

**Acton Conservation Commission**  
Meeting Minutes  
December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024  
7:15 PM  
Hybrid Meeting (Room 09 & Zoom)

**Present:** Terry Maitland (Chair), James Colman (Vice-Chair), Peter Hocknell, Kate Warwick, Amy Green

**Absent:** Zywia Chadzynska, Jillian Peters

**Conservation Agent:** Olivia Barksdale

**Public Concerns and Regular Business**

**7:18** Terry Maitland, Chair opened the meeting at 7:18pm.

**7:19 Public Concerns**

Jeff Fishman, resident of Bumblebee Way would like to make the Commission aware of the documented stormwater runoff issues the neighborhood is having. He shared a video of the stormwater entering wetlands. Mr. Hall is concerned for the public's safety; the area tends to ice over becoming hazardous for traffic. In the past a person has slipped on the ice and a firetruck slide sideways on High Street. He requests that the Commission inspect the "MS4" as it pertains to the runoff. The Chair informed Mr. Fishman that the Commission did not have anything to do with the project on Bumblebee Way. The project did not merit a filing, there are no wetlands within 100 feet of the property. Mr. Hocknell pointed out that there is a resource area on the backside of Audubon Drive and if water is flowing into it would be in their jurisdiction. Ms. Barksdale clarified that she spoke to Town Counsel who looked into Mr. Hocknell's question. The resource area on Audubon Drive is over a hundred feet away from Bumblebee Way, along with the resource away on the northeast side of Audubon Hill. In general, the Commission does not have jurisdiction over runoff from storm drains going down a road, you would have to show a buildup of adverse effects in the wetland (example oil spill or silt build up). DPW, Town Engineering and the Towns' Peer Review Firm have been onsite. The project was permitted through the Planning Board and under their regulations Chapter X was applied. The project is outside of the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction, there are no resource areas on site. Terra Fredericks called in asking a hypothetical question, "if I put in a pipe on my house that went into wetlands, would that be the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction to enforce wetland buffer protections, would the Commission implement Stormwater X or would it be the planning board". The Chair answered that if the work was in the buffer zone it would be in the Commission's jurisdiction.

**7:33 Notice of Intent –Public Hearing –64 & 68 Charter Road**

Daniel Carr from Stamski and McNary represented the Town. There is a small isolated wetland that floods the road and sidewalk. The proposed project is to re-direct water to a larger wetland down the road near 87 Hayward Road. During the site visit a couple of

Commissioners voiced their concern about the proposed tree removal. Mr. Carr was able to move the catch basin so that no trees will be removed. The existing pipe is 12-inches and they are proposing a 12-inch pipe tie-in. They believe the pipe is sufficiently sized. The Chair opened the hearing to public comment.

Hannah Richards, 60 Charter Road asked for a clarification about the existing drainage infrastructure near 60 Charter Road. She is concerned about the drainage pipe at the end of her driveway that often backs up with water, with the new infrastructure upstream it may cause further erosion downstream near her house and the new 12-inch pipe might not be sufficient. Mr. Carr responded stating that a silt barrier and erosion control will be installed. The Engineering Department has no record of the catch basin at the end of 60 Charter Road being connected to the Town's pipes. Ms. Richards believes it does connect to the Town pipe, she is concerned that the added water pressure will have a negative effect on her drainage. Mr. Carr suggested that Ms. Richards have her pipes unclogged. Ms. Richards is concerned that the Town is moving the flooding issue from the top of the road to the bottom of the road. She asked if the Commission saw the environmental report for the project at 62 Charter Road, where the project may have caused flooding down slope. The Commission informed her that the report is out of their jurisdiction, the report was for the structure not the wetlands. The project was most likely outside the 100-foot buffer and the Commission did not see it. The Chair asked if Mr. Carr has pre and post calculations of the run-off. Mr. Carr stated that they are not changing the surface type or adding impervious surface, so there is no change to the amount of runoff, and they confirmed that the pipe size is large enough. Run off is not increased, the water that would be over topping the road is being put into a pipe and re-directed. Seems that the Commission has been asked if the water from the project will impact people down slope, it is an issue for the consultant, engineering department and neighbors to work out and come back to the Commission. Town Engineer sent an email about history with the private drainage. Ms. Richards family has been keeping the grate clean, it is suggested that they have a camera go into the pipe to see if it is clogged or damaged or undersized.

