owen asked if the drainage ditch establishes the property line, and the Smiths explained the property line probably extends beyond the drainage ditch and vernal pool. Dr. Smith indicated they do not plan to install a stockade fence. Member Corwin reported she and C. Auman had visited the site in the spring and observed wood frogs, fairy shrimp, and snails in the vernal pool. She requested permission from the Smiths to certify the pool, explaining that this would be entered into the state's database for vernal pools. According to K. Corwin, the edge of the vernal pool was not flagged or verified at the time Dr. Black confirmed the presence of the same species she and C. Auman observed. The Smiths replied that they would prefer to have additional time to consider certification of the pool.

Residents James and Maureen Moisson (77 Champney St.) explained they had initiated the review process in April because of their concern for the protection and preservation of the vernal pool, as well as the entire ecosystem that exists in the area. They felt that the tree canopy protects something valuable in our community although they support the Smiths' right to do what they wish to do with their land. Maureen Moisson pointed out that a number of animals other than amphibians use the wetland area which drains from a culvert on Common St.

B. Easom asked the distance from the wetland to the proposed fences. He felt that installing fence posts could damage the wetland and recommended that the specific distances between fence and wetlands be provided. P. Morrison suggested that this was an agricultural project, and E. Owen pointed out that conversion of land to agricultural use is usually a limited project. B. Easom recommended maintaining at least a 50' buffer of tree canopy next to the vernal pool. Dr. Smith estimated it would be 12' between the gate and the existing canopy and stated that he was not planning to cut any additional trees. Commissioners explained the wetlands Bylaw protects vernal pools whether they are certified or not, but this regulation is waived in the case of a Ch. 40B project which typically bypasses local bylaws.

E. Owen suggested the Smiths return to the Commission once the kind of animals and location and type of fencing is determined. Mrs. Smith mentioned that another component of the filing is the removal of invasives. She noted that the Commission had observed areas where loosestrife was removed in the spring and also commented that bittersweet and honeysuckle are rampant on the property. Commissioners commented they generally look favorably on such initiatives, but generally encourage hand pulling. The Smiths thought that a brush hog or weed whacker might be appropriate. Members urged that a plan with more details be developed, and E. Owen proposed continuing the meeting. P. Morrison suggested that this would be difficult administratively, and Mr. Owen retracted the motion. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative Determination of Applicability for the removal of trees only.
The condition was added that no additional clearing shall occur around the vernal pool past the current tree line.

Members recommended that a plan be developed that includes the spring high water level marking the edge of the vernal pool and detailed measurements be provided between the fences and wetlands.

7:30 p.m. – Sargisson Beach Notice of Intent, DEP #169-904

Member Bruce Easom reported he recently met with Frank Mavilia and Barbara Ganem to develop a design plan for the use of riprap at the point off Sargisson Beach to repair collapsed portions of the existing retaining wall. The broken granite blocks will be placed on the existing slope to construct a retaining wall that will not deflect wave energy into Lost Lake/Knops Pond. Absorbing this energy will help prevent additional erosion into the Lake. He noted that the revised plan does not call for filling the small undercut areas with sand, and the tree root mat will be left intact to help hold the bank. The riprap stone will be approximately 12" to 24" in diameter.

Frank Mavilia, who will be providing the labor and equipment, explained that the angled rocks will discourage boaters from landing their boats and would not require heavy equipment because of the size of the rocks. He compared the construction to "putting a piecrust" on the shoreline. P. Morrison acknowledged that this was necessary in order to assure we do not lose the point. C. Auman confirmed that the work area is from the north side of Sargisson Beach almost back to the cove. E. Owen agreed that it should be a good solution. K. Corwin pointed out the submitted

narrative mentions graded gravel; it was determined that this was an incorrect reference as there are no plans to bring gravel or sand on site.

B. Ganem will get three telephone bids before the Commission can purchase the riprap stones. The project will begin with approximately four truckloads of stone, but F. Mavilia estimated that a total of twelve truckloads will be necessary to complete the job. Depending on the size of the equipment used to deliver materials, the stone may be stockpiled within the parking area or at the approach to the Beach. Resident Rena Swezey asked why the Commission had changed its policy from limiting the amount of retaining wall that could be built under one filing to 49 feet. Commissioners explained that the difference comes in on projects to re-build existing retaining walls which cannot be considered undisturbed banks. If it is a new retaining wall that exceeds 49', the Commission would require a wildlife study because wildlife could potentially be losing habitat. There being no further questions from the audience, and upon motion by P. Morrison, seconded by K. Corwin, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for DEP #169-904.

