

Shutesbury Conservation Commission

Minutes – January 30 2025

Approved – February 13, 2025

Virtual Meeting

Commissioners Present: Beth Willson, Mare Fox, Janice Rowan, Scott Kahan, Bob Douglas
(7:04pm)

Commissioners Absent: None

Other Staff Present: None

Others Present: Jim Martin, Tom Siefert, Kathy Salvador, Joseph Salvador, Miriam DeFant, Meaghen Mikolajczuk, Penny Jaques, Mike S, Tracy McNaughton, Leslie Cerier

Call to Order: 7:00pm

This meeting is being recorded.

Comments from the Chair

This meeting is intended to be particularly focused on addressing the regulations revisions. The Commission's next regularly scheduled meeting is February 13.

Review and vote on minutes of January 9, 2025

Motion to approve the minutes of January 9, 2025: Kahan; second: Rowan. Approved unanimously.

Certificate of Compliance for 32 Lake Drive

Willson forwarded to the other Commissioners her email exchange with Christine Hopps from the DEP. Hopps indicated that she had everything she needed with the confirmation from the Commission and the license has been approved and is being issued, along with the invoice to the applicant. The applicant submitted the invoice and check to the Commission and they submitted the form applying for the Certificate of Compliance. Willson thinks it is clear that the Chapter 91 license has been issued and the Certificate should be issued as well. Willson shares the Certificate of Compliance for 32 Lake Drive and reviews the form and attached findings.

Jim Martin asks that the first section of findings, on the nature of the work indicated in the Notice of Intent, be revised to include the fact that the dock license has been approved. Willson answers that the information about the approval of the dock license can be included in the final section on what the Commission is certifying and she adds that information to that section.

Douglas asks if there are any ongoing conditions for the project. Willson indicates that now that the dock license has been obtained, there are no longer any outstanding conditions.

Motion to issue the Certificate of Compliance for 32 Lake Drive: Kahan; Rowan: second.
Approved unanimously with one abstention (Fox).

Review and Vote on CPA Grant Application(s)

Willson explains that the Commission has two potential CPA grant applications to consider. Kahan has prepared one and Penny Jaques has helped with the other.

Top of the Lake Invasive Plant Management

Kahan shares the CPA grant application for invasive plant management work at the Top of the Lake Conservation Area and describes the intended project. He recognizes Jaques for establishing the Top of the Lake Park and describes the conservation area's location and purpose as a canoe and kayak launch area for the public. The banks at that location have a barrier of glossy buckthorn, which is a dangerous invasive species for both ecological and recreation reasons. The project is \$4,500 in total, with \$4,000 from CPA funds for the contractor to remove and destroy the invasive and \$500 from the Commission to purchase native vegetation to re-establish in the location, with volunteers to donate labor to plant them. The grant is under Open Space and Recreation CPA categories.

The chair recognizes Penny Jaques. Jaques notes that she priced out the native plants at New England Wetland Plants and thinks that \$500 might be more than is needed, but she included it to be safe. She also thinks the contractor, Brian Colleran, might actually come in under \$4,000 as well and wonders if the Commission is comfortable submitting it at that level. Kahan notes that buckthorn is particularly tenacious and this seems like a reasonable budget given that.

Jaques notes that Colleran estimated \$2,000 for the site visit and developing the plan and then another \$2,000 for four visits to work on subduing the buckthorn. She thinks those costs should be under "Other" rather than "Supplies" in the CPA application budget section. She assumed the Commission would get a volunteer to prepare and submit the necessary applications because the bank is in a resource area.

Douglas asks if the parcel is the Town's open space or if it is in the custody of the Commission. Jaques answers that it is owned by the Town and managed by the Commission. Willson adds that it is considered conservation land. Jaques seems to recall it was purchased by the Commission with the Commission's trust fund money.

Douglas notes that even if the budget is slightly padded that is okay with him because costs are going up so much so quickly that it is good to be prepared for this to cost more.

Rowan adds that she thinks the \$4,000 should be put under “Contractual” in the CPA application because a contractor is being hired for the work. Kahan agrees and will make that change.

Jaques notes that Kahan is listed as the project manager in the application. He and Willson agree to that. Jaques indicates she would be willing to work with Kahan on the project as well but that the application should come from the Commission.

