

## **Background Materials for January 25, 2021**

### **Agenda Items #1 through #9**

#### **Persons may join the meeting and/or public hearing by either of the following:**

*Join ZOOM Webinar from your computer:*

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81496936618?pwd=bG1NWitsOE05aUQ2ekQydzNPWmN1QT09>

*Join by phone:* US: +1 301 715 8592

*Webinar ID:* 814 9693 6618 *Passcode:* 804446

#### **Channel 15/Facebook Streaming:**

***Unfortunately, due to the School Committee meeting and recent/temporary personnel changes, the Cable Studio has informed the Planning & Conservation Department that they will not be able to broadcast the Planning Board meeting live. Further, they will not be able to stream the meeting on their Facebook page. However, a recording of the meeting will be posted on the Channel 15 website for later viewing.***

During the meeting, persons who are not joining the meeting, but watching via the online streaming may submit questions or comments via the Google Form or the dedicated email address: [SHPlanBoard@southhadleyma.gov](mailto:SHPlanBoard@southhadleyma.gov)

#### ***Agenda Item #1: MVP Stormwater Bylaw Project***

The Town's MVPC consultant, Scott Turner of Environmental Partners, has provided a memorandum with responses to Planning Board members' comments/questions regarding revisions to the Town's Stormwater Management Bylaw (Chapter 200 of the Town Code). This response is posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7721/Stormwater-Management-2021-01-19-Consultant-Responses-to-Planning-Board-comments>

He will be present to review and discuss his responses and possible revisions to the Town's Stormwater Management Bylaw. Anne Capra, Assistant Planner/Conservation Administrator will take the staff lead on this agenda item.

As was discussed at the December 14, 2020 Planning Board meeting, the Board will need to consider recommendations for amendments to the Stormwater Management Bylaw for presentation for the Annual Town Meeting to be held in May, 2021. The draft of the amendments need to be ready in March – at the latest.

**ACTION NEEDED:** Feedback on the issues raised in the Planning Board member comments/questions and the consultant's responses.

#### ***Agenda Item #2 – Minutes***

The Planning & Conservation Planning Technician has emailed a draft of the January 11, 2021 Planning Board meeting minutes for the Board's review.

**ACTION NEEDED:** The Board needs to vote to approve the minutes as submitted or with edits.

### ***Agenda Item #3 – Correspondence***

A list of correspondence is attached.

**ACTION NEEDED:** No action is required.

### ***Agenda Item #4 – Ethan Circle***

As the Board is aware, this development is a 6-lot subdivision located on the north side of Hadley Street (Route 47) approved by the Board November 10, 2014. The roadway enters off Hadley Street between two preexisting houses – 57 & 61 Hadley Street (see aerial photo below).



At the January 11, 2021 Planning Board meeting, the Board considered and granted “conditional” release of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee and set the Stormwater Management Permit Guarantee.

During the discussion, the Board was clear that the Town is to retain the current balance of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee as the Stormwater Management Permit Guarantee. However, the motion that

the Board made and voted did not expressly condition the Release of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee upon the provision of the Stormwater Management Permit Guarantee. This could be a problem – it has not been since the developer sent an email allowing the Town to retain the Subdivision Performance Guarantee for the Stormwater Management Permit Guarantee and the other conditions of the Release have not been met yet.

HOWEVER, I believe it would be beneficial if the Board clarified the conditions for Release of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee to expressly incorporate a condition that the Stormwater Management Permit Guarantee must be provided. I would suggest that the Board revoke the Release of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee and condition it upon the following:

1. Concurrence with the revised As-Built Plan digitally received January 11, 2021 has been received from the Water Superintendent for Fire District #2, DPW Superintendent, and South Hadley Electric Light Department; and,
2. Receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of two (2) mylar copies of the approved As-Built Plan; and,
3. Receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of a cash Stormwater Management Performance Guarantee in the amount of no less than \$25,000 (or receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of authorization by the developer to retain the balance of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee for this purpose).

**ACTION NEEDED:** The Board should vote to clarify that the Release of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee as voted January 11, 20221 was conditioned upon the 3 items below:

1. Concurrence with the revised As-Built Plan digitally received January 11, 2021 has been received from the Water Superintendent for Fire District #2, DPW Superintendent, and South Hadley Electric Light Department; and,
2. Receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of two (2) mylar copies of the approved As-Built Plan; and,
3. Receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of a cash Stormwater Management Performance Guarantee in the amount of no less than \$25,000 (or receipt by the Planning & Conservation Department of authorization by the developer to retain the balance of the Subdivision Performance Guarantee for this purpose).

***Agenda Item #5 – ANR Plan – 37 and 39 Old County Road***

An ANR Plan has been submitted which will carve off a 16,046 square foot portion of the parcel for 39 Old County Road and add it to the parcel for 37 Old County Road – no new building lots will be created. The subject properties lie in the Agricultural zoning district and within the Water Supply Protection District. Both lots have existing houses located thereon. The properties are located off the south and west sides of Old County Road as shown on the proposed ANR Plan. The portion of land to be added to 37 Old County Road apparently contains the septic system for 37 Old County Road. The ANR Plan is posted on the Planning & Conservation Department page of the Town’s website at the following link:

<https://southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7724/Old-County-Road-37---2021-01-07>

The application form and a related email are also posted on the Planning & Conservation Department page of the Town’s website at the following respective links:

<https://southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7725/Old-County-Road-37---2021-01-07-Application>

<https://southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7726/Old-County-Road-37---2021-01-07-Email-from-Richard-Bradley>

The “road” and the subject lots were created by a Definitive Subdivision Plan approved by the Planning Board in 1995 (decision included with email material for meeting) and “reapproved” in 2000 (the plan was submitted for endorsement following the 1995 approval in a timely fashion; thus, the Board had to “reapprove” the plan in 2000). Since the ANR Plan does not seek to create any new lots nor change any of the substantive conditions – such as the “conservation area” which were attached to the Definitive Plan approvals, an ANR Endorsement would not impact the conditions of such approvals.

