

West Newbury Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting date & place: 7:00 pm, September 18, 2023, Second Floor Town Offices.

Members Present: Chair Molly Hawkins, David Parrott, George Preble, Jack Haley, and Conservation Agent Michelle Greene.

1. Discussion and Vote of Support: CPC application for \$175,000 for Greenbelt and the Town to acquire a Conservation Restriction on 14 acres at 114 Ash Street, “Evergreen Farm”

Participating by phone Vanessa Hall Johnson of Greenbelt said that Greenbelt has an almost-fully-executed agreement for the acquisition of 36 acres at Evergreen Farm. Once acquired 18 acres will be purchased by Fish & Wildlife as an addition to the Crane Pond area, the remaining 18 acres will be sold to an already identified potential buyer who is interested in having a small farm at the property. Of the 18 acres to be sold to a private buyer, 14 acres will be put under a Conservation Restriction that will eliminate all rights to develop the property but would allow agriculture. The 4 remaining acres with the existing house and barns would not be restricted and there is the possibility of developing one more single-family house on two of these acres. The Conservation Restriction will be purchased for \$400K, of which \$175K is proposed to come from West Newbury Community Preservation funding and will be co-held by Greenbelt and the Town. The Community Preservation Committee will meet Thursday September 21st and Greenbelt would like to know that the Commission supports funding the Conservation Restriction with CPA funds and that the Commission would be willing to co-hold the restriction with Greenbelt.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the proposed agricultural use, which can be exempted from the Wetlands Protection Act, would impact wetlands at the site. Ms. Hall Johnson said that a Conservation Restriction does not offer relief from any state or local regulations for activities at the property and that wetlands seem to be distant from the areas where farming may occur.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Haley seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to send a letter of support to be used in the application to the Community Preservation Committee. Ms. Greene said that the minutes or draft minutes of this meeting could be sent to the Committee for purposes of its upcoming meeting.

2. Public Hearing: Notice of Intent (continued): 0 River Meadow Drive – Whetstone Greenway, Applicant: Town of West Newbury, Re: Construction of a new trail and boardwalk, DEP# 078-0755 *Applicant requests a continuance.*

3. Public Hearing: Notice of Intent (continued): 0 Middle Street, parcel R27-28, Artichoke River Woods, Applicant: Essex County Greenbelt, Re: Construction of a parking area and portion of trail, DEP# 078-0766 *Applicant requests a continuance to 10/16/2023*

4. Public Meeting: Request for Determination of Applicability (continued): 362 Main Street, Applicant: Lorrie Gould, Re: Septic replacement

Consultant engineer Alek Chongris described the proposal to upgrade a failed septic system, with most work occurring outside of the 100’ buffer zone except for some minor grading. He noted that the plan has been changed to reflect the Commission’s comments that the wetlands delineation may be used only for this project. New work within the buffer zone would require a new wetlands delineation and new filing.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to issue a Negative Determination of Applicability conditioned on requirements that the applicant 1) install erosion controls as described in the plan and obtain Conservation Agent inspection and approval prior to commencement of work; 2) confine the limit of work to the area within the erosion controls, 3) provide the Agent a construction schedule and notice of at least 72 hours prior to the start of work; 4) locate any stockpile(s) of soil or materials outside the buffer zone and within the erosion controls, 5) that the wetland delineation shown on the plan for this project shall be used only for this project.

5. Discussion & Insignificant Change Request (continued): 0 Middle Street, R27 31, Lower Artichoke Spillway, Re: Time of year restriction & O&M plan review, DEP# 78-0749

Newburyport representatives Thomas D. Cusick, Jr., and Jon-Eric White and their consultant Tracy Adamski, of Tighe and Bond, appeared to discuss the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plan and an insignificant change request to the time of year restriction regarding the City’s proposal to install a stone base at the Lower Artichoke reservoir dam in West Newbury to support super sack sandbags that would be used in emergency flooding conditions to prevent the Merrimack River from backing up into the reservoir.