South Brook Conservation Area Trails

Kahan shares the applications and explains the history of work in the Area. Based on an evaluation of the existing trails, he and a trails consultant identified a number of places in need of repair, rerouting, and new blazing. There are some deficient and degraded trails, trails through resource areas, and inadequate or damaged bridging. Kahan has two CPA grant applications to present to the Commission for this work, both under the Open Space and Recreation categories. Kahan suggests submitting both.

The first application is a proposal for a total cost of \$81,604, full funding, for a design-build project to hire a contractor to design the bog bridging and trail rerouting and then implement it. He contacted several consultants recommended by Kestrel Land Trust and the cost in the application reflects what those consultants suggested as the total price.

\$72,900 would be requested in CPA funding for the design-build contract and \$8,704.02 would be matched from different Commission funding sources and volunteers for part of the contractual costs for purchasing signage by the contractor and the personnel cost to cover the work of blazing. The project would start in spring 2025 and be completed by fall 2025. Kahan reviews the anticipated timeline for the work to get it all done in one year.

The second application is a phased approach to the project, seeking only half the amount of CPA funding this year. In the spring, the Commission would issue its delineations and issue the bid for full design, but the build would be only partial and would only encompass only the southern portion of the two parcels because that part of the property does not have the more expensive bog bridges. In the next year, another grant would be sought to complete the work on the northern part of the parcel. He reviews the timeline for the different stages of work that would be completed under the one-year grant.

Kahan wonders about submitting both to the CPC to give that Committee some options in deciding which they could fund. He thinks doing it all at once would make sense if the funding exists to do so, but this lets the Committee decide if it can manage that.

Willson agrees that submitting both makes sense. As the Commission's representative on the CPC, she indicates that thinking about how much funding exists in the accounts and what other applications come in are important variables for that Committee in how they can fairly distribute the funding. This gives them some flexibility in choosing which they think is workable.

Willson asks about the matching funding and if that would be split over the two years as well. Kahan explains that in the first year, the delineations and blazing portion of the costs would be done in the first year but the signage would all be done under the future grant. He reviews the matching funding section of the grant application to explain the different costs.

Willson notes that the Commission itself cannot do the delineations itself and would have to hire someone to prepare those and the permit applications.

Rowan asks if there is adequate parking at the site. Kahan notes there is parking at the boat ramp and there could be some parking allowed where the sign for the Area is, but in the future it would be good to think of developing additional parking space and creating an accessible trail to the town beach. Those are not included in this particular grant, but it should be done in the future.

Rowan asks if there is a direct connection of a blazed trail to Wendell Road. Kahan answers that there is and notes it on the map. Rowan asks if that will be blazed again in this project and he answers that all of the inadequately marked trails will be re-blazed.

Rowan asks if all the trails, including those in the northern portion of the Area, near the lake, would be addressed in the one-year application. Kahan answers that they would be and shares some images that document the condition of the trails and bridges in that part of the Area.

Kahan thinks it would be best to do the full project in one year. He is concerned that there could be more costs and operational challenges if two different contractors are used over two years. Rowan agrees and would prefer to have it all done in one year if possible.

Fox asks for more information about markers 17, 18, and 19 because that is the worst part of the trail network and is largely impassable even on days with no rain. Kahan shares the images of those points on the trail and that this is based on the assessment from the previous consultant. He does not yet know what specific solutions will be adopted in those places, but he agrees they are in terrible condition. The previous consultant recommended an upland reroute there, though Kahan thinks doing that might run into a resource area, so a bog-bridge might be better. Fox

agrees that there is not much area to reroute in at that point and there are several places in bad shape around that point. Kahan agrees and notes that this is why the work needs to be done by a contractor with expertise in trail design.

Willson recognizes Jaques. Jaques notes that between markers 19 and 21 the trail leaves the South Brook Conservation Area and that needs to be addressed. She adds that there has never been direct management by the Commission on the southern portion of the property: all of the trails are user-made. There therefore may be better ways to direct these trails. Kahan notes that the portion of the trail between 19 and 21 does go onto Russ Greco's property and considers whether it needs to be rerouted. He adds that water washes across the trail there and often makes it impassable. The bridge there is also in poor condition. Because the trails are also used by snowmobilers, they will have to make sure they are passable for those vehicles.

Fox adds that it would be good to remove the dumped shingles from the trailhead.

