



TOWN OF PALMER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, December 18, 2018 – 6:30 PM

LOCATION: Town Administrative Building Meeting Room

Donald Blais, Chair
David Cotter, Vice Chair
Peter Izyk
Nicholas Zeo
Brenda Cole
Dorothy Lawrence
Lucas McDiarmid

Angela Panaccione, Agent
Jeff Stanhope, Assistant

Members Present: Donald Blais, Jr.
David Cotter
Nicholas Zeo
Brenda Cole
Lucas McDiarmid
Angela Panaccione, Conservation Agent
Jeff Stanhope, Conservation Assistant

Members Absent: Peter Izyk
Dorothy Lawrence

Also Present: Donald Frydryk, Sherman & Frydryk
Justin Kasunick, NexAmp

1. **Call to Order:** 6:55 PM – Donald Blais, Jr. (Chair)
2. **Chair, Member & Committee Reports:** No Chair, Member & Committee Reports.
3. **Review Phone/Mail/E-Mail Messages**
 - a. **FEMA – Watershed Study Meeting**

The Agent forwarded the FEMA e-mail questionnaire with attached maps to the Conservation Commission. FEMA is seeking input on our mapping needs, data and information on our flooding issues, and/or data related to changes in the floodplain. The deadline for input is Friday, January 11, 2019. FEMA will summarize all input they have received into a Discovery Report and update the prioritization of streams for detailed study. David Cotter & Lucas McDiarmid questioned if we can gain access to larger images of higher quality for the maps attached in the e-mail. The Agent mentioned we can send a request to Roberts & Sons Printing tomorrow for large scale prints of the FEMA Maps. The Agent circled specific areas of concern or problems areas of flooding for her submission of a revised map drawing. Nicholas Zeo believes there are many areas, like Park Street, where there are a lot of potential issues that FEMA would take an interest in. The Agent commented she included areas like Rondeau Road, because even though it only affects one house it still has a significant impact, as well as added poor or non-functioning culverts in town. David Cotter stated the aforementioned area of concern on Rondeau Road becomes very washed out, especially with heavy rain events, and it has been an area of flooding issues in the past. Lucas McDiarmid asked about the flooding problems nearby the Bondsville Fire Department. The Agent said she has not pointed out that area yet. Donald Blais mentioned that specific area has been known to flood many times in the past.

b. MassDEP Updated Snow Disposal Guidance

The Agent distributed the MassDEP Updated Snow Disposal Guidance to the Conservation Commission. MassDEP has adjusted their stormwater compliance regulations, based on the MS4, and one key change is for municipalities to develop and draft a snow disposal guide that meets the new federal compliances. The concern with proper snow disposal is related to issues that are likely to arise with snowmelt runoff. The snow disposal plan for the town must incorporate guidelines in compliance with the MS4 regulations.

Lucas McDiarmid asked if there are any logical points we need to examine and look at as locations of snow disposal and storage for the municipality. The Agent believes that Chase Park is a reasonable option because of the elevated topography there and the location in the center of town for ease of access.

c. Conflict of Interest & Open Meeting Law Paperwork

The Agent stated the online ethics test is required to be completed every two years. The paperwork for conflict of interest & open meeting law is required to be completed once per year. The Agent distributed the conflict of interest paperwork to the Commission and requested for all members to read the documentation and fill in the necessary information after the conclusion of tonight's meeting.

d. FY 2020 Budget Request

The Agent stated that all budget requests must be submitted by or prior to Monday, January 14, 2019. Lucas McDiarmid asked what the Conservation Commission's priorities were in terms of the budget. The Agent mentioned how the new MS4 stormwater regulations are strict and could essentially require a separate department to manage the MS4 and come into compliance with the demands of it. She commented how the Department of Public Works (DPW) should be more involved with the MS4 because the Conservation Commission in itself does not have the capacity to manage it. Lucas McDiarmid asked for clarification in regard to what the Agent meant by a separate department. The Agent clarified that it would be a stormwater utility within the DPW that could consist of four to five employees. She mentioned the only cost effective way to help fund a separate utility for the MS4 would be an enterprise fund because many towns have tried it and have had success. Brenda Cole asked how a department for the MS4 would work or function as a subdivision under the DPW. The Agent is unsure of exactly how it would play out, but explained how additional responsibilities have been put on Conservation, when they should have been addressed by the DPW. She said ideally there should be another four to five additional employees for the DPW to get all of the work done in order to meet the mandatory requirements of the new MS4 in time for the different upcoming deadlines.

