

**Hamilton Conservation Commission
Minutes of Meeting of Feb. 11, 2009
Meeting held at Hamilton Town Hall**

Commissioners present as meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m.:

Nancy Baker, Virginia Cookson, Robert Cronin, John Hamilton (co-chair)

Staff present:

Jim Hankin, Conservation Commission Coordinator

Others present:

Bill Defresnes, septic engineer

Mark Kusminskas, property owner

John Tomasz, superintendent of Hamilton Department of Public Works

John Dick of Hancock Associates, wetland scientist

Michael DeRosa, wetland scientist

Landowners from the Linden/Howard street neighborhood

Peter Ogren of Hayes Engineering

Jack Stevenson, president, Myopia Hunt Club

The Commission is scheduled to meet on Wednesdays Feb. 25, March 11, and March 25, 2009 at 7:30 pm. at Hamilton Town Hall. Site walk is scheduled for Sat., March 7, 2009. Commissioners will attend a Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions workshop on Feb. 28.

Notice of Intent (Continued from January 28, 2009)

37 Greenbrook Road

Mary Hamilton, applicant; Merrimack Engineering, representative

Install Title V compliant septic system, pump chamber at 30' from edge of wetlands

Bill Defresnes of Merrimack Engineering showed commissioners a site plan and described the septic system he has designed for his client Mary Hamilton, to replace the existing system at 37 Greenbrook Rd. The backyard is all lawn, and slopes toward a brook that constitutes the rear property line. Mr. Defresnes described the brook as well-defined, with a steep bank, and very little bordering vegetated wetland. Mr. Defresnes said the water table is at 6.5' to 7'. A high-pressure gas main runs through the property, for which an easement exists. The existing septic system includes two seepage pits. The proposed new septic system would replace the pits with a leaching field, which would be underground with no change to the existing grading. The system would run parallel to the gas easement. The leaching field would be 52' from the edge of wetlands (EOW), the pumping tank would be 30' from EOW, and the septic tank would be 35' from EOW. A hay bale line would be installed 25' from wetlands to mark the limit of work area and provide erosion control. The entire area in which work would take place is lawn.

Peter Dana joined the meeting during this presentation, at 7:40 p.m.

John Hamilton opened the public hearing, retroactively.

Mr. Hamilton told Mr. Defresne that general conditions would apply, including a ban on pesticide or fertilizer use within 100' of wetlands.

Nancy Baker asked about a reserve area; Mr. Defresne answered that none is required for septic upgrades. She asked whether the owner plans to add bathrooms, or increase septic flow in other ways; he said the owner does not. Ms. Baker noted that if such construction were to be undertaken, riverfront regulations would apply.

Conservation Coordinator Jim Hankin said he walked the property. He confirmed Mr. Defresne's description of the backyard.

Virginia Cookson said she knows the owner, but did not consider it necessary to recuse herself from consideration of this application.

Mr. Hamilton invited further comments and questions from commissioners. There were none. He invited the public to comment or ask questions. None were forthcoming.

Mr. Hamilton told Mr. Defresne the Commission would not act until it receives official comment from the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Mr. Defresne consented to a continuance to the meeting of Feb. 25. Mr. Hamilton said that unless DEP makes comments that change the situation, the Commission would issue an Order of Conditions at that meeting, and it would be unnecessary for Mr. Defresne to attend it.

Ms. Baker made a motion for the Commission to continue this matter to the meeting of Feb. 25. Mr. Dana seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimous.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Defresne to inform his client of the conditions of the order, when it is issued.

Violation Notice

408 Bridge Street

Mark & Karen Kuzminskas, landowners

Substantial cutting of natural wild vegetation within buffer zone to pond, buffer zone to BVW and possibly within riverfront

John Hamilton noted that with the exception of Nancy Baker, all the commissioners present at this meeting participated in a site walk on Feb. 7 at 408 Bridge Street, scheduled because of a report of a wetlands violation. He said commissioners reached a consensus during that site walk that a violation has taken place, but that snow cover makes it impossible to assess the nature and extent of the violation, and necessary remediation. He suggested the Commission continue this matter until the snow melts.

Mr. Hamilton told the property owner, Mark Kuzminskas, that because plant life at the site is dormant, a delay would not be prejudicial to him. Mr. Hamilton said the violation notice is not a hostile or adversarial process, but a way to resolve violations that often occur because landowners unaware of local laws and regulations inadvertently violate them.

