

Town of Franklin



Conservation Commission

**August 22, 2023
Meeting Minutes**

As stated on the agenda, this meeting is available to be attended in person and via the Zoom platform. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link provided on the agenda. This meeting will be held in Room 326A (Third Floor Training Room) of the Municipal Building for citizens wishing to attend in person.

Commencement

Chair Patrick Gallagher called the above-captioned meeting to order this date at 7:00 PM as a remote/virtual/in-person meeting. Members in attendance: Patrick Gallagher, Jeffrey Milne, Jeff Livingstone, Richard Johnson, Michael Rein, Meghann Hagen, Mark LePage. Absent: None. Also present: Breeka Li Goodlander, Conservation Agent (via Zoom); Tyler Paslaski, Administrative Assistant.

Note: Documents presented to the Conservation Commission are on file.

Chair Gallagher stated that on Wednesday, September 6, 2023, the Commission is scheduled to present before the Town Council on the 2023 update to the Open Space and Recreation Plan. He noted that this has been a significant undertaking. He stated that they are hoping the Town Council adopts the plan and then it will go to the state.

Chair Gallagher stated that anyone here tonight for a public hearing, if they have not returned certified mail receipts to the Conservation Department for abutter notifications, be reminded to do so.

Chair Gallagher stated that to the extent we have matters being continued, it is the Commission's practice to engage in conversations on those matters. He stated that we are not in the business of trying to close out a matter without folks being present, but understand that we have had a number of applications that spill into numerous hearings, oftentimes to be continued while other boards and commissions weigh in; this puts the Commission in a difficult spot for those hearings that last for a number of sessions. He said if a commissioner misses two or more hearings, the commissioner is not eligible to vote on that matter. So, that is an issue for the applicant; that is a challenge that we face. He requested applicants file as close as possible to the point they are ready to present to the Commission, and that is much appreciated. He stated that and to the extent a matter may be continued, the Commission will still have some level of discussion to open the hearing for the evening, to discuss if a continuance is merited, and to vote on the continuance. He stated that applicants should not expect that there will be hearing where no substance of their matter comes up, even if the ultimate outcome is that it will be continued.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearing – NOI – Spruce Pond Aquatic Management Program

Mr. Keith Gazaille of Solitude Lake Management, representing the applicant, addressed the Commission. He apologized to the Commission as the project has been continued many times. He stated that he is committed

to getting things back on track. He provided the green cards. He stated that they recently submitted a response last week to the most recent peer review. He stated this information should help to clear up any confusion around what they are requesting and proposing to do to manage the aquatic vegetation in Spruce Pond.

Mr. Jonathan Niro, BETA Group, stated that a summary of what was submitted from the applicant would be appropriate.

Mr. Gazaille stated that in the peer review it seemed like there was some difficulty for the Commission that this is a maintenance level project; there is not a specific project/treatment scenario that they are asking for, so it may be difficult for the Commission to approve a specific plan, so he has tried to remedy that by identifying management zones as to what will be managed in each of the zones. He reviewed the types of zones and locations in the pond area where he is identifying those zones and what is in each zone. He stated that they provided the scope of the program, a table that summarizes the quantities of the products and what they would be used for, and the application rates. He discussed how best management practices should be incorporated. He asked if the Commission would condition the development of best practices plan. He noted comments related to nutrient mitigation and management. He stated that they are in agreement with that and have provided some thoughts on what a sampling program would look like. He noted a request for additional information with respect to the alternatives analysis with the proposed products; he provided that. He stated that they provided information on the local bylaw as well as the Wetlands Protection Act.

Ms. Goodlander stated that she does not have an official response to the applicant's letter.

Chair Gallagher noted the treatment that was done, the enforcement order, and the new NOI submitted. He stated that he does not know if there is any discussion in the filings of appropriate mitigation for the unpermitted treatment. He asked the applicant to provide in a typical year how many treatments they are doing, how often, and whether it would be appropriate to notify the Conservation Department prior to treatments. He asked what is their schedule and what are they anticipating. Mr. Gazaille stated that historically they have been probably doing two to three per year. He stated they have done some floating leaf control, they are monitoring the pond on a monthly basis, and they can provide current plant information to the Commission in advance of treatment, in essence documenting the need for the treatment.

