

**Carlisle Conservation Commission**  
**May 14, 2020**  
**Minutes**

Consistent with Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place due to the outbreak of COVID-19, this meeting of the Carlisle Conservation Commission was conducted via remote participation. **(Virtual Meeting Zoom ID 827 3520 1973)**

**7:03 p.m. Confirming Member Access:** Chair Dan Wells conducted a roll call vote to confirm all members and, staff were present: Lee Tatistcheff – aye; Vice Chair Angie Verge – aye; Helen Young – aye; Alex Parra – aye; Navneet Hundal – aye; Conservation Administrator Sylvia Willard – aye; Administrative Assistant Mary Hopkins – aye. Commissioner Ken Belitz was not present.

**Chair Wells - Introduction to Remote Meeting:** In order to mitigate the transmission of the virus, we have been advised and directed by the Commonwealth to suspend public gatherings, and as such, the Governor's Order suspended the requirement of Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location. Further, all members of public bodies are allowed and have been encouraged to participate remotely.

The Order, which is posted on the Town's website, allows public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so that the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. Ensuring public access does not ensure public participation unless such participation is required by law. This meeting will feature public comment. For this meeting, the Conservation Commission is convening by Zoom conference as posted on the Town's website identifying how the public may join. Please note that this meeting is being recorded. Accordingly, please be aware that other participants may be able to hear you and anything that you broadcast may be captured by the recording. All participants should keep their phones muted unless recognized by the Chair to reduce background noise and feedback. The public is encouraged to follow along using the posted agenda unless the Chair noted otherwise." Wells concluded with a review of the meeting ground rules to allow for effective and clear conduct of the Commission's business and to ensure accurate meeting minutes.

**Minutes:** *Tatistcheff moved and Young seconded to approve the February 27, 2020 minutes with minor revisions. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Young – aye; Parra – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

*Young moved and Tatistcheff to approve the April 1, 2020 minutes as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Young – aye; Parra – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

*Tatistcheff moved and Verge seconded to approve the April 15, 2020 minutes as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Young – aye; Parra – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**7:15 p.m. (DEP 125-1088) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing**

**Applicant: Gretchen Nelson**

**Project Location: 868 Concord Street**

**Project Description: Razing of an existing detached garage, construction of additions to an existing dwelling, installation of septic tanks for a new septic system and construction of a screen porch off an existing cabin, with work within the 100-foot Buffer Zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland and the Riverfront Resource Area.**

Wells opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary presented the revised plan dated May 6, 2020 in response to comments made by the Commission at the April 23, 2020 hearing, with the following changes: (1) a planting schedule is now

provided including 5 trees (*Northern Red Oak*) and 20 shrubs (*Winterberry and Lowbush Blueberry*), as mitigation for the increased impervious site coverage and the removal of 7 trees within the Riverfront Area, in addition to the previously approved seed mix; (2) some of the shrubs are proposed along the stream bank between the cabin and the stream, as requested to mark the stream edge.

Wells noted the revised summary of the updated impacts within the Riverfront Area does not include disturbance resulting from the proposed tree removal. Wells then asked the representative to provide a reminder as to why they believe the proposed patio in the front of the house can be considered an exempt activity. Carr explained they propose the patio is exempt as an accessory use to the single-family dwelling. Wells then referenced CMR 10.58.4(d) under the General Performance Standards which states ... “if there is not a 100-foot wide area of undisturbed vegetation within the Riverfront Area, existing vegetative cover shall be preserved or extended to the maximum extent feasible to approximate a 100-foot wide corridor of natural vegetation”. He said his interpretation of this is no trees should be allowed for removal within 100 feet unless there is sufficient justification. Carr said they are hoping the proposed mitigation would account for any disturbance resulting from tree removal, given they are replacing trees within 100 feet of the stream 1 to 1, with 20 shrubs provided as mitigation for trees proposed for removal beyond 100 feet.

