

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
CITY OF CRANSTON
CITY PLAN COMMISSION

PROCEEDING AT HEARING :
IN RE: :
ADVISORY COMMITTEE :
NATICK AVENUE SOLAR :

DATE: October 22, 2020
TIME: 6:30 P.M.
PLACE: Teleconference via
Zoom

BEFORE:
JASON PEZZULLO, AICP
LINDSAY MC GOVERN
JOSHUA BERRY
FRED VINCENT
SARAH BRADFORD
DRAKE PATTEN
DANIEL ZEVON

PRESENT:
FOR THE PETITIONER ROBERT MURRAY, ESQUIRE

1 (COMMENCED AT 6:35 P.M.)

2 MR. PEZZULLO: Let's call this meeting to
3 order. We can go through the committee and
4 introduce ourselves. I'm Jason Pezzullo, the
5 planning director.

6 MR. BERRY: I'm Josh Berry. I'm a
7 planner, and I'm also on the advisory committee.

8 MS. MC GOVERN: Lindsay McGovern, Revity
9 Energy.

10 MR. VINCENT: Fred Vincent, city planning
11 commission.

12 MS. PATTEN: Drake Patten, community
13 representative.

14 MR. ZEVON: Dan Zevon, community
15 representative.

16 MR. RUSSO: Dave Russo with DiPrete
17 Engineering.

18 MR. PEZZULLO: We also have with us Sarah
19 Bradford, who is the city's landscape architect for
20 peer review with us. Okay.

21 MS. MC GOVERN: We also have John Carter
22 and Bob Murray.

23 MR. PEZZULLO: John Carter. Which number
24 -- is John Carter called in or --

25 MS. MC GOVERN: He's with me in this room.

1 MR. PEZZULLO: Okay. All right. We have
2 prepared minutes from last month's meeting. Those
3 have been posted to the website. Those have been
4 distributed to members of the committee. So those
5 are -- those are a good -- good review of what we
6 discussed last month. So I think I'm just going to
7 hand it off to the committee, and they can start
8 talking about the latest revision to the landscape
9 plan and --

10 MR. BERRY: Some changes to the minutes
11 that I wanted to talk about. First, I just wanted
12 some blanket permissions to fix any punctuation or
13 capitalization errors. There's a few without. I
14 didn't feel like I needed to itemize each one.

15 I have a question. I think sometimes Miss
16 Patten is called Drake Patten and sometimes Miss or
17 Mrs. Drake, would you like Miss or Mrs.?

18 MS. PATTEN: Miss.

19 MR. BERRY: Yup. And I think that
20 happened to Lindsay as well. Would you like
21 Mrs. or Miss to be addressed in the minutes,
22 Lindsay?

23 MS. MC GOVERN: Should be Ms.

24 MR. BERRY: Ms. Got it. On -- under the
25 first paragraph, site visit findings, the last

1 sentence, "She went on to explain that the eastern
2 topography would require a buffer." I think it's,
3 "The eastern portion of the project," not the
4 eastern topography. And I have all these notified.
5 So I can show you later, Joanne. We can work
6 through this.

7 The next line, "Mr. Berry stated" -- this
8 is all on Page 1. "Mr. Berry stated that he would
9 like to see a transect line from the eastern
10 buffer." I think that should be changed to "From
11 the property to the east." On Page 2, middle of
12 the page, middle of the paragraph, right there, it
13 says, "Commercially sourced materials would be
14 warranted." I think that just means warranted.
15 Second to the last sentence in that paragraph,
16 "Deciduous plants would do well as to screening
17 because this lot has been farmed and forested."
18 That should be "This lot has been farmed and
19 forested."

20 And then finally -- actually, two more.
21 Page 3, top of the page says, "Ms. Patten asked
22 about the sources for the plan materials." I think
23 it's "plant materials." And then the last
24 sentence, "Mr. Berry and the committee agreed that
25 the next meeting should be scheduled 10 to 14 days

1 from receiving of the revised materials schedule."
2 It should just say, "from receiving revised
3 materials."

4 MS. PATTEN: It's a small one, and I did
5 actually look at the transcript to make sure I
6 wasn't misremembering; but the first page, Drake
7 Patten pointed out transect done on property. It
8 refers to a singular transect, and we specifically
9 talked about from both residences. We have two
10 houses on the property, and that is in the -- the
11 -- I just want to make sure I wasn't misremembering
12 it. It is in the transcript and later in the
13 minutes it refers to plural, but I just wanted to
14 make sure that was correctly listed.

15 MS. BRADFORD: Can I go back to the
16 applicant materials, which is Page 2? First
17 paragraph, it says, "A mix of evergreen and
18 deciduous within the existing buffer." I think
19 it's outside the existing buffer.

20 MR. BERRY: Drake, I didn't quite catch --
21 I understand you were talking about singular or
22 plural for transects on that. It says transects,
23 plural. Did something need to be changed?

24 MS. PATTEN: It's residence, singular.
25 And I just want to make sure it reflects

1 residences, which it does later in the minutes,
2 because we have two houses. So I just want it to
3 be consistent because as it is, the transect that
4 was added is from a bush and it wasn't actually
5 from one of the residences or both of them. So it
6 just -- it will come up later in the meeting.

7 MR. BERRY: Okay.

8 MS. PATTEN: Thank you.

9 MR. BERRY: I think we have all those
10 changes. Are there any other changes to the
11 minutes? If there are none, I feel like we have a
12 consensus on that. Move forward to the agenda
13 here. On to applicant materials. I trust you all
14 received the revised materials sent by Lindsay this
15 afternoon. I do appreciate the responsiveness to
16 comments and turning around in such a short period
17 of time. And I do appreciate everyone doing their
18 best with a limited amount of time to revise the
19 material -- to look through the materials that were
20 sent, if possible. I think now is an important
21 moment for the applicant to be able to kind of talk
22 us through all those changes on the latest -- on
23 the latest plans.

24 MR. CARTER: Yeah, Hi. This is John
25 Carter, and I can walk you through the changes on

1 the plan. So after the last meeting, we were asked
2 to do -- or at the last meeting, we were asked to
3 do some additional work, including proposing or
4 defining three more transects, which we did, and we
5 did one more transect from Lot 118. We did a
6 transect from Lot 5, which is Map 22-3, this is to
7 the east, and we were asked to do one from the
8 east. And then we added another one from
9 Assessor's Map 18-1, Lot 551, Drake Patten's
10 property, and we did it from the center between the
11 two houses because we were asked to do it from the
12 houses in addition to the one we had done from the
13 barn. And the other thing we did was -- so we
14 did -- we did some minor things. We labeled the
15 gas easement and made it clear to understand where
16 it is. But the majority of the work and the
17 majority of the changes were a result of a
18 collaboration between myself and Sarah Bradford.
19 We had originally proposed a 50-foot, uncut, no-cut
20 buffer along the northerly property line. That
21 remains. A lot of the conversation was that it
22 presently has a fairly transparent understory; and
23 we felt that once it was exposed to light, the
24 understory would fill in naturally. But, in the
25 meantime, it was primarily deciduous trees, oaks,

1 that had raised canopies, and you could see through
2 them, and that was a lot of the feedback we were
3 getting from the neighbors.

4 So we, if you recall, we had proposed
5 doing some plantings over there. And then it was
6 conversation about that may be not being adequate.
7 So then we proposed putting a solid fence. Then
8 that, at the last meeting, was decided that that
9 wasn't wanted.

10 So what we did talk about was doing some
11 kind of an integrated planting which would include
12 taller plants, shorter plants, deciduous plants,
13 evergreen plants, and try to establish a more
14 sustainable and naturalistic buffer. But then that
15 presented a problem because there was discussion
16 about can you go into the existing 50 feet and dig
17 holes underneath the trees that exist and plant.
18 And I felt that was not a good practice. It would
19 be difficult to get them established. Sarah can
20 speak when her -- when she's ready, but in the
21 meantime, I'll kind of paraphrase it, I think that
22 she and I agreed on that.

23 And so an additional 10 feet on top of the
24 50 feet is proposed, and that's going to be
25 cleared. And so the limits of the clearing have

1 not changed. The limit of the buffer has
2 increased. So within that 10 feet, we developed a
3 planting scheme and then that also turns and comes
4 around the easterly side also. And that's
5 explained on the plans; and if you have the plans
6 in front of you and you look at -- well, you can
7 look at the Sheet Number 1 and you can see where we
8 have labeled at the top on the north, 50-foot
9 wooded area to remain. Then we have a 10-foot wide
10 buffer plantings. Then on the right of the east
11 side, it says 25-foot wide area to remain and a
12 variable width buffer 20 to 40 feet. And the
13 reason that's wider, significantly wider, is
14 because of the topography and the grading necessary
15 and so that's going to result in clearing there,
16 but then we would be allowed to plant within that.
17 So -- oh, excuse me, and then down at the southeast
18 corner with Lot 50 -- Plat 22-3, Lot 50, we had
19 proposed putting a solid fence, and a feedback we
20 got was that that wasn't appropriate and why didn't
21 we do -- and this is Sarah and I having a
22 conversation also, the same type of planting.

23 So we added this area we call D, Letter D,
24 and you can see that. So what that -- what that is
25 on the southeast, on the northeast, along the

1 northerly property line is explained on lots --
2 excuse me, on Page 6.

3 On Page 6, what we did was we have -- it's
4 called a typical supplemental planting detail. And
5 we said 50-foot pattern. And the way to describe
6 that is within 50 feet, these plants that we're
7 proposing, and they're explained on the left under
8 the plant schedule, under Areas C and D, how many
9 of the plants, the quantity, what the names of the
10 plants are, the size. And so if you look at that
11 detail and you look at the plant schedule, it
12 quantifies how many plants will be used. The
13 reason is that we were getting feedback from the
14 beginning because we were saying well, really, the
15 best way to do this is to do the clearing, and then
16 you'll know what you have for views in places you
17 can plant and can't plant. I understand people are
18 a little bit squeamish about that. It's very
19 difficult to approve something that's so poorly
20 defined.

21 So, typically, when we do landscape plans
22 for any type of project, we do a plant schedule.
23 If it's reviewed and approved by the board, then
24 upon approval, that plant schedule becomes part of
25 the approved documents, and it's easy to enforce.

1 Everybody knows what they have to do. The
2 developers know what they have to do. The city
3 knows what's been approved and what should be out
4 there and the neighbors know what should be out
5 there. So it quantifies and clarifies the idea
6 that we came up with of the -- what we're calling
7 the supplemental buffer plantings.

8 So, in summary, rather than trying to go
9 into the 50 feet and dig holes and get plants to
10 grow, we're going to plant on the southerly side of
11 that 50 foot. It's going to be exposed to
12 sunlight. It's going to not have any root
13 competition because it'll be cleared, and we feel
14 it would enable us to establish a buffer that will
15 become effective much quicker and have a lot more
16 sustainability so it's not going to just, you know,
17 go away in a little bit -- after a couple of years.
18 It should get better and better with the years.
19 That would be our impression.

20 So that's the major change. I worked
21 closely with Sarah. We shared ideas and so forth,
22 and certainly she could probably elaborate even
23 further than I did. But that was -- we basically,
24 I believe, responded to the feedback at the last
25 meeting and have put everything in a little bit

1 more -- gone a little bit further even with the
2 buffer and adding the additional 10 feet.

