

## GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

### Minutes

June 14, 2011

Chairman Bruce Easom called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room in Town Hall. Members Craig Auman, Marshall Giguere, Nadia Madden, Peter Morrison, and David Pitkin were present. Bill Neacy arrived at 7:09 p.m. Conservation Administrator Barbara Ganem was also present.

7:00 p.m. – Appointment Susan Daniel – proposal for Baddacook Field  
Ms. Daniel was not present so members continued with other business.

Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to approve the minutes of May 10, 2011 as drafted.

Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to approve the minutes of May 24, 2011 as drafted.

M. Giguere abstained from the vote.

In discussion on the Certificate of Compliance for 100 Hollis St., DEP#169-995, B. Ganem mentioned the as-built plan does not include topography, but does appear to match what was proposed. The area around the pond is fully stabilized. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-995 for 100 Hollis St. for the construction of a wildlife impoundment.

Members observed silt and water piping through the stone retaining wall and lawn grasses not well-established during the Saturday site visit to 34 Kemp St. DEP#169-1003 in response to a Request for Certificate of Compliance. Conservation markers are not shown on the as-built plan. Conservation markers and shrubs are in place however. No action was taken on the Request.

B. Ganem reported 30 mountain laurels and rhododendron have been planted in the right-of-way cleared for the installation of the replacement sewer outfall pipe at Groton School. Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-1043 for Groton School.

In discussion on extending the Order of Conditions for 11 Highland Rd., DEP#169-925, D. Pitkin pointed out this would be subject to the Permit Extension Act whose qualifying period is

August 15, 2008 through August 15, 2010. No action was taken on homeowner Val Prest's request for an Extension since it is subject to the automatic extension.

(Bill Neacy arrived at 7:09 p.m.)

In reorganizing for the upcoming year, upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to elect Nadia Madden as Chairman.

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

VOTED: to elect David Pitkin as Vice Chairman.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to elect Bruce Easom as Clerk.

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

VOTED: to appoint Bruce Easom as the Commission's representative to the Community Preservation Committee.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by N. Madden, it was

VOTED: to appoint Marshall Giguere as the Commission's representative to the Earth Removal Stormwater Advisory Committee.

M. Giguere, D. Pitkin, and B. Ganem indicated they planned to attend the breakfast meeting of area Conservation Commissioners on Monday, June 20, 2011 at 8 a.m. at the Nashua River Watershed Association.

Susan Daniel arrived, and B. Easom recused himself as his wife has a business relationship with Ms. Daniel. Ms. Daniel explained she has a business called Herb an' Chicks in which she raises organic herbs and vegetables, as well as chickens. She trained with the New Entry Sustainable Farming Project incorporating biodynamic or nutrient dense farming techniques with no use of herbicides or pesticides. Currently she is selling CSA shares for \$545 with half shares at \$269. It is likely she would be interested in licensing the Baddacook Field (5 - 6 acres) from June through October or November. The use of fields would rotate to preserve the quality of the soils.

Member Giguere said it was the Commission's expectation that the remaining field areas would be regularly mowed, and Ms. Daniel indicated she could provide that service. In addition she understood there are grants available to assist with the development of a water source which would involve something other than a fossil fuel method. She thought pumping tanks were offered by the Charles River Watershed Association. It is also possible to have an 800 gallon tank on the site to provide irrigation.

C. Auman questioned whether there would be a need for any structures, fencing, or shelters. Ms. Daniel responded fencing may be necessary for the left side of the property and would be moved at no charge to the Town. She noted she expects to start with approximately 20 CSA shares, but will also sell directly to World Peas. Dried, composted manure that has no odor would be used as fertilizer. In conjunction with a summer camp run at Helene's Stables, Ms. Daniel would use the property as a teaching site for K-12 students to help them learn how to farm and grow vegetables. She would like to start as soon as possible, but the first year would be devoted to soil testing and adding any necessary nutrients. The lab results can take anywhere from 6 – 8 weeks.