Wells requested comments from commissioners who attended the recent site inspection.

Tatistcheff said it seems to her that the mitigation of replacing a 40-inch pine with a Red Oak sapling does not represent a 1 for 1 replacement, and furthermore, if the only reason to remove these mature and healthy trees is to be able to plant wetland vegetation, it does not seem in keeping with the spirit or the letter of the regulation. She also pointed out that many of the pines TBR marked as 18-20” DBH appeared much larger to her, closer to in the 30” range, noting these healthy trees are part of the riverbank and removal of the stumps would represent significant disturbance within the protected RA. Carr said he believes the applicant is willing to leave 3-foot stumps.

Hundal stated the project first came before the Commission prior to her becoming a member and asked why the trees are being proposed for removal. Carr said the applicant believes the trees are a threat to the dwelling. Tatistcheff said she observed the trees to be healthy, noting they are also located downhill from the dwelling and within the inner 100-foot Riparian Zone. Verge’s position is that if the if the trees were to be removed, she would like to see the number of oak saplings increase significantly, and she does not believe the Lowbush Blueberry is sufficient mitigation in replacement of the lost habitat value of the large, healthy pine trees. Parra said he found it difficult to differentiate between trees proposed for removal and those that would stay, commenting they did not appear to pose a danger to the dwelling nor did the removal seem necessary to accomplish the proposed work.

There was a general consensus among the Commission that the applicant has not provided sufficient rationale for allowing the tree removal nor had they provided an adequate mitigation planting plan. There was also a sense the Commission is not comfortable with justification for removing these trees and does not believe the standards of the regulations relative to work within 100 feet have been met. Wells suggested the applicant consider looking at this project as a redevelopment within Riverfront Area, which would provide more flexibility since they would not be required to meet the standards of 10.58(4) if significant mitigation is provided.

There was no public comment.

*Tatistcheff moved to continue the hearing to May 28, 2020 at 7:45 p.m. with the representative’s approval. Young seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**7:31 p.m. (DOA-361) Request for Determination of Applicability, Continued Meeting  
Applicant: Vintage Builders, Inc.**

**Project Location: 901 Concord Street, Map 4 Parcel 3-0 Lot 2**

**Project Description: Construction of a single-family dwelling and appurtenances outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone**

Wells opened the continued meeting under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Verge recused herself as an abutter.

Dan Carr provided an overview of the changes included in the revised plan dated May 7, 2020: the existing siltation barrier has been located and is now shown; abutter information has been updated; the location of the culvert under Concord Street is now shown; the plan is now stamped. The plan now includes the planting of three 18-24" Silky Dogwood shrubs to address a small unauthorized area of disturbance within the Riverfront Area. Wells said he typically associates the use of Silky Dogwood in wetter conditions and not at such a distance from the river, suggesting they consider more upland appropriate species.

Wells asked Willard to provide her assessment of the newly submitted material. Willard recommended the applicant be required to install permanent bounds along the edge of the Riverfront Area for protection. She also recommended the siltation barriers be extended with a marked Limit of Work at the edge of the Riverfront Area to avoid any unintended encroachment.

Wells asked the Commission if they felt that monumentation in that area is critical to their making a decision. Tatistcheff said she wants to see monumentation along the Riverfront Area and agrees the erosion should be control be extended, which is a standard practice when the cleared area extends up to the resource area. Upon further discussion, the Commission agreed upon a minimum of 4 granite bounds or field stone markers.

Carr asked if these requirements could be included as a condition of approval. Wells explained this would not be possible because the MassDEP WPA Form 2 does not provide for conditions under the category that is appropriate for this request. Carr agreed to provide a revised plan including the monumentation, the extended siltation barrier/Limit of Work. He also agreed to ask the property owner if he would consider more habitat appropriate shrub plantings.

There was no public comment.

