GROTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 24, 2015

Chairman John Smigelski called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. with Peter Morrison (Vice Chairman), Susan Black (Clerk), Mary Metzger, and Bruce Easom present. Members Rena Swezey and Marshall Giguere participated via conference speakerphone from separate, remote locations. Chairman Smigelski announced that the Open Meeting Law requires roll call votes for all votes involving remote participants. Conservation Administrator Takashi Tada was present.

7:03 – Public Hearing: NOI, Baddacook Pond Herbicide Treatment (Board of Selectmen) – DEP #169-1123
Applicant: Board of Selectmen (Selectmen)
Representatives: Great Pond Advisory Committee (GPAC); Aquatic Control Technology (ACT)

Chairman Smigelski opened the public hearing and acknowledged requests by Russell Harris of *The Groton Herald* and Jim Luening of GPAC to record the proceedings. There were no objections.

S. Black read aloud the public hearing notice. Chairman Smigelski laid out the ground rules for the hearing. The project proponents are to present the NOI proposal first; followed by Commissioners' questions and discussion; and then an opportunity for public comments. The Commission will also briefly interrupt the proceedings of this evening's hearing for the purpose of reopening and continuing the two other public hearings scheduled on the agenda. The Commission has yet to receive written comments from the Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP); therefore the hearing will be continued before moving on to other business. [*Note*: *All written comments on this NOI received by the Conservation Commission are included in the file on record at Town Hall.*]

The Notice of Intent (NOI) is for the treatment of aquatic invasive plants in Baddacook Pond using Sonar (fluridone) herbicide. GPAC Chairman Jim Luening presented PowerPoint slides and a video in support of the NOI on behalf of the Selectmen. Mr. Luening's presentation included background information on Baddacook Pond; a description of the invasive weed problem that currently exists; an explanation of the plan to restore the pond; an outline of potential weed treatment methods; the rationale for using Sonar (fluridone) herbicide; a summary of facts and figures relating to the safety and efficacy of Sonar use; and a conclusion that the herbicide treatment would improve the ecology of the pond while having no negative impact on the public water supply. The Groton Water Department operates a public groundwater supply well on the south shore of Baddacook Pond. The water supply protection Zone I extends 400 feet from the well and includes a portion of the pond, while the Zone II encompasses the entire pond. The Groton Board of Water Commissioners (BOWC) is opposed to the herbicide treatment and has expressed its objection and concerns to GPAC, the Selectmen, and the Conservation Commission in a series of memos.

The invasive plant of primary concern in Baddacook Pond is Fanwort (*Cabomba caroliniana*) which has infested approximately 35 acres (45%) of the pond, including the entire littoral zone, according to a 2011 survey by Aquatic Control Technology (ACT). Mr. Luening cited the Department of Conservation & Recreation's (MassDCR) 2005 "Rapid Response Plan For Fanwort In Massachusetts" which recommends the use of Sonar at concentrations greater than 10 parts per billion (ppb) for a period between 60 and 120 days, to treat such infestations. Mike Lennon, a consultant with ACT, said their initial plan is to treat Baddacook Pond with Sonar at concentrations between 10 to 20 ppb, for 60 days, beginning in the springtime. Sonar is a systemic herbicide that inhibits the synthesis of carotene in plants, which in turn makes the plant's chlorophyll susceptible to photodegradation (*i.e.* damage from sunlight); therefore spring is the optimal time of year to apply Sonar. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has approved the use of Sonar in drinking water reservoirs at a maximum concentration of 150 ppb.

Mr. Luening was followed by Savas Danos, Groton resident and retired General Manager of the Littleton Water Department. Mr. Danos spoke about the Town of Littleton's experience using Sonar and Reward (diquat dibromide) herbicides to treat invasive plants in Spectacle Pond and Long Pond over the course of 15 years. The Littleton Water Department operates a public groundwater supply well located approximately 25 feet from Spectacle Pond, and the Town of Ayer also operates a groundwater well on the west side of Spectacle Pond. Sonar herbicide was applied in Spectacle Pond at concentrations ranging from 10 to 40 ppb. There were no detections of Sonar in any of the public or private wells that were monitored in the vicinity of Spectacle Pond. Mr. Danos noted that the geomorphology of Spectacle Pond is similar to that of Baddacook Pond, although Spectacle Pond has a higher flow rate.