7:45 p.m. – 49 Island Road Notice of Intent

Resident Marilyn Richard explained they planned to replace an existing retaining wall on Lost Lake/Knops Pond in order to hold back erosion. The wall will be constructed of interlocking blocks, and they do not anticipate the need to remove any existing trees. Proof of abutter notification was submitted, and Ms. Richard estimated that approximately 100 feet of retaining wall is to be replaced. Jack Carolan will be doing the work, and he estimates that it will take 7 to 10 days to complete. The work will be done during the winter drawdown. B. Easom confirmed there was a pre-existing wall and, noting that there was a steep approach to the retaining wall, he asked how equipment will access the area without causing damage to the Lake. The proponents explained that a neighbor has given permission for access from their property over flatter terrain. K. Corwin indicated that wildlife may use the area around the retaining wall, and she asked if there would be any backfilling. Crushed stone will be used behind the wall. P. Morrison observed that erosion control measures may eliminate adequate space in which to operate. The work will be done in front of the retaining wall, and the dock will be removed before the project commences. There being no further questions, and upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing.

8:00 p.m. – 308 Townsend Road Notice of Intent – DEP #169-903

Lynne Remington, wetland scientist from Ross Associates, submitted the green receipt cards and explained that the project involves a septic system repair within the 100 foot buffer of an intermittent stream with banks, a gravel surface, and associated Bordering Vegetated Wetland. The BVW has gray and red-twigged dogwood, blueberry, ash, and sensitive ferns, among other species. The site is not in floodplain, but is located within the Squannassit ACEC and within a rare species polygon identified by the Natural Heritage Program. The groundwater elevation is approximately 66" below the surface. Ms. Remington estimated that there will be 2.5' of coarse sand used as fill. It is 68' from the leaching trench to the wetland. Access will be gained from the non-wetland side of the house. Ms. Remington pointed out that there is a 10 foot side yard setback requirement, and there was concern about losing mature trees so grading will occur approximately 12' from the lot line. Members agreed to not wait to hear from Natural Heritage, and upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for DEP #169-903.

8:15 p.m. - 106 Peabody Street Notice of Intent – DEP #169-905

Michael Crouse of GPR explained he was representing the Lillian Lukas estate for the upgrade of a septic system at this address. The tank and leaching field are outside the 100 foot buffer, but some of the grading is within the buffer. The plan has been revised to include an area to be cleared and provide access to the detached garage, as well as the replacement of a deck. Mr. Crouse estimated that approximately 1,560 SF of alteration would occur within the buffer zone. C. Auman noted that there is some trash and debris located in the wetlands and asked if there were any

hazardous materials. Mr. Crouse indicated that he was not aware of any assessment. E. Owen commented that clearing is proposed within 9' of the BVW. Debris observed in the area included tires, car body parts, and other foreign materials which should be removed. Mr. Crouse assured the Commission it was his client's intention to abandon the sewer line going into the garage basement toilet through capping the pipe. The cement cover will be removed and the old septic tank crushed in place and filled. Members questioned whether the large ash tree to the north of the garage is to be removed. Several members felt that it is important to save native shade trees with diameters exceeding 4". There will be a Board of Health meeting to discuss the septic design on December 6th. P. Morrison pointed out that there is a woodstove on that side of the garage, and the access should be wide enough to allow equipment necessary to maintain the building. B. Easom asserted he was worried about the wetland, not the building. Two septic tanks are proposed under the upgrade plan, and they would leave the existing cesspool in place so as not to disturb the wetland. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for DEP #169-905.

8:00 p.m. – Appointment/David Moulton and Robert Collins – Deerhaven

Mr. Collins explained that David Moulton is finishing up the site and noted that the detention pond tends to hold water because soils from the stockpiles found its way to the pond. He maintained that the pond was overbuilt so the capacity of the detention pond is not affected. R. Collins noted that Mr. Moulton is looking at several different solutions but does not like the idea of totally re-working an area so close to the wetland. To prevent sedimentation from entering the wetland, another alternative is to create a forebay that will help settle silt before overflowing. This would require a separate filing with the Commission.

P. Morrison felt that either approach could be viable. He commented that the Commission has observed the detention pond overflowing into the wetland on at least three occasions. The soils underlying the pond bottom should drain. Mr. Moulton stated that originally all the water from the surrounding land was directed to the pond. He noted that a berm has since been created to limit the amount of water entering the pond. Mr. Morrison observed that establishing vegetation in the pond would help control the silt in the detention pond. He noted that he has never observed clear water in the pond.

