

Conservation Commission – Town of Spencer

Minutes



Conservation Commission Meeting
Wednesday, May 13, 2009 at 7:00 PM
Conference Room A
Memorial Town Hall

The Meeting was opened at 7:01 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Ernie Grimes (Chairman), Judy Lochner, Karen Rubino, Chris Plant, Mary McLaughlin (arrived at 9:00 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Steve Manuel, Warren Snow

Staff present: Ginny Scarlet & Lisa Daoust

Minutes Approved: April 8, 2009 – *A motion to approve the minutes with amendment as discussed (Rubino/Lochner) passed 4/0.*

Signed & Notarized: 30 GH Wilson Rd., Cert. of Compliance – *A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance (Rubino/Lochner) passed 4/0.*

75 Maple Street, Cert. of Compliance – *A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance (Lochner/Rubino) passed 4/0.*

14 Elm Street, Cert. of Compliance – *A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance (Lochner/Plant) passed 4/0.*

7:15 p.m. Opened the Continuation of Public Hearing for Notice of Intent for Country Spirits Corp.

Property: 10 West Main Street, Spencer, MA DEP#293-0724

Representing Al Letendre, owner of Country Spirits, was Mr. Jason Dubois from Bertin Engineering and Mr. George Lussier, who is the site contractor. Ms. Scarlet asked Mr. Dubois to highlight the changes to the revised plan. Ms. Scarlet asked Mr. Dubois if he received the new review letter from Cullinan Engineering. Mr. Dubois did receive the letter. Ms. Scarlet sent Mr. Dubois some comments that she wanted to address at this hearing. For alternative analysis required by WPA regulations, Mr. Dubois said they did look into some off site properties and the price of commercial properties were approximately three to four times more than the price that Mr. Letendre purchased the current property for. Going that route would put Mr. Letendre over budget for this project.

National Grid wanted the south detention pond shifted up 25 feet to the north which eliminates any room for recharge for that area. Mr. Dubois was out doing test pits on the only other area that you could do recharge on. The grade is approximately a foot and a half high than the existing grades. When the test pits were dug, the ground water was between three and four feet. Mr. Dubois said there is no other alternative for recharge, therefore no recharge is provided. Ms. Lochner asked Mr. Dubois if he knew why National Grid wanted the pond moved. Mr. Dubois said he had no idea.

The third comment Ms. Scarlet had was about the run-on from the abutter to the west onto the property. Ms. Scarlet said the drainage areas delineation doesn't go beyond the property.

Mr. Dubois did add the stormceptor details to the plan. The riprap slope is 1½ :1. The site is so tight even slopes of 3:1 or even 2:1 are not possible.

Ms. Scarlet asked what a "toe key" is. Mr. Dubois said instead of having the bottom of the slope flush with the roadway, they want the bottom to have a stone toe, which goes down a little below the roadway surface.

Mr. Dubois said he did not contact Rob McNeil from Utilities and Facilities about the revised discharge of stormwater to Olde Main Street right of way. He will try to reach him again tomorrow. Ms. Scarlet said that Cullinan Engineering wants a written document stating that discharge can be done. Ms. Scarlet asked who would be in charge of cleaning out the catch basin and trench drain. Mr. Dubois assumes the Town would be in charge since it is on Town property. This question will have to be addressed when Mr. Dubois meets with Mr. McNeil.

Ms. Scarlet asked if Mr. Dubois had a detail on the swale. Mr. Dubois said no; the swale is 4 feet wide. There are two manhole drawings on the detail sheets. Mr. Dubois said they typically are as shown on the detail sheets and he also added the drawings from Mark Robidoux's sheets that were emailed to Mr. Dubois. The utility trenches have no piped drainage outlets from the bottom. The trenches will have sand or gravel around the pipes.

The sanitary sewer line comes out from the house next door and the detention basin top rim goes over the top of the pipe. Mr. Dubois shifted the pond as much as he could and regraded the area to put more fill over the pipe. The shallowest part is about 3 feet. Mr. Dubois spoke with Vito, the reviewing Engineer, from Cullinan Engineering and he said he would like to see 4 feet for the shallowest part. The pipe slopes at about 20%, which is really steep. A manhole is already there but Cullinan is concerned that there will not be enough cover on the pipe when the pond is finished. Cullinan wants the pipe dropped or move the detention basin but the basin can not be moved.

