

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

(COMMENCED AT 6:35 P.M.)

MR. PEZZULLO: All right. I think we can get started here. So this is our first meeting of the Advisory Committee for Natick Farm Solar. The committee's purpose was to work with the neighbors in an inclusive way to come up with an appropriate buffering plan for the solar farm prior to us going to development plan review and the plan commission. So, at this point, we have a plan from the applicant which has been distributed to members of the committee. And members of the committee include: Fred Vincent, plan commission; Joshua Berry of the planning department; Lindsay McGovern representing the applicant. Who am I missing? Drake Patten and Daniel Zevon of the neighborhood. We did an election for those two members, and we have Sarah Bradford, who was chosen by the city's planning department to be the city's peer reviewer for this process.

So, at this point, I think I'd like to turn it over to the applicant who is going to -- applicant and the team who is going to present the plans, walk us through the plans, and then we can start our discussion.

So just to note that the way this meeting

1 has been set up is that it was for the benefit of
2 the advisory committee members for speaking, and
3 all the other members of the public can watch our
4 deliberations. So let's keep it that way for
5 tonight so that we don't have any issues and let's
6 get started. So, Bob, you can have the floor.

7 MR. MURRAY: Thank you, Jason. I don't
8 intend to say a lot. Let me just mention to you
9 and the members of the committee that I'm at the
10 offices of Revity Energy in Warwick. Mr. Ralph
11 Palumbo, the principal of Revity Energy is here.
12 Lindsay McGovern is representing Revity on the
13 committee. I just want to note that Ron Rossi, the
14 property owner, is here with his son Andrew just
15 listening in. They will be not be participating.
16 The two principal speakers tonight will be Dave
17 Russo from DiPrete Engineering who is our project
18 engineer. He -- members of the -- I think
19 everybody on the committee is familiar with David.
20 He's done a number of solar projects both in
21 Cranston -- around the -- a number of solar
22 projects around the state, and John Carter, who is
23 our landscape architect.

24 So what was presented to you was the work
25 of John and his firm as it related to the master

1 plan approval and requested condition.

2 I thought maybe it would be helpful if
3 just Dave Russo brought everybody up to date first
4 on the project. The plan, as it's approved by the
5 plan commission, has not really changed. The
6 buffering plan, landscape plan you see is different
7 than what we submitted to the planning commission,
8 but, Dave, why don't you just take a moment and
9 just bring the committee up to date, and we'll
10 stand available to answer any questions. Thank
11 you, Jason.

12 MR. RUSSO: So as Mr. Murray stated, the
13 layout that you have in front of you, the layout
14 itself, has not changed substantially since the
15 master plan submission. The entrance road is still
16 proposed to come off Natick Avenue, utilizing the
17 existing entrance. There will be an access road
18 that will come in off of Natick, and then it will
19 head to the north, and then it will go up to the
20 north and then head to the west of the solar system
21 for access, and there will be a gate to get into
22 the solar system. The fence will be located south
23 of the roadway, the privacy fence along here.

24 To the north, there's a 50-foot vegetated
25 area that's to remain existing vegetation as it is

1 today. There's a wetland complex to the southeast
2 in this area. That is to remain. This application
3 says master plan. We've gone through the DEM
4 process. They've reviewed the storm water design,
5 the operation and maintenance manual, and the soil
6 erosion control report and plan, and that's all
7 been reviewed and approved by DEM.

8 I just want to touch upon some of the
9 difference, just to give an overall feeling of this
10 plan and how far away some of these homes are from
11 the system. AP22-4, Lot 118, which is here, is
12 approximately 220 feet from the home to the closest
13 panel. As you go west to the next lot, AP22-4,
14 122, which is owned by Carl Swanson, that house is
15 approximately 300 feet to the closest panel. The
16 next abutter to the north is AP22-4, Lot 324,
17 that's Barbara Czerwien, and that house is
18 approximately 220 feet to the closest panel. And
19 then you have some residents along Ridgewood Drive
20 here along the bend. Those are approximately 290
21 to 310 feet away from the closest panel, which is
22 in this area. Those are the direct abutters to the
23 north.