Jaques notes that even though it seems expensive, doing it all at once will save money in the long run because it will cost more later. She suggests adding that the Open Space Plan states that residents want trails they know they can walk on that are well marked and safe with parking nearby. Emphasizing that in the proposal is important. She recalls that when the first grant for the assessment was awarded, the CPC indicated that the Commission should come back and ask for money to do the actual improvement work. She does not know how the Committee would respond if the work is broken into two years.

Kahan notes that the application indicates how the project aligns with the priorities in the Community Preservation Plan.

The Chair recognizes Tracy McNaughton. McNaughton brings up a comment she seems to recall Donna MacNicol raising when this property was first established in which she said that snowmobiling should not be allowed on these trails because the type of grant used to acquire the property only permitted passive recreation. Kahan answers that motorized access by cars is not allowed but his recollection was that the Town Counsel indicated that snowmobiling could be allowed. McNaughton recalls MacNicol said that it was not allowed but McNaughton notes that in the rules it is allowed. DeFant states that it is up to the Commission because they do not have to allow or have to prohibit it. She asks if there is any discussion about doing something about ATVs that are tearing up the trails. Kahan answers that the issue of the ATVs is not covered in the grant application under discussion outside of ensuring there is signage up indicating that no motorized vehicles other than snowmobiles are allowed. He explains that the language is from Town Counsel and on signs currently, but that more signs are needed because there are access points where those signs are not currently posted.

Willson explains that the application is for work to improve the trails and that includes signage, but the question for the Commission right now is not what the signage will say. Once the funding is awarded, the Commission can determine what will be on signs at different places on the trail network, both way-finding signs and regulatory signs. DeFant asks if the application includes costs for physical barriers to limit vehicle access. Willson notes that there is nothing in the application for those. Kahan adds that the Commission could work with the Highway Department on that in the future, particularly if trails and access points are changed, but there are challenges because the Commission itself does not own the property. There is more work to be done, but this is the first step.

Willson suggests voting on all three applications. Rowan asks if the Commission should prioritize them. Fox emphasizes the need to improve the South Brook trails because they are currently in such poor condition and are not clearly routed. Kahan agrees and notes that the current routes are too confusing and there is a need to make it clearer and easier to access. There are lots of ways to enhance the trails.

Rowan suggests adding a line in the application indicating that these improvements would help link the South Brook Conservation Area to Kestrel's Bright Water Bog area. Kahan notes they do not actually touch because one would need to hike down Wendell Road. Rowan agrees but notes that the proximity is important and the link could be there. Fox agrees and thinks the Commission should try to do the full project in one year.

Douglas would like to make a motion to vote on the three applications. There is a general discussion about how best to prioritize the three applications.

Motion to submit the one-year South Brook project as priority followed by the Top of the Lake invasive mitigation project followed by the two-year South Brook project: Fox; second: Rowan. Approved unanimously.

The Chair recognizes McNaughton who asks if the Commission is aware that the Police Department plans to put a donated dock on the town property near the Top of the Lake Area on Merrill Drive. Jaques recalls that Becky Torres had asked the Commission about it in the past and was informed that they would have to go through the permitting process. Willson has not heard about it and will reach out to the current Town Administrator about it.

Bylaw Regulations

Willson shares the draft revisions of the Wetlands Bylaw Regulations and begins with Section 10, docks and piers. She moved some paragraphs in the preamble but did not add anything new to it. Rowan notes a typographic error in the last line of 10.1.3 and suggests that the use of the

phrase “close proximity” in 10.1.3 be defined because there are many narrow lots around the lake. Willson proposes changing the language to specify that it refers only to one parcel. Rowan notes that the effects might reach beyond property lines and that the requirement of fifteen feet might create problems in places. She proposes the phrase “close proximity where appropriate.” Willson points out that the Commission can not control or look at neighboring properties; its jurisdiction only extends to the parcel in the application and so they cannot legally evaluate the effect on a neighbor’s property. This means they can only consider something that is in “close proximity” on the parcel in the application. The Chair recognizes DeFant who notes that this is not a performance standard so it does not take away the Commission’s discretionary authority. She points out that the Bylaw includes the scope for looking at cumulative impact, including the effects of development outside of the application parcel, which is different from the Wetlands Protection Act. Willson agrees that because this is the preamble, it is not imposing a requirement.