Old County Road is NOT a publicly maintained roadway. However, one of the standards for a way to be suitable for ANR Endorsement is if the way is “*shown on a plan theretofore approved and endorsed in accordance with the subdivision control law*” (see definition of “Subdivision” from Chapter 41, Section 81L, MGL below).

*'Subdivision' shall mean the division of a tract of land into two or more lots and shall include resubdivision, and, when appropriate to the context, shall relate to the process of*

*subdivision or the land or territory subdivided; provided, however, that the division of a tract of land into two or more lots shall not be deemed to constitute a subdivision within the meaning of the subdivision control law if, at the time when it is made, every lot within the tract so divided has frontage on (a) a public way or a way which the clerk of the city or town certifies is maintained and used as a public way, or (b) a way shown on a plan theretofore approved and endorsed in accordance with the subdivision control law, or (c) a way in existence when the subdivision control law became effective in the city or town in which the land lies, having, in the opinion of the planning board, sufficient width, suitable grades and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land abutting thereon or served thereby, and for the installation of municipal services to serve such land and the buildings erected or to be erected thereon. Such frontage shall be of at least such distance as is then required by zoning or other ordinance or by-law, if any, of said city or town for erection of a building on such lot, and if no distance is so required, such frontage shall be of at least twenty feet. Conveyances or other instruments adding to, taking away from, or changing the size and shape of, lots in such a manner as not to leave any lot so affected without the frontage above set forth, or the division of a tract of land on which two or more buildings were standing when the subdivision control law went into effect in the city or town in which the land lies into separate lots on each of which one of such buildings remains standing, shall not constitute a subdivision.*

Since the “way” abutting the subject properties was depicted on a plan approved by the Planning Board pursuant to the Subdivision Control Laws, the division is NOT considered a subdivision. This is further supported by the that the division shown on the subject ANR Plan does not alter that way nor violate the conditions of the approval – it is merely adjusting the line between two lots created by that Definitive Plan. The proposed ANR will NOT result in any new lots but merely change the lines between two lots. result in three lots – one new building lot. Both of the impacted lots will exceed the minimum frontage requirement of 150 feet and far exceed the minimum lot area requirement of 40,000 square feet. Therefore, I believe the ANR Plan is appropriate for endorsement under the definitions and provisions of Chapter 41, Section 81L and Section 81P of MGL.

**ACTION NEEDED:** The Board must either endorse the plan or file a notice of denial with the Town Clerk. If the Board votes to endorse the ANR Plan, the Board should also authorize the Director of Planning & Conservation or the Conservation Administrator/Assistant Planner to sign the plan on the Board’s behalf consistent with the Board’s vote on July 20, 2020.

***Agenda Item #6 – Letter of Support – MassTrails Grant***

Anne Capra will review the proposed grant application. As a brief background, the Town is seeking grant funds to make ADA and parking lot improvements at the Trailhead for the Leaping Well Nature Trail as well as improvements at Black Stevens and Bynan Conservation Areas. The Town applied last year and did not get funded, but Ms. Capra based on feedback from the MassTrails program, she has revised the application to include the following tasks:

1. Leaping Well Nature Trail, Mosier Street
  - a) Construct an ADA accessible 9-car parking area and seating plaza with four benches overlooking the nature trail.
  - b) Create a formal trailhead at the old access road behind Newton Manor, including a mini kiosk and bench, and grading/re-surfacing the gravel shoulder between the Newton Manor parking lot and the access road.
2. Black Stevens Conservation Area- Install kiosks and trailhead signage at the Newton Street trailhead (next door to the High School) and at the Granby Road trailhead (next to the Plains School).
3. Bynan Conservation Area - Install kiosks and trailhead signage at the Lyman Terrace trailhead and the New Ludlow Road trailheads.

**ACTION NEEDED:** Consider authorizing the Chair to sign a letter of support.

***Agenda Item #7 – Scheduled Public Hearing on North Pole Estates- Hadley Street 6:45 p.m.***  
**This is a continuation of the public hearing began on November 18, 2019.**

Chicopee Concrete Services, Inc. submitted a Definitive Plan Application for the Planning Board's review and approval on a 108.93 acre site consisting of multiple parcels owned by



multiple different parties. Along with this application, they are also requesting a Stormwater Management Permit for the proposed subdivision. The project site is situated along Hadley Street and Sullivan Lane (see aerial photo to the left) in the Agricultural Zoning District and within the Water Supply Protection District. Lying within the Agricultural Zoning District and the Water Supply Protection District and using septic systems instead of a sanitary sewer system, the minimum lot size is 40,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 150 feet.

This project has been under review the Planning Board since November 2019 (see brief chronology following the aerial photo to the left). Nine sessions of public hearings totaling approximately 20 hours have been held to date. Comments have been received from various departments and boards. ***(Follow up to the last public hearing begins on page 14 below)***

Brief Chronology Recap

- Application submitted: October 25, 2019
- Waivers requested as part of original application: Yes – Board addressed those November 18, 2019 – some rejected, alternative relief granted for some
- Waivers requested subsequent to application: Yes – Board partially addressed those December 16, 2019
- Comments submitted by Departments/Agencies: Yes
  - *District 2 Board of Water Commissioners: November 13, 2019*
  - *District 2 Water Superintendent: November 13, 2019*
  - *Conservation Commission: November 14, 2019*
  - *Police Chief: November 15, 2019*
  - *Public Health Director: November 18, 2019; December 5, 2019; and June 16, 2020*
  - *Board of Health Chair: June 12, 2020, September 23, 2020, and October 15, 2020*
  - *DPW Superintendent (Acting): November 22, 2019 and December 13, 2019*
- Public Hearing began November 18, 2019
- Public Hearing Sessions held on: November 18, 2019; December 16, 2019; February 10, 2020; June 15, 2020 (Focused on Stormwater Management Report and Hydrogeological Assessment Study; June 22, 2020 (Focused on Traffic and the Definitive Plan Details; July 13, 2020 (Focused on Definitive Plan Details); September 14, 2020 (Focused on Definitive Plan Details); October 5, 2019 (completed the Peer Review); November 2, 2020; and November 30, 2020
- Continuation Requested by Applicant: March 9, 2020 (for Peer Review Report) and January 11, 2021
- Continuations Requested or Declared by Town: March 23, 2020; April 6, 2020, May 5, 2020, May 20, 2020 (Due to COVID 19), and December 14, 2020
- Revised submittal by Applicant: November 18, 2019
- Revised materials submitted by Applicant: December 16, 2019
- Revised materials submitted by Applicant: January 22, 2020
- Revised materials submitted by Applicant: March 16, 2020
- Peer Review Report Submitted: March 5, 2020
- Responses to Peer Review Submitted: March 16, 2020 and June 12, 2020
- Review of Response to Peer Review Submitted: April 29, 2020
- Title 5 Third Party Review Reports Submitted: June 10, 2020
- Site Visit by Planning Board and Planning & Conservation staff: November 15, 2019
- Site Visit by Peer Review Team and Planning & Conservation staff: February 24, 2020
- Extension of Deadline for filing decision to January 29, 2021: submitted December 14, 2020 in the form of emails between applicant's attorney and Town Counsel.
- **Further extension of Deadline for Filing decision to February 12, 2021 submitted in the form of emails between applicant's attorney and Town Counsel.**

