

TOWN OF LANCASTER
CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

August 29th, 2023

Members Present: Chair Tom Seidenberg, Vice-Chair Jim Lavallee, Bruce McGregor.

Members not present: Shawn Winsor, Dennis Hubbard.

Also Present: Charlotte Steeves (Conservation Agent)

List of agenda items presented:

1. Public Hearing, Notice of Intent: Culvert Replacement on Liggett Road (Fort Devens)
2. Public Hearing, Request for Determination of Applicability: 696 Fort Pond Road- Cloutier
3. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 339 Seven Bridge Rd- Kalon Farm Inc
4. Continued Public Hearing, Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation- 10 Fire Rd 54
5. Continued Public Hearing, Notice of Intent: 433 Brockelman Road- Filipi/ Siddell
6. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 220 Old Common Road (DCAMM Site)
7. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 396 Hill Top Rd- C&H Realty

Chairman Tom Seidenberg called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Public Hearing, Notice of Intent: Culvert Replacement on Liggett Road (Fort Devens)

Present: Kyle Crafts and Zygmunt Osiecki (Representing Applicants)

1. Mr. Seidenberg read the public hearing notice.
2. Mr. Crafts shared his screen and gave an overview of the project. He said he is the natural resource manager for the project. He said the main issue is that the water is flowing underneath the culvert and it is causing instability. The original culvert was not anchored properly. He said this is creating an unsafe condition. There is a beaver dam in front of the culvert, and he said they would ideally like to see the beaver dam remain in place. The Corps said they may be able to leave parts of the dam in place. Keeping the dam in place would preserve the resource areas. This might also affect how much riprap can be restored for the project if the beaver dam is left in place. He said if the beaver dam is removed, a large amount of sediment could move downstream.
3. Mr. Osiecki said there will be grout pumped under the culvert to allow for flow to move over it. He said they want to move forward with conservation guidelines.
4. Ms. Steeves said she was able to visit the site a few weeks ago. She said the culvert is completely dry and it is evident that the water is flowing underneath and that there are stabilization issues. She said this might also be an opportunity to improve the culvert to allow for wildlife crossing with a natural substrate on the base of the culvert.
5. Mr. Seidenberg said the plan was to prevent the water from flowing underneath by pumping grout under, so this would not require a redesign of the culvert.
6. Mr. Osiecki said the culvert needs to remain in place and this would just be a repair operation.
7. Mr. McGregor asked if the box culverts have been deemed to be safe and secure.

8. Mr. Osiecki said the culvert do not meet the bridge standards because the water is flowing underneath the culvert base. This would allow for a bridge permit to be issued. The box culverts themselves are functional.
9. Mr. Lavallee said the description of the project does not match what was written in the NOI, particularly the NOI mentions removal of the dam and replacement of riprap. He asked if they will be revising this.
10. Mr. Osiecki said they submitted the NOI as a worst-case scenario to ask for guidelines from the commission. He said any repair of the riprap would be done with the goal of preserving the beaver dam and water levels. He said they are happy to submit any additional documents or to meet again with an engineer during a future conservation meeting.
11. Mr. Lavallee said he is not clear on how to proceed with the NOI being a worst-case scenario.
12. Mr. Seidenberg said it is up to the applicant to present what they would ideally like to do. He said the ambiguity of the present filing will not work when the commission goes to write the order of conditions. He said the NOI and plans should reflect the work that is going to be done. He asked how they are going to manage the water flow when the grout is pumped underneath.
13. Mr. Osiecki said they have been discussing sandbags and a temporary dam to block any waterflow. He said the engineers will drill holes into the existing base to minimize disturbance outside. He said they are happy to submit more finalized plans, but they want to understand what the commission would like to see in the NOI. He said this filing is a first step.
14. Mr. Lavallee suggested that the Corps submit a notice of intent showing the holes in the existing base. If they find they need to remove the dam, they can submit an amended NOI.
15. Mr. Osiecki said it would be difficult to stop the project once it is started and this is why they submitted a worst-case scenario NOI.
16. Mr. Crafts said usually, they have to submit a worst-case scenario due to diplomacy issues and funding.
17. Mr. Seidenberg said if the Army Corps wanted to remove the beaver dam for the project as listed in the original NOI, he believes the commission can offer their opinions on how the Corps can go about this.
18. Mr. McGregor said as long as the beaver dam is removed responsibly, the project is worth it and there will not be any consequences.
19. Mr. Osiecki said their ultimate goal is to keep the water levels where they are. He said they will do everything they can to return the wetland to its natural state if there is any resulting disturbance.
20. Mr. Lavallee said it would be wise to release the pooled-up water in a controlled way.
21. Mr. Osiecki said the dam will be removed gradually and monitored extensively to ensure the work is done in the most appropriate way.
22. Mr. Crafts said there is an emergent wetland downstream. The total wetland complex is 125 acres.
23. Mr. Seidenberg said he is skeptical of the dam removal. He said the structure itself can easily be permitted. He asked if there had been any movement in the bridge itself.
24. Mr. Osiecki said there was a report showing the bridge is not stable and has the potential to give way.