Members recommended checking the draft Conservation Restriction to be held by the Groton Conservation Trust for compatibility with this activity. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to license the 5 – 6.5 acre cleared field at the Baddacook Field (Shattuck) property for a 3-year period which may be extended to Herb an' Chicks using the standard Commission license form with the understanding that mowing services are to be provided in lieu of licensing fees and that educational services will occasionally be offered on the property.

N. Madden reminded Ms. Daniel that the public should continue to have access to the property. The main trail will remain open, and appropriate signage used to direct the public.

The discussion concluded at 7:30 p.m., and B. Easom returned to the meeting.

7:15 p.m. – Appointment Dan Cyr (forester)

Mr. Cyr noted Forestry Stewardship Plans were prepared for Baddacook Field, Williams Conservation Area, and the Farmers & Mechanics parcel. He pointed out the treatment of invasives at Baddacook could impact organic farming at the site. He then introduced Eric Radlof and Jeff Hutchins on his staff at Baystate Forestry. Mr. Radlof stated he had reviewed the Commission's goals and objectives in the preparation of the Baddacook plan, but noted the strategies or wood products could change. The target would be wood products and treatment of invasives while considering the forest values and aesthetics. Ice damaged and mature trees would be removed in order to obtain an uneven-aged stand. The information in the Conservation Restriction requires that the viewshed be preserved. The main trail can be used for access with the landing located in the area that has experienced the most ice storm damage.

D. Cyr acknowledged the Commission has an interest in expenses vs. income. Under the contract, he estimated the 36-acre parcel would be subject to a \$15/acre charge for the preparation of the management plan (\$540), \$65/hour to blaze the boundaries (\$520), and \$150/acre to manage the marking, bidding, and selling of trees (\$3100) for the 21 acres that are harvestable. Stressing this is a ballpark figure, Mr. Cyr felt the Commission could recognize \$13,000 income from a logging and chipping operation. P. Morrison said most of the Commission's properties are managed by benign neglect so this would be an active step. D. Cyr thought a 10-year turnaround before returning to cut the property was appropriate. This would be somewhat of an aesthetic cut in that ugly trees would be removed to produce a healthier forest in the future.

E. Radlof explained there are Natural Heritage issues which will govern the window of harvest. It's likely to be between November 15 and March 15, with a certain percentage of the basal area left. Natural Heritage will weigh in when the Forest Cutting Plan is submitted to the state forester. Mr. Cyr said, generally, the Plan would be pretty conservative when cutting around wetlands and would use the recommended best management practices (BMPs).

M. Giguere requested information on how the invasives would be handled. Mr. Cyr said this is typically done after one season of growth following the harvest. A spot treatment would then be used to follow up. He estimated the herbicide treatment would be between \$3000 and \$4000. A mist blower is probably more appropriate for bittersweet, but cut surface treatments could also be used. Honeysuckle, glossy buckthorn, and autumn olive are all problematic at the site. N. Madden questioned whether the Commission would need to file under the Wetlands Protection Act and Bylaw for herbicide treatments within 100 feet of wetlands. Mr. Cyr said a different surfactant is used with the herbicide treatment near wetlands, and he noted Athol does its local permitting. He felt that this site could grow between 500 and 800 board feet a year with a sustainable harvest in 10 years.

E. Radlof continued his report with the plan for the 7.9 acre Williams Conservation Area across Chicopee Row from Williams Barn Sorhaug Woods for which the management and cutting plans will be integrated. This site suffers from ash dieback, stagnation, and invasive plants. The boundaries were recently surveyed, and he was able to locate all the bounds. He estimated 52,000 board feet could be harvested so the parcel has some forestry value. A timber cruise has been done at Williams Barn Sorhaug Woods, and the boundaries should be blazed. The site is chiefly white pine and red oak. The creation of a field has been discussed, but this would require stumping, an expensive process, if farmers are to consider licensing portions for agricultural use. Invasives are rampant here. The Commission may wish to postpone this option until the future.