Dean Charter, 81 Charter Road has seen flooding causing the sidewalk to be impassable. There is a concern that water overflows the road and goes both ways, flowing north near 71 Charter. He is puzzled that the plan states there will be no additional water, is a severe problem that needs to be addressed. He would like the design to be reconsidered to take into consideration the northern flow. The Commission encourages the consultant to take a larger look at the project, considering the public comments. Hearing continued to January 8<sup>th</sup> 2025 at 7:15pm.

## **8:05 Notice of Intent –Public Hearing –12 Spring Hill Road**

Mark Arnold with Goddard Consulting represented the applicant. The Application is for the construction of two single family homes, a tennis court and barn. The application is only filed under the Wetland Protection Act (Act) and not the Town's Bylaw. An ANRAD was filed previously and is still valid. The resources on the property include bordering vegetated wetlands and an intermittent stream. The wetland system drains from the north through an intermittent stream, enters another stream system and drains east

into another wetland and into the fire pond. There is an old drainage easement in the northeast corner of the property and an access easement on the adjacent property 8 Spring Hill Road. The back-upland forest is majority white pine, the wetland is majority red maple. Mr. Arnold is not sure if there are vernal pools. There is no endangered species, habitat priority, or floodplain. The wetland delineation was not re-done, the flags on the property are from the previous application. A tree survey was not completed for the application. A public comment came in with concerns about wildlife seen on the property (deer, coyote, fox). A wildlife survey was not done. Mark argued that a wildlife survey/evaluation is not needed under the Act, it is not listed as a requirement in the DEP guidelines and addressed the wildlife impacts for the stream crossing. A box culvert will be installed, which complies with stream crossing standards and performance standards in terms of minimizing impacts to wildlife movement. The Act does state as one of the interests "protection of wildlife". The Commission can require that a wildlife study plus or minus 48 linear feet of bank to be completed to address the concerns of how the project will protect wildlife and mitigate damage to habitat. For the bank the threshold is 50 linear feet or 10%, whatever is less than 50. If it is under 50 linear feet it is not assumed to be significant habitat.

The proposed barn would have access of Spring Hill Road with two parking spaces and a paddock with a fence 10 feet off the wetlands that run along the edge of the wetlands. It will be an accessory structure for animals or storage. The other feature is a sports court with two parking spaces and a fence around it. The driveway connects with the easement and will cross at the smallest wetland crossing on the property to gain access to the upland. The stream channel is also fairly narrow. A four-sided box culvert with wing walls will be installed, the driveway will be raised with graded slopes and the culvert raised off the stream bed. In terms of bank and full width, the applicant claims that it complies with the stream crossing standards. Wetland replication is shown on the plan, along with two septic systems, wells, garages, retaining wall, and lawn where the grading limit of work is 10 feet off the wetlands. The applicant states that there are no compliance in terms of performance standards for Buffer Zone under the Act. They propose erosion controls and silt fence to ensure the wetlands are protected during construction. The wetlands impact is 1,530 square feet which is mitigated with a wetland replication area of 1,540 square feet meeting the ration under the Act. The area is proposed to be monitored for two years. The reports should include information on surface water in the mitigation area as well as monitoring inside the box culvert for erosion, and 75% surface area re-established with indigenous plant species.

#### Discussion Questions

- The ANRAD expires in 2025, but is extended based on the State Extension Act.
- Complete a tree survey
- Wildlife survey/wildlife habitat evaluation
- Is the fire pond considered a vernal pool, is it certified?
- How many trees in total will be cut down for the whole project?
  - How many acres of trees will be cut?
  - What is the square footage of the disturbance in the buffer zone?
  - What is the pre and post vegetation disturbance?

