

GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

June 27, 2006

Chairman Peter Morrison called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room in Town Hall. Members Craig Auman, Bruce Clements, Kris Corwin, Bruce Easom, Marshall Giguere, and Evan Owen were present. Conservation Assistant Barbara Ganem was also present.

7:00 p.m. - Appointment Acorn Path neighborhood

Wendy Good, a member of the Trails Committee, said the Trails Committee has been trying to determine where the trail boundaries are located for several years and is very much in favor of putting in this trail. With no one else present, the Commission suggested completing some other business before continuing the discussion.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to approve the minutes of the Open Session on June 13, 2006.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Clements, it was

VOTED: to approve the Executive Session minutes of June 13, 2006.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to approve the minutes of May 20, 2006.

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

VOTED: to issue an Order of Conditions for DEP #169-958 for the New England Power R-O-W.

Returning to the topic of the Acorn Path trail, resident Chris Colton (39 Acorn Path) asked the Commission what the proposed trail would entail. Chairman Morrison responded, stating that it was likely several trees would be taken down to create a walking trail which was on town-owned land. The trail would have natural ground cover, and there would be trail posts at either end. Mr. Colton expressed concern that there was ledge on this land and that the vegetative screen that exists there would no longer screen his house from the neighbor. He pointed out deer and turkey are unlikely to continue to use the area. Materially, he thought the whole space would be changed. He has lived there for ten years, and there are five other trailheads within a half mile of the property, all of which are wider and have parking. He did not see this trail as vital to the area.

Mr. Colton felt the trail would change the whole concept of conservation. He has concerns about safety and the fact there are multiple other accesses. He asked why this is vital now.

P. Morrison said wildlife will continue to frequent trails used for recreation. Wendy Good said it is unlikely it will be necessary to take down large trees as the trails are generally 4 ft. wide with 3 ft. buffers on either side. The Planning Board always encourages such trail connectors as it is a useful access for neighbors. Once the trail is in, the "public" is usually a neighbor. She pointed out abutters are free to plant more landscaping if they wish to preserve their privacy. Ms. Good explained the trail has not been constructed because it has been harder to determine the boundaries of this particular conservation area. A number of other subdivisions within the community also have trails, and she gave Northwoods as an example. Such links provide access without having to go a half mile down the road which is safer for children. B. Clements added it is likely the trail will be used only by those in the neighborhood. He noted the land was set aside for this specific purpose. K. Corwin pointed out the Trails Committee has had a backlog of projects

which may explain why it is becoming important now.

Member Owen explained that developer Don Desrosier used this piece as a tradeoff for constructing individual wetland driveway crossings. Mr. Colton said he would reconsider purchasing his house had he known this was a public trail. But, he stated it was okay for people to use his driveway because he knows it is easier. Mr. Colton noted some of the trees exceed 10 in. in diameter, and he questioned how the Commission will gain access to take out such trees.

Mr. Auman commented the town's trail network is very important to residents and is supported by both the 2020 Master Plan and the Open Space & Recreation Plan. It would be the exception, rather than the rule, if the trail was not done. The Trails Committee generally works with abutters to mark the access so that users will not trespass on private land. C. Colton said it was his understanding that the 1993 subdivision plan allowed the Boy Scouts to have a trail there at some point.

M. Giguere acknowledged there may be objections to the trail in the beginning, but they are likely to go away over time. He also pointed out this land is owned by the Town of Groton. B. Easom commented there are similar situations all over town. It is important to distinguish the trail area owned by the Town and the land in private ownership. He noted the trail head usually has posts and medallions are used to direct people to public ways. Mr. Easom said the biggest problem is usually abutters encroaching on town-owned land so it very important to have the trail properly marked. Chairman Morrison noted there is sometimes a delay in creating new trails because existing trails also require maintenance. He commented there is a trail next to his lot which does not bother him at all.

B. Clements pointed out there will likely be trailhead posts at the beginning of the trail, and signage is also a possibility. C. Colton said he would like to see a certified plot plan showing any markers. He said people showed up without even coming to the door, and no one notified him of the discussion. (NB All abutters were notified that the topic was going to be on the Commission's agenda.) He asked that the Trails Committee show more diligence in notifying abutters. E. Owen mentioned that Mr. Colton is certainly free to hire a surveyor, and Mr. Colton argued that it is not his obligation. E. Owen said they were trying to locate the boundary markers, and Mr. Colton asked that he come and introduce himself. B. Easom commented they were simply on a fact finding mission, in preparation for getting the trail off the ground. Mr. Colton felt it was common courtesy to introduce oneself.