3 And I can answer any questions if it's
4 appropriate at this time.

5 MS. PATTEN: On the -- let's see. So on
6 previous plans, there was a plan on Ridgewood --
7 are you able to hear me?

8 MR. CARTER: I can hear you, yes.

9 MS. PATTEN: There was a plan to address
10 the folks on Ridgewood, and then I don't see that
11 here.

12 MR. CARTER: Yeah. I can explain that if
13 you'd like.

14 MS. PATTEN: I'm just trying -- (technical
15 difficulty) -- the name is down in the corner
16 there. That seems to be missing now. So --

17 MR. CARTER: As far as the issue with
18 Ridgewood, we had proposed plantings up on the
19 property line which were going to be within the
20 established forest. So that's the point that we
21 discussed in the past, and I clarified again
22 tonight that we thought that was a lesser of a -- a
23 less preferable option. So what we did was we took
24 the ten-foot planting strip and we extended it all
25 the way along the northerly property line. It

1 wasn't over there on the previous sets of plans,
2 and thought that would be a better solution.

3 MS. PATTEN: So I'm just curious for
4 the -- let's see what it is. Lot 22 -- no. 22-2,
5 216, I'm just -- I'm not seeing how they're
6 benefiting from that.

7 MR. CARTER: Well, they have a significant
8 existing vegetation between their property and the
9 project.

10 MS. MC GOVERN: 410 feet, yeah, labeled on
11 the transect. 410 feet of it is existing
12 vegetation that won't be cut. So that house --

13 MR. CARTER: Well, no -- so it's 410 feet
14 from the house to the closest panel, and it's about
15 280 feet of existing vegetation that's not going to
16 be altered.

17 MS. BRADFORD: John, I think you could
18 talk more about the locations that you've put these
19 individual patterns in.

20 MR. CARTER: Thank you, Sarah. So that's
21 a good point. So the intent is to not plant this
22 entire ten feet in its entirety. What we wanted to
23 do is find a way to, as I said in the beginning, to
24 recognize where the most effective ways to
25 establish screening and not be putting plants where

1 it's not going to make any significant difference.

2 So what we did was we tried to identify
3 what we thought were the more sensitive areas and
4 cluster together these planting groups so that we
5 could make a more solid buffer in that area, and
6 then lesser, and then more solid in another area.
7 So if you go along that ten feet and see we do
8 that, that gives a little latitude. So, again, I
9 still believe that once this site is cleared, it's
10 going to be obvious where the more sort of wide
11 open views are and where this kind of natural
12 vegetation is already providing some screening, and
13 this gives us the opportunity to put the plants
14 where they need to go. So, basically, prioritize.
15 So that's why we kind of put those patterns the way
16 we did.

17 MS. PATTEN: John, just going back, I'm
18 sorry, I'm looking at this on a very small screen.
19 I'm just going to move it around here. Just going
20 back to Ridgewood again, I understand that there's
21 a lot of planting there, which is great, but it is
22 outside of the project area. So there's no control
23 in terms of the company and the work of what
24 Mr. Rossi might do in the future with that land,
25 which really, you know, in terms of our due

1 diligence, really needing to make sure that the
2 neighbors are being taken care of. That would be a
3 concern, I think. And then -- the tree. So -- I'm
4 looking at the legend here, the proposed tree line
5 that runs south, that's the proposed tree line
6 of --

7 MR. CARTER: The clearing for the project.

8 MS. PATTEN: Right.

9 MR. CARTER: Because of (inaudible).

10 MS. PATTEN: Right. So then you're really
11 talking that -- to project line we're clearing and
12 behind that, then depending on what the property
13 owner decides to do, there's no benefit to
14 Ridgewood, which is not -- I'm mean, I'm very
15 excited to see all these things and I'm very
16 excited to see that we're actually dealing with the
17 Lawrences' property. That's, you know, it's great
18 to see that, but I'm just, again, because we're
19 representing the neighborhood, that's a corner that
20 we've not really addressed, and I'm wondering if
21 you or Sarah have any thoughts on that?

22 MS. BRADFORD: I thought it was going to
23 be covered by the existing woodlands. It's there.
24 It is a -- now, the project area, itself, that is
25 taken to the city for this, what is the boundary

1 line for that, then, on this plan?

2 MR. CARTER: Sarah, what was that question
3 again? I'm sorry. We were talking.

4 MS. BRADFORD: I'm not quite sure I'm
5 understanding Drake's concern either for Lot 216.
6 It relies on the area that the Transect 14 goes
7 through really staying somewhat wooded. If it were
8 to be cleared completely, I do think we have a
9 different issue.

10 MR. CARTER: Well, I think that Reivity
11 would be willing to commit that if that was cleared
12 significantly up to the property line, that they
13 would plant at that point. There's no reason to do
14 it now. I mean, how could you do it now?

15 MS. BRADFORD: I agree. There's no reason
16 to do it now.

17 MS. PATTEN: Right, but it's not -- sorry.
18 I didn't think that was in your project area,
19 though. Am I missing something?

20 MR. CARTER: It's not inside the lease
21 area; but as I said, they'll commit to, if that's
22 cleared in the future, to doing some additional
23 planting at that time in the place where it's most
24 appropriate.

25 MS. BRADFORD: I think trying to do any

1 planting now, particularly along the property line,
2 does more damage than it does good.

3 MS. PATTEN: I understand. I'm just
4 trying to understand how they're --

5 MR. ZEVON: Hi. This is Dan Zevon. I
6 have a question. On Page 6 of 6, can you just
7 explain to me, and maybe Sarah's got to get into
8 it, I'm not sure, but when you said the quantity,
9 so am I to understand that the total quantity of
10 all the plantings is 24 plants?

11 MR. CARTER: No. The total quantity of
12 all the plants in Areas C and D is -- what is it,
13 Lindsay, you told me?

14 MS. MC GOVERN: 200 for C and D, Sarah?

15 MS. BRADFORD: Correct. That's what you
16 have on your plant list, yes.

17 MR. ZEVON: From -- you said on Page 6 of
18 6, so we would see that number there?

19 MS. BRADFORD: Dan, will you (inaudible) a
20 different way and look at the supplemental planting
21 detail, and do you see that to the right-hand side,
22 lower right-hand side, there's a plan basically
23 with some bubbles. Each of those bubbles
24 represents a plant, and there are eighteen of them
25 there, I think. And so that is part -- that's the

1 basic pattern. We are repeating that basic pattern
2 eighteen times. And you get up to 180 plants --
3 180 trees, basically. This isn't including the
4 shrubs. And John has thrown in an extra 20 because
5 he's a good guy.

6 MR. CARTER: There's 200 trees and 144
7 shrubs.

8 MR. ZEVON: Okay. I just didn't see that,
9 John, when you said it was somewhere on this page,
10 I was trying to see where that was and --

11 MR. CARTER: See where it says quantity,
12 "Q-T-Y"?

13 MR. ZEVON: Yup.

14 MR. CARTER: Just add down that column and
15 then below it.

16 MS. MC GOVERN: The C and D column.

17 MS. CARTER: The C and D's.

18 MS. BRADFORD: For the trees there, yup.

19 MR. PEZZULLO: John, is there any way we
20 can put this plan on the share screen so that we
21 can all look at that while we're discussing --

22 MS. MC GOVERN: Dave Russo, is there any
23 chance you can put it on your screen?

24 MR. RUSSO: I can. Give me one second.

25 MR. ZEVON: While he's going that, Sarah,

1 I just have another quick question. On the plant
2 sizes where it's five to eight feet, I spoke to
3 somebody else, and I know Lindsay referenced last
4 week eight feet as well, but somebody had told me,
5 again, I'm not an expert, but that ten feet is the
6 typical norm for a buffer in this -- any type of
7 neighboring situation like this.

8 MS. BRADFORD: I don't think there is a
9 norm, really, but look down under Area C and D, and
10 you'll see that there are various sizes depending
11 on the plant that's being proposed. So for the --
12 if you look at the pines, which are *pinus strobus*,
13 there are some smaller ones and there are some
14 bigger ones.

15 MR. ZEVON: I saw like five to eight, but
16 I was just concerned --

17 MS. BRADFORD: Five to eight really isn't
18 a category. That was an approximate thing. That's
19 for a different issue, but I think we need to keep
20 talking about Areas C & D.

21 MR. CARTER: Also the -- if I could point
22 out, the ordinance talks about plant material shall
23 be sized and planted so as to achieve a year-round
24 effective buffer height of at least eight feet
25 within three growing seasons. So I think we'll

1 have eight significant -- we'll meet that and
2 hopefully exceed it, and then, of course, it
3 continues to grow.

4 MR. BERRY: So are you quoting with
5 Development Plan Review section of the code?

6 MS. MC GOVERN: Yes, that's correct.

7 MR. CARTER: Yes, that's correct.

8 MR. ZEVON: I don't have it. Is this the
9 new one that you just sent out today?

10 MR. CARTER: The new plan?

11 MR. ZEVON: No, this picture right here,
12 this page. I was following on the nice package I
13 got in the mail.

14 MR. CARTER: It should be the same, I
15 guess.

16 MR. ZEVON: That's why I was having a
17 difficult time following. You know, when you said
18 the quantity, I'm looking -- the only thing I see
19 that says quantity on this page, so it's 24. So
20 thank you.

21 MR. CARTER: That's right. That's right.
22 I'm sorry if there was --

23 MS. MC GOVERN: I'm sorry about that.

24 MR. CARTER: But that was one of the big
25 exercises was to let's quantify the numbers and the

1 sizes and the species so that once approved,
2 everybody knows what the expectation is because if
3 not, it would turn into a sort of endless quest to
4 achieve the perfect buffer.

5 MS. BRADFORD: It would be clearer, John,
6 and maybe as you do your final on this, if, when
7 you do the key, you could do, say, for the
8 Amelanchier, which comes in two different sizes,
9 you could do ACS for small, and you can use large
10 ones. And also makes up for the corresponding
11 change in the typical detail. (Inaudible) versus
12 PS.

13 MR. CARTER: Yup.

14 MS. BRADFORD: And I would like to have
15 the names of those or the perhaps in the notes say
16 that the Amelanchier, the shad bush, and the birch,
17 if either of those are used, they should be
18 multi-stemmed.

19 MR. CARTER: Got you. I agree.

20 MS. BRADFORD: Are the people who are
21 looking at this list familiar with these plant
22 materials enough to recognize that some are
23 evergreen and some are deciduous? Okay. The
24 first -- the ones that will be labeled AC or ACS
25 are shadblow; and as an alternative to that, if we

1 wanted to vary it, would be birch. And those are
2 deciduous. And we want them to have several
3 trunks, three to five, probably. If we go further
4 down, *ilex opaca* is American Holly, that's
5 Christmas holly, basically. That's evergreen.
6 We're not using very many of them. They're
7 expensive and they're slow growing. So we will use
8 those judiciously.

9 When we go to the red cedar, *juniperus*
10 *virginiana*, that's your common evergreen column
11 that you see in old fields, but it's evergreen and
12 should do fairly well here.