- What are the types of vegetation in the buffer zone?
- What is the lawn going to be?
- How would disturbed areas be established as lawn or naturalized?
- What is the square footage of the impervious surfaces such as the driveways?
  - Mr. Arnold stated that he can provide the existing square footage of area within the buffer zone and what's proposed to be left as natural
- What is going to be lawn and what is going to be impervious
  - Mr. Arnold stated that he can provide the numbers
- Does the State require stormwater management study? Report?
  - Mr. Arnold stated that the Stormwater Standards say that housing developments with 4 or less units do not require compliance with stormwater regulations, no study/report was provided. The Commission can still ask stormwater related questions when determining all the work in the buffer zone and how it would affect adjacent wetlands.
- Is the culvert 4 sided?
  - Mr. Arnold stated that there is concrete on 4 sides, and 2-foot natural bed inside the culvert. The depth is fairly deep so the bottom acts as a larger footing. The design is for faster installation. The precast footing will be done separately, details were provided. The proposed culvert does not meet the optimum stream crossing standard, which is a bridge. The standards state that 3-sided box culverts are strongly preferred. The Commission needs an explanation for the choice of using the minimal design (4-sided culvert, not a bridge which is optimal), and its impact on wetlands and the stream. The applicant needs to show why they are not doing a 3-sided culvert.
  - Mr. Arnold explained that he has constructed culverts and bridges before, stating that in terms of disturbance the span of the structure is not the only impact it is also the footing. The box culvert will have the same level of disturbance on the banks because of the excavation required footings and wing walls. He stated that a bridge is better suited for larger flow, perennial river and active floodplain and that the stream bed will be disturbed with a 3-sided box culvert. The applicant does not think it is necessary to provide functions of the stream crossings.
  - The Commission asked for a detail description showing the justification for using a 4-sided culvert instead of a 3-sided culvert or bridge.
  - The Commission asked for plans for a bridge.
  - The Commission asked for an analysis of why the walls are not extended so there is less wetland impact.
- Why is the applicant only applying under the Act and not the Town Bylaw as well?
  - The submitted plans state that it does not comply with the Bylaw
  - The Commission asked for the disclaimer that the plan does not confirm to the Bylaw be written on every page and in bold type.
  - Mr. Arnold explained that he can only speak to the application before the Commission.
- The Commission asked for the filling fee to be re-assessed. The Commission believes the applicant filled under the wrong category and that it should be a category 3, 2 because of the 2 single houses and the wetland crossing.
  - Mr. Arnold quoted the regulations in response.

- Barn
  - Will there be plumbing or water connection? plumbing facilities, drainage, drains, also inside the building?
  - Will there be electrical connection? If so show on plans.
  - Will there be outdoor lights, and what impacts will they have on wildlife?
  - For the paddock, will it be cleared and grubbed? The Commission needs information on if its going to be loam and seeded.
    - Might be lawn grass
  - Is there a maintenance plan?
  - No fence is shown, if there is going to be a fence how will it be installed, show on plan.
  - There is no grading shown for the paddock or the court
    - Paddock will be left with similar grading, and no grading for the barn
  - Is the driveway paved or dirt?
    - Paved
  - The erosion control is identified differently on the detail sheet, is it straw wattle or straw, wattle and silt fence?
  - What is the management plan for livestock manure?
  - Will the barn need a foundation? How much excavation is needed?
    - Standard foundation for the 4-foot frost wall
  - If material is coming back in, where is being stockpiled, where are the erosion controls around the stockpiles?
  - Will you have to dewater the site?
- Sports Court
  - Will it need a foundation?
    - Minimal in grading, go to subsoil, compact and set gravel base before adding sports court layer which will be concrete.
  - Will there be parking for the court?
    - Yes, shown on plan
  - Are outside lights needed for the court? If so show on plan.
  - Will the fence around court be will it be installed? Will there be extra excavation? Please make sure that the owner knows if they want to do tree work it will have to be permitted. There could be a condition for signage, and need to respond to the limit of clearing.
  - What is the surface of the court?
    - Concrete with grass around the edges within the limit of work
  - What kind of seed will be used?
  - How many trees will come down and shrubs cleared?
  - What is the pre and post vegetation in the buffer zone?
  - There is no plumbing shown on the plan? Have you considered facilities for the barn and court, it will be far from the house? There will need to be a note that if the applicant wants to add facilities they will need a permit and work with the Board of Health on independent septic system and soil testing. Can put a note that it is not proposed on the plan at this time.
- Driveway
  - Will it have guard rails? There is a 4-5-foot drop.