Mr. Morrison indicated that Mr. Colton had said he had no problem with people using his driveway, but Mr. Colton said it was alarming to his family to see two strange men walking on his property.

7:15 p.m. - 95 Birchwood Avenue NOI

Stan Dillis explained there will be temporary disturbance of the buffer zone while the septic tank and pump chamber are installed. K. Corwin asked if the flagging was done at low water, and Mr. Dillis replied the wetland or lake edge was beyond the floodplain. All plumbing comes out of the front left of the house and will go 6 ft. - 7 ft. into the ground. It would require more than the allowed maximum of 3 ft. In response to a question about the time of year in which the work will be done, Mr. Dillis said it would be preferable to do it this summer as he had noted an algae pool offshore from the house, and this upgrade will improve the situation. Members noted that work is extremely close to the wetland, and Mr. Dillis said it would be difficult if the ground is frozen such as when the lake is drawn down. The old leach pit is in the same approximate location of the new tank which will be fitted with an alarm. The pit will either be crushed or removed. The leach system will be in the front yard approximately the same distance from the lake as the old system.

Norm Johnson (97 Birchwood Avenue) said he has seen septic systems fail on the 4000 to 6000 sq. foot lots in the lake area, and felt this would be a substantial improvement over what has been there previously. There being no further questions, upon a motion by E. Owen, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for 95 Birchwood Avenue.

7:30 p.m. - B & M Railroad RDA

With no applicant present, Jack Risdon urged the Commission not to allow spraying. Commissioners noted the wetland was not flagged, and it was not possible to review the wetland from the information presented. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to issue a positive #2B Determination.

7:45 p.m. - Appointment/George Moore - proposed Agricultural Commission

Mr. Moore explained that an ad hoc group plans to have an article for presentation at the next town meeting to form an Agricultural Commission. The Agricultural Commission will have no regulatory authority, but will act in an advocacy capacity for local farmers. It is likely it will be called a "farm preservation" article. It was noted that the Wetlands Protection Act does cover agriculture, and projects have to be in compliance.

B. Easom said he had attended a meeting with the Commissioner of Agriculture, Douglas Gillespie, who explained the need for towns to organize themselves. He wished the committee great success in their efforts. P. Morrison said he has met with the committee several times and stressed the need for good communication. B. Clements thought there was good support in town for farmers. Mr. Moore explained the committee will represent farmers before different boards, advocate for farm interests, receive notification of sale of real estate, assist with the resolution of disputes, and perform outreach to farmers to answer questions. He commented it is gratifying to know how much farming activity is occurring in town. E. Owen noted the proposed Agricultural Commission would review new bylaws from a farming perspective. C. Auman said there can be objections from new homeowners about noise, dust, or smells.

Jack Risdan, owner of W. Groton farm #841, said he has sheep, and he sees the Agricultural Commission as a way to protect farmers. B. Easom pointed out that anything that helps farms helps preserve open space and is ultimately a way to slow down development which is within the mission of this board. Mr. Moore stated members will be appointed by the Board of Selectmen to serve farmers and to serve boards.

Regarding the apparent work at Grolex, E. Owen thought they may be removing interior tanks and bringing fill into the building. Members suggested including the site on the next round of site walks.

B. Ganem explained that MassHighway is digging several new wells for homes along Boston Road where private wells are contaminated with salt. This work is within the Riverfront Area according to the most recent USGS topographic map. B. Clements, K. Corwin, and E. Owen thought this work could qualify under an exemption, but C. Auman disagreed and felt they should file. M. Giguere noted this would essentially be a Commission opinion that a well is accessory to a residential building. B. Easom thought there were two issues: 1) doing the actual work and 2) pumping water. If the work is on existing lawn and relatively close to the houses and erosion control measures are in place, it could fit under CMR 10.02. Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to allow the work to go forward under 310 CMR 10.02.