24 On the south side, the only direct abutter
25 to the project is AP22-3, Lot 50, Walter Lawrence.

1 His home, located here, is approximately 220 feet
2 to the closest panel in this area, and then there's
3 also a property here, AP22-3 Lot 51, but there's no
4 home on this property. There's two -- excuse me,
5 three residences located along Natick Ave, these
6 houses here. The house on the north, AP22-3 Lot
7 116, is approximately 270 feet away from this
8 panel. As you go south, AP22-3 Lot 5, the Dutras,
9 that house is approximately 380 feet from the
10 closest panel. And then you have Clint Rossi, who
11 is directly south of the access, and that house is
12 approximately 510 feet from the closest panel.

13 The layout, as I stated, hasn't changed
14 substantially. There's still a fence proposed
15 around the system. The gate for the access will be
16 on the north. That's a general overview of just
17 the site layout, and John Carter is here to talk
18 about the details of the landscaping.

19 MS. BRADFORD: Dave, can you point out the
20 buffer zone.

21 MR. RUSSO: The buffer zone along the
22 north is here. This 50-foot area is not to be
23 disturbed.

24 MS. BRADFORD: Correct, and what is it on
25 the east?

1 MR. RUSSO: On the east, you have the
2 existing trees along here which are approximately
3 30 feet along here and the --

4 MS. BRADFORD: But not a buffer zone?

5 MR. RUSSO: We're not touching, and the
6 topography over there is substantially different,
7 so there's really no need for it. Due to the
8 topography, there's a big ridge in this area. So
9 they're kind of like -- these homeowners are in
10 more of a valley, and they're looking up
11 topographically towards this ridge. And then as
12 you go to the southeast, this entire wetland area
13 is to remain as is because of, you know, we adhered
14 to the DEM regulations and didn't disturb any of
15 the wetland or the wetland buffer.

16 And then along the south is the existing
17 gas easement. There's some vegetation along the
18 existing stone wall. That will be -- most of --
19 the majority of the trees are inside the stone
20 wall. A lot of trees along this area were cleared
21 with the gas line installation. There will be some
22 selective clearing in this area for shade cast on
23 the system. Do you have anything else, Sarah?

24 MS. BRADFORD: Not at the moment. Thank
25 you.

1 MR. CARTER: Yeah. Good evening. This is
2 John Carter from the landscape architect. I think
3 we've presented -- I presented to the board before
4 with this. Okay. That's my good side.

5 So after the master plan, our direction
6 was to focus on the visual impact on the adjacent
7 properties. So that's what we did. As Dave
8 pointed out with the topography on the site, it is
9 significant in that it plays a role in the
10 visibility of the site also. It slopes in a
11 general southeasterly direction so the homes in the
12 northwest are up considerably higher than the,
13 well, the panels will be. The site's presently
14 wooded, and it's wooded with a primarily oak
15 overstory. It's part of a working farm. It's not
16 pristine. It's been managed. The canopy is -- you
17 can see through the canopy. You can tell there's
18 been -- farming activities have gone on through the
19 years. So it's not a dense understory on the
20 majority of the site.

21 So what we did to try to both study for
22 ourselves for a solution and illustrate to the
23 board members what the visual impact would be is we
24 drew a series of transects that you can see on the
25 plan that's up on the screen now. And there are

1 eleven of them, and what we've done is we've used a
2 topography that was provided to us and estimated a
3 height of the floor elevation and an eye elevation
4 and then drew the transects from that. They're not
5 intended to be a hundred percent accurate or
6 inclusive of every view possible to this site, but
7 they're certainly representational of what the
8 views will be looking from outside the site onto
9 the site after it's developed.

10 So what we identified was the northerly
11 property line seemed to be -- gather the most
12 attention in the last meetings, and we wanted to
13 see what we could do to buffer the panels from
14 those homes up to the north. We had, in an earlier
15 presentation, talked about planting in-fill
16 planting, adding evergreens and so forth.

