



Town of Ashland

MASSACHUSETTS

MEETING MINUTES
ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION
July 11, 2022

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Present: Greg Wands (Vice Chair)
Gene Crouch
Carl Hakansson
William Moulton
Owen Ackerman

Absent: Cathy Van Lancker (Chair)
Preston Crow

Agent: Becca Solomon

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

Vice Chair Greg Wands read the Ashland Conservation Commission virtual meeting protocols, and meeting recording announcement.

Request for Determination of Applicability, George Medri, 80 Oregon Road, Sewage Disposal System Replacement

Mr. Gemma, Metrowest Engineering, summarized the proposal to replace an existing sewage disposal system at 80 Oregon Road. There is Bordering Vegetated Wetland and intermittent stream to the west of the work site. Mr. Gemma showed the wetlands on the plan. There is one leaching line in the 100-foot buffer zone at approximately 94 feet from the wetland edge. Erosion Control is proposed as shown on the plan at limit of work.

Mr. Moulton asked what the depth to ground water was. Mr. Gemma responded the depth to ground water was 3½ to 4 feet. Soils are tight basal till. It's a fairly large system for the size of the home. Mr. Moulton asked if the leaching field would be raised. Mr. Gemma confirmed. Mr. Moulton asked for clarification on the access. Mr. Gemma clarified that access is from the existing paved driveway of the abutting property. Mr. Moulton asked if there would be any stockpiling. Mr. Gemma responded that everything should be removed as it is excavated. If stockpiling is necessary, the east side of the property could be cleared. The majority of the site is brush, there are not many significant trees. Mr. Hakansson clarified the location of the property.

Mr. Crouch asked if Ms. Solomon had visited the site and reviewed the wetland boundaries. Ms. Solomon confirmed and continued that the vast majority of the site was shrubs, with invasive oriental bittersweet and Japanese knotweed present. The area was overgrown garden, and the majority was raspberries, blackberries, and grapevine outside of the invasive plants. The delineations appeared accurate, but was not possible to accurately measure the distance with tape due to the overgrowth. Visually the distance shown on the plans appeared accurate. Mr. Crouch asked Ms. Solomon if she had viewed the isolated wetland in

44 the rear of the property. Mr. Solomon responded she had not gone out the isolated wetland at the time of
45 the visit due to the overgrowth. The majority of the site was overgrown, and some was cleared for the test
46 pits. Mr. Gemma clarified it was a depression of about 150 square feet that the botanist felt had some
47 wetland characteristics to it, but had no inlet or outlet. Mr. Gemma stated the work is about 65 feet off the
48 limits of the isolated wetland.

49

50 Mr. Crouch asked if the erosion controls continued in that area. Mr. Gemma stated there was an existing hill
51 located between the work and the isolated wetland. Mr. Crouch clarified that the driveway was between
52 the wetland and the work, and is an active driveway. Mr. Gemma confirmed. Mr. Crouch stated if the
53 erosion controls failed and went across the driveway it would be reported fairly quickly.

54

55 Mr. Wands recommended a condition for daily inspections of the erosion control. Mr. Gemma stated the
56 contractor could take daily photos and email them to Ms. Solomon. Mr. Crouch agreed with the idea. Mr.
57 Moulton asked if the erosion control would be straw wattles. Mr. Gemma stated the erosion control would
58 be 12" filter mitt. Ms. Solomon shared photos of the existing conditions.

59

60 Mr. Wands summarized the proposed conditions, the contractor will submit daily photos of the erosion
61 control, the erosion control will consist of filter mitts. Erosion control would be installed as shown on the
62 approved plans.

63

64 **Motion:** Mr. Ackerman motioned to issue a negative 3 determinations with conditions as stated. The
65 motion was seconded by Mr. Moulton.

66 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

67

68

69 **Request for Amended Order of Conditions, Nitsch Engineering, 90 Concord Street, DEP File No. 95-958**

70

71 Mr. Gentilucci, Nitsch Engineering, summarize the amendment request for drainage improvements at the
72 David Mindess School located at 90 Concord Street. The original order was issued in 2021, which had a
73 condition to conduct additional test pits for Subsurface Infiltration System #4 (SIS#4). Two test pits marked
74 on the plan as TP201 and TP202 were conducted and found to have seasonal ground water at elevation 198,
75 which was slightly higher than expected. To accommodate the requirement of 2-foot separation to seasonal
76 high ground water, SIS#4 was shifted north and raised 1.2 feet. The infiltration basin to the south west was
77 also raised from 199 to 200 elevation to accommodate the seasonal high ground water. Because of the
78 raised elevation of SIS#4, the catch basins to the south could no longer drain to SIS#4. The catch basins will
79 be tied directly to the closed drainage system. Mr. Gentilucci showed Table 3 of the Stormwater Report,
80 noting the changes to Design Point B (DP-B). The proposed conditions will still be below the existing peak
81 rates of runoff.

