



MEETING MINUTES  
ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
May 23, 2022

1  
2 Present: Cathy Van Lancker (Chair)  
3 Greg Wands (Vice Chair)  
4 Preston Crow  
5 Carl Hakansson  
6 William Moulton  
7 Gene Crouch  
8 Owen Ackerman  
9  
10 Agent: Becca Solomon

11 **Meeting held by Zoom**  
12 **Call to order: 7:00 P.M.**

13  
14 **Chair Cathy Van Lancker read the Ashland Conservation Commission virtual meeting protocols, and**  
15 **meeting recording announcement.**

16  
17  
18 **Review minutes from 5/9/22**  
19 **5/9/22 Meeting Minutes:**

20 Commission Members reviewed and edited the May 9, 2022 meeting minutes.

21 **Motion:** Mr. Wands motioned to approve the May 9, 2022 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was  
22 seconded by Mr. Crow.

23 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW, CVL).  
24

25 **Legacy Farms, Update**

26 Ms. Solomon summarized that Mr. Bemis was working on revising the stormwater plan and Notice of Intent  
27 for review. At this time no NOI or Stormwater Plan has been brought to Town Management for a signature.  
28 There will be significant changes to the plans, with some being jurisdictional to Hopkinton Conservation  
29 Commission, and some being jurisdictional to Ashland. This would include resizing the basins on the  
30 Hopkinton side, in addition to the original proposal on the Ashland side. The rooftop infiltration is expected  
31 to be changed. Mr. Carter from GCG will be able to summarize the changes at the next meeting. There was  
32 water testing done at five locations. Ms. Solomon summarized the results of the testing. One of the test sites  
33 had manganese 3.5x the EPA limits.  
34

35 Mr. Wands asked if there were other parameters that were high other than manganese. Ms. Solomon noted the  
36 high iron at the Test 3 location. Mr. Wands asked if the manganese levels were caused by earth disturbance.  
37 Ms. Solomon responded without having testing above that location it is difficult to make a determination;  
38 however, as it lowers the further it gets from that location, it is reasonable to suspect it may be related. More  
39 information is needed to determine if it is correlation or causation. Mr. Hakansson asked if by the time that  
40 same sample reached the pumping station it is at normal. Ms. Solomon stated that it was just slightly above  
41 normal.  
42

43 Mr. Crouch asked if the iron and manganese levels were drinking water standards. Ms. Solomon stated she  
44 wasn't sure, as the report only listed them as "EPA Limits", but she believes they were drinking water limits.

45 Mr. Crouch stated that Iron and Manganese are common elements in soil and they contribute to hard water if  
46 there is too much of it. Mr. Crouch stated that the limits were likely drinking water levels not toxicity levels.  
47

48 **No motion was made and no vote was taken.**  
49

50 **Notice of Intent, Andrew Pandolph, 65 Concord Street, DEP File No. 95-967**

51 Mr. Pandolph, Vineyard Engineering, shared the plans and summarized the proposed work. Repairs to the  
52 home began in December 2021, which included replacement of a 7'x19' enclosed porch with a 7'x42' open  
53 sided porch, which created a 177ft<sup>2</sup> of impervious area. Excavation of an existing crawl space to create a  
54 basement, and removal of shingles form the side of the home were also done. An Enforcement Order with a  
55 Cease and Desist was issued for work without Conservation Commission approval within a jurisdictional  
56 area, which required the filing of a Notice of Intent. The property consists of 2.3 acres of land with an  
57 existing single family residence with a driveway and existing lawn and landscaped area. The property is  
58 bound to the North and South by the Sudbury River which runs the entire length of the property. There is  
59 Bank on both the North and South tracks of the Sudbury River, Wooded Deciduous Swamp, 25' No Disturb  
60 Zone and 100' Buffer Zone of those resource areas, Riverfront Area, and Zone AE 100-Year Flood Zone. The  
61 porch that was replaced is located outside the 25' No Disturb Zone. Debris stockpiles were generated during  
62 construction which are within the No Disturb Zone and a roll-off container located within the same area.  
63

