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### **Conservation Commission Meeting**

#### **Tuesday, February 08, 2022 at 6:30 PM**

**Victual Meeting – Zoom**

## **Present:** Larry Hurley, Chairmen; Alison Hamilton, Clerk Olin Lathrop, John Smigelski, Peter Morrison, Eileen McHugh, Bruce Easom,

## **Absent:**

**Others Present:** Nikolis Gualco, Conservation Administrator, Mark Haddad, Town Manager\

6:30 PM L. Hurley called the meeting to order.

**1. APPOINTMENTS AND HEARINGS\***

6:30 PM – NOI (MassDEP#-not yet assigned), 119 Tavern Road, for replacement of an in-lake retaining wall, patio, and landing area.

Applicant: Peter Braudis; Contractor: Frank Massarelli

F. Massarelli represented the applicant proposing the removal of a patio and a stone wall at the water's edge and to be replaced with a Redi-Lock type wall in the same footprint and dimensions. The flagstone and cement would be disposed of and replaced with pavers and the stones that are currently falling into the water would be used for the riprap. The second stone wall would be pushed back post removal of the stumps. The stairs that lead up to the driveway would be eliminated and a small landing would be installed replacing three cement steps. The paved pathway would be removed, flattened, and widened. Recycled asphalt would be used for the entire path from the landing up to the driveway to prevent washing out. The homeowners were willing to accept the recommendation to use permeable pavers.

E. McHugh questioned where the riprap would be installed in the first photograph shown and how the work would be completed. F. Massarelli referenced the base of a tree where the riprap would be located which was approximately 2- 2.5 feet to the exposed shore. Both a mini machine and by hand would be used for the installation. E. McHugh questioned if the stone walls would remain in place. F. Massarelli replied the first wall would remain; the second wall would be pushed back and continued across the property. The concrete steps would be removed and replaced with granite steps. The pathway will continue down to where the stumps are being removed and flattened to the proposed granite steps and the permeable landing. E. McHugh questioned the width of the pathway. F. Massarelli stated that the pathway is four feet wide. There was discussion if the path would be wheelchair accessible however F. Massarelli expressed that the slope is too steep. E. McHugh questioned if any cutting would be required. F. Massarelli replied yes on the uphill side and the cuts that are made would be restored. E. McHugh questioned if the rhododendrons would be removed and if there is a plan to replant. She commented that it is important to slow down the flow of runoff. F. Massarelli replied yes and the applicant is considering replanting the area with smaller rhododendrons. E. McHugh then questioned the length of the riprap. F. Massarelli replied 40 feet. E. McHugh recommended that permeable pavers be used and the recycled asphalt. She also wanted to ensure that the contractor worked within a limited area to prevent disturbances. F. Massarelli confirmed that he and his one helper would work within the designated areas as shown on the erosion control plan.

O. Lathrop was concerned that there might be a decrease in the flood storage with the installation of riprap; the state of Massachusetts is very strict on reducing flood storage. O. Lathrop then questioned where the wall measurements were calculated. F. Massarelli replied that the walls are leaning and the measurements are an average number taken at the bottom of the wall. They are not straight or parallel with the driveway. O. Lathrop requested that the walls not encroach on the lake and are measured from the bottom. He also recommended a permeable path and a condition stating that a permeable pad would be installed.

B. Easom requested three wooden stakes to be driven into the ground where the new wall would be installed and prior to any work being completed a measurement is required to be documented from the existing wall to the stakes on the plan. A pre-site inspection would be conducted and the stakes would remain until the Certificate of Compliance is approved. B. Easom explained that this would ensure that there are no new encroachments.

A. Hamilton questioned how the runoff would be controlled when the stairs are removed. F. Massarelli explained that the plan is to reforest the area and the process would include topsoil, seeding of rye grass and then being stabilized with straw netting. A. Hamilton suggested native species.

 L. Hurley requested clarification on the work being performed at the second wall. F. Massarelli stated that the wall would be moved back slightly so it could be reconstructed in a straight line.

E. McHugh requested a plant list and the approximate quantities to ensure that there is a commitment to replanting. F. Massarelli questioned if there were any recommendations. E. McHugh directed the contractor to the Conservation website.

The Commission had a brief discussion if there was a specific timeline that the applicant was trying to meet to commence the project. F. Massaralli commented that the applicant would like to start the project before the lake rises. N. Gualco noted National Heritage had commented on the two lower portions of the project.