82

83 Mr. Crouch asked if at least one of the test pits was still within the area of the new proposed footprint. Mr.
84 Gentilucci confirmed. Mr. Crouch if the raise in elevation of the system will affect the parking lot. Mr.
85 Gentilucci stated it doesn't. Half of the main parking lot drains to the main system to the south and no grade
86 changes are proposed. Mr. Crouch asked if the catch basins being redirected are going through a water
87 quality unit. Mr. Gentilucci confirmed. Mr. Crouch asked what credit was being claimed and what type of
88 unit was being proposed. Mr. Gentilucci responded they were claiming 25% for pre-treatment and 80% for
89 all water quality structures on site, with some not draining into any recharge BMPs. Catch basins that were
90 too low in elevation to drain into any of the surface or subsurface basins, and will be provided deep sump
91 catch basins with water quality structures sized based on a one-inch standard. Mr. Gentilucci continued that
92 they were unable to specify one manufacturer because it is a public project. Mr. Gentilucci believes they are
93 Contech units. Mr. Crouch stated MassDEP does not allow claiming 80% for a water quality unit, for some
94 they allow 77% and only after evaluating the manufacturer's materials. Mr. Crouch asked if there was any

95 way to get the catch basins to drain into the surface basin. Mr. Gentilucci stated the catch basins are at
96 approximately elevation 200, and the bottom of the surface basin is the same. There is no way to pipe the
97 structures. Mr. Crouch asked if the basin at the front of the property is a lower elevation. Mr. Gentilucci
98 confirmed, but stated that the volume is already maxed out and there isn't enough room on site to make it
99 larger without expanding into the front yard setback and major regrading.

100
101 Mr. Moulton asked if the amendment was being peer reviewed by GCG. Ms. Solomon stated it had not at
102 this time, but could be done. Mr. Hakansson stated that there were comments from the Town Engineer. Mr.
103 White, Town Engineer, stated he had questions regarding the increased flow to DP-B, which is the
104 connection to Concord Street. Mr. White recommended peer review be done.

105
106 Mr. White asked if there was an increase on Table 6 of the Stormwater Report. Mr. Gentilluci responded
107 that Table 3, discussed earlier, was strictly peak run off rates, and Table 6 is runoff volumes. The volumes
108 are still less than existing. Calculations were re-run for all design points. Changes are highlighted. There was
109 a decrease in the 100-year storm and event and that is still the case. There was an error in Table 6
110 previously that showed a higher value for the 100-year storm, which was corrected in the new report. Mr.
111 White clarified that the peak flow rates are decreased for all designed storms, but more volume will be sent
112 out to Concord Street. Mr. Gentilluci confirmed. Mr. White asked if a volume assessment was completed for
113 the closed drainage system for Concord Street. Mr. Gentilluci said that a full analysis had not been done, but
114 they did look at everything flowing to that system in the existing conditions, and tried to mitigate volume
115 based on that.

116
117 Mr. Crouch stated that there was an increase by more than double for the 1-inch storm, however, the rate is
118 less, indicating there will be increased runoff for a longer period of time. If the rate is going down the water
119 is being delayed going into the system and how long it takes to go through the system. The storm drainage
120 systems will be growing longer than currently. Mr. Gentilluci agreed with the assessment. The water would
121 be slowly released to a stream via culvert. Mr. Crouch asked Mr. White who maintains the drainage systems
122 on school properties. Mr. White stated it was split with Facilities, but general maintenance and cleaning was
123 typically DPW. Mr. Crouch asked if DPW was familiar with water quality units and cleaning them. Mr. White
124 stated they hadn't cleaned one yet, but were familiar, and does have access to a vac-truck for cleaning. Mr.
125 Hakansson asked if the Commission should discuss if a peer review should be completed. Ms. Solomon
126 stated the original NOI was peer reviewed by GCG. It is up to the Commission if they would want another
127 peer review.

