

**Carlisle Conservation Commission**  
**May 12, 2022**  
**Minutes**

**7:05 p.m. Chair Alex Parra Introduction to Remote Meeting:** This meeting was conducted remotely pursuant to an Act extending to July 15, 2022 certain Covid-19 measures adopted during the State of Emergency. For this meeting, the Conservation Commission convened via Zoom web conference as posted on the town's web site identifying how the public may join. No in-person attendance of members of the public was permitted, but every effort was made to ensure that the public could adequately access the proceedings.

Members Present: Alex Parra, Chair; Dan Wells, Vice Chair; Helen Young, Navneet Hundal, Nick Ognibene (7:20)  
Members Absent: Brian Murphy, Lee Tatistcheff  
Conservation Staff: Sylvia Willard, Conservation Administrator  
Mary Hopkins, Assistant to the Conservation Administrator

**Administrative Matters/Discussion Items: (taken up throughout the meeting as time permitted)**

**Signatory Authorization:** On the motion by Hundal and seconded by Wells, it was unanimously VOTED to authorize the Administrator to sign documents discussed at this meeting on behalf of the Conservation Commission. Roll Call Vote: Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

**Approval of Bills:** On the motion by Wells and seconded by Hundal, it was unanimously VOTED to approve the General Fund and Foss Farm Community Gardens expenses as presented. Roll Call Vote: Roll Call Vote: Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

On the motion by Young and seconded by Hundal, it was unanimously VOTED to authorize the town to return the excess funds in the 53g Account established for Brendon Properties/81 Russell Street. Roll Call Vote: , Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

**Minutes:** The March and April draft minutes were held to the next meeting pending review.

**Meeting Schedule:** The Commission deferred a decision on revising the summer schedule to the next meeting.

**7:15 p.m. (DEP 125 – 1132) Notice of Intent, Continued hearing**

**Applicant: Homer T. Ash**

**Project Location: 163 Nowell Farm Road**

**Project Description: Removal of 27 +/- trees from around a residence which are diseased or present a hazard to the existing dwelling.**

Parra asked Mr. Ash to summarize what he has done since the previous hearing. Mr. Ash said he had consulted with Brian McLay of New England Nurseries to provide a mitigation planting plan based on the Commission's recommendations. He said there is an additional 12-inch pine they would like to remove in the vicinity of trees marked #10 and #11 that is not flagged for removal on site plan, bringing the revised total number of trees proposed for removal to 14. Parra asked Mr. Ash to describe the mitigation planting he is providing. Mr. Ash said the plan includes 2 shrubs or 1 tree for each of the trees proposed for removal, excluding the 2 dead/diseased ash trees, for a total of 22 plantings. Willard asked if the proposed plantings are all straight, native species. Mr. Ash said the proposal is based on the Commission's posted list of recommended plants for jurisdictional areas.

Parra polled the Commission for comments. Wells said he had expressed his desire at the previous meeting to exclude tree #s1 and 2 from the removal plan and this remains an issue for him. He said he would like to see a more clearly defined plan of what is being proposed for removal and what is not so there is no confusion when the cutting is done. He recalled the Commission had also discussed the potential of leaving some 12 to 15-foot

totems, as well as the need for monumentation in the back as a permanent limit of work. Mr. Ash said they were advised by the arborist that tree #s1 and 2 were risky because they are out in the open. Addressing the monumentation, Mr. Ash said they have included a line of shrubs in the planting plan to create a barrier in the back and they would not be opposed to installing 2 granite markers. Mr. Ash said he did not follow Well's request for a revised plan. Wells explained he finds the current plan difficult to read because the trees are shown so close together. He requested a revised plan that clearly identifies what is being removed and what is being left in place. Mr. Ash agreed to provide a full-sized, annotated plan. Wells again asked if some of the trees would be left as totems for habitat value. Mr. Ash said they were not opposed to leaving a couple of trees as totems in the back of the property. Wells suggested all trees in the back of the property that are located within 20 feet from a wetland should be left as totems, noting the wetland contains a vernal pool. Young and Hundal agreed with Wells in recommending more of the trees should be left as totems.

