

GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

December 13, 2011

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

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

VOTED: to approve the minutes of November 22, 2011 as amended.

M. Giguere abstained from the vote with the remaining Commissioners voting "yes".

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

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions as drafted for DEP#169-1065 for 583 Lowell Rd. under the Wetlands Protection Act.

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

VOTED: to issue the Order of Conditions as amended for DEP#169-1065 for 583 Lowell Rd. under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

In discussion on a Certificate of Compliance for 16 Forest Drive, B. Easom commented soils were coming out between the boulders in the retaining wall behind the house. Builder Dennis Lacombe was present and assured the Commission that silt matting was placed behind the retaining wall which is two boulders deep. No sink holes were apparent in the lawn, and he believes this is only a temporary situation. Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for DEP#169-754 for 16 Forest Drive.

The vote was unanimous.

D. Pitkin pointed out the actual building deviated slightly from the Notice of Intent plan and asked why an amended plan was not submitted. Mr. Lacombe responded that the original plan called for a house that was 30 ft. x 80 ft. while the actual house is 30 ft. x 56 ft. He acknowledged the deck is larger than proposed. B. Easom made a motion, seconded by B. Neacy, to issue a fine of \$25.00. Discussion followed on whether it was appropriate to issue a fine for a violation of the Order of Conditions. P. Morrison questioned how the Commission can issue a fine when they just found everything in compliance. B. Neacy replied that the applicant did not follow the process. Mr. Lacombe mentioned the house is far smaller than originally

proposed, and B. Neacy said no proposed changes were brought before the Commission. B. Ganem said the Commission issued a fine to the builder of the house on the Gleason property on Kemp St. when he added a fence that was not included on the NOI plan. Attorney Bob Collins was present and stated that typically an applicant will return to the Commission if the house is to be larger or closer to the wetlands than originally planned. He indicated this is somewhat of an innocent mistake on Mr. Lacombe's part and suggested the Commission consider putting him on notice that he could be subject to having to move a house if this happens in the future. B. Neacy made a motion to move the question, and it was

VOTED: to issue a fine of \$25 for the violation of the Order of Conditions for DEP#169-754.

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

7:15 p.m. – 122 Old Ayer Rd. Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation

Surveyor Stan Dillis explained he had returned to the site after the Commission's December 10th site visit, particularly the area behind the swale. Due to anticipated winter conditions, he suggested the Commission review the revised flagging as soon as possible. He mentioned the area in the upper field had a different appearance because soil sampling was done several years ago. Wetland flags CC1 – CC3 were replaced, and BVW sheets have been prepared.

Commissioners agreed to schedule a site walk for December 17th at 8 a.m. Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing to January 10, 2012.

The vote was unanimous.

In response to a request for a Certificate of Compliance for 58 Old Lantern Lane for the completion of the septic system installation under DEP#169-1031 and upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 58 Old Lantern Lane under DEP#169-1031.

The vote was unanimous.

In discussion on the request for a Certificate of Compliance for 7 Paugus Trail, DEP#169-751, B. Ganem reported the applicant has done a follow-up Request for Determination of Applicability to complete the house. The Determination requires the as-built plan show the location of the stone wall. Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to issue a Certificate of Compliance acknowledging DEP#169-751 is an invalid Order of Conditions.

The vote was unanimous.

7:30 p.m. – Groton Electric Light Department Notice of Intent DEP#169-1073

Kevin Kelly, Manager of the Groton Electric Light Department (GELD), said he felt the Commission and Department had reached a preliminary agreement on the new facility. Pointing out it would be in the public good to move the pole yard and transformers into storage away from the wetlands, he also noted the revised design shows parking moved 3 feet further from the wetlands. The design also pulls the building as far as possible from the Rail Trail to allow for future development in that area. The Selectmen have requested this in order to leave options open for a possible fire station. The next step would be to declare that parcel surplus. Mr. Kelly mentioned there is also a public good in saving the ratepayers money.