C. Auman abstained from the vote.

8:00 p.m. - Public Safety Building NOI

Consultant Bob Pine explained that the last filing for temporary work to gravel some new parking areas was never done. Currently, parking at the Public Safety Building does not meet the needs of the occupants, and there are safety issues for getting cars out of there or parking in inadequate spaces. Mr. Pine noted the work will also require filings under site plan review for the Planning Board and a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Districts Commission.

There are two parking issues: 1) regular day time uses of the property since the Fire Chief and staff has moved to the facility and 2) for training sessions when a large number of cars overflow the site and must park on the street. B. Pine said he was trying to provide additional parking as efficiently as possible while minimizing the amount of grading. All of the work is within the buffer zone. One technique is to reinforce the grassed area. Four spaces will be added to the visitor area with one set aside for handicapped parking. Some of the landscaping will be removed to allow these

spaces. The police cars and private cars are generally parked in the back. Some scrub trees will be removed to allow for the additional parking spaces. The reinforced grass area will be highly drained but structurally stable enough to support vehicles. Mr. Pine said the materials have been used successfully in a number of places. An additional reinforced grass parking space will be added right next to the building. Occupants generally park there now, and it can become muddy. Well-graded, crushed stone will allow recharge so there will be no increase in runoff. There is 100% absorption in the reinforced grass area. Two infiltration systems have been added to the site to compensate for the increase in impermeable surfaces. Two catch basins presently discharge directly into the wetland. The infiltration trenches will treat the first flush of water which typically has more pollutants. The back area pitches to the catch basin in the corner, and there is less potential for recharge from infiltration methods. The addition of measures to pick up the first flush represents a substantial improvement over existing conditions. Mr. Pine maintained that going from four to twelve paved parking spaces and seven to nine spaces in the reinforced grass area and gravel parking area could be mitigated by the addition of hoods to the catch basins and the infiltration trenches.

Mr. Pine indicated he has discussed the suggestion to have parking closer to Pleasant St. with other people who have jurisdiction, e.g., the Planning Board and the Police Chief. Both are opposed to this as people are not likely to use it, and there is a narrow walkway over the wetland crossing. According to B. Pine, no soil tests have been done as yet. M. Giguere asked if there is likely to be a need for still more parking at a later time. Mr. Pine noted that the four spaces are parallel, and the property boundary is quite close to the end of the access road. Existing catch basins will be retrofitted with hoods so petroleum products can be captured. The project will definitely improve the water quality condition of the outflow. Calculations confirming the effectiveness of the infiltration trenches will be prepared once the soil testing is completed.

B. Easom asked if it would be possible to improve the sidewalk if parking is provided on the street side of the wetland crossing. Ultimately, the final solution in the future may call for an addition and additional parking will still be necessary. Having people walk an additional 50 yards is not asking too much. The sand and salt necessary to maintain the current parking area has already degraded the resource area.

B. Pine said, essentially, the need for additional parking cannot be adequately provided on the grassed cell area. He maintained this combination of techniques is a permanent solution, and he did not anticipate the need to ever return before the Commission on the subject of parking at the Public Safety Building. He stated the drainage system will be improved and an additional 450 SF of impervious surfacing will be done in a previously disturbed area. K. Corwin advised that the wetland is a certified vernal pool that wraps around the property. She first visited the site in 1999 and has noticed a steady degradation of the resource area. Snowplows are pushing snow with sand and salt directly into the resource area. The infiltration trenches and parking on grassed, rather than paved, areas may represent an improvement. E. Owen questioned whether there was a snow removal plan and noted that sometimes the grass steps become raised. He asked if the pitch of the infiltration trenches is toward the wetland and noted that snow plows are likely to still push sand and salt into the wetland. Mr. Pine confirmed that the catch basins will not be new structures, and it will be necessary to patch the pavement near the catch basins. He suggested just plowing the snow from the parking area and not using sand or salt. He also noted that crusher run stones graded from 1 inch down to ¼ in. are porous unlike Starpac which packs down.

The green cards for Natural Heritage and DEP should be submitted for this filing. There will be some grading required for the additional parking to provide handicapped parking spaces. It will improve the sheeting of runoff. The size of the infiltration systems will depend on the results of soil tests. It will not be necessary to remove major trees although on the north side, it is very problematic.

