

**Town of Auburn  
Conservation Commission  
March 3, 2015**

**Members Present:** Jeff Porter (chair), Alan Villeneuve, Peg Donovan, Ed Fehrenbach

**Others Present:** Eric Mitchell, Jean Gagnon, George Chadwick, Mike Seraikas (wetland scientist), Dan Tatem (STANTEC), Rob Starace, Bob Baskerville (Bedford Development)

Meeting called at 7: 07 p.m.

**Eric Mitchell - Lover's Lane Subdivision (Calef Estates, Tax Map 8, lot 25)**

Mr. Mitchell started by saying he was asked by zoning to present to the Commission because their proposed detention ponds were within the 125' setback. He presented pans with markings in both red and black

Mr. Mitchell also said he would like to clarify something that came up at the Zoning Board meeting, but had not been relayed to the Conservation Commission when they submitted the [National Heritage Bureau](#) application there was a hit for Blandings Turtles (status endangered). He said they submitted an application to the wetlands bureau and referenced this, noting that Blanding turtles were in the area. As a result they have been asked to revise the structures crossing the wetlands, said it was all part of the application on file with the state.

Mr. Mitchell said around station 6plus 0, they have reshaped the detention pond to have it further away from the natural(?) pond, is now about 60' away, they have taken the access road on the brook side and moved it onto a lot, to be further out of the wet.

They are working under the presumption the Zoning Board will require a variance, have been asked by the Zoning to move the detention pond. If Zoning requires a variance, they will be maintaining a 60' no cut, no disturb.

At the end of the cul de sac, the detention pond is not in level 1 so they do not need a variance, they filed a conditional use permit because the detention pond placed in level 2. This way they will, have less impact, they have created a feasible design to put the pond on other side of a wetland finger outlet not away from the brook, so would still require a conditional use permit? Lot line goes along pond so would not need a variance on that lot.

They are looking for a reduction in the setback, they are not sure if they will be re applying for lot 20 to get variance, the Zoning Board denied the variance for the rest, so are not sure if are going to apply for it.

Next zoning meeting will be March 31, going to be re-notifying the abutters via certified mail of change of date, will be at the Planning Board on the 18<sup>th</sup> to discuss these plans.

Station 1000, is within the 75' buffer with road so they will be asking for a variance for that as well. Filed for variance but did not discuss, road comes within the buffer. Mr. Mitchell says that no run-off from the road will go into the wetland, this should leave more land on the north side of the property where a bigger level 1 wetland is and they will be able to maintain the 125' buffer.

J. Porter – any chance of moving detention pond onto the lot it abuts?

E. Mitchell – We could but that will take that lot away.

J. PORTER – exactly, that is where I am going, that will be an active stream and having a detention pond emptying into a level 1 wetland is not acceptable, moving it out of the buffer would be preferred.

E. Mitchell – the emergency spill way heads towards the level 2 and there is a natural buffer before it would get to the level 1. We think we have done the best we can without losing a lot.

P. Donovan - how big is the lot?

Eric – it is 0.57 acre, so it is small already, yes, we are within the setbacks but nothing should flow down to the wetland.

A. Villeneuve – given the road geometry, can you install this pond, based on our regulations, without going into the buffer?

E. Mitchell – no, the profile of the road is just under 3% coming down, then it goes to 4% going up, could not do that, in this particular case have nowhere to drain pond by gravity without going into the wetland because need to minimize the fill because of the road itself, we have no way to raise it, at the cul de sac because no there is wetland crossing this is not an issue.

J. Porter – what is base height of the pond?

E. Mitchell – it is 416' at the bottom, then 414' because will be adding a wet bottom, is 420' at the top and very bottom 412'.

A. Villeneuve - was this information shared at last planning meeting?

E. Mitchell explained that the black was new, but what they see in red was on the plans he presented before, he said the plans were not in great detail, and not in specific detail because they were going to be looked at by the Zoning Board.

A. Villeneuve - asked when the town's engineering saw the altered plans.

E. Mitchell – the town's engineers have not seen the new stuff, that is new tonight, the red stuff they have seen

A. Villeneuve - is there a correspondence we could look at?

D. Tatem - yes, we forward information to Denise, we can forward to you as well in future. Could the pond be built out of the buffer? Is it correct that if you lose the lot you could be out of the buffer?