Parra agreed the plan is difficult to decipher and should be revised to provide a clear plan of the trees that are to be removed, both for the Commissions records in order to verify compliance and for the tree contractor who will be doing the removal. Addressing the monumentation requirement, Parra said the Commission typically requires a line of large boulders spaced at 20 feet in addition to a marker at each end of the limit of work. He said he believes Wells' request for totems in the vicinity of the vernal pool is a good mitigation measure. He recalled there had been some discussion of removing the woodshed located within the wetland and asked Mr. Ash if it is his desire to keep the woodshed. Mr. Ash said the shed has been there for almost 40 years and the area has never flooded. Wells said he did not believe the Commission could require removal of the woodshed, but they are looking for substantial mitigation if they are going to approve the request and that would certainly go a long way.

Mr. Ash requested further clarification regarding monumentation. Wells recommended 3 markers vs 2 due to the angularly edged lawn, to be located in front of tree #s 3 and 8, with the third in front of WF #15. Parra noted that at least one commissioner would view the removal of the shed as a substantial mitigation measure for this project.

Parra said he would like to continue the hearing to June 9 because the May 26 agenda is full. Mr. Ash asked if the Commission could approve the project contingent on a revised plan. Parra explained the Commission only considers contingencies for very limited plan changes. He said the Commission could vote tonight if that is the applicant's preference, but his sense is the Commission would deny the project. He summarized the suggested mitigation measures as follows: leave tree #s1 and 2; leave totems in the back, particularly tree #s 3, 4 and 5; a clear plan of record; permanent demarcation; and removal of the shed. Mr. Ash asked what is within the realm of acceptability if the shed is left in place for the time being. Wells suggested that short of removing the shed from the wetland, and alternative is leaving all the trees located in the back within 30 feet of a wetland as totems.

On the motion by Ognibene and seconded by Hundal, it was unanimously VOTED to continue to June 9, 2022 at 8:00 pm. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

### **8:02 p.m. (DEP 125-1136) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing**

**Applicant: Michael Napier, East Coast Development**

**Location: 42 Bingham; Map 15 Parcel 15-27-A**

**Project Description: Filling approximately 278 SF of Bordering Vegetated Wetland to construct a driveway crossing and open bottom box culvert to provide access to a proposed single-family dwelling. Also proposed is construction of a patio, pool, portions of a sewage disposal system, and grading with work in the Bordering Vegetated Wetland and within its 100-foot Buffer Zone at 42 Bingham Rd. Map 15 Parcel 27 Lot B.**

Parra announced the filing has been withdrawn by the applicant and a Request to Amend the existing wetlands plan approved in the original Order of Conditions for this project has been submitted for the Commission's next meeting.

### **7:50 p.m. (DEP 125-1137) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing**

Carlisle Conservation Commission  
Meeting Date: May 12, 2022  
Approval Date: June 30, 2022

**Applicant: Glenn Reed**

**Location: 576 Rutland Street, Map 36 Parcel 4-2**

**Project Description: Removal of 20 trees, stumps to remain, that pose a safety hazard within the 100-Buffer Zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland at 576 Rutland St. Map 36, Parcel 36-4-2.**

Present were the applicant and his representative, Aidan Schlotman of Stamski and McNary. Mr. Schlotman reviewed the revised plan via screen share. Changes made in response to comments at the previous meeting include the following: mitigation including 4 trees have been added at a replacement ration of 1:1; 32 shrubs have been added at a replacement ratio of 2:1; total of 36 native plantings have been added to the plan as mitigation for 20 trees proposed for removal.

Parra polled the Commission for comments. Young said she viewed the trees as a potential threat to the house. Ognibene said he was curious to hear other views on the adequacy of the mitigation plan in terms of replacing large trees with small shrubs. Young said it was her understanding that the property owner did not want to plant trees that could again pose a hazard to the house in the future. Wells said lowbush blueberry is fairly common plant in town in that type of setting and he did not see a concern in the fact that it is a smaller plant.

Willard noted there is a large Burning Bush (*Euonymus alatus*), a highly invasive shrub, located near the house, and she asked if the applicant would be willing to remove it. Mr. Reed said he would be willing to take it down. Willard asked if some of the trees were to be left as totems. Mr. Reed said he was not sure how many the Commission wanted left as totems. He suggested four trees located farther from the house be left as totems. Parra said those trees were the only ones he had marginally questioned. Otherwise, he was impressed by the fact that there were so many very tall trees located very close to the house and thinks this is a reasonable mitigation plan as a whole. Willard said she had noted during a site visit a tree that had fallen into the wetlands in the vicinity of WF #60 and suggested this could be considered for removal as well.