25. Mr. Seidenberg said they can easily permit the grouting. He said changing the size of the pond and beaver dam removal will result in several issues, especially because this area is within an area of critical environmental concern. He said they would require a habitat study.
26. Mr. Crafts said he agreed, and that they do not want to see the dam removed. He said this also might require the pond to be drained upstream.
27. Mr. Seidenberg said he would prefer to see a new notice of intent showing no beaver dam removal. He said the riprap would improve the stability of the stream, but this would result in a more challenging review of the project.
28. Mr. Osiecki said this is exactly what they are asking for. He said the point of the meeting was to get feedback so they can talk with the engineers and ask them to find a way to leave everything in place.
29. Mr. Seidenberg asked for the height of the water above the base of the culvert.
30. Mr. Crafts said it is between 6 and 8 feet deep. The beaver dam is likely 4 feet above the culvert. He said removing the beaver dam would likely significantly reduce the water level. He said they could potentially add a beaver dam analogue so the beavers could re-build the dam after the original one is removed.
31. Mr. Seidenberg said he would not vote for any plans to be approved that show pond draining. He said the pond has been there for a long time.
32. Mr. Osiecki said he agrees. He said he will work on submitting a solidified notice of intent.
33. Mr. Seidenberg said the commission is looking for a modified narrative and plans, and that the commission give them time to put this together. He said this requires a continuance.
34. Mr. Osiecki said he would like a one-month continuance to the 26th of September 2023.
35. Mr. McGregor made the motion to continue the hearing and it was seconded by Mr. Lavallee.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Public Hearing, Request for Determination of Applicability: 696 Fort Pond Road- Cloutier

Present: John Cloutier (Applicant); GFI Group (Property Owners)

1. Mr. Seidenberg read the public hearing notice.
2. Ms. Steeves said the applicant had requested a continuance based off her recommendation. She said she had advised Mr. Cloutier to request the continuance in case the site visit was not able to be scheduled in short notice before the meeting.
3. Mr. Seidenberg said the continuance was up to Mr. Cloutier. There was a brief discussion to continue the meeting between the representatives of GFI partners and the applicant.
4. Mr. Cloutier said there were discussions to continue based on the timing of the site walk and the amount of material to be reviewed. There were also several abutters that were not present who were under the impression that the meeting would be continued.
5. Mr. LaRoche said he was not aware of the continuance request.
6. Ms. Palazola said she was not aware of the request.
7. Mr. Seidenberg said the site walk occurred before the meeting. He said he was not sure a continuance would be necessary. He said there are a number of interested parties present in the meeting, including the applicant, and he was inclined to open the discussion.