Ms. Lochner asked if Cullinan reviewed the Stormwater plan. Ms. Scarlet said that the Planning Board had Cullinan review the SWPPP. There is a statement in the initial review and in the current review that they verified the calculations and drainage areas. Everything is correct. Ms. Scarlet said the only outstanding question is whether they comply without having any recharge. As Ms. Scarlet understands DEP's regulations, it is not clear whether or not the Commission has the discretion to say that recharge can not be done and still permit for the project. Ms. Scarlet looked in the DEP Regulations (310

CMR 10.00) to see if recharge has to be done in order for the project to be permitted. The regulations did not give enough information, therefore; Ms. Scarlet went to print off the pertinent sections of the cited DEP Stormwater Handbooks from the computer. The handbook says that the project can not be permitted without recharge. Mr. Dubois said he had done this just recently and is sure there is something in the regulations saying the project is allowed to be permitted based on “maximum extent practicable” (the best that can be done). Mr. Dubois is going to check the regulations again and will be in contact with Ms. Scarlet. Ms. Scarlet said given that this project has not been approved by the Planning Board yet, an option for the Commission is to continue until the next Conservation meeting. The Planning Board’s meeting is on Tuesday, May 19th.

At the applicants’ request, the hearing has been continued to May 27, 2009.

8:10 p.m. Opened the Continuation of Public Hearing for Notice of Intent for James Sielis

Property: Greenville Street, Spencer, MA DEP#293-0725

Mr. Jeff Howland, Graves Engineering, presented the revised plan to the Commission. Mr. Howland has incorporated to the plan all the comments from the Planning Board, Fire Chief and Utilities and Facilities. Also added to the plan was the cul-de-sac, as requested by Ms. Scarlet. The gravel access road to the detention pond has been added. It will also be used for the snowmobile trail in the winter. In the summer, it will be access to the detention pond for maintenance. Ms. Scarlet asked if the roadway has an actual easement. Mr. Howland said yes; there are easements for the roadway and the detention pond and a temporary easement around the treatment wetland. There is also a separate easement for the snowmobile trail.

The ANR plan has been approved but not recorded yet. Ms. Scarlet mentioned the things that haven’t changed are there is the same amount of fill in the wetlands and the same amount of replication. Mr. Howland said there might have been a slight increase in fill due to the gravel road. Ms. Scarlet said she was very pleased to see the construction sequence but it doesn’t mention when the treatment wetland will get planted and it doesn’t mention constructing the wetlands replication. Mr. Howland said the planting of the wetland species in the stormwater wetland will be done but the replication wetland plantings will be done last because they want to get that stabilized and established. Ms. Scarlet requested that a timeline and plant list be put in writing for the wetland planting. Mr. Howland said he will do that. Mr. Scott Morrison said both wetlands will be monitored for a couple growing seasons. Mr. Grimes said it should be written in somewhere that the wetland replication must be done, including planting, at the beginning of the project. Ms. Scarlet said the project will most likely need at least one extension.

Mr. Howland said that they are meeting with the Planning Board next Tuesday, May 19, 2009, and all Planning Board comments from the last meeting have been addressed. The projects biggest outstanding issues were comments from the Fire Chief and the Sewer Commission.

Ms. Scarlet asked where the recharge is. Mr. Howland said based upon conversations with the Planning Board, due to the amount of rock, it was determined that recharge is not feasible. Ms. Scarlet said it must be permissible to forgive recharge. Mr. Morrison said that there is currently ledge so there is no recharge there anyways. Mr. Grimes said the only reason that wetland is out front there is because the ledge holds the water.

Attorney Damien Berthiaume said that they would like to close the hearing tonight, in light of the comments and questions of the timeline of plantings and construction. Attorney Berthiaume said if it is reflected in the minutes of the meeting the timeframe in which those scheduled events would occur, the hearing could be closed. Ms. Scarlet said she is not sure if the Commission can close until the final plan is submitted. Mr. Grimes said if the hearing is closed, the Commission can not accept any further information. Attorney Berthiaume understands but he is suggesting that information can be provided now in reference to the plan. Mr. Sielis asked if the information can be in the Order of Conditions. Ms. Scarlet commented that the Commission might like to see the actual easement for the snowmobile trail. Attorney Berthiaume commented that there are other issues that the Commission would like to see on paper. Ms. Scarlet said yes. Mr. Sielis asked why Conservation is concerned with the easement of the snowmobile trail. Ms. Scarlet said because it is involved with the wetland and wetland fill. It needs to be labeled on the plan. Mr. Sielis asked what if he eliminates the snowmobile trail? He is only providing it as a favor to the snowbirds. If the Boards are going to keep going back and forth about the trail, he will just take it out. Attorney Berthiaume said that the easement for the trail is labeled on the plan, Pg. 6 of 13, C-2-0, showing that Mr. Sielis' intention is to maintain the trail that has been used for the snowmobiles forever and he would like to keep it that way.