On the motion by Wells and seconded by Ognibene, it was unanimously VOTED to close the hearing for DEP 125-1137. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

On the motion by Parra and seconded by Wells, it was unanimously VOTED to issue a Standard Order of Conditions, with the following Special Conditions: three tree totems of at least 12 feet in height shall be left near the wetland for wildlife habitat enhancement; the invasive Burning Bush located near the home shall be removed; a fallen dead tree located within the bordering vegetated wetland near WF #51 may be lifted out of the wetland and removed. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

### **8:28 p.m. (DEP 125-1130) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing**

**Applicant: Chris Buono, South Street Carlisle LLC**

**Project Location: 0 South St, Map 5 Parcel 54 & 56**

**Project Description: Construction of a single-family home, water supply well, tree removal, grading, construction of a driveway with wetland crossings, wetland fill and in the 100-foot buffer zone of a bordering vegetated wetland.**

On the motion by Young and seconded by Wells, it was unanimously VOTED to continue the hearing to June 9, 2022 at 8:30 p.m. at the representative's request. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

**Enforcement Order - 271 Russell Street:** Property owner David Thomas updated the Commission on his progress in addressing the requirements of the Enforcement Order: he has installed siltation fencing to address the erosion occurring from the end of his driveway down to the wetland due to an improperly installed culvert on Russell Street. He has contacted Norse Environmental to flag the wetland and the vernal boundary. He agreed to keep Willard updated on his progress.

### **Project Updates:**

Carlisle Conservation Commission  
Meeting Date: May 12, 2022  
Approval Date: June 30, 2022

**Stillmeadow Farm – West and Acton Streets:**

Project manager Jeffrey Herz of Onyx Development Corporation was present to discuss two issues raised at the pre-construction meeting: an acceptable Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and revised details for the temporary stream crossing.

**Tree Protection Plan:** Mr. Herz said the Order of Conditions requirement that every tree greater than 4 inches in diameter that are located within 10 feet of the work area be surrounded with construction fencing is not practicable on this site due to the extremely large number of trees that would require this treatment. He proposed as an alternative installing a line of vertical construction fencing in areas that include trees within 10 feet of the limits of work to exclude equipment from the forested areas by establishing a defined work area.

Willard explained the purpose of the TPP is to prevent equipment from hitting/damaging the trunks of the trees and to prevent equipment from driving over the tree roots located under the drip line. She noted the Commission recently had a situation where trees were inadvertently removed from town conservation land. She noted there are many trees located just beyond the limit of work that are located on land held under a conservation restriction. Wells asked what the Condition specified within the Order of Conditions. Mr. Herz read the Condition as follows: ... “trees greater than 4 inches in diameter at breast height, located within 10 feet outside of the limit of work shall be marked with surveyors tape in the field, to be prepared by a certified arborist. Any tree identified for protection that is observed to be dead or projected to die as consequences of construction shall be replaced in the same general location by the applicant with a native tree of the same or similar species with a minimum size of 2 inches in diameter”. Wells noted the Condition does not specify whether or not the requirements pertain only to trees within jurisdictional areas. He asked if the concern is that there are hundreds of trees within the Buffer Zone. Mr. Herz estimated there are at least 100 trees. Wells asked if the intent could have been to be applicable to trees located within 10 feet of the resource area itself vs within the Buffer Zone. Willard said the Condition had been provided by a peer reviewer and it was her understanding it was in reference to trees within the Buffer Zone. The Commission agreed a site visit was in order due to the difficulty in visualizing if the proposed alternative would suffice.

**Temporary Stream Crossing:** Mr. Herz presented revised details for the temporary stream crossings after the original plans were found to be unacceptable by the building inspector during the pre-construction meeting. On the motion by Hundal and seconded by Young, it was VOTED to approve the revised construction detail for the two crossings. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

**Conservation Land Management:****Towle Field – Revised Mowing Protocol:**

Present to discuss the revised mowing regime were Land Stewardship Committee co-chairs Warren Lyman and Rhonda Michaud and members Debbie Geltner, Tom Brownrigg, and Dwight DeMay. Mr. Lyman credited LSC member Judy Asarkoff, who was not able to be present, for the tremendous amount of work she did in researching the revised the document. Lyman said when the LSC last discussed a revised Towle Field Mowing protocol with the Commission in January, 2022, the main concerns were related to budget impacts and frequency of edge maintenance.