Mr. Kuzminskas asked whether he could burn some of the already-cut brush at the site in question. After some discussion, commissioners told Mr. Kuzminskas to leave the site completely undisturbed until they inspect it after the snow melts.

Commissioners agreed that if snow has melted by Sat. March 7, they would reinspect the site on that date. If snow cover persists, they might schedule an inspection in mid-March, or wait until the scheduled April site walk.

Notice of Intent (Public Hearing continued from November 19 and December 10, 2008, and January 14 and 28, 2009)
Linden and Howard Streets
Hamilton Department of Public Works, applicant
Clear streams of debris, re-establish flow

John Hamilton briefed other commissioners and the audience on issues regarding documents received since the previous session of the public hearing on a Notice of Intent (NOI) for a municipal project to clear a stream near Linden and Howard streets. First, he said the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) suggests that a 25' vegetated zone should be created adjacent to the stream after it is cleared, on what is currently privately owned lawn. Mr. Hamilton said it is routine to restore land to its previous state at the conclusion of a project; he called DEP's suggestion of a new use "unexpected," and said it would be hard to enforce. Second, he said that although owners of land abutting that stretch of the stream signed documents giving the Town rights to work on their property, those rights are "slim indeed, and revocable at will." He said he and Mr. Hankin, both of whom are attorneys, agree that the documents do not create an easement.

Mr. Hankin said the DEP comments call for a buffer, but do not specify 25'.

Mr. Hankin photocopied the DEP comments and distributed them. While he did so, commissioners informally discussed the pitfalls of accepting photos as evidence of the presence of endangered species, now that Photoshop® makes it possible to change digital photos' colors and contents.

Mr. Hamilton pointed out an apparent typographical error; documents abutters signed to allow the Town to work on their property state that such permission is to expire at the end of FY 2008, but the documents were executed after that fiscal year ended. He suggested permission probably was intended to expire at the end of FY 2009.

Mr. Hamilton said that houses along Linden and Howard were built decades ago, and that under current wetland regulation it probably would be impossible to build there now. He stated also that landowners' property rights have a bearing on this project.

Hamilton Department of Public Works (DPW) Superintendent John Tomasz gave an overview of the proposal, which he had described in more detail at prior sessions of this public hearing. Brooks carry water from a watershed area around Day Ave., through the Linden and Howard area; the brooks cross Highland St. and discharge into another watershed area. Years ago, crews from the Northeast Mosquito Control District (NMCD) regularly cleared the brooks, but no such work has taken place for about 10 years. In recent years, a number of homes on Linden and Howard have experienced significant flooding one or more times a year, in heavy rain. The DPW proposes clearing debris and vegetation from the stream, which passes through and between

privately owned yards near the junction of Linden and Howard. Mr. Tomasz said the goal is to “allow the flow to go to where it used to” and “work the way it should.”

Mr. Tomasz originally planned to use a small tractor to clear the stream while the ground was frozen, to minimize damage to private property adjacent to the stream. Now he proposes to do the work in late spring, using only manual labor.

Mr. Tomasz said that culverts that carry this stream below roads should be improved in the future; one has collapsed, and another probably is too small. Flooding problems will not be resolved until both stream clearing and culvert repairs are completed, he said.

Mr. Hamilton invited commissioners to ask questions, and comment.

Nancy Baker inquired about the source of several documents commissioners received prior to this session of the hearing. Mr. Hamilton said an outline of watershed problems was prepared by residents of the neighborhood, and filed with the NOI. Mr. Hankin said a feasibility study about ditch dredging was prepared 10 years ago for a warrant article that applied to the entire town; in the document, “study area #2” is the Linden and Howard area. He said that feasibility study confirms quantitatively the situation Mr. Tomasz described.

Ms. Baker asked whether culvert repairs are more urgent, and might be more effective. Mr. Tomasz replied that he is uncertain that upgrading the culverts without also dredging the stream would solve the problem.

Mr. Hankin said the Commission issued a permit in 2003 to replace a failed pipe culvert that carries this stream under Linden St., but that he does not know whether the work took place.

Commissioners discussed whether the stream is natural or man-made, and whether it is intermittent. Mr. Hamilton recalled NMCD official Walter Montgomery stating in about 1998 that the stream is natural.

Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Hankin explained how DEP’s comments complicate the situation. Having made the suggestion that a vegetated buffer strip be created, DEP might check to see whether the Commission includes this stipulation in its Order of Conditions (OOC) for the project. If the Commission were to issue an OOC that does not require creation of a buffer strip, DEP might intervene, as it is legally entitled to do. Mr. Hamilton said this could delay the project, add expense, and result in “a plan that no one in this room might want.” Mr. Hankin read aloud the comment posted by Heidi Davis of DEP, dated Jan. 28, 2009. She wrote: “Why is this project being undertaken? Branches and stones are important features of a stream and provide bed and bank complexity as well as habitat for macro invertebrates. Also, where applicable, a buffer should be provided between maintained lawn and the stream bank.”

Mr. Hamilton said the Commission has no authority to order the planting of a vegetated buffer strip on the lawns of private property, and the DPW does not have the authority to do such planting. He called DEP’s comment “unreasonable.” He said lawns have been maintained on both sides of the stream for 30 years in the neighborhood around Linden and Howard streets, and the Commission does not have the authority to change that. He expressed doubts that landowners would consent to creation of a vegetated buffer strip. He said if all work were done by hand, and the Commission were to make the finding that preexisting conditions on private land would be restored, he does not see how DEP could object.

Virginia Cookson suggested the amended filing should specify that the stream does not just contain a few branches at the edge that water can flow around, but rather some very big branches that dam the stream. She suggested the filing could state that if these stay in place, the stream could become a marsh or swamp. She said if Mr. Tomasz includes this level of description it should mitigate the DEP comment.

Commissioners discussed the likely nature of post-project restoration. Ms. Baker noted that most work would occur within the stream channel. She said in spots where some wetland exists between the streambed and lawn, the town crew should try not to alter existing vegetation beyond the bank and if any were disturbed it should be allowed to grow back. She said existing lawn areas could be replanted as lawn, unless landowners were willing to allow natural growth in the disturbed area.

Mr. Hamilton invited the public to comment, and ask questions.

Peter Sanidas of 32 Howard St. asked whether after clearing, the stream would hold more water. He noted the culvert size would not change and expressed concern that if the stream capacity increases, more flooding could take place around the culverts. Mr. Tomasz answered that the goal is to make the water move more swiftly. The stream has become wider because the sides are collapsing, depositing stones and sticks in the stream. Returning flow to the original channel should speed up flow and provide some relief, he said; replacing culverts later should further improve the situation.

Dick Flynn of 183 Linden St. requested more details about how the work would be done. Mr. Tomasz said he would not know until the job gets underway. He said he would consult with Mr. Hankin throughout the project, and would welcome guidance from property owners about what each one is willing to let the town crew do on their parcel. He said this is unusual, but necessary in this case.

Wetland scientist John Dick, who was at the meeting to represent a client later in this meeting, suggested the proposal could be reframed as a “limited project” under the terms of regulations for routine maintenance of road drainage structures. Mr. Hankin located the appropriate section in the regulations pursuant to the state Wetland Protection Act. He read aloud the title of WPA regulation 310 CMR 10.53(3)(k) “Routine maintenance and repair of road drainage structures including culverts and catch basins, drainage easements, ditches, watercourses and artificial water conveyances to ensure flow capacities which existed on the effective date of these regulations.” He noted the regulations took effect in April 1983. Commissioners thanked Mr. Dick for his suggestion.

Mr. Hankin explained to the audience that WPA regulations ordinarily set strict performance standards for work directly in resource areas such as streams or swamps. However, if a project meets the definition of a “limited project,” those strict performance standards do not apply.

Commissioners advised Mr. Tomasz to amend his proposal in writing, as a limited project. Mr. Hamilton said this change could decrease project cost, and eliminate many landowners’ fears. Mr. Hankin said DEP will not comment on the NOI amendment.

Ms. Baker asked what specific conditions the Commission should set for restoration of the site after the stream is cleared. Mr. Tomasz suggested he spend about two hours at the site with Mr. Hankin prior to the commencement of work, to agree on what would be acceptable in particular areas. Commissioners decided to inspect the site along with Mr. Hankin, on a weekday in mid-

March or later, as weather permits. Mr. Hankin noted that this site inspection will not be an official meeting, and no decisions will be made during the site inspection. Following the inspection, commissioners would formulate special conditions at a regular meeting.

