

## GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

### Minutes

September 9, 2008

Chairman Marshall Giguere called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room in Town Hall. Members Wayne Addy, Craig Auman, Bruce Easom, Ryan Lambert, and Peter Morrison were present. Conservation Assistant Barbara Ganem was also present.

#### 7:00 p.m. – Appointment/David Pitkin - Applicant for Commission Vacancy

Candidate for the Conservation Commission vacancy, David Pitkin, introduced himself, noting he has been a Groton resident for 3 years and works for Hewlett Packard. His wife serves as Executive Assistant to MassAudubon Director Laura Johnson. He is a member of the Groton Conservation Trust and the Nashua River Watershed Association and serves as a steward for the Throne Hill Conservation Area. Mr. Pitkin expressed an interest in becoming more involved in his community, and the environment is important to him as a person. He indicated he is aware of the two night meetings per month, as well as the preceding Saturday site visits. Although he sometimes travels for work, he felt that he has the time to commit to board activities and has a degree of flexibility in when he has to travel.

Member Lambert said he was interested in having a new face on the Commission. W. Addy explained he has served on the Commission for about a year and pointed out members cannot vote on the final permits if they have not attended all the hearings. Mr. Auman thanked him for his interest and encouraged him to submit the application. He noted it is a good opportunity to learn about the community while cautioning that the Commission needs a quorum of four people present for meetings and the Commission has a clear timetable once an application is filed. C. Auman acknowledged sitting on the Commission is a time sink, with regular meetings typically going until 10 p.m. and sometimes later. In general, there must be a quorum of the same members for all parts of a hearing. There is training available which defines a Commissioner's role and judiciary responsibilities.

B. Easom commented there is additional time necessary to read the applicants' submittals and to attend MACC conferences for training and certificates. Members serve as liaisons to other town committees such as the Community Preservation Committee, Trails Committee, Great Pond Committee, Sustainability Committee, Earth Removal, Stormwater Advisory Committee, and Station Avenue Committee. Mr. Easom joked that it is a good way to do community service without having a misdemeanor charge.

P. Morrison clarified that you can actually miss one hearing, providing you read the minutes and other written materials, and still vote on the final decision. If you miss a second hearing, you would be ineligible to act in the judicial phase of the Commission's duties. He noted it is important to have members with different experiences as there are legal issues which come under review such as conservation restrictions or licenses.

Chairman Giguere explained the process for nominating new members. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to recommend to the Board of Selectmen the appointment of David Pitkin to fill the vacancy on the Conservation Commission.

7:15 p.m. – 200 Hollis St. Request for Determination of Applicability

Homeowners David Hansen and Rosemary Giammarino were present. Mr. Hansen explained they wished to re-do an existing addition. Wetland flagging was done with wetlands identified within existing lawn approximately 80 ft. from the 20' x 14' addition. A 16' x 16' porch on sonatubes is also proposed while the main addition will have a full poured foundation to form a cellar. Roof runoff will be directed into a dry well via gutters and downspouts. The site is fairly flat, with a gradual gradient toward the back of the lot. Haybales will form an erosion control barrier approximately 20 ft. from the edge of the addition. Any excess materials will be going off site. Commissioners reviewed photographs showing existing lawn throughout the work area. The existing addition consists of a raised slab which will be removed with the new addition tied into the house elevations. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative #3 Determination 1) providing a dry well is installed to handle roof runoff; 2) erosion control measures are installed as shown on plan; and 3) any excavated materials are removed from the site.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to approve the Open Session minutes of August 26, 2008 as drafted.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to approve the Executive Session minutes of August 26, 2008 as drafted.

P. Morrison questioned whether Condition #43 in the draft Order was appropriate, but it was noted the applicant had stated daily removal would occur during the time concrete was being chipped from the face of the dam. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions for DEP #169-996 for the repair of the Squannacook River Dam under the Wetlands Protection Act.