There was a motion made by Michael Rein to continue the public hearing for the NOI for Spruce Pond Aquatic Management Program to September 7, 2023, at 7:01 PM. The motion was seconded by Meghann Hagen and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Public Hearing – ANRAD – 1 Paddock Lane

Chair Gallagher stated that at the previous Commission meeting, this item was voted to be continued to the September 7, 2023, meeting at 7:02 PM; therefore, no action needs to be taken on this item.

Public Hearing – NOI – 100 Financial Park

Ms. Goodlander stated that the applicant requested a continuance.

Mr. Jonathan Niro of BETA stated that he would rather wait until the applicant is present before summarizing the received letter. He noted the applicant is also working with the Planning Board. Ms. Goodlander confirmed the variance request was received from the applicant.

There was a motion made by Meghann Hagen to continue the public hearing for the NOI for 100 Financial Park to September 7, 2023, at 7:03 PM. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Public Hearing – NOI – 15 Liberty Way

Ms. Goodlander stated that the applicant requested a continuance. She stated that the applicant will be submitting updated plans. She stated that she has not received notification that the applicant has filed with DEP or has a DEP file number. She stated that she gave them her review, and she received an okay from the applicant.

There was a motion made by Mark LePage to continue the NOI for 15 Liberty Way to September 7, 2023, at 7:04 PM. The motion was seconded by Richard Johnson and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Public Hearing – NOI – Lot 1A Prospect Street

Mr. Louis Petrozzi of Wall Street Development Corp. addressed the Commission. He stated that this is a property that used to be a sand and gravel operation since the 1960s. He stated that he provided photographs of the area that have been identified as degraded. He showed and explained the proposed plan. He stated that his original NOI included use of the degraded area as part of the project to construct a single-family house. The driveway is outside the 200 ft. riverfront area. He noted that BETA did a peer review on the project and they had a site visit on the property. He discussed that during the site visit there were no objections to the flagging of the degraded area. It came to their surprise when BETA came to some conclusions that were not consistent with their flagging of the degraded area. He discussed that according to BETA's report, they have no objection to the right side of the degraded area. They also have no objection to other flags as noted.

Ms. Goodlander interjected that auguring was done during the site visit and top soil was found; she said she watched it being done and photos of the findings are included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Petrozzi stated that he disagreed and his consultant on the site walk said no auguring took place. He stated that whatever was augured during the site walk was not brought to the attention of their consultant Paul McManus of EcoTec Inc. to determine the discrepancy. He stated that therefore they do not know what BETA identified. He stated that there is no question that the area in pink on the plan is degraded. He reviewed the areas shown in purple and said they were areas where there was dumping. He stated the whole area is a redevelopment of sorts given that the sand and gravel that was there. He suggested BETA and his person go out to the site together and go down the access road and come to an agreement as they are both professionals.

Chair Gallagher noted that the regulatory requirements are complicated and he assumes BETA will be determining and providing specific answers.

Mr. Petrozzi reviewed on the plan the area of disagreement. He discussed the area is about 1,000 sq. ft. He stated that it is easy to make up the 1,000 sq. ft. and comply with the regulations. He suggested BETA meet with his consultant Mr. McManus in the field and measure out what they think they can agree to.

Mr. Jonathan Niro of BETA stated that Mr. Petrozzi is correct in the lower area as it is degraded. He stated that the access is degraded due to the absence of top soil and from the aerial photo it was access to a previously developed and disturbed graded area. He noted the aerial photograph and that the degraded areas as such before the Wetlands Protection Act was passed in 1997. The area on the left side in the historic photos is still shown as well vegetated. He noted that it was an abandoned dumping ground, but based on the photos submitted and what was seen on the ground, the area was well vegetated with topsoil and no real signs of abandoned dumping grounds. He stated that he would be happy to meet the applicant and go through it in more detail. He stated that regarding the process, BETA goes to the site, assesses what is there, and provides the findings to the Commission. If there are questions during the public hearing, they are happy to go back out to the field to further discuss. He noted that besides the degraded riverfront area, there are a few items outstanding including some construction sequencing, more formal restoration plan, planting plan with

definitive species, and alternatives analysis per the bylaw. He explained the alternatives analysis requirement.

