

Shutesbury Conservation Commission

Minutes – 6/22/2023

Approved – (8/23/23)

Virtual Meeting

Meeting Start: 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Miriam DeFant, Mary David, Robin Harrington, Beth Willson

Commissioners Absent: Scott Kahan

Other Staff: Carey Marshall (Land Use Clerk)

Other present: Scott Campbell, Amanda Alix, Jon Lawless, Henry Geddes, Mike Vinskey, Elisabeth Goodman (SCC Special Counsel), Don Wakoluk (SCC Consultant), Mark Rivers, Ziporah Hildebrandt, Penelope Kim, Penny Jaques, Roger Hoyt, Brad Foster, Elaine Puleo, Mary Anne Antonellis, Eric Stocker, Neil Joyce, Marie Houle, Dale Houle, Dominik Wit, Susie Mosher, Matt Oudens, Mark Protti, Gail Fleischaker, Steven Bressler, Becca Wheeler, Joseph Salvador, Michele Sedor, and all other unidentified individuals.

Chair's Call to Order at 6:00 p.m.

Meeting is being recorded.

Camel Brook NOI/DCR Public Hearing, DEP File # 286-0299: bridge replacement

Campbell informs the SCC that he doesn't expect to answer all the questions SCC may have and that he has questions as well. He introduces himself as the DCR Regional Engineer for the Quabbin Area. DeFant screenshares the site plan for the Camel Brook Bridge Replacement via screenshare for SCC and Campbell to review. Campbell explains that there is an existing bridge on site which is what the first engineered plan is depicting; a couple years back, they placed a portable bridge on the crossing to restore access over the brook with the idea of coming back to upgrade it. DeFant shares a photo of the bridge taken at the site visit. Campbell elaborates on the current condition of the bridge, as shown in the photo, that it resides over the original timber bridge; also noticed the deterioration of the north side abutment wall – south side abutment wall is stable. It is presumed that the timber bridge existed on the side before DCR acquired the property in the 1930's.

DeFant has spoken with Mark Stinson, Circuit Rider for MassDEP, who commented that work in the stream bed should be reflected as impacts to Land Under Waterbodies and Waterways in the NOI. Campbell agrees and admits this section of the project is become more trouble than originally intended. The idea was to reset the stones. Campbell states that the intent of restoring the wall was to establish a stable Bank – protecting the Bank from scouring and erosion.

Campbell discusses the demolition plan and tree removals; due to their large size, they have a few options on how to remove them; can drop them into the wetland during the winter frozen period which as the potential to impact the wetland or to drop the trees along side of the road. DeFant shares that DCR's proposed plan was to bring a crew in with a crane to drop the trees along of the road; SCC feedback was they believed the crane method would be best because they agreed that dropping the trees in the Bordering Vegetated Wetland during frozen ground conditions would still be disruptive to the Resource Area. Campbell agrees.

Campbell reviewed staging area, location of gabion cage retaining wall, and erosion controls. Stormwater management system has been revised as they not using a level spreader. Their intention is to convey water and let it dissipate using its energy to spread it out. There is not enough area for a level spreader.

DeFant asks if Campbell was planning to close the Public Hearing tonight or if he plans to continue the Public Hearing to revise the plan. Campbell plans to continue the Hearing and revise the plan based on the comments he has received and tonight's discussion. They are trying to mimic and retain country drainage which is encouraging sheet flow off the road surface; not concentrating water, not piping and not directly discharging into a Resource Area.

Campbell shares the DCR comments document for SCC to review via screenshare. To address the Alternative Analysis and the implications of the Performance Standards, he wants to emphasize they view this route/corridor that goes towards the northern watershed as a critical axis because of the number of acres this opens up for emergency access, firefighting, and security – they have upper roads above Cooleyville Rd that they open to the public. DCR believes this alternative is the best choice; if they were to consider an alternative would be to try to locate a new crossing which he believes would create more impact to Resource Area. DeFant asks for clarification of road maintenance and bridges; asks if they are looking to be considered for both. Campbell shares that they were looking for guidance.