In response to Ms. Greene and the Commission’s query about who in Newburyport would be responsible for making the determination to deploy the super sacks in an emergency, Mr. Cusick said that would be the Director of Public Service. When asked what data sources would be used to make the emergency determination to use the super sacks, the Newburyport representatives referred to their O&M plan and said that the decision would be based on the National Weather Service and Hurricane Center reports. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Greene repeatedly asked whether local information would also be used, noting that the Merrimack River is tidal and that coastal flooding information alone may be insufficient to make a determination about the tidal river’s impact on the reservoir. Ms. Hawkins noted that if the peak flooding occurred at low tide, the impact would be less.

Mr. White said that everyone follows the National Weather Service and that perhaps a favorite local weather channel could be chosen. When asked again about the information to be used, Mr. White said that they would be looking at the Weather Service spaghetti models generally and asked, “If I told you model A or model B would you understand the difference?” Ms. Greene again said that local tides may be an important factor and the point is not to pick a favorite local weather forecaster, but rather to take the tides into account. Mr. White said that they have a water source to protect and everybody is always asking about the models the City is using for planning climate change resiliency and this is a complicated matter, and apologized for getting excited about the models.

When asked if the City would use a wetlands scientist in the event that damage or spilling of the super sacks results in a spill of materials into the resource area, Mr. White said that the super sacks contain sand—usually clean sand. If it gets into the voids of the stone foundation, it will merely strengthen the foundation. The Commission explained that the question was about a spill that goes beyond the foundation and into the resource area. Mr. White wondered how a cleanup might occur and whether it would make things worse. Ms. Adamski said that a large spill would require a cleanup. Ms. Hawkins said that it needs to be documented that a wetlands scientist would supervise cleanup of a spill in a wetland resource area.

Concerning the City’s request for a waiver of the winter work ban to install the stone foundation, the Commission stressed that the waiver could apply only to the stone foundation work—and not to tree cutting planned in conjunction with the project. The Commission also asked about the dewatering plan for installation of the stone base. Mr. White provided a document dated September 18, 2023 that described a

system of syphons on each side to effect dewatering. He said that this is very commonly used and that the velocity is low so there should be no erosion, and further the outflow would be directed upwards to dissipate the flowing water's energy. He said that the plan is to leave the syphon system in place during the installation in case of additional rainfall requiring more dewatering.

The Commission advised that a more detailed dewatering plan would be needed for a waiver of the winter work ban. If conditions were very wet or icy or snowy, the Commission may have the work wait until conditions became drier and more suitable. It proposed that the City provide 72 hours advance notice to the Agent; a preconstruction meeting with the Agent, the City, and the contractor; and a reservation that the waiver may or may not be available at the Agent's discretion depending on site conditions.

Mr. Haley asked if the City deploys the super sacks in a rain event, would the City monitor conditions as water backs up in the reservoir—what would happen to abutting properties? Ms. Adamski said that the elevation will go only to 12' and this would not flood the Quaker Cemetery. Above the 12' level, water would overtop the dam and the situation would be catastrophic.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to accept the O&M plan with conditions that 1) tidal conditions will be added as forecast that the City will use in the determination to deploy the super sacks and 2) a wetland scientist would supervise any cleanup that may be necessary if materials are spilled into the resource area.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the insignificant change request to waive the winter work ban for installation of the stone foundation with conditions that 1) the waiver does not apply to tree removal or any other work aside from installing the stone base, 2) before commencing work, the City will give the Agent 72 hours' prior notice and will hold a preconstruction meeting with the Agent, the City, and the contractor, 3) the Agent will monitor the site and may delay installation work until conditions become appropriate, 4) dewatering will be conducted in consultation with the Agent; will be done using a siphon system similar to the one shown in the September 18, 2023 diagram provided to the Commission; and that any dewatering activities shall be discussed with and approved by the Agent prior to their commencement.

**6. Public Meeting: Request for Determination of Applicability (RDA): 16 Donovan Drive,
Applicant: Daniel Chiango, Re: Construct at 24'x32' barn**

Dan Chiango appeared to discuss his proposed barn/garage project and Ms. Hawkins disclosed that she knows Mr. Chiango because their children are in activities together. She confirmed that she is not an abutter and that she has no financial interest in this matter.

Mr. Chiango described the property as containing a steep pitch and a drainage culvert under the driveway. The barn would be 57' from the nearest wetlands flag and three trees would be removed, with the remaining trees preserved and additional native plantings installed to slow runoff.