13 The *pinus strobus* is white pine. That's
14 fairly common in Rhode Island, as well; and that's
15 evergreen, and we've got two different sizes going,
16 the bigger one -- and, you know, these evergreens,
17 and particularly nursery grown white pine -- it's
18 not "pent." It should be white pine -- are heavy.
19 So we want to make sure that the places where
20 they're going to be planted with a backhoe are
21 easily accessible, but if we wanted to plant some
22 back in the buffer area, those probably have -- we
23 want to plant without a backhoe. We want to do
24 those manually. So those are -- for that reason,
25 we needed smaller materials there.

1 If you go down to the shrubs, we have all
2 of those. We have blueberry and (inaudible)
3 bayberry, dogwood. They are all deciduous. They
4 all lose their leaves, but they're pretty twiggy.
5 They'll make a pretty good thicket once they get
6 going. We're starting small. At the time that
7 they're planted, they won't have a whole lot of
8 impact as a visual barrier or buffer; but I think
9 within five years, they'll be double that size and
10 they'll move right along up to about, I don't know,
11 eight feet tall. I don't think many of them are
12 going to get a whole lot more than that. Other
13 thoughts? We might need to talk a little bit more
14 about D.

15 MR. BERRY: Just really quickly, can you
16 clarify, was this -- were these species selected as
17 a collaborative effort, Sarah, with you and John,
18 or was this something that John came up with and
19 you've kind of reviewed it?

20 MS. BRADFORD: He had some of them in the
21 list that was sent out before this particular one,
22 I don't know what date you got it, 10-10 or
23 something like that, but that last also included
24 some non native. So I just sort of said -- took
25 what I thought was going to be (inaudible) and, you

1 know, talked to John about it, and put them back in
2 and I guess he thought that that was -- sort of
3 worked for him, too, and there we are.

4 MS. PATTEN: Should we assume that the
5 giant arborvitae was the choice of the people that
6 are having it put on their land, the Rossi's, not
7 really the Rossi's; is that the --

8 MS. MC GOVERN: That is correct. Are you
9 referring to Area B?

10 MS. PATTEN: Yes.

11 MS. MC GOVERN: Yes. They requested green
12 giant arborvitaes. That would be the screening for
13 them.

14 MS. PATTEN: (Technical difficulty) John
15 Francisco, that is the wrong address for them. 785
16 is owned by John Akqulian, and you might want to
17 (technical difficulty) for Josh's (technical
18 difficulty) --

19 MS. MC GOVERN: Drake, I can't hear you at
20 all.

21 MR. BERRY: I heard the first part about a
22 wrong address for John Francisco's letter, but then
23 I lost you after that.

24 MS. PATTEN: I know. It's a little -- I
25 having trouble tonight. So the Francisco's

1 property, the listed property that was signed, is
2 not their address. They're actually at 789 Natick
3 Avenue, and the property is not (technical
4 difficulty) by Linda. So that would be something
5 to be addressed. Did you hear that?

6 MR. BERRY: I did.

7 MS. MC GOVERN: I did hear that. He
8 signed it. I will talk to him about it, but I
9 don't know if we need to get a new letter for that,
10 Josh. We worked really hard to get these. He was
11 very hard to get a hold of, and Linda was present
12 when she signed. So I have no problem calling him
13 up; but to go back, I don't think is necessary. I
14 can correct it on the plan if it's not corrected on
15 the plan.

16 MR. BERRY: Jason, I don't know. It seems
17 like a technical issue. I'm not sure that --

18 MR. PEZZULLO: I think we can handle that
19 offline.

20 MR. BERRY: Okay.

21 MR. PEZZULLO: It's just a scrivener's
22 error. We'll handle that later.

23 MR. VINCENT: I have a question. Fred
24 Vincent. Can you hear me, Jason?

25 MR. PEZZULLO: Oh, yeah.

1 MR. VINCENT: Okay. First of all, my
2 apologies for missing the last meeting. The
3 minutes show that there was great discussion, and
4 I'm very happy to see that. I was concerned when I
5 looked at the October 8th plans, and the quantities
6 were very meager. And so today's discussion really
7 has made me feel much, much more comfortable and
8 positive. John, I -- John Carter, I think the
9 concept you laid out with Sarah, of course, having
10 these 18 strategically located as a starting point
11 just makes sense to me, and my concern is the
12 topography and the soils here, do we know -- I know
13 this was a tree farm or is a tree farm, but is
14 there any concerns with the lack of irrigation in
15 the soils with all these new plantings?

16 MR. ZEVON: And, Fred, this is Dan, I just
17 want to point out -- and I tried to make this a
18 point on the last topic. This parcel of land has
19 never been a tree farm. Never. It was never in
20 the Rossi family for generations as John talked
21 about on the last call. And that's the only point
22 I was trying to make. We keep hearing like the low
23 level or the low -- excuse me, the -- what is that
24 word, the tree -- I forget what you guys are
25 calling it -- the umbrella --

1 MS. BRADFORD: The canopy.

2 MR. ZEVON: The canopy, thank you, is
3 because it was a tree. This was not -- the tree
4 farm, as I got from Ron's lawyer on day one, is in
5 that 17 acres up by their house, the tree farm.
6 This was never a tree farm. That's all. So I'm --
7 just to point it out.

8 MS. BRADFORD: It's a managed wood,
9 however.

10 MR. VINCENT: And, Sarah, is the soil --
11 can you gather anything from the soils because
12 Western Cranston has some very difficult soils, you
13 know, very clay, a lot of difficulty with drainage.

14 MS. BRADFORD: Well, I think -- the plant
15 materials we've chosen are pretty resilient and
16 should be able -- they do need some -- some
17 drainage, I agree. I think we need to talk a
18 little bit more about this planting strip. As John
19 is describing it, it is an area that needs to --
20 it's part of the regrading for the solar farm. So
21 all the existing soil in that area, it is to be
22 regraded. All the top soil is going to go with
23 this stripping of the plants, I guess. Am I right,
24 John? Can you describe what happens in preparation
25 of this area?

1 MR. CARTER: That's correct, Sarah. And
2 so the whole purpose of this additional ten feet is
3 to provide suitable planting area, and that
4 includes the soils, that includes adequate light,
5 that includes lack of competition from an
6 overstory. So the intent is going to be to plant
7 these plants in suitable soil to provide adequate
8 water as necessary. This is going to be expensive.
9 There's no intention to put it in and have it die.
10 I mean, it's going to be a commitment to this to
11 get it to grow. The plans, Sheet 6, has planting
12 details on it. It talks about how to put the
13 plants in, take them out of the containers, take
14 them out of the wrapping, and so forth, which are
15 typical details that a good quality landscape
16 contractor would do without us telling him to. But
17 we put it on the plans just as a guideline and a
18 commitment that that has to be done.

19 So I understand your question. I think if
20 you went out right now and put a shovel in the
21 ground, I don't know what you'd find, if it's going
22 to be rocky, if it's going to be what. That
23 whole -- with the grading, the whole top soil is
24 going to be altered anyways and there'll be
25 available planting soil to make it -- you know, the

1 intent is going to be to make this ten-foot
2 planting strip where it's planted a good
3 environment for the plants to establish.

4 MR. VINCENT: So based on that, John, what
5 it suggests is that for each plant, you're bringing
6 in soil in that ten-foot planting strip should get
7 the plant off to a healthy start.

8 MR. CARTER: That's correct.

9 MS. BRADFORD: John, I think we need to go
10 one step further because within outside -- or how
11 am I going to describe it? Anything that you have
12 green in the area of your planting strip, I think
13 that should also have topsoil, and I don't know
14 whether you're envisioning it being seeded or
15 mulched?

16 MR. CARTER: Probably wood chip mulch
17 would be my guess.

18 MS. BRADFORD: I think it should have loam
19 or whatever you want -- top soil in those areas,
20 too. So that there is (technical difficulty)
21 backfill for each of the plants, but in between
22 those plants, there's also loam of 6-inch depth.

23 MR. CARTER: Yes. Well, I think that the
24 way that this would be planted is where you did
25 your 50-foot planting pattern by ten feet, it would

1 all be dug out and have topsoil put in. In between
2 them, to some degree, yes, but that's how that
3 would be done. I don't think they're going to be
4 individually pocket planted one at a time like
5 that.

6 MS. BRADFORD: But we still have
7 substantial lengths of green on your plan, and I
8 don't think it's enough just to cover that with
9 wood chips.

10 MR. CARTER: What do you think it should
11 be?

12 MS. BRADFORD: I think it should be loom
13 and seeded.

14 MR. CARTER: You know, the wood chips are
15 mulch around the planting beds, Sarah. If there's
16 bare spots, it will be loomed and seeded, yes, like
17 the rest of the site.

18 MS. BRADFORD: Okay. That's the
19 clarification I need. So the green parts that are
20 not -- that do not have a planting pattern is shown
21 as red will be loomed and seeded.

22 MR. CARTER: Right. We can -- we can
23 clarify that, yes.

24 MS. BRADFORD: Can we go back down to D
25 again now, just to make that clear. I'm not sure,

1 do we -- let's see, the Lot Number 50? Look at D
2 more carefully, and D is an area where we need to
3 have screening of, you know, ultimately ten, twelve
4 feet would be fine because that's about the height
5 of the panels behind them. If we used the pattern
6 that is shown by John (technical difficulty) pine
7 trees, and pine trees would not be suitable there.
8 So we need to keep a little flexibility, but still
9 keep the whole plant list, giving us the same
10 numbers of plants and the same size of plants.

11 MS. PATTEN: This is Drake, and I just
12 want to ask, I guess, a little question about that
13 section, and I'm relieved to see it there because
14 the Lawrences really haven't -- their issue hadn't
15 been addressed. And to be honest, they're in a
16 very bad position. They're quite close to the
17 project. They are looking up the slope at it at a
18 fairly steep angle. And so I guess in addition to
19 what you were saying, Sarah, which I understand and
20 I'm not trying to interrupt, I just want to add to
21 this, I guess I had a question. There's been quite
22 a lot of clearing going along the gas easement
23 lately along the wall. So the southern wall of the
24 gas easement, and I'm assuming that that's, you
25 know, that's the right of the gas company to do,

1 but I'm also assuming it may be related to the
2 future of the project. I don't know. But I've
3 just been seeing things being cut along that wall.
4 And so if this plant -- if this plan assumes that
5 there's going to be anything along the wall on the
6 easement side, I think we should assume there will
7 not be, in part, because of the shade that these
8 things might create on the panels.

9 And then just -- I just want to add in,
10 and this is really for you, Lindsay, we had
11 discussed the tree topping question at the last
12 meeting, and you had said very adamantly that that
13 never happened. And just for the record, I want to
14 make sure that we add in the minutes of January 8,
15 2019, when Mr. Lawrence appeared at the meeting and
16 did talk about being approached by Southern Sky to
17 allow trimming of the trees. I just want to make
18 sure that we're not -- because Mr. Lawrence was
19 incredibly offended that this -- you know, he
20 wasn't believed. So I just want to make sure that
21 we get that on the record.