Fox notes that there is more than one 10.1.3 in the draft document and Willson agrees that the numbering and formatting will have to be corrected when all the revisions are complete.

Rowan suggests adding “as appropriate” to the end of 10.1.6.

In the definitions section, Rowan notes the date of November 1 as when seasonal piers need to be removed from the water and notes that, while that has been traditional, that date might need to be changed based on changes to when the lake drawdown date occurs due to climate. Willson adds language to account for that possibility.

In the presumptions section, Willson notes some wording changes for clarifications. Rowan notes a typographic error on the third line of the section.

In the performance standards section, Willson reviews some additions and changes. Rowan questions whether they should keep 10.4.2 because Chapter 91, which is the subject of the item, is about navigation and boating safety, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission, which can only address wetlands protection. She does not think a seasonal float, buoy, or swimming platform would have much impact on wetlands. Willson notes that the Commission does have control over any work that would impact a bank or land under water, which would cover an anchor for such objects. Rowan points out that such anchors are usually very small, often only an empty detergent bottle filled with concrete. She suggests that the Commission have some sensitivity to what is actually an issue and what is trivial. Fox notes that this is also already addressed under rules regarding boating safety and that residents of the lake are already aware of these rules and practices. She agrees that this section should come out of the regulations because they are already regulated by other rules. Willson notes that the Commission is interested in protecting the resource area of the lake bottom and has no role in regulating boating safety. She notes that the resource area is impacted based on the weight of the anchor and by how many of

the anchors are dropped. Rowan notes that disturbances happen already, even by swimmers, and that they are really inconsequential to the area. Douglas states that anything that impacts something that is under the Commission's jurisdiction should be addressed in the regulations, no matter how small the impact might be because the Commission has an obligation to protect that resource. Willson notes that this is similar to how the Commission protects the AURA even with small structures and this does not seem to be less significant than what they require to protect other resources. Kahan agrees. Fox asks how this would work because this would mean that every person putting in a seasonal float or swimming platform, including the Lake Wyola Association, would have to submit a Small Project Application every single year. Willson points out that this would be for a new float that has never been put in before and it would have to indicate the location, the square footage, and weight. She does not think they would require it of objects that have already been in the lake. The Chair recognizes DeFant who brings up that the Bylaw does not allow a Small Project Permit to allow work within a resource area, only within the outer fifty feet of the AURA. This means that a buoy or float could not be covered by a Small Project Permit, though it could possibly be covered by an Administrative Approval. Fox asks if this would have to be done every single year, because that does not seem to make sense, particularly because "season float" is not defined. She notes that waterfront property owners are allowed by law to put out a marker at a certain distance indicating where boats are and are not allowed to travel. Willson agrees this is debatable and it comes down to the kind of impact the Commission would be willing to allow. The approval would have to be for permanent permission, just as an NOI for a seasonal dock is perpetual following certain conditions. She suggests covering the process under an RDA. Rowan disagrees because the lake bottom within the 150-foot zone from the shore is constantly being disturbed by human activity of all sorts. The buoys and platforms move in the wind, so they do not have the permanent impact that a dock has, and this imposes a cost and permit requirement on owners who have had these objects in use for many years. She can possibly see the value of doing an Administrative Approval process for the reason of keeping track of where these objects are, but other than that she does not see the purpose in imposing this requirement. Willson agrees with the Administrative Approval idea but she notes that docks are seasonal in the same way that these objects are. Rowan asks if Administrative Approval is for new installations, or perhaps anything since 1987, as with the docks. Willson observes that the Commission only requires a permit for a new dock or if there are other changes happening on the property and they have a dock without an existing permit. Fox points out that the large boats do more damage to the lake bottom than the anchors of these objects, so if the purpose of this is to protect the lake bottom it would seem to make more sense to regulate those. She thinks people will be upset about this because these anchors are not a problem. She asks if 10.4.2 is new and why it was added. Rowan notes the whole docks and piers section is new. The Chair recognizes DeFant who explains that this was included because in the past the Commission in the past received questions from the public about buoys and racing lanes that were put up on an ad hoc basis. There was uncertainty about who put those up and how long they would be put up and in the past the Commission used Administrative Approval to review