- Will there be utility poles needed to be accounted for or will it go under the road?
- Will the guard rails be within the footprint of the grading?
  - Mr. Arnold does not expect the limit of work to change
- Will there be enough underground clearance for any obstacles going over or under the box culvert?
- Will there be lighting for the driveway?
  - Mr. Arnold, there are no proposed driveway lighting in terms of posts along the driveway. Any exterior lighting will be on the back of the houses
- Where will snow be stored? Need some indication that it will not be pushed into the wetlands.
- Stream Crossing
  - The Commission needs a detail on how the box culvert will be installed, and information about dewatering.
  - The Commission needs updated plans showing dewatering outside of the buffer zone, and add the note to the plan.
  - The Commission needs updated plans showing stockpiling and or material storage outside of the buffer zone, and add the note to the plan.
  - The Commission needs updated plans showing where the material from the stream bed will be stored in the buffer zone, and add the note to the plan.
  - Will there be a temporary stream crossing?
    - Mr. Arnold, a temporary stream crossing is not expected to be necessary
  - Will sheeting be needed to keep in excavation?
    - Mr. Arnold, from my experience it is not necessary because they are not going that deep a normal box culvert or 3-sided box culvert
  - Does the 4-sided culvert need footing, is there temporary excavation? Please add details for the wing walls.
    - Mr. Arnold, from my experience it is not necessary, the limit of work will not change in terms of the walls.
  - How are you going to ensure bank stability? Material will have to be brought in.
    - Mr. Arnold, based on experience, getting the material into the culvert is not a problem, small conveyor belts are used and work will be contained in the limit of work. The stream bed material will be re-used. The stream bed is muddy with some stones, so there is not high flow. They usually try to reuse some extra stones from other parts of the site inside the culvert for dry space for wildlife habitat and use the stones within the culvert banks.
  - The Commission would like to see the details of the cross section of the culvert showing the rocks used for wildlife habitat and bank stabilization. The Commission would like to see details for upstream and downstream to ensure that it is built correctly and the property materials are used
    - Mr. Arnold, the bank is relatively flat with about a 6inch high bank. The water flow is low, which means they can use the material onsite for controlling the stability of the stream bed.
  - Will the streambed material be checked for invasive species? Will any material brought in be checked for invasive species? The Commission needs these questions clarified and shown in the details.

- Mr. Arnold, the wetland scientist will be checking the soil for rhizomes of Japanese Knotweed. Organic material will be brought in as well. Organic topsoil will be used in the replication area.
- Wetlands
  - The Commission needs clarification on the retaining wall at the southern portion of the property
    - Mr. Arnold, the footing is a lot smaller, it's a large block wall which allows to keep the footprint tighter
  - The Commission stated that the project may have to do dewatering in the wetland mitigation area, material will need to be on hand for the wetland impacts.
  - The Commission would like to see a list of trees in the wetland that are being impacted by species and DBH, percent of shrub and herbaceous cover.
  - How deep is the ground water? In the wetland replication and stream crossing plan it said the groundwater is more than 12 inches from the surface based on soils.
  - The Commission has concerns about the grade. Plan seems to show that the existing wetlands are at elevation 214 but proposed grade is 215, explain expected establishment of wetlands based on the elevation? Show on plan a cross section of the grading.
    - Mr. Arnold, points out that the wetland slope is going in direction of 215. They are bringing the replication areas to the average grade along the wetland edge. 215 runs through the wetland itself. It sounds like the replication area is a foot above the wetland, but a large portion of the wetland is at 215 or higher.
  - The Commission wants the monitoring plan to include not just 75% cover but also 75% of trees and shrubs and emergents that survive.
  - The Commission needs more information on the location of the stockpiles and on the wells and how they are going to be constructed. There is a concern about drilling and the drilling fluid control.
  - The Commission needs the erosion control to be closer to the work site near the actual limit of grading. Show on plan.
  - The Commission would like the amount of clearing to be re-assessed. It seems like there is more than necessary.
    - Mr. Arnold will provide the square footage of lawn and impervious surface.
  - The Commission wants to make sure the impervious calculation is correct it should include: barn parking, sports court parking, the sports court, driveways, structures, everything else would be lawn within the limit of work except the replication area. Provide number of acres of clearing
  - The Commission would like the applicant to clarify their plan, it does not show patios, porches, decks, basement exits, sidewalks.
  - The Commission would like the plans to be color-coded.