128
129 Mr. Kendall, Building Committee Chair, asked Mr. Gentillucci the original Tables of the Stormwater Report,
130 and show the changes from the approved design and amended design, instead of the changes from the
131 existing conditions to the amended design. Mr. Gentilluci presented a side by side of the tables and
132 summarized the differences. Mr. Crouch stated that the letter showed a reduction in system volume from
133 12,124ft³ to 10,250ft³ under SIS#4. Mr. Crouch asked if that related to DP-B. Mr. Gentillucci confirmed. The
134 change is a result of SIS#4 being reduced in size. Mr. Crouch clarified that the reduction in the volume of the
135 system is related to the runoff volume. Mr. Crouch stated the rates are decreasing, which is what the
136 Wetlands Protection Act requires to be reviewed.

137
138 Mr. Quinlan, Compass Project Management, referred back to previous questions and stated the approved
139 product for water quality structure is HydroInternational First Defense. Mr. Quinlan continued that the
140 changes are relatively minor and felt an extended peer review would slow the project down and cause
141 additional costs to the town.

142
143 Mr. Wands asked if a Peer Review was necessary, or if the Commission was satisfied with the volumes and
144 recharge. Mr. Crouch asked how long a review would take of the system. Ms. Solomon it would depend on

145 how many other projects were currently being reviewed. Mr. Wands stated he was inclined to ask for a peer
146 review. Mr. Moulton agreed. Mr. Crouch asked if GCG could be asked to expedite the peer review.
147
148 Mr. Small, Ashland DPW Director, stated that the work on the project so far has been excellent.
149
150 Mr. Quinlan asked if the Commission could consider an off-cycle meeting if a quick response from GCG was
151 possible. Ms. Solomon stated that the Commission will need to state a date and time the hearing is being
152 continued to in the motion. Without knowing when the peer review would come in, the options are to
153 continue to the next meeting or choose a date and plan for the hearing to be on that date whether the peer
154 review is complete or not. Mr. Quinlan stated that they would request continuance to the next regular
155 meeting with that in mind.
156
157 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to continue the hearing to July 25, 2022 at 7:05pm. The motion was
158 seconded by Mr. Ackerman.
159 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).
160
161
162 **Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation, Susan McArthur, 0 Prospect Street, DEP File No. 95-969**
163 Ms. Solomon stated the applicant had requested a continuance to July 25, 2022
164
165 **Motion:** Mr. Crouch motioned to continue the hearing to July 25, 2022 at 7:05pm. The motion was
166 seconded by Mr. Ackerman.
167 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).
168
169 Ms. Mimms, 20 Raymond Way, asked when the continuance was asked for. Ms. Solomon stated the
170 applicant made a verbal request during the site visit on June 30, 2022 and again by email when the agenda
171 was sent out, as revised plan would not be able to be submitted in time for the current hearing date. When
172 the Commission has a public hearing and they motion to continue that hearing, they must state the specific
173 date and time the hearing is being continued to. If a request for continuance is made after that, it still needs
174 to appear on the agenda so the Commission can make to vote to grant the continuance, so abutters are
175 aware of when the item will be discussed.
176
177 **Notice of Intent, Andrew Pandolph, 65 Concord Street, DEP File No. 95-967**
178 Ms. Wands stated the applicant had requested a continuance to August 22, 2022.
179
180 **Motion:** Mr. Crouch motioned to continue the hearing to August 22, 2022 at 7:05pm. The motion was
181 seconded by Mr. Moulton.
182 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).
183
184 **Emergency Certification, Evan White, E. Union Street and Nikkie Terrace, Emergency Culvert Repair**
185 Mr. White explained he had come before the Commission previously to make a sidewalk passable where a
186 sinkhole had been created by this culvert. After the temporary repairs, the culvert had been inspected. The
187 culvert is a 24-inch corrugated metal culvert. The floor of the culvert is gone, and the culvert is deformed
188 and pulling away. The roof of the culvert is significantly deteriorated. A structural assessment was provided.
189 Mr. White expressed that the culvert was an imminent danger to public safety if not corrected.
190
191 Mr. Crouch asked if the culvert is under East Union Street or Nikkie Terrace. Mr. White explained that the
192 culvert takes flow from a stream off of East Union Street and goes to a structure at the end of Nikkie Terrace
193 where it turns to the corner of East Union and Nikkie Terrace and discharges to a wetland system. The
194 structure where it turns is a newer pre-cast concrete structure. The pipe leaving that structure is newer than
195 the one entering it. Mr. White speculated that the old culvert was connected to a new development. Mr.