Chair Gallagher asked Ms. Elyse Tripp of BETA to walk through her process while out in the field.

Ms. Tripp (via Zoom) stated that she went on site with the applicant's scientist Mr. McManus and Ms. Goodlander. They went flag to flag and she observed vegetation, existing features, she took augur holes, and looked for evidence of top soil. She stated that she looked to see if there was anything to consider being an abandoned dumping ground. She stated that she asked clarifying questions. She stated that it was all noted in the peer review letter to the Commission. She stated that it was noted why they disagreed with the degraded areas.

Ms. Goodlander stated that she wanted to correct some inconsistencies for the record and parrot what has been said about public process and then make a few notes looking on the horizon. She said that for inconsistencies she wanted to make the commissioners aware of the timeline of events. She said the initial site visit was on July 27. She said BETA and herself conduct their own separate reviews whenever we receive a submission. She stated the applicant asked to be present on this site visit but the initial site visit is meant for us to quietly collect our own data and to parrot Pat to digest that information to take a look in the field and at our desktops to really get a broad view of the project and then respond accordingly. She stated the BETA review letter was submitted nine business days after that initial site visit on August 9; she delivered it to the applicant via email on August 10. She said she did not get a response from the applicant until late last week responding to the BETA review letter. She stated that she was present at the site visit and Ms. Tripp did take soil samples. She reviewed the site visit. She stated that looking ahead, she would happily conduct another site visit, but that would require an amendment of the scope and fee for BETA.

Mr. Niro stated that they do have some funds remaining to do the site visit, but any further writing of documentation they would be required to submit an amendment.

Mr. Petrozzi stated he understood what the process is. He stated the purpose of the site walk is to identify areas of disagreement and make the applicant aware of areas in dispute. He stated that could have easily been done. He stated that if someone does an augur and finds topsoil, isn't it incumbent upon them to bring that to the attention of the consultant on the site visit. He stated that he is the one paying the bill. He questioned if BETA is going to charge \$2,600 to go out to the field to do a report and do an incomplete report in the field.

Chair Gallagher stated that he would dispute that BETA's report was incomplete in the field. He stated that as Ms. Goodlander noted, BETA is the Commission's consultant.

Mr. Petrozzi stated that for BETA to not put a flag where they thought it was marked wrong, is doing an incomplete job as a peer reviewer.

Chair Gallagher discussed BETA's peer review fee is a cost of doing this type of project. Ms. Goodlander stated that BETA does not hang flags for applicants; they will make note where changes need to be made, but it is the burden of the applicant and their representative to reflag.

Mr. Niro stated that he wanted to clarify that the cost scope that was submitted to the Commission that the applicant agreed on, we have addressed the items in the scope with a site visit and response.

Mr. Johnson stated that this is a single-family residence that someone wants to live in. It seems that we could get together to come to a reasonable solution so these people can get their house built. The animosity should be tamped down and get together and solve this. He stated that there should be enough with the you said, he said, etc. Mr. LePage confirmed that the dispute is over the dumping ground.

Mr. Niro reviewed the dispute of the dumping ground location. He asked where Mr. McManus disagreed with the assessment. Mr. Petrozzi explained that BETA did some testing, but did not indicate where the line of testing was and where is the limit of the line. He stated that they need to go back out together and indicate that this flag is degraded area or is not degraded area and if not, why. It is very simple.

Chair Gallagher asked Ms. Tripp for her process. Ms. Tripp stated that she honed in on the large soil mounds that were within the area that in the report is noted as being degraded as an abandoned dumping ground. She stated that she reviewed vegetation that she saw and she reviewed her process of how to determine if it is degraded. She stated that BETA's purpose is not to reflag or say you need to move this flag exactly 5 ft. until we are actually able to document the disagreement with it and to discuss it with the Commission.

