

***SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION***  
***Minutes of the Meeting Held March 28, 2011***

Present: Victor Sulkowski, Vice-Chairman; Parker Coddington; Richard Bell; Sam Webb; Sharon Rizzo; Debbie Dineen, Coordinator; Victoria Parsons, Technical Assistant

**WPA & Bylaw Request for Determination of Applicability: 21 Murray Dr.**

Present: Jim Daigneault; builder

Mr. Daigneault presented plans for the construction of a 20' x 24' house addition on existing lawn and deck/porch area. The Coordinator explained that the wetland resource is an intermittent stream/drainage ditch approximately 80' from the proposed activity. The lawn is flat so erosion control should be available only if soil is stockpiled. She recommended a negative Determination.

The contractor plans to remove all excavated soil except what is necessary to backfill around the new foundation. Roof runoff will be channeled to infiltration pits. A 14' x 22' shed on a poured concrete pad is also planned to be built on the lawn area. A drip trench will be constructed for both the shed and house addition.

On a motion by Sam Webb, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Victor Sulkowski, the Commission voted unanimously in favor of a negative Determination.

**Review for Comment: Preliminary Proposal -Carding Mill Pond Dredging**

The Commission reviewed for comment to Hop Brook Protection Association the Ambient Engineering Permitting Proposal for Carding Mill Pond dredging.

Commissioners expressed concern about the statement "In satisfying the Con Com we will gain an ally which will be supportive of our submission to the state and federal permitting authorities". When the Commission reviews and permits this project it will do so in a regulatory capacity to determine compliance with performance standards of the state and local wetland laws. The Commission may, or may not, "like" the project and may or may not be involved or supportive in other permitting processes.

The Commission will expect to see a detailed comparison of dredging methods evaluated specifically for protection of wetland values and functions.

Dewatering of sediments was discussed as another area of concern. Drainage bags on the pond bank have the potential for harm to this resource. Detailed bank restoration plans will be required as part of the overall permit. In addition, at what point in the project are the sediments tested? Will 6 -8 samples throughout this large pond be adequate to properly evaluate the sediment quality?

Use of town agricultural land for dewatering will need to be investigated as an acceptable use. If allowable, compaction of soils and erosion are likely to result. A plan for restoration of the altered area and how the operation will not impact the current agricultural use of the land will be necessary.

The stated goal of the project is to restore water quality to Carding Mill Pond and the brook and ponds downstream as well as enhancing the wildlife habitat. Wildlife enhancement will include stabilizing plantings, water features (rocks, basking logs, etc), nesting areas, etc. There was no mention of the methods for habitat enhancement other than water quality improvement through pond deepening. There was no mention as to why this project does not begin at and include the upstream Grist Mill Pond.

V. Sulkowski noted that the project scope appears to be dictated by the amount of removed sediments to avoid an Environmental Impact Statement. This should not be the driving force of the scale of the project. The project should include the amount of sediment removal necessary to achieve and

maintain the stated goals. If the project will have a better outcome with greater than 25,000 cubic yards of sediment removed, the requirement for the EIS should not be the determining factor.

The total cost of the project is listed as \$75,000. It is not clear if this cost includes the actual mechanical work of dredging. The overall cost seems to be much lower than expected.

The Coordinator will draft comments to HBPA and send them to all for review prior to mailing.

### **Minutes**

On a motion by R. Bell, 2<sup>nd</sup> by S. Rizzo, the Commission voted unanimously in favor of approving the Minutes of Feb. 7, 2011 with Parker Coddington abstaining

On a motion by P. Coddington, 2<sup>nd</sup> by V. Sulkowski, the Commission voted unanimously in favor of approving the Minutes of Feb. 28, 2011.

On a motion by S. Rizzo, 2<sup>nd</sup> by S. Webb, the Commission voted unanimously in favor of approving the Minutes of March 14, 2011. Victor Sulkowski abstaining

### **Miscellaneous:**

#### **Conservation Restriction Monitoring SubCommittee**

D. Dineen and V. Parsons reviewed with the Commissioners the proposed scope of tasks for a CR Monitoring Subcommittee. The expectation is that the volunteers will contact the private property owners, visit the CR site, complete a checklist of observations, and enter the data into a database. Violations/Inconsistencies with the CR wording might be noted to the homeowner but all compliance enforcement will be handled by the Commission or staff.

The Commission agreed that we are ready to advertise for volunteers at this point.

#### **Community Gardens Perennial Section Regulations**

V. Parsons reported that she had received an inquiry from a potential new community gardener to plant fruit trees and berry bushes in the perennial section of the Lincoln Meadows Community Garden. Commissioners were concerned that trees may grow to shade other plots. D. Dineen noted that fruit trees are likely to invite more deer into the garden and they have been pests.

Commissioners agreed to permit the berry bushes but not the trees. D. Dineen will revise the Regulations to address tree planting.

Commissioners also agreed to permit mouse traps but no use of poison.

Vice-Chairman Victor Sulkowski declared the meeting adjourned at 8:20pm.