

GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

January 11, 2011

Vice Chairman David Pitkin called the meeting to order 7:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room in Town Hall. Members Craig Auman, Marshall Giguere, and Nadia Madden were also present. Members William Neacy and Peter Morrison arrived at 7:03 p.m. Chairman Bruce Easom was absent. Conservation Administrator Barbara Ganem was present.

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

VOTED: to approve the minutes of December 20, 2010 as drafted.

(P. Morrison and B. Neacy arrived at 7:03 p.m.)

7:00 p.m. Appointment Stan Dillis

Mr. Dillis reported the survey on the NEFF Baddacook Pond parcel was complete. Based on the offset to the wetlands, they installed 54 corner pins vs. the 28 proposed in their estimate. The acreage still comes in at 52 acres, and they are ready to go before the Planning Board with the plan. The iron pins have orange plastic tips. Once approved by the Planning Board, the survey plan can be recorded. He asked if the Commission has any concerns, and there being none, the Commission moved onto other topics.

Concerning the draft community survey to accompany the revised Open Space & Recreation Plan revision, C. Auman observed the questions in the draft seem to be geared toward getting an answer that there is no need to protect any more land. He pointed out that half of what we say is protected land can actually be developed if some of the non-profit organizations decide to sell. He stressed the real need is for stewardship and preservation of rural character. Mr. Auman submitted written revisions for the draft. M. Giguere suggested we include a question about whether residents would like to see Sargisson Beach continue to be operated as a beach with lifeguards and swim lessons. N. Madden thought that specific facilities should be called out.

If we mail out the survey with the GELD electric bill, we need to keep the document to 1 page although it can be double-sided. It was agreed M. Giguere, C. Auman, and B. Ganem will prepare a revision and then return to the Commission with a recommendation. P. Morrison said he preferred not to use Survey Monkey, especially since GELD reaches every address. Members Giguere and Auman will meet with Patti Kelleher of Community Opportunities Group on January 18th at 10 a.m.

7:15 p.m. Appointment Meredith Scarlet

M. Giguere thanked Ms. Scarlet for the installation of the new dry trail access. He acknowledged she did not have to do this, but it was appreciated. One of the concerns Ms. Scarlet outlined in her letter received on October 7, 2010 is the lack of boundary markers and whether this would be

something she needs to address. Mr. Giguere explained some of the markers had gone missing, probably due to snow clearing activities, but their replacement would not be her responsibility.

Ms. Scarlet also asked if the Commission would prefer to see the tractors and farm equipment parked closer to the barn. Members noted the envelope that defines the easement boundaries is where clients should park but farm equipment can move outside the easement. The farm plan may further define this.

The gate closure question has been addressed. M. Scarlet questioned whether movable jumps, fences, piles of logs, and stone walls built to mimic natural farm features were an issue. M. Giguere said "It is a good idea to coordinate with the holder if there are any questions, but movable features are generally okay while more permanent features could be problematic." Cleaning ditches is usually considered a regular farm maintenance activity. Training structures or digging a pit for drainage are temporary in nature while the water jump is more permanent. P. Morrison asked whether this is part of a farm pond. D. Pitkin said the Commission is being asked, as the holder of the Conservation Restriction, what threshold M. Scarlet should consider before coordinating with the Commission. M. Scarlet said she had removed buckthorn in the buffer zone to create cross country trails without consulting with the Commission. N. Madden asked what improvements or changes she anticipated in the next few years, and M. Scarlet mentioned fencing repairs and ditching. Acknowledging the water jump is probably the biggest change, she does not anticipate anything of that scale in the future. They do move the jumps around, but generally try to fit them into the natural landscape.

Ms. Scarlet does not need a forestry management plan as tree removal is apt to be the removal of hazardous or fallen trees in accordance with the wording in the Conservation Restriction itself. She is working with Dan Lenthall to pull together a farm management plan within the next two months. M. Giguere suggested taking comments from both parties to revise the Monitoring Committee's report and giving Ms. Scarlet another copy to review. Members recommended she give the Conservation Commission a call if something big is proposed, and thanked her for excellent stewardship of the land and the new trail. B. Easom has copies of the plan and will make the revisions noted above.