22 My understanding was it was Ron Rossi and
23 Ralph Palumbo who met with him. But he testified
24 to that at the meeting. So if we're assuming that
25 there may be some tree topping happening on places

1 that are not owned by the Lawrences, then does it
2 change that particular location, which is a pretty
3 tricky one? I was just over there again this week,
4 and they are in a very difficult position in terms
5 of the angle.

6 MS. BRADFORD: Do you think what is shown
7 as D is enough, or does it need to be longer?

8 MS. PATTEN: You know, Sarah, I -- I
9 obviously just saw this today -- tonight, and so,
10 honestly, I'm sort of -- I guess that's what I'm
11 trying to digest a bit. Maybe not -- I mean, the
12 longer I think yes, and I actually took a bunch of
13 photos when I was there this week because I was
14 really trying to understand their situation better,
15 but also it's the height that concerns me. And I
16 hear what you're saying about the pines, and I get
17 that, that that's -- they would have height, but
18 they might not do well there, right? So they're
19 just on such a -- it's like you're looking up at
20 the sky there. They're so close.

21 MS. BRADFORD: I think it is difficult,
22 but if we can get materials that -- if there are
23 some shads or birch in there that are going to get
24 ten, twelve feet height fairly rapidly, that's
25 going to help a good deal.

1 MS. PATTEN: That makes sense, yup.

2 MS. BRADFORD: I would like you to be --
3 to be the one to help us out whether it's a big --
4 a long enough area, or do we need another grouping
5 to the left of --

6 MS. PATTEN: Yeah. That would be my
7 instinct, and I think longer might be an answer,
8 Sarah. Again, I'm just trying to catch up on this
9 particular spot because the plans that we saw
10 before were the fence, and that didn't make any
11 sense. So I'm excited to see this, and I think the
12 Lawrences will be, too.

13 MS. BRADFORD: John, is there any chance
14 that we could get our planting strip wider than ten
15 feet in that area? Could we go all the -- I don't
16 know. It looks thin for that area, knowing that
17 the gas easement is wide open.

18 MR. CARTER: If it's -- yeah, but they
19 can -- there's a shade issue because that's to the
20 due south. So 6 feet.

21 MS. BRADFORD: It would have to be -- it
22 would have to be extending south and east. They
23 couldn't go -- you can't go closer to the panels, I
24 don't think.

25 MR. CARTER: So south and east, but

1 there's an access road, like, between Transect 1
2 and Transect 2? Is that --

3 MS. BRADFORD: Can the access road shift
4 east a bit?

5 MR. CARTER: You mean, like, double those,
6 double the width? Oh, I see.

7 MS. BRADFORD: I need some help.

8 MR. CARTER: Give my one second, Sarah.
9 Let me just look at this with --

10 MS. PATTEN: I mean, Sarah, maybe the
11 other way would be two layers? That's not the
12 right word. But sort of two staggers of things to
13 try to --

14 MS. BRADFORD: I think that, yeah,
15 that's -- effectively does the same thing. We're
16 doubling -- we want to double those -- the width of
17 the planting strip if there's any way possible, or
18 increase it anyway. The stagger would help us. It
19 looks like there is little space between the
20 planting strip as drawn and the gas easement
21 boundary. Don't know. I think we need help from
22 others.

23 MR. CARTER: Well, I think the problem
24 there is that there's a lot of topography there.
25 It's very steep. So by shifting the road, you're

1 pushing out the -- the necessary slope, and you'd
2 be cutting some of the trees that we're leaving.

3 MS. BRADFORD: We don't want to cut more,
4 okay. It looks open, but if it's not, it's not.
5 What if we get towards the gas easement itself, you
6 can drive on the easement, right, that's
7 acceptable. So do you have some -- you have some
8 space between the easement boundary and the
9 planting as you show it now?

10 MR. CARTER: Right to the left to the
11 Number 1 on Transect 1, that space in there. Yeah,
12 we can make that a little thicker.

13 MS. BRADFORD: So we can do another -- we
14 could stagger another couple of patterns in there.

15 MS. MC GOVERN: So you're talking about --
16 yeah, the only --

17 MR. PALUMBO: When Sarah says patterns,
18 John, she means the grouping of the --

19 MS. BRADFORD: I haven't got a good word.

20 MS. MC GOVERN: Just because it's spaced
21 out, the plantings have to be 6 feet or under.

22 MR. CARTER: The thickest, Sarah, I think
23 we can accommodate in that area, yes. We're
24 staying out -- because there's strict language on
25 what you can and cannot do in a gas easement.

1 MR. PALUMBO: Hi, this is Ralph Palumbo.
2 I just wanted to respond to Drake with Mr. Lawrence
3 on it. So we're not touching Mr. Lawrence's trees
4 on his property. We're not going to go on his
5 property and touch them. This whole thing about
6 topping, Drake, I never had a conversation with
7 Mr. Lawrence about topping his trees. I understand
8 what he said in public, but I never had a
9 conversation with him about topping his trees, and
10 we don't plan to do it. So that's on the record,
11 okay.

12 MS. PATTEN: I'll let him know.

13 MS. MC GOVERN: So, John, for this buffer,
14 then, it will be trees that are six feet, won't
15 exceed six feet and then they're going to extend it
16 south, right? Not --

17 MR. CARTER: Yeah. South.

18 MS. MC GOVERN: Sarah, is that your
19 understanding?

20 MS. BRADFORD: The thick -- thicker, if
21 that's a good word for it, a broader planting
22 strip, and extending it further to -- a little
23 further to the west. Now, in terms of the six
24 feet, particularly we're looking uphill, the six
25 feet I understand is an issue if we're talking

1 about shade, but the panels are about that,
2 basically. And I think we have to figure out
3 wording again. All of these shrubs that we're
4 proposing, if growing conditions are good, they
5 could get above six feet. They could -- might get
6 up to ten feet. We need to allow you to cut at
7 certain height. There's a maintenance issue. And
8 keep things at some predetermined height, but
9 there's some verbiage that needs to be worked out
10 there.

11 MR. CARTER: Like a little bit of
12 consideration to what's planted because as you
13 pointed out, we don't want to put white pines that
14 will be six feet in one year and then you top them
15 because that's not good practice. So I agree that
16 if we're careful what we put in there, even if it
17 exceeds six feet and it was cut, it would still be
18 healthy and vigorous like the viburnum and some of
19 those things.

20 MS. BRADFORD: Correct. Can -- well, we
21 can -- perhaps, I can discuss this more with John.
22 This six-foot limit, I need to understand a little
23 more why it is six feet when the panels are twelve
24 feet.

25 MR. PALUMBO: This is Ralph, Sarah. The

1 lower lip of the panel, which is closest to
2 (technical difficulty) is three feet off the
3 ground; and as to stacking up, it's twelve feet.
4 So it goes to the low of three and a high of
5 twelve.

6 MS. BRADFORD: But the sun never comes
7 absolutely horizontal. It's always up in the sky a
8 bit. So we have some angle of illumination there.

9 MR. PALUMBO: You do have some, you know,
10 the spacing of it, but the sun, you know, does
11 start low and comes up high, I agree with you. But
12 there are points in time where it's low, and we're
13 trying to protect against that, within reason,
14 Sarah.

15 MS. BRADFORD: We certainly want, if we're
16 going to do this, they ought to be efficient and
17 effective. No doubt about that, but I don't want
18 to overdo it either.

19 MR. PALUMBO: Yeah, so, you know, the
20 question is, and I haven't given an answer to it,
21 and I know you're asking it, you know, what is the
22 appropriate level height or maximum height of it,
23 you know, and the question is does six feet work.
24 Mr. Lawrence's house is much lower than the
25 plantings that we're talking about here. So it

1 does have the effect of a much taller tree or a
2 visual block. So I, you know, I understand what
3 you're asking me, but I'm not sure it needs to be
4 more than six feet to accomplish the task.

5 MR. CARTER: I think density is part of
6 it.

7 MS. BRADFORD: What did you say, John?

8 MR. CARTER: I said I think the density is
9 going to be more important.

10 MS. BRADFORD: The density and the width
11 is going to help us a lot.

12 MR. BERRY: This is Joshua. This is
13 probably maybe just an error, but it looks like
14 Transect Lines 1, 2, and 3 don't have sight lines
15 on the most current plan. Maybe it would help,
16 especially when we're talking about when the other
17 sight lines you can really see how the height of
18 the proposed plantings impact where that sight line
19 is through, and that we're talking about
20 specifically that relationship between the height
21 on the proposed plantings, but that line wasn't
22 drawn. So maybe that's just a quick revision you
23 can just add back in, Mr. Carter.

24 MR. CARTER: Yeah, that's not a big deal.
25 You can also do it yourself if you have the plan.

1 I mean, just look at the eye level of the person
2 and draw a line to the panel, and in the case of 3,
3 2 -- 3, 2, and 1, it's going right through the
4 existing vegetation and the supplemental
5 vegetation. So whether the line is drawn -- and
6 I -- yeah, he put it on when the plans are issued
7 to go to the planning board or whatever, but -- if
8 that helps people, but it's there. The information
9 is all there.

10 MS. BRADFORD: And just as a reminder for
11 those -- the transects from -- that have just been
12 issued and the previous ones, the numbering isn't
13 quite the same, so make sure you've got -- the
14 transect that you're concerned with is the current
15 numbering system.

16 MR. CARTER: They should be. Are you
17 saying that you found one that was misnumbered?

18 MS. BRADFORD: Well, they're not the same
19 as the ones from last -- the last --

20 MR. CARTER: Yeah, well, that's because we
21 wanted them consecutive, and we added --

22 MS. BRADFORD: I think it's just -- we
23 just needed to make sure that people were aware of
24 that.

25 MR. CARTER: Okay. Yup. Correct.

1 MS. MC GOVERN: We don't need to update
2 anything. I'm just taking --

3 MR. BERRY: Going back to that height
4 issue if I may, I think Mr. Palumbo even told me
5 this fact at one point about the relationship of
6 height to distance from panels. I think it was a
7 relationship of maybe 3 to 1. I don't know if you
8 can recall it, Mr. Palumbo. I know obviously to
9 the north there's no shade cast; but to the south,
10 there's the largest amount of shade cast, and
11 that's where the distance between the planting
12 height and the solar panels needs to be the
13 greatest. Do you know what that ratio is off the
14 top of your head?

15 MR. PALUMBO: For flat land, without
16 escalation, it's a three to one. So for every one
17 feet of height, it's three feet of distance. If
18 it's flat, Jason, but -- Josh, I'm sorry. In this
19 particular case, I'd have to do a little bit of an
20 engineering formula because the land escalates.
21 You know, in south high, you know, it's a little
22 bit more impactal (sic). It may be a four to one
23 or five to one there. You know, with flat land, I
24 know the formula. But when you have different
25 escalations, you have to adjust obviously. So I

1 would say it's probably between four and five and
2 one, Josh. That's probably what it is.

3 MR. BERRY: Great. Maybe if we work the
4 exercise to do that calculus, and then we can just
5 kind of mathematically establish what the height
6 maximum would be for that Planting Area D, just so
7 that we are getting what you need with no shade
8 casts on panels, and then we can maximize the
9 height of the screen. Does that make sense?