8. Mr. Lavallee asked who thought it was going to be continued and why they were not here.
9. Mr. Seidenberg said he had a discussion with Ms. Steeves and Mr. Christopher. He said he thought the applicant was GFI and he misunderstood what was happening with the hearing. He said the applicant had submitted a written request for a continuance, and this was prior to him being able to review the RDA. He said the applicant was present, the site walk had occurred, and he was inclined to proceed with the discussion.
10. Mr. LaRochelle said he was under the impression that the commission was happy with the delineation of the wetlands on the property. He said he thinks the RDA application was a result of Mr. Cloutier trying to delay the project.
11. Mr. Lavallee said he was happy to have the discussion today.
12. Mr. McGregor said he thinks they should proceed with the discussion. He said interested parties can see the meeting recording. He asked if the commission would be bound by the process to continue the meeting.
13. Mr. Cloutier said the original intent was to give the commission ample time to review the meeting materials. He said there was not a lot of notice for the site walk, so many abutters were unable to attend. They are also not in the meeting tonight. He said this was information that would warrant a continuation.
14. There was no motion to continue.
15. Mr. Seidenberg said they can take that action if they feel the meeting needs to be continued. He said as far as the WPA is concerned, the conservation commission has no ability to regulate a project outside of the buffer zone prior to any alteration occurring. He said the DEP has determined that there is no basis for the commission to do a preconstruction review for projects outside of the buffer zone. The GFI project has no encroachment. He said the commission cannot act on the RDA and will have to file a negative determination. He said the by-law also has a 100-foot buffer and that during his time on the commission, they have never done a pre-construction review on projects outside of the buffer zone. He said it would be a bad idea for the commission to find a reason to require an NOI on the project.
16. Mr. McGregor said the scope of the project and location of the wetlands would certainly warrant concerns from abutters. He said the project, however, is not within their jurisdiction. He said he understands the concerns of the abutters.
17. Mr. Lavallee said the project is non-jurisdictional and the commission has no authority. He said he appreciated the site walk and that there are vast areas within the complex that should be protected.
18. Mr. McGregor said all of the newer flags from the re-flagging matched perfectly with the older delineation.
19. Mr. Seidenberg said there was a site walk with GFI and Mr. Cloutier where everyone got a chance to walk the wetland line. He said they walked around 1000 feet of the wetland resource edges. He said the intention was to investigate if there was any reason to believe that the ORAD was no longer correct. He said he saw no reason to believe that the ORAD was incorrect. He said the wetland resource areas seemed to be largely correct and therefore, GFI plans were non-jurisdictional. The commission investigated the wetland boundaries and there is no reason to mandate an NOI. He said the project may cause an alteration in the future, but at this time, the commission does not have jurisdiction to regulate the project.
20. Mr. McGregor said hopefully none of the resource areas will be impacted in the future.

21. Mr. Cloutier said he wanted to thank the commission for going through the process. He said the scope of the project and resource areas warranted input from the commission to make sure everything was designed correctly.
22. Ms. Palazola said that GFI had reduced the scope of the project to make sure everything was outside of the wetland resources.
23. Mr. Seidenberg said the proposed project is the best possible outcome from the commission's standpoint.
24. Mr. Lavallee made the motion to issue a negative determination. It was seconded by Mr. McGregor.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Request for Certificate of Compliance: 339 Seven Bridge Rd- Kalon Farm (Continued from last meeting)

Applicant not present

1. Mr. Seidenberg said this COC was presented during the last meeting, but it did not meet the requirements for the COC, and there were no as-built plans. He said he also visited the site. He said the sewer pipe crossed under a culvert adjacent to a resource area. The project involved buffer zone and intermittent stream crossing. He said he walked to the point where the sewer line crosses the culvert. He said he found the outlet for the culvert and there was flowing water. He said all the erosion controls were taken out and the site looked like it was back to its original condition. He said he would be happy to issue the COC.
2. Mr. Lavallee said the packet of meeting materials includes a note that the E-1 pump chamber was substituted for a concrete chamber, and this was indicated on the plans.
3. Mr. McGregor said he would be happy to approve the COC.
4. Mr. McGregor made the motion to approve the COC and it was seconded by Mr. Lavallee.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Continued Public Hearing, Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation- 10 Fire Rd 54

Present; Bill Hannigan (Representing Applicant)