17 MR. ZEVON: Can you point out where you're
18 referring to.

19 MR. CARTER: I will. That's the northerly
20 property line. North is up on the plan. That's
21 the northerly property line. The 50 feet that Dave
22 Russo pointed out is going to remain intact and not
23 be disturbed. So that's the buffer area that we're
24 referring to. And as I was saying, we did propose
25 some plantings and didn't get the -- I didn't get

1 the sense that people wanted to invest in the
2 long-term benefit of a planned buffer. It's not
3 something that is immediate, and it takes some
4 commitment and investment on the part of the
5 neighbors, the town, the project developer, and so
6 forth to establish plants.

7 So in order to get some type of immediate
8 visual screen, we've proposed to put a fence, and
9 where Dave's pointing now, along that northerly
10 edge, there'll be a 10-foot -- proposed a 10-foot
11 solid fence to help remediate most of the impact,
12 the visual impact, to those houses to the north.

13 The remainder of the site is surrounded,
14 as you can see, by fairly dense vegetation.
15 There's a couple of areas that we looked at and
16 they're labeled in green, and there's an A, a B,
17 and a C. That's C, A, and then B is right at the
18 entrance. Those are suggestions or proposals to do
19 evergreen planting. Those we'll work out between
20 the project developer, the property owner, and the
21 owners of the adjacent properties, who I understand
22 would be satisfied if there was additional planting
23 done in those areas.

24 So that's what those proposed A, B, and C
25 areas are is to add some additional evergreens.

1 And then the remainder of the site, as Dave pointed
2 out, to the west is -- Ron Rossi is the property
3 owner. To the east is a big wetland complex, which
4 will remain in place and be protected. To the
5 south is very heavily wooded, and there's a couple
6 of houses in there in that area, labeled as A
7 would -- was it response to the owner over there,
8 and screening that view. The two houses you asked
9 about, Sarah asked about, in the northeast corner,
10 there's a ridge, there's sort of a big drop-off in
11 grade, and a ridge, and I don't believe if you
12 stood at those houses, you'd be able to see up onto
13 the farm onto the panels. So that's why nothing --

14 MS. BRADFORD: If you went up onto the
15 ridge for a lookout or whatever, you would be; is
16 that correct?

17 MR. CARTER: Yes, but then like I said
18 earlier, Sarah, you know, we're not representing
19 you're not going to see this thing. It's, you
20 know, of a scale that if you want to see it, you're
21 going to be able to find some place to stand and
22 see it. But in our opinion, we mitigated the views
23 substantially in response to the feedback we got.

24 So I can answer questions, but that's sort
25 of the summary of what we're proposing.

1 MS. BRADFORD: I would have a general
2 comment. Basically, I think that any mitigation
3 that is to be done should be on the project
4 property, not the individual -- not the private
5 property. The private property, they can do as
6 they need or want to, but that shouldn't be part of
7 the mitigation that is part of this agreement. I
8 have --

9 MR. PALUMBO: I just want to understand
10 that. When we're talking about that, Sarah, this
11 is Ralph Palumbo, are you talking about the A, B,
12 and C area, Sarah; is that what you're referring
13 to?

14 MS. BRADFORD: A and B look to be on
15 private property. C is -- looks not to be; am I
16 correct?

17 MR. PALUMBO: So I just would say I had
18 conversations with those folks, and they asked for
19 the plants to be in those areas, Sarah. So we're
20 not doing it on our own accord.

21 MS. BRADFORD: I have no doubt that is
22 advantageous to screen there. It's just where and
23 how that should happen.

24 MR. PALUMBO: It's at the property owner's
25 request. That's all the point I wanted to make.

1 MR. MURRAY: The point that Ralph was
2 making is that, as it relates to A and B, that was
3 proposed in direct response to communication with
4 the abutters. I believe Area C, John, correct me
5 if I'm wrong, is on Mr. Rossi's property. So C --
6 that is on Ron Rossi's property, and he is
7 agreeable to that because he, in fact, coordinated
8 the meetings with the abutters in the field. So
9 there -- you know, particularly as it relates to A,
10 we have the Tennessee Gas pipeline there. So
11 that's why we're working on the Francisco property
12 with his approvals. And the Clint Rossi property
13 at the access, we've had extensive discussions with
14 him, and that was -- that's proposed at his
15 request. So --

16 MS. BRADFORD: Can we go back to the gas
17 easement. It looks to be that there is more
18 vegetation at the east end of the gas easement and
19 less -- but you're clearing back further as we get
20 near the panels; is that correct?

