

Carlisle Conservation Commission
April 11, 2019
Minutes

Pursuant to the notice filed with the Town Clerk, Chair Angie Verge called the meeting to order in the Clark Room at the Town Hall at 7:06 p.m. Also present were Commissioners Alex Parra, Ken Belitz, Lee Tatistcheff, Dan Wells and Helen Young, and Conservation Administrator Sylvia Willard. Vice Chair Melinda Lindquist was not present.

Certificate of Compliance:

(DEP 125-468) 92 Kimball Road; Owner: Michael Davin; Project: Construction of a portion of a house and grading to occur within the 100-foot Buffer Zone of a BVW; Issued: 4/29/1997.

Willard reported the final requirements for establishing bounds to the adjacent Conservation Restriction and the removal of chain link fencing within the 100-foot Buffer Zone have been satisfactorily completed and recommended issuance. Tatistcheff noted for the record that Willard's Annotated Agenda incorrectly states the fencing had not been removed in error. *Tatistcheff moved to issue a COC for DEP 125-468, Belitz seconded the motion and all voted in favor.*

Enforcement Order: (DEP 125-469) 92 Kimball Road; Michael Davin (previous owner): Removal of unpermitted fencing installed within the 100-foot Buffer Zone of a BVW

The previously authorized Enforcement Order allowing the removal of the fencing was circulated for signatures.

Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw (CWPB) Revision –Peer Review: The Commission discussed and approved the recommendation of Town Counsel to establish the following policies with regard to peer review procedures: (1) upon recognizing the need for a peer review for confirmation of a wetlands delineation or other wetland resource or jurisdictional area, the Commission shall vote for that peer review to occur; (2) if the Commission determines that a peer review of a project is necessary, the Commission should make a finding that the Commission is authorized to collect reimbursement from the applicant because the project meets the qualifications in Section 2.7 of the CWPB and shall vote to authorize the Conservation Administrator to send a written request for payment per Section 2.9 of the CWPB; (3) that should there be more than one peer review quote, the Commission shall vote to select the peer reviewer; (4) that, on the advice of Town Counsel, the CWPB should be updated as well.

It was noted that the establishment of these procedures were recommended until such time in the future that the CWPB can be amended to include these provisions and receives approval by Town Meeting.

VOTE: Tatistcheff moved to adopt this regulation as drafted, Wells seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Project Updates:

162 Nowell Farme Road: ATF NOI submission pending since May, 2018 (deadline 5/13/2019): There has been no response to the recent email to the wetlands consultant requesting an update on the status of the NOI filing

81 Russell Street/Garrison Place:

-Willard reported the seeding that was done after the compensatory storage was excavated outside of the timing parameters included within the Order of Conditions is beginning to germinate.

-The Commission will request that the applicant and the engineer attend the next meeting to discuss the plans for the restoration of a filled BVW/LSF that has not yet been initiated and to review all other remaining outstanding work.

-The Commission will be scheduling a site visit with the engineer and the wetland scientist in order to familiarize new members with the site

Carlisle Fire Station - Communications Tower: The cement pad poured to support the tower was found to be substandard and will need to be removed and replaced. Willard will confirm erosion control measures remain satisfactorily established.

7:15 (DEP 125-1064) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing

Applicant: Robert Silva/Septic Preservation Services

Project Location: 95 Hanover Road

Project Description: Installation of a septic system for an existing single-family house with work within the 100-foot Buffer Zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland

Verge opened the Continued Hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Property owner Chantal Nouvellon was present to request clarification relative to the Commission's peer review selection procedures following the determination that a peer review of this filing would be required due to significant discrepancies between the current wetland delineation and the previously peer-reviewed wetland delineation for this property. She said she has received two proposals obtained by the Commission – one from Dr. John Rockwood of EcoTec, Inc. for an amount not-to-exceed \$2,180 and one from Jillian Davies of BSC for an amount not-to-exceed \$3,585. She said it was her understanding that the Commission has worked with these consultants previously and asked if that was a requirement in their selection process.