Chief Mulhern explained there are 34 to 40 people who work at the facility and who park on the driveway and down the street. The Emergency Management staff, previously part time, is now full time. The Fire Chief and his secretary have recently been added. The facility is currently maxed out, and parking is limited. People park all the way in the back and could collide head on with cars entering the area. Cars currently park right up against the building. Chief Mulhern stated he did not believe non-paved parking areas would meet the need. Visitors will question whether they can park there, and staff with nice cars will not want to park there either. He indicated he felt at least ten additional paved spaces are necessary. Chief Mulhern maintained that parking at the front of the parcel would interrupt the line of sight for those emerging onto Pleasant St. He did not believe that any future expansion of the building was feasible

as it cannot go up or out. He also pointed out that there could never be enough parking for the training sessions because there is a 60 - 100% increase in the people using the facility at that time. In addition, abutters do not want lights shining into their houses.

Tom Boggiano (21 Whistle Post Lane) felt that parking near the building looks bad, but people do not see the police station and this is a better solution. Pending the receipt of additional information and materials and upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for the Public Safety Building at 99 Pleasant St. to
July 25, 2006.

8:15 p.m. - Wharton Plantation/NEFF RDA

Peter Morrison stepped down from the Commission proceedings and explained that he is the applicant as well as the NEFF steward for the property. He noted the plan is to replace or repair four trail bridges which are in a state of disrepair or non-existent. Trail bridge #1 is missing completely and provides access over a 2 ft. wide gully. Bridge #2 was constructed of red pine which is probably 7 yrs. old but has folded. It is anticipated that it will be possible to re-use the decking. Bridge #3 is off of Burntmeadow Rd., and the deck needs replacing. Bridge #4 is currently two telephone poles two ft. apart which have been in place for approximately 5 - 6 yrs. and need decking. Mr. Morrison said rubber washers are used at the contact point between the wood supports and the deck.

Member B. Clements pointed out that creosote is potentially a problem in using the recycled telephone poles. Mr. Morrison said these poles have been up for a while. He noted the DEP handout on creosote said re-using could be acceptable in cases where non-food crops are grown. Mr. Clements said his preference would be to use non-creosote treated poles but he was open to a better solution. K. Corwin questioned whether oak or ash trees could be used to span the banks. She too preferred a non-creosote treated product near the wetland.

E. Owen explained he had brought the issue to the MACC forum and even the well-weathered poles were not advised. He acknowledged this was a volunteer effort however. C. Auman provided some documentation from his research on the Internet and noted that creosote is deposited deep within the wood and remains there a long time. He commented the DEP material refers to handling aged creosote-treated wood for landscaping, but not in wetlands, and he indicated he would be opposed to putting it into water.

Mr. Morrison said the weight of the bridge itself would hold it in place. Acknowledging he needs to find an economic way of building the bridges, he asked if there were any sealers that make the poles more environmentally friendly. Mr. Auman indicated he was struggling with how much creosote might leach into water and could not find information on this issue. As an example, he noted that telephone poles treated with creosote are not allowed within 500' of town wells.

Member Giguere commented he would like to see the bridges restored. For the ones already there he had no objection about re-decking them, but his preference is not to add chemicals to water or soils. K. Corwin suggested felling a tree, and E. Owen added red pine is not good for water contact applications. B. Easom recommended an application for CPC funds for which private organizations can apply. Bruce Ringwald, a member of audience, added the trails at the Wharton Plantation are good and maintenance is important.

K. Corwin noted the Commission had a similar discussion on an Eagle Scout project and should consider developing a policy. B. Easom said this was also discussed on the original Gratuity Rd. trail bridge which was later changed from creosote-treated poles to pressure-treated lumber. He proposed issuing a negative #3 Determination that would require the project be done in accordance with DEP and EPA regulations. Mr. Morrison asked for further clarification of those regulations. Members suggested adding a condition that any new materials not contain creosote. Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by B. Clements, it was

VOTED: to allow the project to proceed under a negative #3 Determination providing
no new materials contain creosote- or arsenic-based preservatives are utilized.

P. Morrison said this will result in two of the bridges not being built.

8:30 p.m. Crossroads Plaza NOI continuation

Bruce Ringwald submitted new materials showing a replication area of 1200 SF. The depression will first be excavated and underlain with 6 - 8 in. of silt/clay. Approximately 10 - 12" of loam, including translocation of soils, will be added. The clay lens will form a bowl within the sandy soils and will also be run underneath the riprap channel discharge. The site will have a 50% increase in plant materials. Mr. Ringwald stated Appendix A had been completed, and it was estimated that the cost of completing the replication area, including plant materials, supervision, and reports, would be between \$3500 and \$4000. He summarized his firm's approach as addressing the Commission's finding that it was a freshwater wetlands and advice that they look at the Bylaw and be creative.