By general consent, commissioners continued this matter to the meeting of Feb. 25. The applicant consented to the continuance.

Notice of Intent (Public Hearing continued from December 10, 2008, January 14, 2009, and January 28, 2009)

358 Chebacco Rd.

Michael Pallazola, applicant; DeRosa Environmental, representative

Install floating dock, trail

John Hamilton reopened the public hearing on this Notice of Intent (NOI).

Wetland consultant Mike DeRosa showed commissioners a digital depiction representing a sitting area his client Michael Pallazola proposes building near the lakefront of his property at 358 Chebacco Rd. To a photo taken from high on the slope between the house and the lake, Mr. DeRosa added photos of stepping stones, a stone patio, and chairs and a table. He said blue stone would be dry laid in stone dust, with open gaps and seams to provide drainage. He said the purpose of the sitting area is for the owners to supervise their children when they are in the lake. He noted that the Notice of Intent for the path, sitting area, and a floating dock is separate from a restoration plan the Commission approved for this property, under an Enforcement Order. He reiterated that the dock (about which he presented details at a prior Commission meeting) would be removed from the water each fall, and stored for the winter in an ancillary parking area outside the wetland buffer zone.

Peter Dana, who was not present at the prior meeting, asked Mr. DeRosa to explain how the dock would be constructed, and what a dark green area along the waterfront signifies on the site plan. Mr. DeRosa said the dark green area is bordering vegetated wetland. He said the dock would be pinned to exposed rock, and no filling would take place.

Mr. Hamilton reminded Mr. DeRosa that at the last meeting, commissioners and Mr. DeRosa agreed trail, sitting area and dock work would not begin until the mitigation planting has taken place.

Mr. Hamilton invited commissioners to comment, or ask more questions. None were forthcoming.

Conservation Coordinator Jim Hankin asked whether the applicants are happy with the proposed project. Mr. DeRosa replied that they are. Mr. Hankin said that if commissioners visit the site in the future and find that further development has taken place without permits, they would not be happy.

Virginia Cookson commented that the sitting area looks closer to the lake in the photo collage than it did on the site plan. Mr. DeRosa said this was due to the angle of the photo, and that there is land beyond the sitting area sloping to the lake, which is not visible in the photo; he said the center of the sitting area would be 35' from the lake bank. After examining the plan with Mr. DeRosa, Ms. Cookson said she was satisfied.

She reiterated her statement at prior sessions of this public hearing that she has a problem with the applicants “getting everything they want.” Mr. DeRosa replied that the applicants will have to pay a lot for restoration planting.

Mr. Hamilton invited the public to comment and ask questions. None were forthcoming.

Robert Cronin made a motion for the Commission to close the public hearing. Mr. Dana seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimous.

Mr. Cronin made a motion for the Commission to grant an Order of Conditions. Ms. Baker seconded the motion. Commissioners set these special conditions:

1. Planting required as a result of a violation notice, per the plan filed by DeRosa Environmental and approved by the Commission, needs to be installed and subject to a Commission site inspection in May or June. Then and only then can work be undertaken that is described in this NOI.
2. Construction and installation of the path, sitting area, and dock are to be completely by handwork. There is no need for erosion control.
3. The dock is to be stored each winter outside Commission jurisdiction.

VOTE: Unanimous.

Mr. Hamilton noted that standard general conditions also would apply. He asked Mr. DeRosa to inform his client of all conditions.

Notice of Intent

1028 Bay Rd.

Martin Zieff, applicant; John Dick of Hancock Engineering, representative
Construction of tennis court, within no disturb zone

John Hamilton opened the public hearing on this Notice of Intent (NOI).

Wetland consultant John Dick described his client Martin Zieff’s proposal to build a clay tennis court near a stream at the back of his property at 1029 Bay Rd., with 603 square feet of the tennis court’s impervious surface to lie within the 25’ no disturb zone (NDZ) adjacent to wetlands.

Mr. Dick reminded commissioners that they previously approved a map of the wetland line on this property. He said the intermittent stream constitutes the back property line, and is bounded along the mean high water line by lawn. He described the area as more emergent marsh than bordering vegetated wetland. A driveway used to run around the house, across the backyard, and across the stream over an old stone bridge. The stone bridge interrupts the stream bank. The tennis court is proposed near the bridge, where he said there “is no resource to protect.” He said that because other areas of the property slope steeply, to build a tennis court elsewhere on the parcel would require cutting down mature trees, and a great deal of filling.