Parra asked the applicant if she had someone else she wanted to suggest for the Commission's consideration. Verge said that if this is the case the Commission would be happy to evaluate other proposals. Willard noted the consultants that were contacted for proposals are the only two with whom the Commission has worked within the last 20 years. She also noted that Dr. Rockwood did the peer review for the Wilkins Hill development and was familiar with the subject property and with the original ANRAD for this project and Jillian Davies was involved in the peer review process for 81 Russell Street. Wells noted Dr. Rockwood has done numerous projects for this Commission and there is no question of his qualifications. Alternately if the property owner wishes, Wells offered to provide a list of 4 or 5 other peer review consultants who have been practicing locally for at least the last 5 years and who have Professional Wetland Scientist certification. He noted the fact that the Commission is requesting another opinion on the wetland delineation, but they do not necessarily have to agree with the peer reviewer's opinion, so the determination is ultimately made by vote.

Nouvellon said she did not believe her proposal fell within the parameters of the requirements for conditions under which the Commission can require a peer review since the work is 175 square feet from the wetland. Wells noted the distance from the proposed work to the wetland is calculated in linear, not square, feet. The Commission clarified the fact that the reason a peer review is being required is due to the significant discrepancies in the current and previous wetland delineations for this property. Nouvellon said she has decided to revert back to the original plan that does not include Buffer Zone work outside of the septic system installation.

Verge stated the Commission would need to continue the hearing until the applicant could determine the discrepancy in the wetland delineations and requested a motion to continue the hearing. *Tatistcheff moved to continue the hearing to April 25, 2019 at 7:45 p.m. with the applicant's approval. Wells seconded the motion and all voted in favor.* Parra requested the applicant submit a revised plan following her statement that she was planning on reverting to the previously submitted plan. Nouvellon requested the Commission put their requirements in writing.

7:32 (DEP 125-) Notice of Intent

Applicant: John Nelson for the John Power Trust

Project Location: Skelton Road

Project Description: Installation of an 8-foot high cedar fence within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and within the 200-foot Riverfront Resource Area

Verge opened the hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Dan Gannon of Stamski and McNary presented the plan and provided a reviewed of the proposed project location and existing resource areas, including a perennial stream with an associated Bordering Vegetated Wetland, Buffer Zone, Riverfront Area and Bordering Land Subject to Flooding. He then provided an overview of the proposed fencing location, noting the plan is to construct the fencing in 20-foot segments, offsetting two feet off the road to allow for snow plowing, and then offsetting and additional two feet back at 20-foot intervals to provide two-foot gaps to allow for wildlife passage.

When asked if the purpose of the proposed fencing is to provide privacy, Gannon stated the property owner is seeking privacy along his driveway, which runs along a public trail easement.

Verge noted the Commission had expressed several concerns with the proposed fencing when this project had been included in a previous filing for paving the common driveway and then subsequently withdrawn from the project. She said those concerns included the perceived “unwelcoming” location of a proposed gate relative to the public trail easement and the potential for the gate to be blocked by snow during winter months, preventing the Sudbury Valley Trustees access to the areas requiring ongoing habitat or other maintenance. Gannon said the homeowner has indicated he plans on having snow pushed off to the side if needed along the roadway, noting he does not plan on accessing this property during winter months. When asked to provide the overall length of the fencing including non-resource areas, Gannon stated the plan includes 176 feet of fencing within the Riverfront Area. He was unable to provide the total length of fencing to be constructed on the property.