21 MR. RUSSO: David Russo, DiPrete. Along
22 here, there's going to be selective clearing.
23 There's a few trees along here. It's a lot of
24 scrub brush I'll call it. So they're going to do
25 selective clearing where they can inside the

1 property line here. This they're not worried about
2 in terms of shading on this --

3 MS. BRADFORD: Correct. Okay. So there's
4 still vegetation there and, in fact, even if we got
5 over towards the "A" planting, that could also have
6 lower vegetation, if necessary; is that correct?

7 MR. RUSSO: That's correct, yes.

8 MS. BRADFORD: If we go up to -- I'm sort
9 of jumping ahead, maybe, but can we go to C. If
10 that is a densely wooded area now, oaks, John, the
11 planting underneath them, getting anything
12 established, then it would actually be very
13 meaningful screening is a hard sell without
14 clearing some of those trees, and I don't think we
15 want to clear trees, right?

16 MR. CARTER: Correct. It's not intended
17 to clear trees. The thought was if we could do
18 some in-fill planting and some pocket planting with
19 some evergreens that could mature into a buffer,
20 this photograph is, you know, clearly with the
21 leaves on. It is, as I said, it's a fairly managed
22 piece of property. There's actually -- you can
23 kind of walk everywhere in the understory. It's
24 not what you might be envisioning with, you know,
25 green briar and that type of stuff. So I -- while

1 I agree that's not always ideal, you know, if the
2 agreement between the developer and the owners
3 above are to try to do that, then it's certainly a
4 worthwhile thing, and it's just the -- the only
5 people invested in that is the two of them. So
6 there's no risk, downside risk of the city or
7 anything if it wasn't as successful as, you know,
8 intended.

9 MS. BRADFORD: I'm not sure I'm quite with
10 you there, but let's talk further about this
11 screening issue. Now, you're saying -- you're
12 proposing a 10-foot fence all the way along from
13 east to west?

14 MR. CARTER: That's correct.

15 MS. BRADFORD: Can you describe that fence
16 in detail.

17 MR. CARTER: It's going to be wood board
18 fence, solid wood board fence.

19 MS. BRADFORD: So it's a special
20 maintenance requirement for the company, for the
21 solar company?

22 MR. CARTER: Not initially, but perhaps as
23 time goes on.

24 MS. BRADFORD: Won't take long, I'm
25 afraid. I'm not seeing from your sections really

1 comfortable with that 10 foot being an adequate
2 screen fence or a very effective one. I would like
3 to suggest that you consider doing your planting in
4 front of your clearing line instead. So it would
5 be the other side of the service drive to have a
6 planting strip and so you can -- and not done as a
7 hedge, done so it looks fairly natural. Some
8 groups of evergreens where they're judiciously
9 needed and otherwise would be fine to have
10 deciduous.

11 MR. CARTER: Okay. Let me just, Sarah,
12 because Ralph Palumbo and some of the other people,
13 I want to explain to them what you're listing to
14 make sure we understand and they understand. So
15 what Sarah is suggesting is instead of having the
16 10-foot fence on the north side of the access
17 driveway along with limited clearing line, to do
18 some planting with evergreens. And she brought up
19 clustering them and maybe not just doing a long row
20 of them but making a little more natural looking.
21 But that would be in lieu of the 10-foot fence
22 instead of the --

23 MR. PALUMBO: I think that's intelligent,
24 and it would flow with the property and, again,
25 it's not -- it's not like a fence where you can't

1 see through a fence.

2 MR. BRADFORD: It's not immediate.

3 MR. PALUMBO: It's not immediate, but I
4 think it's the right long-term, intelligent
5 solution and, you know, with proper initial
6 plantings and proper management all the time, it
7 will be natural and well --

8 MS. BRADFORD: I think it can be -- if
9 there are critical views, it can be almost
10 immediate. It depends on what you're choosing to
11 plant and how big it is, but if there are some
12 specific areas, I think they can be looked at.