E. Mitchell - yes, mostly.

A. Villeneuve - you are well aware that we are trying to follow the regulations that the town has voted on, so even though you may be able to fit more houses we need to follow the regulations, why can you not get all the way out of the buffer as regulations require?

E. Mitchell - I am showing red and black for a comparison

A. Villeneuve - can you show me an exhibit that has the maximum ability to stay out of the wetlands, which impact the wetlands the least?

E. Mitchell – yes

A. Villeneuve – well I have no other questions, it is a level 1 wetland, a named wetland. I would like to know if there are there any comments from STANTEC regarding the wetland crossing. This is difficult because we have not seen the correspondences from the engineers.

E. Mitchell - we put in a different crossing

D. Tatem - a box culvert is very typical, DES asks for one of several types of structures, we have seen in town a couple of bottomless culverts, but the interior just kept washing out. We recommended they place baffles with a screen bottom. Literature says if critters will use that type of structure most likely. Best crossing design can have

P. Donovan - I am confused as to why you keep coming back with alternatives that are less than what our regulations are, I keep expecting to see a plan that follows the regulations and it doesn't appear

E. Mitchell - we have a disagreement on what the regulations are and that is a discussion we will have tomorrow. For us to accomplish the things we need to we will ask for conditional use permits because nature is not as linear as the regulations would presume. We think we try to meet all the requirements you have, but will ask for variances as we see they are needed

A. Villeneuve – asked about the road bed, noting it appears it will be 8' above the culvert

E. Mitchell – the elevation is 427' and at the bottom of the culvert 420' but that is in the center of the stream where it needs to be in the lowest area, going lower, in the stream bed, makes it more difficult for, say turtles. Are there alternatives to keep them from climbing up and not

going over the road?

D. Tatem - not really I have not read a lot of literature about that

E. Mitchell – we try to enable them to see day light through the culvert, if they can see that instead of a dark tunnel literature says are more apt to go through

D. Tatem – noted that E. Mitchell's discussion tomorrow night at the Planning Board will cover why he did not get the detention pond info to the Conservation Commission, he says he received a letter saying he did not need to. I think tomorrow it will come out that the detention ponds will need a variance. Wetland enhancement is allowed within the 125' buffer, E. Mitchell contends that the pond is an enhancement so he did not need a variance

J. Porter – is it possible to move the detention into the lot and away from the level 1?

A. Villeneuve - I'm not sure you couldn't push the detention pond more towards the level 2 wetland

E. Mitchell - the 125' still considered a level 1, need to be 125' away from the vernal pool, we stay away from that and have impact closer to stream

A. Villeneuve - how much disruption will there be to the buffer at the end of cul de sac?

E. Mitchell - the fill area is all within the buffer, if we look at an alternative to get water down almost the entire buffer would be impacted on other side. As far as square footage buffer impact reduced by about 50%

A. Villeneuve - but you also manipulated the wetland level designations, taking a level 1 and calling it a level 2.

J. Porter – I am assuming you are looking for a comment regarding the two plans

E. Mitchell – I am looking for input as it is necessary for the other two boards to continue their review

J. Porter –does someone want to make a motion regarding the two lots

Discussed whether had walked the vernal pool area or not

A. Villeneuve – this is tricky because you have level 1 and level 2 wetlands all connected. I do not think we walked to the vernal pool, the wetlands on the top to the interior of the development were not as significant as those on the other side of the knoll that connect to the bigger wetland, those on the outside. I am less concerned about anything going on at the end of the cul de sac, but I have always been concerned about the crossing, the connectedness of one piece or another, the wildlife crossing, I think a disturbance there lessens the wildlife corridor that is created, they do travel along stream bed areas. Trying to gain space around that area and provide more protection for the stream bed

E. Mitchell - because the setback to the level 2 hinders, this is as far as it can go, there is a little bit more room on the other side, took a lot out and adjusted some

J. Porter – the consensus amongst the board seems to be that the plan in black is more favorable than that in red but not necessarily acceptable, we still need more discussion about the stream area and the detention pond by the crossing

***A. Villeneuve - motion to support detention pond (as presented in black) at the end of the cul de sac only, presuming STANTEC supports it as well.***

***P. Donovan - second***

***All in favor, motion passes***

J. Porter – so still more discussion needed about the stream area and the detention pond by the crossing

### **Eric Mitchell Development Proposal (Pingree Hill, Tax Map 5, lot 19)**

E. Mitchell – We did not know we were going to apply for variances for detention ponds within the buffer, we have since applied for those and are here to discuss, and we got no hits from the

heritage bureau. Areas for detention pond for the road one on 19-7 one on 19-6 one a level 1 one a level 2. Grading of road from Pingree about 1.75%