B. Ganem reported on a site visit to 179 Mill St. during which she observed the deck is completed and has a gravel underlayment, an infiltration trench has been installed on the stream side of the addition to capture roof runoff, and three conservation markers have been installed. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to issue Certificates of Compliance for DEP#169-1046 and DEP#169-843 for 179 Mill St.

In issuing the Ch. 91 license for 65 Rawding Rd. the state has required the owner to contribute \$3,430.00 to the Town specifically for the maintenance or operation of the boat ramp and Town-owned and managed beach on Lost Lake/Knops Pond, a Great Pond. This is because 24 feet of their boathouse blocks public access on the Great Pond. The license also allows on-going maintenance of the docks. Members questioned whether it should go into the Conservation Fund or the Sargisson Beach fund. *(It can be either as long as the expenditure is on improving access*

to *Lost Lake/Knops Pond*.) The owner is concerned about future maintenance which is allowed under the Ch. 91 license but not under the Order of Conditions DEP#169-1034. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue a dock permit letter with the accompanying boilerplate conditions allowing on-going maintenance providing he completes all Ch. 91 licensing requirements, including recording of the license and plan.

7:45 p.m. - Appointment Todd Lobo/Larry Beals/Academy Hill Cherry Tree Lane wetland crossing

Neither Mr. Lobo nor Mr. Beals were present at the scheduled time.

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

VOTED: to approve the 2010 Annual Report as drafted.

The application for the Community Preservation Committee was emailed to members last week, but the submittal was due January 8th. B. Ganem said she would like to have letters of support from other boards to accompany the submittal. M. Giguere agreed to approach the Planning Board and Great Ponds Committee, D. Pitkin will talk to the Greenway Committee, P. Morrison will contact NEFF, and B. Ganem will work with the NRWA and the Groton Conservation Trust to prepare letters in support of the Commission's \$150,000 application.

M. Giguere explained he received a call from Virginia Bennett this past Saturday who had concerns about tree cutting on New Pond Rd. on Groton Assessors' Parcel 132-66, a 6.65-acre conservation area. Most of the tree cutting was due to beavers, but a neighbor at 38 Hidden Valley Rd. was also cutting up the felled trees and using them for bonfires when children were ice skating. The beavers have constructed a lodge in a detention basin and are cutting trees/shrubs around the edge. Mr. Giguere suggested hardware cloth might protect the trees against beaver damage most of which he thought were willows. He believes the landowner now understands he should come to the Commission before doing anything on conservation land. The trees should be left in place to provide beaver food. This is a stormwater control structure for the Groton Woods subdivision and, although it is functioning as a wetland, it is not considered a jurisdictional wetland. B. Neacy questioned how detention basins are to be maintained, and it was noted they are supposed to be cleared regularly and silt removed so there is no reduction in storage capacity over time. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to have B. Ganem send a letter to the owner of 38 Hidden Valley Rd. to follow up and reinforce the need to contact the Commission in advance of any activities on conservation land in the future.

8:00 p.m. 54 Hill Rd. Request for Determination of Applicability

Owner James Reilley explained he planned to backfill the old foundation hole and clean up debris. There will be no change in grade, and the area will be maintained as lawn as it has been for hundreds of years. M. Giguere asked whether the existing garage is to be removed, and Mr. Reilley indicated he planned to eventually move it. Mr. Giguere pointed out this was not

mentioned in the RDA. J. Reilley said he had had the septic tank pumped and planned to backfill it. Rubble and materials, including the wood placed behind the garage, are to be collected in a roll-off dumpster. Mr. Reilley said he already removed an oil tank and furnace. He expects to cave in the foundation walls and fill the area. Members noted portions of the piping for the heating system remain within the foundation. C. Auman questioned what will be done with the brick rubble. The site should also be seeded with erosion control measures in place.

J. Reilley said he has been cleaning up trash on the property since he bought it. Wooden materials will go into the dumpster. N. Madden asked if there was any hazardous waste on site, and Mr. Reilley said there was one lead pipe, and there was little or no insulation in the house which did not have steam heat so the pipes were not wrapped with asbestos. D. Pitkin asked about stabilizing the bare soils, and Mr. Reilley said he would seed in the spring. Mr. Neacy pointed out usually an abandoned 1000-gallon septic tank must be crushed and filled in place. Members summarized the steps to be taken on site: existing foundation to be filled, septic tank crushed and filled, debris removed, garage and barn to be removed, and the timing for a container to be dropped off. The Commission's main concern is bare soils washing down into the resource area and the fact the site can't be stabilized until spring. Mr. Reilly said the garage will stay there for now.