DeFant explains that the project is in Riverfront Area and Riverfront Redevelopment Standards apply here; if it is classified as Redevelopment, then not all the Performance Standards need to be met. She knows Campbell is characterizing these as a Redevelopment area because it's a previously developed crossing and road. Campbell admits he defer to others at DCR who have more knowledge of the Riverfront Standards than he does. They have advised him to stay with this exemption standard; it is an existing road, and they are allowed to maintain it. DeFant agrees, but informs Campbell that SCC needs to agree to accept this application as a Limited Project in which then the exemption standards would apply. Willson agrees and confirms that all exemption categories being relied upon should be listed in the application. SCC must approve the exemptions. Campbell listed some of the Performance Standards such as no significant adverse impact (proposed to be less than 1% of the whole lot), stormwater be managed by the standards established by the Department in its Stormwater policy, proposed work does not impair the capacity of the Riverfront Area to provide important wildlife habitat functions, erosion and sediment controls will be used as indicated on the site plan, and areas of alteration and vegetation removal indicated in the site plan.

DeFant asks what the final width of the road will be. Campbell confirm the width will be 12 and a half feet and it currently resides at 9 feet; widening will accommodate for the wall structure as well and will allow for safe navigation for especially for emergency purposes; plan to restore gravel road and re-seed to stabilize. SCC recommends they use a wetland conservation seed mix and to add this into the work plan during the revision. Applicant agrees to revise wetland impacts to include Land Under Water Bodies and Waterways. Campbell confirms that plan is for 25 square feet of BVW alteration, which will be composed of riprap. SCC asks Applicant to quantify the square footage of AURA alterations. Campbell will include it in the revisions.

Campbell mentions SCC had a comment asking where the Baselok will be placed as it was not clear in the plan; he admits the plan did not explain this; if needed, would be used to reinforce the soil as it was being compacted.

Willson asks if there will be any restoration proposed based on the 25 square feet of BVW impact and the removal of trees determined as a result of the project. She understands that this is a Limited Project application but wonders if anything is being offered. Campbell states that they view that restoration of the stone abutment as part of restoration effort; has the best value in protecting the stream channel. He understands their project is Limited Project but also believes their alterations are limited. They are not proposing to plant new trees.

SCC has no further questions. There is no public comment.

DeFant notes that SCC needs to make a decision if they are waiving the requirement for a wildlife habitat evaluation; believes it is not needed. Wakoluk understands that one of the main purposes listed for the project was for emergency vehicles but has never heard of a regional district manager with a bridge manager, unless it has to do with logging; if there is a Forest Cutting Plan related to this, then he believes a wildlife habitat evaluation is needed. Campbell admits there is no specific Forest Cutting Plan; this area has been ignored for some time because for road access issues. DeFant understands that since SCC doesn't have any jurisdiction over the approval of a Forest Cutting Plan, then not clear how a wildlife habitat evaluation affects their decision for this particular project; project wouldn't be not approved because of a future Forest Cutting Plan. Wakoluk explains his idea is that this is a Limited Project with a small amount of area that is along the stream bank, and he doesn't know the effect that would have on it; but he does know if we are talking about the removal of only a handful of trees, there will be no effect – on the other hand, if we are discussing large portions of the forest adjacent to the road than he could imagine that small area could be affected by siltation. Campbell states that, as Wakoluk knows, those Cutting Plans are a public process that allows for review and public comment. DeFant asks the Commission if they believe it is possible that they could include perpetual condition of not removing trees as part of mitigation. Willson is unsure but understands that can place in No Touch zones around Resource Areas. Matter will be rediscussed when public hearing is closed.

SCC agrees that a wildlife habitat evaluation is not needed. SCC agrees that the proposed project is a limited project under Sections 10.53(3)(f) and 10.53(3)(i) of 310 CMR 10.00.

Motion: Willson moves to continue the public hearing for Camel Brook NOI to July 13' 2023 at 6:00 p.m., David seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Bylaw Regulations discussion, including Town Counsel's recent recusal and options for alternative legal review

DeFant summarizes that SCC scheduled a public hearing for June 21 for the draft Bylaw Regulations. On Monday, SCC received an email from Town Counsel, Donna MacNicol, indicating she could not provide a legal review of the draft for them because she has recused herself, citing she owns property on Lake Wyola. SCC has been working on the draft Regulations for over a year now and have been under the impression MacNicol would be providing a legal review of the draft. Based on this information, DeFant made the decision to cancel the public hearing and reschedule it to July 12, 2023, with Garner attending. Due to the public comments SCC has been receiving, DeFant plans to do a presentation at the beginning or the meeting to act as an orientation; SCC agrees.