Mr. Dick said that to compensate for encroaching on the NDZ, his client offers to eliminate the gravel driveway behind the house, and plant with native species all of the NDZ (except the 603 square feet which the tennis court would occupy). The restoration area would involve 220 linear feet of stream bank, and planting of 5925 square feet in the NDZ.

Virginia Cookson called this mitigation proposal reasonable.

Mr. Hamilton asked whether Mr. Zieff would consent to a special condition that the restoration area be permanently left in a natural state. He said a recorded Order of Conditions (OOC) with this condition would be effective forever.

Nancy Baker asked whether the stream might flood the tennis court. Mr. Dick said soil tests showed no evidence of flooding in the backyard; the stream apparently maintains a clear channel through this section of the property.

Mr. Dick said a drainage trench and drywell would be dug. The court would be partly fenced. He noted that the NOI documents incorrectly state that rock in the drywell would be 1.5 feet in diameter; he corrected that to 1.5 inches. He said the court would be somewhat smaller than a regulation court, and would pitch slightly to one side to facilitate drainage. He said his client also proposes additions to the existing house, which he described as “quite a distance back” from the wetland buffer area.

Ms. Baker asked whether the court could be moved even a few more inches away from the stream. Mr. Dick said this would not work, because an existing retaining wall would be in the way of tennis players.

Mr. Dick said he sent his client a list of species to choose from, for vegetation of the NDZ, including native viburnums, Carolina allspice, winterberry, high bush blueberry, spicebush, and native clematis. He said these would create a dense zone, and provide food and shelter for wildlife.

Mr. Hamilton noted that the Commission does not issue a Certificate of Compliance regarding restoration planting until it inspects a site after two full growing seasons have passed since planting took place, and confirms the plantings have taken hold. He asked Mr. Dick to submit a planting plan. Mr. Hamilton asked if Mr. Dick would consent to a continuance of the hearing until February 25, 7:30 pm Hamilton Town Hall, to allow for DEP comments (if any) to be part of the record and to allow for the filing of the plant list and planting plan. Mr. Dick agreed.

Request to Amend Order of Conditions

435 Bay Road

Myopia Hunt Club, applicant

Expand area for pond dredging shown on revised plan to conform to existing conditions; DEP File Number 172-0500, Order of Conditions and Permit recorded Book 27061, Pages 75 and following

John Hamilton described the observations he and other Commissioners made during the site walk and affirmed with Mary Rimmer, the applicant’s representative, that all existing requirements and conditions currently applicable to this project would extend to the additional work area as shown on the filed plans. Ms. Rimmer stated that this was so. Mr. Hamilton asked for a motion to amend the Order of Conditions. Mr. Dana so moved and Ms. Baker seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

9:15 p.m.

Notice of Intent

435 Bay Road

Myopia Hunt Club, applicant; Mary Rimmer, representative

Install force main to serve Title V compliant septic system

John Hamilton opened the public hearing.

Myopia Hunt Club's wetland consultant Mary Rimmer and septic engineer Peter Ogren of Hayes Engineering described to commissioners Myopia's proposal to link 11 existing septic systems with a force main leading to a new leaching field below an existing practice jumping ring. The leaching field would be outside the Commission's jurisdiction, but some of the sewer main is proposed for areas within the wetland buffer zone and riverfront area.

Mr. Ogren said his firm tested a number of areas on the Myopia campus to establish the best location for the proposed leaching field. The engineers recommend siting it beneath the practice jumping ring to one side of the main Myopia access road, on the Bay Road side of the Miles River, because it is part of an outwash plain and has sandy soil that would provide good treatment. Other potential locations were rejected because they had ledge outcrops, were too close to the river, or would not provide good drainage without extensive digging and disruption.