The Agent stated approximately 180 outfalls need to be tested over the course of three years, as well as explained the costs associated with hiring an outside consultant to do that work and the water sampling necessary. The responsibility has fallen on the Agent to coordinate it because she is listed as the Stormwater Management Coordinator on the federal contract, who is tasked with the organization of compliance with the new MS4 requirements. David Cotter wondered who would be ready to hire that is familiar with the brand new MS4 because of how recently it came out. The Agent explained that civil engineering students learn about MS4 in college or university, therefore recent and future graduates are familiar with MS4 to an extent. The Agent discussed the amount of time it took her and the Assistant to map the stormwater outfalls in the summer. She continued to explain the associated costs with the MS4 work needed to be completed and how the Conservation Commission has already done or is in the process of many of the required tasks of the MS4. The Agent mentioned how the Commission does not have money budgeted for the costs that will be incurred as part of compliance with the new standards of

the revised MS4 that all municipalities in the state are required to meet very soon. Brenda Cole asked if the Agent can do a write-up of the total costs of the work she has already done as part of the MS4. The Agent explain that she saved the town \$26,000 because she did a lot of the tasks associated with the updated MS4. She also has the responsibility to write an end-of-year report in regard to the status of our progress with the MS4 requirements. Donald Blais asked why the steep costs associated with the revised MS4 were missed or overlooked last budget. The Agent explained that the timing was inconveinient because the news was released after the budget increased, which was the case for very many towns.

Donald Blais asked how we are currently doing based on our previous budget increase and what we need in order to keep up with the increase in work load associated with the MS4. The Agent mentioned the possibility of an increase in hours for the Assistant to do all of the stormwater mapping for the MS4, especially because he is familiar with the tablet. She also commented on how the town needs to gain access to ArcGIS software like many others town already do, so that we can save a substantial amount of money by creating maps ourselves. The Agent acquired the title of Stormwater Coordinator at the time of the last budget increase as part of her increase in hours from part-time to full-time. She said she was not originally suppose to be responsible for the entirety of compliane with the new MS4 requirements for the municipality. The Agent said it could come down to not only the Conservation Commission requesting a budget increase, but supporting the DPW for budget increase as well, in order to meet the demands of the new MS4. She mentioned the DPW currently has a \$20,000 budget for stormwater management, but that it needs to be at least \$250,000 in order to comply with the MS4 before the specific deadlines associated with the new guidelines. Lucas McDiarmid wants to know where we need to allocate funds so he has a more accurate view of what to request as part of a budget increase. David Cotter explained how the Commission would be in support of the DPW to have an increase in funding for stormwater management specifically. The Agent explained how she should not have had to spend two months with the mapping required for the new MS4. Brenda Cole mentioned she believes the Assistant is an underused resource that the Commission and the Agent have access to utilize more effectively and efficiently. The Agent supported the previous statement and said that because he already knows how to use the tablet and software the Assistant can be a very helpful resource for the MS4.