1. Mr. Hannigan said he had a meeting with Oxbow to make sure everyone agreed regarding the ISLF calculations for the vernal pool. He said his calculations showed a certain impervious area which they limited to the vernal pool area. He said there was a photo showing a flooded area in an abutting property. Mr. Butler (Oxbow) recommended that the extent of the flooding from the photo be used as the extent of the impervious area within the watershed for the analysis. He said there were discussions back and forth and they came to the agreement that it didn't matter, because the watershed itself does not generate enough volume of water to be considered an ISLF. He said they ran the calculations with the ISLF being limited to the vernal pool area and found a volume of 0.92 cubic feet which is below 2.5 cubic feet. He said they also

ran the same analysis using Mr. Butler's recommendations to extend the impervious area to the extent of the flooding and they calculated a volume of 1.25. This figure is below the threshold of 2.5 cubic feet to designate an area as an ISLF. Mr. Butler sent a letter affirming that the vernal pool is not an ISLF. He said they agree that what is shown on the ANRAD plan is accurate and that they are asking for this to be approved.

2. Mr. Butler said he wanted to make sure the ISLF question was answered. He said he included this in his most recent letter. He said the polygon reviewed is around 6 acres and he said it is prudent to define the limits of the property that was reviewed. There is also a large portion of the property that was not reviewed during the scope of the ANRAD.
3. Ms. Steeves asked if the commission would like to see the vernal pool be certified.
4. Mr. Butler said the pool meets the criteria of a vernal pool. He said the vernal pool would be on its own, regulatorily speaking. He said the this resource area is already defined in Lancaster by-law.
5. Mr. Hannigan said the pool is already regulated by the by-law. He said since the pool is not an ISLF, it would not be certified by the state. He said for the purposes of this and future filings, the commission has substantial jurisdiction under the by-law to protect the vernal pool.
6. Mr. Butler said the certification would add a layer to the Mass GIS map.
7. Mr. Hannigan said the commission already has regulatory authority over the pool.
8. Mr. Lavallee said it would be good to have it certified, but it is not required.
9. Mr. McGregor said he was concerned if the commission would be able to regulate it as a vernal pool. He said he appreciated that the ISLF was tested for both calculations.
10. Mr. Seidenberg said he would like to echo the necessity of the notation showing that the eastern portion of the lot was not covered by the ANRAD.
11. Ms. Steeves said she could add this as a notation on the ORAD. They can also add this as a condition on any order of conditions too.
12. Mr. Seidenberg said it would have to be done before any subsequent filings are presented.
13. Mr. Butler said the commission could reference a figure to affirm the line that was accepted during the public hearing process.
14. Mr. Hannigan said the latest plan was from June 27, 2023.
15. Mr. Seidenberg said there are significant areas of jurisdictional areas on the eastern portion of the lot.
16. Mr. Hannigan said this could be noted on the ORAD. He said they can submit a plan with the boundary line marked off. A plan with the boundary line was submitted via email to Ms. Steeves.
17. Mr. Bowen said that the purpose of the hearing is to designate the wetlands. He said he thinks the area around the vernal pool should be designated as a resource area. He said this would affect what could get built there. The current plans show that this is a buffer zone.
18. Mr. Seidenberg said the commission knows that the 100-feet from the vernal pool is considered a resource area.
19. Mr. Bowen expressed concerns about the next steps if this is not clear on the plans.
20. Mr. Hannigan said there are 2 labels on the plans distinguishing they type of buffer zone. He said the 100-foot buffer zone of the vernal pool is a resource area and the plans meet this criteria.
21. Mr. Bowen said the driveway is labeled gravel, but it is actually dirt. He said there is an existing dock on the plan, which is only a year old. He said the structure on the property is existing, He

said the plans should be consistent as to what is considered existing. He said the vernal pool could be certified by the state, but he wondered what the process would be to get recognition from the state that it is a vernal pool.

