

Shutesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
March 7, 2016 Shutesbury Town Hall

Planning Board members present: Deacon Bonnar/Chair, Steve Bressler, Jeff Lacy, Jim Aaron, Ralph Armstrong, and Linda Rotondi

Planning Board members absent: Jon Thompson

Staff present: Linda Avis Scott/Administrative Secretary

Guests: Jean Christie/Tighe & Bond, Attorney Donna MacNicol/Town Counsel, Attorney Michael Pill representing Lake Street Development, Penny Jaques/43 Old Orchard Road, Gail Fleischaker/62 West Pelham Road, Miriam DeFant and Rob Kibler/74 Pratt Corner Road, Leslie Bracebridge/530 Wendell Road; Kevin McCaffery and Mickey Marcus/New England Environmental; Zachary Shulman/Lake Street Development Partners, Gion DiDonna/86 Pratt Corner Road, LiMei Janik, Sarah Kohler/New Salem Planning Board Chair, Robert Skribski/Lot T39 West Pelham Road; Phyllis and Norman Cote/338 Leverett Road, Dian Gula/480 Pratt Corner Road, David and Judy Gage/Lot T8 Sand Hill Road, Andrea Cummings/69 Pratt Corner Road, Mike Vinskey/391 West Pelham Road, Brad Spry/297 West Pelham Road, Allen and Joan Hanson/37 Baker Road, Michael DeChiara and Lucy Gertz/56 Pratt Corner Road, Colleen and Steven Chudzik/422 Pratt Corner Road, Michael Suter/94 Pratt Corner Road, and Roger Tincknell/78 Pratt Corner Road.

Bonnar calls the meeting to order at 7:06pm.

Lacy moves to approve the 1.4.16 minutes as written; motion is seconded by Bressler and approved unanimously.

Lacy moves to approve the 2.11.16 minutes; Bressler seconds the motion and the minutes are approved with the correction that Linda Rotondi was not present.

7:15pm: Continue the Public Hearing for the Special Permit Wheelock Solar Project

Bonnar: New England Environmental (NEE) will present first, followed by Jean Christie/Tighe & Bond, then we will move to comments/questions by others. Marcus: current revisions allowed time for peer review; design layout meets the comments/feedback of the Planning Board, Conservation Commission (SCC), and abutters; the site location has been modified to be outside of the wetland buffer zone, the plan for the slope has been modified, access road location and other changes have been done to meet the spirit of Shutesbury zoning requirements; acknowledges that there are those who will still not like the project. Marcus, regarding trails: there are some landowner concerns about future use of the land; they allow certain use, however, will not allow a formalized trail to be built outside of the leased area; folks can walk up Reed Road and around the fenced area; therefore, NEE has not been able to satisfy the Planning Board request for a formal trail. On behalf of the applicant, Marcus requests the Planning Board close the public hearing tonight.

Lacy: is the fenced-in area and the area leased by Lake Street the same? Shulman: the fenced-in area and access road are leased; the shade area is an easement. Marcus: the new