Engineer Sue Carter of Places Associates explained they envision a two phase demolition process in which the linemen's building remains until the new facility is completed. Upon demolition, that area would then be loamed and seeded for stabilization. What is driving the site design is to provide a garage area where all equipment fits into bays, and there is room to maneuver in the parking area. Ms. Carter pointed out the small protrusions into the 50-foot buffer zone. There is a public area in the front of building which has a 6-foot overhang that wraps around to give the appearance of a train station. The front door must be ADA accessible and has to meet the grade of Station Avenue. Two 150-ft. long by 12-in. diameter pipes will run underground parallel to the building to recharge roof runoff. A drainage swale leading to a rain garden in the southeast corner of the property will replace the thicket of honeysuckle. Wetland flag #19 is 11 feet from the structure.

S. Carter reported that existing conditions include 32,613 SF of impervious surfacing of which 12,393 SF is gravel. The proposed total for impervious surfacing is 33,613 SF of which 15,347 SF is roof area. These figures do not include the roadway to Broadmeadow. Alterations within the 50-ft. buffer zone are 12,144 SF and 28,494 SF in the 50 – 100-ft. buffer zone. Overall, there is a decrease in the rate of runoff from the site. A manhole with a catch basin is proposed to catch overflow during times of high water. The post-construction stormwater management plan includes calculations for the treatment of total suspended solids (TSS) for the site.

Mr. Kelly commented there has been previous discussion about mitigation to include 2.1 acres of the land wrapping around the Lowell Rd. substation adjacent to the Fuccillo parcel the Commission recently purchased. He distributed marked-up copies of the site plan. In response to a question about which trees will be removed from the site, S. Carter replied "All trees within the limit of disturbance will be removed." The removal of bittersweet from some of the trees may necessitate additional tree removal.

Member Neacy said the protection of wetlands and wetland laws is also a public benefit which was recognized through a 2/3's vote at Town Meeting to pass the Wetlands Protection Bylaw. He expressed distress by projects that chip away at the wetland buffer zone. Pointing out that low impact development has nothing to do with the Commission's interests, the fact is this project will require grading within 4 ft. of wetlands. He stated the Commission's concern is that the people who come before us receive equitable treatment. While he understands the costs and compromises involved, Mr. Neacy said he was extremely concerned that we do not give them a chance to write a check or donate land.

P. Morrison said he liked this plan better than the previous plan and thought it a good idea to bring the parking closer to the street side of the building. M. Giguere agreed that this plan was an improvement, but expressed concern about the amount of impervious surfacing. While some of the current impermeable area is to be demolished and planted in grass, the plan is to add impervious areas. He would like to see calculations of the volume of fill. C. Auman mentioned the increase in impervious surface to 33,289 SF includes an area that is to be restored and then put up for sale. The McGregor and Downes houses (both of which have been demolished), as well as the current office space, should be counted within the existing calculations. The project should demonstrate there are no adverse impacts to the resource area. Existing conditions include one catch basin within 3 ft. of the water table, so there is currently very little pre-treatment or attenuation of stormwater. S. Carter said it is possible to reduce the time of concentration and increase recharge using low impact development techniques.

Light Commissioner Kevin Lindemer asked if there is a statute of limitations for disturbances. He noted that bricks were found 5 ft. below the ground surface when they did test holes. Ms. Carter stated that nothing is proposed within the floodplain, and Commissioners requested the floodplain elevation be identified on the plan. Members commented that when the fire station was proposed, it was estimated approximately 5 ft. of fill would be necessary. S. Carter indicated all the drainage has to be subsurface, which did not accommodate a fire station unless fill was brought in. Although groundwater is not an issue for the GELD plan, the conceptual fire station plan did not have enough room for grassed swales. Ms. Carter questioned how the Commission would like to see the area southeast of the linemen's building handled. This is an area where there is an opportunity for management of invasives, and she suggested it could be the site of another rain garden. The plan is to mow and maintain the area near the Rail Trail.