196 Crouch asked if the pipe was being crushed. Mr. White stated it is significantly deformed. It is a slow
197 crushing process, and seeing the deterioration of the roof causes concerns about collapse. Mr. Crouch asked
198 if it was being replaced with an HDPE pipe. Mr. White confirmed, the existing 24-inch metal corrugated pipe
199 will be replaced with a 24-inch HDPE pipe. Mr. Crouch asked if there was flow through the pipe currently.
200 Mr. White said he had not been out recently, but he did not believe so. There was a slow trickle before, and
201 now we are in a drought. Mr. Crouch said it would be best to do the work while there is no flow. Mr. White
202 agreed.

203

204 Mr. Wands clarified it will be a separate Emergency Certification from the first one in the area. Ms. Solomon
205 clarified the first Emergency Certification was only to make the sidewalk safely passable, and this one is for
206 the culvert itself.

207 Mr. Crouch asked for the culvert to be set at the same inverts as the old culverts so there is no lip at the
208 inlet or drop at the outlet, so that the culvert is flush with the stream bed. Mr. White confirmed that was
209 the plan.

210

211 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson motioned to issue an Emergency Certification with conditions as stated. The
212 motion was seconded by Mr. Moulton.

213 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

214

215

216 **Discussion and Possible Vote, 50 Megunko Road, Chris Kotsiopoulos, Enforcement Order, Request to**
217 **Extend Stockpile Removal Deadline**

218 Ms. Solomon summarized that the original Request for Determination (RDA) for the address stated that the
219 stockpiles on site would be removed by July 15, 2022. An Enforcement Order was issued the month prior as
220 additional material was brought in, in violation of the RDA. The Enforcement Order required amongst other
221 conditions, that the stockpiles be removed by July 15th. Mr. Kotsiopoulos requested the extension of the
222 deadline, as the material cannot be removed before it. Mr. Kotsiopoulos stated that additional material had
223 to be brought in to sell the material. Mr. Kotsiopoulos, has since pulled the material away from the
224 perimeter berm and sprayed it with hydro seed. The berm is protecting the wetlands. The stockpile needs to
225 be removed for aesthetics for the Planning Board. Mr. Moulton stated there was material that had gone
226 over the berm. Mr. Kotsiopoulos disputed that material had overtopped the berm. Mr. Moulton stated an
227 RDA was filed stating the stockpile would be removed by July 15th, 2022 and more material was then
228 brought in. Mr. Kotsiopoulos stated he did not bring in more material. Ms. Solomon screen-shared the
229 photos presented when the Enforcement Order was issued. Mr. Kotsiopoulos stated that some rocks may
230 have gone in, but contested there was no damage to the wetland. Mr. Hakansson asked Ms. Solomon when
231 she had last been on the site. Ms. Kotsiopoulos stated Ms. Solomon was out at noon the day after the silt
232 fence was supposed to be installed. Ms. Solomon stated the original Enforcement Order was issued on June
233 13th and set the deadline for erosion control installation as June 15th at noon, and asked Ms. Solomon to go
234 out at 1:00pm to confirm erosion control was installed. Ms. Kotsiopoulos stated he installed the erosion
235 control after receiving the fine. Ms. Solomon responded to Mr. Hakansson's question stating she had been
236 on site last was on June 16th when the silt fence was installed, and since has done drive-by visits as the
237 stockpiles are visible from the road.

238

239 Mr. Hakansson asked when the picture was taken that was submitted before the meeting. Mr. Kotsiopoulos
240 stated it was taken the week prior. Mr. Hakansson asked if any more material would be brought in. Mr.
241 Kotsiopoulos stated the material was too large and they had to bring in a crusher and bring in material to
242 make 2-inch dense grade material, but that's done, and now they will only be removing material. Mr.
243 Hakansson asked Ms. Solomon to inspect the site periodically and to grant an extension for thirty days. Mr.
244 Kotsiopoulos stated thirty days was not enough time to remove the material. Mr. Crouch asked how long it
245 would take to remove the material. Mr. Kotsiopoulos stated it would take a few months. There is 20,000
246 tons of material on site right now, and its good material, but he needs buyers. Mr. Crouch asked if any part

247 of the property is not within buffer zone. Ms. Solomon stated there is a small section near the front of the
248 property that is not jurisdictional. Mr. Crouch stated if the material is moved to a place that is outside of the
249 buffer zone then it is outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, but it seemed like there was too much
250 material to not be in jurisdiction. Mr. Kotsiopoulos stated that he felt the stockpiles were outside the buffer
251 zone. Mr. Crouch stated that if the material is outside the buffer zone it can be kept there as far as
252 Conservation is concerned. Ms. Solomon shared the RDA plans showing the buffer zone and location of the
253 piles at the time. Ms. Solomon highlighted the 100-foot buffer zone. Mr. Crouch asked when the plan was
254 dated. Ms. Solomon responded it was dated December 2018 and the piles were drawn over it for the RDA
255 submission.