Mr. Sielis said his understanding is that snowmobiles operate in the snow when the ground is frozen. Snowmobiles can not rut the ground when they are on top of a snow covered frozen ground. He does not understand why this would affect the wetlands. The trail allows snowmobiles and not ATV's. Ms. Scarlet said having the plan recorded as a snowmobile trail makes it enforceable that it excludes ATV use. Mr. Sielis said it seems there are just minor changes that need to be made to the plan. Ms. Scarlet suggested the changes be made by hand on the plan right now and have it said in the minutes that changes will be on the file plan as drawn. The minutes become part of the record. Mr. Howland said the only thing that he can not write in now is the plant list inside the stormwater wall. Mr. Morrison said if that is the only issue, information can be put in the Order of Conditions that a planting list must be provided and approved by the Conservation Commission. At this time, 8:50 p.m., the hearing was continued to later on in the meeting so the changes can be drawn and written on the plan.

9:30 p.m. Mr. Grimes re-opened the hearing for Mr. Sielis, Greenville Street

Mr. Howland said he wrote in the revisions requested by the Commission. The only other minor detail change to the plan might be the sewer information because Mr. Howland has not heard from the Sewer Commission yet. Mr. Howland is hoping to receive the comments this week.

Ms. Lochner said the Order of Conditions should be issued and if there are any revisions to the plan, they must be submitted to the Commission. Attorney Berthiaume and Ms. Scarlet said citing the current revised plan should be fine and any other revisions to the plans will be submitted to the Commission.

The proposed conditions are as follows:

- Standard conditions
- Replication must be done at the beginning of the project
- An Environmental Monitor must be on site

- SWPPP must be on site and available for Conservation Commission inspections
- A copy of the plant list for the replicated wetlands must be submitted and approved by the Conservation Commission

A motion to close the public hearing (Rubino/Lochner) passed 5/0.

A motion to approve the plan as presented with the discussed conditions (Lochner/Plant) passed 5/0.

8:50 p.m. Opened the Public Hearing for Request for Determination of Applicability for the Town of Spencer

Property: O’Gara Park, Valley Street, Spencer, MA

Ms. Scarlet presented the project to the Commission because Mr. Bove could not attend. The Town did not submit the RDA before they actually made the commitment to start the project. Ms. Scarlet took pictures of the project underway. She inspected the project when it was complete and there was no impact on the wetlands. It is Ms. Scarlet’s recommendation that the Commission vote a Negative Determination because the project had no impact.

Ms. Scarlet said the Highway Department is working on a long term plan to put a sediment trap into the parking lot to catch sediment runoff from the parking lot before it goes into the brook. They will file an NOI when the time comes to do the project.

A motion to close the public hearing (Rubino/Lochner) passed 4/0.

A motion to issue a Negative Determination (Lochner/Rubino) passed 4/0.

8:53 p.m. Opened the Public Hearing for Notice of Intent for Carol Sweeney

Property: 7 Dufault Road, Spencer, MA DEP#293-

The project is to construct an outlet from the shallow well by the house to run about 6’ underground into the riverbank through a perforated pipe through a bed of stone. The pipe will be within 100 feet of the river. The purpose of the pipe system is to lower the groundwater level in the well and in the adjacent basement. Ms. Scarlet said when Jennifer Gensel was here, she had said that the Commission has the discretion to permit small projects of this sort in riverfront area. Ms. Gensel said that a drawing could be submitted instead of an engineered plan. Ms. Lochner asked if a DEP number has been assigned yet. Ms. Scarlet said no; Lisa called DEP and asked for them to assign one for this meeting but a number was not yet assigned. Ms. Scarlet said if the DEP number is the only information needed, the hearing can be closed contingent upon that number. Mr. Grimes said it is a gamble whether or not the number would be assigned within 21 days of the filing. If not, the applicant would need to re-file. Ms. Scarlet said they do not have to re-file; they only have to re-file if someone appeals the Order. Ms. Rubino asked why the pipe has to be underground and is there a standard depth the pipe has to be? The contractor said the water has to remain cool because the river is a trout stream and surface flow would warm it.