10 MR. PALUMBO: It does. I understand the
11 logic to it; but if -- what is the purpose? If you
12 only need six feet, what is the purpose if you want
13 to go to -- if you can go to fifteen feet, what is
14 the purpose of it, if it doesn't accomplish
15 anything? So I'd like to have a balance in it.
16 That's all. We'll take a look at it, but I like to
17 have a balance in it.

18 MS. BRADFORD: I think there is a purpose
19 in that the maintenance would be less. You
20 wouldn't have to cut so often, as well as probably
21 providing a little more screening looking uphill,
22 if we can get a little higher.

23 MR. PALUMBO: Yup. That is logical,
24 Sarah, except, you know, to maintain something
25 that's twenty feet versus maintaining something

1 that's six feet is -- there's logic to that, too.
2 So -- but I'm not resisting you. I'll do the
3 calculation that Josh suggested, and we'll figure
4 it out together. I just wanted you to hear what I
5 was thinking.

6 MS. BRADFORD: Appreciate it. Thank you.
7 Let's see, if we go -- pretty much covered the
8 things we need to. We have not spoken about the
9 seed mix, and I'm not sure we can until we know
10 that -- there's been nothing so far that had told
11 us about the topsoil, the loam that is being put in
12 the solar field area. I think we're going to need
13 to know a depth of topsoil before we can address
14 that. And I had a couple of questions for John in
15 your planting detail -- in your planting notes, if
16 that's okay. On your Planting Notes Number 3,
17 you're talking about fresh dug trees being balled
18 in burlap. I'm sure the shrubs are going to come
19 or many of the shrubs are going to come as
20 container grown. Do we need to note about that?
21 And if you go to 8 is the one -- Note Number 8
22 under planting, 8 I'm struggling with because I
23 think it gives you, John, a lot of discretion there
24 that maybe we need to tie down somehow. If there
25 are substitutions, they need -- and there will be

1 substitutions, and they need to have a way of
2 allowing them. That's only sensible. But we need
3 to make sure we're keeping the same design intact.
4 So that if you should have to decrease sizes on
5 something, you might have to do more of them or
6 make something bigger in some other plant material,
7 something like that. Can we work out some wording?

8 MR. CARTER: I think we can, Sarah. The
9 intention of that wasn't really to -- the sizes, it
10 had more to do with just if we can't get the
11 ones -- the size we want, we would choose from the
12 same list and put some other approved plants in.

13 MS. BRADFORD: I think that's exactly the
14 way to go, but we want to make sure that we are not
15 finding that we're going -- decreasing size in a
16 lot of different things without having the
17 commensurate improvements.

18 MR. CARTER: Right. I think that if
19 something was -- if a particular plant -- I would
20 think the way it works is if a particular plant
21 wasn't available, a five- to six-foot plant wasn't
22 available, it would be substituted with another
23 five- to six-foot plant from the same planting
24 list.

25 MS. BRADFORD: Which is just the way I

1 think it should be, but I'm just not sure you're
2 always going to get it to happen. So I just
3 want -- I think -- if we can put another sentence
4 in there that ties you down a little bit more, I'd
5 be more comfortable.

6 MR. BERRY: So I had a similar related
7 comment if I could interject real quick and maybe
8 just adding the language at the end of that
9 sentence, "With the consent of the city hired
10 landscape architect." I think if the other
11 condition was to keep her on board to implement the
12 plan and including her in that decision related to
13 that condition in some way would be appropriate.

14 MR. CARTER: Yeah, so if I could just
15 mention that. So typically, because this happens
16 often in cities and towns, whether it's the design
17 engineer, the landscape architect, or whoever it
18 is, typically in the approvals that the board
19 give -- gives, they'll require that the design
20 person, in this case the landscape architect,
21 verify in writing at the completion of the project
22 that the project was installed and in this case,
23 the landscaping part of the project is installed in
24 substantial conformance with the approved plans.
25 So I would suggest staying the course on that.

1 That's the better way to do it. It doesn't relieve
2 anybody of responsibility because it's putting the
3 responsibility now on the designer to make sure
4 that they're already in the project, they're
5 already working with the developers, and to make
6 sure that they keep their eye on it and keep the
7 conversation going because at the end of the
8 project, they have to verify it was done right and
9 that's the better way to do it, I think. And I
10 think Sarah might agree. I don't want to put words
11 in her mouth, but we did mention that.

12 MS. BRADFORD: I still wish you could come
13 up with some verbiage, but I think --

14 MR. CARTER: No, I don't mean -- I'm not
15 talking about that verbiage. We can do that.

16 MS. BRADFORD: Okay. We can work on it.
17 I don't want you to assume or that anybody should
18 assume that if this plan is being implemented ten
19 years from now, that all the same players are here.
20 You may be retired, John. I might be, too. Can
21 somebody else deal with it?

22 MS. MC GOVERN: Yeah. I guess my
23 understanding, I know I offered this up at the last
24 meeting, and that was -- my intention was to
25 hire -- for the city to hire a landscape architect

1 such as Sarah. It's in the event that Sections C
2 and D were not defined, and they were not defined.
3 But then John had spoke to Sarah and Sarah
4 suggested, you know, we should define this more,
5 which, to John, it made more sense. And when John
6 spoke to me, he said, you know, certainty is always
7 better than leaving it to the end, and really
8 should define this, come up with height, you know,
9 the species type, the quantity, the height, so
10 there's no ambiguity, and this is not a dragged out
11 process later on. So now that we've defined it, I
12 think there's really no need to hire a third-party
13 landscape architect.

14 MR. CARTER: Because at this point, if the
15 plan's approved, and I -- Sarah, this is to Josh's
16 question, not you, because I agree, we can work
17 some of this language out so it's a little more
18 definitive, absolutely. But once the plan goes
19 forward as an approval, you know, the board can
20 make a condition of the approval that the design,
21 you know, they require sometimes as-builts, make
22 sure things are in the right place, and it's the
23 same thing. So the designer has to verify that it
24 was done in conformance with the plan, the approved
25 plan. And then the city's covered and everybody

1 knows what they're dealing with.

2 MR. VINCENT: That's true, and it's kind
3 of standard practice. I have to agree with John.
4 I think we can do both of them. I think a little
5 clarification on Number 8. I do agree, Josh, that
6 we will hold you to as-builts and, you know, we
7 have a professional tree arborist as our -- in our
8 city engineering office, too. And, you know, so we
9 have some expertise that if there's a question, we
10 have that at our disposal.

11 MS. PATTEN: I think that would be
12 important. I'd have to agree with that. That
13 would be an important piece. If I could just -- I
14 don't -- I don't want to redirect us, but I just
15 wanted to address the one area that we haven't
16 talked about is actually my property. It hasn't
17 really been addressed at any of the meetings. And
18 I realize that the answer will be, well, there's
19 plenty of stuff between my property and the field
20 because that was the answer for the people that are
21 on Ridgewood, although I still think we'd have to
22 codify that there be responsibility if that
23 landscape changed. I would put that to you, Josh,
24 to keep track of as an item. But the same would be
25 said for my property which runs, you know, there

1 are multiple lots along that road, and we are
2 really -- our forest is not carnivorous. We are
3 looking across with deciduous trees and through the
4 wetlands and in the winter, we can see right up on
5 that ridge. In fact, it's quite beautiful, at
6 least now. So I'm just wondering, Sarah and John,
7 if you -- I'm assuming that you're not able to do
8 anything because it's even, perhaps, more
9 challenging than the Lawrences in a different way,
10 but -- because they're on that level, but I would
11 like to know if there was any discussion of our
12 sight lines and what we're facing.

13 MS. BRADFORD: I assume that even though
14 deciduous, that there was quite a bit of vegetation
15 there, and I agree you probably will see through
16 it, and it will -- there will be more feeling like
17 there's an opening beyond the service road.

18 MR. VINCENT: Question, Drake, though, the
19 wetland buffer, I recall in the master plan it was
20 stated that the panels were outside of the wetland
21 buffer area. They were not encroaching. Is that
22 -- and so --

23 MR. CARTER: I'm sorry. That is correct,
24 yes.

25 MR. VINCENT: Okay. So is there area that

1 is outside of the wetlands buffer for additional
2 plantings or not?

3 MR. CARTER: Not really. There's steep
4 grading in that area. It's probably from the house
5 to the first panel is 650 feet, most of which is
6 vegetated, and I understand when, in the complete
7 hard winter when all the leaves are down, you may
8 be able to have a -- some view of the area, but it
9 would still be obscured. There's still a lot of
10 trees there, and, you know, we're not suggesting or
11 promising everybody you're never going to see this
12 no matter how hard you try and where you go because
13 you'll be able to, but I think that, you know,
14 making a reasonable effort to screen with
15 additional plantings where the clearing isn't so
16 close to the property lines and then taking
17 advantage of existing vegetation, that DEM wetland,
18 as you know, or the freshwater wetland, excuse me,
19 is regulated by DEM. Nobody's going to be doing
20 anything in there in the future. So it's pretty
21 much guaranteed that it's going to stay there.

22 MR. VINCENT: True. I don't think we've
23 answered Drake's question. May it's not a simple
24 answer because of the wetlands proximity and the
25 topography.

1 MR. CARTER: I think that's a fair answer.

2 MR. BERRY: Also, the width of that
3 (inaudible) on the transect line is going through
4 one area; but to cover the entire area would be
5 hundreds of feet of planting. I'm taking a look at
6 the transect lines at 4 and 5. Seems like it would
7 be very difficult to plant or, I mean, it says the
8 service road is right there next to the chain-link
9 fence, and then with the grades going down, I mean,
10 if you planted, it might block some of that line of
11 sight of the very first few panels, but the way
12 that the topography goes uphill, I'm not sure how
13 effective planting would be to screen the field of
14 solar arrays behind it. But that's more of an I
15 don't know. Not that it wouldn't do it, it's just
16 that I don't know that it would. I don't know,
17 Drake, does that --

18 MR. CARTER: I think that that would. And
19 I think that this is a case, unlike the property
20 owners to the north where they're looking at ground
21 level underneath the canopies of the deciduous
22 trees, in this case, the view is up as you can see
23 on the transects, through the upper parts of the
24 canopy trees that have the thickest vegetation and
25 branching and so forth even in the winter. So I

1 think that's going to be a significant screening
2 with the existing vegetation that's there. And
3 then, as you just pointed out, I think -- I don't
4 know where you could plant additional planting,
5 not -- particularly anything that would be
6 effective. I mean, you could make some, you know,
7 kind of pay lip service to it and put a few things
8 in. I don't think it's worth the effort or the
9 money because it's not going to accomplish
10 anything, not compared to what's already out there.

11 MR. BERRY: Drake, this is your line of
12 sight. Do you have any --

13 MS. PATTEN: Yeah. I think my concern is
14 just that, you know, we're assuming that that
15 wetland is going to remain intact. We're assuming
16 many things, and I know that wetland cannot be
17 intentionally altered, but we have had some other
18 projects locally that have had some wetland
19 impacts. And I'm just, you know, I'm wary of that,
20 and I do understand what you're saying, John, and
21 certainly from the ground level that is true. When
22 you go to our second floor where we spend a fair
23 amount of time, that's a little different. When
24 we're, you know -- and as Josh said, we have a
25 fairly wide -- we've got those two transects, but

1 we have, you know, we abut a huge portion of the
2 project in the sense of, you know, we're a big
3 chunk of Natick Ave. there.