## Public Comments

- Rebecca Harvey and Cynthia Harvey, 7 Dustin Lane are abutters to the project. Prior to the meeting Rebecca provided her written comments. She would like to understand what is substantially different with this plan from previous plans that were denied. She provided some data and a video evidence showing the significant flooding events that have taken place on Spring Hill Road. The flooding events cause the fire pond to enlarge and the proposed barn, court and driveway would be underwater. She is concerned that the project will need a large amount of vegetation clearing that will make the flooding worse because the removed vegetation will not suck up the water. She is concerned about the animal waste that may accumulate near the barn in the wetland buffer. How are they going to account for the seepage that the animals may cause because the area is muddy and damp. How are they going to account for water for the animals, there are no water connections on the plans? She is curious to know if the landowners will have a manual for the property for all of the environmental and maintenance responsibilities. Ms. Harvey is also concerned about the wildlife, she provided images of wildlife on the property. The property acts like a wildlife corridor. She is concerned that the Commission might set a precedent if the project is approved.
- Joe Cooney 2 Duston Lane, neighbor has a question about the topographic lines near the houses. The 220 line shows that there will need to be about 4-6 feet of fill to meet the 224 line. There is a steep grade near the leaching fields going from 224 to 218. Mr. Cooney would like to know how the material will be brought to site, how many truckloads of fill is needed to build it up, does it create a huge mound above the wetlands in the buffer zone. Mr. Arnold responded stating that the septic systems will be mounded because of the high groundwater to comply with Board of Health Regulations. Some of the fill will be from the house foundation and the rest will be brought in via dump trucks using the driveway. Mr. Arnold will ask his team about the volume of fill that will be brought in. Two trucks will not be able to pass on the driveway.
- Terry O'Sullivan, 8 Spring Hill Road would like to know if there will be chemical runoff from fertilizing the lawns. The Commission stated that the Orders of Conditions could state no use of pesticides. Mr. O'Sullivan is aware that there is a lot of knotweed on the property and would like to know how the spread will be managed from the disturbance from construction. Mr. Arnold stated that there will be no soil moved across the crossing in effort to prevent contamination. The Commission asked for an invasive species management plan and have these details added to the plan. Mr. O'Sullivan has lived there for 18 years, the driveway for the project will connect with his driveway. He thinks the project is a bad idea, it will have a large negative impact on habitat and will increase the flooding. Water has come onto the driveway and a lot of vegetation will be removed. Mr. O'Sullivan would like the applicant to clarify that if DEP does not require stormwater report, then they are not going to provide runoff information. Mr. Arnold stated, correct it is not required to comply with the Mass DEP stormwater standards, the project is considered exempt under the standards. Mr. Arnold is concerned the culvert may be undersized or clogged which may increase the flooding. The Commission would like to know if Mr. Arnold would be willing to provide a stormwater impact study, showing the impact of their proposal.
- Bob and Jill Callahan, 7 Spring Hill Road. They live across the fire pond, they testify that the culvert was not blocked. Last December water was flowing furiously out the culvert and by their house. The stream that was usually 4 feet wide was about 35-40 feet wide



and 10 feet from their house. They would also like to know the project will impact flooding in the area, especially with all of the trees that would have to be removed.

Hearing continued to January 8<sup>th</sup> at 7:30pm.

**9:34 Notice of Intent–Public Hearing- 747 Main Street**

Brian Nelson with Metro West Engineering represented the landowner for the construction of a single-family home. It's currently a vacant lot with a isolated wetland and perennial stream in the back of the property. A small part of the project is in the 100-foot buffer zone which includes grading and a part of the septic system. Also, a new drainage system with a riprap outlet will be connected to the Town's pipe on Main Street. The survey does not show trees in the buffer zone, the contractor will provide it. Once knowing the impact, the Commission will assess tree replacement. Town Engineer sent a note requesting that the Orders of Conditions state "the pipe is privately owned and maintained by the landowner.

Ownership starts at the right of way line. The Town is not liable for the pipe. The Commission would like to see the end of the pipe pulled back as far as possible, outside of the 75-foot no structure. Wetlands were delineated by Dave Burke, it is not a vernal pool. Hearing continued to January 8<sup>th</sup> at 7:40pm

**9:47 Notice of Intent – Continued Public Hearing –416 Great Road #085-1377**

Paul Kirchner from Stamski and McNary represented the landowner. They are still working on the stream crossing standards. Mr. Kirchner requested for a continuance. Hearing continued to January 8<sup>th</sup> at 7:45pm.