F. Massarelli requested further information from ConCom regarding the riprap and the possible effect on the flood storage. O. Lathrop reiterated that flood storage cannot be removed and if it is it needs to be replaced. L. Hurley questioned if the law pertains to beach erosion. The ConCom had a brief discussion and questioned if the damaged wall being removed out of the lake and then being reused as riprap is considered taking away or is it considered a 1:1 ratio. The ConCom agreed that the process would be balancing out the actions as long as additional rocks are not being used. B. Easom suggested moving the wall back a foot to eliminate any flood storage issues.

N. Gualco stated that he would prepare the order of conditions to be able to close the public hearing at the next scheduled meeting.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by B. Easom, it was: Voted to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting on February 22, 2022. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: BE, JS, AH, EM, PM, OL, LH)**

6:45 PM – NOI (MassDEP#-not yet assigned), 32 Court Street, for the construction of a new commercial building.

Applicant: Halsey Platt, Platt Builders

H. Platt provided a brief background of purchasing the existing building over 25 years ago and the recent addition to the building. He is proposing the construction of a 12,000 square foot building to the right of the recent addition. He has been working with various departments to ensure that this project can be achieved successfully. The wetlands are located on the opposite side of the paved rail trail. The driveway would be installed on the uphill side of the building to ensure that traffic and construction vehicles would remain the furthest away from the wetlands. H. Platt proposed a second option of flipping the building 180 degrees however that would relocate the vehicle traffic closer in proximity to the wetlands. With the first proposed plan there is approximately 800 square feet of disturbance to the buffer zone. The soil on the site has been previously disturbed 5 years ago from a 21E Remediation project where the entire property was excavated 10-12 feet down. H. Platt reiterated that there is a 12-foot paved rail trail between the property and the wetlands and a 35-foot band of trees that would not be disturbed. He also commented that the back of the building facing the rail trail would be appealing and a long planting bed would be installed with native plants that are low maintenance.

B. Easom suggested moving the building out of the ConCom’s jurisdiction by changing the dimensions slightly by making it longer and narrower. H. Platt stated in terms of the manufacturing operations the proposed 60-foot width is needed.

A. Hamilton appreciated that the major impacts were being kept away from the wetlands and recommended making a few adjustments to minimize the impact.

P. Morrison commented that there is an efficient buffer being provided by both the State land and the rail trail. He expressed that there is no danger to the wetlands.

E. McHugh requested to see alternative layout plans of the proposed building and a planting plan. H. Platt stated that a plant legend was provided on the plan and explained that S. Dillis placed the building on the lot to comply with both the parking and the drainage. There is a limited amount of area to work within.

L. Hurley questioned the hatch area around the building. H. Platt replied that the area represented grass that would be planted.

O. Lathrop questioned why the land could not be utilized to the east of the proposed building. H. Platt replied there is a driveway easement that needs to remain accessible. He suggested that the building could be flipped however there would be more concerns of impact to the wetlands. O. Lathrop commented that the 100-foot buffer zone does not allow permanent structures and questioned what would be given back to the environment. H. Platt explained that there are runoff issues that create a wet spot on the rail trail; S. Dillis has designed a drainage system that would significantly improve infiltration. There are also plans for Native plantings. Once the project is completed there is 1,000 square feet of proposed planting compared to the 785 square feet of disturbances. Lathrop suggested that the area outside of the easement to the left be restored as a tradeoff. H. Platt agreed to the request.

E. McHugh commented that there are a couple of options for the layout of the building and the building being flipped seems reasonable. She said if the parking was moved from the west side to the east side, it would provide room to move the driveway and the building up and to the west. H. Platt explained that moving the building up would affect the drainage area and a permanent easement that is required for the dwelling. S. Dillis conducted test holes and the proposed drainage area is the only location where native soil was identified. H. Platt noted that changing the elevation of the parking lot would create more drainage issues.

L. Hurley questioned if there is an issue with moving the building to the right. H. Platt replied the building could be shifted 10-15 feet until it meets the next buffer zone and noted if the building was flipped the throughway would not provide an adequate area for any fire apparatus.