4 So, you know, I think my concern is just,
5 assuming that everything stays intact, assuming
6 that there are no issues with, you know, what
7 happens if there's blasting and water changes, et
8 cetera, I mean, those are concerns that I have for
9 all of the plantings we're talking about, but
10 certainly loss of whatever is there now, that's a
11 concern. I mean, I'm assuming we can't deal with
12 that, but it has bothered me a little bit that
13 there's been no discussion at all of our property,
14 you know, through this entire process. I mean I'm
15 more concerned about my neighbors, frankly, at this
16 point, but that is a concern. And I just want to
17 make sure that it is on the record.

18 MR. CARTER: We -- yes, this is John,
19 again. We have talked about your property, just so
20 you know, and we added the additional transect. We
21 looked at it. And we've recognized, and as I said,
22 the significant vegetation across from you, some of
23 which I believe you own the land. So that will
24 stay there as long as you choose for it to. And
25 then across -- I have to say in my 35 years of

1 working in the field, I've never seen anything with
2 wetland regulation change that's been anything
3 other than stricter. So I highly would --

4 MS. PATTEN: I'm not concerned about
5 regulations, I'm worried about impact to the
6 wetlands that we've seen in some other stuff that's
7 happened across the state. So, you know, and then
8 it's a matter of remediation. But in the meantime,
9 you know, there's kind of a crisis.

10 MR. CARTER: Well, I think you have to
11 understand that this is -- that DiPrete
12 Engineering, Dave Russo, have, you know, done a lot
13 of extensive analysis based on exactly your
14 concern, and they have to demonstrate that they're
15 not going to change the hydrology of the site in
16 such a way that it would negatively impact the
17 wetland, and that DEM would approve that. So, you
18 know, if there's a time -- if there is an impact,
19 it would be over some sort of geological time frame
20 of thousands of years, not something that's going
21 to happen in our lifetime.

22 MS. MC GOVERN: And we have DEM approval
23 of this project.

24 MR. CARTER: And there is DEM approval.
25 And they look at it in detail. So I just say that

1 because there is consideration been given to your
2 view, and there's been consideration given to the
3 protection of the wetland.

4 MS. PATTEN: Well, thank you for that.
5 Good to hear.

6 MR. BERRY: I'm going to slightly change
7 topics. If we go to the site plan again, I was
8 looking in the northeastern portion, and there
9 seems to be an area where there are no panels
10 between the fence and the nearest panel. It looks
11 like there was some land area there. John, is
12 there a reason for that? Is that some kind of, you
13 know --

14 MR. CARTER: That is a drainage structure.
15 I don't know if it's a detention, retention,
16 infiltration. Dave Russo would know that, but
17 that's what that indicates.

18 MR. RUSSO: Yeah. This is Dave Russo with
19 DiPrete Engineering. So that's a drainage feature,
20 Josh, in that area. And then, you know, that area
21 that's a little bit to the north is part of it to
22 convey the water to that drainage feature, and then
23 plus the panels are offset from the -- you know,
24 for shading, offset from the wooded area.

25 MR. BERRY: Are those -- in the southwest

1 there, is that another drainage feature, Dave?

2 MR. RUSSO: That's the stone -- it's a
3 stone trench basin.

4 MR. BERRY: And what does that mean in
5 terms of building panels on it and in it; is that
6 okay? That's not going to be an issue?

7 MR. RUSSO: No. It's a stone basin. It's
8 a shallow basin. The water naturally goes there,
9 and it basically, from there, there's a system that
10 allows it to infiltrate as much as it can, and then
11 there's an overflow system that allows it to go
12 where it went before and ultimately all this water
13 goes to that wetland to the east and there's
14 basically, you know, from a real high level there's
15 a lot of little storm water features throughout
16 this site. I'll use the term like a waterfall
17 effect where it kind of captures the water, delays
18 it, allows it to infiltrate. And it basically
19 slows the water down during storm events. So that
20 if -- mitigation. So I think it mitigates peaks
21 during the rainfall events so that we're not
22 increasing rainfall to that wetland. And that's
23 part of (inaudible) stated.

24 MR. BERRY: Thank you.

25 MR. VINCENT: Josh, I have a question on

1 the process. Since it seems as though we are, you
2 know, coming down to really a final recommendation,
3 and the format that this is going to take under a
4 peer review. So I'm assuming the developer will
5 make changes per the discussions today and there'll
6 be a final plan set. Is Sarah then going to issue
7 a statement as a peer reviewer, that she's looked
8 at it and that she can recommend -- make a positive
9 recommendation? I think the commission, when this
10 comes before the full commission, it's taken hours
11 and hours from this advisory committee. So I
12 foresee that there's going to need to be a pretty
13 good discussion before the commission, and I think,
14 you know, explaining the way -- the way John
15 explained it tonight with Sarah present as well, if
16 she's able to, is going to be important. So the
17 commission has confidence that the advisory
18 committee, you know, to their credit, has spent a
19 lot of time; and Sarah, in her review has spent a
20 lot of time, and the applicant has been
21 collaborative. Am I correct? Is that what the
22 staff hopes to present to the commission?

23 MR. BERRY: More or less. So I think, you
24 know and, Jason, feel free to chime in. I'm doing
25 my best to interpret the condition and apply, you

1 know, just a format that is fair and -- to the
2 advisory committee in meeting the role and doing
3 their work and also fair to the applicant. So I
4 think, yeah, if there are any modifications to the
5 plans, they seem to be pretty minimal, but I did
6 hear a few things, especially from Sarah's
7 comments, for the applicant to make some minor
8 revisions, and then we would need some time to
9 review that, and then we would have to decide
10 whether we would just submit our comments to Sarah,
11 and then she can put together her final
12 recommendation or report or whatever exactly she's
13 going to put together. I don't want to get too
14 involved with the semantics of how she wants to
15 present her professional findings. And then that
16 would basically be forwarded to the planning
17 department to be as part of the development plan
18 review portion, and that would also probably be
19 forwarded to the conservation commission and that
20 would -- both of those would happen before the
21 preliminary plan would go before the plan
22 commission.

23 MR. VINCENT: Okayk. Yeah, that makes
24 sense, Josh.

25 MS. PATTEN: And, Josh, are you looking at

1 an opportunity for the revised plans for us to go
2 to abutters in advance of that so we can sort of
3 streamline? Otherwise, if we don't have an
4 opportunity to take this back to neighbors, then I
5 could foresee it being kind of a crazy meeting
6 because we don't have -- in other words, no one --
7 like the stuff that was sent today before the
8 meeting, obviously, no one has seen that. So
9 that's like a new plan. As far as being community
10 representatives, where is the time for us to take
11 this to abutters and to show them this revision?

12 MR. BERRY: Drake, how much time would you
13 need if the applicant provides a final revised
14 plan?

15 MS. PATTEN: Maybe like a week to ten days
16 to reach to people. I mean, it's a little harder
17 now that we can't just all gather the way we used
18 to do. So I would probably think that, I don't
19 know, Dan, you might have thoughts on this, that
20 maybe we would just split up and go to everybody.

21 MR. ZEVON: Right. Yeah. No. Sure. And
22 I think, Josh, just like, you know, in this time,
23 you sent it -- you sent out what I thought were the
24 documents, and we had, you know, ten days to digest
25 it. I'm just not sure why we keep getting these

1 great giant thick packages in the mail, and then
2 it's not relevant at the time of the meeting. But,
3 yeah, no, I agree with you that ten days should be
4 fine.

5 MS. PATTEN: And we can split, you know,
6 Dan, you and I could split up neighbors or, you
7 know, whatever needs to happen to get it done and
8 just get feedback, and I think that's going to be
9 -- from the planning department side, I think
10 that's going to be a wise thing to do rather than
11 just waiting for -- (technical difficulty) abutters
12 who have shown great interest, we'd probably meet
13 with them. (Technical difficulty)

14 MR. BERRY: Drake, we're losing you.

15 MR. PEZZULLO: Who's still speaking?

16 MS. PATTEN: Sorry. I was just saying
17 that if -- we would just need a little time because
18 we can't -- normally, we would just gather, and we
19 used to do that in the same way.

20 MR. PEZZULLO: So the plan as presented
21 tonight, is there major concerns? When I say
22 major, major concerns with the plans that this
23 committee is not ready to make a recommendation on
24 this plan because as we move forward and we say we
25 move forward means we start the actual public

1 hearing process because this is not a public
2 hearing right now, when we start development plan
3 review, everyone is welcome to comment and make any
4 kind of comments they make on the plan. Right now,
5 we're not in that process. So if we're ready to
6 make a recommendation on where we stand with the
7 project as been submitted and as been discussed
8 tonight, I don't see why we need to have another
9 meeting of this committee to discuss what's going
10 to be discussed at a real public hearing. We have
11 many opportunities after this point to get
12 additional public feedback.

13 MS. PATTEN: Right, but I'm going to push
14 back a little bit on that, Jason, because our task
15 was to represent the abutters in the community, and
16 then what I'm trying to say is I think it's going
17 to be in everyone's best interest if we have a
18 chance to take this back and maybe consolidate any
19 comments rather than going into, you know, a public
20 hearing, where you're going to have lots of people
21 having something to say rather than if we're saying
22 let's get these comments together and if there's
23 anything that people are feeling really strongly
24 about, there's a chance to talk about it. For
25 example, tonight, a big part of the conversation

1 was this new section, what is it, D? Yeah. That's
2 not completely resolved. It sounds like it's going
3 in the right direction, but that's an important
4 thing that needs to be taken back to that
5 particular abutter. And we've also got the folks
6 up in Ridgewood. Now, we've got a plan where we're
7 relying on the future staying the same for them.
8 They need to know that; and so, in other words, I
9 think we did great work tonight, and I think this
10 is such a strong plan compared to this idea of a
11 fence we started with, and I'm excited about that.
12 And I feel excited to share this with the
13 neighborhood, but I don't want to share something
14 that's incomplete and I also don't want to just say
15 oh, just go to the public meeting, you know. We're
16 just going to send you there. I don't think that's
17 a great way to represent people. Does that make
18 sense?

19 MR. VINCENT: Well, see -- this is Fred
20 Vincent. We are still in a plan review process,
21 and the advisory committee and this peer review was
22 an add-on to what the normal process is. So, you
23 know, it's intended to capture the major concerns
24 of the residents in the area and reflect those and,
25 you know, the peer review report should speak to

1 those. The applicant should be able to, in his
2 submission, identify what he's done to mitigate and
3 address the concerns he's heard from you, Drake and
4 Dan, and others. And then Sarah, in her comments,
5 should be able to verify, yes, it's a sustainable
6 plan, and we are -- can recommend approval. You
7 know, otherwise, I think, you know, we're looking
8 at another -- Jason, I might disagree and say we
9 don't -- because we don't see -- we haven't seen
10 the final final plan, but we know what it's going
11 to be, based on tonight. I don't think there's
12 going to be -- there's going to be some changes,
13 but --

14 MR. PEZZULLO: Well, Fred, we've got to
15 think we're going to see the final final not at
16 development plan review, and I think that we're
17 going to see another batch of changes when we get
18 to preliminary plan. So to say we're going to come
19 up with a final product through this committee, I
20 don't think is what we were going to do. I
21 think we've done the charge of the condition, but
22 now we're talking doing a fourth meeting to firm up
23 more comments that we can start to carry into the
24 next process. That was the purpose of this.