64 Mr. Pandolph continued, the exterior work that needs to be done includes installation of vinyl siding, roof  
65 replacement, installation of floor in the porch area consisting of concrete and tile, reseeding of the lawn and  
66 landscaped area in the vicinity of the house, and removal of the debris piles to an offsite disposal facility. A  
67 sump pump is proposed to be installed to maintain a dry basement, with discharge directed to a dry well  
68 which will be located outside the No Disturb Zones. The dry well is not yet designed, but will be in  
69 accordance with the local and state requirements. Additionally, there are two existing 4" subsurface PVC  
70 Pipes extending six feet to the south from the southeastern corner of the house and daylighting on the Bank of  
71 the southern track of the Sudbury River. One is still connected to the roof downspouts; one is believed to be  
72 disconnected. At the southeastern most pipe, and existing basement sump pump discharges into that pipe. The  
73 pipes are stated to have been installed by the previous owner, and the proposed sump pump would not be  
74 connected to these pipes, to avoid increasing the flow. Silt fence is installed as required by the Enforcement  
75 Order, and straw wattles will be installed in addition once they are received by the applicant. Stockpiles are  
76 currently covered with tarps and will be removed one an Order of Conditions is received. The roll off  
77 dumpster will be covered with a tarp when not in use, and will be fully removed when work is complete. The  
78 177ft<sup>2</sup> increase in impervious area is a less that 0.2% increase in impervious area on site, and is not believed  
79 to have any impact on flood storage or surface water runoff.  
80

81 Ms. Van Lancker asked if there would be more work on the basement. Mr. Pandolph responded that the  
82 crawlspace was expanded to the footprint of the home, and is complete with a concrete floor. Mr. Wands  
83 asked if there is data on the groundwater levels beneath the house. Mr. Pandolph stated he didn't have a depth  
84 to the ground water, but the work was completed in January and the property owner has not relayed any  
85 information about flooding issues the existing sump pump has been managing.  
86

87 Mr. Crouch asked Ms. Solomon if work was continuing after the Enforcement Order was issued. Ms.  
88 Solomon clarified that the Enforcement Order was issued on April 1, 2022, there was verbal discussion and  
89 warnings prior in early January. Shortly after those warnings, an engineer had called the Conservation  
90 Department about the site, and realized it was beyond their scope and would help the homeowner find an  
91 engineer who could do the work. Mr. Crouch asked if work was continuing during this time. Ms. Solomon  
92 responded that no exterior work to her knowledge was occurring at that time, and no additional debris piles  
93 were being made. The debris piles had been tarped within 24 hours of the request to do so. Mr. Crouch  
94 summarized that the homeowner was notified in January, and it took an Enforcement Order before a Notice of  
95 Intent was filed, and a Cease and Desist from the Building Inspector. Mr. Crouch asked if there were building  
96 permits. Ms. Solomon responded that some of the work did have permits. Before the Enforcement Order was  
97 issued, the Building Inspector put a hold on all future permits for the property, and the week before this  
98 meeting, a full Cease and Desist was put on the property. Mr. Crouch stated that the requirements for local

99 and state permits was being ignored. The entire site is floodplain and Riverfront Area, and that was being  
100 ignored. Mr. Pandolph responded that they were hired to perform a survey plan shortly after January, and  
101 there was some confusion about what was required by the Commission until he had a conversation with Ms.  
102 Solomon in March, when they began working on the NOI. Mr. Crouch asked if Mr. Pandolph was a registered  
103 engineer. Mr. Pandolph stated that he was just the project manager, but they had an engineer on staff. Mr.  
104 Pandolph stated he was hired as a land surveyor after the fact, and it had not been communicated to them that  
105 a NOI was needed. Ms. Van Lancker stated that the homeowner may not have been aware of the filing  
106 requirements.