All of the original application materials, revised materials submitted by the applicant, the comments from the departments, request for continuation, declaration of continuations by the Planning Board Chair, Peer Review reports, and Response to the Peer Review are posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://southhadley.org/1010/Hadley-Street---Northpole-Estates---2019>

Revisions to plans

Over the course of the Board's Review and the Peer Review, the applicant has made some revisions and some supplemental submissions (all of which are posted on the Town's website at the aforementioned link). Some of the revisions include:

- 1) A change in the lot layout
- 2) Changes in the proposed grade of the proposed roadway
- 3) Increase in the amount of material to be removed from the site
- 4) Shift in location of detention basin
- 5) Change in the proposed finished grade of the turnaround
- 6) Change in the number of houses to be served by the proposed roadway

Departmental Comments (through June 19, 2020)

The project application and plans were provided to the various departments. Through June 12, 2020, the following comments had been received:

Police Chief (2019-11-15): I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study Residential Development North Pole Estates as provided by McMahon and can provide the following comments:

- 1). I reviewed the proposed vehicular trip generation (increase) as a result of this development and could not identify any concerns as it relates to the impact of this proposed development.
- 2). I reviewed the level of service approach for the existing roadways that would be impacted (Sullivan Street and Pearl Street) as well as the new northern and southern approaches from North Pole to Hadley Street. Given the analysis within the traffic study provided I could not identify any concerns as it relates to the impact of existing traffic/ (and anticipated non-build traffic growth of 1% per year), on Hadley St.

Further comments:

- A. Lighting: With increase access/volume in the Hadley St area, I would recommend a lighting needs assessment as it relates to vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist safety. While my perception is just that, perception, this is a dark roadway and could benefit from enhanced lighting.
- B. Speeding/Signage: Similarly, a more advanced evaluation regarding speed regulations on Hadley St would be warranted to determine if the posted speed (40 MPH) are appropriate for the increased vehicle trips on the roadway (and even existing vehicle trip activity). The Police Department receives complaints from residents of Hadley St. regarding speeding on this roadway and the Police Department does make efforts to enforce the speeding regulations with personnel, but our opportunities during peak hours are limited given staffing and call volume. Per the traffic impact study, 85% of the traffic is within 47 MPH, but the remaining 15% is travelling in excess of 47MPH is concerning for other motorists,

pedestrians/cyclists. This area of Hadley St. may be a good candidate for electronic speed signs, even absent development.

Water Department District 2 Superintendent (2019-11-13): The applicant must meet with the Superintendent to discuss the following requirements:

- 1). South Hadley Water District No. 2 Rules and Regulations for Housing Developments.
- 2). Water Impact assessment application.
- 3). Material Standards for District No. 2 Water Department.
- 4). Copy of the Water Billing Structure.
- 5). Payment Fee for the development plans.
- 6). Connection Fee's shall be paid to the department before any connection is made to the distribution system.

Additionally, the Water Superintendent for District 2 also provided a letter from the Board of Water Commissioners expressing some concerns and comments (see the attached letter).

Water Department District 2 Superintendent (2019-12-10): Submitted a letter regarding the water service relative to the size of the development.

Director of Public Health (2019-11-15): In a telephone conversation, the Director of Public Health expressed concerns about the extent of excavation and possible fill activities at locations where perc tests were conducted. She indicated that these activities could pose challenges for or even impede installation of septic systems in these locations. I anticipate a letter or email with her concerns prior to the hearing on Monday.

Director of Public Health (Update 2019-11-15): Subsequent to the November 18, 2019 Public Hearing, the Director of Public Health provided a letter denying the Definitive Plan (see the attached letter dated December 5, 2019).

Director of Public Health (2020-06-10): The Director of Public Health submitted copies of the third-party review of the Title 5 plans submitted by the applicant.

Director of Public Health (2020-06-16): The Director of Public Health submitted an email to the applicant and their consultant regarding requirements for the Board of Health permitting:

*“Based on the third-party review from D3 Engineering, dated June 4, 2020 for the Title 5 plan review of the North Pole estates subdivision, the South Hadley Health Department would like to see elevations be associated with each one of the deep holes and percolation tests done on each lot and that each deep hole and percolation test elevation be referenced to a benchmark that cannot be moved. Those elevations are to be indicated on a plan for the North Pole estates subdivision: a copy to be given to the South Hadley Health Department.*

*Also, prior to any construction of a system on any of the lots, a surveyed elevation for that test site must be done to verify that the elevation for those deep holes and percolation test locations are the same as the original elevations. Any disposal works construction permit will need to meet all requirements of 310 CMR 15.000: THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL CODE, TITLE 5: STANDARD REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SITING, CONSTRUCTION, INSPECTION, UPGRADE AND EXPANSION OF ON-SITE SEWAGE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SYSTEMS AND FOR THE TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL OF SEPTAGE.”*

She also attached a copy of the letter and reports transmitted in her June 10, 2020 email to the Director of Planning & Conservation.