Mr. Cyr explained that option B for the field could be to clear the trees and turn it into early successional habitat. Selective herbicide use could target invasives, but there are not a lot of natives on site to take over. The cost of stumping would run about \$8000/acre while \$10,000 is estimated for the control of invasives. If invasives on just the field area were treated, it would be approximately \$1200. There are some areas of hardwoods before the wetland, but a lot of the harvestable trees are shrouded with vines. Mr. Cyr estimated .5 - .75 acres to be necessary for a staging or chipping area. This would involve large scale equipment, and the contractor will have to stump it and re-seed with a conservation mix. This would be maintained for future forestry operations.

The pine is of relatively low quality, but there is some oak. D. Cyr thought \$20,000 in income may be possible depending on the biomass market, but he pointed out the costs for a plan (\$1395), blazing (\$1040), and marking/bidding (\$11,700) are going to be substantial, especially if herbicide treatment and stumping are factored in.

Jeff Hutchins outlined the management plan for the 19-acre Farmers & Mechanics parcel. This is a white pine stand that is financially mature and borders the Nashua River. It is likely they would remove no more than 50% of the basal area within 100 ft. of the bank. The amount of board feet is 115,000, with an income in the \$16,000 range. Fees for the plan and services will be around

\$3585. It is possible to use the old lane for access, but it would be preferable to have the landing on the Fairgrounds piece. There is no Natural Heritage issue so the question of timing should not arise.

Chairman Easom asked what the next steps should be and whether we want to have the public in or do some other form of public outreach to determine the public's attitude toward sustainable forestry on conservation land. P. Morrison felt the three management plans should be accepted, but D. Pitkin questioned whether the Commission should see the forestry cutting plans first. The stewardship plans lay the groundwork for the cutting plans prepared under Ch. 132 which go to the state forester for approval. Members questioned when we need to prepare the public for what this involves. B. Easom thought we should start with one parcel to see how it goes.

Mr. Cyr indicated they would have to start running the meter for site walks. He urged the Commission to move all three projects forward. It would not be cost effective to move forward on only one parcel. C. Auman asked when the work would start, and Mr. Cyr said they would mark the woodlot and prepare forestry cutting plans for submittal to the state which has 30 days in which to hear from Natural Heritage. Concurrently the project would be bid out, they would show the wood lot to potential bidders, and get the bids to the Commission for selection.

Bill Neacy did not feel forestry would cause that much of a stir in the Town, especially since New England Forestry Foundation (NEFF) periodically logs its properties, and a forestry operation recently took place on Partridgeberry Woods. B. Easom expressed concern residents would see a conflict between forestry management and understanding our financial incentive. B. Neacy argued there have been substantial forestry activities within the Town for years. When asked the source of his information, Mr. Easom explained Alan Chaney of the Dunstable Conservation Commission had accompanied the Conservation Commission on a walk through Dunstable conservation properties that were logged and one of his messages was that public outreach is critical. There are apt to be two separate camps, people who wish the forest to remain pristine and untouched vs. allowing sustainable harvesting. NEFF does public walks on some of their properties. P. Morrison pointed out the Commission is charged with maintaining our properties, and we are letting the forests become unhealthy. He felt the Commission should move ahead with the plans and pay Mr. Cyr for any site walks.

M. Giguere agreed that we need to do outreach and he would be in favor of paying Mr. Cyr extra to do site walks. He thought the site walk should be scheduled prior to the cutting but after the marking was completed. D. Pitkin questioned whether we should do a public hearing before that. M. Giguere thought it could be more productive after marking the trees. B. Easom thought there could be value in marking it so people know what is to be cut. P. Morrison stressed that it is our charge to manage the properties. B. Neacy said forestry is nothing foreign to Groton. We could place an informative article in the paper, followed by site walks. P. Morrison added there is a fire danger as well. C. Auman commented we need to manage the invasives taking over the forests. N. Madden thought there is a return in value for managing. Mr. Cyr said he manages over 20,000 acres of public land without an outcry.