He provided details about the construction and design of the proposed system:

- It would collect and treat effluent from 11 existing septic systems that service the Myopia campus. Linking the systems to a single new leaching field would improve treatment overall. Some buildings, such as a shower annex, produce virtually sterile wastewater with inadequate bacteria for septic treatment. Combining this with domestic waste from the huntsman's house and other structures would provide enough bacteria for effective treatment.
- As material is excavated for installation of the sewer main, excavated material would be stockpiled in three areas. It would be used to backfill around the 6" pipe. Sandbags also would be required.
- The bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) line is flagged.
- Septic flow would be pumped uphill from a pumping station that would be constructed outside the riverfront area.
- 1600' of forced main would be laid along the parking lot, through a grove of trees, over the paved Myopia road, across a paddock (to skirt the riverfront area), and would dip down into manholes on both sides of the bridge over the Miles River.
- An insulated section of main would cross the bridge on the outside of the bridge's wall, encased in concrete.
- Equipment in the manholes would make it possible to bypass the main, if necessary for bridge repairs. The manholes also would house flow devices to detect leakage.
- Myopia officials have reviewed the proposed design with the Hamilton's health inspector, have performed required tests, and are ready to file with the Board of Health.

In answer to Nancy Baker's question, Mr. Ogren said the proposed forced main would not expand the system; it would service existing facilities. He said Myopia's septic systems are in various stages of needing repair; the main clubhouse tanks are in good shape, as is the grease trap for kitchen waste. There is a fairly new system by the pool. Where two cesspools are quite old, and "not really functional," new pipes would be laid through the clubhouse to connect in front to the new force main, he said. He said he spoke at length with the state Department of Environmental

Protection (DEP) about septic treatment plants, which he said are “hard to do,” and expensive to maintain.

Mr. Hamilton asked the applicant what adverse impact the project would have on wetlands. Ms. Rimmer replied that the 920 feet of pipe that Myopia proposes installing within the NDZ would be mostly in the existing driveway, or other previously disturbed areas.

Mr. Hamilton said the alternatives analysis in this NOI is satisfactory.

Commissioners agreed to wait to receive DEP’s comment on this NOI prior to acting on the matter. Myopia president Jack Stevenson gave his consent to a continuance.

Mr. Hamilton said Myopia’s representatives probably would not need to attend the meeting at which the vote would take place.

Virginia Cookson made a motion for the Commission to continue this public hearing to the meeting of Feb. 25. Ms. Baker seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimous.

Notice of Intent

537 Highland Street

Pingree School, applicant; John Amato of JJA Sports, representative

Install artificial turf surface

John Hamilton opened the public hearing on this Notice of Intent.

The Conservation Coordinator informed commissioners prior to this meeting that the Commission cannot act until the Hamilton Planning Board decides whether a stormwater permit is necessary for this proposed project.

Peter Dana made a motion for the Commission to continue this public hearing to Feb. 25. VOTE: Unanimous.

Non-Agenda Item

265 Woodbury Street

Tim and Lisa Davis, applicants

Enlarge footprint of garage by 3’ along one side. Permit issued DATE, etc. etc.

Tim and Lisa Davis asked commissioners to modify a previously-issued Order of Conditions for demolition of an existing house, and construction of a new house and garage at 265 Woodbury St. Mr. Davis said the architecture student who drew the plans for the new garage made a mistake; she designed it so narrow that it would be impossible to open the doors of cars parked inside. The Davises noticed this error on the plans only recently. Mr. Davis asked for permission to extend the garage 3’ toward wetlands. This would occupy space where the Davises originally proposed installation of a walkway and steps; the Davises would abandon plans to build these.

Peter Dana asked whether the pitch of the roof would change; Mr. Davis said it would not. John Hamilton and Nancy Baker noted that the modification would not result in any additional fill, or other changes, and they termed it inconsequential.

Conservation Coordinator Jim Hankin used a scale ruler to amend the building footprint on the site plan.

Commissioners approved the changes by general consent, and Mr. Davis signed the amended plan.

Discussion

Nancy Baker reported that the last meeting of the Open Space Committee took place in December, with three people present. The vice-chair is away and when Ms. Baker contacted another OSC member about arranging another meeting she received no reply. Commissioners discussed how to formalize the OSC's membership, and meetings. Ms. Baker volunteered to attend OSC meetings as an observer.

Conservation Coordinator Jim Hankin said that the Commission needs to decide how many should be printed, and whether to mail it to people other than Hamilton residents, such as contractors and real estate agents who do work in Hamilton. Commissioners suggested the document could be posted on the Town website, and copies could be placed at the library for people to pick up.

Commissioners briefly discussed what agency will spearhead the application process for a grant proposal that several towns may go in on together. Information was inconclusive.

Peter Dana made a motion for the Commission to adjourn at 9:53 p.m. Virginia Cookson seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimous.

Minutes submitted Feb. 23, 2009 by Ann Sierks Smith