DeFant shares that she went the Select Board meeting Monday night because one of her concerns was that if MacNicol is recusing herself for this reason, then it is not clear how SCC can access legal guidance for any legal matter; this is the second time Town Counsel has recused herself for two different reasons in the past year. DeFant emailed the Select Board asking them to address this matter as SCC needs to have access to a lawyer to answer legal questions for a variety of topics and projects, not just the Bylaw. If Town Counsel is recusing herself for everything, then what would be the solution that the Select Board would agree to? One option is to appoint a Special Counsel that would be available to SCC to all matters; if MacNicol is only recusing herself from the draft Regulations legal review, then could SCC hire a Special Counsel to do that review for them. She did communicate with Elisabeth Goodman who stated she would be available and willing to do this; DeFant emailed the Select Board to consider allocating funds for in the FY24 legal fund budget for this since the Town had already allocated funds from the FY23 budget, but the SCC was unable to use these funds since MacNicol recused herself. Select Board has not yet responded to these questions but has asked the SCC to attend a joint meeting on July 5. DeFant will inform the Commission of the time whenever she hears back from the Select Board.

The Select Board has decided to obtain a legal opinion from Attorney Gregor McGregor as to the legality of the local Bylaw; DeFant assumes this review will be provided to the Commission. Willson: SCC will need a legal review for the draft Regulations and process of drafting a new Bylaw; she supports hiring Special Counsel and asking for funds from the Town for this. Harrington and David agree. DeFant was surprised and disappointed about the recusal at this late point in process. SCC needs a contingency plan in case it encounters an emergency situation where legal advice is needed and SCC is unable to access Town Counsel; good municipal government should ensure all municipal boards have access to counsel when needed. Goodman clarifies for SCC that they can ask Town Counsel about her recusal and its extent. SCC agrees that DeFant should draft and send a letter to the Select Board and Town Counsel for clarification of MacNicol's recusal.

DeFant Select Board may believe that SCC shouldn't have a legal review of the draft Regulations based upon their view of the Bylaw and its validity; SCC should maintain its independence since the statute tasks the Commission with promulgating Regulations. SCC still has to administer the Bylaw as it is the SCC's charge and the Commission has no statutory authority put it aside. David: SCC should vote that it needs a legal review and go ahead and propose to hire a person to do that.

DeFant shares a document of drafted motions regarding Special Counsel and funding via screenshare for SCC to review.

Motion: David moves that SCC approve the hiring of Attorney Elisabeth Goodman to act as Special Counsel for the Commission for the purpose of advising the Commission on the Bylaw and Bylaw Regulations, including reviewing any drafts that the Commission may produce, Harrington seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Abstain, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Motion: David moves to approve that the Chair on behalf of SCC ask the Select Board to approve this appointment of Attorney Goodman as Special Counsel for this purpose stated above and further ask for the Select Board to approve legal funds from its FY24 budget to compensate Attorney Elisabeth Goodman for up to 5 hours of legal consultation for the purpose stated above, Harrington seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Abstain, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Motion: David moves that, in the event that the Town does not authorize the use of funds to hire Attorney Elisabeth Goodman, the Commission shall use funds in its Bylaw Fee Account for this purpose. The Chair is authorized to facilitate this process or take any other appropriate action relative to this purpose, Harrington seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Abstain, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Proposed Wetlands Protection Bylaw donation from Town resident

SCC received an email from a resident whose partner was a wetland scientist and previous Commission member who passed away several years ago. He wants to make a donation to SCC on behalf of his partner for any legal review for the Bylaw/Bylaw Regulations. DeFant acknowledges the generosity of the resident but Select Board must first allow SCC to accept the donation.

SCC needs to vote independently to decide whether SCC should accept those funds and then ask the Select Board for creation of a gift account to be earmarked for the purpose for which the donor is intending. DeFant: Town boards can have gift accounts. Willson adds that in Amherst there is an account for residents to donate to help Amherst buy land. Wakoluk adds that the donor is not present in the

meeting tonight because of hearing difficulties, but Wakoluk understands that the purpose for the donation was for the creation of a legal fund for the Bylaw and Bylaw Regulations.