Resident Bob Pine (100 Hollis St.) said NEFF has been strongly criticized for some of their management activities. The problem is finding the right balance of interests. Upon a motion by B. Neacy, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to place an appropriate information article in the newspaper and to authorize Dan Cyr to move ahead with completing forestry cutting plans for the three parcels.

The motion passed by a majority with M. Giguere, P. Morrison, C. Auman, N. Madden, and B. Neacy voting in favor, and D. Pitkin and B. Easom voting in the negative.

M. Giguere felt it was important to keep trails clear and assure unimpeded access to conservation lands. D. Cyr suggested the Commission consider certifying some of the properties as Tree Farms, a program which has been in effect since 1941 to encourage active forestry management. There are no costs associated with it, and the certification is done every 5 years. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to apply for certification as Tree Farms.

8:00 p.m. – Pine/100 Hollis St. Request for Determination of Applicability

Mr. Pine explained he has been managing the invasives behind his house for the past 9 years. At the time he took title to the property, it was totally overgrown with invasives. Continued management is crucial and will consist, primarily, of brush cutting. B. Neacy commented the area is very pleasant and asked the background on using the beetles to control loosestrife. Mr. Pine said the beetle raising program is run through the Nashua River Watershed Association, and he has allowed a release on his property. Their negative effect on loosestrife was observed during the Saturday site visit.

M. Giguere commended the Pines on the job they have done in controlling the invasives on the property. He thought continued management through brush hogging and hand pulling was reasonable. C. Auman offered congratulations on how the property looks now, especially seeing how many native plants have come forward once the invasives are beat back. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative #3 Determination allowing selective hand pulling with mechanized removal as necessary for on-going control of invasives.

Members explained the Certificate of Compliance was previously voted on, and Mr. Pine acknowledged the location of the stream and waterfall had shifted very slightly.

8:15 p.m. – Mt. Laurel Development ANRAD DEP#169-1057 continuation

Chairman Easom noted three letters have been submitted to the Commission which he would like to read into the record. Attorney Rob Antcil protested his letter was too long to read into the record. Resident Bob Pine (100 Hollis St.) asked about a point of order having to do with the fact this hearing was advertised as an Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD) so he was surprised to hear the Commission is making a formal decision on whether the Bylaw is applicable without proper advertisement. This means the public is not properly informed of the

decisions to be made. Chairman Easom said this has been posted in the newspaper and abutters were notified. Mr. Antcil maintained the purpose of the meeting is to decide on the wetland delineation.

Mr. Easom pointed out the decision whether the Wetlands Protection Bylaw applies affects the wetland delineation because the boundary is defined differently under the Act and the Bylaw. P. Morrison did not understand what the difference would be. B. Easom read from the CMR 10.55(2)(c)1-3, the regulations under the Wetlands Protection Act. He noted the default seems to be based on 50% wetland vegetative cover, and it is up to the Commission to determine whether plants define the delineation boundary. Mr. Antcil asked if it mattered because the wetland scientist examined the soils, vegetation, and hydrology. The assumption is that the soils indicated where wetlands were historically located while the plants represent more current conditions.

David Crossman, the applicant's wetland scientist, said he located the wetland line using soils. The Conservation Commission expressed concerns about conditions above the wetland line. The question is whether only vegetation or vegetation and soils need to be present to delineate the wetlands. Mr. Crossman maintained the area does not have both criteria. He looks at soils for hydric characteristics if an area has been disturbed. He pointed out there is a strip of upland plants between the wetland and the area questioned by the Commission due to the presence of wetland plants. B. Easom pointed out if we look at just soils or just plants, we get two different stories. The Bylaw, under Definitions, defines the boundary by any one of the following features: over 70% wetland vegetation, soils, or hydrology. D. Crossman asserted the methodology under the Wetlands Protection Act is the preferred method where you have at least two characteristics present. Based on that whether the Commission considers it under the Bylaw or under the Act, it is possible we could come up with two different interpretations of the wetland boundary.