13 MR. CARTER: I would agree with that and
14 by walking out there, we've actually done that
15 analysis. We could probably find some critical
16 views and plug them up with some evergreens. So
17 instead of the wood fence, it would be just the --

18 MS. BRADFORD: The security fence.

19 MR. CARTER: Yeah. The security fence
20 would still be there.

21 MR. PALUMBO: So just the plantings, John,
22 what -- can you just describe what you're thinking
23 about the plantings.

24 MR. CARTER: Probably White Pine. I don't
25 know, Sarah, jump in if you want, but --

1 MS. BRADFORD: Well, we don't -- we want
2 it to look fairly natural, and we don't have a
3 whole lot of options. So I think maybe more the
4 question is is there -- we have a 50-foot buffer
5 which, in my mind, should be a violet, nothing
6 should happen in there. Then --

7 MR. CARTER: That's the agreement.

8 MS. BRADFORD: Then beyond that, then,
9 there should be a planted area, and I don't know
10 how wide that is yet. I think we'd have to --
11 you'd have to decide, John, what you actually --
12 what's reasonable to do the planting that we need.
13 I don't know whether it's 10 feet or 25 feet.

14 MR. CARTER: So we've got 50 feet and 20
15 feet, 50 feet of vegetation, 20 feet of a gravel
16 road, which I think the width is dictated by fire
17 codes and so forth. So we have to plant on the
18 outside of the gravel road along the edge of the
19 deciduous. So that's something we -- you know,
20 there's areas in there also that are clear within
21 that 50 feet that wouldn't require any touching.
22 There was no intention to touch anything there
23 that we may be able to interplant or under plant.

24 MS. BRADFORD: I think it's something we
25 should consider, but I think we need to have some

1 kind of -- it's not rules, but goals, for a
2 planting strip if we can do that just so
3 everybody's on the same page.

4 MR. CARTER: Yea. I agree because what we
5 don't want is to make some representation that
6 we're going to plant this so that you can't see it
7 because it would never get there.

8 MS. BRADFORD: No. Everybody's going to
9 now have a wonderful big view, wonderful sky, but
10 we want to make sure you don't see too much. Can I
11 ask you, John, if you have your lines -- your
12 transects 1011, the houses that are up higher on
13 the other side of Ridgewood on the other side of
14 the street have a substantial -- I think they need
15 you to draw a transect because I think that's the
16 critical one. Winter's coming --

17 MR. CARTER: Yeah.

18 MS. BRADFORD: That's like being in the
19 attic unit of these other houses, I would think.

20 MR. CARTER: I guess they could see,
21 maybe, between the houses. There's a lot of
22 vegetation up there. I don't know -- let me ask,
23 if you would, Sarah, Dave, do we have any idea what
24 the grade change would be --

25 MS. BRADFORD: Well, it's about 20 feet, I

1 think. It's pretty high.

2 MR. CARTER: There's quite -- you know,
3 there's trees in front of those houses. You can
4 see the canopy --

5 MS. BRADFORD: I know. I drove up there,
6 which is why I'm asking. I think you need another
7 look.

8 MR. CARTER: We would have to look at
9 that --

10 MR. PALUMBO: So let's look at it and you
11 know if it's 20 feet higher, I just want to
12 understand, John, because these houses look like
13 they're screened by these trees right here.

14 MR. CARTER: Correct.

15 MR. PALUMBO: And they're also in, say,
16 visual path of this house. So they would be
17 looking at their neighbor's house.

18 MR. CARTER: The neighbor's house, the
19 neighbor's trees.

20 MR. PALUMBO: The neighbor's trees. So I
21 just -- I would like you to go up there and walk
22 with Sarah or take pictures, if you couldn't meet
23 Sarah, just so we could see, you know, what it
24 truly is.

25 MS. BRADFORD: I'm asking you to look into

1 more I think is the best I can do.

2 MR. PALUMBO: Yeah. I think it's a good
3 suggestion, Sarah. I'm not resisting you.

4 MS. BRADFORD: Otherwise, let's see,
5 that's most of the north boundary would be dealt
6 with in that way. I'm -- I'm still a little
7 concerned about the east. I understand the
8 topography which protects the houses, but does it
9 really protect the property if they did some
10 additional clearing up on the ridge? So I think
11 they need the same thought process of if you're
12 getting additional buffer being -- or the buffer,
13 whether it's additional or not, buffer being
14 maintained and not cleared in any way, and they may
15 also need some screen planting along there
16 judiciously. I'm not quite sure where, but the
17 upper most property, and I read it, is it Lot 1 --
18 is it 116. I can't quite read it on that.