We will have a wetland crossing, we are not allowed to have any of the storm water drain into the wetland so we need to have the water go into something to be collected. On lot 7 and in lot 6 the plan is to put the detention pond in the open field, water comes from top of cul de sac both ways to the low point that is the detention pond. Placed these where the water will get to them, we are trying to keep them as far away from any of the wetlands as we can, the water close to the water table, we will be minimizing the amount of fill going out here, create cape cod berms so no wetland impact for the detention ponds themselves. Wetland mitigation allowed in the buffer and we feel this is part of mitigating, the project's impact on the downstream wetlands so that is why we have placed them here.

J. Porter – you are still showing lots 47-b and 19-3 and 18-4 designed with a 75' setback, we still have a problem with that. This will be very tough with this road for your detention ponds, I understand that...your spillway goes right into the stream

E. Mitchell - the intermittent stream

A. Villeneuve - No the level 1 stream that you have misclassified

E. Mitchell - that is something we can change. The outlet location, can direct that out towards the open field

A. Villeneuve - what does it look like on the other side of the cul de sac, does the ground on the neighbor's property keep going up?

Mr. E. Mitchell showed a schematic of the neighboring property, Country lane. He said the planning board wanted to know if feasible to have the roads connect though, asked to leave a right of way (?)

A. Villeneuve - I wonder about storm water and where it goes

E. Mitchell - nothing from their site comes to our site

D. Tatem - did you look at relocating detention pond 2 down on lot 6, relocate that to about station 1200, between the 2 lots back at (5& 6) there, then you get out of the 125' completely

E. Mitchell - we are trying to minimize the fill needed to be brought in

D. Tatem – there is only about a foot difference, could hard pipe the water and reverse your slopes only about a foot difference

E. Mitchell - I can look at it

A. Villeneuve - unfortunately the discussion of the second detention pond is tied to the level 1 level 2 wetland designation disagreement. I am not sure where to go with this as we as a Commission have repeatedly said we feel this is a level 1 and yet it continually shows up on your plan as a level 2

J. Porter – I agree, our regulations say running water is a level 1

E. Mitchell - the planning board has asked for STANTEC to review it, we got correspondence from Dan showing water running somewhere, we have not talked with him about it. Trying to figure what is out there where the water goes. We believe it is an intermittent stream, but also want to move ahead with the project.

Mr. Mitchell then talked about possibility of designating the edge of the stream a level 2 and the center a level 1. Adding that if they must keep the 125' then they will probably look for a variance, the Planning Board suggested having a peer review. Dan indicated water flowed, our scientists did not see a channel, and we are contemplating submitting an application to the Zoning for the variance. A buffer that is 125' from the channel that may be there changes everything as far as access getting into the area. Part of issue applicant has here is wanted a cluster changed to have grid lots in front and cluster in back kept lots out, planning asked for standard grids and small lots, so because of input from various boards we have made changes.

A. Villeneuve -with lot 19-4 if went you to 125' there would be no impact to a non-buildable area and lot 19-3 probably could find some relief if went to 75', I have said this before, if you just

went to the level 1. Asked about the lot sloping towards the road trying to understand the drainage easement in the back between lot 6 cannot find the 75' line

E. Mitchell - they merge so we did not show lines, they overlap

E. Fehrenbach - so it is completely in the buffer?

A. Villeneuve - so outfall shows it going to the tree line, I am trying to figure out what the dotted line is representing

E. Mitchell - we would probably come within 30' of the wetland. Need to design it so there is no increase of flow from before to after the building

A. Villeneuve - judging by the soils out there, there will be infiltration, the water table is about 24 "below the soil.

E. Mitchell - that is why we have to build it up

A. Villeneuve - did STANTEC review these

D. Tatem - yes we did and sent letters out to the town. Commented that detention ponds should be discussed

P. Donovan - sounds as though there are recommendations and things may have to be changed, so shouldn't we wait until Eric has a chance to look at those recommendations?