107  
108 Mr. Hakansson asked if the homeowner was present on the call. Ms. Van Lancker noted that the homeowner  
109 had a language barrier. Mr. Pandolph added that the language barrier contributed to the issues. Ms. Van  
110 Lancker stated that Mr. Pandolph was the engineer and was representing the homeowner. Mr. Hakansson  
111 stated that he has concerns on how it got to the point it did prior to the Commission being involved. Mr.  
112 Hakansson asked if the applicant was totally unaware of the process that was needed, prior to the Commission  
113 getting involved. Mr. Pandolph responded that they were first hired to do a land survey of the property, and  
114 his understanding at the time, was that it was for an issue with Building permits, not Conservation. Once they  
115 were hired to do the Notice of Intent, that was done. There was some time when it was confusing to the  
116 homeowner as to what was being required. Once they were hired to do the work and provided deadlines, they  
117 met those deadlines.

118  
119 Mr. Moulton asked if a test pit was dug where the dry well was proposed. Mr. Pandolph responded the test pit  
120 was not done yet as it was a last minute addition to the plan, and it will be, but he wanted to get it on the NOI  
121 for the Commission. Mr. Moulton asked if the porch was on sonotube footings. Mr. Pandolph stated that it  
122 was. Mr. Moulton asked if the former porch was on sonotubes. Mr. Pandolph stated that the work was done  
123 prior to his involvement, and that Mr. Souza, the homeowner, may be better able to answer the question. The  
124 debris stockpile at the end of the driveway does have brick and concrete in it, which was presumed to be from  
125 the old porch. Mr. Moulton asked if there was an increase in the number of sonotubes, and if they are sitting  
126 above grade. Mr. Pandolph stated he could find that information but does not have it on hand.

127  
128 Mr. Hakansson asked if there was a determination that the property was not part of the Nyanza Plume. Ms.  
129 Solomon stated she confirmed with the Board of Health using the maps provided by DEP and EPA, and  
130 determined the site was outside of The Plume. Mr. Hakansson stated that his understanding was that the entire  
131 basin of the Sudbury River was the Nyanza site, and if the property is between two branches of the Sudbury  
132 River, it should be somewhat proximate to the Nyanza impact. Mr. Crow responded that the impact was not  
133 the same as the plume. Mr. Hakansson stated that the plume is in the bottom of the River, and requested that  
134 the before the dry well is dug it should be confirmed that it is not within the plume. Mr. Crouch asked if that  
135 area was dug out by EPA and replaced with new material. Mr. Hakansson responded that it was dug out  
136 further down behind Ashland Lumber, where the culvert enters into the Sudbury River, which runs under  
137 downtown Ashland, and is further downstream of this property.

138  
139 Mr. Pandolph circled back to Mr. Moulton's question about the sonotubes and stated that six were used to  
140 construct the new porch, and the old photos porch suggested that it was either a slab on grade porch, or may  
141 have has a frost wall foundation, but it definitely was not on sonotubes. Mr. Crouch asked if the flood plain  
142 conditions had been improved by adding more flood storage under the building. Mr. Pandolph responded he  
143 needed to confirm the previous conditions of the porch prior to making that determination. Mr. Crouch asked  
144 what the property elevation is compared to the floodplain elevation. Mr. Pandolph stated that it was based on  
145 an arbitrary datum of 100, but weren't able to find a benchmark elevation nearby. Mr. Crouch stated that they  
146 need to know how much flood storage is being lost. Mr. Pandolph responded that only 177ft<sup>2</sup> and the  
147 sonotubes are only 12 inches wide, on a 2.3-acre property, so the amount of flood storage that will be lost  
148 will be minimal. Mr. Crouch stated that is not the performance standards that need to be met are not minimal  
149 lost. Mr. Pandolph stated that the porch will have no sides, where the previous one did. Mr. Crouch asked  
150 what the floodplain elevation is.