B. Easom requested that a drawing of the building being flipped 180 degrees be provided to the ConCom.

E. McHugh requested specific details of the tradeoff. H. Platt requested what ratio seems appropriate. O. Lathrop commented that various factors are taken into account and if the area to the left of the easement is kept natural in perpetuity and the additional planting was guaranteed the request would be satisfied. O. Lathrop then recommended that a plan be submitted showing the naturalized area along with its size. He then suggested that both areas be referenced in the order of conditions. N. Gualco commented that the word natural should be considered as a restoration.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by A. Hamilton, it was: Voted to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting on February 22, 2022. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: PM, OL, JS, AH, BE, EM, LH)**

7:00 PM – RDA (2022-03), 49 Valley Road, for the removal of trees within the buffer zone.

Applicant: John Kilgo

The applicant requested the removal of four trees that are hazardous to his dwelling. The stumps would remain. J. Kilgo described that there are concrete steps adjacent to the foundation that are settling and leaning towards the house and proposed removing them and replacing the steps with a deck and crushed stone. He then discussed the original planting plan and informed the Commission that some areas had been reseeded and the raspberry bushes were unsuccessful which resulted in holding off additional planting. J. Kilgo said that he would try to remedy the issues by bringing up more soil to allow the plants to thrive. He suggested planting wildlife flowers, native grass, Mountain Azalea, shrubs or trees to build a privacy screen and canopy.

B. Easom noted that a crane would be used to remove the trees to allow for minimal disturbances. He was pleased with the proposed replacement of the impervious area (concrete pad) with a pervious area.

The ConCom was in agreement that the applicant has provided great improvements to the property over the last few years and commended his actions.

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by P. Morrison, it was: Voted to issue a Negative 3 Determination under the conditions: 1. Trees will be removed by a crane. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: PM, EM, JS, BE, AH, OL, LH)**

**L. Hurley excused himself from the meeting.**

7:10 PM – ANRAD (MassDEP#-not yet assigned), 500 Main Street (a.k.a., the former Deluxe campus).

Applicants: Ron Strohsahl, Oxbow Association; Greg Roy: Dillis and Roy

Greg Roy expressed that they are very anxious in commencing the project and asked when the earliest the ConCom would be available to conduct a site walk.

The Commission had a brief conversation to determine if a special site walk could be conducted outside of the regularly scheduled time. There was a concern that there was too much snow covering the ground preventing visibility and the representative was questioned why the site walk was prolonged if the delineation was completed in July and November. G. Roy explained it was not ideal at the time due to budgeting. The majority of the Commissioners accommodated the request and agreed upon meeting on Sunday, February 13th. N. Gualco suggested that the Commissioners segregate into two groups and view the site on different dates to give everyone the opportunity to view the site. J. Amaral suggested that a local Commissioner visit the site prior to the scheduled site walk to ensure that it would be a success.

Upon a motion by E. McHugh, seconded by J. Smigelski, it was: Voted to nominate Bruce Easom to meet with John Amaral on Saturday February 19, 2022 at 3:00 PM to determine if a sidewalk would be successful for the following day on Sunday. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: PM, JS, AH, BE, OL) LH- Abstain**

E. McHugh requested that a second site walk be scheduled for February 19, 2022.

N. Gualco requested that B. Easom contact him by both email and phone to provide the determination for the site walk and he would then forward the response to the other Commissioners.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by J. Smigelski, it was: Voted to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting on February 22, 2022. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: OL, EM, PM, JS, AH, BE)**

7:20 PM – *continued –* NOI, MassDEP#169-1229, 92 Common Street, for the construction of a single-family house, driveway, and sewage disposal system.

Applicant: Greg Roy; Attorney: Bob Collins

N. Gualco informed the ConCom that the DEP requested that the applicant provide information on how the wetlands were delineated.

Attorney Collins was requested at the prior meeting to receive written justification of the location of the septic system and why it could not be relocated closer in proximity to the dwelling to remain outside of the 100-foot buffer zone. S. Dillis was able to receive the results from the test holes and the results identified ledge in between the dwelling and the septic system.

G. Roy briefly discussed the revised plan which includes a dry well being added to the roof infiltration plan; the stormwater management area has been elongated and converted into a bio retention area. The outlet was formalized with riprap and the details were provided on the plan of the no cut area and the limited disturbances.