access road can be used by the public; the fenced in area is not available to the public; assumes Cows will develop new logging roads off of the new access road; the new logging roads will require a Forest Cutting Plan. Lacy: the new logging road will allow forestry cutting; will the soils used on site be from basin excavations? Marcus: cites the Deerfield Lake Street project with a similarly sized layout – Wagner Forestry cut the trees, popped the stumps and filled in the holes with existing soils – no soils were brought in; there will be excess material on site that could be used if needed; this excess will come from the topsoil scraped off the new access road. Lacy asks if NEE read Rolf Cachat-Schilling's email, dated 3:14pm 3.7.16, with comments about the seed mix. Marcus acknowledges seeing this email; the seed mix was changed from the standard solar seed mix to be more of a wildflower seed mix; this wildflower mix was used on another site and will be used at Hampshire College; NEE's agronomist developed a protocol seed mix for a meadow that will ensure this mix will develop a meadow; the seed mix has been approved by Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (NHESP). Marcus: the goal for a solar seed mix is good ground cover; repeated seedings to ensure coverage will be required; there are specifications about the procedure in the plan. Lacy: Cachat-Schilling may have compared the seed mix to early succession rather than the creation of a meadow. Marcus confirms that the goal is to convert the habitat to open meadow rather than succession; early succession doesn't work with a solar site because growth height needs to be less than 3'; annual mowing is done to keep out the woody plants. Lacy: due to bird nesting, is spring the best time to mow? Marcus suggests a condition requiring that mowing be done in late fall which is the best time. Bressler: which comes first in the five acre phasing process? Marcus: first phase is the access road then site stabilizers; the site contractor and logger will work in tandem through the site; the specifications for phasing are left to the site contractors. Lacy: access road, erosion control, basins made ready, and then panel installation. Marcus: during the initial construction, basins are roughed out; the contractors area required to stabilize each section before moving on; once the entire site is cleared and stable, the solar contractors arrive – the piles are installed first, the racks are put in place, followed by the panels, then the electricians install the invertors. Lacy: under the stormwater regulations, the solar panels are treated as impervious surface. McCaffery: correct, based on DEP guidelines. Lacy: the ditching is sized to take that amount of runoff? McCaffery: the model is for a 100-year event. Lacy: it seems that the basins are overbuilt. McCaffery: the basins are designed according to DEP guidance. Lacy: once the site is complete, the basins may dry out and, if that occurs, the seed mix in that area may dry out. McCaffery: seed mixes have some overlap. Lacy: there may need to be a future condition to change the design of the basins. Marcus: the basins are designed for the first year after construction; once built, there is really no runoff – there is infiltration. Marcus to Lacy: you are right, for the long term, the basins are overbuilt; the applicant will have to maintain the basins. Lacy: there is about 500' to the first basin on the entrance driveway; the access road is shown with ditching on one or both sides, could it be built with a crown and no ditching? McCaffery states that he is working with the Shutesbury Highway Department (SHD) on the curb cut; the SHD prefers drainage swales. Lacy: long driveways in Shutesbury are generally not ditched. McCaffery: the ditches will be pervious, will treat any runoff, and will deliver little if anything to Pratt Corner Road. Bressler: view? Marcus: once installed, if there is a view

problem, screening will be installed. Bressler: plans for screening are not currently in the plan so would need to be conditioned. Marcus: based on the screening analysis, the site did not appear to be visible from the public way. Bressler: a special permit condition would be needed? McCaffery: we proposed it as a condition that the Planning Board will need to put in writing. Lacy: fence color? Marcus: vinyl-coated fence is not proposed here because the array is so far into the woods. Norman Cote states that he owns half of Reed Road and asks for confirmation that a different road is being used. Marcus: Reed Road will be left as is; a new driveway will be constructed. N. Cote: how will the cable run down the new road? Marcus: the line will run underground down the driveway. Cote: could a second electric line be run in order to help Shutesbury? Marcus: that is a fair question; there is three-phase power on Pratt Corner Road and the substation controls where the power goes; Lake Street has not determined who will get the power, however, it has to be a National Grid user. DeChiara: the State assigns competitive points; if you sell the power to a housing authority you get the competitive credits.

Christie/Tighe & Bond states that she prepared a comment letter for the 2.8.16 hearing that was postponed; NEE responded to the comments in that letter. Christie reviews her 3.7.16 comment letter (see file for both letters): the seed mix is adequate, recommends conditions for late fall mowing, the possibility to revisit the basins as well as for limited habitat development. Christie: keeping the roadside swales vegetated is the developer's responsibility. Lacy: was the 6.11.15 stormwater report updated? McCaffery: yes, 12.30.15. Christie: the 12.30.15 report was provided for general stormwater design; the project does not need to comply with Stormwater Standards. Lacy: the project met stormwater standards even though it is not required to? Christie: yes. Lacy asks if the special permit application needs to be updated. Attorney Donna MacNicol/Town Counsel: the final plan must include all the updates. Fleischaker: a narrative as well as drawings? MacNicol: yes. Lacy: the special permit application is not up to date. MacNicol: the conditions are not to the application; they are to the final narrative and plan. Lacy: the special permit is a narrative and refers to the plans. MacNicol: the condition is that the project "must be built according to plan dated..." and "must be built according to narrative dated..." DeFant: HydroCad calculations are dated from June; why aren't there new calculations? McCaffery, referring to the 12.30.15 revision: the intent is to keep the size of the basins approximately the same so that the original calculations remain relevant; the project does not need to meet Stormwater Standards. MacNicol: will you build to the 12.30.15 stormwater plan? McCaffery: we need to respond to the 2.26.16 plans and the NEE response letter issued at the same time. DeChiara: regarding the push to close the hearing; it would be irresponsible to close the hearing because there is a need to know what documents are being approved. DeFant states that she doesn't feel there is nothing that can be done to satisfy her and that she is feeling encouraged that we are getting closer. DeFant states she spoke with Cachat-Schilling who could not attend this meeting though could attend in the future; he does have a feeling about the type of plants that could be used and has concerns about soil improvements that may be used and could affect surrounding wetlands. DeFant: in November, there was an agreement for careful soil analysis; not all of the test pits were dug and high levels of water were found in one of the pits; asks the Planning Board to require this test pit be dug; appreciates improvements to plan. DeFant notes that water from drainage sub-basin 4B is being redirected to a wetland just north of it and, that at last the SCC meeting, Emily