He noted that the Bylaw, in Chapter 215-1, specifies resource areas. This resource area is small and not protected currently because of extensive surrounding land disturbances. There will be no offsite impacts as the wetland is isolated to this site and not part of a larger wetland system. In line with the Bylaw, the replication size triples the size of the current wetland, monitoring, controlling invasives, protecting groundwater (runoff from a rubberized roof is characterized as clean), the use of deep sumps, controlling floodwater runoff, USDA letter praising how the project proposes to prevent erosion and sedimentation through the use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques, and cellular confinement mat to provide stability on the steep slope.

In Section 215-5, A, B, and mostly C in which the public and environmental benefits provided by the proposed alterations and mitigation are addressed. The public benefits provided by the project include the beautification of the intersection which is currently a blighted area, addition of 15 street trees of at least a 4 in. caliper, providing \$40,000 in landscaping services, providing needed services (e.g. a bank), creating sidewalks to link with others along Sandy Pond and Boston Roads, and the donation of the cost of two Opticon transmitters (\$3500) for the intersection. The environmental benefits include the handling and treatment of stormwater, protection of groundwater, control of water pollution, and the creation of a larger wetland and wildlife habitat. The plan also calls for enhanced treatment of on-site septic flows.

Scott Smyers explained that the functions of the existing wetland are limited, and much of the upland community has similar plants. He estimated that groundwater is 40" below the surface. The catchment area is mainly due to overland flow. The new wetland will have deeper water for a longer period of time. If the intent of the Bylaw is to protect wetlands and their functions, the replicated wetland will now serve more functions.

P. Morrison said this plan is a lot better than that originally proposed. B. Clements stated "It is my opinion that the enhanced functions are a benefit." K. Corwin cautioned that providing services to the community is not a benefit under the Bylaw, but she agreed that the plans to enhance a marginal wetland would be a benefit. She continues to struggle, however, with the idea of setting a precedent with moving a wetland rather than working around it. Ms. Corwin questioned the density of plantings, and Mr. Smyers replied the perimeter of the replication area has been increased, and 36 shrubs will be planted, 7 ft. on center, rather than the 24 proposed originally. It was noted that Appendix A had not been completely filled out, and Mr. Ringwald indicated much of the sequencing section has been addressed verbally. Ms. Corwin summarized her concerns as finding out legally what the Commission can do and not setting a precedent.

E. Owen explained that typically the Commission is looking at benefits to wetlands and wildlife. He reminded the Commission of the donation of 300 acres by an abutter to this parcel. C. Auman pointed out that the interests protected under Ch. 215-5 C have to be satisfied, and he is looking for environmental benefits. The three to one replication is a benefit. He noted that Low Impact Development is a big interest to the Commission and suggested that a sign kiosk might be a way of educating the public and would also give the owners some good publicity. B. Ringwald said the applicant's attorney had liability concerns about bringing people to the replicated wetlands, but he did not think there would be an issue with explaining the design process from the paved areas within the project itself.

The project will be developed by one owner, but each site will be separately leased. There will be one owner responsible for the whole site and such items as snow removal. Members questioned whether the applicant would

consider payments to the Conservation Fund which could be considered an environmental benefit since the money would be used to buy conservation land.

B. Ringwald agreed a sign and information on Low Impact Development would be an interesting thing to do, and he thought the applicant would be interested. The applicant has considered making a donation of \$2000 available toward education or to the Conservation Fund. Member Giguere noted the Town is trying to encourage LID projects, and he likes what he is seeing. He added he is still struggling with the idea of moving a wetland.

B. Easom questioned whether the riprap on the northwest side of the replication area would tend to disrupt the flow. Mr. Ringwald responded this is a four to one slope and the purpose of the riprap is to dissipate the velocity of the flow so that vegetation will not be dislodged by surface water coming via a pipe from the bioretention basins after going through the catch basins. This will help assure that sediments do not reach the replication area. Mr. Easom noted the lens is essentially impermeable, and water will evaporate over time. He questioned whether the replication area will be overcome with salt and nutrients. Mr. Smyers maintained this would not happen as water will also come in as overland flow from adjacent forested areas. The waters from the bioretention basins are also treated, and salt will not be used because of the site's location in a Watershed Protection District. Members advised the Commission is likely to require approval by the GCC before the LID signs are posted. Upon a motion by B. Clements, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for Crossroads Plaza.