B. Easom pointed out there is no legal access to a public road for the portion of the lot GELD is proposing to turn over to the Commission. S. Carter suggested a conservation restriction may be more appropriate. Mr. Easom said it is his preference to have title rather than a conservation restriction. He recommended the preparation of a spreadsheet showing the before and after impermeable surfaces for the site. Members commented that using the GELD garage as part of the existing and proposed calculations was misleading because clearly there are plans for future re-uses that will likely include more impervious surfacing. Even if there is no way of knowing now, it should not be included in the net equation. The breakdown in the calculations should exclude the portion that will be sold later.

K. Lindemer questioned whether it is best to leave the garage and pavement in place and do nothing in the short term in order to make the impermeable calculations more straightforward. D. Pitkin asked if there is any way GELD can bring in a plan that is in compliance with the Groton Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Mr. Lindemer claimed that no building would be allowed in the Station Avenue Overlay District (SAOD) if that is the Commission's performance standard. Mr. Pitkin questioned whether this was being filed under the expedited permitting process, and B. Ganem said "no" because they have already begun the permitting process by filing a Notice of Intent with the Commission.

Chairman Madden noted the GELD filing is subject to both the Wetlands Protection Act and Bylaw through the proposed use of the 100-ft. buffer zone to construct the facility. Changing the

amount of impervious surfacing will have huge impacts down the road, and the Commission has to look at the long-term effect. She commented this is a bigger encroachment on the wetland buffer than the Commission has seen. Her recommendation was an evaluation by a peer reviewer to determine whether what is proposed is as good as what is currently there. S. Carter mentioned that Tim McGivern of Nitsch Associates had been present when the test holes were recently dug on the property. B. Ganem requested a copy of the testing results for the Commission's records.

Commissioners asked if the areas proposed for snow storage were adequate for the site, especially with sand, snow, and de-icers factored in. S. Carter said she could prepare an estimate on the anticipated snow volume. She stated the elevations on the plan were based on an on-the-ground survey by Ducharme & Dillis. K. Lindemer questioned what needs to be done for GELD to have a plan that moves this project forward. P. Morrison cautioned against leading GELD on by repeatedly asking for more information. B. Easom agreed, adding that the project was a non-starter in his mind. B. Neacy affirmed this was a non-starter in his opinion as well as he did not see wetland interests being protected with a building within 11 ft. of the wetlands, especially a huge building almost totally within the buffer zone. K. Lindemer maintained the SAOD design guidelines define the degree of flexibility for the site.

N. Madden and C. Auman stressed the need to have information about where former structures were located as this is important input. D. Pitkin mentioned the applicant certainly has the option to close the hearing tonight, based on the already submitted information, and allow the Commission to vote. K. Lindemer asked if the requests for additional information will continue as he thought GELD had a positive response before. He felt we have taken a step forward although some were on the fence and some were taking a hard line with their opinions. How far from the wetland resource area is satisfactory? S. Carter said there has to be sufficient water draining from the site to support the plants in a rain garden.

Member Auman stated the standard for altered areas, according to the Wetlands Bylaw, is that there is no increase in adverse impacts. Under Section 215-7. Presumptions. A.3. "Standards for altered areas. Where an adjacent upland resource area is already altered in such a manner that the purpose of this chapter is not being met, the Commission may issue an order of conditions for a project, provided that it finds that the proposed alterations will not increase adverse impacts on that specific portion of the adjacent upland area or associated wetland and that there is no technically feasible construction alternative." He said the Commission needs to know how much was already altered and to discuss mitigation and plans. He questioned whether we are looking at improvements or degradation, and stated a limit has to be set. The Planning Board will be reviewing stormwater mitigation, but the Commission will need to know the consequence of moving forward. B. Neacy advised that the technical questions a peer review would address should be very specific. B. Easom challenged the wisdom of getting a peer review as he felt the Commission ignored their recommendation in the case of 134 Main St. C. Auman pointed out there were changes in the invasives management plan and the level of mitigation. B. Easom questioned whether anyone can claim degradation will not occur.