Art Prest, President of the Groton Lakes Association (GLA), provided a handout that included some of the Sonar monitoring results from Littleton mentioned by Mr. Danos. The handout also included results of downstream monitoring conducted by the Groton Water Department during the Sonar treatment in Lost Lake/Knops Pond in Groton in 2013. Sonar was not detected in the Whitney Pond Well (a groundwater supply well), and it was only detected at very low concentrations (2.3 ppb or less) in surface water. GLA is implementing a Boat Launch Monitoring Program and also a Weed Watchers Program at Baddacook Pond and Lost Lake/Knops Pond to educate residents and recreational users about the spread of invasive plants. Reducing the invasive plant population in Baddacook Pond will help to prevent the spread of these plants to other ponds by recreational boaters.

Chairman Smigelski asked members of the Conservation Commission for questions/comments. P. Morrison asked Art Prest about the duration and results of Sonar treatment in Lost Lake/Knops Pond in 2013. Mr. Prest stated that the targeted plants had died off by the end of the summer.

S. Black noted that the 2011 Baseline Survey conducted by ACT recommended the use of Clipper (flumioxazin) herbicide as the preferred management option. [*Note: Clipper was not yet approved for use in Massachusetts in 2011. In 2013 it was approved for limited use, with a number of restrictions. It is prohibited in aquatic rare species habitat.*] S. Black asked if this

was the most recent survey of Baddacook Pond. Mr. Lennon said it was. S. Black also asked about which formulation of Sonar would be used, and the water use restrictions associated with treatment. Mr. Lennon said they would most likely use the pellets in Baddacook, which are a slow-release formulation, rather than liquid Sonar. This will help them maintain Sonar levels between 10-20 ppb for around 60 days. The only water use restriction during this period is for irrigation of plants; otherwise it is categorized as safe for drinking, swimming, fishing, etc. Mr. Lennon pointed out that ACT has been treating the Neponset Reservoir in Foxboro for six years with Sonar herbicide. There have been no detections of Sonar in monitoring wells, and the reservoir vegetation has gone from 100% non-native cover to 60% native cover.

R. Swezey said there have been no negative impacts to private wells located around Lost Lake/Knops Pond following Sonar treatment there in 2013. She expressed the belief that Sonar is safe to use as recommended. She concurred with Art Prest's assessment that the treatment was successful.

M. Giguere asked if there were any studies of Sonar use in drinking water reservoirs. Mr. Luening said he would provide to the Conservation Commission a list of approximately 20 reservoirs where Sonar has been used. M. Giguere also asked about the timing of the treatment. Mr. Lennon said Sonar is optimally applied in the springtime. Mr. Danos emphasized that Sonar works systemically to disrupt photosynthesis, and applying in the springtime results in the most die-off. M. Giguere followed with a question about the consequences of not treating Baddacook Pond. Mr. Lennon said the unchecked growth of Fanwort is effectively filling the pond. The area of the pond has been reduced by 30 acres in the last 100 years. The dense vegetation is bad for panfish, trout, and other native fish. It inhibits recreational use and is a drowning hazard due to entanglement. And it also becomes a source for infestation of other water bodies via downstream migration and transfer by boats/trailers. M. Giguere said restoring habitat for native species, including rare wildlife, could be a benefit of the treatment. Art Prest noted that he observed an increase in the number and diversity of diving ducks last year on Lost Lake/Knops Pond following Sonar treatment in 2013. Mr. Prest also mentioned the potential impact on property tax revenue if the Town's ponds were to become vegetated wetlands.