Member Owen said there is likely to be a perched water table in the detention basin. D. Moulton indicated that gutters and sumps have been cleaned out and the roadway swept. In response to K. Corwin's question about where the silt is coming from, Mr. Collins replied that there is on-going construction on several lots so there continues to be runoff to the roadway. Once the loam pile is gone, it will reduce the silt load in the roadway. Lot 26 is finished (the residents were present), but work on Lot 27 continues. Mr. Moulton said he prefers to hold off on finishing Lot 27 until the detention pond has been re-done. He assured Commissioners that there is a right of way for maintenance of the detention pond. B. Clements observed that the pond functions as somewhat of a wildlife pond. He suggested that constructing a forebay as opposed to dredging the pond might be less disruptive. In general, members agreed that whatever solution is decided upon is fine providing the design works, but lifting the pipe and doing the forebay is preferred. A separate filing will be required for this work.

8:45 p.m. – Appointment/Chris Petroff – 235 Riverbend Dr.

Mr. Petroff distributed an informational packet and stated that he believed there has been a violation of the Order of Conditions issued to the residents of 235 Riverbend Dr., Lynn and Daniel Sheehy. He felt that the abutter notification was not correct and that trees over 8" in diameter were removed. C. Petroff expressed concern about the loss of his privacy. He noted that the October 12th Commission minutes reflect his question about whether this work would change the screening between the properties. He said Mr. Marro's response was that the marked trees had, for the most part, already lost their lower branches. Mr. Petroff offered a photograph showing the view from his porch before and after the tree cutting. P. Morrison observed that a lot of the difference was a result of fall defoliation.

C. Petroff conceded the work had generally been done in a very conscientious manner to protect the 50' buffer around the pond. He expressed concern, however, about plans to plant grass 30' from his house and its possible effect on

maples on his property. He questioned whether the submitted plans have been followed and exclaimed that one does not know what is going to happen next. Mr. Petroff spoke with Gary Dulmaine at DEP who told him the Commission should force them (the Sheehys) to follow proper procedure for plan changes by getting an amendment. P. Morrison asked if DEP had visited the site, and Mr. Petroff said he did not believe so. He maintained that the proponent should re-plant the area so that screening is restored and recommended that a scaled plan should be submitted so abutters can see what it would look like.

Environmental consultant Matt Marro, representing the Sheehys, stated he has been working in the field for 20 years. He indicated that he has not heard from DEP to get his clients' side of the story. He said the pool has actually been moved 25' closer to the house so that the 50' buffer could be protected. Mr. Marro maintained that the scrub pines were damaged as a result of removal of the larger trees. He noted that his client intends to file a re-planting plan with the Commission. Mr. Marro felt that Mr. Petroff's issues were related more to procedure and aesthetics than to the Wetlands Protection Act or Bylaw. He asserted that his client did not wish to have an adversarial relationship and had voluntarily approached the Commission to clarify the scope of work. He apologized for any confusion and assured the Commission his client takes the Act and the Bylaw very seriously. An invitation was even extended to Mr. Petroff to allow him to visit the property. It is the intention of the Sheehys to keep the area clean and natural.

Chairman Clements suggested that the re-planting or landscaping plan may make the problem go away. K. Corwin noted that screening is not within the Commission's jurisdiction. In addition, she acknowledged there was more cutting than she expected, but it did not reach the point of issuing an Enforcement Order. M. Giguere concurred with this assessment, but he did not feel there were significant concerns within the 50' buffer. E. Owen commented that the plan was sloppy, given 20 years of experience; he indicated his preference for a surveyed plan. B. Easom recommended showing the marked trees on the surveyed plan, as well as the proposed area of clearing so that the work can be confirmed later. He thought that the removal of larger trees could indeed damage the smaller scrub pines. The Commission's main concern, however, is the protection of the wetland. Mr. Easom encouraged the Sheehys and Mr. Petroff to work out their differences. C. Auman also urged them to resolve these issues by working out something agreeable to both parties.