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern that at the site visit it was apparent that with all the rain this year, there has been considerable erosion on the grassy hillside and the Commission has experienced a number of serious problems with erosion and silty runoff from construction sites this summer. Thus, she is concerned about potential adverse impacts of the project to wetland resources, making a negative determination of applicability inappropriate. An engineered plan and a Notice of Intent (NOI) filing would provide assurance that stormwater issues would be managed. Mr. Preble agreed, saying it would be better to have an expert come in to figure out how to mitigate impacts better. The Commission also noted that the question of how to level the driveway to access the barn is not resolved. It was unclear if retaining walls would be required, whether

there would be cuts or fills, and what the contours and grading would be. Mr. Parrott said that the RDA process is lightweight and this project is a major one raising concerns about wetlands impacts. Ms. Greene explained that one of the purposes of an RDA filing is for the Commission to determine if a proposed project will alter a resource area; if the Commission finds that a project proposed in a buffer zone will alter a resource area then the Commission should issue a positive determination requiring the applicant to file a NOI, with engineered plans, to permit the project.

Mr. Chiango said that after construction of his proposed barn, the existing situation with runoff and erosion would be improved. He said retaining walls would not be needed. He objected that an engineered plan is needed by the Commission for their review of the proposed project and indicated that one would cost \$30-40K and would only provide a stamp. The same kind of erosion controls he is now proposing would be the outcome. He is an engineer and works with engineers and does not put stock in their certification.

Ms. Greene noted that engineered plans submitted with an NOI give accountability if something goes awry as there is someone to hold accountable for the design; provide a baseline of current and proposed grades; provide a design; and having approved plans facilitates adaptations if a problem arises – the area is already surveyed and understood often reducing the time needed design a fix. The Commission cited an example of problems arising with construction on Middle Street where the engineering consultant and the plans allowed the Commission and the property owners to more quickly address drainage problems that arose due to the rains. Here, it is unclear how the grading and the driveway would be done and whether it would cause problems.

Mr. Chiango proposed a middle course in which he would provide additional information about grading and erosion impacts. The Commission agreed, noting that with the RDA, it is their job to evaluate the project and determine whether there would be wetlands impacts and they cannot, with the information now available, make the determination that no such impacts would occur.

At Mr. Chiango's request, the matter was continued to the October 16 meeting.

7. Public Meeting: Request for Determination of Applicability: 350 Middle Street, Applicant: Maureen Knowles, Re: Temporary construction access road

Jim Scanlan appeared before the Commission explaining that the septic replacement for which the access road is proposed for is not due to a failing septic system but rather the homeowner's desire to increase the capacity of the septic system for added bedrooms in the existing house. All septic work and grading will take place outside of the buffer zone but a temporary gravel or recycled asphalt access road I needed for equipment to reach the work area.

The wetlands lines were reviewed by Ms. Greene with Julie Vondrak who delineated them in April 2023. During the review, a few flags were adjusted and the plans provided to the Commission tonight show the adjusted wetlands line and buffer zone. As only the wetlands in the area closest to the proposed construction access road were reviewed, the plans contain a note that additional work may not be done using the delineation shown on the plans and that a new delineation and new filing would be needed for any future work in the buffer zone. Mr. Scanlan noted that the area between the proposed construction access road and the wetlands is fairly flat with an existing paved driveway separating the access road from the wetlands and erosion controls proposed adjacent to the wetlands so the risk of wetlands impacts from the work is small. Mr. Scanlan noted that the homeowner is eager to get started on the project.

Mr. Parrott discussed with Mr. Scanlan how the temporary access road will be built and how tracking from construction activities will be minimized. Mr. Scanlan explained the road will be built in less than a day – first the top soil will be scraped off and stockpiled on site, then gravel or RAP will be brought in and spread for the road. Tracking should be minimal as the equipment will stay on site until the septic system is installed and any trucks needing to reach the area of the septic install will be passing over the access road. The entire project from installing the access road, to installing the septic system, then removing, filling and seeding the access road should take about 10 days to 2 weeks.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to issuing a Negative Determination of Applicability to construct the temporary access road conditioned that 1) Erosion control shall be installed as shown on the plan by the applicant and inspected by the Agent prior to the start of work; 2) notice of at least 72-hours be given to the agent prior to the start if any work; 3) the erosion control shown on the plan is the limit of work; 4) any materials or soils to be stockpiled on site shall be located outside of the 100' buffer zone; 5) At the end of construction the gravel or RAP shall be removed from the access road and the area shall be loamed and seeded; 6) Gravel or RAP removed from the access road shall be disposed of outside of any resource area or buffer zone or be disposed of lawfully off site; 7) the plans and wetlands delineation shall not be used for permitting any other project under the Wetlands Protection Act.