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

VOTED: to issue the same conditions under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

After some discussion on the merits of using straw or salt marsh hay over haybales which may have weed seeds, and upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to issue the draft Order of Conditions for DEP #169-998 for 133 Gratuity Rd. under the Wetlands Protection Act.

Upon a motion striking Conditions #5 and #10 in the draft Order by P. Morrison, a second by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to issue an Order of Conditions, as amended to require the removal of existing materials in the resource area in Condition #14, for DEP #169-998 for 133 Gratuity Rd. under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

7:30 p.m. – 174 Shelters Rd. Request for Determination of Applicability

Homeowner Dr. Bill Eger explained his existing 6 ft. x 3 ft. shed had been demolished by a falling tree. He plans to replace the shed with a 3 ft. by 8 ft. structure, probably made of plastic resin, which will have no permanent foundation and will go directly on raw dirt. A 2 ft. by 8 ft. wooden barrier will keep dirt away from the structure. He questioned whether he even needed to file since it is a replacement, and M. Giguere noted it is always better to ask if the project involves work in the buffer zone.

B. Easom clarified that the work is within a previously disturbed area with an extension of the footprint by 2 ft. The shed will be parallel to the lake, and the installation of peastone under the base and at the dripline might prevent erosion. Dr. Eger argued that the shed will slant away from the lake and rainfall will soak into the landing formed by the existing cement seawall. There are no changes except for the extra 2 ft. in length. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by W. Addy, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative #3 Determination.

Upon a motion by R. Lambert, seconded by W. Addy, it was

VOTED to sign and issue an Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD) for Island Pond Rd., DEP #169-1000.

In discussion on the draft Order of Conditions to amend DEP #169-908 for Squannacook Hills, it was noted that their Operations and Maintenance Plan was incorporated as a condition in the amended Order. B. Easom said it is a unique site with much of the work uphill of the wetlands, and this makes it appropriate to be careful about maintenance of the drainage infrastructure. P. Morrison worried that the requirement to remove grass clippings after mowing the detention basin would be taken too literally by future Commissioners. He agreed to add substitute wording about following the maintenance plan to Condition #83. W. Addy questioned whether they will move the handicapped walkway out of the buffer, and members noted there was a reason it was proposed in that location which was reviewed under the original filing. Our Bylaw is not in effect for a 40B project. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to issue the amended Order of Conditions for DEP #169-908 for Squannacook Hills.

7:45 p.m. – Lowell Rd. Notice of Intent continuation

No DEP number has been assigned to this project, and the applicant's consultant did not provide the green card documenting the mailing date to Natural Heritage. Mr. Marsden emphasized that his focus has been on resolution of the deeds. Attorney Bob Collins explained that he and Steve Marsden are present on behalf of applicants Bill and Barbara Gale. Mr. Collins noted the property had been subdivided by Mr. Gilson and is challenged by the presence of resource areas and topography. He has previously provided information on the deeds showing that Lots 4 and 3A have recently been purchased by John Sheedy, based on a 1983 approval-not-required (ANR) plan in which lot lines were subsequently changed. Mr. Collins stressed that no driveway easement was ever created, and these two lots always stood alone. An old cart path provided access to a newly created lot now owned by Scott Wilson, but there was never an easement in place in favor of Lot 3. He maintained that it is problematic to get to the other lot and there is less disturbance of woodlands to have Lot 3 stand on its own. The applicant is prepared to do anything the Groton Conservation Commission might require to make this a developable and saleable lot.

Chairman Giguere mentioned there are technical issues related to the lot boundaries, in particular the southeast boundary where the building envelop is laid out. This could result in moving the grading closer to the wetlands. Engineer Steve Marsden stressed that the main question which must be addressed is whether this is a self-imposed hardship. He felt that this legal question must be answered first before incurring additional costs for the Gales. There are a number of technical questions that involve changes to the plan that will not be addressed until the self-imposed hardship question is resolved. He indicated he could provide these changes at the next meeting if the questions of limited project status and self-imposed hardship are addressed in the current hearing.