256
257 Mr. Hakansson recommended extending the deadline, by 60 days, and as long as there has been a good
258 faith effort to remove the material it can be extended again. Mr. Hakansson asked that Ms. Solomon visit
259 the property periodically to ensure the wetlands continue to be protected, and if the material is not
260 removed in 60 days the Commission will re-visit it again.

261
262 Ms. Moulton asked Ms. Solomon to document the piles now and at each visit after. Ms. Solomon asked the
263 Commission how often they wanted the visits to be. Mr. Hakansson responded that a visit should be done
264 during the week, and then once every two weeks after.

265
266 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson motioned extend the stockpile removal deadline within the Enforcement Order by
267 60 days from the July 15th. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crouch.

268 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

269
270

271 **Discussion, 171 Prospect Street, Wetlands Violation**

272 Ms. Solomon summarized that she had been asked to the property by the Board of Health to confirm
273 proximity of a chicken coop to a wetland. It was found the coop was within 20 feet of the coop, and had
274 been constructed without Conservation of Board of Health approval. Ms. Solomon later had gone out to the
275 area for a boundary inspection of Warren Woods after reports of encroachment, and found material had
276 been left in or near the wetlands edge., though not believed to be encroaching into Warren Woods. There
277 was firewood near the wetland edge, lawn clippings, and other landscape debris, some of which was in the
278 wetland itself and some were within the no disturb zone. Board of Health also asked the Conservation
279 Commission if they would want the chicken coop moved outside the no disturb zone.

280

281 Ms. Crispin, 171 Prospect Street, stated that the material in the wetland is being removed. Mr. Crouch asked
282 if Ms. Solomon if an Enforcement Order had been issued. Ms. Solomon responded she had not, because of
283 the multiple facets involved. Mr. Crouch asked if the material was put in by Ms. Crispin. Ms. Crispin
284 confirmed and stated there was n line showing where the wetlands began. Ms. Solomon added there is a
285 boundary marker for Warren Woods, but there is no 25-foot no disturb markers installed on the property.

286

287 Mr. Crouch asked that Ms. Solomon perform a follow-up inspection once the material is removed from the
288 site. Ms. Crispin asked if the chicken coop needs to be moved or if they can be left where they are. Mr.
289 Crouch asked where the coop was. Ms. Solomon stated it was within 20 feet of the wetland in an area that
290 was partly within lawn and partly wooded area. Mr. Crouch stated that the issue with the proximity to the
291 wetland is the Board of Health bylaw, but the Conservation Commission would want the coop outside the
292 25-foot no disturb zone. Mr. Wands agreed.

293

294 Ms. Solomon asked if the Commission needs a separate permit filing for moving the coop elsewhere in
295 buffer zone. Mr. Crouch said it would be at least an RDA. Mr. Hakansson agreed and stated the Board of
296 Health bylaw is stricter than the Conservation Commission. Mr. Moulton asked if Ms. Crispin had installed
297 the chicken coop. Ms. Crispin confirmed. Ms. Solomon shared a satellite image of the property, and

298 highlighted roughly where the chicken coop was located. Mr. Wands asked how readily moveable the coop
299 was, and if it was prefab or built on site. Ms. Crispin stated the coop was built on site.

300
301 Mr. Hakansson asked that an RDA be filed, and that Ms. Solomon work with the Board of Health to ensure
302 their requirements are within the wetland regulations.

303
304 **No motion was made and no vote was taken.**

305
306
307 **Review minutes from 6/27/22**

308 **6/27/22 Meeting Minutes:**

309 Commission Members reviewed and edited the June 27, 2022 meeting minutes.

310
311 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to approve the June 27, 2022 meeting minutes as amended. The motion
312 was seconded by Mr. Hakansson.

313 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

314
315

316 **Discussion and Vote on Appointments for Land Stewardship Committee**

317 Mr. Hakansson stated that everyone currently on the committee is interested in being re-appointed. The
318 appointments all expire in August 2022.