8. Public Meeting: Request for Determination of Applicability: 139 Indian Hill Road, Applicant: Karl Hambrecht, Re: Replacement Septic System

Engineer Jim Scanlan described the plans for a septic upgrade for a 4-bedroom home with a septic system in failure. Two wetlands are adjacent to the property, with the one across the street from the property 66' from the proposed work. A water well also requires a 100' buffer from the septic system and this is also shown on the plans. The work would remove no trees but would take out some rhododendrons. A silt sock would be installed around the work area and an existing stone wall would be extended on either end. The existing septic tank could be removed or left in place and filled with clean soil. Two existing leach pits would be removed as part of the project. The plan states that the wetlands delineation may be used only for this project as only the wetland in the front of the house for which the proposed work is in the buffer zone of was reviewed by Ms. Greene. Any new work in the buffer zone or resource area would require a new delineation.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to issue a Negative Determination of Applicability conditioned on requirements that the applicant 1) install erosion controls consisting of 12" staked silt socks as described in the plan and obtain Conservation Agent inspection and approval prior to commencement of work; 2) confine the limit of work to the area within the erosion controls, 3) provide the Agent notice at least 72 hours prior to the start of work; 4) keep any stockpile(s) of soil or materials outside the buffer zone and within the erosion controls, 5) remove no trees except for the rhododendrons and 6) the wetland delineation for this project shall be used only for this project.

9. Public Meeting: Request for Determination of Applicability: Town right-of-way in front of 119 Middle Street, Applicant: Ross Courtemanche, Re: Installation of new utility pole

Ms. Greene explained that this matter involves a pole that is in the buffer zone and on the Town's right of way. If the Commission approves the pole installation, the matter will then go to the Select Board for its approval of activity in the right of way.

Mr. Courtemanche said that they need two poles, only one of which is within the buffer zone of wetlands. No trees will be removed as part of this work, but according to the National Grid forester, some tree trimming may be needed. Ms. Greene stressed the importance of no tree removal: if a tree is removed, local Scenic

Roads approval would be needed and the pole is in a priority habitat, so the state's Division of Fisheries & Wildlife Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (Natural Heritage) would become involved.

Ms. Hawkins sought and received assurance that all work would be conducted from the road or driveway.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to issue a Negative Determination of Applicability for installation of pole #55 as described on the plan.

10. Insignificant Change Request: 119 Middle Street, Applicant: Ross Courtemanche, Re: Installation of new underground utility trench, DEP# 78-741

Mr. Courtemanche said the trenching would occur along the already-constructed driveway. The plan is to dig the trench, insert a conduit, and have it inspected and closed prior to the October 15 winter work ban. The electric line can then be run through the conduit at a later time. He also noted that the septic system will be completed by October 15. By October 15 it will all be stabilized and seeded with winter rye.

Ms. Greene explained that the cutoff date applies only to the trench, which is part of the Order of Conditions. The utility pole is a separate matter subject to the RDA and not subject to the Standard Conditions and time of year restriction in the Order of Conditions for DEP# 78-741 which permitted the construction of a single-family home.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the insignificant change request for the new underground utility trench.

11. Certificate of Compliance Request: 9 Pleasant Street, DEP# 78-348

Ms. Greene said that this Order of Conditions is from 1998 and permitted a new septic system and house addition with portions of the work within the buffer zone. The owners are now selling the property and seek a Certificate of Compliance. The property is entirely stable, and subject to no ongoing conditions. In these circumstances, instead of requiring an as-built plan, Ms. Greene received a certified plot plan showing that addition was constructed where it was proposed under the Order of Conditions. An as-built plan for the septic system had been previously submitted to the Board of Health shortly after the septic system was installed.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to issue a Certificate of Compliance.