[7:45 p.m. – Public Hearing (cont'd): NOI, 69 Boathouse Rd., DEP #169-1122 (Chapman)
The applicants submitted written request to continue the hearing to March 10th. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for 69 Boathouse Rd., DEP #169-1122, to March 10th. The roll call vote was unanimous.]

M. Metzger said the issue of invasive plants is a major ecological concern. She asked about the potential for downstream migration of Fanwort and other invasive plants. Bill Strickland of GPAC responded that the Groton DPW maintains a screen at the outflow near Old Dunstable Road that impedes the flow of plant fragments. M. Metzger also wondered if the applicants could utilize benthic mats within the Zone I portion of the pond, while applying Sonar in the rest

of the pond (Zone II). Mr. Danos responded that it is permissible to use Sonar within the Zone I, as was done in Littleton. He stated further that the BOWC might have control of the Land Under Water, but he did not think they could restrict activities within the water column. M. Metzger also said phosphorous was a primary contributor to the proliferation of aquatic vegetation. She asked if there were any attempts to monitor phosphorous inputs to the pond. Art Prest replied that the Lost Lake Watershed Advisory Committee is looking into this issue as its main priority. The use of phosphates is being reduced nationwide. He said the MassDEP has identified stormwater runoff as the biggest contributor of nutrient loading to surface water. Val Prest, resident on Highland Road, provided a copy of an article from the January 2015 issue of *Civil Engineering* magazine relating to cyanotoxins in drinking water. Cyanotoxins can lead to algal blooms when the combination of high nutrients and high temperatures is present, and they are very expensive to remove from drinking water.

[8:00 p.m. – Public Hearing (cont'd): NOI, Old Ayer Road, DEP #169-1121 (Chapman)
The applicants submitted written request to continue the hearing to March 10th. Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to continue the hearing for Old Ayer Road, DEP #169-1121, to March 10th. The roll call vote was unanimous.]

B. Easom asked if Mr. Luening could provide a copy of his PowerPoint presentation, as some of the details were difficult to see. Mr. Luening said he would email the file to the Commission. B. Easom asked for a comparison of depths between the Baddacook Well in Groton and the Spectacle Pond Wells in Littleton and Ayer. Tom Orcutt, Superintendent of Groton Water Department, said the Baddacook well is approximately 15 feet deep and 64 feet from the pond. Mr. Danos said the Littleton Well is 52 feet deep and 25 feet from Spectacle Pond; while the Ayer Well is between 40-50 feet deep. On the topic of the health and environmental risks associated with Sonar herbicide, B. Easom reminded participants to be cognizant of their terminology when making any assertions. He also stressed the importance of weeding through the jurisdictional issues associated with this NOI. He is a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is currently being sued by the Planning Board and Board of Health over a decision on an unrelated matter. The litigation costs taxpayer money and makes it difficult for board members to focus on the tasks at hand. B. Easom mentioned the BOWC's claim of control over the water rights in Baddacook Pond, and asked if one of the Water Commissioners could weigh in.

Gary Hoglund, Chairman of the BOWC, said their mission is to protect both the Town's water supply and the rate-payers. In January 2014 the BOWC denied the GPAC's initial proposal to treat Baddacook Pond with Sonar on the premise that the project benefits neither the water supply nor the rate-payers. The BOWC issued a memorandum dated January 28, 2014 which outlined (6) primary concerns with the proposed Sonar treatment (copy provided):

1. MassDEP regulations prohibit the use of herbicides and other chemicals in the Zone I area surrounding a public water supply.