Motion: DeFant moves for SCC to authorize the Chair to request that the Select Board allow SCC to accept a donation into a gift account controlled by SCC to be used by SCC for Bylaw-related consultation services, Davide, Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Motion: DeFant moves for SCC to accept the donation offered by Robert Seletsky if permitted by the Select Board, David seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

DeFant shares with SCC that she has draft an updated version of the Town Wetland Protection Bylaw; about 90% of it was taken straight out of the MACC Model Bylaw and some language is from some recently enacted Bylaws from other communities that have also been approved by the Attorney General's Office; language has been vetted by attorneys at MACC.

Discussion with Library Building Committee and consultants about pending NOI for new library on Lot O-32

Elaine Puleo, Chair of the Library Building Committee (LBC), introduces SCC to their architect Matt Oudens; they are trying to minimize the cost of building the library. Oudens shares a PowerPoint presentation for the current options the LBC is considering for their final design via screenshare. Oudens summarizes that they took their design of the Shutesbury Public Library through the schematic design phase and had it estimated by their professional cost estimator; estimate was much higher than anticipated; they have created new design with ways to reduce to the cost – looking for any comments from SCC on how these changes could affect permitting. There was two ways they have significantly reduce cost; first being the decreasing the building size from 6,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet, which is under the threshold that the state requires a fully automatic sprinkler system. They can reduce costs by reducing the building size. Currently, design has the building set back further back into the property which results in more site work (300 feet off of Leverett Road; 300 foot driveway).

LBC and team believe the site plan is where the most cost saving opportunities are. Their original plan was to stay out of the 50-foot Buffer Zone(s) as much as possible but resulting the in the front of the building being about 350 feet back from Leverett Road, thus requiring a large driveway. In new design, the building can be moved about 100 feet closer to the road, thus reducing the driveway length. The front face of the building would start right where the previously disturbed area ends (near the previous 3-bay garage). This location of the building would require the removal of one or two groupings of evergreen trees that were deemed by the Tree Warden as non-native. Moving the building brings it closer to the two northern wetlands (BVW-1 and BVW-2), but farther way from the southern wetland (BVW-3). They would be within 50 feet of wetlands and in some places, within 25 feet of wetlands. This approach will reduce extent of tree removals. Limit of work would be a 25-foot ring around the building which pushes it even closer to the upper wetland, but they are proposing to restore the area as they wrap up the project. There is a meadow that would be in front of the building that has been mowed over the past 12 years. They have had discussions about reducing the currently mowing practice to only once a year and propose to re-seed the area after construction with meadow mix. They hope to enhance and preserve the wetland/meadow area by this method of reseeding and reducing the mowing.

DeFant asks if there are any specific questions being asked of the Commission. Oudens' main concern is whether this change in building and site plan would be supported by SCC; these changes are critical in terms of being able to manage the cost of the project. Puleo further explains that moving the building closer to the road not only reduces cost but also is less of a disturbance to the area behind; further away

from the wetland but also preserving the natural habitat around it. They believed by moving the building into the area that has already been disturbed for many years was a good trade off.

David asks to confirm that the driveway would be going through the 25-foot and 50-foot Buffer Zones of the northern wetland. Oudens confirms but adds that this site plan is a rough draft and not finalized by the civil engineers. An official site plan is being drafted currently; there is a chance the drive could be located differently. DeFant asks if the septic tank and leach field is still to be located in the same location. Oudens confirms it is, but they hope to reduce the size of the field. DeFant: where will stormwater basins be located? Oudens states they are no longer placing stormwater features next to the driveway, but rather have an underground structure under the parking lot/turn around part of the driveway. There is a proposed vegetated bioswale that would run above the driveway starting from the road and running a few feet alongside the drive that would continue between the building and the parking lot and ending along the side the end of the building. Willson asks if the underground system would be an infiltration basin. Oudens clarifies it would be a Cultec system.