K. Lindemer protested that any changes will add up to additional expenses. He asked for a vehicle significant enough to move the project forward. He estimated his board would have to spend \$.5 million to move the facility 20 ft. This alternative will cost GELD a lot more money,

and they are not looking for anything other than flexibility. It is GELD's hope to have the surplus land to balance their costs as this will impact how the debt is to be structured. A straw poll of members' opinions on the matters was requested. C. Auman indicated he would like to see how much disturbance has already occurred on the parcel from buildings that are or were there. He also recommended a peer review to assure the project meets Bylaw standards. D. Pitkin said he would like to see a plan in compliance with the Bylaw and would also like to see an environmental peer review. C. Auman, D. Pitkin, and N. Madden had questioned whether this would set a precedent for future development, and P. Morrison thought that it would set a precedent only in the case of the SAOD. B. Easom and B. Neacy were not in favor of the project, as currently proposed. P. Morrison would vote in favor.

Member Giguere said he has found nothing that exempts GELD from compliance with the Wetlands Bylaw. GELD has not been given a guarantee that the board would approve this plan. He suggested rotating the building 90°, which he demonstrated during a previous meeting using paper cutouts, and keeping the parking and structure out of the 50 ft. buffer zone. He did not feel that GELD's need to have surplus land was the Commission's problem. If there remains a minor intrusion afterwards, he may still be on the fence. K. Lindemer reiterated that the Board of Selectmen has asked GELD to stick to this plan. It seems the Commission would prefer to see no disturbance within the 50-ft. buffer zone. With the concurrence of the applicant and upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing to January 10, 2012.

7:45 p.m. – 27 Old Carriage Path Request for Determination of Applicability

George Dimakarakos, an engineer with Stamski & McNary, was present and introduced his client, Russell Broz. He explained they were having difficulty with drainage due to the presence of Isolated Land Subject to Flooding on their land and an adjacent parcel. This is a certified vernal pool, and the wetland vegetation has recently been flagged. Mr. Dimakarakos felt the area where work is proposed is outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. A catch basin rim is to be installed at the same elevation as the elevation of the ILSF. It would catch any overflow from the volume that fills the ILSF.

Member Giguere pointed out the elevation of the ILSF according to Stamski & McNary differed from the one approved by the Commission in the ANRAD for the Monarch Path filing. Mr. Dimakarakos said they prepared a topographic survey of the Broz property, and he indicated the difference was due to the baseline elevation taken from the NGVD for 1929 vs. 1982. The drainage system will not drain the wetland when it floods. C. Auman recommended the work be done at a dry time of year. B. Easom asked what reference elevation was used, and Mr. Dimakarakos responded the old septic plans referenced a control point in front of 248 Forge Village Rd. based on the 1929 NGVD. The ILSF elevations were thus based on two separate benchmarks for the property. The top of a berm on the Broz property matches the top of concrete at the house bulkhead.

This represents a unique case in that normally ILSF has a 100-ft. buffer zone under the Bylaw, but the house and lawn preceded the implementation of the Bylaw so it is unlikely the area is serving as wildlife habitat. N. Madden pointed out the Commission is faced with differing plans

that have been signed and stamped. Mr. Dimakarakos stated Joseph March of his firm is both a surveyor and an engineer, and he felt the basis for the difference was the use of the different benchmarks. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to issue a negative #3 Determination requiring the work to be done at a dry time of year.

The vote was unanimous. Mr. Dimakarakos said the edge of the ILSF was based on calculations for a 100-year storm in which no rainfall infiltrated the soils.

8:00 p.m. – 8-10 Valliria Dr. Notice of Intent – DEP#169-1072

Attorney Bob Collins explained his client, David Moulton of Deerfield Realty, owns the property and has received a permit from the Board of Health for a septic upgrade. The 2-compartment septic tank will be located within the lawn area, but out of the 50 ft. buffer zone. The existing system is in front of the house, nearer the road. Turgeon Environmental did the wetland flagging. The system will be raised about 2 ft. Surveyor Russ Wilson indicated the system is in failure, and they would like to do the repair as soon as possible. The existing leach field will be left in place, and the septic tank will be pumped and crushed in place. B. Ganem asked if parking will be allowed on the leach field, and Mr. Wilson said this would not be good for the septic system. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by D. Pitkin, it was

VOTED: to close the hearing for DEP#169-1072.