Wells requested an enlargement of the area within the proposed fencing at a 1” =20’ scale since the current plan included extensive detail from previously permitted projects, making a review of the current project area difficult. He also requested they include the Inner Riparian Zone on the revised plan. He noted Section 10.58.(4)(d) within the WPA Regulations allows for a certain amount of Riverfront Area alteration provided the plan meets certain criteria, including it provides a 100-foot wide area of vegetation, with no proposed work within 100 feet of the Mean Annual High Water line. He said it appears the fencing is extending up to the line and he would therefore consider the first 100 feet not meeting the Performance Standards. Gannon said it was their opinion this is a previously disturbed area due to grading and the roadway construction. Wells suggested the applicant should consider pulling the fencing back to at least 100 feet from the MAHW regardless.

With regard to the omission of a Wildlife Habitat Evaluation within the proposal, Wells noted that the Regulations state that if work within an undeveloped Riverfront Area exceeds 5k s.f., the issuing authority may require this be included in the submission. He also noted that although the cumulative impact of Riverfront Area alteration is still below 10 percent, including the recent submittal which includes 2661 s.f., he suggested it should be acknowledged within the narrative they are now adding 500 s.f and it should be clear there is existing Riverfront Area disturbance. He recommended a site visit would be helpful in determining whether the Commission agrees the area is previously disturbed and therefore meets Performance Standards and does not require a Wildlife Habitat Evaluation.

Verge asked Gannon if the applicant has considered vegetative screening vs solid panels. Gannon referenced the Alternatives Analysis which excludes vegetative screening as a viable alternative due to the substantial financial investment and the financial burden of maintaining the vegetation. Abutter Elizabeth Elliott Platais, who was present for the hearing, said the area on the lower side of the proposed fencing had in the past become heavily established with Buckthorn and Oriental Bittersweet and it will likely come back along the fencing without maintenance. Gannon said he would speak to the applicant to determine if he is willing to remove invasive plants as mitigation for the proposed work. Tatistcheff questioned the assertion that the planting of native plants species as an alternative to the fencing would create a financial burden. Verge suggested they conduct a cost comparison of planting hemlock and cedar in lieu of certain panels vs fencing only, noting alternating fencing would provide for wildlife passage for larger mammals.

Parra asked Gannon what has been submitted to NHESP. Gannon said they have submitted the Notice of Intent as well as the Streamlined Consultation Form in accordance with MESA requirements due to work proposed within Priority and Estimated Habitat for the Northern Long-eared Bat. The submittal is currently under review for a potential future site visit and Gannon agreed to inform Willard when a determination has been made.

Sarah Elliot Holmes Tucker was present to provide testimony on behalf of her aunt, Ruth Elliott Holmes, owner of a lot on Skelton Road. Her written statement was submitted to the Conservation Commission for the record.

Tucker-Holmes said she was present to request that the Conservation Commission consider a different approach that ensures the privacy for the new owner but will also be in respect of the landscape, the wildlife, and in keeping with the

vision shared by the Carlisle community with alternatives including natural screening or post-and-rail fencing supplemented with natural screening. Holmes noted the fact that a finding within the Planning Board’s Decision in

approving the development plan in 2011 that states... “the plan seeks to preserve to the greatest extent practicable the natural landscape and grading so the existing vista will not be unreasonable adversely impacted”. In addition, Tucker-Holmes said the family believes the fencing is inconsistent with the vision of the dozens of members of the Carlisle community who came together to create The Elliott Preserve. In conclusion, Ms. Tucker Holmes said the family does not feel the NOI adequately addresses the alternatives and provides no basis for its conclusion that there is no practicable or substantially equivalent alternative to the fencing. She requested the applicant be required to provide a more detailed analysis of the alternatives and in doing so to also consider the strong wishes of the many members of the Carlisle community who came together to preserve the open views and natural landscape.

Sudbury Valley Trustees’ (SVT) Director of Stewardship Laura Mattei said SVT was involved in all the transactions to protect this land and are they extremely dismayed by what is there now. She said they would encourage that alternatives be explored in terms of using vegetative screening to intermix with [the fencing], especially in the areas that are closer to the trail to try to maintain some of the scenic aspects and also to provide for wildlife movement across the landscape. She noted there are some legal issues SVT will pursue in terms of access to their property.