Willson: because of proximity to wetlands, SCC would want to see how the wetland would be protected during construction; in terms of impact, SCC would want to see some ideas for restoration which could go along with protecting the wetlands. She likes the idea of reseeded the one wetland with wetland mix while also leaving it alone and no longer mowing the area so that it become a wetland. Since this area will be a public site, SCC would want some reassurance that the wetlands would be protected in the future; some kind of design that would prevent foot traffic near or through them. She recommends that if there is any invasive species present in the area, then removal of those invasives can be proposed. Oudens notes there is a rock wall along Leverett Road that has knotweed patches that they can explore removing. DeFant agrees; SCC is open to considering and reviewing design with Buffer impacts, but would encourage creative thinking going into restoration and mitigation options; believes there are a lot of options for this property or even on other Town-owned property.

Oudens doesn't believe they will be permanently disturbing the 25-foot Buffer Zone, but there will be temporarily disturbed to complete the work; building would be located partially in the 50-foot Buffer Zone. Goodman recommends they be prepared to explain why proposed location is unavoidable and must be within the 50-foot Buffer Zone; notes that the proposed Bylaw Regulations regard the 50-foot Buffer Zone is a "no touch" zone. Oudens agrees. DeFant asks if the building could be turned so its axis could be east-west and have a slightly smaller parking lot north of the building. Oudens believes that design would not work and wouldn't help reduce costs. Goodman recommends that when it comes time to submit the permit application for the project, to list other alternatives where the building could be placed and explain why those location would be work. Oudens agrees.

Puleo: LBC would appreciate knowing if SCC preliminarily agrees with the design, because the next few steps they would need to take will be costly; don't want to run the risk of having to redesign again. DeFant states SCC is open to designs that LBC believe are necessary, and to hearing how other alternatives have been explored and how the LBC arrived at the most viable option; SCC appreciates the care being put into the thinking from both an environmental and cost perspective. SCC will need to see the finer details of what they are proposing, and they would be expecting some kind of meaningful mitigation that would make SCC more open to considering a proposal. SCC agrees with DeFant's response. Willson adds that she is okay with the design they have shown specifically because it is currently not in any wetlands; LBC should continue with it and gather calculations for Buffer Zone impact and think about restoration and how to protect the wetlands as previously discussed. DeFant points out that there is a lot of debris on site that is in and out of Buffer Zone, the removal of the debris could also be proposed as mitigation; offers to lend her metal detector to LBC if needed. Puleo thanks DeFant for her offer and will keep it in mind in the future.

Oudens asks about scheduling; they will have another decision point after having their cost estimator look over the proposal again; curious if SCC can estimate how many more meetings this proposal may need for it to be approved. DeFant: there is also a wetland delineation line that has yet to be confirmed; SCC may seek a 3rd party review for such. The review process would have two parts to it; the first being the review and possible approval of the line, and then then second being the building proposal.

Goodman asks if the project subject to MEPA (Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act) Regulations for review; LBC is unsure and will research this further.

Oudens is unsure when they were looking to submit the NOI. Their 3-month design development phase will start in August, followed by 5 months of construction document production, which will then take them to the bidding process through the new year – months of bidding put them into starting construction around the end of March 2024.

70 Lake Drive/Rivers Certificate of Compliance Request

DeFant and Harrington conducted a site visit last week noting work has been completed and work area is revegetated. DeFant shares the drafted COC for 70 Lake Dr for SCC to review; DeFant notes that the OOC has 2 Perpetual Conditions which are reflected in the COC document. COC must be recorded at the Franklin Registry of Deeds. Willson suggests minor edits to COC document. DeFant edits as such. DeFant notes that the Condition for photographs at 12 months seems unnecessary due to stable site conditions; SCC agrees this condition has been met.

Motion: David moves to approve the COC for 70 Lake Drive, Harrington seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

17 Cove Road/Avonti home addition RDA preliminary discussion

DeFant informs SCC that Avonti had an RDA approved last year for the removal and rebuild of a shed on his property. Avonti explains that the plan is to enlarge a preexisting addition to enlarge the bathroom. DeFant: SCC typically would want an RDA for this kind of project because it is small and there is no proposed dug foundation; using piers. Willson asks if the project is within the Buffer Zone; Avonti confirms it is within 100 feet. Avonti plans to submit the RDA.

530 West Pelham Road/Ross Special Permit Application for ground-mounted solar project-review of wetland delineation

DeFant and Harrington did a site visit and found wetland vegetation indicators; landowner hired Ward Smith to conduct a delineation and found a large wetland 110 feet from the project site. He agrees there are wetland plant indicators in the area but found no sign of hydrology. SCC agrees to sign off on the BPA.