The vote was unanimous.

8:15 p.m. - Boles/58 Old Lantern Lane DEP#169-1070 continuation

While engineer Rob Oliva will be presenting additional information, Attorney Collins said he has heard from Lauren Glorioso of Natural Heritage. She plans to send a letter explaining the project is exempt from the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act regulations. Mr. Collins has also submitted a letter explaining the construction sequence which will occur in two phases: 1) work on the existing structure and 2) the construction of the addition. Mr. Oliva said he has extended the erosion control barrier as requested by the Commission and added setback distances and the length along the shore line. Based on calculations given in the December 7, 2011 letter, he estimated the proposed site conditions would be 7 – 8% impervious. M. Giguere asked if the trees to be removed could be shown on the plan. Mr. Oliva felt that soils and materials would probably be stored in the area of the driveway footprint. Mr. Collins maintained that less than 7% of the parcel would be disturbed by the addition.

The guidelines for Notices of Intent call for the identification of the tree canopy and building dimensions on the plan. Members, with the applicant's consent, agreed to hold the hearing open pending the requested information as well as notification from Natural Heritage. Upon a motion by D. Pitkin, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing to January 10, 2012.

The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Collins asked the Commission informally if they found this plan satisfactory, and members indicated it was likely to be acceptable, but subject to a formal vote by members.

8:30 p.m. – Sgrosso/2 Wyman Rd. DEP#169-1067 continuation

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

VOTED: to continue the hearing for DEP#169-1067 to January 10, 2011.

The vote was unanimous.

8:30 p.m. – Appointment Pollard/10 O'Neill Way Enforcement Order DEP#169-1068

Mr. Pollard explained Ross Associates has prepared the submitted plan showing the wetlands, house, and pool. The DEP sign has been fixed and is up. The soil stockpiles were removed November 25th, the haybales have been cleaned up, and straw wattles added adjacent to the wetlands at the front of the property.

Member Auman asked the status of the temporary road. Mr. Pollard replied that it is his intention to remove the compacted gravel and level out the area for seeding in the spring. B. Easom thanked him for his efforts to address the issues. It is likely the decking will be poured in the spring as will the plastering inside the pool. B. Easom said it seems best to clean out the materials when it is frozen. N. Madden added that the level of the gravel is higher than the surrounding grade. She would like to see the gravel materials removed and the area brought level with the adjoining lawn. Ross flagged the wetland doing core samples, and it pretty much follows existing lawn.

M. Giguere said he preferred to see the road removed and lawn restored. He asked if conservation markers along the wetland edge were acceptable, and Mr. Pollard said he had no problem with that. Discussion ensued on the best time to remove the gravel, and members noted it may be necessary to temporarily stabilize bare soils with hay or straw for the winter, especially if the access must be used again for finish work on the pool. D. Pitkin stressed the need to stabilize the site at all times to protect the wetlands. Upon a motion by B. Neacy, seconded by P. Morrison, it was

VOTED: to rescind the letter to stop work and to require the use of conservation markers at the edge of the wetland, the removal of gravel from the access way and the use of hay to stabilize the soils pending loaming and seeding in the spring, and all subsequent work to be done in compliance with the existing Order of Conditions.

The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Pollard said they are contemplating adding a 14 ft. x 12 ft. dressing room as part of the decking around the pool. D. Pitkin questioned whether this should be considered an amendment which will require re-publication of the legal notice and notification of abutters. P. Morrison stated this is a minor modification, and engineer Dan Wolfe added it will result in slightly more

concrete for the pool decking. Commissioners agreed this could be considered minor as the work will be no closer to the wetlands. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by C. Auman, it was

VOTED: to accept this change as a minor modification in the shape of the decking around the pool.

The motion passed by majority vote, with D. Pitkin abstaining.