S. Marsden acknowledged these determinations affect both access and accessibility. Bob Collins explained changes between the two plans promulgated in 1983 resulted in the deeds referencing both lots and two additional triangles of land. These matters do not involve the wetland crossing, but he concurred that Mr. Marsden will have to tweak the design plan. Mr. Giguere pointed out that access to the parcel is a matter of the Commission's discretion, but the fact that both lots were previously owned by the Gales created the question of self-imposed hardship. B. Collins agreed this was problematic, but noted an additional wetland crossing was necessary either way. Mr. Giguere disagreed, noting there was an existing crossing which could have been or could be used to provide access to the proposed house. Mr. Collins argued that this would have impacted the sale of the house which the Sheedys now have. The issue comes within the context of a common driveway. Mr. Sheedy has indicated that there is no possibility of allowing an easement for a shared driveway. There were two prior potential sales which both fell through because of having to share a driveway. Members requested a letter stating the owner is not willing to have a common driveway. C. Auman added this should include the statement 'under any circumstances'. W. Addy asked if they had approached the Country Club. Chairman Giguere pointed out the language in the Regulations states 'land owned or previously owned'. C. Auman expressed concern that 310 CMR 10.53(3)(3) also states a landowner can't create their own hardship by selling off property that might have been used to provide access. He questioned how

many common driveways exist in Groton and added that because one buyer is unwilling to have a common driveway doesn't mean there aren't others who might be willing.

B. Collins acknowledged there are 100's of common driveways out there, and he lives on one, but not by choice. This driveway would go beyond an existing house, and he felt the DEP regulation applied to situations in which the applicant owned the whole site and then created lots. He said this lot has existed since 1983, and there has never been an easement, and each lot was meant to stand on its own. When he served on the Planning Board in the late 1980's, they were just beginning to recognize the wisdom of limiting multiple driveways. C. Auman said selling off property that would have provided such access does not mean the Commission is now obligated to allow multiple wetland crossings. Mr. Auman stressed that the Regulations spell out 'currently or formerly owned' with the point being the owner did own both lots originally. B. Collins indicated he will look into case law on the matter. C. Auman stressed that the new owner must confirm that he would not consider a common driveway under any circumstances.

Members R. Lambert, W. Addy, and P. Morrison indicated they did not have any further comments. B. Easom said he did not pay much attention to the fact that there is a new owner and believes the Commission is being asked to make a decision on where we are today. He questioned under what conditions, if any, the Conservation Commission, would exercise its prerogative to allow the project to go forward. He mentioned the Commission sometimes looks outside the normal track record for an additional environmental or resource area benefit. He did not see what environmental benefit will occur that could convince the Conservation Commission that the project ought to go forward within the scope of what the Commission can allow. He questioned what compensatory environmental or resource area benefit would occur as a result of this project.

M. Giguere said he believes the crossing is likely to have an enormous environmental impact, and it is the Commission's responsibility to limit impacts. Steven Marsden mentioned there could be less tree cutting with a different access, and this would benefit the resource area. He suggested re-visiting this point during a site visit. W. Addy stated he would not design the project but he previously raised questions about connecting the wetlands on either side of the driveway. Members mentioned some of the wetland flags were not numbered in the field, and the Commission previously requested re-numbering or verification so another site visit appears to be in order. C. Auman said he has a couple more points, including the fact the Bylaw requires three times the amount of wetland filling for replication while the applicant is calling for a 1.4 replication size as he states there is no room to do that much replication. This gives an idea of the amount of the total site that is being altered. In addition the proposed elevation changes within the 100-ft. buffer zone exceed what is allowed under the Bylaw. B. Collins confirmed that it will be necessary to re-visit the project again, and upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing to September 23, 2008.