Steve Tobin, who was present for the hearing, said he is the current Chair of the Trails Committee and was also involved in the permanent protection of the land. He explained that when they were working to protect the land they needed a way to cross the stream and, since the bridge had not been constructed at that time, they constructed a small, temporary bridge off to the side which is where the trail is presently located. He requested the current location of the trail be included on the revised plan and asked that the applicant consider granting the town an easement where the existing trail is located in order to provide the legal right to use it in its current location. He noted there is currently a chain across the trail easement before the bridge and asked if the long-term plan was to block public access. Gannon said he would discuss these issues with the applicant.

Carlisle Conservation Foundation Chair and former ConsCom Chair Kelly Guarino said her comments echo what was already said but she would also encourage a good look at the Alternatives Analysis in terms of determining if this is the least disruptive option and in providing more supporting documentation. Regarding the trail location, she said it would be very useful for existing conditions to be reflected on the plan and enlarged so it is clear where the easement and trail are located relative to the proposed fencing. She noted the Common Driveway Special Permit incorporated a Declaration of Common Driveway Easements, Restrictions and Covenants and Easement dated 4/25/2011, which together set forth the provisions for the management and maintenance of the common driveway, the fire protection system, trail easements and the bioretention systems. She suggested this document should be part of the documentation so it can be determined whether or not the fencing is within the terms of the easement within jurisdictional areas.

Elizabeth Platais stated for the record she felt it was important to understand that they as abutters need access for mowing to maintain the open pastures and a chain or gate at the entrance is a problem.

With no further comments, *Verge requested a motion to continue the hearing to April 25, 2019 at 8:00 p.m. pending a site visit and the issuance of a DEP file number. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff, seconded by Young and all voted in favor.*

Carlisle Trails Committee:

Permitting Procedures/Requirements: Steve Tobin was present to review permitting procedures relative to the repair of existing, previously permitted boardwalks since many were installed over 20 years ago and in need of maintenance. Tobin explained the necessary repair work would involve replacing the wood boards only, leaving the existing concrete bumpers in place. The Commission determined this repair work would be considered an Exempt Activity under the Regulations.

Tobin next asked what the requirements are to allow construction of a 40-foot extension to the Rodgers Connector Trail boardwalk that was installed last fall following the issuance of a Negative Determination. He explained they had originally requested and received approval to install a 120-foot long boardwalk but the final length measures 110 feet.

They are now finding the area beyond the boardwalk gets extremely muddy during wet periods and an additional 40 feet in length would get trail users to high and dry land. The Commission determined there would be no further requirements since the extension would provide better protection to the resource area.

Also relative to boardwalks, Tobin said the Trails Committee would like permission to test out several approaches to address the problem of shaded boardwalks becoming slippery, creating hazardous conditions for trail users. Potential proposed methods include polyurethane roughened with sand, chicken wire and/or metal lathe material. He said they would apply the proposed treatment to half the width of some boardwalks as a control measure. *Tatistcheff moved to authorize the Trails Committee to perform a test trial as discussed for up to a three-year period to determine the best solution for improved traction, with the requirement that a report be submitted to the Commission at the conclusion of the trial period. Wells seconded the motion and all voted in favor.*

Community Preservation Act Funding: *Tatistcheff moved to support the Trails Committee's request in CPA funding \$15k for the restoration and construction of trails throughout the town of Carlisle for a five-year period, Young seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.*

Carlisle Community Trails Day Challenge: Tobin announced the Carlisle Conservation Foundation and the Carlisle Trails Committee are co-sponsoring Carlisle Community Trails Day Challenge on Saturday, May, 2019 in an effort to encourage Carlisleans to experience the town's wonderful natural environment, with the goal that the community can walk all trails within one day. Tobin said any members willing to lead a public walk during the event will be very much appreciated.