E. Mitchell - we need input and are working through various boards simultaneously. Detention areas based on some things Dan brought up, but we still get down to level 1/ level 2, I do not know that we are going to get a variance so I can't give you complete information. It makes problems for us when we think it should be a level 2. We would need relief from the Zoning board to get a driveway to get into the lot

A. Villeneuve - When I look at the plan, I see house and house, then water, water, water - (pond, poorly drained soils, pond, stream bed crossing, it all seems so tight - have you ever looked at mitigation, doing something underneath the circle, or other options than detention ponds?

E. Mitchell - we would need to raise road so high it would be tough

J. Porter - considering how shallow the water tables are, how do you see the septic's draining?

E. Mitchell talked about his designs how most will try to get in the front, the house foundation will be up and they will grade to it at the front porch, no issue with design

J. Porter - raising foundation on 19-4, 19-3 will change slope of water back to the wetlands

E. Mitchell - talked about landscape items creating a subtle diversion so water goes to plantings not the wetland

J. Porter - the Zoning Board had good comments about having that delineation, personally I would like to hear what STANTEC has to say

A. Villeneuve - I have heard enough to know that whether the wetland is a level 1 or a level 2 hasn't been nailed down, I also have concerns about the outfalls, it seems like all of it is road, everything is going within 200' of each other and the slopes are flat and the water table is high, I'd like to hear STANTEC say it is okay

E. Mitchell - we need to calculate for 100 year storm to be held there

A. Villeneuve - interesting to see how the calculations take when put Cape Cod berm, where one side has small berm sheet flow goes right against it, have a storm it will jump the berm

D. Tatem - state regulations say you cannot send water to an adjoining property, but nothing about moving it on your own land, if you have concerns about decreasing flow to one wetland and sending it to another that is another issue and I agree it is a lot of flow

A. Villeneuve - this property is flat and wet, why would you want to make it flat and a mud hole?

J. Porter - with the exception of directions of the out flow that is about as much as we can offer at this time

E. Mitchell - if variances were offered for a couple lots in the field area would the Commission recognize this

A. Villeneuve - would a driveway into lot 6 go through the 125'?

E. Mitchell – we would need relief to get in there, it would come through field but kept as far away as possible

A. Villeneuve –the Commission is on the record more than once about that. Lot 4 does not need anything you could design lot 6 to get there, you are through the buffer so would need to show some kindness around 19-3.

J. Porter – I am really looking forward to the input from STANTEC, I have less concern for the driveway on 19-6 than Alan but if you end up with 125' because of the flowing stream it is certainly worthy of a variance.

P. Donovan –I think we need to see how the Level 1 level2 breaks out before moving on it because will have an effect on how the plans play out.

### **George Chadwick (Bedford Design) – Pingree Hill Development Proposal (intersection of Silver & Pingree – Old Galvin Property)**

This is a 59.83 acre parcel, McDuffy Brook runs through it and the head waters of the Cohas is on the property. The wetlands on the property have been flagged, there are four numbered wetlands, 38 in corner, 41 is part of the brook, 28 bisects the property and 25 the brook as it leaves the property. We called wetlands relating to the main brook a level 1 and that in the far corner, a level 2.

Mr. Chadwick showed a schematic of the surrounding properties and how the open space relates to the project. The design they propose would have open space in the back that would connect open space already present on the adjoining properties.

Mr. Chadwick said they o=propose a cluster that they think best fits the property. They have the more than 25% steep slopes and wetlands that are needed in order to do a cluster. There are 17.17 acres of wetland and 6.14 acres steep slopes. Mr. Chadwick then described his process for determining how many houses they can build.

Ultimately it is 16 units based upon the town's calculations, and they intend to leave 45.95 acres undeveloped. He noted they intend to stay 75' away from wetland 38 and 125' away from wetland 28

P. Donovan asked how far the first house would be from the road. G. Chadwick answered about 125'.

J. Porter expressed skepticism that the head waters of the Cohas is a level 2 because of the connectivity of the wetlands. Mr. Chadwick said he could stay 125' away.

A. Villeneuve said that he didn't think the townspeople wanted to see a cluster and asked Mr. Chadwick what he thought were the two best features of the property.

Mr. Chadwick said he did not want to mention the one that he figured A. Villeneuve wanted him to mention and then replied "the functions and values of characteristics of the acreage saved, you are going to tell me the field, however the land owner has a right to develop, whether with a cluster or grid, the field will be developed."