Discussion commenced that the applicant would have to show why the areas are degraded. Mr. Niro said they will walk through their letter and findings, but BETA will not reflag. Responding to Ms. Hagen's question, Mr. Niro stated that there is no actual definition of dumping grounds; he reviewed areas that are considered dumping grounds.

Mr. Johnson said that we should be able to work this out. Chair Gallagher stated that compliance with regulations, both state and Town bylaws, can be very expensive. He stated that the Commission's job is to enforce the regulations. He stated that around riverfront areas is a very complicated regulatory regime. He stated that this is a single-family proposal, and we need to take the land as it is and we need to work around the regulatory constraints. Ms. Hagen stated that she was looking at the regulations of the riverfront area. She asked if the area does need rehabilitation and improvements to the ecosystem. Mr. Niro stated that there needs to be a balance of the riverfront area; having an accurate delineation in the field would allow the applicant to know how to address it.

Mr. Petrozzi stated that once an area is degraded, it is degraded, regardless of what is growing on it. He stated that the regulations do not tell you how much topsoil needs to be measured. He stated that he wants someone to tell him where they think the line is. Ms. Hagen stated that she is going through the regulations and asked where it says that degraded riverfront areas are always degraded and cannot be classified otherwise. Mr. Petrozzi stated that there is no such information in the regulations. He stated that his experience has been that degraded is degraded. The only gray area is how much someone determines topsoil. He asked that they go to the site and walk the purple line and determine if it is degraded. He stated that Mr. McManus is available.

Chair Gallagher said that a follow up site visit is warranted. He stated that going forward, he would ask that everyone is treating each other with respect.

Mr. Petrozzi asked about the alternatives analysis. He noted a previous submission with an alternatives analysis related to this property. He stated the alternative is what they are doing now. He asked for permission to not have to do the alternative analysis for this item.

Ms. Goodlander stated that since this is a new filing, they would have to file an alternatives analysis under the regulations. She stated that what has happened in the past is in the past. Chair Gallagher asked what is typically seen for level of detail for an alternatives analysis for a single-family project. Ms. Goodlander stated that she can try to find an example from prior. She explained the level of detail she would expect.

Mr. Petrozzi explained that he does not think it appropriate to have to do an alternatives analysis for something they already presented as a lot to be built on at this location.

Ms. Goodlander stated that they have been working with the new lots. She stated that they are outside of riverfront area. She asked Mr. Petrozzi to include this in a letter on a letterhead for the record and for her to

dig deeper into instead of solely discussing this at a public hearing especially when she is remote that way she can look at what was approved before, like projects, answer the Commissions questions.

Chair Gallagher stated that he thinks that makes sense. He stated that they are asking for a good faith attempt at an alternatives analysis. He stated that it is a requirement of the regulations.

Mr. Niro stated that he will take a closer look at the calendar for a few dates/times to meet at the site.

There was a motion made by Meghann Hagen to continue the NOI for Lot 1A Prospect Street to September 7, 2023, at 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Public Hearing – ANRAD – Veterans Memorial Drive

Chair Gallagher stated that this item is still under review. Ms. Goodlander stated that it will be continued to September 7, 2023.

There was a motion made by Mark LePage to continue the ANRAD for Veterans Memorial Drive to September 7, 2023, at 7:06 PM. The motion was seconded by Meghann Hagen and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Public Hearing – NOI – Upper Union Street Solar

Ms. Colleen DeBenedetto of Valta Energy (via Zoom) on behalf of the applicant VS Union Solar Smart LLC addressed the Commission for an NOI for a proposed solar development project at 0 Upper Union Street including perimeter fencing, photovoltaic solar panels, racking systems, inverters, transformers with association concrete pads, above and below ground utilities, stormwater facilities, and gravel access road; the site is currently vacant and primarily forested. She stated that they did receive their peer review comments, yesterday. She stated they are beginning to work on them.