Conservation Commission (2019-11-15): The Conservation Commission provided a letter which notes, in part, that the work in proposed Phase 1 of North Pole Estates as presented on the plans “will not require a permit from the Conservation Commission”. However, they also note that subsequent work on proposed Lots #4 and #5 might require Conservation Commission permitting. Additionally, subsequent phases of the subdivision might require Conservation Commission permitting action (NOI or RDA). Additionally, the Commission provided further comments and suggestions (see the attached letter).

South Hadley Electric Light Department – SHELD (2019-11-18): SHELD will provide electric service based upon any town approved plans, both for the initial design, and the full conceptual plan. I don’t anticipate any unusual or unique conditions that would limit our ability to design, construct, operate and maintain the electric system for the development.

Fire District #2 – Fire Department (2019-12-09): South Hadley Fire District #2 Fire Department has reviewed the plans for the proposed development off of Hadley Street (route 47) and participated in the walk through. We have no concerns at this time in regard to road width, fire access, and hydrant locations. Any questions or concerns please let me know.

Building Commissioner (2019-12-06): Per § 255-84 of the zoning bylaws, if the subdivision site preparation activities for North Pole Estates “involve the removal, excavation, and/or addition of 5,000 or more cubic yards of material for use on parcels of land other than the parcel(s) from which the materials were removed or extracted”, a special permit from the planning board will be required prior to issuance of a permit from this office for said activities. Incidental activity exemptions (not requiring a special permit) apply only to premises for which a building permit has been issued or for the development of site improvements for a subdivision for which definitive plans have already been approved. Neither exemption applies.

Acting DPW Superintendent (2019—11-22): The DPW Superintendent submitted a letter regarding the issue of a possible sanitary sewer extension to serve this development.

Acting DPW Superintendent (2019-12-13): The South Hadley DPW would like to request that the Planning Board have the plans reviewed by an outside expert with particular focus on stormwater and traffic.

Board of Health Chair (2020-06-12): The Board of Health Chair submitted a letter via the Public Health Office.

Board of Health Chair (2020-09-23): The Board of Health Chair submitted a letter to the applicant regarding a planned Board of Health meeting to deliberate on the application scheduled for October 13, 2020. The Public Health Office provided a copy to the Planning & Conservation Department.

Board of Health Chair (2020-10-15): The Board of Health Chair submitted a letter to the applicant regarding the Board of Health review of the proposed development and identified issues the Board of Health had in reviewing the project. The Public Health Office provided a copy to the Planning & Conservation Department.

Site Visit – November 15, 2019

A site visit was held for the Planning Board on Friday November 15, 2019. Also in attendance were the staffs of the various departments that are participating in the review including the Planning Director, Assistant Planner, Planning & Conservation Senior Clerk, Acting DPW Superintendent, District 2 Fire Chief, District 2 Water Superintendent, and SHELD Engineer.

Site Visit - - February 10, 2020

A site visit was held for the Peer Review team on Monday February 24, 2020. Also in attendance were the Planning Director and Conservation Administrator/Assistant Planner,

Standards for Approval – Stormwater Management Permit

Section 200-11 provides that to grant a Stormwater Management Permit, “the Planning Board must . . . find that the stormwater management and erosion and sediment control plan submitted with the permit application meets the following criteria:

- A. The stormwater management and erosion and sediment control plan are consistent with the purposes and objectives of this bylaw in Article I;
- B. Provisions for stormwater management meet the performance standards described in Article VI;
- C. Provisions for erosion and sediment control meet the design requirements in Article VII.”

Standards for Approval – Definitive Plan

Town Counsel has provided the Board with a memo as to the standards for the Board to use in reviewing a Definitive Plan submittal and taking action on such a plan (see attached July 10, 2020 memorandum from the Town Counsel to the Planning Board).

Requested Waivers

The applicant requested the following waivers from the Subdivision Regulations (see their letter dated October 25, 2019 in their application):

- 1). 360-20A – Requirement for submittal of a Mylar of the Definitive Plan with the initial submittal
- 2). 360-21A – Requirement that plans be at a scale of 1” equals 40’
- 3). 360-21B(8) – Requirement that proposed street addresses be shown on the original submission plan
- 4). 360-21B(16) – Requirement topographical detail be shown for the entire site
- 5). 360-21B(16)- Requirement that topographical contours be in 2 foot intervals
- 6). 360-21B(16) – Requirement that existing topographic lines be shown as solid lines and proposed topographic lines be shown as broken lines
- 7). 360-21B(21) – Requirement that proposed parks, etc. be depicted

At the December 16, 2019 public hearing, the applicant submitted a revised Waiver Request Letter which outlined the Board’s responses/actions regarding the initial requests and made an addition waiver request:

360-22A(1) Requirement for Design plan of proposed on-site sanitary sewage system

All waiver requests are included in the in the aforementioned link on the Town’s website.

#### Status of Peer Reviews

The Board determined that a Peer Review of the following elements of the applicant’s submitted was necessary:

- Hydrogeological Assessment
- Traffic Impact Study
- Stormwater Drainage Report
- Definitive Plan details (all plan sheets)

The Board selected Weston & Sampson to perform the Peer Review. The applicant objected to some of the scope of the peer review and Weston & Sampson revised the scope to address appropriate concerns.

After some delay, the Town was provided the funds necessary to contract with Weston & Sampson for a Peer Review of the application and associated materials. The Initial Peer Review Report, the applicant’s responses, a subsequent Peer Review Report document, and subsequent Response regarding traffic are posted on the aforementioned page of the Town’s website.

#### Resumption of Public Hearing – Virtually (June 15, 2020 and June 22, 2020)

After a 4-month break in holding hearings primarily due to the COVID-19 State of Emergency, the Board resumed hearings on June 15, 2020. The applicant’s consultant and Planning & Conservation staff suggested, and the Peer Review consultant and Planning Board concurred that the resumption of the public hearing should occur in two phases:

- June 15, 2020 –focused on the Stormwater Management Plan and the Hydrogeological Assessment Study
- June 22, 2020 – focused on the Traffic Impact Assessment and the Definitive Plan

The Board conducted a virtual session of the public hearing on June 15, 2020 focusing primarily on the Stormwater Management Report and the Hydrogeological Assessment Study as had been posted. That session lasted approximately 2-1/2 hours. Five members of the public spoke, and several other members of the public had submitted comments/questions via email and/or the Google Form – those comments/questions were read into the record by Town staff.