319
320 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to re-appoint Carl Hakansson, Greg Wands, Gene Crouch, Marcia Reni, and
321 Cliff Wilson to the Land Stewardship committee for a three-year term. The motion was seconded by Mr.
322 Ackerman.

323 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

324
325

326 **Discussion and Vote on Recommendations for Re-Appointment to Conservation Commission**

327 Ms. Solomon summarized that both Ms. Van Lancker and Carl Hakansson had terms expiring in August 2022.
328 Ms. Solomon stated she was asked by Ms. Van Lancker to add this item to the agenda to vote on a re-
329 appointment recommendation. Mr. Hakansson clarified that the Select Board had been discussing changing
330 the re-appointment process, but a recommendation has never been required in the past.

331 **Motion:** Mr. Moulton motioned to recommend the re-appointment of Catherine Van Lancker and Carl
332 Hakansson to the Conservation Commission for a three-year term. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crouch.

333 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

334
335

336 **Discussion of Minor Modification Standards**

337 Ms. Solomon summarized the changes to the draft standards provided at the previous meeting. The
338 Commission reviewed and edited the draft.

339
340 Ms. Solomon asked if the Commission wanted to continue reviewing the draft, or to move forwards. Mr.
341 Hakansson felt it should go to a public hearing at some point. Mr. Crouch asked if the proposal was to
342 amend the regulations. Ms. Solomon responded that when it was first discussed, it was brought up as either
343 a policy or as an amendment to the regulations. Mr. Hakansson felt that keeping the standards as a policy
344 was preferable. Mr. Crouch agreed, and stated that it can still be presented to the public at a meeting and
345 then be enacted as policy for future Minor Modification Requests. Ms. Solomon asked the Commission if
346 they would want the agenda item posted as a public hearing to notify residents or to post it as a general
347 discussion item. Mr. Crouch stated that it should be a general discussion item. Mr. Hakansson agreed. The
348 Commission discussed the meeting schedule, and determined to discuss the draft further at a later meeting.

349 Mr. Ackerman felt waiting longer would allow the commission to apply some case studies to see how the
350 standards work. Mr. Hakansson proposed having it on a meeting in September. Ms. Solomon stated there is
351 a meeting on September 12 and on September 26; however, the latter date is Rosh Hashanah and Ms.
352 Solomon would not be present. There is a meeting the week after September 26th, which will be on October
353 3, 2022. Mr. Crouch recommended continuing the discussion on September 12th. Mr. Hakansson agreed.
354

355 **No motion was made and no vote taken.**

356

357 **Member Prerogative**

358 Mr. Hakansson stated there were some RDAs for the Valentine Property, but there are some proposals with
359 regard to working on the area. Mr. Hakansson proposed that it be on a future meeting. Ms. Solomon stated
360 it could be put on the August 8th meeting if an RDA is submitted or if it's as a discussion. Mr. Hakansson
361 asked for a copy of the 2021 RDA, as it may fit the proposed work.
362

363 **No motion was made and no vote taken**

364

365 **Meeting Adjournment:**

366 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crouch.

367 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 5-0-0 vote. Rollcall vote: OA, GC, CH, WM, GW).

368

369 The meeting was adjourned at 10:14p.m.

370

371 **Documents reviewed by the Conservation Commission on 7/11/2022**

- 372 ● Document entitled, *Agenda, dated 7/11/2022*
- 373 ● Document entitled, *Meeting Minutes, dated 6/27/2022*
- 374 ● Document entitled *Request for Determination of Applicability for 80 Oregon Road, dated 6/24/2022*
- 375 ● Plans entitled, *Proposed Repair Sewage Disposal System 80 Oregon Road, dated 6/13/2022*
- 376 ● Document entitled, *Stormwater Report for David Mindess Elementary School, dated 6/24/2022*
- 377 ● Document entitled, *RE: Nitsch Project #13609 Amended Order of Conditions David Mindess School,*
378 *dated 6/24/2022*
- 379 ● Plans entitled, *Mindess ES Plans- OOC Amendment, dated 6/24/2022*
- 380 ● Document entitled, *Culvert Assessment Form DL-0850, dated 6/21/2022*
- 381 ● Email Correspondence entitled, *E Union Street Culvert Collapse, dated 7/6/2022*
- 382 ● Document entitled, *Draft, Revised 6-28-2022 Example Minor Modification Policy*