Solar Working Group: Jonathan Dekock was present on behalf of the Solar Working Group to request the Commission's support for two Town Meeting Warrant Articles: (1) Amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws/Revisions to Solar District; (2) Authorize Solar Facility leases(s), PILOT Agreements, easements for Transfer Station and CPS parking lot. Dekock reviewed the provisions of the proposals and explained Town Meeting approval of these Warrant Articles would allow the town to produce enough energy to power all municipal buildings and gain a "Net Zero Community" designation. Following Mr. Dekock's summary of the proposals, *Verge requested a motion to support the Solar Working Group's Warrant Articles at Town Meeting. The motion was moved by Belitz, seconded by Young and all voted in favor.*

Annual Farmers' Meeting:

Dick. Shohet – Mill Iron Farm:

Fox Hill East -Shohet reported on the previous season when he grew mixed grass for hay; soil amendments included 300#/acre poultry manure; total yield was 350 bales/7 tons); In-kind services included clipping the field after the single haying throughout the remainder of the season; cut back borders by 50 feet on three sides

Fox Hill West- Shohet reported he will be taking over the west field to grow mixed grasses for hay this season following the previous farmer's decision to relinquish the agricultural license agreement for this parcel due to the lack of a water source. Shohet said he planned to begin haying this summer if he could get some help widening the passageway leading from the east to the west field to provide adequate access for haying equipment. He explained they have been cutting and stacking brush in this area over the years and suggested the DPW may be able to provide some assistance chipping up and removing material. He reported the previous farmers have removed all the wire fencing from the west field and are amenable to him mowing down the remaining vegetation.

Mark Duffy – Great Brook Dairy:

Bisbee (6 acres); Crop - hay for livestock feed; Integrated Pest Management/IPM - (no specifics provided); Fertilizer - Cow Manure; In-kind Service –mow field edge

Cranberry Bog Cornfield (2 acres); Corn for livestock feed; IPM 2018 – Atrazine, Satellite; IPM 2019 – adding Glyphosate; Fertilizer – cow manure, potash, corn starter; In-kind Service – maintain field edge;

Fiske Meadow – (5 acres); Crop – corn for livestock feed; IPM – Atrazine, Satellite; Fertilizer – cow manure, corn starter; In-kind Service – maintain field edge

Foss Farm (18 acres); IPM Atrazine, Satellite, glyphosate; Fertilizer – cow manure, corn starter; In-kind Service – mow around edge; plow and harrow community gardens

Greenough (4 acres); IPM Atrazine, Satellite; Fertilizer – cow manure, corn starter; In-kind Service – maintain field edges

Hutchins/Robbins (28 acres); IPM Atrazine, Satellite; Fertilizer – cow manure, corn starter; In-kind Service – maintain field edges

Desiree Ball – Woodward Land: First year under agreement; Grazing /4 goats; Pest control – none; Soil Amendments – none; In-kind Service – fence repair, remove trees on fencing; invasive plant removal (by goats and farmer); Ball noted the new abutters have requested the fencing be moved. She is currently in the process of recruiting volunteers to assist with the project.

Extension Requests:

(DEP 125-0916) Order of Conditions: John Pearson; Lions Gate Development.; 570 West Street, Project: Work including a subdivision roadway with stormwater management features, fire cistern, pathway, underground utilities, and landscaping. Expires 4/20/2019.

Engineer Ian Ainsley of Meisner Brem Corporation was present to discuss the request for a two-year extension to the Order of Conditions (OOCs) expiring 4/20/2019. He reported the owner of this project passed away suddenly over the weekend and said there is not much clarity at this point regarding who will be taking over the project. He anticipates the primary site contractor, Steve Doherty, who has been managing the site for the past year, will likely be the most reasonable contact for the time being.