The Board conducted a virtual session of the public hearing on June 22, 2020 focusing primarily on the Traffic Study and the Definitive Plan Details (mostly, however, on the traffic study) as had been posted. That session lasted over 3 hours. Five members of the public spoke, and several other members of the public had submitted comments/questions via email and/or the Google Form – those comments/questions were incorporated into the record. Due to the amount of time devoted to the Traffic Impact Assessment, there was not sufficient time to review the Definitive Plan Details.

The Board continued its examination of the Definitive Plan Details Peer Review in a virtual session of the public hearing on July 13, 2020 and again on September 14, 2020. However, the Board was unable to complete its review.

At the October 5, 2020 Public Hearing, the Board allowed the hearing to go considerably longer than the time limit called for in the Board's virtual meeting guidelines. But, the Board was able to conclude its review of the Peer Review reports. The Board also received, prior to the October 5<sup>th</sup> hearing, and discussed during the hearing an overlay of the boundaries of the Preliminary Plan and the Definitive Plan – this is posted on the Town's website at the following link: <https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7013/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan-over-Preliminary-Plan-2020-09-22>

Following the September 14<sup>th</sup> public hearing, Board members provided the Director of Planning and Conservation with lists of apparent inconsistencies regarding the plan, public hearing comments, and related documents. The Director of Planning and Conservation compiled the submitted statements and provided them to the applicant to allow for a response prior to the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. The applicant's representative subsequently provided responses to the Planning Board members' comments. While this aspect of the Board's review and the responses were not discussed at the October 5, 2020 meeting, the Board's listing of inconsistencies and the applicant's responses are posted on the Town's website at the following links:

*Planning Board Members list of Inconsistencies:*

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7154/North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan---2020-09-24-Planning-Board-Members-Comments-as-to-Inconsistencies>

*Applicant's Responses:*

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7155/North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan---2020-09-28-Letter-Responding-to-Inconsistencies>

Following the October 5<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing session, the various materials were submitted to the Board in response to the Board's requests including:

The Applicant's consultant submitted aerial overlay and it is posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7220/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates---Defintiive-Plan---Aerial-overlay-2020-10-16>

The list of questions posed for the Peer Reviewer and the Applicant's consultant is posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7286/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates---2020-10-05-Questions-for-Peer-Reviewer-and-Applicant-Representative>

The Peer Reviewer submitted responses to the questions posed to them and they are posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7254/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates---2020-10-19-Memo-from-Weston-and-Sampson-Peer-Reviewer-Responses>

The Applicant's consultant submitted responses to the questions posed to the Applicant and they are posted on the Town's website at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7284/North-Pole-Estates---2020-10-23-Letter-from-Rob-Levesque>

Additionally, the Board of Health Chair submitted a letter to the applicant with a copy to the Planning Board Chair and it is posted at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7250/North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan---Letter-2020-10-15-from-Board-of-Health-2020-10-21-Received>

The focus of the November 2, 2020 public hearing was to begin reviewing the "design standards" detailed in Chapter 360 – the Subdivision Regulations. During the public hearing, three items were identified which the Planning Board felt it needed and the applicant's consultant agreed to provide:

- A letter or document from the Traffic Consultant providing responses to several traffic concerns
- An estimate of the economic value of the material to be excavated
- An updated aerial image showing accurate existing conditions.

The applicant's consultant provided a letter on November 23, 2020 which addressed the first two items. The November 23, 2020 letter is posted on the Planning & Conservation Department's page of the Town's website at the following link:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7411/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan---2020-11-23-Letter>

The applicant's representative provided the updated aerial to the Town for the November 30<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

The Board was unable to complete review of the “design standards” November 2, 2020 in part due to the need for the above-referenced materials.

**Follow Up to November 30, 2020 Public Hearing**

**Design Standards**

The Board completed a review of the Chapter 360 “design standards” using a matrix provided to the Board with my assessment of the plans where there were clear “objective” standards which do not require Planning Board determinations. The Board determined that the following items were needed from the applicant:

**360-31A(8)**

The vertical alignment at grade changes or minimum stopping sight distance at 3.5 feet above the pavement shall be 200 feet.

Where is it demonstrated on the plans?

**360-31D(1)**

Type “A” The minimum center-line radii of horizontal street curves shall be: 100 feet.

Where is it shown on the plans?

**360-38A**

Bituminous concrete curbs of the type and dimensions as shown on the Typical Street Cross-Section (see Appendix[1]) shall be required along both sides of the roadway, except at curb inlets or where, in the opinion of the Planning Board, such curbs are not necessary.

Where is the detail?

The applicant provided a response to the technical questions raised above regarding 360-31A(8), 360-31D(1), and 360-38A. The response is posted on the Town’s website at the following link: <https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/7618/Hadley-Street---North-Pole-Estates-Definitive-Plan---2021-01-04-Letter-from-Applicant-Consultant>

However, I have not received any revised plans

Additionally, the following excerpt from the November 30<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing minutes indicate that the applicant would provide additional responses or plan details regarding some of the “subjective” or “discretionary” standards:

*The applicant’s consultant was given an opportunity to address the Board and offer clarity on items discussed during review of the design standards. Rob Levesque reviewed that the cul-de-sac would be revised and reflected as ‘permanent’. Either through special conditioning or plan revision, he would add screening along the lots nearest the mining operation to benefit the livability of the area. He added that additional information regarding the traffic assessment would be provided. Attorney Seidel would speak with the*

*applicant regarding the installation of sidewalks on both sides of the road, rather than the side as was currently proposed.*

I have indicated in an email January 8, 2021 to the applicant that the labeling of the cul-de-sac as “permanent” can be addressed as a condition of approval with the actual change being made when the plans are submitted for endorsement. But, the other items need to have documentation in the hearing that avoids the Board making any "decision" after rendering a decision.