*Tatistcheff moved to continue the hearing to May 28, 2020 at 7:45 p.m. with the representative's approval. Young seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – abstain; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**7:47 p.m. (DEP 125-1085) Abbreviated Notice of Resource Delineation, Continued Hearing**

**Applicant: Chris Buono, All Things Real Estate**

**Project Location: 0 South Street, Map 5 Lots 54 and 56**

**Project Description: Review of 6,500 feet of Bordering Vegetated Wetland Resource Area delineation.**

Wells opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Present for the discussion were David Cowell and Brian Goudreau of Hancock Associates, Melissa Robbins of Deschenes & Farrell, P.C. and the applicant, Chris Buono.

Robbins stated a letter was submitted to the Commission earlier today addressing the administrative information requested at the previous hearing. Included is a statement from Principal Engineer, George Dimakarakos of Stamski and McNary, in which he has testified to the validity of the affidavit provided with the evidence 5 years ago.

Cowell reported he has communicated with MassDEP since the previous hearing and has received verification there is no regulatory expiration date on evidence. He said at this point they understand the Commission is still

seeking new evidence, and they want to ask if the Commission is willing to provide them with the opportunity to await a continuance until stream conditions are dry. If so, he said they would like to afford the opportunity for members to serve as witnesses.

Cowell acknowledged there has also been discussion of whether there are impoundments upgradient and he is hoping to discuss and resolve the issue. He believes his client's apprehensions in waiting to catch a dry spell and record 4 days lies in the fact that the question remains as to whether the evidence would be accepted without further deliberation on whether that evidence is valid based on upstream impoundments. Because of this he would like to have some reassurances from the Commission that if they do receive 4 days of no flow, the issue of impoundments is not raised again. The Commission concurred with Wells' opinion that the sole issue is getting the 4 days documented and agreed a continuance would be appropriate.

On an administrative matter, Cowell said they would be submitting revised WPA Form4A including the property owner, South Street Carlisle, LLC as the applicant for the ANRAD application.

There was no public comment.

*Young moved to continue the hearing to July 9,2020 at 7:15 p.m. Verge seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

### **8:00 p.m. (DEP 125-1089) Notice of Intent, Continued Hearing**

**Applicant: Wilkins Hill Realty**

**Project Location: Curve Street, Map 19, Parcel 19-39-X**

**Project Description: Construction of a proposed driveway, including tree clearing and grading with approximately 1,560 SF of wetland fill associated with the driveway crossing using an open-bottom box culvert; construction of a single-family home; installation of a water supply well; construction of a 1,610 SF Wetland Replication Area and associated grading.**

Wells opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Present were Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary and David Crossman of B&C Associates.

Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary noted Wells had visited the site since the vernal pool was delineated by David Crossman of B&C Associates and revised the Vernal pool flags to address what he found at the time of his visit and consistent with NHESP guidance. A sketch by Wells showing the vernal pool flag changes was sent to the applicant's engineer and to David Crossman. A response was received from Crossman indicating an unwillingness to revise the pool flags. There has been a request by the applicant for an additional site visit, which has not yet occurred due to time constraints.

Crossman said he first wanted to say he is not disputing Wells' findings; he believes it is just a difference of opinion as to the edge of the vernal pool. He explained that it would appear the deepest section of the vernal pool is located on the street side; where the flags were set on April 7, there was no standing water along the entire back side. He reported visiting the site last week and again today, when he found the edge of the water remains at the flags he set with no water beyond.

Wells thanked Crossman for his comments. He noted the Wetlands Protection Act regulations do not define what constitutes the boundary of a vernal pool, and do not classify a vernal pool as a resource area. He explained that in order to obtain more information, he visited the site in late March and observed wood frog and spotted salamander egg masses, meeting the criteria for vernal pool certification. At that time he placed a marker of where he believes the extent of the vernal pool is located. On a second visit following the placement of flags by Crossman indicating his interpretation of the extent of the vernal pool, Wells inspected the new vernal pool flaggings and observed the extent of flooding was located closer to the BVW edge in this vicinity. He reported that of the two times he visited the site, the area labeled "ditch" on the plan was of interest to him because he

was not convinced it was a stream, since there was no flowing water. He noted there was a clear transition from stagnant water from within that channel to clear flowing water and he personally would consider that the vernal pool extends to where the standing water stopped, and the water began flowing.