C. Auman pointed out the state regulations (2c) indicate 50% or more and saturated conditions indicate wetland line. B. Easom said we go to soils when vegetation has been cleared. C. Auman said he thought there are line changes. B. Easom said the question before the Commission is whether to follow the 50% vegetation guidelines as the preferred method or whether all have equal weight as under the Bylaw. B. Neacy said Town Counsel's letter appears clear about the Bylaw being applicable. D. Pitkin said this area is likely to be in transition, and interpreting the wetland line becomes part of our job.

B. Easom thought the Commission has more discretion under the Bylaw. P. Morrison suggested the Commission also has the option of getting a third neutral party to examine the boundary. B. Neacy said we have already asked Town Counsel who said we should move forward under the Bylaw. B. Easom commented the Commission needs to move forward under one or both. B. Neacy asked if we just go presumptively under the Bylaw. It does not necessarily supersede two findings under the Act. Members thought the Bylaw has a more liberal interpretation. P. Morrison suggested hiring a peer review if we go there. M. Giguere argued the Bylaw allows more discretion, i.e., the use of one criterion rather than two. P. Morrison said the controversy arises as part of a delineation under the Act. B. Easom said we did review conditions in the field, and C. Auman added that Mr. Crossman did not want to accept certain areas based on plants because he did not have the soils. B. Easom said the Commission needs to answer the question whether it falls under the Bylaw through an indirect connection.

B. Neacy questioned whether we really think there is a difference in the delineations. B. Easom commented it has been put on the table for discussion whether we are hearing it under the Act or under the Bylaw. B. Easom read from both the Bylaw regulations defining the wetland boundary and regulation under the Act. If we are to proceed under the Bylaw, we need to get all the information we can. It is a tough area to delineate.

Applicant Bob France questioned how the Commission can change the delineation prepared by the wetland scientist he hired in the first place. If the science has been applied to determine the boundary, why is it up for discussion by the Conservation Commission? B. Neacy responded we may ask for a second opinion. M. Giguere clarified that it is the Commission's job to agree or disagree with the science. B. France said he meant no disrespect but wants to understand the process. P. Morrison said the wetland line can be a broad brush, but usually there is some give and take in the actual line once we take a sharper look at it. Commissioners have some training, and it is the applicant's job to convince us or not where the line is located. The Commission has knowledge and experience in this. B. Neacy suggested perhaps a consultant could add clarity. C. Auman said the Commission is not questioning the science, but is questioning the application of the law to science. D. Crossman argued DEP issued a manual in the 1990's in which wetland delineators were urged to look at both vegetation and hydrology and soils so that you can really nail down the boundary in the field. This area is transitional between uplands and wetlands. He said he is not disputing there is more than 50% wetland vegetation, but does disagree that the soils confirm the wetland edge. Preparation of the BVW data sheets at different points on the topography usually helps with wetland delineation, as do the presence of upland plants. He pointed out wetland flags 8A and 9 were moved in the field, but he did not feel stakes B, C, D, and E represented the wetland edge. He acknowledged stake E had all silky dogwood and sensitive fern, but it was separated by 100% upland vegetation and soils from the wetland. He maintained there was no connection to the wetland line which is down below. Most people who delineate wetlands look at both criteria. The area does have high groundwater but no higher than 12" below the ground surface. M. Giguere pointed out there were more than 50% wetland plants around stake B, sphagnum moss was visible, and his feet were wet at that point. Mr. Crossman said hydric soils were questionable according to the Munsell color chart.