O. Lathrop expressed that there is a remaining issue with the location of the septic system and the response received from Ira Grossman was extremely vague and unsatisfactory. Attorney Collins stated that the question was specifically posed on the area that was in question. He reiterated that there is ledge located between the house and the septic system and not in front of the house. O. Lathrop commented that a clear interpretation was not provided in the documentation and requested additional information from a professional. Attorney Collins assured the ConCom that he would return with a sketch of where the test holes were performed or a more informative response from I. Grossman. G. Roy stated that he would contact the previous designer.

E. McHugh commented that S. Dillis was asked to provide a planting plan and noticed a discrepancy between the legend and the plan. The quantity on the legend said10 Junipers and only 5 were marked on the plan.

The applicant requested that the ConCom have an order of conditions compiled for the next scheduled meeting.

Upon a motion by P. Morrison, seconded by J. Smigelski, it was: Voted to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting on February 22, 2022. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: EM, AH, PM, JS, BE, OL, LH)**

7:25 PM – *continued –* NOI (MassDEP#-not yet assigned), 342 Main Street (Florence Roche Elementary School), for the demolition and reconstruction of the school and athletic track.

Applicant Design Team: Meryl Nistler, Studio G Architects; Steve Michener, Studio G Architects; Leena Long, Leftfield; David Saindon, Leftfield; Steve Power, Saminotes; Jeffrey Pilat, Saminotes; Kelly Connelly, Terranink; Kelly Ashton, Terranink; Tripp McElroy, Gilbane Building Company; Stan Dillis, Ducharme & Dillis

M. Nistler introduced the project of the Florence Roche Elementary School and proposed a two-story building approximately 109,855 square feet, located east of the existing building at 342 Main Street. The project includes the demolition of the existing elementary building, improvements, and the construction of a 400m athletic track.

J. Pilat briefly discussed the information that was requested by the Commissioners and the revisions to the original plan. The 50-foot buffer zone is decreasing from 6,478 square feet of impervious surfaces to 5,258 square feet. The impervious area within the 100-foot buffer zone is increasing from 25,270 square feet to 59,524 square feet. Erosion controls have been adjusted based on the comments from the Commissioners. The stormwater layout now includes water quality units prior to each underground infiltration system to be in compliance. The Planning Board and the Stormwater Advisory Committee requested low impact designs and the drainage in the courtyard have been reconfigured and a rain garden has been added into the 200-foot buffer zone. The system overflows into the infiltration system located in the southern parking lot. The tree line disturbance was pushed back. J. Pilat confirmed that the calculations for the cut and fill and the proposed disturbances for each series of wetlands have been provided including all impervious structures. J. Pilat assured that there has been environmental trade dedicated to the installation of the additional rain garden and the 9,092 square feet of enhancement of connecting the two wetland series. The proposed nature walk within the 50 foot buffer zone has been eliminated.

K. Connelly discussed enhancing the existing buffers by using three different plant groups. The lower right photo showed a New England Wetland Seed Mix (roadside matrix upland) which is recommended for sloped conditions to create stabilization with the use of grass, perennials, and shrubbery. The secondary group which is displayed in orange on the plan is a naturalized planting using more established shrubs and trees to build up against the existing forest edge. The blue area located in the middle is the rain garden, there would be a grouping of plants and supplemental shrubby. K. Connelly noted that the green circles on the plan are native trees being used including Heritage Birch, Red Sunset Maple, Tulip Tree and Black Tupelo.

K. Ashton briefly listed the materials that would be used in the learning lab: permeable pavers, concrete/patterned concrete, stabilized stone dust, planting materials, low shrubs, and shade sails.

P. Morrison had reviewed the provided spreadsheets regarding the existing, proposed, pervious, and impervious areas within both the 50 foot and 100-foot buffer zones. He expressed that there is still a lot of impervious area and new disturbances being proposed. P. Morrison questioned if there are any alternative plans that are less intrusive. J. Pilat replied that due to programming, layout, and the restrictions posed on the site there are not many options available. He hoped that the enhanced planting would be significant and help with an offset. P. Morrison questioned what would be recommended for no permanent structures within the 100-foot buffer zone. S. Powers replied that he understands that permanent structures include roads. He expressed that they are making every effort to remain outside the 50-foot buffer zone. The upper north east corner of the track is being pulled back and would only require grading. They are working with a landscape architect to enhance that area and tie it into the second wetland to become a stabilized buffer. The building is being pulled away as far as possible. The emergency fire access road does encroach on the 50-foot buffer however there needs to be a safety circulation around the entire building. P. Morrison requested documentation justifying the location of the proposed project or an alternative plan.