Wells said there is still some uncertainty about whether the vernal pool is accurately represented on the plans. The applicant has revised the plan to relocate the crossing 100 feet from the vernal pool boundary as flagged by Crossman. The new flags would extend the vernal pool boundary farther, resulting in the need to shift the driveway outside of the revised boundary. The NHESP Guidelines for Certification of Vernal Pool Habitat state, "...the maximum observed or recorded extent of flooding represents the ecological boundary of the vernal pool...". In addition, it is clearly stated that the shallow edges of the vernal pool are critical biologically to the animals inhabiting the vernal pool for breeding. With regards to the application before them, determining the boundary is important to the Commission because, within the regulations, a vernal pool extends 100 feet from the edge of the vernal pool, but the boundary must be located within a resource area. In this case, that vernal pool habitat line does not extend up to the Buffer Zone, but it would extend up to the stream, and the proposed crossing may be within 100 feet, so technically the crossing may be located within vernal habitat, which would trigger the requirement for an Appendix B Wildlife Habitat Evaluation.

Crossman pointed out there is also a requirement within the certification process that requires the vernal pool to hold the water for two continuous months during the spring. However, in this case, the pool did not hold water up to the edge of the wetland flags for two continuous months. Wells said his interpretation of the guidelines is there must be standing water for two consecutive months, but the pool does not have to be flooded for two consecutive months.

Commissioners spoke in support of Wells' interpretation and agreed with his recommendation that a Wildlife Habitat Evaluation should be provided. Crossman estimated he would require additional time to complete the assessment beyond the next meeting scheduled for May 28, 2020.

Sarah Wilson of Wilkins Hill Realty said they had requested they be invited to participate on site walks and stated for the record she would like to be present for any walks going forward in order to be educated. Wells assured Wilson that moving forward the Commission will ensure she has advance notice for all site walks.

With no further comments, *Wells said he would entertain a motion to continue to the hearing to June 18, 2020 at 7:15 pm with the representatives' approval. The motion was moved by Tatistcheff and seconded by Young. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**8:28 p.m. (DEP 125-1091) Notice of Intent**

**Applicant: Elizabeth Valentine**

**Revised to: Alison V. Pascarelli & Elizabeth Hudson Valentine**

**Project Location: Lot 12 West Street**

**Project Description: Grading associated with a single-family house and a portion of driveway within the 100-foot buffer zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland**

Wells opened the hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary provided an overview of the plan. The site is a vacant lot. The northern, eastern and western edges of the lot are adjacent to property under a Conservation Restriction. There are Bordering Vegetated Wetlands located on the northern side of the lot, and there are BVW to the south and the west that project a 100-foot Buffer Zone onto the property. They are proposing a single-family dwelling and appurtenances. Work within the 100-foot Buffer Zone includes a portion of the driveway and associated grading and a small amount of grading for the septic system. They have provided a siltation barrier downward

of the proposed work. Although non-jurisdictional, Carr noted they are proposing to connecting downspouts from the roof of the dwelling to a dry well in order to control the amount of impervious runoff.

Willard said she had not had an opportunity to conduct a site inspection to confirm the wetland delineation. She noted they are providing erosion control near the septic field that does not continue beyond. She suggested the limit of work be delineated with construction fencing at the edge of the 100-ft Buffer Zone in order to prevent unintentional encroachment into the Buffer Zone during tree removal activity associated with the construction of the house. Verge suggested the bounds of the CR should also be delineated with construction fencing during clearing, to be replaced with permanent bounds upon completion of the work.