25 MR. VINCENT: Well, Jason, (technical

1 difficulty) peer review report. There is not on
2 the table a written report codifying what our peer
3 review concluded. We've had meetings. We've had
4 minutes, but I want to see a final report. And as
5 a commissioner, that's what I was -- thought we
6 would get. So --

7 MR. PEZZULLO: It was my understanding
8 that the comments from this process were to inform
9 the peer review product, not the other way -- it
10 wasn't the other way around. I think that it was
11 your feedback, good or bad, is what is given to
12 Sarah to come up with her final report and the
13 report then moves along in the pipeline to the next
14 phase. So that's how I understood it.

15 MR. VINCENT: Well, Jason, we're saying
16 the same thing. Where is that report?

17 MR. PEZZULLO: The report will be issued
18 after this committee comes up with their final
19 critique of what is on the table. So, you know,
20 there's a third meeting now. So if we're saying,
21 were we incomplete, we don't like what's on the
22 table, or we want to see more -- like very fine
23 detail; is that what we're talking about right now?

24 MR. ZEVON: Well, we just got this today.
25 So we just wanted to be able to digest it, and I

1 work during the day. So I didn't look at this
2 until right now tonight. I didn't -- I got what I
3 previously got in the mail, but it's drastically
4 different, in a good way, but it's different.

5 And then I just had another question
6 because -- about these ponds that are going to be
7 made or these, I guess over in the north, you said
8 in the northeasterly side, there's going to be some
9 type of ponds, maybe.

10 MR. RUSSO: This is Dave. That's the
11 detention -- that's where the water goes today.
12 The water flows down south away from your property,
13 Mr. Zevon.

14 MR. ZEVON: Okay. Yeah, just because --
15 they do about three cemeteries right there. So that
16 would be a gross scene, but okay.

17 MR. RUSSO: The water doesn't flow that
18 way at all. It all comes from your property onto
19 Mr. Rossi's property down to that well, and we're
20 maintaining all the flow patterns on the site.

21 MS. MC GOVERN: I just want to interject
22 for a second. This is Lindsay from Reivity Energy.
23 We heard good comments tonight, and I think they're
24 classified as minor as Jason had characterized
25 that, and we're okay with going back and updating

1 those and making sure Sarah signs off on them. And
2 I'm in agreement that this is not the be-all,
3 end-all because we have to go through a public
4 process and the whole purpose of development plan
5 review is to look at the landscaping esthetics of
6 the project, and we're expecting, again,
7 constructive feedback and the neighbors will all
8 get public notice. I hope they give comment and
9 they come. We're still open. This is not the
10 end-all, be-all, but I agree with Jason that we
11 have -- I think we've all come to agreement that
12 this is close to final form based on all the
13 feedback we've gotten from the last few meetings,
14 and I think it makes sense to move forward, update
15 these plans, share them with everyone, Sarah does
16 her recommendation, and we move forward on to
17 development plan review.

18 MR. VINCENT: Now, we're saying --
19 Lindsay, Fred Vincent, we're saying essentially the
20 same thing. All I'm saying is show a product, show
21 a -- show a final report, set a plan -- a peer
22 review report with Sarah's letter, the plans
23 attached, and move forward with it. You know,
24 if --

25 MS. MC GOVERN: I agree. I'm with you,

1 Fred. Maybe -- I think you and Jason are saying
2 the same thing. I think we're all aligned. So
3 we're going to send a new plan to Sarah, onto the
4 whole committee, and then Sarah can move forward
5 with her report, and we will -- we'll forward to
6 development plan review.

7 MS. PATTEN: Well, as a member of the
8 committee, I was trying to suggest, and I think we
9 were having a conversation about this, perhaps we
10 would have a chance to take the direct abutters and
11 the people that have been very involved, we are
12 happy to submit those comments to Sarah, but I
13 think it would be important for -- if we've been
14 out here representing people, it seems important
15 that we go back and at least say this is what's
16 going forward. Is there anything you want to add
17 before this goes and kind of goes through -- you
18 know, gets its report written and so forth. That
19 seems like a reasonable thing to ask for. We're
20 not asking to spend six months on it. We're asking
21 to have the opportunity to return to the people
22 that have been involved in this from the beginning
23 and let them know kind of where we are. And --

24 MR. ZEVON: To Drake's point, the most
25 significant was, you know, this new Section D,

1 which was just added in this evening, and that was,
2 you know, she did spend a good amount of time with
3 Mr. Lawrence, and we would like to talk to him
4 about the result of what came up tonight. This is
5 a good thing, but we should be able to share it
6 with him, not just, you know, we're moving --
7 nobody has seen this.

8 MR. VINCENT: Well, what Lindsay just
9 said, if I understood her correctly, she's going to
10 provide you with the last and final set of plans
11 that you can share, and then I think you're
12 (technical difficulty) and take the comments and
13 bring them to development plan review committee. I
14 think as an advisory board, we spent (technical
15 difficulty) to look at the set of plans and in
16 thirty minutes try to digest them. The heavy lifts
17 have been done already. This committee has done a
18 great job, and Sarah has done a superb job.

19 MS. MC GOVERN: I agree.

20 MR. BERRY: My two cents is just that the
21 way the condition reads, if you go back to it, is
22 that the committee -- that Sarah is supposed to
23 review any and all landscaping plans, and that the
24 advisory committee is supposed to provide input and
25 information on those plans. I don't think Drake

1 and Zevon are asking for anything other than a
2 little bit of time to solicit some comments from
3 Mr. Lawrence and the abutters and to submit them to
4 Sarah so that she can incorporate them into her
5 deliberations as she drafts her report. So, to me,
6 that would be the way that we would fully comply
7 with the condition.

8 MR. VINCENT: And the timeline that you
9 seek, Jason, I heard ten days.

10 MR. BERRY: If they submit a plan, we can
11 just (technical difficulty) website and then
12 perhaps give ten days to -- for the committee to
13 submit all of their final input in to Sarah and
14 that would be that.

15 MS. MC GOVERN: Ten days is way too much.
16 I think three days -- three business days is good.
17 I'm trying to keep this process moving. We've done
18 everything you guys had asked us. Josh, we have
19 done, like, literally, like we went from a robust
20 landscaping plan, to a stockade fence, to a new
21 landscaping plan, to getting Sarah on board, to
22 doing additional plantings, to filling in the gaps
23 in Section D. Everything you guys had asked, we've
24 done. And this is gone too long. And we're
25 patient, but we're losing our patience, and we're

1 trying to move this forward. So we would ask,
2 respectfully, that you guys collaboratively work
3 with us to give us three days business. I think
4 that's more than fair at this point. The changes
5 are minor. Everyone has e-mail these days; and if
6 they don't, I'll drop them off at their house.

7 MR. ZEVON: Can I ask why we did get that
8 packet in the mail, and then we are showing new
9 plans today? Like, what happened, like, why are we
10 getting -- you know what I'm saying? It's like --
11 I just don't feel -- I feel like everything has
12 always got to have an extra story to it, and we're
13 just looking for time to digest what is about to be
14 now the final final because there is significant --
15 and, yes, to your advantage, I mean, I looked at
16 the plans that you sent to me, and it says -- it
17 shows twenty-four plants. And now John's telling
18 us, you know, we're talking about in the hundreds.
19 So that's a good thing. But let us just digest the
20 document, Lindsay. Okay? I work. Okay. I have
21 another job. I have a job, a full-time job, okay,
22 that I've got to do between 9 and 5. Then I've got
23 to squeeze in dinner, and I've got to take care of
24 my family. So let us, as the community, and
25 respect the community, we understand you're

1 business people, but respect that we have lives
2 outside of this solar farm, but we need to digest
3 the material.

4 MS. MC GOVERN: So, respectfully,
5 Mr. Zevon, you wanted to be on this committee. It
6 is a commitment on everyone's part, and everything
7 that you asked for, we've done. And we need to
8 move forward, and ten, fifteen days is just too
9 much. Too much. We're going through several
10 processes --

11 MR. ZEVON: You're exaggerating --

12 MS. MC GOVERN: Excuse me. Excuse me.
13 Please don't interrupt me. We're going through
14 several processes. On top of this ad hoc, we've
15 gone above and beyond what we're required to do in
16 the development plan review ordinance because we're
17 trying to be good citizens. I'm asking you to let
18 us move forward because this is not the final
19 meeting. We have a development plan review
20 meeting. We have a conservation commission
21 meeting, which is even more thorough, and then we
22 get to preliminary plan review. I think we can
23 move forward, and I'm willing to give three days
24 and I think that's sufficient.

25 MR. BERRY: Sarah, how much time will you

1 need to draft some kind of final document? Sarah,
2 are you there?

3 MR. ZEVON: I could go -- we can -- since
4 he said fifteen and three, we could meet at the
5 halfway point, which is probably ten days. I don't
6 have my calculator in front of me, but --

7 MR. BERRY: Jason, is Sarah still on the
8 call?

9 MR. PEZZULLO: I don't see her. She's not
10 in the waiting room. Here she comes. She must
11 have gotten taken out.

12 MR. VINCENT: That's the important thing.
13 How long does Sarah need to prepare her comments
14 based on what we all know thus far? The planning
15 board meeting is Tuesday, the 3d, November 3d. So
16 that's -- next Tuesday is the 27th. And then a
17 week from that. So --

18 MS. PATTEN: Election Day? Dear Lord,
19 that's bad planning.

20 MR. VINCENT: We're meeting -- well, we're
21 going on the 4th, aren't we, Jason?

22 MR. PEZZULLO: Our meeting is on the 4th.
23 We're, so I'm clear, talking right now about the
24 comments coming back to Sarah are going to be more
25 of an off-line thing. We're not getting together

1 for an additional meeting just to talk about the
2 final comments, are we?

3 MR. VINCENT: That's correct.

4 MR. PEZZULLO: All right. So --

5 MR. VINCENT: Lindsey wants them in three
6 business days, which is the 23d, 26th, 27th. So
7 they need to be by close of business on the 27th
8 back to Sarah. Then she can start her report on
9 the 28th. Hopefully get it to you Jason by the
10 30th, and then we'll meet on November 4th. You can
11 circulate the report, and we can have it in advance
12 of the planning board meeting. I'd like it in
13 advance.

14 MR. PEZZULLO: You're saying you want this
15 as an agenda item on the city plan commission?

16 MR. VINCENT: I think the commission is
17 expecting a peer review report.

18 MR. PEZZULLO: I thought that that was
19 coming when we actually get to plan commission in
20 due course.

21 MR. VINCENT: Yeah. That's the fourth of
22 the month --

23 MR. PEZZULLO: This project hasn't applied
24 to preliminary plan yet. It's not -- it's not in
25 the hopper yet to start a discussion with the

1 planning commission.