22. Mr. Seidenberg said in the past, the commission has mandated that certain vernal pools be certified.
23. Mr. Bowen said he would like to see these features clearly marked on the plans so that there is no confusion in future hearings. He said the plans indicate that there is a driveway, but there never has been one.
24. Mr. Seidenberg said the purpose of the hearing process is to certify a plan showing areas that the commission will regulate. He said the driveway concern is hard to answer because they can not tell what has been developed vs what has not been developed. He said most of the area has been modified in some way over the years.
25. Mr. Bowen said there are wetlands on one side and vernal pool on the other. He said the applicants would therefore be limited to the existing footprint of the structure. He said he does not want anything to be given more significance simply because it is marked on the plans.
26. Mr. Hannigan said there were questions about the limits of disturbance and that they will be limited to working in areas that have been previously disturbed. He said the purpose of this plan is to have the commission approve the limits of disturbance and resource areas on the present plans.
27. Mr. Bowen said the commission should be talking about the limit of disturbance and the definitions of that before the plans are approved.
28. Mr. Butler said there are areas on the plan that are not jurisdictionally significant.
29. Mr. Seidenberg said there is an exemption to regulation for structures existing before the creation of the by-law. He said the commission would be obliged to recognize the limit of disturbance. He said disturbance is a relative term, and this would warrant a discussion when an NOI is submitted. He suggested that they approve the ORAD only on the western portion of the property and note this on the ORAD.
30. Mr. Lavallee made the motion to close the hearing and it was seconded by Mr. McGregor.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

31. Mr. Lavallee made the motion to approve the ORAD with a note to the scope of the delineation. It was seconded by Mr. McGregor.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Continued Public Hearing, Notice of Intent: 433 Brockelman Road- Filipi/ Siddell

Present: Elias Filipi and Daniel Siddell (applicants and owners)

1. Ms. Steeves recapped a site visit and said they went over the special conditions including the raised pavement, proposed tree removal, and erosion controls. She said Mr. Windsor and Mr. Hubbard were satisfied with the site visit.

2. Mr. Seidenberg asked if there was an updated plan with notation according to what was asked for during the first site visit.
3. Ms. Steeves said there was no new site plan yet.
4. Mr. Seidenberg said he would be uncomfortable moving forward without the new plan. He said he remembers there was going to be a discussion among the neighbors about the updated plans. He said without the new plan, the commission would have to vote for a continuance.
5. Mr. Fillipi was having connection issues, so the commission decided to move to the next hearing until he was able to rejoin.

(CONTINUED 10 MINUTES LATER IN THE MEETING)

6. Mr. Fillipi said he thought Ms. Steeves was going to add to the map. He said he was not explicitly told what to do. He said he does not know how to add these features to the map.
7. Ms. Steeves said the intent was to have an annotated map submitted by the applicants and then she would add special conditions once the OOC was issued.
8. Mr. Seidenberg said all they needed to do was take the existing plan and identify areas where there are concerns about runoff. He said the applicants can add notations showing the crown of the driveway. The commission is asking for this because of the significance of the proposed paving, and this makes the plans clearer to everyone. He said he would be willing to accept a reasonable sketch of the area.
9. Mr. Fillipi asked if he could trace over the original and add notes.
10. Mr. Seidenberg said he would potentially be OK with this, as long as the plan shows the annotations.
11. Mr. Lavallee said similar hand-drawn plans have been accepted in the past as long as they are detailed enough.
12. Mr. Siddell said they can mark up the map showing the erosion controls and everything that was discussed during the site visits.
13. Mr. Fillipi said the driveway is deteriorating rapidly and he asked if there is any way they can close the hearing by the next meeting.
14. Mr. Seidenberg said the sooner they submit the map, the sooner the commission will see it. He said he would be happy to review it. The commission will not be able to discuss things outside of the open meeting.
15. Mr. McGregor made the motion to continue the hearing and it was seconded by Mr. Lavallee.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Request for Certificate of Compliance: 220 Old Common Road (DCAMM Site)

Present: Mark Casey; EBI Consulting (Applicant)

1. Mr. Casey shared his screen with an as-built plan. He said there was an OOC issued to DCAMM in 2021 for the removal of a 20,000-gallon underground storage tank located under the parking lot of a former power plant. The tank was located within the buffer zone to a BVW. The tank was removed in September of 2021 along with 76 yards of contaminated soil. A water tank and

smokestack were also demolished. He said the entire area has been reestablished with vegetation and the embankment has been reestablished with a wildflower mixture. There was a riprap swale constructed along the embankment to control erosion. He said the work under the OOC has been completed, so they are here requesting a COC.