There was no public comment.

*Wells requested a motion to continue the hearing to May 28, 2020 at 7:15 p.m. with the representative's approval to allow for plan revisions as discussed and the scheduling of a site visit. The motion was moved by Verge and seconded by Tatistcheff. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**8:40 p.m. (DEP 125-1092) Notice of Intent**

**Applicant: David Chaffin**

**Project Location: 52 East St., Map 22, Parcel 64.**

**Project Description: Repair of a failing subsurface sewage disposal system a portion of work to be located within 100-ft Buffer Zone of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland but greater than 50 feet**

Wells opened the continued hearing under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and the Carlisle Wetlands Protection Bylaw. Present for the discussion were Lar Greene of McCarty Engineering, Inc. and the applicant, David Chaffin.

Greene provided an overview of the site. The house is located toward the northeasterly corner of the lot, with an intermittent stream and wetland area bisecting the lot located within the central and east side of the property. The stream is not shown on the USGS map and not a digitized channel on the USGS StreamStats program. The boundary of the BVW was delineated by WDA Design Group on September 27, 2019. The existing, failing septic tank is located within lawn area along the east side of the home. The plan for replacement of the septic system includes minor grading within a portion of the 100-foot Buffer Zone that is existing lawn area, with the soil absorption system located beyond the 50-foot setback requirement. Due to the existing well location and wetland constraints, they are concurrently requesting a waiver for the Title V setback of 100 feet from the BOH. An erosion control barrier will be installed within lawn area between the system and the wetland.

There was no public comment.

*Wells requested a motion to continue the hearing to May 28, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. to allow time for a site inspection to evaluate the wetland delineation and a response from the BOH regarding the Title V waiver request. The motion was moved by Young and seconded by Tatistcheff. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**(DEP 125-1064) Woodward Village Tree Protection Plan:**

Present were developer Dan Gainsboro of NOW Communities and Dan Carr of Stamski and McNary to discuss the details of the Tree Protection Plan (TPT) for this phase clearing and development for the project as required in the Order of Conditions. Willard reported visiting the site with Carr to inspect the protection flagging for Phase 1 as previously set by Carr for trees located within close proximity to the limit of work. She has added additional alternate color flagging for trees she believes should be saved. She noted the flagging of the bank resource area near the wetland crossing must be reestablished before the start of work. Willard stated for the record that when she visited the site, she used the limit of work as it was staked in the field and did not make a

determination on the accuracy of the location of the stakes. Gainsboro confirmed the stakes were set by a registered surveyor.

Wells displayed the proposed Tree Protection Plan. Willard expressed concern that some of the trees to be saved are near/within the limit of work. Carr stated the TPT includes a provision that requires they provide a layer of mulch/woodchips around trees located within or near the limit of work to prevent root compaction and trunk armor if they are unable to maintain an adequate distance. Wells requested an inventory of trees to be saved including approximate locations so the Commission can confirm they were left following clearing. Gainsboro offered to have the approximate locations identified by the surveyors in accordance with the sketch plan.

There was no public comment.

Following a review of the sequencing schedule, *Parra moved to conditionally approve the proposed Tree Protection Plan for Woodward Village subject to receiving a plan showing approximate locations of the trees to be protected as marked in the field prior to tree removal. Tatistcheff seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

**Deer Control Committee (DCC) Proposal:** Present were DCC Chair Jonathan DeKock, Deer Agent, Dan Bojanic, BOS Liaison Barney Arnold and member John Keating. The discussion was held in response to a request from the BOS that the commission review the proposed measures to expand the Bow Hunting program and provide their feedback. Arnold said the board is seeking guidance from both the ConsCom and LSC because they have a greater understanding about what is happening to the woodlands in Carlisle and also because much of the land included in the Bow Hunting program is conservation land.