19 MR. CARTER: Yes. You're correct.

20 MS. BRADFORD: That may need some more
21 thought, too.

22 MR. PALUMBO: So, John, let me just
23 understand that. So there's these two lots here,
24 Lot 5 and Lot 116, and Sarah is saying if they cut
25 all the trees on their property, they could

1 potentially have a view of our property; is that
2 what we're talking about?

3 MS. BRADFORD: If they did more clear -- I
4 think if any of these properties did more clearing,
5 we have to have thought through some of that
6 process.

7 MR. PALUMBO: I understand, Sarah, but
8 we're leaving the 50-foot buffer.

9 MS. BRADFORD: Not there. Not at the east
10 end. At least I don't think you are -- I don't
11 read it --

12 MR. PALUMBO: We're leaving that buffer --
13 what you're saying if they come in and just cut
14 everything right up to the edge of the property,
15 that's my responsibility.

16 MS. BRADFORD: I don't want to think that
17 anybody would do that, but I want to make sure
18 we're not just talking about a house. I think
19 that's certainly the most important part, but I
20 think that -- I think you still need a 50-foot
21 buffer at that end, if we can do it. Is that -- we
22 might get the turning radius --

23 MR. PALUMBO: I do understand your
24 suggestion, but you're holding me to a standard and
25 not the abutting property owner to a standard and I

1 think that's unfair.

2 MS. BRADFORD: Not to the --

3 MS. PATTEN: So this is Drake Patten. I'm
4 wondering if I can just check in, please.

5 MR. PEZZULLO: Yes, Drake, please.

6 MS. PATTEN: So, hello, everyone. I am an
7 abutter. I -- and I just (inaudible) the
8 conversation, but I want to make sure we're not
9 losing track of those of us that are actually from
10 (inaudible), and I know we kind of jumped into the
11 meeting and everything, but I also want to point
12 out that the advisory committee is a very specific
13 pool that were named and asked to be involved, and
14 I'm feeling like we're probably getting a little
15 bit in the weeds here. Have a lot of voices at the
16 table that are not part of the group that was asked
17 to deliberate, and I think it would be great if we,
18 as a group, and I'm speaking to you in a way, Josh,
19 because I believe you're representing the planning
20 department, if we could have a chance to speak as a
21 group, to share ideas, to talk a bit about what
22 we're seeing. This is, of course, our first pass
23 with this plan and then be able to come back to the
24 applicant with some response. I very much
25 appreciate what you're saying, Sarah, and these are

1 concerns that many of the neighbors share, but we
2 are here as a group to speak about this. And I
3 think we've got a lot of voices in the room. We're
4 not actually on the committee, and it would be nice
5 to have some time with this collaboration to work.

6 MR. VINCENT: This is Fred Vincent
7 representing the planning commission. That was the
8 goal that we set in establishing this peer review
9 process to have inclusionary discussions and
10 collaboration. So I would support, you know -- I
11 never thought this was going to be our one and only
12 meeting. I think this is -- we're not under a time
13 frame. We have to come up with the best, most
14 feasible and realistic buffer plan. I was not
15 excited about a 10-foot fence without, you know,
16 it's just -- it doesn't strike me as what we all
17 thought of a buffer, a natural buffer should be.
18 And I know I can understand the logic based on the
19 topography, but I much prefer Sarah's approach,
20 that trying to make this look natural and yet
21 provide the screening that the neighbors deserve.
22 So, yes, I think Drake is right that we should have
23 a discussion, post meeting, and then come back and
24 make sure we're covering all the bases.

25 MR. BERRY: Are you suggesting that we

1 have that -- just exclusive discussion with the
2 advisory committee and not the applicant or -- I'm
3 just trying to clarify.