Members asked if there was any leakage associated with the oil tank. Mr. Reilly stated it was in good shape, and there were no leaks. P. Morrison observed that fieldstone does not necessarily make a good foundation. Mr. Reilley stated the foundation was in poor shape because the Groton shale shattered in places. Members asked whether the Historical Society had any interest in the foundation or history on the house. J. Reilley said it was at one time owned by Mrs. Hill, and the Hill family owned 175 acres in the late 1700's. Butternut was used for the beams. Members asked if any other work was anticipated. Plans submitted to the Board of Health show some grading associated with the new septic system and the removal of an existing barn structure within the 100-ft. buffer zone of wetland resources. An additional permit is necessary from the Commission for this work. P. Morrison said the question is whether the whole project arises to the level of a Notice of Intent. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a positive #3 and #5 Determination, requiring the filing of a Notice of Intent.

P. Morrison explained that any work within 100 feet of the wetland is jurisdictional, and this applies to the whole project due to the extent of proposed work. There is backfilling, more demolition, and the need for erosion control. The wetland flagging is probably okay. Members explained that plans that show all the points of disturbance are necessary and these points should be measured and shown on a plan. M. Giguere noted that, even though this filing is after-the-fact for some steps i.e., the re-location of the house to a new foundation, there appear to be other things to be done.

Mr. Reilly asked why he wasn't exempt because it is an existing house, and members explained this is new work on an existing lot, and the Commission must authorize the work to go forward. He asked the Commission to sign off on his Building Permit Application since the new house is out of the buffer. Members pointed out that some of the grading associated with the new septic system is within the 100-ft. Buffer Zone, as is the barn he proposes to remove. The Order of

Conditions must be issued and recorded before a sign-off can occur. Mr. Reilly questioned the benefit of that, and Commissioners noted the conditions will protect the resource area. Mr. Reilly argued that the land is not sloping, and it is 100 ft., give or take. He felt it was more of a guideline and is not like disturbing a wetland. Mr. Giguere suggested picking up the 'Wetlands Kit' from B. Ganem in order to see how to proceed with filing the Notice of Intent.

8:30 (scheduled for 8:15) p.m. - Appointment Frank DiPietro Request for Certificates of Compliance for Rivercourt

Mr. DiPietro explained he is an engineer working for Vanasse, Hangen, & Brustlin. He briefly reviewed the background for the construction of the River Court Assisted Living facility. An Order of Conditions was issued in 1999 for the renovation of the old Leatherboard mill. A second Order was issued for the adjacent brick house. A third filing was made in 2005 in which the completion of compensatory floodplain storage was proposed. F. DiPietro said one quarterly report was filed on the first project, and the applicant did sign off on the acknowledgement. The same contractor worked on both the mill and the brick house. He asserted that three areas under the building provide flood storage that more than compensates for the fill associated with the septic system. The breakaway windows also provide a way for floodwaters to enter the basement of the building. Mr. DiPietro indicated the sluiceway was never sealed. There is a 3 ft. elevation difference between the old floor and the new floor, and this area also provides flood storage. The NGVD standard is 225 ft. while the new floor is at 228 ft. There is a Stormceptor manhole that discharges to the Squannacook River. Mr. DiPietro provided two photographs showing the extent of flooding in spring 2010 which is estimated to have been between 222 ft. – 223 ft and to be between a 10- year and 50-year storm event.

The state considers the Squannacook Dam to be a significant hazard structure due to the development of the River Court housing downstream. Mr. DiPietro stated there is an emergency evacuation plan in place that includes moving people to the second floor and then re-locating them into area hotels. He thought the floodplain was .8 ft. lower in the new FEMA mapping, but the extent of flooding would be comparable to the older FEMA maps.

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

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-930 for Rivercourt since the Order of Conditions has expired and the project was never commenced.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Neacy, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-739 for work associated with the separate brick house at River Court.