### **Outstanding or Remaining Issues – Planning Board**

As a follow up to the November 30, 2020 Public Hearing, Planning Board members were asked to provide the Director of Planning & Conservation with their view as to the “outstanding” or “remaining” issues. The following responses were provided (and have been forwarded to the applicant – but no formal response is expected at or before the January 11<sup>th</sup> public hearing):

#### **Hydro Study**

See pages 1-3 of the 10/19/20 memo from Weston & Sampson:

-Loss of recharge capacity and temporary recharge storage (based on 400,000 cubic yards of earth to be removed) are not addressed. If/when addressed, the analyses should be based upon a mapping of the lateral and vertical extents of the intended sand and gravel removal relative to the existing site topography.

-HAS does not specifically address the currently proposed 9 lot subdivision (only a hypothetical buildout) to account for its specific impacts/activity.

\*Note: 11/2/20 memo from BOH also references these deficiencies.

-The cumulative effect of nitrogen nitrate and run-off from fertilizer (and other known contaminants associated w/homeowners) have yet to be analyzed in this study.

-Testing for and a potential remediation plan for prior known contaminants (e.g., lead bullets) - Richard: I know this issue was discussed at a prior hearing but do not recall if remedied...

#### **Traffic Study**

See pages 4 and 5 of the 10/19/20 memo from Weston & Sampson. As of 11/23/20, it appears the traffic consultant responded to the tree/ROW issue while the others remain outstanding, such as:

-Sight line measurements for northern driveways as per AASHTO,

-Sight line measurements from the existing driveway to the gravel operation,

-Provide calculations to support truck traffic analysis.

#### **Definitive Plan**

-Street layout, design does not appear to meet standard 360-31 A(1) and possibly (2) as well, as elaborated on at the most recent public hearings

-Temporary cul-de-sac not appropriate as per 360-31F

-“Due regard” not given to Dry Brook Hill as required per standard 360-33B

-RH to clarify whether we have appropriate info for 360-31A(8), 360-31D(1) and 360-38(A)

- Provide details on how the lot purchasers will be informed that they are in a Zone II area.
- Landscape/fence buffer, safety measures needed for lots abutting the active gravel pit.
- Amount of earth removed is not “incidental” for the construction of 2 houses - as highlighted in multiple public hearing discussions by the Board, members of the public and the Peer Reviewer, Weston & Sampson, most recently cited in their 10/19/20 memo.

**Question about the value of the lots and the value of the materials being excavated.**

At the November 30, 2020 public hearing there was information discussed as to the value of the proposed lots and the value of the excavated materials. The applicant has indicated that the value of the excavated materials is approximately \$1,575,000 to \$1,800,000. There was some information provided by a member of the public as to the value of the proposed lots. I would suggest a simpler approach to estimating the value of the resulting lots using the “assessed value” of lots in the Agricultural zoning and Water Supply Protection District located in a subdivision (*keeping in mind that current assessed valuations are based on 2019 calendar year sales*) as follows:

Chatham Estates is a 4-lot subdivision located off Woodbridge Street slightly south of Pearl Street. It is located within the Agricultural zoning district and within the Water Supply Protection District. Two lots abut Woodbridge Street and two lots do not. One lot is over 2 acres in size and the other 3 are very slightly over 1 acre in size. The former lot is assessed at \$120,000 (land only) while the latter 3 lots are assessed at \$116,000 to \$116,200 (land only). None of these lots have sanitary sewer and none abut an active or former earth removal operation. I am suggesting that only the land value be used in the comparison because the typical subdivision developer creates the lots and sells them to either a builder or an end use (future homeowner) who has the home built. Therefore, the value to the subdivider is the value of the lots not the lots and houses – the value of the houses depends on what is built which is unknown at this time.

The North Pole Estates Definitive Plan involves creation of Frosty Lane which is necessary for proposed lots 2 & 3 as shown on the proposed plan. One lot is over 2 acres and the other lot is approximately 1.33 acres. The other two lots proposed as part of the Definitive Plan are abutting Hadley Street and could be created as ANR Plan lots not necessitating the construction of Frosty Lane. Using the assessed values from the Chatham Estates development, the value of proposed lots 2 and 3 would appear to be in the range of \$120,000 and \$116,200 for a total value of the proposed lots of \$236,200.

The applicant’s consultant has indicated that they would also create additional lots off Frosty Lane using an ANR Plan once the roadway was built. It is impossible to know how many lots would be so created and their size. However, the “concept plan” on Sheet D-2 of the submittal suggest that there could be a net of 3 additional lots. Assuming they are also the size of Lot 2 or Lot 3, they could be similarly assumed to have a value of approximately \$120,000 each. Therefore, the combination of the value of Lots 2 and 3 and the potential additional of 3 more lots by ANR Plans could be assumed to possibly result in a “lot value” of approximately \$596,200. However, it should be noted that this would be “market” or “retail” value which is more than the “net” value to the developer as a developer would

deduct their development expenses (plans, permitting, legal, infrastructure costs, etc.) It would not be unreasonable to anticipate that the “developer costs” would exceed \$100,000 for Frosty Lane.

Obviously, there are numerous factors which impact assessments, and this is not presented to suggested that this would be the “assessed value” but to provide some comparisons in the area.

**Deadline for Decision - Changes in Section 17, Chapter 53 of the Special Acts of 2020**

Since Spring of 2020, the Board has been operating under the provisions of Section 17, Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020 which, among other things, tolled the deadlines for acting on various applications until after the State of Emergency was lifted. However, recently, the legislature passed amendments to this statute which changed the deadline of the “tolling” period to December 1, 2020. Thus, the “clock” for rendering decisions, beginning public hearings, etc. is no longer measured by the end of the ‘State of Emergency’ but resumes on December 1, 2020.

The applicant’s counsel, in an email exchange with Town Counsel, extended the deadline for completing the public hearing to January 11, 2021 and the deadline for filing a decision to January 15, 2021. This was subsequently further extended to completing the public hearing to January 25, 2021 and the deadline for filing a decision to January 29, 2021.

In an email exchange on January 8, 2021, the applicant’s counsel and Town Counsel agreed to a continuation of the public hearing to January 25, 2021 which resulted in a further extension of the deadline for completion of the public hearing to February 8, 2021 and filing of a decision until February 12, 2021.