Stockman/Stockman Associates testified that this wetland was not fully delineated as it was outside the scope of SCC jurisdiction; the Planning Board has wider jurisdiction. DeFant points to the B series wetland on map: water is being diverted up gradient from this wetland which could have an impact on the wells of abutting properties; we know the hydrology is being altered and even if the SCC does not have authority, the Planning Board does. DeFant states that she wants this question resolved; the test pits were not fully examined and we need to have this information in order to know how the test pits will function. McCaffery: these test pits were to be evaluated prior to construction. Christie: sometimes, you cannot access a test pit without cutting trees. McCaffery: would need to look at the memo regarding the depths of basins. Lacy, referring to the map, do we need all this area (at top of map) to be collected or could it be left to sheet? McCaffery: we could let it sheet to feed the wetland; would recommend something during construction. Lacy: unsuccessful basin test? McCaffery: we couldn't get a 4-ton excavator in to dig this test pit; this would be one of the first things done during construction; all the perimeter control is installed before interior work is done. Lacy: the test pit could be an early condition; understood peer reviewer was okay with this plan. Christie: yes, agrees with this plan. Marcus: this basin was moved 30' up gradient and pushed back further from the wetland. Lacy: could the drainage be modified? Christie: looking at existing and proposed conditions, points to an area in the northeast corner and states that she does not think this triangle has a negative impact; water will infiltrate and go to sub-basin 5; she is less concerned about this small triangle. Lacy: are we changing the basin alignments in gross or are we making minor changes? Christie: big picture, we are making some water infiltrate and recharging ground water; does not see any negative impacts to wetlands; ultimately water is flowing. Jaques states that, as an individual, she is providing "Comments on 'Planning Board Special Permit Application: Solar Array, Shutesbury, MA'" written by herself and Fleischaker that contains a list of seven points they are asking the Planning Board to consider, most importantly to note, is that the plan is diffuse. Jaques states she would want a narrative that matches the existing plan and notes that the current plan is infinitely better than the first plan. Marcus: ultimately, we expect the Planning Board will approve a plan with a narrative; in the plan, there is a narrative every step of the way including notes about the construction sequence and seed mix. MacNicol asks if there is a narrative that specifically matches this final set of plans; we need dates to match the promises in the plans. Marcus: the 12.30.15 storm water plan, the 2.26.16 plan set and the cover letters accompanying the plan revisions. MacNicol: there needs to be a final plan set and narrative. Marcus: all the modifications are encompassed in the 2.26.16 plan set. McCaffery: usually, the issued special permit refers to the plan set. MacNicol: Marcus says these plans refer to a narrative. Marcus: a narrative has accompanied every plan revision so, ultimately, the final document is the plan that includes notes, written material, and changes; the secretary has accumulated all of these materials. At 8:33pm, Armstrong moves the Planning Board recess this public hearing; Lacy seconds the motion that is unanimously approved.

At 8:34pm, Bonnar opens the public hearing for two Citizen Petition Zoning Bylaws. Bressler moves the Planning Board recess this public hearing and resume the public hearing for the Special Permit Wheelock Solar Project; motion is seconded by Armstrong and is unanimously approved.

Marcus: the secretary has been receiving comments, etc., so there is a chronology; once closed, the Planning Board has 90 days to issue a decision. Rotondi asks NEE to state what documents are to be used as the final plan set, i.e. "this is what we are accounting as the final documents". Marcus: the (2.26.16) plan set in front of Planning Board is the culmination of all the comments. Marcus indicates how plan sheets include information/narrative and a detailed construction sequence. MacNicol: if all of the most current narrative is in the plans, does it include stormwater? Marcus: the stormwater report is a separate document. MacNicol: the final documents that the Planning Board must condition are the 2.26.16 plan set and narratives therein, the 12.30.15 stormwater report, and 2.26.16 NEE letter. Lacy: what about the original application? MacNicol: the original application has been amended by the final documents. Bonnar: superseded? MacNicol: yes. DeFant: there are a lot of inconsistencies in the stormwater plan and the final plans; there may be ambiguities i.e. the different mowing schedules and the HydroCad; she is concerned about use of the current plans and the stormwater report. Lacy: there is one revision to the stormwater report. Christie: the zoning bylaw does not require a stormwater report; the project has been designed with the goal of stormwater compliance. MacNicol: make it compliant with the 12.30.15 revision of the stormwater report. Lacy: the stormwater is overbuilt; would the plan change with a new HydroCad? MacNicol: as long as we have a reference - 2.26.16 plan set with narratives included, 12.30.15 stormwater report as modified by plans of 2.26.16, letter of 2.26.16 and Planning Board conditions.