Mr. Jonathan Niro of BETA stated they did a field review; most of their comments stem from observations by the wetland scientist in the field. He noted that BETA agreed with a large portion of the flags in the field. He stated that there are a handful of changes requested. Of note, where the access road comes in there are isolated wetlands on either side. He noted that one of the boundaries has wetland indicators. He recommended the applicant take a look at that as they revise their plans. He noted that towards the northwest to the access of the site they found another isolated wetland; he discussed the location. He noted that some additional information was requested on the mitigation approach outlined. He stated that there were a few other requirements that need to be provided.

Mr. Andrew Thibault of Goddard Consulting (via Zoom) stated that he took a quick look at the letter. He stated the comments regarding the mitigation are fair and they will revise. He stated Goddard will go out to the field and take a look at the areas in question; they will provide responses to the Commission and BETA.

Chair Gallagher stated that this project requires a variance. He reviewed the standard for a variance under the bylaws. He stated that he is not of the view that granting a variance would further the interest protected under the bylaw. He stated that in fact, I think granting the variance would have an adverse effect on the interest protected under the bylaw. He read aloud additional information regarding the bylaws. He stated there was a lot of legalese in there. He suggested that the Commission request an opinion from Town Counsel on whether a denial of the variance would constitute a taking of property in this case. He stated that is a critical question for this application. He further explained that under the Town's bylaw there are several enumerated interests which dovetail with the Wetlands Protection Act for the most part. He stated that there are six which he read aloud. He stated that to him, this project which would require taking down of significant forest, does

not promote conservation. He stated it would be a fair question if denial of the variance would be a taking which is a legal question for Town Counsel to weigh in on. He stated that this would help to inform the Commission's view of this.

Ms. Goodlander noted that there are outstanding local filing fees. Chair Gallagher stated that he would send an email to Town Attorney Mark Cerel.

Ms. DeBenedetto asked that if the Town Counsel information becomes available prior to the next meeting, will it be available to share with her. Chair Gallagher stated yes.

Mr. Thibault stated that he would be happy to set up a site walk with the Commission. Commission members indicated interest in a site visit. Chair Gallagher noted that it may be best to denote it as a meeting if more than four would like to attend. He stated that he hopes he will get a response from Mr. Cerel quickly. He reviewed the bylaws regarding the 25 ft. no-touch buffer zone.

There was a motion made by Jeffrey Milne to continue the NOI for Upper Union Street Solar to September 7, 2023, at 7:07 PM. The motion was seconded by Richard Johnson and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Chair Gallagher called a five-minute recess.

Public Hearing – RDA – 121 Grove Street

Chair Gallagher recused himself.

Ms. Goodlander stated that the applicant requested a continuance to September 7, 2023.

There was a motion made by Richard Johnson to continue the RDA for 121 Grove Street to September 7, 2023, at 7:08 PM. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 6-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Chair Gallagher reentered the meeting.

Public Hearing – ANRAD – 124-146 Grove Street

Ms. Goodlander stated that the applicant is waiting on a BETA peer review; however, the applicant did not request a continuance.

Mr. Jonathan Niro of BETA stated that they went out to the site yesterday, and they prepared their letter.

There was a motion made by Richard Johnson to continue the ANRAD for 124-146 Grove Street to September 7, 2023, at 7:09 PM. The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Milne and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Minor Buffer Zone Activities: 3 Abbey Lane

Ms. Goodlander stated that she would be comfortable with the Commission approving this without the homeowner present given the cooperativeness of the homeowner. She stated that it is standard tree removal; however, what is unique about this is that there is a tree just outside the 25 ft. of BVW. She said the homeowner is also seeking to remove some other trees in the 50 ft. to 100 ft. and has amended his MBZA. She stated that Derek Adams went with her; she brings Mr. Adams with her for all tree removal site visits

since he is a certified arborist. She said that he attested these trees are hazardous and should be removed. She stated that while onsite, she noticed an unpermitted fence, so she asked the resident to include it in the MBZA. She stated that they are 1 sq. ft. posts and they would be under the square foot threshold of 1,000 sq. ft. She said she would be okay recommending the Commission approve this. She stated that she has spoken about all standard conditions with the resident.