ConsCom liaison to the DCC Parra said there was some sentiment on the DCC and also with respect to the BOS during their recent joint meeting to reevaluate the program and consider what might be done to make the program more effective in terms of reducing the negative ecological impacts of deer browsing. With that in mind, the DCC came up with a series of proposals which were recently presented to the BOS. Those include: the addition of two parcels – the Hart Swanson Land and the DPW Land, which would provide additional acreage for an additional 3-7 hunters; increase the number of hunters from 18 to 34; increase utilization of each of the designated hunting areas by allowing time sharing and implementing hunter logs in order to maximize the efficacy of the hunters; extending the season beyond the archery season to encompass the entire hunting season; reach out to the abutters to the existing parcels to see to what extent permission to hunt within 500 feet of their property line might be granted. Parra said one of the issues discussed at some length at the joint DCC/BOS meeting was the question of providing scientific data to support the expansion, which will likely require significant expenditures.

DeKock said the issue comes down to the BOS wanting to find out if the program is justified. He noted this was not in the charter of the DCC, since the justification of managing the deer overpopulation was well known when the program was established 3 years ago. He said now being questioned is whether there is a deer overpopulation issue and whether deer hunting is the appropriate solution. Ultimately what the DCC is asking of the BOS is not necessarily decisions but direction as to whether the hunt should be expanded, reduced, eliminated or continued as it exists. The DCC is now recommending the program be expanded based on their understanding of the nature of the issue that the program is not taking a sufficient number of deer to make a reasonable difference in the understory. Arnold said the BOS is wanting to hear from the Commission as to whether the impact on the understory is something they recognize as a concern and whether they support the idea of taking deer as a means of reducing that impact.

Parra said his thoughts, as a Conscom member, are he thinks the program as presently constituted manifestly is inadequate and he would not support its continuation without expansion due to the time and effort involved without producing effective results. Verge expressed concern about the amount of administrative time

previously required from the ConsCom assistant to establish the deer program – 60 hours in 2018 and 50 hours in 2019. However, she said she would agree to an expansion to determine if it would result in reducing the impact to understory browsing. DeKock said the DCC has spent time trying to understand how the time was being spent and how to reduce DCC members' time and administrative overhead costs. As a result they have determined that combination of approaches to reduce the amount of administrative time required. Included in these measures is a proposal to simplify the regulations, some of which he said are redundant and unnecessary. He noted the committee also anticipates a decrease in the amount of time required to manage public feedback, which they believe will not increase with a larger number of hunters. Bojanic pointed out that in the first and second year, the DCC was dealing with start-up costs and in the learning phase. The Committee now believes they can get into an auto pilot mode using extra resources within the DCC, limiting the Administrative Assistant's time to printing and issuing the permits, so the actual costs going forward will not be that great.

Tatistcheff urged the Commission to take the total number of deer taken into consideration in proportion to what is previously occurring in the town since this provides important perspective. She also pointed out that members of the Commission and DCC are unqualified to make or evaluate the site-specific data the BOS is seeking, and for that reason she looks to the Commission's peer organizations, particularly their paid staff. She said she as a commissioner would be happy to support a motion where the Commission points that out to the BOS and to members of the public.

Hundal asked how other towns measure how many deer they need to take in a particular season to achieve their goals. Bojanic said most people rely on Mass Wildlife for this information because they establish deer density estimates, the appropriate number of permits based on that information. According to Mass Wildlife's recommendations, Carlisle's current estimated 30-60 deer per square mile should be reduced down to 12-18 deer per square mile, which takes time. He noted the town of Weston has been running a program for 10-12 years, and they are seeing a steady decrease now in the number of deer collisions as they have gotten their deer population under control.

Dan Wells said that although he does not hunt, his background is in biology and he has a particular interest in bird populations. He is aware of some research that has shown the overpopulation of deer can affect species that nest in the mid canopy. He said in the 5 years he has lived in Carlisle, he has observed certain species he would expect to find more of, and although he does not know the cause, he suspects it does have something to do with over browsing. He has also noticed a lack of regeneration in shrub species such as spice bush and winterberry in both wetlands and uplands near his property. Because of this he said he supports the hunt for the purpose of trying to bring back the regeneration of a lot of these native plants, and if it would have an effect on breeding bird populations, he would support that as well.