Member Morrison said things become more difficult when considering the Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-668 for the main River Court buildings. There are downspouts going into the ground, so the assumption is that roof runoff is re-charging the water table. Roof runoff on the River side of the building is handled by downspouts directly into the River. The breakaway windows are not visible in the submitted photographs, but Mr. DiPietro said they were under water last spring. C. Auman questioned how the Commission is to know whether the

building is strong enough to take a 100-year flood if the dam should fail. N. Madden underscored the need for peer review to determine the adequacy of the proposed flood storage concept. Mr. DiPietro estimated the size of the windows is about 1 ft. by 2 ft., and they are outfitted with a grate and insect screening. Ms. Madden noted that debris blocking the windows could be an issue and also questioned whether the Board of Health would have concerns about flooding and subsequent growth of mold at the facility although this issue is outside the Commission's purview.

Mr. DiPietro said the state law requires that compensatory flood storage be provided at 1-ft. increments equaling the area that was filled. He noted that HUD requires that the first habitable floor be at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation, and there is 3 ft. between the new floor and the old floor.

Ms. Madden asked the effects of the change between the old and new FEMA maps. Mr. DiPietro said the references have changed, but not the actual elevations. DEP#169-668 was filed under the old FEMA map so the standard would not change. C. Auman commented he did not feel competent to know whether this flood storage scheme will work. B. Neacy said he was perfectly fine with what he has seen and heard. P. Morrison affirmed it seems an appropriate way to deal with flood storage. C. Auman expressed concern about the Commission's jurisdiction because this is an unusual approach for flood storage. Including a condition that the building should never be flood proofed in the future is difficult because the Order has now expired, and the Commission cannot now add a new condition. P. Morrison inquired whether the peer review would involve just a check of the calculations.

N. Madden said different modeling is proposed, and C. Auman noted a big difference is letting floodwaters go through the building and whether the building can sustain this if there is a significant flood. Ms. Madden added it is a very real concern how water would go into the vault and through the building. Vice Chairman D. Pitkin summarized the Commission's concerns as 1) the structural integrity of the building, 2) the hydrological connection between the River and its floodplain and compensatory flood storage, and 3) calculations supporting incremental flood storage. The applicant is substituting vaults for what was originally proposed for flood storage. Mr. DiPietro said water could come up through the hatch into the workshop area. D. Pitkin contended that this remedy is also after-the-fact, and the Commission needs to understand whether it is comparable to what was originally proposed. B. Neacy pointed out the board does not need to certify this. P. Morrison agreed with this statement, but noted the board has a responsibility to the Town and downstream residents. B. Ganem read from the original Notice of Intent the intention to create incremental flood storage adjacent to the fill added for the septic systems.

Upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to seek a peer review of the proposed flood storage conditions, both the philosophy and the calculations, to determine whether storage provided under the building adequately compensates for or is equal to or better than the originally proposed compensatory flood storage methodology.

The motion passed by majority vote with B. Neacy voting in the negative.

Originally scheduled for 7:45 p.m., the appointment with Surveyor Larry Beals and developer Bruce Wheeler took place at 9:25 p.m. to discuss the Academy Hills Cherry Tree Lane wetland crossing. Mr. Beals explained they had created a civil sketch for dealing with the wetland crossing. There are two areas within which they are proposing earthwork which will constitute 1,077 SF of additional disturbance. The cross culvert has concrete footings, and the lip or berm is part of the footings. The structural engineer has indicated an area approximately 3 ft. x 6 in. could safely be removed from the lip at the outlet and inlet providing a transition to dirt in the culvert. There is the option of making it deeper but it could affect the structural integrity of the retaining wall. L. Beals reported the soil stockpile has now been re-graded and covered with erosion control matting. He submitted an erosion control report, dated January 11, 2011, from the site supervisor. The actual survey elevation is 269 ft. on the downstream side when 271 ft. was proposed, and the upstream elevation is the same as originally proposed. The total area of disturbance would be 2,839 SF, well under the 5,000 SF limit, and replication is proposed.