The Agent mentioned the fact you cannot just send one person out to do all of the MS4 groundwork needed, especially because it is a safety risk. She has tried to schedule meetings for the issue with our stormwater management budget and how it will not keep up with the demand of the revised MS4 requirements. More specifically, the Agent has attempted to schedule important meetings with the Town Manager as well as the DPW in regard to developing a plan that will accomplish the required goals of the MS4. The Agent believes we can save a lot of money if we can approach the budget setback correctly and appropriate the funds properly to hire our own staff of employees in-house. She stated that we would need about six employees to meet the labor demands involved with the new MS4 stormwater compliances for our municipality. Nicholas Zeo asked if we can get any guidance from the state in order to push this issue to the immediate attention of the Town Council. The Agent wondered if we should push for a budget increase or push for a stormwater utility with an enterprise fund in order to be able to eventually comply with the demands of the MS4 for our community. She also brought up the problem with the failed infrastructure in regard to the stormwater management system and how it will have a significant impact on coming into compliance with the new MS4. DPW will attend our next meeting to present their Notice of Intent (NOI) for bulk work in the town, therefore it is a time to discuss the stormwater management predicament between the Conservation Commission and the DPW.

In terms of the Conservation Commission budget in itself, The Agent would request for an increase in our spending account. The majority of our members are new, therefore there will be additional costs for

educational and training opportunities. The Agent mentioned a potential increase for the spending account from \$1,500 to \$3,000 in order to cover all of the costs associated with trainings, like the MACC conferences and programs. The Agent believes we should request increases in our other accounts as well. Lucas McDiarmid requested a breakdown of our \$62,165 budget for the Conservation Commission. David Cotter commented how we have three different and separate accounts in terms of our budget and explained how each relates to how the money can be spent. Lucas McDiarmid asked if we are allowed to fundraise and the Agent responded she was told no we cannot. Lucas McDiarmid clarified that he meant other means of fundraising that may or may not be appropriate and allowed for the Commission to utilize in order to raise funds.

Donald Blais concluded that we will return to the budget topic at our next meeting on Tuesday, January 8, 2019 at 6:30 pm, so that Peter Izyk and Dorothy Lawrence can be included in the budget discussion.

4. **Public Inquiries:** No Public Inquiries Scheduled.

5. **Approval of Minutes**

a. November 13, 2018

Motion made by Brenda Cole to approve the minutes from November 13, 2018 as amended.

Motion seconded by Nicholas Zeo.

David Cotter abstains.

No further discussion – 4-0-1 – Motion Carries.

b. December 4, 2018

Motion made by to Brenda Cole approve the minutes from December 4, 2018 as amended.

Motion seconded by Nicholas Zeo.

Lucas McDiarmid abstains.

No further discussion – 4-0-1 – Motion Carries.

6. **Approval of Payables:** No Approval of Payables.

7. **Signing of Documents (DOA, OOC, COC, Ext, Etc.):** No Signing of Documents.

8. **Schedule of Public Hearings**

a. 7:00 PM Request for Determination (RDA) SFH Addition: 20 Beech Street (Map 68-95-2)

The applicant is requesting a determination to see if the work associated with a 6' x 14' addition to a single family home is subject to the Wetlands Protection Act and the Town of Palmer Wetlands Ordinance.

The project proposes to construct a 6' x 14' building addition. The construction entrance will be off Beech Street to the south of the existing drive. The lawn is will be used for construction staging. The oil tank will be relocated on site within the limit of work. Mitigating measures for this project include the installation of erosion control barriers shown on the plan and details. The erosion controls shall be installed as shown on the plans at the up gradient side of the gravel drive. All disturbed areas shall be loamed and seeded. All slopes greater than 4:1 shall be mulched. Erosion controls shall be installed prior to any disturbance on the site. The existing lot consists of a Single family home with driveway and lawn area. Lake Thompson is located to the west of the parcel at the rear of the building and the work is within 100' of Lake Thompson.

Donald Frydryk of Sherman & Frydryk was present at tonight's meeting. All work is proposed within the 50' offset from the edge of the wetlands; Lake Thompson. The Agent feels with proper erosion and sediment controls there will be no negative impacts to the lake. She did the finding of facts and determined the total disturbance within the 100-foot buffer zone to be 1,102 square feet and no disturbance within the 50' offset. With proper use of erosion and sediment controls there will be no impact to the wetlands.