**9:48 Notice of Intent – Continued Public Hearing – 104 Concord Road #085-1378**

Paul Kirchner from Stamski and McNary represented the Town. He provided the additional information that the Commission requested. DPW/Cemetery Department will be removing the landscape debris near the gravel area, shown on plan. Material will be processed at the transfer station. A graphic showing the new dumping area was provided, it is well away from the wetlands. The plantings will be native species (Sugar Maples, American Linden, Red Cedar, and London Plane. About 14 boulders (3-4-foot diameter) will be placed adjacent to the driveway, and they have no intention of plowing snow into the old dumping area. On plan note 10 states that the area will be restored with loam as needed and seeded with conservation wildlife seed mix. There is a proposed increase of impervious of 953 square feet, but they are proposing to remove all existing impervious within the 75-foot buffer. All of the proposed impervious will be directed to the stormwater management system which consists of basins one of which is within the buffer zone. Construction stock pile is placed outside of the buffer zone. Ms. Green moved to issue the Orders of Conditions with no special conditions and Mr. Colman seconded. All voted yes.

#### **9:57 Request for Certificate of Compliance- Public Hearing – 96 Newtown Road**

Ms. Barksdale can attest that everything has been built to plan. The stone diaphragm was installed and the boulders were placed. A member of the Commission went to the site and builder be placed and it was. Mr. Colman moved to issue the Certificate of Compliance and Ms. Green seconded, all voted yes.

#### **9:59 Hazard Tree Removal – 506 Acorn Park Drive**

Ira Wolf, landowner submitted the arborist recommendations that specifies two trees that the arborist and Commission identified as being unhealthy and prune several other trees. The arborist identified different branches that can be pruned on four trees. Tree 1 will be pruned. Tree 10 (Red Maple) and 11 (Red Oak) will be pruned, Tree 14 will be pruned. Mr. Colman moved to approve the cutting of the two trees and four trees identified to be pruned. Mr. Hocknell seconded and all voted yes.

#### **10:04 Enforcement Order – 43 Kinsley Road**

Landowner Armand Porrazzo was present. He was not able to make the last site visit and would like to reschedule. Mr. Porrazzo is concerned about the fines. He submitted the restoration plan at the last meeting. It came in late past the previous deadline, so the fines continued. The Commission understands that there are multiple personal challenges making the situation difficult. Mr. Porrazzo is also concerned that the fines are addressed to the wrong property, and he is starting a garden in the buffer zone. He wants to continue grafting fruit trees. There is a specific criterion to be classified as agriculture in the Mass Wetland Protection Act. Two site visits have been scheduled and they both have been canceled. The Commission will consider addressing the fines if the site visit is conducted by Friday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>. If the site visit occurs, the Commission will consider canceling the fines between December 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 and January 3<sup>rd</sup> 2025.

### **Administrative Updates**

#### **10:13 Vote to rescind 308 Old High Street trail amendment**

Town Counsel has recommended to rescind the vote that granted the second trail and it would revert the approval to the trail behind the building. The applicant is still working on a second solution. The Commission gave them approval for the trail contingent on having the necessary approvals. The amendment is supposed to be recorded, the vote to rescind would have to be recorded. It is unsure if the orders are recorded. The applicant should come in with a plan and at that time the Commission will amend the order. Pressure is coming from the abutter to have this addressed. The applicant could send the Commission a letter saying that they are unable to get the approvals and permits as required under the amended order of conditions, therefore they are no longer pursuing the option and will come back with a feasible option as soon as they can.

#### **10:30 Review and Approve Meetings Minutes**

The Chair asked for a motion to approve the 12.04.24. Mr. Hocknell moved and Mr. Colman seconded, all voted yes.

### 10:31 The meeting closed at 10:31PM

The Chair asked for a motion to end the meeting. Mr. Hocknell moved to end the meeting and Ms. Green seconded, all voted yes.

### Documents and exhibits used at this meeting:

12-18-2024 Meeting Information

<input type="checkbox"/>	Type	Title	Owner	Modified Date	Size	Actions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Folder	Public Concerns	obarksdale	12/18/24	1	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	PDF	12-18-2024.pdf	obarksdale	12/11/24	266 KB	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Word	Minutes_12.04.24_DRAFT.docx	obarksdale	12/16/24	84 KB	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	104 Concord Road NOI	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	12 Spring Hill Road NOI	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	308 old High Street Vote	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	416 Great Road NOI	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	43 Kinsley Road EO	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	506 Acorn Park Drive Haz Tree	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	64 & 68 Charter Road NOI	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	747 Main Street NOI	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...
<input type="checkbox"/>	Image	96 Newtown Road COC	obarksdale	12/11/24	0	📄 ☆ ...

All Documents can be found at:

<https://doc.actonma.gov/dsweb/View/Collection-18777>