4 MS. PATTEN: Well, I can't speak for what
5 Fred is looking for, but if we consider the
6 advisory committee and one representative from the
7 applicant, which seemed quite reasonable, and it
8 seems like we should try to do that, at least those
9 are the people that should be speaking because we
10 know that the public -- there are people attending
11 tonight who are not able to speak. So at least for
12 me, and I can't speak for Fred, but for me that's
13 really what my goal would be, an opportunity to
14 speak. I'd like to learn from Sarah. I
15 (inaudible) and a lot of planting myself in the
16 same area. So, you know, I think we all have
17 expertise to bring to the table. So let's kind of
18 drill down on that.

19 MR. MURRAY: Okay. So this is Bob. Can I
20 just make a brief comment?

21 MR. PEZZULLO: Go ahead, Bob.

22 MR. MURRAY: First of all, we're not
23 trying to work across purposes here. Jason, you
24 and I chatted earlier today. I thought it would be
25 helpful to the committee for our consultants to

1 present what was submitted to them. You know, that
2 is not at the exclusion of anybody on the committee
3 commenting, offering thoughts, or Sarah's input.
4 We're here to try and facilitate a good discussion
5 but, you know, I thought the starting point should
6 be at least a presentation from the applicant's
7 consultants; but, you know, at this point, you
8 know, we've said what we -- we're here to answer
9 questions at this point. Thank you.

10 MR. PEZZULLO: So, Drake, you want to
11 start with some of your comments on the plan that's
12 on the table right now?

13 MS. PATTEN: Sure. I mean Dan is also out
14 there, but I'm happy to start. I think we should
15 all feel like we can jump in, but (inaudible)
16 slightly shocked to see that the biggest response
17 was a 10-foot fence. That is not the spirit of
18 what we discussed, and I understand we're, you
19 know, we're considering that now, but that was a
20 surprise and a surprise to our neighbors. The way
21 we had spoken of this is really about a buffer
22 resolution that will be taking into account what we
23 have now, and let's remember that although those
24 transects are single lines coming from people's
25 homes, none of us have one spot within which we

1 stand in our home or two spots. We actually live
2 here because we like to be outside. We like being
3 on the property, and our property, and I believe,
4 Sarah, you refer to this, are actually critical
5 components of how we do this work. And so to begin
6 with, and I -- just to identify myself to anyone
7 who doesn't know, I own quite a large piece of
8 property next to this, which was not mentioned when
9 things were called out, and you'll see a Number 4
10 on the map. So we own that little triangle,
11 AP22-3, I think it is, on the side of Natick, and
12 then we own a very large parcel on the other side
13 of Natick. And just to be clear, that transect
14 from my property is to my barn. And while I think
15 my sheep have a great appreciation for landscape,
16 you know, that's not my home. So even in my case,
17 that's not a logical transect for my property,
18 which actually has two dwellings on it. So, again,
19 I think we need to look at things like that.

20 Certainly to me and to those of us that
21 care about this place, this is not a carnivorous
22 forest, not an evergreen forest. In fact, there
23 are quite, you know, there are two examples of
24 that. I have a fairly large stand of pine on my
25 property at the very lower end near my wetlands,

1 but that's really one of the only places where we
2 see large stands of evergreens.

3 So, again, if we're looking at working
4 with what we have, one of the things that I would
5 think would be important would be to do an
6 inventory of existing species and existing
7 conditions and then establishing what our
8 opportunities would be. And to Sarah's point, you
9 know, trying to integrate understory, overstory,
10 something that's going to look more naturalized,
11 that's really the goal that we all have, and that
12 is as much about what our needs are and what the
13 land needs are in an ecosystem and the critters
14 that we have living on the land. So trying to come
15 up with some kind of balance there has been our
16 goal from the beginning, and that remains our goal.

17 MR. ZEVON: And, hi, this is Dan Zevon.
18 So I just wanted to make a couple of points. So
19 when this project was first laid out to me by Ron
20 Rossi and Andrew in his kitchen, the most important
21 thing he emphasized to me in that November 2018
22 meeting was you better make sure that you get the
23 proper buffering because this thing -- and this is
24 the first I was looking at his blueprints, he was
25 showing me the blueprints of the plan, that you