FINDING OF FACTS:

Proposed Work: The project proposes to construct a 6'x14' building addition. The construction entrance will be off Beech Street to the south of the existing drive. The lawn is will be used for construction staging. The oil tank will be relocated on site within the limit of work. Mitigating measures for this project include the installation of erosion control barriers shown on the plan and details. The erosion controls shall be installed as shown on the plans at the up gradient side of the gravel drive. All disturbed areas shall be loamed and seeded. All slopes greater than 4 to 1 shall be mulched. Erosion controls shall be installed prior to any disturbance on the site. Erosion controls shall be maintained until the Palmer Conservation Commission approves removal of the controls.

The proposed work will include a total of approximately 1,102 square feet of disturbance in the 100-foot wetland buffer zone. The project will not result in any disturbance within the 50-foot wetland offset. The project disturbance will result from placing erosion controls at the limit of proposed work, building addition construction, final grading, and loam and seeding of disturbed areas. Lake Thompson is located to the west of Beech Street. The wetland limit has been delineated at as the edge of water property line. The proposed work will take place outside the 50' wetland offset, south of the exiting building. The work will include placement of erosion controls along the property line and down gradient of the proposed addition.

The Commission has determined the work associated with the proposed 6' x 14' building addition is located entirely within previously disturbed area (altered/regularly maintained lawn) within the 100-foot Buffer Zone to BVW, and with the use of proper erosion & sedimentation controls and the restoration of all disturbed areas upon completion of construction, the proposed 6' x 14' building addition will not alter adjacent Resource Areas.

Motion made by David Cotter to close the public hearing at 7:05 pm.

Seconded by Lucas McDiarmid.

No futher discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carriers.

Motion made by David Cotter that the Commission has determined the work associated with the proposed 6' x 14' building addition is located entirely within previously disturbed area (altered/regularly maintained lawn) within the 100-foot Buffer Zone to BVW, and with the use of proper erosion & sedimentation controls and the restoration of all disturbed areas upon completion of construction, the proposed 6' x 14' building addition will not alter adjacent Resource Areas.

Seconded by Lucas McDiarmid.

No further discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carries.

Motion made by Lucas McDiarmid to make a negative determination that the work described in the Request is within the Buffer Zone, as defined in the regulations, but will not alter an Area subject to protection under the Act. Therefore, said work does not require the filing of a Notice of Intent, subject to the following conditions.

CONDITIONS:

- 1. Prior to any activity on site, the limits of wetland resource areas closest to the garage shall be flagged with surveyor's tape and the flags shall remain in place during construction. Additionally, the limit of work shall be clearly marked with erosion control, construction fencing, stakes or flags, and shall be confirmed by the Commission or its agent. Such markers shall be checked and replaced as necessary and shall remain in place during construction (until all construction is complete). Workers shall be informed that no use of machinery, storage of machinery or materials, stockpiling of soil, or construction activity is to occur beyond this line at any time.**
- 2. The applicant shall notify the Conservation Commission at least 48 hours prior to any activity on the site and shall provide the name(s) and telephone number(s) of all person(s) responsible for compliance with this Determination.**
- 3. No work shall be performed during rain events in order to minimize runoff and washout situations. Site grading and construction shall be scheduled to avoid periods of high surface water. Once begun, grading and construction shall continue in an expeditious manner to minimize the opportunity for erosion.**
- 4. Siltation barriers and erosion controls shall be installed according to the site plan entitled Peritz Family Trust, Proposed Building Addition, 20-24 beech Street, Depot Village, Palmer, MA; Prepared by Sherman Frydryk, LLC, Land Surveying and Engineering; dated November 9, 2018 and shall remain in place until all disturbed areas are re-vegetated and stabilized.**
- 5. All Erosion control measures shall be inspected cleaned or replaced during construction and shall remain in place until stabilization of all areas that may impact resource areas is permanent. These devices shall also be inspected to assure that the maximum control has been provided, and maintained or reinforced as necessary. Any entrapped silt shall be removed to an area outside the buffer zone and resource areas, and maintained or reinforced as necessary.**
- 6. The applicant shall immediately control or correct any erosion problems that occur at the site and shall immediately notify the Commission, which reserves the right to require additional erosion and/or damage prevention controls it may deem necessary.**
- 7. Only upon completion of this project, *and* when The Commission and/or its Agent is assured that there is complete stabilization of all areas, shall erosion control measures be removed.**
- 8. All exposed soils and other fills shall be permanently stabilized at the earliest practicable date. Excavated areas and stockpiled material shall be located at the furthest possible distance from all resource areas to prevent erosion into wetland areas. Material shall be removed from the site shall be properly disposed of per all local, state and federal regulations.**
- 9. All top soil stock pile areas will be protected by silt fence armored with straw bales or equivalent.**
- 10. All disturbed areas, slopes and proposed landscape areas shall be loamed and seeded or stabilized through the use of erosion control blankets or other approved means. All disturbed areas will be graded, loamed and seeded prior to November 1 of each year, if possible. No disturbed areas or stockpiled material will be left unprotected or without erosion controls during the winter.**
- 11. Loaming and seeding will occur within (5 - 30) days of final grading. Barren areas should be stabilized by seeding if work on the project is interrupted for more than 90 days, unless the 90 days are in the winter. If this condition should occur, the applicant shall request a determination from the Commission as to whether seeding or an alternative measure should be conducted.**
- 12. The seed stock to be used to restore disturbed areas shall complement or contain native flora and be of proven value to local wildlife.**
- 13. The contractor shall be provided a copy of this Determination, and the Conservation Commission shall be notified of the name, address, phone number, and the contact person of the contractor.**