Sarah Koehler/New Salem Planning Board Chair reads her testimony into the record. Koehler notes the EOEA/DOER model and statement discouraging the loss of forest land for solar; cites a New York Times article about the results of significant forest loss concluding that forest land can take as many as 150 years to regain its carbon sequestration. Koehler asks if the Planning Board has contacted relevant native tribes as this site may be of significance; because the project is using Federal dollars, she recommends this contact.

DeChiara reads "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Regarding Wheelock Tract Proposal" dated 3.7.16 into the record.

MacNicol: it is standard practice for the applicant to submit findings and conditions; the case law is clear that the Planning Board must go through these findings and conditions one by one. Lacy to MacNicol: if we close and go into the 90 day deliberation period, it is the sense of the Board to approve with conditions in an open meeting and meetings are posted for that purpose, may interested parties speak? MacNicol: once closed, no further facts may be entered into the record; there can be comments regarding the conditions, i.e. mowing in September vs. October - no new evidence, only comments on conditions; you will not necessarily need public comment on the findings because that is a Planning Board document. Lacy: it would be preferable to continue the dialog with both sides as we craft the permit. MacNicol: there may be tweaks that make the conditions better; there cannot be any more evidence and the Board has to be vigilant about this. Lacy: could the Planning Board leave the public hearing open and move into talking about the conditions then, once done, close the public hearing and create the permit. MacNicol: you cannot vote on the permit until you have the conditions. Bonnar: leaving the hearing open could

present an attendance problem. Fleischaker: at what point, does the Planning Board make a decision on the permit? MacNicol: the decision is made in a public meeting. Lacy: usually one board member drafts the permit which is then discussed at the next meeting; once the decision is made, the Board has ten days to file the decision with the Town Clerk. MacNicol: evidence is new information that is argumentative in nature, i.e. a condition with testimony is new evidence. DeChiara: if closed today, there are 90 days to decision; there are pieces of information you don't know and the SCC is no longer involved; at the last meeting, Lacy said that the Planning Board would take wetland concerns into consideration; now it is only on your shoulders therefore it is premature to close the public hearing. Lacy asks Fleischaker and Jaques about the wetland at top of plan. They consider triangle area with Christie; agree water will infiltrate. Marcus: SCC will be included in the construction documents and weekly SWPPP reports; this could be included as a condition. MacNicol: the SCC can comment as a board; they don't have jurisdiction, however, they can review and submit suggested conditions. Fleischaker: the SCC has not had a chance to meet and develop suggested conditions. MacNicol: anybody can put forth conditions; there can be no new evidence once the hearing is closed.

DeChiara: once the conditions are set, does the applicant accept them? MacNicol: the Board sets the conditions; if the applicant does not like the conditions, they appeal on the basis that the conditions are unreasonable via a court proceeding.

Suter states his concern about the project's impact on property values and water; he will be testing his well water before and after construction.

Gula: does National Grid have room for additional power? Schulman: yes, will provide letter stating this. Gula: concerned about logging trucks damaging roads. Lacy: will access for site work logging be by Reed or the new driveway? Marcus: project construction access will be by the new road. Gula: will Rhoda Pratt Road be used; it may be an abandoned road? Pill: if your land bounds an abandoned road, consult your attorney for guidance.

Bressler: we have a choice to collaboratively condition before or after closing the public hearing; if we keep it open, attendance is an issue. Armstrong: if we close, we have a timeline; if we close, we will have less to manage, as there can be no new testimony. Lacy agrees with Armstrong; if the hearing is kept open, the flow of evidence will not stop as we are trying to write conditions; if it is the will of the Board, we will start writing conditions at the next meeting. Rotondi: do we all need to be present during deliberation? MacNicol: all Board members do not need to be present for the drafting; all need to be present for the deliberation and vote on the permit. Lacy: if we close, we are not saying we will approve the permit. DeChiara: if 90 days pass and the Board has yet to vote? MacNicol: the permit is constructively granted. Pill: Lake Street is not going to claim a constructive approval of the permit; they would, in good faith, agree to a reasonable extension.