N. Madden said the second site walk revealed a different line with the increase in vegetation. She asked what made them change the flagging from the original. B. Ringwall said the flagging was done in December with soils somewhat frozen and less vegetation. He noted there are honeysuckles both above and below the wetland line. New groundwater was observed this past Saturday, and D. Crossman did not dispute the presence of wetland vegetation. The delineation was originally based on soils, not vegetation. Hydric soils might have a dark B horizon with mottles close to the surface. B. Easom admitted it is an unusual site. If a site is mowed or disturbed, soil samples would determine wetland line, perhaps resulting in conflicting answers. Karen Corey (150 Main St.) asked if the land is transitioning, if there is 100-year floodplain and which way is it going. D. Crossman said in 20 years it is likely to be wetter. He explained he looked at the parcel again, more recently, and observed the vegetation. Soil testing can really be done at any time of year. Now is the best time of year to observe the growth of plants. M. Giguere felt the indicators point to a high groundwater table. K. Corey said she was an abutter to the property and could confirm the high groundwater. M. Giguere said the ground was saturated

with sphagnum growing. P. Morrison, seconded by B. Neacy, made a motion to accept the ANRAD as presented.

N. Madden stated she was a hydrologist by training. The time of year when you do the analysis can influence the wetland line, as well as indicators within 12 in. of the surface. For a deep A horizon (more than 1 ft.), mottling can be used if it is visible. The motion failed with P. Morrison, D. Pitkin, and B. Neacy voting in favor, while N. Madden, B. Easom, C. Auman, and M. Giguere voted in opposition.

P. Morrison made a second motion, seconded by D. Pitkin, to approve the delineation under the Wetlands Protection Act only. The motion failed to pass with P. Morrison and B. Neacy voting in favor, and N. Madden, D. Pitkin, C. Auman, M. Giguere, and B. Easom voting in the negative.

P. Morrison made a third motion, seconded by B. Neacy, to approve the wetlands delineation under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw only. B. Neacy, D. Pitkin, and P. Morrison voted in favor, while N. Madden, C. Auman, M. Giguere, and B. Easom voted in opposition. Members discussed whether having a third party peer review would help resolve the issue. The Commission would have to be willing to live with that line. Attorney Antcil asked if board members would allow the applicant and his consultants to confer privately, and Commissioners agreed to this arrangement.

8:30 p.m. – Bigelow/19 Baby Beach Rd. Notice of Intent DEP#169-1058 continuation

Engineer Kevin Ritchie of Civil Solutions reported his client has received a letter from Natural Heritage indicating no adverse impact to rare species with the placement of the tight tank. With no further questions from the Commission, and upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for 19 Baby Beach Rd., DEP#169-1058.

8:45 p.m. – Cloyd/2 Loomis Lane Notice of Intent continuation

At the applicant's request and upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for 2 Loomis Lane to June 28, 2011.

C. Auman, N. Madden, and B. Easom indicated they planned to attend the pre-application joint boards meeting on 134 Main St. on June 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m.

B. Ganem reported the Park Ranger, Alex Gerhardt, has started work at Sargisson Beach. His first time sheet has been submitted and is among the bills to be signed tonight.

Members visited 55 North St. after the owner contacted the Conservation Commission to see if there was any interest on the Town's part to acquire the land. This 39-acre property is listed as a second priority property for its location (1st attribute), location (2nd attribute), and schools (3rd attribute). Recent mapping associated with the Master Plan shows the parcel in Living Waters Supporting Watershed, a primary resource area, but not a key gap or in the focus area. Portions of the parcel are in BioMap Core Habitat, Priority Habitat, and a Primary Resource priority. The

property was logged in 2004 – high grading with a goal of short-term income. The harvest was restricted to 3/1 – 10/31 with 75% canopy to remain because of rare species. Two adjoining Tully lots were cut at the same time and the yard was to the west of the house. The property adjoins the conservation-restricted land behind the High School. There appear to be substantial wetlands at the back of the lot. The property is currently assessed at \$488,600.

The priority list will be updated as part of the Open Space & Recreation Plan update. Members questioned whether it would be worthwhile to make a minimum offer, but B. Neacy expressed concerns about acquiring more land in the current environment and economic times. He thought we should pay attention to the first priority properties, many of which still are not protected.