Under the new protocol, the field would be divided into three sections, with each section to be mowed in sequence every third year. Existing trails would be mowed as needed to maintain clear walking paths for the public. Each year, the entire edge perimeter of all fields would be mowed to a six-foot width in the fall at the same time as one of the three parcels is being mowed. The LSC asserts that going to increased infrequency of mowing will increase the diversity of plants, animals, and insects that it supports. Estimated costs are projected to result in savings in comparison to current mowing costs as outlined in the report due to a reduced frequency of mowing. LSC suggests savings could be used as needed in the future for special projects such as invasive plant removal, planting of native plants and/or improving field conditions as it transfers from a hay field to a more diverse habitat. Mr. Lyman emphasized the importance of monitoring as a key component to the revised protocol and said the field conditions should be evaluated every year as conditions change.

Parra asked who would mow the public trails. Lyman said the trails on the field will be mowed by Ms. Asarkoff following a protocol stipulated by the Trails Committee. Parra said he thinks there is a recreational/aesthetic benefit to a grass field and asked if in their studies of transitioning Towle Field from grassland to shrubland they had considered this. Lyman said the Towle Land was purchased for conservation and recreation and over the years there were occasional recreational activities, but there does not seem to be much interest in that recently. He said there is a great interest in walking the trails in terms of vistas and LSC believes it will be an improvement in terms of visual impacts.

Mr. Lyman asked Mr. Brownrigg to comment on his observations of the differences between the mowed and unmowed portions of the field last year. Mr. Brownrigg said he saw very few birds in the majority of the main field that was comprised primarily of grass, but he saw a benefit to the birds and insects he observed in the area that Ms. Asarkoff had set aside for a plant biodiversity study, presumably due to the insects and seeds that were blooming in that part of the field.

Young asked if there would be an effort to keeping poison ivy at bay. Mr. Lyman said that although the proposal does not include an ongoing poison ivy control program, LSC members would conduct regular monitoring for invasives or problematic plants. Mr. Brownrigg said that when the decision was made to conduct herbicide treatments to address poison ivy and Buckthorn at Towle, one of the concerns raised by David Freedman regarding funding for the project was the fact that he felt it was important to have a treatment program that would continue into the future. Mr. Brownrigg said this was not part of LSC's focus for this proposal. Parra said he thinks it is fair to say that by going to a 3-year rotation, invasives will become more prevalent in the field. Lyman said he believes that is speculative and something that could be managed because every third year the vegetation will be cut down; if monitoring reveals further remediation is required, LSC would come to the Commission to determine what is appropriate. Ognibene seconded Lyman's point on monitoring as a key component of the proposal. He also suggested, to the extent there is any increase in invasives, that is a negative that should be viewed on balance against the positive ecological benefits of this approach.

Parra polled the Commission for comments. Wells, Hundal, and Young expressed support for the proposal. Willard said she has concerns about the long-term impacts and believes there is an obligation to keep the poison ivy and buckthorn under control. She suggested a control study comparing the 2-acre study area to the adjacent land that was mowed, noting the potential costs of treatment if the invasives get out of control again across the entire field.

Parra asked Willard if there is an existing mowing contract for the current year. Willard said the contract has not yet been established for this year, since the funds for this purpose are typically encumbered at the end of the fiscal year. Parra asked if there would be no mowing this year if the revised mowing protocol is enacted. Lyman said there would be a mowing of one section as well as edge mowing this year.

On the motion by Wells and seconded by Young, it was unanimously VOTED to approve the revised Towle Field mowing protocol proposed by the LSC as dated April, 2022. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Hundal-aye, Young-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye. Parra thanked the LSC for all the tremendous work they have done on the proposal and said he hopes it is a great success.

**Cranberry Bog Dam #1:** David Crossman of B & C Associates will be flagging within the next couple of weeks. Mark Duffy has agreed to remove the now-abandoned beaver lodge.

**Request to site a memorial bench on the Cranberry Bog Conservation land:** Willard has received a request to site a memorial bench on the Cranberry Bog Conservation Land. The Commission asked Willard to request a proposed location.

9:09 On the motion by Young and seconded by Hundal, it was VOTED to adjourn. Roll Call Vote: Ognibene-aye, Young-aye, Hundal-aye, Wells-aye, Parra-aye.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Hopkins

**All supporting materials that have been provided to members of this body can be made available on upon request**