**Workshop**

As discussed at the January 11, 2021 meeting, a workshop between Town representatives and the applicant’s representatives was held on January 20, 2021 to review the list of outstanding issues as identified by the Planning Board and Town staff. The purpose of the workshop was to ensure that the applicant understood what the issues were from the Town’s perspective – it was not to make any decisions – and no decisions were made.

**Participating in this workshop were:**

- Two members of the Planning Board (Chair Brad Hutchison and Member Melissa O’Brien);
- Town staff representatives including Planning & Conservation Director Richard Harris, Assistant Planner Anne Capra, and Town Counsel Brian Winner; and
- Representatives of the applicant including Attorney Michael Siddall, consultant Rob Levesque, and Jason Ouellette.

**Outstanding Issues Discussed:**

Approximately 23 issues were identified as outstanding prior to the workshop and reviewed by the participants. Below, each of these issues are listed and a summary statement regarding the discussion is provided for each of the issues.

*General*

1. Changing the cul de sac labeling to "permanent".  
**Summary:** The plan does not meet the requirements for being a “temporary” cul de sac since all of the applicant’s property is within the subdivision. Applicant’s attorney indicated that they will remove the term “temporary” and just label the turn around “cul de sac”
2. Add screening along the lots nearest the mining operation to benefit the livability of the area.  
**Summary:** The Planning Board must have a plan for the screening before they can act on the Definitive Plan. The Board cannot have in the decision that it is subject to the Board approving a screening after the decision is made. The applicant’s consultant will provide a screening plan.
3. Additional information regarding the traffic assessment.  
**Summary:** This was discussed under items 9 through 12 and item 21 below.
4. Installation of sidewalks on both sides of the road, rather than the side as was currently proposed. – to be on both sides  
**Summary:** The Board’s practice has been to require only sidewalks on one side of a street of the length proposed for Frosty Lane. However, if the roadway were to be extended to serve an additional 40 to 60 homes, then the traffic would warrant sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The sidewalks always are located within the Right of Way. However, homeowners tend to assume they own to the edge of the pavement – which is not true for a Town accepted roadway. The applicant intends to construct the sidewalks on both sides of the roadway and that will be reflected in the plans.

*Hydrogeological Assessment Study*

**Summary for items 5 through 8 and item 20 below:** The applicant indicated that they are retaining a consultant to do additional study work to address the Board of Health letter and items 5 through 8 and item 20 below. They plan to meet with the Public Health Director and other Town representatives to verify the scope of the additional work.

5. See pages 1-3 of the 10/19/20 memo from Weston & Sampson: Loss of recharge capacity and temporary recharge storage (based on 400,000 cubic yards of earth to be removed) are not addressed. If/when addressed, the analyses should be based upon a mapping of the lateral and vertical extents of the intended sand and gravel removal relative to the existing site topography.
6. HAS does not specifically address the currently proposed 9 lot subdivision (only a hypothetical buildout) to account for its specific impacts/activity.
7. The cumulative effect of nitrogen nitrate and run-off from fertilizer (and other known contaminants associated w/homeowners) have yet to be analyzed in this study.
8. Testing for and a potential remediation plan for prior known contaminants (e.g., lead bullets)
20. For the hydrogeologic study, I believe that study assumed that 23 acres would be preserved as an “offset”. Since the 23 acres will not be preserved at this time the offset included in the hydro. Geo. Study assumptions is no longer valid. – a statement – part of new HAS study work

*Traffic Study*

9. See pages 4 and 5 of the 10/19/20 memo from Weston & Sampson. As of 11/23/20, it appears the traffic consultant responded to the tree/ROW issue while the others remain outstanding. Confirm.  
**Summary:** The applicant is to provide an updated response from their traffic consultant.
10. Sight line measurements for northern driveways as per AASHTO.  
**Summary:** The issue regarding this aspect is that it is unclear if the traffic consultant was evaluating Frosty Lane or a different access point. The applicant is to provide an updated response from their traffic consultant.
11. Sight line measurements from the existing driveway to the gravel operation – part of background traffic  
**Summary:** There was a question as to whether the continuation of the existing gravel operations using their existing driveway was taken into consideration. The existing driveway is a “given” existing condition which is not part of the Subdivision Definitive Plan.
12. Provide calculations to support truck traffic analysis.  
**Summary:** This issue relates to the truck traffic associated with the earth removal as part of the Subdivision. The applicant is to provide an updated response from their traffic consultant.
21. For the traffic study, the study documents and diagrams reference a “Northern Site Driveway” and a “Southern Site Driveway”. If I’m not mistaken, Rob was going to get the engineer that prepared the report to confirm which, if either, of the access drives studied by the analysis correspond to Frosty Way. – Part of Traffic Study comments  
**Summary:** The issue regarding this aspect is that it is unclear if the traffic consultant was evaluating Frosty Lane or a different access point. The applicant is to provide an updated response from their traffic consultant.

*Definitive Plan*

13. Street layout design does not appear to meet standard 360-31 A(1) and possibly (2) as well, as elaborated on at the most recent public hearings – see 2 above  
**Summary:**
  - Standard 360-31A(1) has multiple parts. One part relates to “the maximum livability and amenity of the subdivision”. To address this concern, the applicant indicated November 30, 2020 that they would propose some mitigation of the potential impact of the gravel operation on the new lots being built. As noted in Issue #2 above, the applicant is to provide a screening plan regarding this aspect of this issue.
  - Another aspect of Standard 360-31A(1) is the last sentence which reads: “As far as practicable, streets should follow natural contours.”. There is question whether the amount and scope of the excavation is necessary for the proposed subdivision and whether it could be developed without the width and depth of the proposed cuts – this is in regards to the approach from Hadley Street but also in regards to the extent of earth removal to be undertaken around the cul de sac. The applicant indicated they understand the Board’s concern – they have indicated in the past that they don’t agree.
  - Standard 360-31A(2) relates to conformity with the Master Plan. There is concern that the Master Plan defines the character of the corridor on Hadley Street and the proposed excavation would be contrary to that character.
14. Temporary cul-de-sac not appropriate as per 360-31F  
**Summary:** This was addressed under issue #1 above.