Mr. Grimes said the hearing needs to be continued until the DEP number is assigned. The contractor does not have to attend the next hearing. An Order of Conditions will be voted and issued when the DEP number is available.

At the applicant’s request, the hearing has been continued to May 27, 2009.

Other Business:

Bigelow Nurseries: A big gully formed on their property off of Northwest Road that had a lot of sediment washing into the new drainage that the Town recently constructed by the road. The nursery installed erosion control measures in the gully. They will repair the gully and clean out the sediment from the town road drainage. Ms. Scarlet will monitor their progress.

125 Ash Street: The Order of Conditions has expired. Ms. Scarlet asked the Commission to look at the property because Ms. Scarlet was not here when the Order was issued. She believes the wetland replication is too steep away from the water and the pond water level may be wrong in comparison to where the Commission originally wanted it. If this is the case, Ms. Scarlet wants to follow up on Enforcement before the statute of limitation takes effect. Ms. Lochner asked if ownership has changed? Ms. Scarlet said the property has been transferred to the original owner's nephew. Mr. Grimes said that the original applicant was Mr. Westerman. Ms. Scarlet said the Order was issued to Gene Supernore and now Matthew Supernore is the owner of record.

Thompson Pond: Mr. Marty Nathan said that every year there is a minimal chemical treatment done on Thompson Pond to try to control and contain milfoil. Treatment is currently being done under the Extended Order of Conditions that expires June 30, 2009. He asked that an Extension be issued to the Spencer Health Department, which was the applicant in 1989. Mr. Nathan had submitted some information to the Commission about the history of treatment and management on Thompson Pond.

Ms. Scarlet said there are some issues with this particular Order. The original applicant was the Spencer Board of Health. DEP says the Commission can not transfer the Order to a different applicant. Nobody knows who the owner of Thompson Pond is. Mr. Nathan said at one point, the Town Administrator did acknowledge in a letter to Mr. Nathan that Thompson Pond was owned by the Town of Spencer. Mr. Nathan did provide that letter to the Commission. Ms. Scarlet said the town Council currently does not believe the town owns the pond. The state of Massachusetts owns the water and Department of Fish and Wildlife and DCR own the dam. It is not clear who owns the land under the pond. The pond was created as part of the water controls for Spencer Wire Company. There are a lot of deeds that refer to flowage rights not being owned by private property owners. Nobody has been able to track flowage rights.

Mr. Nathan said the Thompson Pond Association has received at least 5 previous extensions and now for the first time, there is a problem with extending the Order. Ms. Scarlet said DEP said the Order is old, weak and has minimal information in it, therefore, should now be reviewed by the Conservation Commission. Mr. Grimes said what has been done for other ponds in Spencer is the old Orders of Conditions have all been updated with new Notices of Intents. Ms. Scarlet said DEP is not allowed to give opinions about issues that are being considered by the Conservation Commission but will answer hypothetical questions. They have a book of guidance about lake management which says there should be a new Order of Conditions periodically. Mr. Lee Lyman, President of Lycott Environmental, says that is not true. He said there is nothing in the regulations that requires a new Notice of Intent. Ms. Scarlet agrees guidance is not the same as regulation. Mr. Lyman said there are new standards of care for filing a Notice of

Intent and the Commission does have the right to ask for new updated information such as wild life habitat surveys, management plans for the pond and labels of new products that will be used. Mr. Lyman said there is nothing being changed from has been done for the past 20 years, therefore; Mr. Lyman said that the Commission is able to and should issue an Extension of the Order.

Mr. Lyman repeated there is no need for a new Notice of Intent. Ms. Scarlet said according to DEP, the Commission can not issue an Extension to the Thompson Pond Association. Mr. Lyman asked what the reasoning was for that. Ms. Scarlet said because the recorded Order will not change and that means the recorded Extension will not properly, legally link to the existing first Order. Ms. Scarlet said the Board of Health does not want to sponsor the Extension. Mr. Lyman said the Board of Health needs to send the Association a letter stating they do not want to be the sponsor of the Extension. Ms. Rubino asked why the NOI was originally done through the Board of Health. Mr. Lyman said because the Board of Health wanted to help out the residents by pulling the necessary permits so the residents wouldn't have to pay the filing fees.