2. The Town of Natick opposed a similar proposal by MassDCR to treat Lake Cochituate.
3. It is unclear to BOWC if Sonar has been previously applied in a Zone I area with similar hydrology to Baddacook Pond. The pond is relatively stagnant without significant flushing from in/out flows. BOWC also questions the testing methodology used by the manufacturer (SePRO) to support the claim that Sonar has never been detected in groundwater monitoring wells.
4. BOWC has concerns about adequacy of the USEPA's methodology for assessing the effects of Sonar on human health and the environment. [*Note: Use of Sonar has been approved by USEPA since 1986.*]
5. BOWC believes Sonar treatment in Baddacook Pond would benefit a limited number of property owners and recreational users, while providing no benefit to the water supply or water consumers.
6. Although more expensive initially, BOWC prefers the Town pursue longer-term, non-chemical methods to combat invasive aquatic plants, such as benthic mats, DASH, dredging, etc.

Mr. Hoglund said the BOWC and GPAC have gone back and forth over these issues and made limited progress in resolving the BOWC's concerns. In a subsequent memorandum dated September 23, 2014 (copy provided) the BOWC reiterated its concerns regarding the unknown health risks and liability costs associated with applying Sonar in Baddacook Pond. The BOWC listed a number of action items that it felt the GPAC should take in order to address the concerns. Mr. Hoglund said the September 23, 2014 memo represents the BOWC's current stance on this matter. B. Easom asked Mr. Hoglund if the BOWC could provide an updated punch-list of action items for the Commission's edification. Mr. Hoglund was non-committal and referred back to the memo.

Susan Horowitz, Board of Health (BOH) member and also the BOH's representative on GPAC, said the BOWC doesn't trust the USEPA's health risk assessment protocols. Ms. Horowitz has been in contact with an independent health risk assessor, Sue Sundstrom, who was the BOH's consultant for the Surrenden Farm remedial assessment in 2005. According to Ms. Horowitz, Sue Sundstrom says it would be impossible to conduct a health risk assessment of exposure to Sonar in groundwater because it has never been detected in groundwater, and all of the available data indicate that it is unlikely to migrate from surface water into groundwater.

Chairman Smigelski asked the BOWC if the groundwater supply well at Baddacook was influenced by surface water in the pond. The Water Commissioners were not clear on this but seemed to suggest that there was some degree of influence from surface water. Chairman Smigelski presented a copy of correspondence from MassDEP that showed results of Microscopic Particulate Analysis (MPA) testing conducted by the Water Department in the well from 2005-2007. The MPA test looks for bio-indicators of surface water in samples taken from the groundwater well, and provides a relative risk rating of surface water influence based on the categories Low-Moderate-High. Testing is done twice per year, in spring and fall. During the three year period covered by the MPA testing, the Baddacook Well received relative risk ratings of Moderate in 2005, and Low in 2006 and 2007. Based on the Low risk ratings in 2006-2007, MassDEP has concluded that the Baddacook Well is not under the influence of surface water in

the pond. Chairman Smigelski asked Mr. Orcutt how often the Water Department conducts the MPA test. Mr. Orcutt said every three years.

Jim Gmeiner, BOWC member, questioned Mr. Danos about some of the details of the Sonar treatment of Spectacle Pond in Littleton. Chairman Smigelski reminded Mr. Gmeiner that all questions must be addressed to the Chairman of the Conservation Commission. Mr. Gmeiner also questioned the data regarding Sonar's half-life, which has been shown in field tests to be an average of 21 days in pond water and 90 days in pond sediment (Washington State Dept. of Health, Fluridone Fact Sheet, 2000. Copy provided by Art Prest, GLA). Mr. Gmeiner presented a copy of a public policy leaflet prepared by the Groundwater Policy Education Project that indicates a longer half-life for Sonar in soil.

Brad Harper, resident on Birchwood Avenue and member of GLA, said Lost Lake was choked with weeds prior to herbicide treatments (Sonar and Reward) in 2013 and 2014. Now it is a lake to be proud of. He felt the control of invasive plants with Sonar would be good for Baddacook Pond and other ponds as well.

Mr. Orcutt asked Mr. Luening if they were proposing to use chemicals other than Sonar in Baddacook Pond. T. Tada said the NOI proposal only specifies the use of Sonar.