15. “Due regard” not given to Dry Brook Hill as required per standard 360-33B  
**Summary:** Standard 360-33B provides that “Due regard shall be shown for all natural features such as large trees, watercourses, scenic points, historic spots and similar community assets, which, if preserved, will add to the attractiveness and value of the subdivision and the Town.” There is concern that development of Dry Brook Hill, particularly with the extent of excavation proposed demonstrates a lack of showing “Due regard” for the natural feature.
16. Is there sufficient info for 360-31A(8), 360-31D(1) and 360-38(A)  
**Summary:** The Director of Planning & Conservation had noted that the plans don’t appear to demonstrate compliance with these three standards. The applicant’s consultant previously provided a response to these concerns in a letter dated January 4, 2021 which is posted on the Planning & Conservation Department page of the Town’s website as noted above on page 14 of this background packet. While the response noted that the plans do provide the information for standards 360-31D(1) and 360-38(A) – they were not picked up in the staff review, a revision in the plan is required for standard 360-31A(8). However, the plan revision has not been submitted as of January 21, 2021.
17. Provide details on how the lot purchasers will be informed that they are in a Zone II area.  
**Summary:** There is concern that persons buying homes in this subdivision will not be aware of the sensitive environment associated with this area as a primary source of public water. Other houses constructed on Sullivan Lane were on lots created as part of ANR Plans which do not afford the Town any opportunity to raise these concerns. There are multiple ways to address this issue. With the Stonegate Subdivision, approved in the 1980’s there was concern about the presence of a dairy farm and how homebuyers might be “offended” so the Planning Board required a deed attachment – not the most effective way to inform people particularly in regards to the issues raised for North Pole Estates. A placard placed in the home could be a more effective educational tool. The Town is looking to the applicant to propose a means to address this concern and they have previously indicated a willingness to do so.
18. Landscape/fence buffer, safety measures needed for lots abutting the active gravel pit.  
**Summary:** This was addressed under issue #2 above.
19. Is amount of earth removed “incidental” for the construction of 2 houses - as highlighted in multiple public hearing discussions by the Board, members of the public and the Peer Reviewer, Weston & Sampson, most recently cited in their 10/19/20 memo.  
**Summary:** There is concern that the amount of earth removal proposed for this subdivision is not “incidental” and the subdivision could be developed with less removal. The applicant has previously offered their justification as to why the work must be done as proposed.
22. Section 360-35A Re: Abnormal lot sizes. We briefly discussed this as the plan has several abnormal shape/size lots but not sure if this "resolved".  
**Summary:** This was discussed previously at public hearing sessions and it was noted that the lots proposed are not “porkchop” or “flag lots”. The Director of Planning & Conservation and Town Counsel have noted that there are some very large lots but all the lots meet the frontage requirements without any special considerations.
23. Section 360-38D Re: Special conditions w/regard to specially constructed berms or gutters. I don't have notes on whether this was discussed. Given the sensitivity of this particular site, should DPW (or another entity) should weigh in on whether these are needed?  
**Summary:** This standard provides that “Under special conditions, specially constructed berms or gutters may be required by the Planning Board, particularly in areas of heavy

slope.: The DPW Superintendent will be asked to advise if this subdivision, as designed, would warrant “specially constructed berms or gutters”.

Requests to speak:

As of January 21, 2021, no one has signed up to speak; however, Robert Pleasure had previously indicated a desire to speak when the hearing was held.

Google Form Responses and Emails – Comments:

No new comments have been received since the November 30, 2020 public hearing as of January 21, 2021.

**ACTION NEEDED:** Hold the public hearing.

***Agenda Item #8 - Development Update and Planning & Conservation Department Report***

The Planning & Conservation Department staff will provide a report on the following items:

a. Development Activity

- Skinner Woods
- Rocky’s Hardware
- PeoplesBank – Illuminated Signs

b. Bylaw and Map Amendments

- At the present time, it looks as though we need to work on Bylaw amendments regarding Floodplain management and the Stormwater Management.
- If the 82 Pearl Street (aka 82 Sorbi Circle) zoning map amendment is to be considered by Town Meeting in May, 2021; the Planning Board will need to hold a new public hearing in March or April 2021. Chapter 40A, Section 5, MGL provides that “if a town meeting fails to vote to adopt any proposed by-law within six months after the planning board hearing, no action shall be taken thereon until after a subsequent public hearing is held with notice and report as provided”. Though the Statute refers to “bylaw”, that would also apply to bylaw amendments and map amendments. Since the public hearing was held October 19, 2020 which is more than 6 months before the May 2021 Town Meeting, a new public hearing will be required to enable Town Meeting to take action – whether to deny or approve.
- Several property owners have expressed possible interest in having the Zoning Map amended regarding their properties; but they have not submitted any such request yet.

c. Master Plan Update

- As the Board is aware, the Master Plan Update Advisory Committee has recommended the draft Update to the Planning Board for their review and consideration. The Board met on January 21, 2021 to begin its discussions and review of the Master Plan Update. Some special meetings are likely to be needed to complete the Board’s review before holding a public hearing and considering its adoption.

d. Planning Board Meeting Schedule

As set at the December 14, 2020 meeting, the meeting schedule through April 30, 2021 is as follows:

- Monday, January 25, 2021
- Monday, February 8, 2021
- Monday, February 22, 2021
- Monday, March 8, 2021
- Monday, March 22, 2021
- Monday, April 12, 2021
- Monday, April 26, 2021

e. Planning & Conservation Department Grant Activity

- MassWorks
- MVP
- Land Grant
- APRs
- MDI Local Rapid Recovery Grant

f. Other

- The Deputy Town Administrator has sent out the 2021 Sexual Harassment Policy and Acknowledgement. To date, we have seen acknowledgements Sexual Harassment Policy from all but one of the Board members. If you have not submitted your acknowledgement, please review the policy and sign/submit the acknowledgement today.

***Agenda Item #9 – Other New Business***

I have included this agenda item for Board members to bring up new items (for discussion and future consideration) that are not on the agenda and which the Chair could not reasonably expect to be discussed/considered as of the date which the agenda was posted.

Additionally, this is an opportunity for the representatives on various committees and the PVPC Commissioner/Alternate Commissioner to make reports to the Board. The reports should be less than 3 minutes each.