Ms. Scarlet asked why would the town sponsor the treatment for Thompson Pond and not for any other pond/lake in town? Ms. Scarlet said she spoke with the Wetlands Chief for the Central Region and he said they will allow the applicant for a wetland Notice of Intent be listed as "multiple" when the ownership of a water body is not clear. The Association has to pay the filing fees if there is a new NOI. The only exemption for filing fees is for the state or a municipality. The question is can this municipality be a co-applicant. Ms. Scarlet did speak with the Board of Health and she was verbally told no, they do not want the responsibility. Ms. Scarlet said to go further, the request has to be formally asked in writing at one of the Board of Health meetings. The Board of Selectmen must be notified also because they fund the Board of Health.

Mr. Lyman suggested that the Spencer Conservation Commission sponsor the Extension. Ms. Scarlet said the Commission does not have any kind of budget to be sponsor. Mr. Lyman said he has a number of Conservation Commissions that sponsor the management of lakes and ponds.

Mr. Lyman said it may take a week or two before the association will be able to speak with the Board of Health. The Order of Conditions expires at the end of June and the pond needs to be treated now. He asked if a short-term extension could be issued just for this summer so the pond can be treated. Ms. Rubino said she understands arrangements have already been made to treat the pond the same way as it was treated last year. Mr. Grimes asked if Ms. Rubino is a member of the Thompson Pond Lake Association. She said yes. Mr. Grimes told her that she should not be sitting at the Commission's table at this point and time. Ms. Rubino excused herself from the table.

A motion to grant an Extension until October 31, 2009 (Plant/McLaughlin) passed 4/0.

Conservation Land Restriction: Ms. Scarlet read aloud a letter from Mr. Adam Gaudette regarding Pine Cliff Condominiums and the Conservation Restriction. Attorney Berthiaume said that the conservation restriction is to be given to the Town of Spencer after applying through the Conservation Commission. Ms. Scarlet said the Conservation Commission's primary responsibility is to make sure the land given for Conservation purposes remains used for Conservation purposes. Attorney Berthiaume said the Zoning Bylaw does permit the Commission to own the land. If the Conservation Commission

owns the land, a Conservation easement would not be necessary. If the entity that takes ownership of the land is not the Conservation Commission, then an easement would be required.

Ms. Lochner asked Attorney Berthiaume if any land trusts have been looked into that would be interested in the land. Attorney Berthiaume said no land trusts have been approached. Mr. Adam Gaudette, Town Planner, suggested a local land trust. Attorney Berthiaume said they wanted to come to the Conservation Commission first.

Mr. Sielis asked what would be the positives and negatives of deeding the land to the Town. Ms. Lochner said the Town would be responsible for managing it and maintaining it. If the Land Trust owns it, they are responsible for managing and maintenance.

Mr. Grimes said when the Commission was involved with the Rail Trail, the ATV people were invited in along with the Snowbirds. The ATV people complained but never offered any help refurbishing the trail. They are not allowed to ride on it at this current time because the ATV's tear up the trails. Ms. Scarlet feels there should be a place for all wildlife. She would like to have a piece of Conservation land that was local and legal for people to ride on, however, she is not sure land this close to Knox Trail School is the right place. She would discourage ATV use on this piece of land and would discourage it on any piece of land close to the core of Spencer center.

Ms. Scarlet asked Attorney Berthiaume if the Commission is going to own the property or get the Conservation Restriction, does the Commission have to go through the Town Meeting vote for acceptance. Attorney Berthiaume does not believe so. Ms. Scarlet believes even a gift of land to be used for Conservation purposes should be accepted formally by the Town. Mr. Sielis said what if it is voted down. Then there is a problem.

Attorney Berthiaume said if the Commission had an easement on the land, they would be able to decide who is allowed on the land. Mr. Sielis said if the Town changes the Zoning Bylaws and the Town likes the Open Space but don't have the money to purchase the land, why not just take a gift of the land. Ms. Scarlet said that Mr. Gaudette was hoping the Commission would at least vote whether or not to leave this pending or just say no at this point. *A motion to consider this land, in the future, as Conservation Land (Lochner/Rubino) passed 5/0.*

37 GH Wilson Road: Enforcement action because earth and debris is pushed into the wetlands. Ms. Scarlet gave pictures for the Commission to review. Ms. Denise Aucoin, owner, said that more stuff has been thrown in the wetland by other people. Ms. Aucoin showed pictures she has from previous years of what the surrounding area looked like before the beaver flooding. Ms. Aucoin did buy wildlife seed to put down where the wetland was torn up. Ms. Aucoin also said they intend to clean up the wetland. Ms. Scarlet said the Enforcement Order issued required removal of debris and then restoration of the wetland. The questions now are whether a professional wetland specialist is needed to mark the wetland boundary and what kind of deadlines need to be set for removal and restoration.