E. McHugh was pleased with the proposed enhancement and commented that the additional rain garden and the elimination of the walking path were undocumented. She also questioned the 24-month establishment period for the vegetation. S. Powers explained that he wanted to present the plans before submitting a final plan to the Commission. K. Connelly stated that in the performance spec the seeded areas would include a special provision with a two-year care cycle.

B. Easom commented that there was an error on the labeling of the wetlands and stated that there needs to be additional work performed to remove the permanent structures outside of the buffer zones.

A. Hamilton commented that a single tree does not represent naturalized planting. K. Connelly explained that the naturalized planting would occur adjacent to the woodland areas. The picture represents a tree and a mix of shrubs, the style would not be in a row, and rather grouping would be formed in and under certain species. A more detailed planting plan would be submitted.

O. Lathrop commented that he could not support this proposal as there are too many permanent structures and disturbances within the buffer zones and not enough adequate area being given back to the environment. S. Powers replied that there were many restraints and factors addressed including property lines, four wetland series, and two existing operating schools. An extensive contingent phasing was developed. There were several exercises executing a design that would create the least impact. O. Lathrop questioned the oval area in front of the proposed building. K. Connelly said that the area is made up of native turf grass and would be used as a recreational space.

D. Saindon said that a feasibility study had been performed and this design plan is the best option. The project was approved at the Town Meeting. D. Saindon explained that time has been lost with global challenges and the supply chain. There is a budget that needs to be met and the plan cannot be redesigned. The Groton Tax Payers would be affected. He noted that the stormwater system would benefit at the end of the completed project.

J. Pilat outlined the existing school on the plan and explained that they tried to pull back on the disturbances as much as they could. D. Saindon stated that the idea of the project was to construct a new building and leave the campus operational. Gilbane provided an efficient plan on how to phase the project to ensure that was achieved. M. Nistler stated that once the project was approved a Wetland Scientist conducted a study and the actual footprint of the school was moved slightly to have less of an impact on the wetlands. F. Raynor noted another reason for the position of the school is for the demolition and the ability to keep the existing building active. Traffic patterns and bus circulation were accounted for; traffic tends to back up on route 119. The added segregated parent pick up/drop off area would ensure safety to the students.

E. McHugh commented that it would have been appropriate for the design team to come to the ConCom prior to being in their final stages. She expressed that the Commissioners have been put in an awkward position. She reiterated that the people of the Town have approved the project and would like the existing building to remain open during construction and stated that she would be likely to approve the request.

P. Morrison questioned if the building could be moved forward and if this plan is approved how will the ConCom proceed with other proposals that are within the buffer zones. S. Powers replied that the utilities would be impacted and there would not be enough through way between the two schools. F. Raynor stated that the building is very important to the Town and discussed the challenges of the escalating costs due to Covid. She questioned what an appropriate tradeoff would be. O. Lathrop questioned if there was any other land that could be acquired. F. Raynor said that there was an extensive community outreach and each site had challenges and 342 Main Street was the best option. The Middle School, Elementary School, and the Twomey Center all utilize each other's buildings. M. Haddad informed the ConCom that the budget does not allow for the Town to acquire land and the project needs to move forward or it will cost millions of dollars. He apologized for not coming to the ConCom sooner however they were working with a tight timeline and receiving other permit applications. M. Haddad stated that they cannot go back to the Town Meeting and they are locked into this site. The Building Committee will be meeting to downsize the project due to increased costs. He urged the ConCom to work with the group to approve the requests. O. Lathrop commented that Wetland Series B was a nonfunctioning wetland and there could be more encroaching in that area. D. Saindon noted that the track would be too tight to the property line. B. Easom asked who owns the parcel that is used for cross country skiing. N. Gualco suggested adding a CR to that parcel which would provide permanent protection on the land. The school could continue using the area for recreational purposes. Mr. Haddad questioned when this could be addressed to the School Committee. F. Raynor replied that the School Committee would be meeting tomorrow and the next meeting is scheduled for March 9th. P. Morrison recommended adding the wetlands to the CR. The Commission agreed that this would be an adequate tradeoff. J. Pilat stated that the parcel is 4.2 acres.