B. Easom asked about NHESP's review timetable. T. Tada said NHESP has 30 days to issue a determination letter, and they received a copy of the NOI on 2/10/2015. M. Giguere, formerly the Commission's representative on GPAC, expressed frustration that the BOWC has not taken any steps to work through its own concerns about the proposal while being unreceptive to information provided by the GPAC and other groups. M. Giguere also explained that the Commission could issue two permits in response to this NOI; one permit under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) and another under the Groton Wetlands Bylaw. There are separate appeals processes for each permit. Appeal of the WPA permit would be referred to the MassDEP for a Superseding Order of Conditions; while an appeal of the Bylaw permit would go to Superior Court.

Art Prest of the GLA said he would like the BOWC to produce a single, updated punch-list to help move the discussion forward. He also pointed out that the BOWC prohibited public input in its meetings. Mr. Hoglund reiterated that the BOWC's September 2014 memorandum is the punch-list. Mr. Luening asked the BOWC to restate, for the record, the reasons for opposing the use of Sonar in Baddacook Pond, rather than referring back to the memorandum.

Chairman Smigelski asked the BOWC to explain its disdain for the USEPA. Mr. Hoglund said it isn't disdain, but rather a healthy skepticism. P. Morrison asked if the BOWC's was also skeptical of the MassDEP. B. Easom mentioned the Consultant Bylaw and suggested this NOI as an appropriate circumstance for bringing in an outside expert. M. Giguere added that invoking the Consultant Bylaw would only seem to make sense if they could find someone acceptable to the BOWC. M. Metzger asked the BOWC what questions it wants answered. Mr. Orcutt said the BOWC lacked the technical expertise to know what questions to ask. R. Swezey asked why the BOWC does not trust the real data from the Town of Littleton's treatment of

Spectacle Pond. Mr. Hoglund insisted that Spectacle Pond has a higher flushing rate and therefore is not comparable to Baddacook Pond.

Chairman Smigelski showed copies of the soil maps around Baddacook Pond and Spectacle Pond as classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). The soil maps are very similar. He also said the USDA-NRCS office in Westford was impressed by the Town of Littleton's studies on the use of Sonar. Chairman Smigelski brought up the MPA testing results again and asked Mr. Orcutt if the Water Department disputes the MassDEP's conclusion that the Baddacook Well is not influenced by surface water. Mr. Orcutt said the Water Department does not dispute MassDEP's conclusion, but clarified that the MPA test is a limited biological test and is not the same as a hydrologic study.

Chairman Smigelski asked if the Commission was ready to consider a motion for outside consultants. M. Giguere emphasized that the questions posed to a consultant must be specific and quantifiable.

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by M. Giguere, it was

> VOTED: to request that the applicant (Selectmen) provide funds to establish an account under the Consultant Bylaw in the amount of $10,000.
>
> The roll call vote was 6 in favor and 1 opposed (R. Swezey).

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

> VOTED: to continue the public hearing for Baddacook Pond NOI, DEP #169-1123, to 3/10/2015. The roll call vote was unanimous.

8:45 p.m. – Public Meeting: RDA, Artificial Turf Field, 282 Farmers Row (Groton School)
Applicant: Groton School
Representatives: Robert Collins, attorney; Andy Truman of Samiotes Consultants, Inc.

Chairman Smigelski opened the public meeting for Groton School's Request for Determination of Applicability (RDA). S. Black read the public meeting notice into the record.

Andy Truman passed around a sample of the artificial turf that Groton School will be using. Robert Collins presented Groton School's proposal to replace an existing athletic field with the type of artificial turf on display. Mr. Collins said the project will result in approximately 5,600 square feet of disturbance within the 100-foot buffer zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW) to the southwest of the field. It will also disturb 1,800 square feet of the outer riparian area of an intermittent stream to the north, under the local bylaw. The BVW happens to be upgradient of the field and is therefore protected by virtue of topography. Replacing the existing grass field will also result in less fertilizer use. The applicants are in process with the Earth Removal & Stormwater Advisory Committee because of the amount of overall grading involved.