Another previously raised issue was the change in slope between the inlet and outlet and the potential for downstream scouring. N. Madden thought it was good the applicant was willing to go back and look at the depth and potentially how much of the lip or berm at the culvert inlet and outlet could be adjusted. The elevation of the current bottom of the culvert is 268.9 ft. M. Giguere asked, once you make the cut, how far above the original grade will the culvert bottom be, and Mr. Beal responded "The grade will be close, but we are not exactly sure where the original grade was located." Mr. Auman questioned whether they could go down 4 ft. or better on the lip or berm. The spirit of the Order clearly indicates the continuity of the stream should be maintained by having an open bottomed culvert. The Stream Guideline conditions were not followed. The minimization of filling did not happen. L. Beals said the retaining wall was an attempt to limit wetland filling at the crossing. He asserted the contractor has done a reasonably good job of meeting the conditions, and he was not sure he could change the culvert elevation enough to satisfy the Commission.

M. Giguere pointed out this is a change to the invert. Without shooting the streambed elevations before the wetland crossing was installed, D. Pitkin noted we do not have accurate pre-disturbance grades. Mr. Beals acknowledged it will be very difficult to make things perfect according to the Stream Crossing guidelines which he stated were for fish-bearing streams. Where do we go from here? Tear it out and re-build from scratch or accept some type of mitigation? P. Morrison protested that reiteration of the problem does not get us any further long. D. Pitkin thought it important the Commission understand what the proposal is. L. Beals said he understood the Commission wanted to match the substrate. N. Madden questioned whether the Commission is willing to accept what we have here for future wetland crossings. Members discussed an additional field visit to help determine where the grade was and is. M. Giguere summarized the Commission's choices: 1) accept proposal to mitigate, 2) tear down and re-do, 3) issue an Enforcement Order, or 4) entertain amendment to change the Order. There seemed to be little agreement for tearing down the structure.

Bill Neacy asked if there is another area on the site where mitigation might occur. N. Madden pointed out it is not a peak time for determining intermittent stream flow. M. Giguere said he

wants something closer to original conditions. L. Beals said the culvert capacity is oversized for the anticipated flow. N. Madden suggested adding a fix on the details for the outlet to assure it is not acting as a waterfall. B. Neacy expressed concern about disturbance to the habitat, but suggested this could be addressed in replication areas elsewhere on the site. Lining the culvert bottom with leaf litter to more closely mimic the forest substrate would be preferable to the layers of stones there now. A 12 in. reduction in the surface elevation of the culvert bottom seems more workable with Commissioners. The replication area also has not been completed as required.

8:30 p.m. (10:30 p.m.) 213 Whiley Rd. Request for Determination of Applicability continuation
Owner Jeff Aubuchon reminded the Commission he was before them to discuss alternatives to moving his retaining wall and the backfill at the shore line of Lost Lake/Knops Pond. He proposed assisting the Commission with the repair of the retaining wall at Sargisson Beach. P. Morrison acknowledged our efforts to improve the shore line at Sargisson Beach have had poor results in the past. M. Giguere said it was his hope that the outstanding issue for the retaining wall at 213 Whiley Rd. could be resolved. C Auman clarified that Mr. Aubuchon was looking for Commission approval to work with someone, agree on a salary or payment, and that Mr. Aubuchon was willing to participate. N. Madden questioned whether we would look at something equal or better than what is currently there. P. Morrison acknowledged the points on the Sargisson Beach property have experienced severe undercutting of the banks. He suggested determining the amount of time involved and the type of labor and materials necessary to arrive at a value for the project to remove the retaining wall at 213 Whiley Rd. In general the Commission was in favor of the concept, but wanted to have a proposal with a value attached before making a final decision. The Aubuchons agreed to put this together.

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

VOTED: to authorize B. Ganem to purchase two CDs of the MACC Environmental Handbook.

In other matters, Special Town Meeting is scheduled for February 28, 2010 with warrant articles due January 14th. The Magellan Mobile Mapper 6 has been placed on order. Peter Andrews has paid the \$50 fine for constructing the fence without a permit at 34 Kemp St. (Lot 1 Gleason, DEP#169-1003). The Housing Appeals Committee has upheld the Town's ZBA decision on Mattbob's request for modification of its comprehensive permit. They have found an age restricted development would produce a return of more than 15% and therefore the age restriction does not make the project uneconomic.