B. Easom commented if there is no compensation for the disturbances then he could not approve the request. He was not pleased with the perception that the Wetland Bylaws apply to residential properties and not Town owned properties.

J. Smigelski expressed that the ConCom was put in a vulnerable position and to be satisfied there needs to be a guarantee of something in return for the ConCom.

M. Haddad apologized to the ConCom for feeling bullied and expressed that was not the School Committees intentions. He explained that they were waiting on approvals and stated that he would collaborate with the ConCom on a compromise that would offset the encroachments.

N. Gualco stated that he is pleased to work with the Building Committee and provide any assistance. F. Raynor informed the ConCom that the next school committee is scheduled for March 9, 2022 and if it is imperative, she could request a brief meeting with the chair. M. Haddad stated that the open meeting law would allow for the topic to be added to tomorrow's meeting. F. Raynor ensured that she would notify the chair in the morning. D. Saindon requested that an order of conditions be ready for the next meeting to maintain the schedule. N. Gualco stated the earliest the Commission would be able to issue an Order of Conditions is on March 8th as long as the land is added as compensation, the details of the enhancement of the buffer zone and the planting plan are provided. There will then be a 10 day appeal period within the DEP. N. Gualco noted that the ACEC timeline also needs to be taken into consideration.

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by P. Morrison, it was: Voted to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting on February 22, 2022. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: BE, PM, OL, EM, JS, LH)**

**2. GENERAL BUSINESS\***

Permitting

*COC, 70 Longley Road, MassDEP#169-807*

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by P. Morrison, it was: Voted to issue the Certificate of Compliance for 70 Longley Road, MassDEP# 169-807. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: EM, OL, JS, PM, BE, LH)**

*Discuss sending comments to the Select Board on Heritage Landing/Cow Pond Brook 40B proposed development.*

The Commission briefly discussed that there were only minor disturbances of grading and a letter would not be submitted to the Select Board.

General Discussions/Announcements

*Update on outreach efforts to the United Native Cultural Center*

B. Easom said he intended to converse with Marina Novak the head of UNCC however, Becky Pine has already contacted her. He would like to have a conversation with B. Pine to hear what has been discussed prior to reaching out.

*Review a draft of the Commission’s 2021 annual report*

Upon a motion E. McHugh, seconded by P. Morrison it was: Voted to accept the Commission’s 2021 annual report as edited. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: EM, BE, PM, OL, JS, LH)**

Land Management

*Update of Priest Hill Habitat Restoration (on-going project)*

None

Committee Updates

O. Lathrop updated that the Invasive Species Committee has been asked to write a letter of support for the CPA and there will be a special meeting prior to the regularly scheduled meeting to approve the letter of support.

B. Easom said at the CPC meeting there was an application submitted last year to reposition the middle school track for $1.4 million and the Town has returned and stated that the amount is now $2.4 Million. The bonding will be for 10 years and in FY23 there will be a shortfall of $80,000 in unallocated reserves due to all the submitted applications. B. Easom commented that the ConCom may want to rescind their offer. N. Gualco questioned when a decision would have to be made. B. Easom stated that the CPC may request a reduction in March.

Approve Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were not available for review.

Invoices

Upon a motion by E. McHugh, seconded by B. Easom, it was: Voted to approve and pay the invoice from the Groton Herald for the amount of $55.00 **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: PM, JS, EM, OL, BE, LH)**

Upon a motion by E. McHugh, seconded by B. Easom, it was: Voted to approve and pay the invoice from the Groton Herald for the amount of $216.40. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: EM, BE, JS, OL, PM, LH)**

Upon a motion by E. McHugh, seconded by B. Easom, it was: Voted to reimburse the Conservation Administrator $69.95 for micro spikes. **The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: OL, JS, PM, EM, BE, LH)**

**3. Open Session for topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting**\*

None

4. **(IF NECESSARY)** Executive Session pursuant to MGL Ch. 30A, Sec. 21(6): \* “To consider the purchase, exchange, lease, or value of real estate, if the chair declares that an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.”

 Not Necessary

5. Adjournment

 9:57 PM

Upon a motion by B. Easom, seconded by E. McHugh, it was: Voted to adjourn the public hearing at 9:57 P.M.

**The motion passed by a roll call vote. (Yes: PM, OL, BE, JS, EM, LH)**

**Minutes Approved: March 8, 2022**