They will be using material from Groton School's ongoing schoolhouse addition project to achieve the proper pitch of the new field and to create several spectator viewing mounds.

Mr. Truman noted that the infill material that is placed in between the plastic blades of "grass" is comprised of recycled cork and coconut husks. Because it is mostly natural, the cork/coconut infill material eliminates some of the health concerns associated with other types of infill, such as recycled rubber tires. He also added that the artificial turf field will infiltrate stormwater more effectively than natural grass, and the stormwater will be directed to the drainage system.

M. Metzger asked what the substrate underneath the new field will consist of. Mr. Truman said they would place a 12-inch layer of crushed stone beneath the field to accommodate stormwater drainage. P. Morrison asked about field maintenance. Mr. Truman said regular maintenance will consist of "fluffing" the infill material with a rake to keep the "grass" blades upright. S. Black asked if the other existing fields are to remain. Mr. Collins said yes. M. Giguere asked if the field is located within mapped rare species habitat. It is not. He also asked if the new field would occupy the same footprint as the existing field. Mr. Collins said it will, although the new field will have more usable area for regulation play due to improved grading across the whole field. M. Giguere then asked whether the intermittent stream feature shown on the project plans was indicated on the USGS topo map. T. Tada said the stream feature does not appear on the USGS topo map. M. Giguere clarified that an un-mapped stream does not have a 200-foot riparian area under the local Bylaw; it would only have a 100-foot buffer zone.

T. Tada asked about the proposed erosion controls depicted on the plan. Mr. Collins said that the configuration of the erosion controls is based in part on the fact that the BVW is uphill of the field, and there is an existing drainage swale at the southwestern edge of the field. They propose hay bale check dams within the drainage swale.

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by M. Metzger, it was

> VOTED: to issue a Negative #3 Determination of Applicability to Groton School for the artificial turf field, subject to the following two (2) special conditions.
>
> 1. No grade changes within the 100-foot buffer zone of BVW.
> 2. Erosion controls to be installed per the plans.
>
> The roll call vote was unanimous.

[Note: R. Swezey and M. Giguere signed off remotely at this point.]

Moving on to General Business, the Commission reviewed draft minutes of the meeting held on 11/12/2014.

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by S. Black, it was

> VOTED: to approve the meeting minutes of 11/12/2014 as written. The vote was unanimous (5-0).

Moving on to Land Management – Property Inventory, M. Metzger provided a summary listing of management issues for the Commission's properties in the northwest portion of town. Invasive plant species are the primary concern, but the list also includes management issues relating to trails, trash, encroachment, and turtle nesting habitat. M. Metzger said she is also working with the Trails Committee to improve coordination of volunteers interested in tackling small-scale invasive species infestations. Her main goal is to stay on top of the black swallow-wort at Baddacook Field. She is also working with the volunteer steward of Knowles Siding Conservation Area (R. Coveno) to deal with invasives around the meadow.

On the topic of the Conservation Forum that was held on 2/11/2015 at the Groton Country Club, M. Metzger provided a write-up of the presentations made by the various environmental organizations in attendance. At the forum she managed to enlist one volunteer (S. Black) to assist with invasive species monitoring.

Moving on to Community Preservation Committee (CPC) updates, B. Easom reported that the CPC conducted its public informational hearing to review all of the draft funding requests submitted for FY16 Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds. T. Tada and Chairman Smigelski represented the Commission's proposal to replenish the Conservation Fund with a transfer of $200,000. B. Easom reported that there is enough money available to fully fund all of the requests. However, there is opposition to the Commission's request from the "active recreation" constituency (*i.e*. Park Commissioners and supporters). He recommended that the Commission be proactive in presenting its case for the Conservation Fund in front of Town Meeting, to head off some of the inevitable questions.