With regard to the suggestion for a standardized study, Wells acknowledged that although there are no resources to support this kind of work, how does the town know the program is working without any kind of biologically based research. DeKock said they are hopeful the Sudbury Valley Trustees may be able to provide regional support in analyzing the effect of existing deer programs within their region through their MetroWest Conservation alliance program, and although information may not be specific to Carlisle, it could provide increased leverage to help us understand what is going in the Sudbury Valley. He noted that Mass Wildlife visited 6 or 7 properties in Carlisle in 2016 but have not returned since then due to lack of staffing.

Jeannie Genezsko 898 Maple Street said she attended the recent joint DCC/BOS meeting and her understanding of the discussion is that the proposed expansion is quite large and for this reason the BOS believes the public should be informed of that. She also reported on research being done by Carlisle resident Kay Hurley, who has been accumulating data on two parcels of land in town and is also reviewing Mass Wildlife's work on how they estimate the number of deer in Carlisle to understand if it is accurately capturing what is happening to the understory.

(there was a Christina on the Zoom, but I don't know if it was the person you have listed. The Kristina you have has just received a COC and is leaving town) A resident noted the actual dollar cost of expanding the hunt was brought up by the Commission but she has not heard any discussion about ecological costs. She asked, what is the effect of 34 hunters having access to sensitive land that otherwise the Commission is protecting; what is the impact of the hunters on the land; what is the effect of the additional foot traffic by the hunters in these sensitive areas where most trail walkers do not use. She also commented that there is no baseline data established for Carlisle nor any data coming in to determine whether the program is successful or a failure. She noted Carlisle has a number of mature forests which naturally have less understory and does not necessarily mean it is due to browsing.

Parra agreed to prepare a draft summarizing the Commission's recommendations and comments on the DCC proposal, which he will circulate to members for their individual comments and the revised document will be discussed and voted upon at the Commission's May 28, 2020 meeting.

### **Project Updates**

**(DEP 125-0971) Judy Farm Road Common Driveway:** Willard reported visiting the site earlier this week to inspect the work now underway. The new owner of the house is concerned that an existing culvert has deteriorated significantly due to construction vehicle travel over this existing driveway being converted into a Common Driveway. She advised the property owner to take some photographs documenting his concerns and she also advised Planning Board Administrator George Mansfield.

**Great Brook Farm State Park:** Work on the culvert will begin next with the installation of coffer dams.

**FY21 Budget and FY20 Town Meeting:** A 5% budget reduction has been submitted to FinCom as requested, with the largest reduction being the removal of the invasive plant management project on the Benfield Conservation Land and a small reduction for Cranberry Bog Maintenance.

### **Conservation Land Management**

***Towle Field and Benfield Land Mowing Agreements:*** *Tatistcheff moved to approve the Mowing Agreements for Towle Field (\$2,054.00) and the Benfield Conservation Land (\$1,034) as submitted by Jack O'Connor. Young seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

***Towle Field Herbicide Treatment Agreement:*** *Tatistcheff moved to approve the Towle Field Herbicide Treatment Agreement in the amount of \$1,500 as submitted by John Bakewell. Hundal seconded. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

Tatistcheff thanked Chair Wells and Administrator Willard for their hard work and flexibility in preparing for and conducting the meetings remotely.

*10:12 p.m. Tatistcheff moved and Hundal seconded to adjourn. Roll Call Vote: Verge – aye; Tatistcheff – aye; Parra – aye; Young – aye; Hundal – aye; Wells – aye.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Hopkins  
Administrative Assistant

**All supporting materials that have been provided to members of this body can be made available on upon request**