Bressler: 90 days is not that long; how many meetings will be needed to accomplish the conditions? Fleischaker suggests giving a deadline for condition input by others.

MacNicol: the lion's share of the work goes to the person assigned to draft the permit conditions. DeChiara: if the hearing stays open, could the Board review certain conditions, i.e. 1, 2, and 3, during a meeting? MacNicol: if you take evidence on every condition, it could take many meetings to review. DeFant: she would want to know if it is possible to have stronger financial sureties, i.e. decommissioning and insurance; there has

been no discussion about this. Bressler states that he will look very closely at the suggested conditions in the most recent citizen petition solar zoning bylaw; the Board will come up with an initial draft of conditions; public input could be given as long as there is no new evidence. Pill: Cows will have adequate legal arrangements relative to the lease of their property. DeChiara: Lake Street will not be around in the long term. Lacy: we have access to land-use attorney guidance and conditions that have been used on solar project permits across the state.

Lacy moves the Planning Board close the public hearing on the Wheelock Solar Project special permit application; Armstrong seconds the motion. Bressler asks to be clear on the process going forward if the Board closes the public hearing. Lacy: once closed, we have 90 days to make a decision and take final action which is to file the decision with the Town Clerk; we can start deliberation tonight; we should not make any decision to grant the permit at this point; once the decision is made, there are ten days to take final action. Bressler: for clarity going forward, the Board will have a first draft, then, at the next meeting, begin to go through the conditions and receive input. Armstrong: specifically, input on the conditions. MacNicol: you can take comment, you cannot take evidence, such as, the seed mix is not correct, because it is argument; we are talking about whether a condition is good; one could say "wildflower" seed mix – no argument. DeChiara: the before and after is very different. Cummings: presence of peepers would be evidence. MacNicol: we are talking about proposing, tweaking, or saying one doesn't like a particular condition or requesting to add a condition. Lacy: we can accept proposed conditions. MacNicol appreciates Fleischaker's suggestion to set a due date for submitted conditions; lists of conditions from Christie, DeChiara, Jaques and Fleischaker, NEE and her own are already available. Lacy: draft may take ~ 2 weeks – have this be the date for others to submit their conditions. Lacy suggests receipt of conditions by the 3.14.16 meeting. DeFant: her preference is have a two-week window for them to meet and compile a document. MacNicol: we would like any suggested conditions by 3.21.16 then set a subsequent meeting; all suggested conditions are to be sent via email to the Administrative Secretary who will forward them to the Planning Board and file; no discussion of conditions. Bressler: in a public meeting, we will go down the list of conditions for tweaks only. Pill states that he will observe these proceedings; the Board is the decision maker. MacNicol: there is not going to be any dialog; there is no discussion. DeFant states that she accepts the process and will abide by it. DeChiara: we have gone from some comments/input, to tweaks, and then to Attorney Pill observing. Bressler: in one-way communication, intent will be missed; we will need help to ensure we don't cross the line (receiving evidence). Lacy confirms the plan for conditions to be submitted to the Administrative Secretary. Motion to close the public hearing passes unanimously. Armstrong motions the Planning Board select Lacy to compile the first draft, Bressler seconds, and all agree.

Bonnar resumes the public hearing for Two Citizen Petition Solar Bylaws at 10:00pm. Brad Spry presents a petition signed by residents attached to the 3.2.16 letter from Evan Jones to the Planning Board; by signing, the residents indicate their support for the solar project and their opposition to the citizen petition solar bylaw; the petition is received into the record.

DeFant: these two warrant petitions are slightly different; the initial petition (#2) has a typographical error and could not be rescinded so a correct version (#3) was submitted. DeFant apologizes for the confusion created by this error; the submitting petitioners will not be supporting the first one. MacNicol: an explanation regarding this will be made at town meeting. DeFant provides some of the documents submitted for the first petition (#1) public hearing into the record (dated 9.9.15). DeFant reads 3.7.16 "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Regarding Solar Bylaw Warrant Article Petition," submitted by herself and others, into the record. Armstrong asks for an explanation about reference to "dark sky". DeFant: it refers to a specific requirement for night sky. Kibler: sites the importance of dark sky requirements in a rural setting.