151

152 Mr. Wands asked if the basement excavation was completed and the materials in the open., and if the  
153 excavation under the house complete. Mr. Pandolph responded that it was, and the exterior work was the  
154 main proposal, with the exception of the sump pump installation. Ms. Van Lancker asked if the deed stated  
155 the property was within Riverfront Area. Mr. Pandolph stated the deed only mentioned the property lines,  
156 with one being the center of the Sudbury River and the other being a “drainage channel”, which was clarified  
157 by Ms. Solomon to actually be another track of the Sudbury River. Mr. Hakansson clarified that the drainage  
158 channel splits from Sudbury River at Mill Pond and drains under Myrtle Street below the factory on Main  
159 Street into the raceway, which connects back to the Sudbury River east of the property, and is technically part  
160 of the Sudbury River.

161  
162 Mr. Moulton asked if the debris piles were sitting on lawn or natural vegetation, and for the restoration of  
163 those areas if they will be restored to lawn or more natural vegetation. Mr. Pandolph stated it was mostly  
164 lawn, and some planting beds. The intent is to rake out and reseed with lawn. Mr. Crouch stated that the town  
165 put a sewer line into the building across the drainage channel for this house. Mr. Crouch added that not only  
166 is the property in Floodplain, which is listed at elevation 184, the entire property is also Floodway. Mr.  
167 Crouch asked if the footprint of the porch was extended. Mr. Pandolph confirmed. Mr. Crouch stated that as  
168 the work is within Floodway, it requires a No Rise Certificate, as a potential obstruction is being constructed  
169 within Floodway. FEMA regulations require changes to a Floodway to have a No Rise Certificate. Mr.  
170 Crouch clarified that the Conservation Commission does not regulate the No Rise Certificate, as that is  
171 FEMA’s jurisdiction. Mr. Crow stated that with the open sides it should be fairly easy to get that. Mr. Crouch  
172 agreed, but stated that it needs to be proven.

173  
174 Mr. Crow asked if there has been Peer Review. Ms. Solomon stated that it hadn’t been asked for at this time,  
175 but if the Commission requests it, it would be arranged. Mr. Crow stated that it seems like the main changes  
176 are the porch and the drywell, as well as construction impacts from the roof, siding, and waste removal. The  
177 history of the project is making it seem more complicated than it actually is. Mr. Moulton stated that more  
178 information is still needed before the Commission can close the hearing.

179  
180 Mr. Morgan, 136 Concord Street, stated that he has routinely seen work continuing on the site without  
181 mitigations after the Enforcement Order. A silt fence has been installed recently, but it did not happen for  
182 months. Mr. Morgan continued, that it is floodplain, and the entire project is within a controlled zone at  
183 federal, state, and local level. Mr. Morgan felt the homeowner was trying to avoid a historic teardown, the  
184 house is listed with the Massachusetts Register of historic places. Ms. Van Lancker stated that the historic  
185 register was not jurisdictional to the Conservation Commission. Mr. Morgan stated that he felt the OUs for  
186 Nyanza Plume included this property. Mr. Morgan stated that the drainage channel runs up to the cemetery,  
187 there’s always been water flow and there are some cross flows, and felt the digging should be removed and  
188 remediated.

189  
190 Mr. Crow asked if there would need to be any special treatment of the materials taken off site. Ms. Van  
191 Lancker asked Mr. Pandolph to reach out to DEP and determine what controls if any are required to happen in  
192 regard to the Nyanza Plume, and to determine the floodplain and property elevations. Ms. Van Lancker  
193 continued that the test pit for the sump pump needs to be done, and the FEMA requirements for work in  
194 Floodway need to be determined.

195  
196 Mr. Pandolph asked the hearing be continued to the June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2022 meeting.

197  
198 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to continue the hearing to June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 7:15pm. This motion was  
199 seconded by Mr. Crow.

200 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. Rollcall vote: Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW, CVL).