8:15 p.m. – Robin Hill Notice of Intent DEP #169-999

Attorney Collins said he represented the builder, David Moulton, who was in the audience. The house lot included in this filing is close to the culvert crossing for the Rocky Hill Subdivision. The disturbed area is associated with the development of Lot 2. Mr. Collins said the builder realized after-the-fact that some of the work should have been submitted to the Commission which is concerned about both the size of disturbance and the proximity to an intermittent stream. The finished grade for the lot feathers into the grading associated with the culvert and is now fully vegetated. Mr. Collins pointed out the developer had given away, for permanent preservation, some 450 acres of this 650 acre parcel to become a wildlife sanctuary owned by MassAudubon. Another 15 acres was donated directly to the Town, in the care and custody of the Conservation Commission. He maintained the developer is deeply sorry for the mistake and is willing to fulfill any plantings requested by the Natural Heritage Program. The resource area is a rather steep cut into the terrain, and there are no wetland plants within the upland area surrounding the intermittent stream.

Chairman Giguere noted the letter from Natural Heritage calls for the restoration or re-planting of the area with native plants. B. Collins acknowledged the lawn may have to be replaced with native plants. P. Morrison also advised the Commission is likely to require conservation markers to help insure against lawn creep in the future. He suggested perhaps 1/3 of the area would require re-planting. B. Collins said he would pull together a specific proposal for type of vegetation, as well as density of plantings. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for DEP #169-999, Lot 2 Robin Hill, to September 23, 2008.

8:30 p.m. – Groton School Notice of Intent, DEP #169-1002

Attorney Bob Collins explained this project involves the replacement of the School's oil boiler which provides heat and hot water to the facilities with a biomass or wood chip boiler. There is currently a brick boiler house with a stack, and it is this building that will be renovated to convert from heating with #6 crude oil to wood chips. There is a wetland close to the recently renovated stables which now serves as the maintenance building. This involved the demolition of several buildings near the wetland. The boiler house and a series of utilitarian type buildings support the school's infrastructure in this location. Groton School wishes to clean up the area and direct surface runoff into an infiltration basin and replicate some of the area being disturbed.

Two specialists, John Hinckley and Jeff Forward, further explained the process. Mr. Forward spoke from an emissions control point of view, explaining this is an opportunity to use biomass and to consider energy conservation and efficiency, a process which Groton School began in 2005. Wood is a renewable, sustainable fuel that will reduce reliance on foreign fuels, with energy dealers kept local through local forestry activities. The goal has been to develop a market for low grade products. There are many trees that are unmerchantable that currently go unused. Current logging activities typically leave behind a lot of waste wood which rots. Biomass is good from a greenhouse gas analysis, because it uses carbon already in the carbon cycle rather than using old carbon that has been sequestered for years. In general it is considered CO<sup>2</sup> neutral. There are many examples in New England with Vermont, with its State House and 30 public

schools already using the new technology, at the forefront. The biomass would consist of residue that remains after a timber harvest. The cost of the fuel is relatively stable (doubling in the past 20 years). The proposed Groton School project could serve as a model for sustainable use of resources.

Green hardwood chips are delivered in tractor trailers which can unload in 20 minutes. The chips would go into bins where a conveyor belt takes the chips to the boiler. It is generally not a smoky operation as the burner burns very hot, and the fuel and oxygen levels are carefully controlled according to need. No creosote is generated, and there is very little residue. The process is very different from the outside wood burners many homeowners are installing. Approximately 25 to 30 tons would come in on the tractor trailer. The resulting ash is not considered a hazardous material and is sometimes used as a low grade lime treatment on lawns. The system is fully automated, and the proponents anticipate a half hour per day for management and maintenance activities.

The greatest concern for emissions involves particulate matter. In evaluating the school facilities for energy efficiency it was determined the older buildings are not appropriate for solar, wind, or electricity. The biomass or #6 crude oil were the only other alternatives. Building & Grounds Supervisor Tim Dumont estimated 1000 tons of biomass would be necessary to heat the buildings each year. This amount would have an emission equivalent of 5 or 6 woodstoves. The stack is 93 ft. high and will widely disperse any emissions.

Mr. Forward stressed that this is not just a supply side analysis as the School has made a very big commitment to green up the campus. There is a Sustainability Committee composed of both faculty members and students, and the School is taking active steps to reduce their carbon footprint.