DeChiara submits "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Regarding Solar Bylaws for Shutesbury" dated 3.7.16 into the record and summarizes his points: Leverett has a one acre dimensional requirement; we wrote the new petition based on feedback; notes Marcus's observation that bylaws are helpful to developers; the current project before the board would not comply with the proposed bylaw. Allen Hanson: would acceptance of this bylaw affect the current project? Lacy: we are in a limbo right now; if this solar bylaw passes, the current project would be subject to it. MacNicol: under Chapter 40A Section 6, you are grandfathered if the permit is issued before the notice of public hearing for the solar bylaw; you could also be grandfathered if a subdivision is filed. Lacy: thus far, we have not seen a preliminary subdivision plan; unless amended, the fate of the current project is in the hands of town meeting. DeFant makes three points: 1. We did not create the bylaw to stop this project. 2. We anticipate that the applicant will file an Approval Not Required (ANR). 3. We need dimensional requirements; we need this bylaw to be decided on its own merits. Bressler: could the bylaw be prospective? Lacy: it could reach forward. Bressler: asks if DeFant would consider an amendment. DeFant: the warrant article bylaw cannot be amended; amendment could be done at town meeting; she would consider a prospective bylaw as a vision for the future. Armstrong states his agreement. DeChiara: the Planning Board either supports the bylaw or not; this is a stellar piece of work on behalf of the town; this is a highly workable bylaw. Bressler: agrees that it is a well written bylaw; would not want it defeated at town meeting because folks feel it will kill the Wheelock project. MacNicol: the Board could recommend the bylaw only if it is amended to exclude the current project, i.e. "any project commenced prior to the passage of this bylaw is not subject to it." DeFant: we need a bylaw with dimensional limits; in the future, 10 acres could be substantial project. Kibler: this bylaw is not aimed at the Wheelock tract project, is was guided by the project and the process it required; would support making the bylaw "from this point forward." DeFant: pieces of the bylaw will streamline the application process. Armstrong: speaking for himself, appreciates Kibler's sense of intent; would like to disengage the bylaw from the Wheelock project; the bylaw will make the application process clear. Allen Hanson states his agreement with the "going forward" recommendation. Armstrong: that way, both projects are allowed to go forward. MacNicol: even without a Planning Board recommendation, the bylaw goes to town meeting. DeFant: we would welcome support from the Planning Board; states her concern that the bylaw may not pass due to clouding of the issue with feelings about the Wheelock project. DeFant: the Wheelock project is much better; we are not as worried as we were six months ago. DeChiara highlights the spreadsheets he submitted into the record as a resource of town bylaws and a reference for conditions.

Vinskey: what will the Planning Board consider relative to the petition? MacNicol: the Planning Board doesn't approve the bylaw, they write a report, perhaps with a recommendation for town meeting. DeFant: we have a better chance of approval with Planning Board support. At 10:40pm, Lacy moves the Planning Board close the public hearing and adjourn the meeting, Armstrong seconds the motion that passes unanimously.

List of Documents and Other Items Used at the Meeting:

1. NEE 2.26.16 Plan Set
2. NEE 2.26.16 "Response to February 8, 2016 Peer Review Comments" with attached "Proposed Planning Board Conditions" and "Proposed Planning Board Findings"
3. 2.8.16 Tighe & Bond "Peer Review Services – Fourth Review" by Jean Christie
4. 3.7.16 Tighe & Bond "Peer Review Services – Fifth Review" by Jean Christie
5. 3.7.16 emails from Rolf-Cachat Schilling: "Wheelock Tract Planting Plans"
6. "Solar Farms are Industrial Land Development" by Sarah Kohler
7. 3.7.16 "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board regarding Wheelock Tract Proposal" by Michael DeChiara
8. "Comments on 'Planning Board Special Permit Application: Solar Array, Shutesbury, MA'" by Penny Jaques and Gail Fleischaker
9. 3.2.16 Letter from Evan Jones re: "March 7, 2016, Hearing on Lake Street Project and Zoning Bylaw Changes for Solar Installations"
10. 3.2.16 Evan Jones letter with attached petition and 39 citizen signatures
11. "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Regarding Solar Zoning Bylaw Warrant Article Petition" submitted by Miriam DeFant and 10 others
12. 9.9.15 "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Warrant Article Petition Proposed Solar Zoning Bylaw" by Miriam DeFant with attached documents
13. "Testimony to Shutesbury Planning Board Regarding Solar Bylaws for Shutesbury" dated 3.7.16 and submitted by Michael DeChiara
14. Solar Bylaw spreadsheet by Michael DeChiara

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda Avis Scott  
Administrative Secretary