2 MR. VINCENT: Jason, (technical
3 difficulty) the report being brought to the
4 commission.

5 MR. MURRAY: Jay?

6 MR. PEZZULLO: Is that Bob?

7 MR. MURRAY: Yes, this is Bob Murray. Can
8 I just offer this? My anticipation was that
9 following this process, we would then go forward
10 because we can't submit for a preliminary plan
11 until we do development plan review and the other,
12 you know, conservation commission, et cetera, that
13 my expectation was that by the time we submitted
14 for preliminary plan review by the planning
15 commission, you know, at that point, the peer
16 review landscape architect the planning commission
17 directed be hired and that we've paid for, would be
18 part of that process that we were not going to
19 be -- we were not going to make a new stop at the
20 planning commission to let them know what was going
21 on. That's not how I read the regulation or my
22 understanding of the process is that, you know,
23 that ultimately Sarah will advise the planning
24 commission, but she'll have the benefit of the
25 development plan review process and -- because

1 that's, you know, that's the regulations as I
2 understand it.

3 MR. PEZZULLO: I would have to agree,
4 Fred. This is not -- this is not in before us
5 properly to be before the planning commission for
6 any type of report out or any kind of a
7 presentation. We're well premature for that at
8 this point. That would only -- that would only be
9 after DPR and then when they submit for preliminary
10 plan, and then we would start with the final
11 review.

12 MR. VINCENT: I missed that. I stand
13 corrected, Jason. I don't think that was explained
14 well enough in our first meeting what the travel
15 would be. I was assuming that the advisory
16 committee would result -- its proceeding would
17 result in some kind of peer review report.

18 MR. PEZZULLO: And they will. They will.
19 And we'll have that report, and then that report is
20 going to travel to DPR and help inform the DPR
21 committee as well as the conservation commission as
22 well as their review of the plan, then that report
23 and Sarah will travel, again, to the preliminary
24 plan for the planning commission. So that will be
25 the third swipe at it just in this phase.

1 So I think that we're on target for that,
2 but I think that, you know, the sooner we get to
3 regular business, the better because this process
4 is ad hoc and is a little strange, to say the
5 least, in terms of what we're actually doing, you
6 know, before we get to an application. So if we
7 agree, that's the travel. I think that was one of
8 our agenda items towards the bottom of the agenda
9 was next steps. So we kind of jumped the gun on
10 that. So I think that, you know, are we clear now
11 in terms of how this is going to travel into the
12 actual public hearings, with the -- the peer review
13 report and the presentation to planning
14 commission -- get to plan commission?

15 MR. VINCENT: Okay. But we still have a
16 difference, but the way Bob Murray just explained
17 it is he sees Sarah's report as being part of the
18 conservation commission meeting and the development
19 review committee meeting and then submitting her
20 report, which is different from what you just said
21 that the report --

22 MR. PEZZULLO: I think that that's --
23 yeah. We're going to have a report from this
24 process. This process is going to, you know, round
25 out. We're going to have the final comments from

1 everyone, and we're going to have the report from
2 Sarah. That -- then this process is concluded.
3 Then we move on to the next step and that report,
4 with the -- with all of the feedback we've gotten
5 will travel now into the next phase, into the
6 public hearing phase. That's how I've always
7 understood we're going to, you know, march into the
8 next phase.

9 MR. MURRAY: This is Bob Murray. I agree
10 with that. If I -- if I confused the issue, Fred,
11 I apologize. But as Jason just summarized it,
12 that's what I intended to say. Thank you.

13 MR. VINCENT: All right. I'm clear, and I
14 think that's a proper path to follow.

15 MS. PATTEN: Can I just ask again, is
16 there a reason that we can't get some time to take
17 this into the community. I'm just -- it doesn't
18 sound like we have a date for something at this
19 moment that we're in a rush to, you know, Lindsay
20 wants three days. That doesn't seem real thick for
21 people that are working and we have to find people
22 in the evenings, et cetera. So, you know, a week,
23 just some kind of time after the new plans have
24 been generated I think would be great, and we're
25 not asking to meet again. We're asking to be able

1 to assemble any comments, give feedback. That goes
2 to Sarah, I guess, and, you know, I'm just unclear
3 why we can't accommodate that at this point. I'm
4 asking for this. I'm not asking about what you
5 have done. I'm asking to complete this with our
6 neighbors.

7 MS. MC GOVERN: The changes are going to
8 be minor, and I know you got the plans today, but
9 we tried to get updated comments from the city and
10 Sarah so you could see a plan so there would be a
11 more effective discussion. But three business days
12 is what we're sticking to. It's more than enough
13 time. You can look at a plan in a half hour. Like
14 three business days to me is very fair, and that's
15 what we're sticking to.

16 MR. BERRY: I review plans all the time,
17 and it took me much longer than a half an hour to
18 review this and I think contacting a long list of
19 neighbors with different schedules and soliciting
20 all their feedback, compiling that, and putting
21 that into some kind of document to send to Sarah is
22 going to take more than three days. That's my
23 personal opinion. I don't know who the authority
24 would be, Jason, on how days -- I mean, this is
25 obviously not something that is written into the

1 conditions. So we kind of have to determine it
2 ourselves. We were asking, I think I heard like
3 seven to ten. And then, you know, Lindsay wants
4 three. I mean there's six or seven. Just a happy
5 medium.

6 MR. PEZZULLO: Okay. So I think if one of
7 those considerations revolves around how much time
8 it will take for Sarah to generate the report once
9 all the final feedback has been provided, so,
10 Sarah, how much time do you need to prepare your
11 report once you get all this feedback? Sarah?

12 MR. VINCENT: I think she's at the
13 presidential debate.

14 MR. PEZZULLO: Almost. Because the point
15 is, and, Lindsay, correct me if I'm wrong, you're
16 ready to submit for development plan review and get
17 that application in so we can have the first real
18 public hearing?

19 MS. MC GOVERN: That's correct. We are
20 ready.

21 MR. VINCENT: When are you going to drop
22 off the final revised plans with today's comments
23 to Jason for distribution, tomorrow?

24 MR. PEZZULLO: Which plans for
25 distribution, Fred? The --

1 MR. VINCENT: She's going to make the
2 changes. What I heard was she's going to make the
3 minor changes and submit those to you, Jason, and
4 to the -- so my question, when are those -- when
5 will we receive those?

6 MR. PEZZULLO: Lindsay, when can we get
7 revised plans sent with the minor changes from
8 tonight?

9 MS. MC GOVERN: You'll get them on Monday,
10 Jason. We'll -- John is very kind to put
11 everything else aside and work on this first thing
12 tomorrow and focus on this. So we can drop them
13 off on Monday.

14 MR. PEZZULLO: So if we can work within
15 blocks of time, say we get it on Monday, the rest
16 of the committee gets it on Monday, if we get
17 comments by Friday; is that acceptable? I know
18 it's -- just rounds out the week at least we work
19 in -- can you do that?

20 MS. MC GOVERN: Yeah, we can do that.

21 MR. PEZZULLO: Okay, and then from there,
22 Sarah, are you with us?

23 MR. VINCENT: I think you're just going to
24 have to tell Sarah, this is the schedule.

25 MR. PEZZULLO: Sarah will need to work on

1 the report from there, and my expectation is if
2 you're looking to file for development plan review,
3 are you looking to get on a meeting in November,
4 like the second meeting of November?

5 MS. MC GOVERN: Yes.

6 MR. PEZZULLO: Okay. So the second
7 meeting in November, we would need your application
8 in addition to Sarah's -- sorry, I can't see my
9 calendar. Hold on one second. The calendar,
10 second meeting in November is the 18th. We would
11 need the full application -- middle of -- after
12 Election Day. So probably, you know, probably by
13 the end of the week in November. So if we can get
14 the application, the landscape peer review will be
15 part of that application. If it comes to us the
16 first week of -- the beginning of the 9th, I think
17 that we would have enough time to incorporate that
18 into our distribution, and that's gets us into the
19 November 18th DPR. So we can begin the public
20 hearing. So we can do our advertising. So I think
21 that that's -- that's enough time -- that's enough
22 time to hit the -- hit the comments. Everyone gets
23 us our comments by the 30th. We get our plan
24 sometime around November 9th-ish, and we schedule
25 for the 18th, and then that is the public hearing.

1 Does that sound like a plan?

2 MS. MC GOVERN: That sounds like a plan.
3 Thank you for laying that out. I appreciate it.

4 MR. PEZZULLO: I just wanted to keep us
5 rolling and make sure that we have expectations
6 that we will get this -- get this final report from
7 Sarah around that -- the 9th, if that's doable.
8 Sarah, if you're just -- are you there, Sarah?

9 MR. VINCENT: She's not there, Jason.

10 MR. PEZZULLO: I don't think she's there.
11 So -- okay. So that's at least a time frame. So
12 we can start our first public hearing on this.

13 MR. MURRAY: Hey, Jay, this is Bob Murray.
14 Can I assume that the DPR will still be a Zoom
15 meeting?

16 MR. PEZZULLO: Yes.

17 MR. MURRAY: Okay. That's fine. Thank
18 you.

19 MR. VINCENT: I think we're good, Jason.

20 MR. PEZZULLO: Well, we certainly did
21 cover a lot of ground. Hold on one second. Are
22 you still there, everyone? Okay. My thing -- I
23 have too many windows open now. I can't find my
24 thing. There it is. Okay. All right. So is
25 that -- is the time frame acceptable for the

1 committee to get written comments to us by next
2 Friday?

3 MS. PATTEN: Yeah, that's great. We
4 appreciate it very much.

5 MR. PEZZULLO: All right. We will touch
6 base with Sarah and work with her on our expected
7 timeline so that we can get this part of the DPR
8 package for the 18th. And -- okay.

9 MS. MC GOVERN: I just want to thank all
10 the committee members and Jason and Josh for all
11 the collaborative efforts in bringing us to this
12 point. I think we've covered a lot of ground, a
13 lot of good discussion, and looking forward to
14 moving forward. So thank you.

15 MR. BERRY: Thank you, Lindsay.
16 Appreciate you guys turning around and responding
17 so well to so many of the comments that we've had,
18 and I know this has been a long process, but it's
19 not without bearing fruit. So that's the goal and
20 I appreciate everybody's volunteering their time as
21 well to be here and do this with us.

22 MR. VINCENT: I think this was a very
23 important project -- a process and a project, and I
24 think it's to everyone's benefit that we spent the
25 time and effort. So thank you. Thank the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

committee members, and thank the developers.

MS. MC GOVERN: I agree with you. Thank you very much, Fred. Thank you.

MS. PATTEN: All right, everyone. Go watch the debate.

MR. PEZZULLO: Good night, everyone. Thank you for a good discussion tonight. Thank you.

(ADJOURNED AT 8:34 P.M.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, RONALD M. RONZIO, Notary Public, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings, and that the foregoing transcript contains a true, accurate, and complete record of the proceedings at the above-entitled hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 20th day of November, 2020.

Ronald M. Ronzio, Notary Public

RONALD M. RONZIO, NOTARY PUBLIC/CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: July 24, 2021

IN RE: Cranston Plan Commission Advisory Committee
In re: Natick Avenue Solar.

DATE: October 22, 2020