Willard reported having been requested to attend the previous Planning Board meeting to discuss the applicant's request for an extension to the Subdivision Approval, in particular with regard to her evaluation of the status of the implementation of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. She said she does not believe it has been followed at all, possibly due to the fact that site management of this project has changed several times over the last three years. She noted she had informed the applicant during the Planning Board meeting that the Order of Conditions were due to expire on 4/20/2019 and was then immediately provided with a handwritten request for an extension.

Ainsley said he believes he now has a better understanding of work that is yet to be completed following two recent site walks – one with Willard, John Pearson and site contractor Steve Doherty and one with Planning Board Administrator, George Mansfield, and the Planning Board's peer reviewer, John Hedlund of Nitsch Engineering. He said it was his opinion that there has been significant improvement in addressing the erosion and stability issues identified in an Enforcement Order issued in November 2018 which he believes is largely due to more consistent site management.

Willard reported issues with the wetland flagging that was to have been reestablished by survey, including missing flags and inconsistent numbering. Ainsley said he will work with the survey crew to make the necessary adjustments. Verge requested a brief summary of outstanding work. Ainsley reviewed his assessment of work to be done including the final pavement course on the roadway, completion of the pocket stormwater wetland basin and associated plantings, removal of various material piles on the site, installation of the paved walkway and curbing along the finished roadway pavement. Regarding the ongoing issues with the fire cistern, Ainsley said the site contractor has been in communications with the fire chief and to his knowledge the runoff infiltrating/exfiltrating issues have not yet been resolved. Willard noted there have been significant runoff problems in the past regarding the process used for emptying the cistern that impacted the roadway and abutters to the project.

At Wells' suggestion the Commission agreed on granting a temporary extension to allow for the required reflagging to be done. Willard noted they will also be required to provide a Construction Management Plan that includes proposed measures to avoid problems that occurred in the past due to lack of adequate project oversight and management.

Tatistcheff moved to grant a two-month extension for DEP 125-0986, Wells seconded the motion. Parra requested the motion be amended to include the requirement that the representative return with whoever is designated as the decision maker moving forward. Wells requested the motion be amended to state for the record that he has evaluated the Isolated Wetland identified on the Plan of Record and determined it is a certifiable vernal pool due to presence of wood frog and spotted salamander egg masses, making it a significant habitat feature. Ainsley asked how this would impact the existing OOCs. Wells explained that under the Regulations an isolated wetland is not jurisdictional but if it were to become certified with the owner's permission, this would affect stormwater management, septic system locations and snow storage requirements. With no further comments, all voted in favor.

(DEP 125-1000) Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD); South Street, Parcels 54 & 56; Applicant: Attorney Howard S. Fisher on behalf of Ira Nagel, Trustee, Inga L. MacRae Trust; Issued: 5/5/2016; Requesting two-year extension to 5/5/2021

Parra recused himself from the discussion. Willard said she has not been contacted by the applicant since the request was submitted. She noted the property is currently on the market and both the ConsCom and Planning Board offices have received numerous inquiries perspective buyers. It is her understanding there is more than one potential development plan, none of which has been provided to the Commission.

Willard provided an overview of the 25-acre site including jurisdictional areas. She noted the peer review done to establish the ORAD was submitted in March, 2016. Verge noted the ORAD includes a very large area and no work has commenced on the site to date. Willard noted that if the ORAD is extended, it extends the original Plan of Record with no provisions for revisions to the delineations so the standard process in reviewing this request for an extension would include a peer review of the reestablished flagging.

The Commission was generally inclined to deny the request for extension but was open to giving it further consideration if the applicant provides a representative at their next meeting on April 26, 2019; otherwise the ORAD will expire on 5/5/2019.