Rob Antcil, Bob France, David Valletta, and Bruce Ringwall returned to the conference room at 9:50 p.m. B. Ringwall asked if the Commission would consider approving the wetland delineation if the wetland flagging is moved to stake C. Water filled the augered hole at the time the Commission visited with the wetland scientist. Mr. Ringwall sketched in the change to the BVW line and the 50-ft. and 100-ft. buffer zone lines. B. Easom said he would like to look at it again in the field. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to approve the modification of the wetlands delineation as sketched on the ANRAD plan and dated June 14, 2011.

The motion carried by majority vote, with B. Easom voting in the negative.

Mr. Ringwall agreed to provide an engineered plan showing this modification. Buildings proposed within the buffer zone are not part of the discussion as yet.

B. Neacy reported he hopes to have an informal meeting with abutters to the Ames Meadow property about the proposed agreement between the Town Forest Committee and the Conservation Commission over access. The land where the trail intrudes would be donated to the Town Forest Committee.

Mr. Neacy said he has been working with Eagle Scout David Linzey to prepare a plan to clean up the Bertozzi area. Members suggested having him come to a Commission meeting to present the plan.

(B. Neacy and P. Morrison left at 10:03 p.m.)

Members reviewed the draft Baseline Documentation Report and Land Management Plan for the Baddacook Pond II (NEFF) parcel recently acquired by the Town. This is part of the package to be submitted to the Division of Conservation Services for reimbursement through the state LAND grant program. Town Planner Michelle Collette raised concerns about allowing swimming at the site, but members noted this has been a traditional swimming spot for years. It will be very difficult to restrict swimming now so this will remain as one of the permitted uses. Upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to accept the Baseline Documentation Report and Land Management Plan

as drafted.

Celia Riechel recommended the Commission be more specific about the prohibited uses, and upon a motion by M. Giguere, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to adopt the standard Rules and Regulations for use of conservation lands for this parcel.

Commissioners agreed to send a letter to the Board of Selectmen asking for an update on the Shattuck easement for the B & M railroad parcel.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem  
 Conservation Administrator

**Approved as drafted 6/28/11.**

EXHIBITS

Document	Source	Date
Business Plan for Herb An' Chicks	Susan Daniel	Undated
General Company Proposal	Susan Daniel	Undated
Herb An' Chicks Farm Project brochure	Susan Daniel	Undated
Minutes	Conservation Commission	5/10/11
Minutes	Conservation Commission	5/24/11
DEP#169-995 Request for Certificate of Compliance	Pine/100 Hollis St.	Notice of Intent filed 6/10/08
DEP#169-1003 Request for Certificate of Compliance	Andrews/34 Kemp St.	Notice of Intent amendment filed 6/13/10
DEP#69-1043 Request for Certificate of Compliance	Groton School/sewer outfall pipe	Notice of Intent filed 6/7/10
DEP#169-925 request for Extension	Prest/11 Highland Rd.	Notice of Intent filed 6/2/05
Forest Stewardship Plan Williams Conservation Area	Baystate Forestry/Eric Radlof	May, 2011
Forest Stewardship Plan	Baystate Forestry/Eric Radlof	May, 2011

Baddacook Field		
Forest Stewardship Plan Farmers & Mechanics Conservation Area	Baystate Forestry/Jeffrey D. Hutchins	May 2011
Request for Determination of Applicability	Pine/100 Hollis St.	Filed 5/26/11
Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation	Mt. Laurel Development/134 Main St.	Filed 5/9/11
DEP#169-1058	Bigelow/19 Baby Beach Rd.	Filed 5/10/11
Plan for cleaning up Bertozzi Conservation Area	Eagle Scout David Linzey	6/14/11
Baseline Documentation Report and Land Management Plan	Marshall Giguere, Nadia Madden, & Barbara Ganem	6/14/11 (rev. 6/28/11)