To follow up on the Saturday site visits, members reported an Enforcement Order was issued to the new owner of 583 Lowell Rd. for the unauthorized removal of 32 trees within the wetland buffer zone. Upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to ratify the Enforcement Order issued to Dominic Iovino.

Members reviewed outstanding land management tasks, including the Saturday site visit to Surrenden Farm during which Commissioners observed newly planted trees (3 oaks and 1 red maple) and a newly installed fence within the bounds of Surrenden Farm. It is unclear who may

have planted them, but the fence is in the triangular area adjacent to John Maynard's property. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Neacy, it was

VOTED: to authorize B. Ganem to call or write a letter requesting the removal of the fencing and no further planting of trees.

P. Morrison recalled the former owner of 583 Lowell Rd. had been before the Conservation Commission, probably with a Request for Determination of Applicability, about a proposal to install a swimming pool.

Bob Black has been asked to place 6 boulders (\$600) at the Redskin Trail Conservation Area. Concerning the potential for a trail access from Rt. 119 to the Nashua River Rail Trail at Arlington St., the Town is still awaiting authorization from Honeywell to use GPS to determine the preferred trail location. The \$1 million indemnity insurance has been offered, but this item may need to be addressed at a planned meeting in March.

The Conservation Restriction for the Shattuck 'Baddacook Fields' property to be held by Groton Conservation Trust is still under review with a goal of submitting to the Division of Conservation Services in the upcoming month. This will be on the agenda for January 25th. As far as maintenance of the property, John Crow Farm (Robert Varisco) has been informed of the Commission's preferences with regard to pasturing livestock at the site.

P. Morrison is preparing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Town Forest Committee concerning the Ames Meadow access. The American Baptist Church of Massachusetts (TABCOM Groton Woods Camp) Conservation Restriction is still under review by Nicole Sicard at the Division of Conservation Services. M. Giguere and Gordon Newell are to confer on the W. Groton Water District Conservation Restriction on the Blood parcel. B. Easom and D. Pitkin are working on recording several other GPS points to develop the Angus & Gibbet Hill Stewardship Plan to be approved by the Town, owners, and DEM.

Ginny Bennett has provided some figures on dead turtle counts in the vicinity of the Fuccillo property which may be helpful in developing a turtle nesting habitat plan. There may be funding opportunities through the EPA and the Federal Fish & Wildlife Service for this effort. In addition, B. Easom plans to review a draft document to the surveyor R. Wilson requesting a correction in the recorded plan of the Fuccillo property

B. Easom and M. Giguere plan to re-check the possible encroachment from 55 Allens Trail and finalize the CR Monitoring Report on Allens Trail Conservation Area.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem
Conservation Administrator

Approved as amended 1/25/11.

EXHIBITS

Document	Source	Date
Minutes	Conservation Commission	12/20/10
Survey Plan of Land – Baddacook Pond NEFF purchase	Ducharme & Dillis	1/3/11
CR Monitoring Report for Angus Hill	B. Easom & M. Giguere	3/17/10
Letter	Meredith Scarlet	10/6/10
DEP#169-843 and DEP#169-1046	Michael Currie 179 Mill St.	
Dock permit & letter for 65 Rawding Rd.	Conservation Commission	1/11/11
Annual Report	Conservation Commission	for 2010
Community Preservation Application for \$150,000	Conservation Commission	1/7/11
Request for Determination of Applicability	James Reilley 54 Hill Rd.	1/11/11
ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey Existing Conditions	Frank DiPietro, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Received 1/11/11; 100 yr. floodplain sketched on plan dated 1/2/02
Drainage System Drainage Area Plan	Frank DiPietro, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Received 1/11/11; sketch on plan dated 5/20/99
West elevation showing windows	Frank DiPietro, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Received 1/11/11
Presentation Board #4 bird's eye view of vault & under habitable floor storage	Frank DiPietro, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Received 1/11/11
Presentation Board #5 showing vault & under habitable floor storage cross section	Frank DiPietro, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Received 1/11/11 (no date)
Letter & civil sketch	Beals Associates Academy Hill Cherry Tree Lane wetlands crossing	1/7/11
Email Phase II erosion control report	Bruce Wheeler/John Harvey	1/4/11