2. Ms. Steeves said she visited the site and noticed that the area seeded itself back in. She said there was a special condition outlining stump removal. She said there was a stump in the buffer zone and was wondering if the commission would like to see that removed. She also said she gave them a special permit to remove overgrown vegetation to allow for access to multi-level sampling wellheads. There was no cutting of trees or anything permanent, just chopping back some of the vegetation.
3. Mr. Seidenberg said that he assumed the stump was from a tree being cut. He said the intent of the condition was to prevent stumps from being removed and then buried in place.
4. Mr. Lavallee said this is how he interpreted it too. He asked if any contaminated soil was removed.
5. Mr. Casey said 76 yards of impacted soil was removed. He said only soil that was readily accessible was removed. They monitor water quality via wells twice a year.
6. Mr. Lavallee made the motion to issue a certificate of compliance and it was seconded by Mr. McGregor.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Request for Certificate of Compliance: 396 Hill Top Rd- C&H Realty

Present: Jonathan Collette (Representing applicant)

1. Mr. Collette said they are requesting a COC based off of an amended order of conditions. He said the members of the commission got a chance to look at the roof structure that was added to the project during a recent site walk. He shared his screen showing an as-built plan.
2. Ms. Steeves said she was on the site walk. Nothing stood out as deviating from the as-built. She said there were no obvious signs of drainage issues.
3. Mr. McGregor made the motion to issue the COC and it was seconded by Mr. Lavallee.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

Other Business; Extension Request McGovern Boulevard

1. Mr. Seidenberg said that this hearing was already continued to September 12th.
2. Mr. Lavallee asked if there is any progress to set up a site visit.
3. Ms. Steeves said the site visit was scheduled for September 6th.

Other Business: Bartlet Pond/ Wekepeke Brook Restoration COC request.

1. Ms. Steeves said an abutter who is affected by this project urgently needs a COC to be issued. The town was the applicant in the project. She said she needs to draft paperwork to apply for the COC. She wanted to know if the commission has any background on this project.

2. Mr. Christopher said there was a request from the Nashua River Watershed Association to do some planting along the Wekepeke.
3. Ms. Steeves said there was an OOC from 2013 mentioning Larry Jacobs. There were no special conditions, and it was signed by Mr. Christopher.
4. Mr. Seidenberg wondered why a third party has an interest in the OOC.
5. Mr. Christopher said the Wekepeke is an important cold-water fishery. He said he does not recall any work that was done on the Wekepeke other than the Bartlet dam removal.
6. Mr. Seidenberg said the applicant was the old town administrator, Orlando.
7. Ms. Steeves said she thinks this was for the removal of the dam.
8. Mr. Christopher said this needs to be approved since the work is long-since done.
9. Ms. Steeves asked if there needs to be a site inspection.
10. Mr. Seidenberg said he would like to see the OOC. This project is going on 10 years since it was completed.
11. Ms. Steeves said Mr. Jacobs is trying to get the COC because there is a homeowner that is trying to close.
12. Mr. Christopher said this should be granted.
13. Mr. Seidenberg said he was hesitant to grant the approval because he has not reviewed the plans. He said many of the records relating to this project are long gone.
14. Ms. Steeves emailed the original OOC to the commission.
15. Mr. Christopher said the reason there were no special conditions was probably because the work of the consulting company resulted in some disagreements during the construction regarding the budget.
16. Mr. Seidenberg said the abutter (applicant) was listed on the OOC. This is why the abutter is asking for the COC.
17. Mr. Christopher said the Moulton property is a listed party on the order due to access during the dam removal. He said at one time, this was the location of a mill, and the dam was encroaching on the Moulton property. After the area was drained out, they had to do some planting on the south side right up to the edge of the water. The area had to be replanted and stabilized after the dam was removed. He said the lowest bidder on the project was \$275,000.
18. Mr. Seidenberg said he was now comfortable on the approval.
19. Mr. Lavallee made the motion to issue the COC for the dam removal project and it was seconded by Mr. McGregor.

Roll Call Vote: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.

CLOSE THE HEARING at 10:05 PM:

The motion to close the hearing was made by Mr. McGregor and seconded by Mr. Lavallee.

Roll Call Vote to close the hearing: Thomas Seidenberg yes, Jim Lavallee yes, Bruce McGregor yes. The motion was passed.