(DEP 125-0971) Order of Conditions; 61 Judy Farm Road; Applicant: Adam Ostrow; Project: tree clearing, expansion and extension of a driveway to a common driveway and installation of a dry hydrant stand pipe into an existing pond; Previous extension to 4/30/2019

Adam Ostrow was present to discuss his request for a fourth extension to the OOCs. Mr. Ostrow explained that when he submitted a request for an extension in December 2018, he was in negotiations with an end user and their builder to purchase the land and construct the Common Driveway. An agreement was not reached at that time, and they are continuing to market the land to others as well as making significant price reductions in order to expedite a sale prior to the expiry of the OOCs. He said the decision was made in mid-February that if they still had no buyer by March 1, they would construct the driveway. He said the process for obtaining a surveyor to reestablish the wetland flags took a lot longer than he had anticipated and consequently this work was just completed yesterday.

With regard to a proposed timeline going forward, Ostrow said they hope to finalize a contract with a contractor and their attorneys by May 1 followed by a pre-construction meeting with the Commission by May 15, with the goal of beginning work between June 1 and 15. He noted the Planning Board has provided an additional extension to June 30. Verge explained the Commission had approved a shorter extension than the Planning Board due to concerns relative to the wetland flagging, with the requirement that they be restored per the Plan of record prior to the Commission's consideration of a request for an additional extension.

When asked if he currently had an engineer under contract, Ostrow said he has someone who will provide an As-Built Plan. He said it was his understanding that the roadway engineering submitted by Stamski and McNary was previously approved in 2015. He said it was also his understanding that he would need to have the center line or offsets staked and that a surveyor is qualified to do this work. Verge clarified the requirements include submission of a Construction Management Plan from his engineer for review by both the CC and the Planning Board, contact information for the engineer and contractor, and participation in a Preconstruction Meeting with the project engineer and contractor, representatives from the Commission and the Planning Board to review construction procedures and management for the driveway.

At Wells' suggestion, the Commission determined that a peer review of the re-established flags will be appropriate in this case and requested that Willard contact John Rockwood of Ecotec, Inc. to schedule the review. It was noted and agreed by the applicant that he will be responsible for the costs associated with the additional peer review services. *Tatistcheff moved to authorize the Conservation Administrator to submit the invoice for the additional peer review services to the applicant, Wells seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.* A final decision regarding the request will be made at the Commission's next meeting.

41 Skelton Road: Anthony Pisani of Pisani & Associates Architects was present to request guidance on a concept plan that includes work within the Riverfront Resource Area. He said the property has changed hands and the new owners require more space, so they have designed a plan that addresses this with an 800 s.f. addition on one side of the house and a 500 s.f. addition on the other. The Commission informed Pisani they would be required to file a new Notice of Intent for

this plan and the suggestion was made to include an infiltration system to mitigate impervious surface and to include a planting plan with native, non-cultivar species.

Conservation Land Management:

CR #68: Woodward Land Conservation Restriction: The previously-approved Conservation Restriction document was circulated for signatures prior to being submitted to the BOS for final approval.

Greenough Dam Repair: The CPC has requested formal bids on the Greenough Dam repair and a site visit was held this past week to review the project

Cranberry Bog House & Foss Farm Well: Irrigation Well #8 at Foss Farm was replaced with funding from the Foss Farm Community Gardens 53e.5. The CO detectors at the Bog House were replaced by Jasonics as they had aged out.

Committee Liaison Reports/Cranberry Bog Working Group: Upcoming meetings - May 13, June 10 and 24, July 8

FY20 Budget Update: Verge reported the Commission did not get a vote of support from the BOS to accept the Personnel Board's recommendation that the 5-hour per week increase in hours and the grade change request be approved, in spite of doing their best to stick within the existing parameters of the timeline and process. She estimated the budget differential for both requests at \$7k per year. Moving forward she said the Commission will be requesting to meet with the BOS in May in order to get all required approvals for these requests prior to budget planning meetings with FinCom beginning in October.

9:45 p.m. With no further business, *Tatistcheff moved to adjourn, Belitz seconded the motion and all voted in favor.*

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Hopkins, Administrative Assistant

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:

RE: Skelton Road NOI – letter from Ruth Elliott Holmes