12. Request for Return to Compliance Letter for Enforcement Order: 13 Meetinghouse Hill Road, Re: Unpermitted clearing within BVW and the 100' buffer zone

Ms. Greene explained that the developer came in for an RDA but then cleared the wetland vegetation. An enforcement order was issued and native vegetation was restored. The site is now stable and lush with vegetation. The property was sold, so the letter closing out the enforcement matter would go to the new homeowner.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to issue a return to compliance letter for the enforcement order.

13. Enforcement Order Ratification: 333 Main Street, Re: Unpermitted excavation of a trench within the 100' buffer zone of the bank of an intermittent stream.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was recusing herself as an abutter and left the Commission table for the duration of discussion of this matter. Vice Chair, Mr. Preble then assumed the role of Chair for this discussion.

Ms. Greene provided background information about the stormwater problems that arose at 335 and 333 Main Street as a result of the intense rains on August 8 and August 18. A culvert that undergounds an intermittent stream at 335 Main Street was insufficient and/or failed causing water to bubble up and do damage at both properties.

Nathan Dennis of ND General Construction, whose company owns and rents out 333 Main Street dug a trench within the buffer zone of the intermittent stream at 335 Main Street without filing for and receiving a permit from the Commission permitting the work. Ms. Greene issued an enforcement order by mail which did not reach Mr. Dennis until today. The enforcement order requires restoration (removal of the exposed trench and raw soil berm) and reseeding of the area to return it to its previous, stable condition, which is lawn.

Mr. Dennis described in detail how, due to problems with stormwater coming from Daley Drive and 335 Main Street, the basement of 333 Main Street filled with 6' of water within 45 minutes. He also discussed his various conversations with Mass DOT about these problems adversely affecting Rt 113. He said that because of these problem spots out of his control, he had no choice but to dig the trench to redirect water back to 335 Main Street, mentioning that the property is occupied by tenants with children who need a house with electricity and heat, which is centered in the basement.

Mr. Dennis repeatedly insisted that the Commission should not ratify the enforcement order because the trench is the only thing keeping water out of the 333 Main Street basement and he would be happy to plant grass. He mentioned that using sandbags to protect the basement of 333 Main Street would be too costly.

Ms. Greene noted that she had advised Mr. Dennis not to put a shovel into the ground without first coming to the Commission with an engineered plan. She added that the Building Inspector advised Mr. Dennis to use sandbags at the bulkhead to keep water out of the 333 Main Street basement. Mr. Dennis said that without digging things up in areas where the water is coming from, he does not know what is happening or how to devise a plan to fix it.

Mr. Haley asked if the project would have been approved with conditions if Mr. Dennis had applied to the Commission. Ms. Greene noted that is a question for the Commission. Mr. Parrott said that the sandbags would be an immediate, expedient, and appropriate response on a temporary basis. Instead, Mr. Parrott said, it appears that Mr. Dennis dug the trench and now is indicating that Commission requirements can be ignored and his trench allowed—with no drawings or other information aside from some photos.

Ms. Greene said that during today's rain, she witnessed silty stormwater from the 333 Main Street, likely originating from the unstable trench, crossing under the fence at 333 Main Street, over to 335 Main Street, and into the catch basin in Rt 113 that then feeds an intermittent stream running through the Mullen property. Mr. Dennis again argued that the enforcement order should not be issued, repeating the points he had raised.

Mr. Preble moved to ratify the enforcement order and require that the trench be filled and stabilized by October 2. Mr. Dennis again argued that the enforcement order should not be issued, repeating the points he had raised.

Mr. Haley seconded Mr. Preble's motion and the Commission voted 3-0-1 with Ms. Hawkins recused, to ratify the enforcement order and require that the trench be filled and stabilized by October 2, 2023.

14. Enforcement Order Update: 22-24 Main Street - PRSD, Re: Continuing sedimentation into intermittent stream, DEP# 078-0701

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern that ongoing issues first identified in December 2022 are not being addressed. Ms. Greene said that on September 13 during a rainstorm where brief periods of heavy rain and flash flooding had been forecast, she went to the site and saw active discharges of silty materials into the wetland. A large volume of stormwater was bypassing the erosion controls near the baseball field and rushing into the wetlands. This involved surface and subsurface flows.