them. She notes that there can be a cumulative effect over time if anchor lines are cut, leaving objects in the resource area, or if a large float or platform is put out with a very large anchor that would have the same impact as a dock in terms of shading on vegetation. Fox notes that people drop anchors when they are boating or fishing and that also disrupts the bottom of the lake and she asks if the expectation here is that those people would have to apply as well. She explains that it is not clear how this would work in practice and it does not seem to her like there is a problem in need of regulating. Willson explains that land underwater does qualify as a resource area and the Commission does regulate other resource areas for such small impacts, such as in buffer zones, because those areas are defined as protected areas in the Bylaw and the Wetlands Protection Act. Rowan notes that in front of any house on the lake there is a beach and any amount of human traffic in or out of the lake through that area is going to cause a disturbance. Saying that these activities all impact the resource in an equal way that requires regulation is absurd. Willson responds that she is flexible with this but comes back to the fact that even small activities in an AURA require an RDA because that is how the Bylaw works. She does not see how this kind of impact on a resource area would be thought of as different from those where it is also required. Kahan understands the other argument but agrees with Willson that this regulation is specifically about a resource area that falls under the Commission's authority in the Bylaw and it is a resource area specifically not owned by private property-owners so the Commission has a particular responsibility to protect it. Douglas agrees with Kahan that the Commission has a duty to regulate impacts on the resource area and he notes that similar wetlands bylaws in surrounding towns also regulate underwater land.

The Chair recognizes Tom Siefert who notes he is on the Boating and Safety Committee and that Committee will be making some decisions about the issue of buoys and floats as well as boats that churn the lake bottom, degrade water quality, and erode the shore. He recalls an application that came before the Commission a few years ago in which a representative from the state gave a presentation about the impact of even small objects put into the lake for even just a few months. He adds that the boating and safety bylaws refer to designated swimming areas, moorings, and buoys, and enforcing that bylaw follows the definition of objects put into the water given in Chapter 91 of the state law or from other town bylaws or regulations, such as the Wetlands Bylaw Regulations. He thinks that including these items in the Commission's jurisdiction would make it clearer for boating and safety purposes as well.

Rowan responds that navigation and safety on the lake are not part of the values or jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission. Willson notes that Siefert seemed to be noting that by having these objects designated and identified by the Commission, they would then become specifically associated with an address or person. Siefert compares the safety bylaw and wetlands regulations to a zipper that could work together to regulate how the lake is used because there is no other way to designate a mooring, dock, or swimming area other than through Chapter 90b and Chapter 91, so he thinks they should work in tandem.

The Chair recognizes DeFant who notes that the Wetlands Protection Bylaw does specify recreation as a value for the Commission to protect and take into consideration. She notes the particular importance of ensuring that people do not abandon anchors in the lake at the end of the season. In the past the Commission has received complaints about lines of buoys left in the middle of the lake for many weeks by an unknown person, apparently for racing or water skiing. The concern is cumulative effects and not just one or two individual incidents, which is why having standard conditions might be the best way to go.

Willson asks if the language in the proposed regulation follows what is used in other towns, such as in Belchertown. DeFant notes that most coastal communities and towns with Great Ponds have something similar and that most of the language in the proposed language comes from Chapter 91, which defines a water-dependent use and water-dependent structure.

Fox asks what the administrative approval review process would be like. Willson answers that the Administrative Approval Request process is done without a form or fee, only through a letter, for requests that are not substantive enough to require a permit. Fox asks what a reason would be for disapproval because it is not clear what the requirements are for these objects, such as proximity to someone else's property. Willson gives an example of someone who wants to put in three ten-by-ten platforms, which would have a clear cumulative impact on the non-private property of the lake bottom. This would also give abutters the chance to have a voice in the process if they felt something was excessive. Fox notes there is no notice requirement for an Administrative Approval Request.

Willson suggests leaving this language for now and returning to it after some more consideration.

Rowan notes that in 10.4.7 the meaning of "maintenance" might cause some confusion because some maintenance on docks, piers, or walkways might be minor and inconsequential to the resource area, such as replacing bolts. She suggests this be specified as the application of paints, stains, or preservatives. Willson notes that the language does already include that specification. Rowan points out that in the proposed regulation that language only applies to wooden structures, but the general term of "maintenance" is applied without explanation to all structures. Willson proposes revising the language of the section to clarify what kind of maintenance would be allowed within a resource area and what would have to occur outside the area and clarifying that this applies to all water-dependent structures and not just wooden ones. Rowan adds that maintenance should not be allowed while the structure is in the lake or on the water. Willson revises the language to specify that the regulations apply to maintenance undertaken in the resource area other than the AURA.