201  
202 **Aggregate Industries, Andrew Seaha, Minor Plan Change Request, DEP File No. 95-956**

203 Mr. Seaha stated the project had previously been issued an Order of Conditions last fall. The request is to  
204 rotate a bin ramp 90°, which will not increase disturbance to the buffer zone, but may increase truck traffic in  
205 the buffer zone. Ms. Wilson, shared a plan showing the existing conditions and the proposed changes. The

206 ramp would and bins would be rotated so the aggregate bins will be closer to the tank location, rather than the  
207 resource area. Additionally, proposed stock bins that were partly within jurisdictional area, would not be  
208 constructed, and would be maintained as stockpiles, as they currently are. There would be no impact to  
209 stormwater. Mr. Hakansson stated that the Commission was deliberating in other agenda items, what was  
210 considered a minor change, and what was not. Mr. Hakansson felt this may require an Amended Order. Mr.  
211 Crouch asked where the 100' buffer zone was. Ms. Wilson highlighted the marking. Mr. Crouch asked the  
212 purpose of removing the bins. Mr. Seaha clarified that they did not need the bins to separate the aggregate.  
213 Mr. Crouch asked what size truck will be using the ramp. Mr. Seaha stated it would just be a loader, that they  
214 already use in the area. Mr. Crow stated that if the first plan had been completely built, and then an RDA was  
215 submitted for the proposed change and a negative determination would be issued, it should be a minor  
216 change, and if a positive determination would be issued, it should be an Amended Order. Mr. Hakansson  
217 agreed, but stated that the Commission needs to be consistent on how they rule on minor changes. Mr. Crow  
218 agreed that the Commission should set standards. Mr. Seaha clarified that the approved layout had concern  
219 from the Commissioners at the time about aggregate falling over the berm and into the resource area, and the  
220 rotation would prevent that. Mr. Hakansson stated that what was before them was whether the change was  
221 major or minor. Ms. Van Lancker agreed, and added that evaluating whether the impact changed was  
222 important to consider. Mr. Hakansson stated that most of these changes are going to be improvements, but the  
223 Commission still needs to determine if the change is a minor change. Mr. Hakansson pointed out that the  
224 changes at the Public Safety Building was a positive change, but was not minor. Mr. Crouch clarified the  
225 Commission had asked for an Amended Order in that situation. Ms. Van Lancker asked if this change should  
226 be an Amended Order.

227  
228 Mr. Wands stated the change was only in orientation, there's no change in the footprint, or added  
229 construction. Mr. Hakansson responded that they are removing bins and replacing them with stockpiles. Mr.  
230 Seaha stated the bins on the ramp are still the same, and the others being removed are outside of the 100-foot  
231 buffer zone. The ramp and the associated bins are the same size, just rotated. Mr. Moulton asked if the bins  
232 not being constructed already had stockpiles there. Mr. Seaha said the stockpiled material is currently kept  
233 across the street. Mr. Ackerman asked if the stockpiles would have a chance of run-off into the resource area  
234 without the bins. Ms. Wilson responded that the stormwater design pre- and post- construction is designed to  
235 flow to sump area and infiltration basin, so nothing will leave the site. Mr. Crouch asked what the stockpiled  
236 material consisted of. Mr. Seaha stated that it was crushed stone.

237  
238  
239 **Motion:** Mr. Wands motioned to accept the minor plan change for Aggregate Industries, DEP File Number  
240 95-0956. This motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

241 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. Rollcall vote: Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW, CVL).

242  
243 **Notice of Intent, Matt Lundsted, 0 Aikens Road, Sudbury River Access Facility, DEP File No. 95-966**

244 Mr. Lundsted summarized the discussions of the last hearing and the site visit. Work was partly within  
245 Floodway was removed from the plans by shrinking the Fishing Area to prevent any changes in slope to the  
246 peninsula. The Southborough Conservation Commission and Abutters were notified, and the same for  
247 Hopkinton. Table 3 showing the Compensatory Flood Storage was revised to be more clear.