Seconded by Nicholas Zeo.

No further discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carries.

9. Requests for Certificate of Compliance: No Requests for Certificate of Compliance.

10. Project Monitoring

a. DEP #256-0331: 271 Breckenridge Street Solar

The Agent stated this was the second inspection for 271 Breckenridge Street Solar. David Cotter did the first inspection when she was out sick. The Agent explained what the applicant plans to do is dig a trench and redirect all of the water to a basin, which will collect a percentage of the water that has been ending up in on the neighbor's property, but not all of it because of the amount of water. David Cotter clarified why the Agent referred to the amount of water collection as a percentage because of the missing details and information on exactly where all of the water is coming from and how much of it is groundwater. The Agent is worried about the proximity of the Mass Pike to areas of erosion and sedimentation concerns. A small sediment trap will not prevent much, therefore there is a concern for erosion and sediment runoff that could end up in the Mass Pike or much too close in proximity to it. Lucas McDiarmid asked if we should send MassDOT a notice and the Agent said she sent the abutter's notice to them because they are indeed an abutter to the property of this specific site. Lucas McDiarmid is worried about the amount of accountability that could be held to the Conservation Commission if MassDOT has any concerns or complaints that have the potential to fall back on us.

The Agent informed the Conservation Commission that a tree was uprooted in the excavation process of the runoff field. David Cotter noticed 6" – 12" of water beneath the root ball in the location where the tree was uprooted because of the high water table on the property, therefore was curious as to how much of an impact that could have on water runoff on the site. Donald Blais asked what the purpose is of the woodchips on the runoff field and The Agent explained the woodchips are to prevent the occurrence of mudslide-like events. Brenda Cole asked when the engineer was suppose to get back to the Agent and she responded hopefully within a few days. The Agent explained the runoff field has not helped the water problem to the extent that it should have, therefore it could certainly be improved upon. The Agent stated one issue was that the stormwater was not in our jurisdiction or else she could have taken a different course of action, as well as explained how she cannot take another approach unless their erosion and sedimentation controls happen to fail, or an event occurs in which any natural resource areas are altered. The Agent stated that one issue that is bound to happen is that we will have a freeze and then a thaw, which can cause paths of pure muddy water with particles so fine that there is no definitive trace.