P. Morrison noted that the remaining young pines are likely to fill out quickly with increased exposure to sunlight. He agreed that the site looked different than he anticipated, but within a tolerable range. Mr. Morrison underscored the need for the person at DEP to contact the Commission directly as the Commission takes any interaction with DEP very seriously. It was noted that it is unusual for DEP to get involved in a buffer zone issue. Commissioners asked Mr. Petroff if he was satisfied with this outcome, and he indicated he was. Members reiterated their previous directive that there would be no work within the 50' buffer zone, and the Sheehys will be allowed to extend a lawn area no more than 50' around the pool. Mr. Marro indicated that his clients will be filing a re-planting plan. Commissioners noted that the buffer benefits both parties and would be worked out through nature or otherwise.

9:00 p.m. – Appointment/Josh Webber – Gibbet Hill Conservation Restriction

Mr. Webber stated that the parking lot for the Gibbet Hill Grill was inadequate. He submitted a plan showing where the expansion of the parking area is proposed in exchange for additional conservation-restricted land. The trail will still be temporarily located between the restaurant and the function room. He estimated that 36,271 SF of conservation-restricted land would be exchanged for 23,000 SF of additional parking area. The new plan would incorporate a permanent trail easement with public access. The permanent trail would originate in the new parking area that provides additional space for restaurant parking. The other option is to have parking to the east of the building, but the Webbers would prefer to put in the proposed expansion area to the north of the restaurant. J. Webber asserted that this proposal makes sense for everyone. He noted that Nancy Reed at DEM plans to present this to the department Land Committee on Dec. 2nd, and she feels this is a superior parking plan to the original.

B. Clements questioned whether parking spaces would be specifically designated for trail users. P. Morrison felt this would be unnecessary because trails users were unlikely to conflict with the restaurant's high traffic times. Concerns were raised that the access to the trail remains on private property, and although this works for the Webbers, there could be a future owner who is uncomfortable with the arrangement. K. Corwin pointed out that the Commission

would have no authority over their private parking lot. B. Easom observed it would not be any worse than it is now. Josh indicated he did not know whether the parking area would be paved, but he estimated the number of parking spaces to be around 30. C. Auman asked why the temporary trailhead had not been marked, and Josh responded the grass was not well enough established to allow walkers.

Concerning the proposed new barn, Steve Webber explained that he was having difficulty justifying the expense of crossing the wetland for access.

(P. Morrison recused himself.)

Mr. Webber did not feel that the alternative to cross at a narrower spot in the wetlands would work because of the hillside. Gaining access from Lowell Road is also problematic because of the distance. A pole barn is proposed with one end heated and the other enclosed for tractor storage. The gable end will be enclosed. He indicated that the roadway was not designed yet, and C. Auman asked if it would be a floating road. The wetland area appears to be underlain with clay. The Commission's concern is to minimize impacts to the resource area. B. Easom suggested getting an easement from a neighbor, and S. Webber said he has attempted to do so and it is not practical right now. E. Owen asked if too much land would be out of production with a roadway from Lowell Rd., and S. Webber indicated it was not practical for tractor access. Mr. Owen pointed out that the Commission does not often approve a project that bisects a wetland. K. Corwin asked what utilities would be necessary, and S. Webber stated an oil tank would be located on the north side, and he expected a water line to be brought in from Martins Pond Rd. M. Giguere suggested that a sketch would be useful to the Commission. Chairman Clements recommended filing a Notice of Intent that lays out the alternatives and why they are unacceptable. S. Webber said he is currently losing money on the cattle operation, and the need to file makes it more difficult and uneconomical to continue farming. He conceded he may have to get rid of the cows.

C. Auman noted that the Commission is responsible for protecting wetland interests, such as the protection of water supplies, and the disturbance involved in this wetland crossing could be considerable. S. Webber confirmed there is a culvert under Martins Pond Road, probably on the Pietras land. Josh Webber noted that his family has made a lot of sacrifices to keep the farm going, and sacrifices from the town may be necessary or it becomes impractical to continue the farming operation. Chairman Clements indicated the Commission is willing to push limits but still needs to be guided by the Regulations. S. Webber agreed to provide a plan from an engineer and said he did not want to threaten as we all want to see it work. Commissioners asked if it would be feasible to locate the barn nearer the restaurant on land currently under the conservation restriction. Mr. Webber said this specific parcel on Martins Pond Road was set aside in the Restriction for a new barn. Members noted that the parking lot change and the barn location change could then be combined under the same Article 97 process. This can be a lengthy process requiring the assistance of our local state representatives.

P. Morrison, speaking as a member of the public, said he was concerned about the time involved to make such a change, and S. Webber said he needed to think some more about this proposition. Mr. Morrison agreed with the Webbers' assessment of the difficulty of traversing a cross country roadway from Lowell Road to the new barn, particularly during muddy, wintry weather.