Ms. Greene reported that minimal, readily accomplished measures she recommended, such as reinforcing erosion controls, had not been done. When she phoned WT Rich about this, she was told that she should have seen the site earlier, when it was worse. Compounding the problems, loam was installed on the 13th, ahead of the forecasted heavy rain, with no additional erosion controls installed and due to the rain a lot of the loam washed away into wetlands, onto sidewalks, and into the stormwater system. Ms. Greene asked why erosion controls weren't installed before spreading loam in light of the forecast and was informed that there are only two WT Rich employees left on site, that they had dismissed United Civil, which was responsible for compliance with the Orders of Conditions, stormwater requirements, and other requirements their contractor, and that the wattles were located on the other side of the site away from where the loam was being spread. Ms. Greene stressed the importance of installing and maintaining controls at the site to protect wetlands resources and reminded WT Rich that the enforcement order issued in January 2023 orders that no more releases or discharges originate from the site.

Earlier today, September 18th, Ms. Greene stopped by the PRSD site during a rain event that had been forecast to be light and long duration and the rain had been light throughout the day prior to her site visit. Ms. Greene observed that instead of addressing the deficiencies in controls that she pointed out to WT Rich on September 13th, work at the school site has turned to planting trees while controls had not been bolstered. When she arrived on site the contractor was attempting to sweep the water and washed away loam from the sidewalk with push brooms while sediment laden surface and sub surface water was actively bypassing the deficient controls and discharging into the intermittent stream.

Ms. Greene added that Mass. DEP has continued to advised that it does not have the resources to take on this enforcement, but is quite concerned. Her contact at DEP shared a belief that the contractors are not taking wetlands protection seriously. This afternoon MA DEP contacted Vertex, a supervising contractor for the school project, and received only vague responses to the concerns raised from the site visits on September 13th and 18th.

Ms. Hawkins observed that a cease-and-desist order could be issued to stop all work except for that related to wetlands protection compliance and will help the contractors prioritize compliance with the enforcement order. Many simple and readily available steps repeatedly identified by Ms. Greene have not been taken but should be, such as multiple erosion controls, wattles at the toe of the slopes, bolstering erosion controls with hay bales, addition of and maintenance of check dams, etc. If work stops except for these measures, the project might start to meet performance standards. Also, if the raw ground at the baseball field near Route 113 and the stream were vegetated and stabilized, the site condition would begin to give a better idea of the

adequacy of the permanent stormwater management for the site.

Ms. Greene also suggested that the Commission may want to consider drafting a letter to the Select Board, the School Building Committee, and other stakeholders in the school project describing the ongoing problems and recommending that the contractors not be given a final release unless the issues are resolved.

Ms. Hawkins moved, Mr. Preble seconded, and the Commission voted unanimously to amend the existing enforcement order to impose a cease-and-desist order with the exception of work that would immediately promote site stabilization such as bolstering erosion controls and other measures Ms. Greene has recommended. The cease-and-desist order may be lifted upon the Conservation Agent's determination that the minimum measures for site stabilization have been put in place.

15. Other Business:

None

16. Informal Discussion:

None

17. Approval of Minutes: August 8, 2023

Deferred

18. Approval of Minutes: September 6, 2023

Deferred

19. Approval of Minutes: September 11, 2023

Deferred

20. DEP Comments:

None

21. Land Agent Update: Invasive plant removal workday 11/4/2023

Ms. Greene reported that the request for funding invasive plant management was increased at the Select Board meeting to \$50K.

22. Commission Representative to Open Space Update:

Ms. Greene reported that the Open Space Committee will discuss trail management with stakeholders at a new time to be determined.

23. Commission Representative to Community Preservation Committee Update:

Mr. Haley noted that a meeting is planned for Thursday to address Greenbelt's Evergreen Farm proposal.

24. Upcoming Meetings: October 2, 2023 @ 7:00 PM, regular business;

October 10, 2023, @ 7:30 PM Admin business/bylaw;

October 16, 2023, @ 7:00 PM regular business;

Adjournment 10:15 pm

Meeting Documents

Presentations and records associated with each matter identified, as included in the Conservation Agent's files.

Respectfully submitted