A. Villeneuve asked how big the proposed lots would be. Mr. Chadwick answered, about  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre. E. Fehrenbach asked how big the field was. G. Chadwick said about 14/15 acres. J. Porter mentioned that the Cohas had been flagged for Blandings, G. Chadwick said yes, and they also got some historical hits. E. Fehrenbach asked how far in they needed to go the first house. A. Villeneuve said 100', G. Chadwick said a minimum of 100'. Maximum of 250'.

There was discussion about an easement and greenways, they asked whether the house lot was going to be a part of the development.

G. Chadwick said the house area will be broken into two lots, and they have an agreement with an abutter (D. Glynn) to do some land swapping to make the property line straighter, the barn in front will be taken out. He also mentioned there was a finger of water that goes into the field and they feel the function of this wetland is much different from the other. He wondered if the commission had any thoughts about that. P. Donovan answered not without a site walk.

A. Villeneuve said a cluster would work for this property, because a grid would not. The best part of this parcel is the field which is an historical part of Auburn, we would lose that and everyone would be staring at houses as they drive by, this is not the best use via our cluster regulations.

G. Chadwick asked if the Planning Board agrees that a cluster is the best use, would he have the Commission's support? P. Donovan said we would need to walk the land before we could say anything.

There was discussion about whether the property was in current use or not. E. Fehrenbach said he thought the field was registered with NRCS. A. Villeneuve noted that the water has quite a flow across the property. G. Chadwick said there is a lot of value to it, keeping it unencumbered because of its high value. E. Fehrenbach noted that is a moot point as the wetland cannot be built anyway. A. Villeneuve said he did not feel there was a giant trade off here, nothing is being protected, as the wetland is unbuildable, clusters are designed to preserve historical pieces. He noted that he has heard a lot about that from people town.

M. Seraikas, wetland scientist said the Wetlands Bureau always wants to acquire land along brooks with contiguous properties this would be accomplished here.

Discussed easements and mitigation

### **Eric Mitchell – Anderson Property**

E. Mitchell and the property owner Rob Starace, came back and tried to negotiate a compromise about the 125' setback. They wondered if they were 125' from the edge of the wet, would they support building a house on the lot if they needed relief to get into the lot, they cannot keep a 125' buffer and get into the lot. E. Fehrenbach wondered that since they still need a variance to utilize the parcel what's the big push?

R. Starace asked what it would take to make it work and how long would he have to wait for a peer review. Noting that he did not have to wait to get a peer review. J. Porter said it is active water, the Commission had heard from an abutter and it is wet all the time. R. Starace suggested calling the center of the stream a level 1 and the edge of the stream a level 2. A. Villeneuve said they are currently waiting to hear back from STANTEC and the peer review. E. Mitchell said the peer review people would not have much information as there were no pictures or data sheets.

A. Villeneuve said call the stream a level 1 and come back with what you want to do, do not ask us to tell you what to come up with, you are responsible for presenting to us what you want to do and have you propose it will work. If you want to avoid the peer review, call it a level 1 and come back with a plan.

R. Starace again asked if the Commission was okay with calling the center of the stream a level 1 and the edge of the stream a level 2. P. Donovan said she had never heard of that done before. A. Villeneuve said call the stream a level 1, establish your lines and parameters, submit an application and if the boards cannot come together, pull it.

P. Donovan agreed with the idea they put an application in and return. They discussed the possibility of having a meeting Wednesday March 14, at 6:00, before the planning board meets. Will confirm with the Town Hall that the room is available.

### **Pingree Hill Development Proposal (Tax Map 5, Lots 29 & 36)**

For this plan they will be submitting to the Zoning Board and have already submitted to the Planning Board, also have applied for a conditional use permit.

A. Villeneuve asked what was going on with the vernal pool. The response was they have Meridian Wetland Services doing an impact study. E. Mitchell said he knows that the Commission is not in favor of the impact they will have on the vernal pool with these plans. A.

Villeneuve responded, correct we are against impact to the vernal pool.

E. Mitchell said the total wetland impact is approximately 6,000 sq. ft., about 2363 sq. ft. would be to the vernal pool, their intent is to fill in about 2/3 of the vernal pool and figure the remaining 1/3 is not disturbed. The plan is to attempt to create three vernal pools on another portion of the property will a total of 10,000 sq. ft. they will have different depths. This will be a 4:1 change in terms of square footage. A. Villeneuve mentioned that the only vernal pool mitigation the Commission has done was 70:1.