Based on the Commission meeting at Hidden Valley this past Saturday, the Commission will monitor the trailhead for the next six months to assure that mowing between the trail posts does not occur too frequently.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by K. Corwin, it was

VOTED: to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance for Canterbury Lane within the Walnut Run subdivision, DEP #169-636 as soon as the silt fencing is removed.

Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to send a letter to the homeowner at 12 Canterbury Lane requesting the

removal of the swing set and to quit mowing the grass.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP #169-800 at 131 Northwoods Road once wood chips are installed in the bare spot to the right of the driveway.

The Commission recently received a ballot to vote for a candidate to serve on the Farm Service County Committee. Based on the two candidates who have been nominated, Commission members K. Corwin, E. Owen, M. Giguere, and P. Morrison voted for Frank Matheson, Jr. while B. Easom and B. Clements voted for Jodie Gilson. The Commission will cast one ballot vote for Mr. Matheson.

B. Ganem reported that New England Power plans to replace Pole #49 carrying electric transmission lines in Groton. The pole is located within a beaver impoundment south of Raddin Road. They have inquired whether the Commission would prefer to have the impoundment drained, the activity take place under frozen conditions, or the installation of swamp mats to allow vehicular access in April when there is a planned outage. K. Corwin expressed concern about the rare turtles that use this area as habitat and suggested the work be done in the dry season. B. Easom said it is likely they pick a time of year when electricity use is at its lowest. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by K. Corwin, it was

VOTED: to recommend the use of swamp mats and 1) that they notify the Commission ahead of the planned activity and 2) that they consider doing the work at a dry time of year.

B. Easom volunteered to observe the process.

The Commission must anticipate an increase in the fees for land management in planning for the upcoming FY '06 budget. P. Morrison suggested contacting Peter Myette to get an estimate for mowing the top of Gibbet Hill, and he volunteered to assist with the development of the budget.

B. Ganem reported that one fine of \$50 has been issued to Mark Enwright for a violation of the Order of Conditions at 28 Boathouse Road. She noted that photographs taken at the site yesterday show conditions unchanged from the original date of the violation. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by K. Corwin, it was

VOTED: to issue a second fine of \$100 and remind Mr. Enwright that each day of a continuing violation can be considered a separate offense.

Members recommended using a town constable to deliver the notice of the fine to Mr. Enwright's home address at 85 Boathouse Road.

Members had reviewed the draft Conservation Restriction proposed for Rocky Hill and questioned why so many groups are involved in developing the rules and regulations. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to recommend the removal of "the Groton Conservation Trust, and the Massachusetts Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program of the Massachusetts Department of Fisheries and Game" from the second paragraph on Page 5 of the draft.

The motion passed with C. Auman, K. Corwin, M. Giguere, B. Easom, and P. Morrison voting in favor, and E. Owen and B. Clements voting in the negative.

The Commission will be holding a public meeting on December 14, 2004 to discuss and vote on the draft Regulations to accompany the Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Consultant fees remain the only outstanding item for discussion. The

MACC model bylaws tie the cost of the project into the amount of the fee, but members were concerned that this fee schedule would not be applicable for small projects that could potentially have a big impact on wetlands. K. Corwin suggested having Judith Nitsch Engineering, Inc. verify the costs of a project given by a proponent. This schedule would have the advantage of being reasonably easy to understand. Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to substitute the consultant section in the model MACC bylaw for the draft section on consultant fees currently in the Regulations.

Member Morrison, who serves as a steward for Wharton Plantation owned by the New England Forestry Foundation, reported that there are several trail bridges in need of replacement, and he would like the Commission's position on the use of old telephone poles for this purpose. B. Easom commented that the Gratuity Bridge used pressure-treated beams that span the banks, resting on telephone poles. Members questioned whether the poles were safe as the Groton Electric Light Department hands out information warning of the potential hazards when they give out poles. The Commission recommended filing a Request for Determination of Applicability, and providing more documentation on the safety of using the poles near or in wetlands, particularly since a precedent has been set with the Gratuity Bridge. P. Morrison urged the Commission to also consider the low cost, strength, and durability of the poles. The actual bridge will be above the water levels in the wetland crossings. He noted he will be working with the Trails Committee to put information on the town web site after the Wharton Plantation trails have been GPS'd.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem
Conservation Assistant.

Approved as drafted 12/14/04