248  
249 Mr. Crouch clarified that the grading off the fishing platform was removed from the plan.

250  
251 Mr. Smithson, 2 Aikens Road, Hopkinton, stated that a lot of people go down the road to bypass the  
252 Hopkinton State Park, and was concerned that these people may take up spaces before the intended users  
253 show up. Mr. Smithson asked if there was a way to monitor it. Mr. Lundsted stated that he can't speak for  
254 sure the Office of Boating and Fishing Access, but they could discuss signing. The intent is for the parking  
255 area to be accessible access to the path, and maybe a sign will be placed saying such. Mr. Lundsted stated he  
256 is not sure how the Hopkinton State Park manages the issue on their end. Mr. Smithson asked how canoes and  
257 kayakers are going to access the River with the tree down blocking access just down the river from the  
258 proposed launch. Mr. Smithson asked if the tree would be removed for access. Ms. Van Lancker asked who  
259 manages the issue. Mr. Lundsted responded that the Office of Fishing and Boating Access would not be

260 responsible for that, and there are many stakeholders that would have a say. Mr. Smithson added that there  
261 was beaver activity historically, and recalled when a beaver dam was washed out the water level in that area  
262 drastically dropped. Mr. Lundsted noted that beaver activity was noted during the site visit.  
263

264 **Motion:** Mr. Wands motioned to close the hearing for DEP File Number 95- 966. This motion was seconded  
265 by Mr. Crow.

266 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: Rollcall vote: OA, PC, CH, GC, WM, GW, CVL).  
267

268 The Commission reviewed and edited the draft conditions for the Order of Conditions presented by Ms.  
269 Solomon.  
270

271 **Motion:** Mr. Wands motioned to approve the Order of Conditions with special conditions as stated for DEP  
272 File Number 95-966. This motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

273 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: Rollcall vote: OA, PC, CH, GC, WM, GW, CVL).  
274  
275

### 276 **Discussion, Minor Plan Change, Standards**

277 Ms. Solomon stated that the DEP Policy referenced at the last meeting was not actually for minor plan  
278 changes, but in regard to changes in plans during an appeal process; however, it did contain some language  
279 that may be useful. Ms. Solomon read the language as stated regarding the definition of substantial and  
280 insubstantial plan changes, with the burden of proof being on the applicant. Ms. Solomon summarized  
281 Rockport’s Minor Amendment Policy, and Ipswich’s Minor Project Change Policy. Mr. Crouch stated the  
282 Ipswich Policy was not a “minor modification” but rather if it’s minor and Amended Order will be granted.  
283 Ms. Van Lancker asked if the Commission wanted to allow Minor Modifications. Mr. Crouch stated part of  
284 the Amended Order process is so neighbors and abutters know what is being done. Mr. Hakansson state he  
285 felt this is being set up for making arbitrary decisions if there isn’t some consistency. Mr. Hakansson stated it  
286 was similar to a previous concern with Emergency Certifications being used on trees that weren’t  
287 emergencies. The Commission should be able to look at a project 10 years later and determine if looks the  
288 same as approved. Mr. Crouch stated the Rockport policy had rules for how a determination is made. Ms.  
289 Solomon added that Town Counsel advised if the Commission wanted to make a formal process, it could be  
290 added to the regulations as long as the Commission had a public hearing first. Mr. Crouch clarified that it  
291 could be codified in the regulations rather than having to go back to Town Meeting to revise the entire Bylaw.  
292 Mr. Crow felt having a Minor Modification policy would be useful, and help save residents from going  
293 through extra rigmarole when things really are minor. Mr. Hakansson felt if it was just someone putting up a  
294 fence, that would be one thing, but that’s not always the case. Having a set of rules or guidelines to steer the  
295 Commission in the right direction takes the arbitrariness out of it. Mr. Moulton asked what would be  
296 considered a minor change, if an applicant had ½ inch stone to cover an area, and they change it 1½ inch  
297 stone, that’s a change. Ms. Van Lancker referenced the Rockport example, which stated that purpose and  
298 intended use of the project should not change. Mr. Moulton brought the same up about orientation. If it’s a  
299 square and you rotate it 90° is that change if it’s in the same footprint. Mr. Hakansson referred back to the  
300 Aggregate Industries Plan change approved earlier in the meeting and questioned how a minor plan change  
301 shows no impact to stormwater and erosion. Ms. Van Lancker stated for the Aggregate Industry item the  
302 drainage was addressed. Mr. Moulton said one bin was rotated, the rest were removed from the plan. Mr.  
303 Crouch clarified the bin is actually more of a hopper that connects to conveyor, it’s not for storage. Mr.  
304 Hakansson felt the Commission needed more guidance to eliminate the chance of acting arbitrarily, and to  
305 streamline the discussion. Ms. Van Lancker suggested she work with Ms. Solomon to write up a draft to look  
306 at for the following meeting. Mr. Moulton suggested checking the Massachusetts Association of Conservation  
307 Commissions (MAACC) for additional guidance.  
308