8:30 p.m. - 687 Townsend Road NOI continuation

Natural Heritage has indicated the proposed garage will not affect rare species, and upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for DEP #169-956 for 687 Townsend Road.

Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by E. Owen, it was

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions for DEP #169-956 for 687 Townsend Rd.
as drafted.

Members reviewed the draft Order of Conditions for 227 Boston Rd., and K. Corwin said she continues to have concerns about the consultant's interpretation of what will happen as a result of changing the size of the culvert under the driveway. Upon a motion by E. Owen, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions for DEP #169-957 for 227 Boston Rd. as
drafted.

Six members voted in favor of the motion while K. Corwin voted in the negative.

In discussion on yield plans, members noted that details about the specific layout are usually not provided, e.g., driveways and septic systems are not shown. K. Corwin suggested the Commission consider allowing only one wetland crossing per development, and it must qualify as a limited project. B. Clements recommended the applicant be required to show us the plan. P. Morrison said the applicant must demonstrate the project is permittable but he was not in favor of having them file before the Commission as a yield plan comes before the Planning Board. One alternative is to request the Planning Board to implement our regulations rather than have applicants come before the Commission. B. Clements suggested the Planning Board and Conservation Commission can work together to get to this point. B. Easom recommended that applicants demonstrate their project meets the most global of requirements. K. Corwin will represent the Commission before the Planning Board on June 29, 2006.

Regarding the request for a Certificate of Compliance for DEP #169-730 for 120 Lost Lake Dr., upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate for DEP #169-730 contingent upon a member or agent of

the Conservation Commission confirming the applicant has installed 3” - 5” trap rock within the eroded area adjacent to the polishing basin.

The Commission has received a request from Nathan Pfenninger, the Eagle Scout who is building the trail bridge at the Northwoods Conservation Area, for funding of materials for the project. B. Clements protested that the Scout should be thinking of more creative means to fund the project. Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to reimburse, from the Land Management line item, \$325.86 to G. V. Moore for the materials to construct the trail bridge at Northwoods Conservation Area.

The motion carried with B. Clements voting in the negative.

Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to authorize the expenditure of up to \$400.00 for the purchase of turtle signs to warn motorists traveling public ways near turtle habitats.

K. Corwin agreed to place the order.

Ms. Ann Hand has asked the Commission to consider placing a bench at the Flat Pond Conservation Area. B. Clements questioned whether she has any suggestions for funding a bench, and B. Easom suggested perhaps she could figure out the funding and getting materials.

It will be necessary to purchase new posts for the installation of signs on conservation properties. B. Ganem reported the Trails Committee purchases 8 ft. long, 5 in. by 5 in. posts from Gate City Fencing in Nashua, NH, and the cedar posts are considerably less than those at other lumber yards. Upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by B. Clements, it was

VOTED: to authorize the expenditure of up to \$1000 for the purchase of posts to be used for signs to identify conservation areas.

B. Ganem will contact the Highway Department to see where these items can be stored, and B. Easom agreed to pick them up since he has a truck suitable for transporting them.

The Commission has postponed re-organization until there was a full complement of members present. With all members present and upon a motion by K. Corwin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to elect Evan Owen as Chairman of the Conservation Commission.

The vote was unanimous.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to elect Marshall Giguere as Vice Chairman of the Conservation Commission.

The vote was unanimous.

Upon a motion by E. Owen, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to elect Kris Corwin as Clerk of the Conservation Commission.

The motion carried with K. Corwin abstaining from the vote.

C. Auman and B. Easom thanked P. Morrison for the excellent job he has done during the past year as Chairman.

At 10:15 p.m. upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, and a roll call vote of B. Clements, K. Corwin, C. Auman, M. Giguere, B. Easom, P. Morrison, and E. Owen, it was

VOTED: to enter Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of a land acquisition,
not to return to Open Session at adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem
Conservation Assistant

Approved as amended July 11, 2006.