Attorney Bob Collins asked if the Commission would consider creating and adding a matrix of the wetland types and jurisdiction to attach to the Order of Resource Area Delineation (DEP#169-1069) for Groton School. This would not add anything new, but would identify individual resource areas within the 100-acre site. D. Pitkin cautioned that any conflicts or mistakes between the matrix and the plan would only confuse the issue in the future due to human error. Commissioners agreed that adding a statement that if there are any inconsistencies, the plan shall control, would address this problem. Mr. Collins agreed to take the matter up with the Commission on January 10th.

The Greenway Committee has a presentation before the Board of Selectmen on December 19th, to discuss the future use of Fitch's Bridge to link pedestrian and equestrian trails across the Nashua River. The first plan was to restore the old bridge, but that has proven extremely expensive. An alternative is to seek Community Preservation funding to construct a new bridge. N. Madden indicated she was interested in attending on behalf of the Commission since D. Pitkin is unavailable that evening.

The Nashua River Watershed Association has requested a letter of support from the Commission for a grant proposal to set up a walking program on local conservation lands. Upon a motion by B. Neacy, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

VOTED: to send a letter in support of the NRWA's grant application for funding through the Nashoba Valley Health Care Fund.

The vote was unanimous.

The Board of Health and its agent are concerned about the materials that have been dumped near the wetlands behind 126 Main St. B. Easom stressed the need for a clear plan for removal and restoration of the wetland buffer zone. Upon a motion by C. Auman, seconded by B. Easom, and it was

VOTED: to require the landowner, George Pergantis, to file a Request for Determination of Applicability to remove the materials or an Enforcement Order and fines will be considered.

The motion passed with a majority vote with member Neacy voting in the negative and the remaining members voting in favor.

An inquiry has come in from Steve Webber about the feasibility of installing solar panels on the Lyman conservation-restricted area in W. Groton. Members determined that the language in the Conservation Restriction excluded this type of use.

Chairman Madden pointed out there are some conservation matters which have been pending for some time, and one of them is following up on a letter requesting a filing from the Aubuchons of 213 Whiley Rd. The residents did not file by May, as requested by the Commission, for the removal of the shore line retaining wall extending into Lost Lake. Upon a motion by B. Neacy, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to require the Aubuchons to file a Notice of Intent no later than January 6, 2012, with a fine of \$50 to be implemented on January 9th, a fine of \$100 on January 10th, and a fine of \$300 for January 11th and all subsequent days for failure to submit the NOI for the removal of the retaining wall.

The vote was unanimous.

Members requested B. Ganem review the Commission files to determine whether action is necessary on any other outstanding matters under the Wetlands Protection Act or Bylaw.

Members quickly ran through the land management tasks, noting that R. Wilson & Associates has prepared an updated plan for the Fuccillo land, showing the correct metes, bounds, and directions.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara V. Ganem
Conservation Administrator

Approved as amended January 10, 2012.

EXHIBITS

Document	Source	Date
Minutes	Conservation Commission	11/22/11
Order of Conditions DEP#169-1065	Conservation Commission Iovino/583 Lowell Rd.	Filed 8/4/11
Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation	The Thomas More Foundation/122 Old Ayer Rd.	Filed 11/22/11
Notice of Intent	Groton Electric Light Department	Filed 12/1/11
Request for Determination of Applicability	Broz/27 Old Carriage Path	Filed 11/28/11
Notice of Intent	Moulton/8-10 Valleria Dr.	Filed 11/28/11
Notice of Intent	Boles/58 Old Lantern Lane	Filed 11/7/11
DEP#169-1068 Enforcement Order	Pollard/10 O'Neill Way	Filed 9/13/11
DEP#169-1069 Order of Resource Area Delineation	Groton School	Filed 10/12/11
DEP#169-754 Certificate of Compliance	16 Forest Dr.(Lot B 32) D.M.L. Custom Homes	Filed 9/29/00
DEP#169-751 Certificate of Compliance	Paugus Trail (Lot B 31)/D.M.L. Custom Homes	Filed 9/29/00
DEP#169-1031 Certificate of Compliance	Boles/58 Old Lantern Lane	Filed 10/26/09