The Agent mentioned that the engineers did all of their hydrology models based on NRCS TR20 from 1964, which is not even an approved model now. MassDEP is underway with major revisions to their regulations that will address stormwater management and target specific concerns. The Agent commented how the MS4 is the first time the feds are ahead of the states in regard to municipalities stormwater management regulations.

11. Violations & Enforcement

a. DEP #256-0312: MA DOT Turnpike

The Agent was hoping to have an update today, but she did not receive any update whatsoever.

b. Enforcement Order – DEP #256-0332 – L12 Breckenridge

Donald Frydryk of Sherman & Frydryk and Justin Kasunick of NexAmp were present at tonight's meeting. They have retained Peter Levesque of Wetland Consultants Inc. as their wetlands consultant, who prepared the following restoration plan.

Restoration Plan:

Removal of Invasive Species:

Invasive species consisting of Multiflora Rose – (*Rosa multiflora*) and Bittersweet – (*Celastrus scandens*) will be removed prior to conducting any restoration activities. These species can easily be removed by either pulling the plants and roots out by hand or by using a chain and mini excavator. In either case care must be taken to minimize any earth disturbance by slowly tugging on the plant, and once it is removed filling any voids with loam and then compacting them.

Removed plants and roots should be bagged and disposed of properly to prevent further spreading of the species.

Removal of Pavement:

Bituminous pavement within 6-feet of the southerly existing bank of the intermittent stream will be saw cut, carefully removed and properly disposed of at a licensed facility. The work should be conducted at the same time that the restoration work is conducted; so temporary erosion controls are not needed.

BVW/Bank Restoration (360 SF):

This area is immediately adjacent to the southerly bank of the intermittent stream, which flows easterly along the northerly edge of the existing pavement.

- Care must be taken to preserve the existing vegetation. All non-invasive vegetation including cut sprouts, root systems and stumps should remain in place. It is acceptable if stumps are partially covered with the proposed grading described below.
- 9-inch diameter coir logs will be installed at the top of the existing bank of the intermittent stream with an effort to minimize disturbance to existing functional bank. One-third of the coir log should be buried to create a capillary fringe connection with the "base flow" of the stream. See the installation specifications below and on the site plan for detailed installation instructions. Proper staking is very important.
- Remove loose debris from the restoration area (6 x 180-foot area from the southerly bank of the intermittent stream to the edge of the pavement).
- Apply loam containing 50-percent organics from the top of the installed coir logs (6-inches high) tapered to the blend with the grade at the edge of the cut pavement. The loam should be very lightly tamped to prevent settling.
- Install 2" plugs of Tussock Sedge – (*Carex stricta*) and Spike Rush – (*Eleocharis palustris*) and 18-inch whips of Silky Dogwood – (*Corus amomum*) within the installed coir logs as specified on the site plan and in the table below. Plants should be immediately watered upon installation.

Buffer Zone Restoration:

- Install erosion control blankets over the organic loam between the coir logs and edge of pavement. See installation specifics on the site plan.

- Install supplemental plants consisting of Red Maple – (*Acer rubrum*), Gray Birch – (*Betula populifolia*), Speckled Alder – (*Alnus rugosa*) and Spicebush – (*Lindera benzoin*) as specified on the site plan. Plantings should be immediately watered upon installation.
- Overseed the entire restoration area with New England Conservation / Wildflower seed.
- Lightly mulch with straw at a 50% rate of coverage.
- Place 24-inch diameter boulders 20-feet apart along the edge of the restoration area.

Construction Sequence:

1. Identify and label invasive species.
2. Remove invasive species.
3. Remove litter and loose debris from the restoration area.
4. Cut pavement 6-feet south of stream bank.
5. Install coir logs.
6. Apply organic loam from coir logs to newly cut pavement.
7. Install plantings in coir logs as specified.
8. Install erosion control blankets over organic loam.
9. Install supplemental plantings in buffer zone.
10. Overseed restoration area with specified seed mix.
11. Lightly mulch seeded area.
12. Place 24-inch boulders 20-feet apart along the edge of restoration area.
13. Water supplemental plantings as needed to assure survival.
14. Monitor the restoration areas, and notify the wetland consultant if issues arise.