Ms. Lochner asked when the wetlands could be cleaned up. Ms. Aucoin said as soon as it dries up to get back there. Mr. Grimes said he would like to see the cleanup done by September 1st. Ms. Scarlet said Ms. Aucoin should contact her in July so a decision can

be made if the September 1st deadline needs to be adjusted. Ms. Scarlet will send a letter to Ms. Aucoin that modifies the Enforcement Order. The letter will be a new page of the Enforcement Order stating what needs to be done and the deadline. *A motion to ratify the Enforcement Order (Lochner/Plant) passed 5/0.*

69 East Charlton Road: Wetland bank was torn up. A Notice of Violation was sent to Mr. Seymour last fall. Nothing was done. This time an Enforcement Order and \$100 ticket were issued. Mr. Seymour did not pick up the certified mail; therefore, it was delivered by Constable today. Mr. Seymour did call Ms. Scarlet this evening asking what he can put down on the bank and in the wetland. Ms. Scarlet called him back leaving a message that she would be happy to meet with him. She is proposing first that he install erosion controls because it is bare. Then the wetlands edge needs to be established because Mr. Seymour has torn it up enough that it is not obvious. Finally, restoration will need to be done. Ms. Lochner said the Commission needs to do a site visit. *A motion to ratify the Enforcement Order (Lochner/McLaughlin) passed 5/0.*

Spencer Abbey Dam repair: Ms. Scarlet has contacted three firms looking for Peer Review and has not heard back from any of them. The hearing is scheduled for May 27th.

Land of Interest for Commission: There is a piece of land that the Town Collector thought the Conservation Commission might be interested in. It is located along Turkey Hill Brook and north of Gold Nugget Road. The snowmobile trails go through it. There is a road that goes through it called Waite Road. Ms. Scarlet thinks the property has Conservation value because it is free. Ms. Lochner asked how to get there. Ms. Scarlet said there is a trail to follow from the 4-H camp. This piece of land will not cost the town any money. Ms. Scarlet would recommend that the Commission adopt this piece of land. *A motion was made to research the steps to make a final decision to adopt this piece of land (Lochner/McLaughlin) passed 5/0.*

190 Northwest Road: A three year Extension request was submitted. Ms. Scarlet inspected. The project has not been started. The work is not in the riverfront area. Ms. Scarlet said this one should automatically be extended. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.

200 Northwest Road: Ms. Scarlet inspected. This project does involve work in the riverfront area. Since the project has not been started, the Commission has the right not to grant an Extension. Ms. Scarlet said she has not finished her research. This should be discussed further at the next meeting.

10 Wilson Avenue: A three year Extension request was submitted. The property is on both sides of Wilson Avenue. The project is to install a septic system across the street. The owners haven't had the money to do the project. Ms. Scarlet said the Extension should be granted because they have no choice but to do this project. *A motion to grant a three year Extension (Plant/Rubino) passed 5/0.*

69 Bacon Hill Road: Ms. Scarlet needs an answer from the Commission whether or not her strategy to allow the owner to get across the frozen wetland is acceptable. The owner wants to clean up from logging that was done and from the ice storm. *A motion to ratify Ms. Scarlet's strategy (Lochner/Plant) passed 5/0.*

Site Visits: Site visits have been scheduled for Monday, May 18, 2009. Meet at the Town Hall at 6pm. The addresses to visit are as follows:

- 125 Ash Street, check compliance
- Spencer Abbey Dam, new NOI?
- 37 GH Wilson Road, Enforcement
- 69 East Charlton Road, Enforcement

Warren Snow and Judy Lochner will not be in attendance for the May 27th meeting. Karen Rubino will only be at the meeting from 7:15 until 7:30 p.m. for the voting for Country Spirits.

New Applications: North Spencer Rd., Spencer Abbey Dam, NOI

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 p.m. (Lochner/McLaughlin) passed 5/0.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lisa Daoust, Clerk
Development & Inspectional Services