G. Chadwick replied those were the numbers we put on the application, we got hits on the Heritage Bureau, they found both Blandings and Spotted turtles, there were actual turtles found about ½ mile away, we would put up notes about what needs to be done if a turtle should be found during construction.

A. Villeneuve asked to see the Heritage Bureau document which after the first three pages was blank – a copying error?

G. Chadwick discussed their plan to put a detention pond in front near the vernal pool and create a culvert crossing embedded 30", adding the Fish & Game requested the side of the culvert not be smooth and be embedded with rock and stone to try to create a natural bottom.

J. Porter asked if STANTEC had reviewed the plans.

G. Chadwick said as of yet, no. He continued that they have a 3,200 sq. ft. wetland impact for the other crossing. Lots 17 & 12 will also have detention ponds, they will have long, and narrow pipe going away so can make an elongated pond and decrease impact. There will be an access road along the lot line on the high side, a similar configuration will be used for the other detention pond. Because we cannot put water anywhere outside the buffer, we have done the best we can based upon the constraints of the slope of the road, designed to limit impact back into the wetland. Unless the Zoning Board tells them they do not need to, they will be applying for a variance from the 125' setback.

J. Porter asked if the vernal pools they plan to create are in the open space with 125' buffers around them. E. Mitchell said they would be more than 125' from any private property, and they will be within the open space.

A. Villeneuve noted that on page 3, they designated a well-defined stream as a split level 1/level 2. E. Mitchell said they intended the middle of the stream to be designated a level 1 and the edges a level 2. A. Villeneuve noticed the drainage easement in touching the stream. E. Mitchell said the grading will be 25' from the edge. A. Villeneuve said so you plan disturbance to a level 1 wetland 25' away.

E. Mitchell said the parcel has 62.31 acres, they plan on putting up 25 units leaving 41.16 acres of open space.

P. Donovan asked how far from the detention ponds to they plan to put their created vernal pools. E. Mitchell drew them on the plan as way of explanation, saying they will be in the middle of nowhere relative to the rest of the site. A. Villeneuve said he has a similar objection with, where the wildlife connector is cut off, just putting up another barrier to connectedness

E. Mitchell said runoff from the half way point of the road goes to the vernal pool.

A. Villeneuve said he did not like the idea of interrupting the area more than it already have, but this plan shows disruption on both sides of the road with smaller lots, plus he was not happy with a proposed 50' or less buffer to a level 1, perennial stream.

E. Mitchell replied "so noted that the Commission does not want to support reduced buffers in level 1 wetland areas, and he would see if they could do something, but was not sure that it would be enough to change the opinion of the Commission. They continued with discussions about changes that might be made. J. Porter said amount of disturbance should be part of the calculation. E. Mitchell mentioned that there is a portion with the design has a road going alongside the wetland with a 25' setback and they have applied to the Zoning board for relief, have an area of level 3 wetland with disturbance. . A. Villeneuve and J. Porter both said that disturbance to a level 3 is not as important as that to a level 1.

A. Villeneuve noticed that the wetland buffers cross the lot lines significantly in this design, compared to others Mr. Mitchell had created and he replied that the soils were more conducive



to building.

A. Villeneuve also mentioned that he was still not in favor of supporting the destruction of the vernal pool. All the members of the Commission echoed agreement. J. Porter said, that brings them back to the idea of the developer "buying a lot" so he can put his road there and not through the vernal pool.

### **Approve Minutes of February Meeting**

***P. Donovan – motion to approve the minutes of the February meeting as written***

***E. Fehrenbach – second***

***All in favor, motion passes***

### **Earth Day – Audobon Request**

P. Donovan mentioned that she had been asked by Kellie Dwyer of the Audubon Society in Auburn if the Commission would be interested in participating. There was some discussion about this, none of the members could get the time to do so, it was determined that the resources were not there and Peg would rely this to Ms. Dwyer.

### **Old/New Business**

J. Porter reported about a Zoning Board meeting he had attended. He mentioned that the plans E. Mitchell showed the Conservation Commission were different from those he showed the Zoning board, and there was a huge discussion about the level 1/level 2 stream designation.

P. Donovan noticed that the items about the presented plan that had been denied by the Zoning board were still on the plans E. Mitchell presented tonight.

J. Porter mentioned there was notice from the Massabesic Water Works about some clearing they intended to do because of a red pine scale insect.

There was an intent to cut from H. Eaton

***P. Donovan – motion to adjourn***

***E. Fehrenbach – second***

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.