Ms. Hagen confirmed the stumps would be left in place.

There was a motion made by Mark LePage to approve the MBZA for 3 Abbey Lane subject to standard conditions, with stumps left in place, and that any mobilization comes from the cul de sac and utilizes appropriate matting, etc. The motion was seconded by Meghann Hagen and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Permit Modifications/Extensions: None.

Certificates of Compliance: None.

Violations/Enforcement: 305 Union Street

There was a motion made by Richard Johnson to extend for 30 days the enforcement order for 305 Union Street. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage. Discussion: Ms. Goodlander stated that it is with DEP. The motion was accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Violations/Enforcement: 3 Natalie Circle

Ms. Goodlander reviewed the information on her agent's report which was provided in the meeting packet. She explained that in August 2023, a wetland resource violation was submitted to the Franklin Conservation Office for unpermitted work at 3 Natalie Circle. Initial attempts were made to contact the property owner in person; however, no one was available at the property to discuss at the time of a site visit. Given the nature of the activities, an Enforcement Order was sought promptly. Unpermitted activities resulted in the alteration of the 100 ft. buffer zone to Bordering Vegetated Wetlands and the locally regulated 25 ft. no disturbance buffer zone including, but not limited to, tree and herbaceous coverage removal, fill/gravel stockpiling, installation of semi-permanent structures (e.g., shipping storage containers), conversion of land use, and potential grading and/or wetland drainage. The Town of Franklin's Conservation Commission/Office does not have an approved permit on file for this property or project. Any work conducted, including the aforementioned, should be documented and presented to either the Conservation Agent or Conservation Commission pursuant to the Town of Franklin Wetlands Protection Bylaw (Chapter 181) and associated regulations and the Wetlands Protection Act (310 CMR 10.00). The Enforcement Order orders that: • The property owner, their agents, permittees, and all other shall immediately cease and desist from any activity affecting the buffer zone and/or resource areas; • Resource area alterations resulting from said activity shall be corrected and the resource areas returned to their original conditions; • A restoration plan shall be filed with the Franklin Conservation Commission on or before September 21, 2023 (see Section C of the Enforcement Order for additional details); • Complete the attached Notice of Intent (NOI) packet and file the NOI with the Franklin Conservation Commission on or before September 21, 2023 (see Section C of the Enforcement Order and the attached packet and filing and fee requirements); and • No further work shall be performed until a public hearing has been held and an Order of Conditions has been issued to regulate said work (see Section C of the Enforcement Order for additional details). She stated that she has yet to notify the building commissioner for the hazardous materials. In response to a question by a commission member, she discussed how the residents took the news of the enforcement order.

There was a motion made by Michael Rein to ratify the enforcement order for 3 Natalie Circle. The motion was seconded by Meghann Hagen and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Minutes: August 10, 2023

There was a motion made by Meghann Hagen to approve the meeting minutes for August 10, 2023. The motion was seconded by Mark LePage and accepted with a roll call vote of 7-0-0. Roll Call Vote: Gallagher-Yes; Milne-Yes; Livingstone-Yes; Johnson-Yes; Rein-Yes; Hagen-Yes; LePage-Yes.

Discussions: None.

Chair and Commission Comments

Ms. Goodlander announced that at the Farmers Market last Friday, the Conservation Commission won the zucchini races for the mid-weight class. Discussion commenced on the Farmers Market event. Chair Gallagher thanked all for their work on the Farmers Market. All thanked Chair Gallagher for his work on the Commission. Ms. Hagen stated that she would like the Commission to get to one Farmers Market in September and one in October. She asked everyone to look at their calendars.

Executive Session: None.

There was a motion made by Jeff Livingstone to adjourn the meeting. No second made. The motion was accepted with a vote of 7-0-0. (No roll call vote taken.)

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi
Recording Secretary