David Cotter asked if the asphalt will be removed after the installation of the coir logs. Don Frydryk responded yes. David Cotter questioned if they will first cut the asphalt, second install the coir logs, and third remove the asphalt in that order. Don Frydryk answered yes, so that they can maintain control of the stream. The Agent asked when they would start the restoration work. Justin asked if it would be okay with the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board to start the work tomorrow or as soon as possible. The Agent answered that the restoration plan start work date would be approved by the Conservation Commission and not the Planning Board. The Planning Board would not approve any future work from the site plan itself until the restoration work is complete based on the restoration plan. The Agent asked which restoration work from the construction sequence would be done in the spring. Her recommendation is as soon as construction sequence numbers 1 – 6, 8 & 12 are completed, NexAmp shall contact her to check the work and if the Commission is amendable, authorize the other work to begin contingent on the other plantings going in during the spring. Don Frydryk explained to Justin Kasunick as soon as the Agent checks the restoration work, then he will be able to schedule a meeting with the Planning Board, but with the busy holiday schedule he will likely not be able to schedule a meeting until after the new year. The Agent said for now she requests that construction sequence numbers 1 – 6, 8 & 12 are done immediately. She commented on how the restoration plan is separate from the site plan, so to make the Planning Board aware that the work being done is part of the restoration plan and not the site plan itself that the stop work order is on.

Motion made by David Cotter to approve the draft restoration plan and authorize restoration work to commence.

Seconded by Nicholas Zeo.

No further discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carries.

Motion made by Nicholas Zeo to lift the stop work order on the proposed solar array project as soon as construction sequence numbers 1 – 6, 8 & 12 have been completed and approved by the Agent.

Seconded by Brenda Cole.

No further discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carries.

12. New/Old Business

a. Trail Grant Update – Gazebo

The Agent has been calling the Gazebo people for two weeks now in order to schedule a site visit. The Building Inspector is on it as well.

b. MVP Core Team Meeting Tuesday 1/8/2019 @ 1:00 pm

The Agent explained it is more of a reminder for Donald Blais, David Cotter, and Dorothy Lawrence.

c. MCR Meeting in Ware Wednesday 12/19/2018 @ 6:00 pm

The Agent and David Cotter will attend and anyone else on the Commission is welcome to join them.

d. 3090 Palmer Road Update

The Planning Board has required changes for interconnections and other things as well, therefore SWCA will provide a revised Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD) for a whole different set of wetland delineation boundaries and wetland flags. The Planning Board has required the applicant to move the solar project farther back, so that it is not as visible from the road, but in doing so the solar panels will be closer to areas of natural resources, wetlands, and rivers.

e. 168 State Street

The Agent is unsure about what the source of the water runoff is, but presented photographs of the issue to the Conservation Commission. It is a conservation violation because all of the runoff goes directly into the stream. David Cotter stated an area nearby the road near the culvert was plowed by the DPW in order to redirect the water, therefore the Agent wants to check it out. The Agent explained it is a violation to redirect water as an illicit discharge of water into catch basins.

f. 2039 Bridge Street

This new business was requested to be skipped by the Agent until our next meeting to be held 1/9/2019.

g. MACC Annual Conference 3/2/2019

The MACC Annual Spring Conference will be held 3/2/2019 at Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts. Save the date. The Agent will run a workshop; MS4.

h. Other New Business

The Agent applied for a grant; 'Neighborhood Outreach Pilot Project'.

i. Notes

Bennett Street Violation Notice.

13. Office Closed: Monday, December 24, 2018 – Tuesday, January 1, 2019

14. Set Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 8, 2019 @ 6:30 pm

15. Meeting Adjourned: 9:35 PM

Motion made by Brenda Cole to adjourn at 9:35 PM.

Motion was seconded by Lucas McDiarmid.

No further discussion – 5-0-0 – Motion Carries.

Sincerely Submitted,

Jeff Stanhope
Palmer Conservation Assistant