Mr. Collins added that a pellet stove does not burn as hotly as would the biomass boiler. C. Auman questioned at what point there is likely to be a supply problem. Foresters have estimated 1.7 million tons of biomass currently goes unused each year. Some electricity is necessary to activate blowers, and there will also be emergency generators.

John Hinckley stated several state permits are required for this type of operation. M. Giguere commented air quality was a big issue when wood burning generated a lot of smoke in the 1970's in response to the energy crisis then. It will be necessary to get a limited comprehensive permit which is a legal document with permit conditions. It is his goal to determine whether the project can meet air quality standards. He explained that 99% of the particulates are controlled by the 'Bag' house which is maintained annually with testing every year. Sensors maintain the proper air to fuel ration. In general there are low CO<sup>2</sup> emissions, just a little more than a natural gas boiler. Because the stack is 93 ft. tall, the emissions are not affected by turbulence caused by buildings. He noted that an atmospheric dispersal model report has been developed in conjunction with DEP, and everyone is confident that all standards will be met.

It was estimated that 90% of the School's heating needs will be addressed with this system. The system was designed to incorporate supplemental heating methods during the coldest parts of the year, but it also can operate harder and more of the time as needed. W. Addy questioned whether

thermal modeling had been considered, and Mr. Hinckley replied topography, building geometry, stack perimeter, exhaust temperatures, flow, and velocity were all taken into consideration and combined with 5 years of weather data that includes such elements as wind speed and temperature. The stack reaches 400° F; members questioned whether this would result in microscale global warming in the vicinity. Mr. Hinckley explained that the temperatures in the stack are likely to be higher than the ambient air so the heat would rise rather than settling onto the ground.

Engineer Andy Truman of Samniotes Consultants pointed out the new boiler would be installed within the existing boiler building. An addition with three storage bins will be installed at the back of the building and the woodchips will be mechanically conveyed to the boiler. It is proposed that an already disturbed area will be paved, bringing up the grade slightly. There is a slight increase in impervious surfacing in the buffer zone as a result of this project. Some plantings are proposed to screen the building. Bulrushes will be planted within the infiltration basin. No vehicles are to be parked near there, but sand is the biggest control issue.

W. Addy pointed out drainage appears to be directed to a riprapped swale. Mr. Truman indicated they wanted sufficient offset to groundwater, and the project is designed to meet TSS removal standards and is actually oversized as far as requirements go. The three bins can store three truck loads which equates to about 3 days' worth of heat. Trucks now deliver the #6 crude in an area with broken bituminous pavement, and the proposed project will result in a significant improvement over what is there now. Very little tree cutting will be necessary. It is anticipated the Commission will do a site visit on Saturday, September 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Dumont estimated the School goes through approximately 140,000 gallons of #6 crude oil in an average year. Gas heating is likely to be used on the shoulder months of September through November and April through June. The oil tank holds 10,000 gallons, and they typically do weekly deliveries. The new system will significantly reduce the number of deliveries.

B. Easom expressed concern that a spillway to the wetlands will be created. Mr. Truman maintained this will act as a dam to contain any spills. The walking floor (conveyer belt) also has hydraulic waste products. Mr. Easom pointed out ash is alkaline in nature, and can contain heavy metals. Ash will be removed from the site and have a beneficial use determination on where to apply it at an agronomic rate. C. Auman requested that snow storage be shown on the plan. A question arose as to why the road has to be so wide thereby increasing the amount of pavement in the buffer zone. The underground oil storage tank has been tested at some point, but Mr. Dumont could not say exactly when. The #6 crude oil is different from gasoline and #2 heating oil. It tends to be very viscous, and will not flow at normal temperatures. Would DEP allow underground storage now? If there is a leak, it is likely the oil would plug the hole as it has to be heated to make it flow. Commissioners questioned whether heavy equipment will be running over the tank, and it was noted this should be avoided.

Members reminded the Groton School consultants of the need to clean up several outstanding projects with Orders of Conditions before commencing a new project. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by C. Auman, it was



VOTED: to continue the hearing to September 23, 2008.