309 **No motion was made and no vote was taken.**  
310

### 311 **Meeting Adjournment:**

312 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

313 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. Rollcall vote: Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW, CVL).

314  
315 The meeting was adjourned at 9:08p.m.  
316

317 **Documents reviewed by the Conservation Commission on 5/23/2022**

- 318 ● Document entitled, *Agenda, dated 5/23/2022*
- 319 ● Document entitled, *Meeting Minutes, dated 5/9/2022*
- 320 ● Document entitled, *WPA Form 3- Notice of Intent 65 Concord Street*
- 321 ● Document entitled, *65 Concord Street Proximity to Nyanza Plume*
- 322 ● Email Correspondence entitled, *65 Concord Street, dated 5/4/2022*
- 323 ● Document entitled, *65 Concord Street Violation Ticket, dated 5/5/2022*
- 324 ● Document entitled, *Notification to Abutters 65 Concord Street, dated 5/3/2022*
- 325 ● Document entitled, *NOI Addendum 64 Concord Street, dated 5/12/2022*
- 326 ● Email Correspondence entitled, *65 Concord Street Update, dated 5/5/2022*
- 327 ● Email Correspondence entitled, *re: Construction on Concord St dated 5/4/2022*
- 328 ● Plans entitled, *65 Concord Street, dated 4/25/2022*
- 329 ● Document entitled, *2 Aikens Road Certified Mail Receipt, dated 5/12/2022*
- 330 ● Document entitled, *Draft Conditions Aikens Road*
- 331 ● Document entitled, *Notice of Intent for Aikens Road, revised 4/22/2022*
- 332 ● Plans entitled, *Sudbury River Access Facility, revised 4/22/2022*
- 333 ● Document entitled, *Hopkinton Abutters, dated 4/28/2022*
- 334 ● Document entitled, *Southborough Agent Notification, dated 4/19/2022*
- 335 ● Document entitled, *Revised Table 3, Aikens Road*
- 336 ● Document entitled, *Revised Section B WPA Form 2, Aikens Road*
- 337 ● Document entitled, *Water Quality Analysis Exhibit, Legacy Farms, dated 4/25/2022*
- 338 ● Document entitled, *Aggregate Industries Plan Change Request Letter, dated 5/12/2022*
- 339 ● Plans entitled, *Aggregate Industries Plan Change Request Plans, dated 5/12/2022*
- 340 ● Document entitled, *Wetlands Program Policy 91-1: Plan Changes, revised March 1, 1995*
- 341 ● Document entitled, *Rockport Conservation Commission Policy: Amending a Final Order of*
- 342 *Conditions*
- 343 ● Document entitled, *Ipswich FAW Minor Project Change*