Willson notes that she moved the Limited Projects Provisions language from the BVW section to the conclusion of the docks and piers section.

Willson moves the discussion to the sections on rivers and riverfronts. Rowan identifies a typographic error in 7.1.3. Fox suggests moving the definition of “hyporheic” from 7.2.1.8 to the definitions section in article two and defining it again when it is used in the regulation at 7.1.2. Willson agrees that the definition should be moved up.

In 7.2.1.2, Fox suggests defining “pool/riffle systems” in the definition section as well.

In section 7.2, Willson asks the Commission’s views on the regulations defining two types of streams. Rowan is fine with that but asks for clarification of the language regarding defining the AURA of the two types in 7.4.3 and 7.4.4 and why they are defined differently since both types are supposed to have a 100-foot AURA. Willson explains that the language regarding “inner” and “outer” measurement points refers to the intermittent stream and not to the AURA. Willson also finds the language confusing, especially because this differs from the Wetlands Protection Act. Rowan suggests that the language in the regulation be revised because it is currently not clear. Willson agrees that the language should be revised. She points out that as written now, a Type I intermittent stream would be treated as a perennial river because the inner 100-foot of river would be the more restrictive zone of riverfront. Rowan asks how the intermittent stream would be treated under the Wetlands Protection Act. Willson answers that they have a 100-foot buffer zone under the Act and the bank and land under water are also protected. She notes that riverfront is considered a resource area under state law but the buffer zone around an intermittent stream is not; the Shutesbury General Wetlands Protection Bylaw, however, treats that buffer zone as a resource area, which makes it more restrictive. Rowan notes that there have been summers with constant rain but also drought summers and summers in between, which might complicate trying to define an intermittent stream as being specifically Type I or Type II. Willson agrees that there are debates about how to define particular streams and notes that the definition of a stream as perennial only lasts for three years, which can also lead to problems. She notes that there is the question of who has the authority and information to identify whether a particular stream classifies as a Type I or a Type II and how they can go about doing that. Rowan notes also that hiring a wetlands professional might not answer the question of how to classify a particular stream because their rates and periods of flow change year to year based on weather. She suggests it might not make sense to have the distinction between the two types. Willson notes that this might be more work and confusion than the regulation is worth since it increases the stream types to consider. Douglas agrees that having the intermittent stream divided into two types seems like a new idea and there are other, more accurate ways to calculate the flow of a stream using data and, per the Wetlands Protection Act, the USGS map. He thinks it would be difficult to judge a stream on a year to year basis and that having only intermittent and perennial would make more sense. Kahan agrees with Douglas and notes the late hour.

Willson proposes moving discussion of the riverfront section to the next meeting and concluding with this discussion about streams. She offers to return the section to only identifying the two types of intermittent and perennial. Rowan agrees with that and asks about the inner/outer one-hundred foot provisions. Willson answers that the inner/outer distinctions would also be removed and the regulation would return to the original 100-foot AURA for all intermittent streams, which follows the practice used in other resource areas.

The Chair recognizes DeFant who notes that the two types of intermittent streams came from what is done in other communities in identifying intermittent and ephemeral streams, and some communities have four types.

Willson highlights the performance standards section and notes the removal of 7.4.3 and 7.4.4 to align with the removal of the two different types of intermittent streams. She points out the language explaining how to identify whether a stream is perennial or intermittent.

Kahan notes that the reference to rainfall data in 7.4.5.2.2 might need to change if the citation changes in the future. Willson proposes adding “or as amended” to the item.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Rowan; second: Kahan. Approved unanimously.

Adjourned: 9:43pm

List of Documents Used:

- Email exchange between Beth Willson (Chair, Shutesbury Conservation Commission) and Christine Hopps (Assistant Director, Waterways Regulation Program, MA DEP) regarding Chapter 91 license for 32 Lake Drive
- Certificate of Compliance for 32 Lake Drive with attached findings
- CPA grant application for invasive plant management at Top of the Lake Conservation Area
- CPA grant applications for South Brook Conservation Area trails work
- Draft revisions to the Wetlands Bylaw Regulations