Review draft minutes for 5/25/23 and 6/8/23

5/25/23 – SCC has reviewed the 5/25/2023 draft minutes. **Motion: David moves to approve the 5/25/203 minutes, Harrington seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.***

6/8/23: review tabled.

CPC representation

Willson has agreed to take DeFant's spot on the CPC. Jaques had also provided interest in being SCC's CPC representative, but since Willson is currently on SCC and interested, SCC chooses to recommend Willson.

FY24 MACC Dues

Motion: David moves to approve the pay of the FY24 MACC Dues, Willson seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Emergency Certifications for Beaver management at Lakeview Road/Lake Wyola Culvert and Montague Road/Dudley Pond Culvert

DeFant informs SCC that the Highway Department has hired Mike Callahan from Beaver Solution to install a flow protection device at the Montague Rd Culvert tomorrow; she wrote and sent an Emergency Certification because it was needed today – needs SCC to ratify. DeFant screenshares the Emergency Certification Special Conditions for beaver management at Lakeview Road/Lake Wyola Culvert and Montague Road/Dudley Pond Culvert; no edits were made.

Motion: David moves to ratify the beaver management at Lakeview Road/Lake Wyola Culvert and Montague Road/Dudley Pond Culvert Emergency Certifications, Willson seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Unanticipated Business

Beaver management at Lakeview Road Culvert – DeFant spoke Callahan of Beaver Solutions who believes there could be an inexpensive long-term solution to the beaver damming issue in this location by placing a diversion dam of boulders upstream of the culvert that would allow the beavers to build on the boulders rather than the culvert; also believes there could be a way to create fencing to allow kayaks and canoes to circumvent the boulder line. DeFant recommends that SCC should try to hold a meeting with all involved parties to discuss the suggested long term solution from Callahan; SCC agrees.

Site Visit Scheduling

13 Cove Road-tree removal request – *pending*

45 Schoolhouse Road/Sweeney (BPA/ studio addition) – *pending*

West Quabbin Woodland Conservation Area – TBA

South Brook Conservation Area – TBA

Dudley Pond/Montague Road culvert Emergency Certification for beaver dam flow protection device – TBA

Lakeview Road culvert beaver dam – TBA

17 Cove Road/Avonti (building addition) – TBA

Chair Updates

West Quabbin Woodlands Parking Lot – DeFant learned at the last CPC meeting that it wasn't clear who was building the parking area; she believed it would be the Highway Department (HWD). Jaques states it was never discussed that the Highway Department would complete the work. DeFant asks if the HWD completed the parking lot for the Top of the Lake Conservation area; Jaques confirms, but it was negotiated with HWD before she submitted the CPC proposal. Jaques recommends that SCC discuss this with Select Board if they want HWD to complete the work, Jaques was assuming a 3rd party would complete the parking lot. Jaques asks what the budget is; DeFant confirms \$5,000. Jaques asks if a location has been selected; DeFant confirms it has not and if part of the site visit the is scheduled; Jaques will be attending.

Motion to Adjourn: David moves to adjourn, Willson seconds. Vote: David – Aye, DeFant – Aye, Harrington – Aye, and Willson – Aye. *The motion carries.*

Meeting Close: 8:35 p.m.

Next Meeting: July 12, 23 at 7:00 p.m. -- Public Hearing for Draft Bylaw Regulations
July 13, 23 at 6:00 p.m. -- Regular Meeting

Documents Used

- Agenda
- DCR Camel Brook NOI
- DCR Camel Brook Site Plan
- DCR, SCC, and MassDEP (Mark Stinson) emails with comments on project
- Camel Brook Site Visit Form
- Donation fund email to SCC
- Draft Wetlands Protection Bylaw Motions document
- 70 Lake Drive Site Visit Form
- 70 Lake Drive COC Request
- 70 Lake Drive COC Form + Perpetual Conditions Attachment
- 530 West Pelham Rd Site Visit Form
- Draft Lakeview Road/Lake Wyola Culvert and Montague Road/Dudley Pond Culvert Emergency Certifications

Respectfully submitted by Carey Marshall, Land Use Clerk, 8/8/23