8:45 p.m. – ANRAD/227 Boston Rd. DEP#169-1001 continuation

Because there were no site visits this past Saturday, the applicant has agreed to another continuation. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing to September 23, 2008.

Upon a motion by R. Lambert, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 341 Martins Pond Rd., DEP #169-840.

Upon a motion by W. Addy, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 31 Autumn Leaf Rd., DEP #169-774.

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

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 7 Shenandoah Ave., DEP #169-648.

B. Ganem reported three complaints have come in about the overnight parking of heavy machinery and lack of erosion control measures for the Island Pond Rd. testing Determination of Applicability. Essentially both conditions spelled out in the Determination were violated. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue a fine of \$50 for failure to notify the Groton Conservation Commission about leaving equipment overnight.

The fine will be issued to the applicant, and the letter should spell out the specific violations as stated in the Determination.

B. Ganem noted that a high school student has done some of the maintenance work at Sargisson Beach this summer. His parents have signed a waiver letter because he is under 18, but it is not necessary to have work papers from the school. His fee is based on the hourly salary paid to a Land Manager of \$12. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: to pay Michael Haynes' bill of \$228 for 19 hours of work at Sargisson Beach.

A 'Friends of Sargisson Beach' group is tentatively getting underway with a small group meeting. M. Giguere agreed to attend this on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Giguere also indicated he has been trying to talk with Tom Hartnett about possible help from the Commissioners of Trust Funds.

In discussion on plans to hold a second Mock Fox Hunt at Surrenden Farm, members agreed that it would be necessary to have confirmation from the Smigelskis that either October 21 or

October 28 are acceptable dates and also to check with Pat Huckery to see if Fish & Wildlife is alright with this plan. Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by R. Lambert, it was

VOTED: that the Mock Fox Hunt is conditionally approved depending upon approval by the Smigelskis and Fish & Wildlife, providing signs are posted one week in advance advising the public of this use.

Members reviewed the proposed warrant articles for the upcoming October Town Meeting. The first article has been prepared in conjunction with Town Counsel and will allow an application for LAND (formerly Self Help) funding and the allocation of any receipts back into the Conservation Fund. The second article allows the re-allocation of funds that went into the General Fund to the Conservation Fund as agreed to by all the parties involved in the Town selling a piece of land to Tom Wilson at 21 Moose Trail. The third article requests authorization from Town Meeting to allow the Town to apply for title certification to the Conservation Commission for two parcels of registered land previously dedicated to conservation purposes by Town Meeting. C. Auman suggested that the third article include more information about the size and location of the parcels in question.

B. Easom asked if there were any deed restrictions which should be renewed, and Fletcher Hill was the only one that seems to fall under this category. Most of the Conservation Restrictions held by the Commission are 'in perpetuity' under Ch. 184, §31-33. He also questioned whether the revolving fund has expired, and it was noted this is typically renewed at the April town meeting.

Regarding the draft license for the re-location of the lower Gibbet Hill trail, M. Giguere questioned whether we need greater detail (a survey?) to specify the area to which the trail will be re-located. He also asked whether this would apply to Mr. Webber's successors and assigns. Members thought not as it would have to be negotiated between any new owner and the Town, so the document would essentially evaporate with a new owner taking possession. It would encumber the property for a new owner. The new trail would parallel Lowell Rd., but be moved 15' to 20' closer to Lowell Rd. It was agreed to send Steve Webber a copy of the draft to see if this is what he had in mind.

B. Ganem reported that Mr. Truax/124 Mill St. has filed a Request for Determination of Applicability, but indicated he is not available until the end of October for a site walk and meeting.

Town Counsel David Doneski has indicated he will be meeting with Town boards and employees on Monday, September 15<sup>th</sup>. B. Ganem will email out a specific time for the Commission to meet with him.

Upon a motion by W. Addy, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to enter Executive Session for the purpose of discussing land acquisitions and litigation, not to return to Open Session at adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem  
Conservation Assistant

**Approved as drafted 9/23/08.**