M. Metzger asked which of the Commission's properties were "last minute" acquisitions made possible by the Conservation Fund. P. Morrison said the Williams Barn/Sorhaug Woods purchase at foreclosure auction is the prime example. He also said the Town only pays 25 cents on the dollar for lands acquired with CPA funds, and it does not impact the tax rate. S. Black asked if the Commission had ever refused to accept a property that was offered up as a donation. P. Morrison said there have been some instances where land offered as a donation did not have any meaningful conservation value.

Chairman Smigelski said he would be meeting with Gineane Haberlin of the Park Commission and Town Manager Mark Haddad to talk about other potential funding sources for open space preservation. T. Tada asked about the origin of the Commission's goal to maintain the Conservation Fund balance in the range of $750,000 to $1,000,000. P. Morrison thought it came about in a meeting with the Selectmen following the acquisition of Surrenden Farm. M. Metzger asked if there was a point when the Commission would stop trying to protect land. T. Tada said the Groton Open Space and Recreation Plan does not set an upper limit for land protection. B. Easom suggested the Commission's goal should be to keep trying until the last undeveloped parcel in Groton is either protected or developed.

Moving on to Pipeline Working Group Committee updates, P. Morrison reported that John Giger submitted his resignation from the Groton-Dunstable Regional School Committee and, as a

result, would no longer be the School Committee's representative on the Pipeline Committee. Mr. Giger was the Chairman of the Pipeline Committee. P. Morrison was Vice Chairman and is now Chairman by default. The Pipeline Committee has not met since February 5th.

There being no further business, upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 9:32 p.m. The vote was unanimous (5-0).

Notes taken by

Takashi Tada
Conservation Administrator

Exhibits on file at Conservation Commission Office:

1. NOI, Baddacook Pond Herbicide Treatment (Selectmen), DEP #169-1123
    a. WPA Form 3, Notice of Intent
    b. Assessors Map
    c. USGS Locus Map
    d. Project Description
    e. Notification to Abutters
    f. Certified Abutters List
    g. Copy of MESA Filing Fee Check
    h. Baddacook Pond Baseline Survey 2011, prepared by ACT
2. Supporting Documents, Baddacook Pond NOI:
    a. GPAC PowerPoint Presentation (J. Luening)
    b. MassDCR Rapid Response Plan For Fanwort, prepared by ENSR
    c. Baddacook Well Zone I – map figure provided by GPAC
    d. Material Safety Data Sheet for SePRO Sonar herbicide (fluridone)
    e. Sonar fact sheets, compiled by GLA
    f. Article re: drowning in Framingham, MA
    g. USDA-NRCS Soils Maps for Baddacook & Spectacle Ponds
    h. Baddacook Well MPA Testing Results, provided by MassDEP
3. Comments & Responses To Comments on the Baddacook Pond NOI:
    a. BOWC Memorandum to BOS *et al*, dated January 28, 2014.
    b. Response to BOWC titled, "Restoration & Revitalization of Baddacook Pond". Prepared by A. Prest on behalf of the GLA, dated February 10, 2014.
    c. BOWC Memorandum to BOS *et al*, dated September 23, 2014.
    d. Response to BOWC titled, "Baddacook Pond Environmental Restoration – Answers to Water Commission Questions". Prepared by GPAC.
    e. Email correspondence from Hotze Wijnja, PhD., Environmental Chemist for MassDAR, dated February 23, 2014.
4. Additional information presented during the Baddacook Pond NOI public hearing:

a. Groundwater and Public Policy Leaflet #2, "How Contaminants Reach Groundwater". Prepared by the Groundwater Policy Education Project. Copy presented by BOWC.
b. Article from the January 2015 issue of *Civil Engineering* magazine relating to cyanotoxins in drinking water. Presented by Val Prest.

5. RDA, Groton School Artificial Turf Field
6. Meeting Minutes, 11/12/2014
7. Property Inventory – Management Issues List (M. Metzger)
8. Conservation Forum Summary (M. Metzger)

Approved 3/24/2015