1 better make sure you get the buffering. So I also
2 heard on the site tour when there was people in the
3 van on the site tour and Ron was pointing out and
4 telling people that I was on his property and just
5 giving false kind of boundaries, I guess, with what
6 the properties are, but then also saying that I
7 cleared some of the property and stuff that -- some
8 of the -- what we're saying here is the buffering
9 or the limit of clearing. That's clear because
10 that was cleared by Ron Rossi and his excavators,
11 and, you know, the stone wall has two openings in
12 it where his excavators, you know, because we were
13 friends for 25 years, but it was all cleared by Ron
14 Rossi with his excavators, trees, removing -- I
15 repaired the stone wall recently, but the complete
16 area, I've got a sight line from my house -- my
17 kitchen but also my backyard, straight through the
18 property because of all these roads that had been
19 built coming into my property and then even on the
20 other side of the wall where he's cleared the
21 property with his equipment over the course of, you
22 know, 10, 15 years. So to say that there is
23 natural buffering there, that doesn't exist, and I
24 think, you know, Josh and others who have been out
25 here for site visits will attest that, you know,

1 the view. And then furthermore -- and, Sarah, I
2 like where you're going, but the elevation from my
3 house, so I'm 5 and 6 if you look at that map, but
4 the elevation goes uphill, okay. So like what
5 Drake referred to, I have probably the largest
6 chunk of property, and I'm glad I was the closest
7 friend to the Rossi's for the last 25 years, not
8 two to three years like Ron said in the van, that
9 I've been living here for two to three years. I've
10 been here for over 20 years paying my taxes in the
11 city of Cranston, but my house 5 and 6 right there,
12 the land goes uphill, okay. So I'm not just
13 sitting in that one kitchen window. As Drake said,
14 I've got almost eleven acres that abut this
15 property, okay. I don't just sit in one, you know,
16 one window wherever this satellite image was taken
17 of the property.

18 MS. PATTEN: I think one of the other
19 pieces for all of us just to make sure that we're
20 speaking for all the folks that have given us their
21 thoughts is that, you know, we are not looking at
22 a -- when you think about looking into a -- the
23 woods, let's think about what it looks like all
24 times of year because there's never a lack of
25 complexity in the woods around us. That's one of

1 the reasons many of us chose to live here. So even
2 in winter, there's a beautiful complexity in the
3 trees, in the understory, and just the nakedness
4 of winter. And then, of course, it fills out in
5 this time of year, it's remarkably complex and I
6 think complex is what we are trying to discuss
7 here. A ten-foot fence does not grow in the middle
8 of the woods. So that's, you know, incredibly out
9 of place. I think most of us would choose to have
10 both the fence and plantings; but, again, that
11 would be something we need to go back to our
12 neighbors and discuss.

13 But I also want to ask one question which
14 goes back to something I'm not sure who said from
15 the applicant's group about people were not
16 invested in a long-term commitment. So I believe,
17 and I may have misunderstood this, but that was
18 somehow saying that we, as the abutters, would be
19 responsible for maintaining a landscape, any
20 changes to landscape, which we are not and would
21 not be and that should not fall upon us. But I do
22 want to mention there are other projects around the
23 state where landscape plans, and I'm going to use
24 this term quite loosely, have not been cared for.
25 And in many situations such as this, we could be

1 looking at a three-year commitment to establish
2 sizeable plantings. Think of this summer, had
3 anything been planted this spring and not
4 maintained, we would have, as we've seen it on
5 other projects across the state, a lot of dead
6 trees.

7 So this is a complex thing we're looking
8 at, not only in how we need to design this, but
9 also in how it's going to be maintained.

10 MR. BERRY: Yeah. My interpretation --
11 this is Joshua Berry, Senior Planner. My
12 interpretation of that statement, I didn't directly
13 think to the maintenance of the landscaping. I
14 think, and I can't speak for the applicant, but I
15 think what they meant was that it would take a long
16 time for the plantings to mature. And in that
17 time, that you wouldn't have the adequate buffer
18 for three or five or more years, and I think maybe
19 my interpretation of what they were saying was that
20 a more immediate buffer was the goal, not something
21 that would effectively screen the project five
22 years from it being built or something similar.
23 But I, you know, I can't speak for that. It's just
24 my interpretation of the comment. It would
25 obviously be up to the applicant to maintain and

1 that is something that we can certainly stipulate
2 in any preliminary plan condition.

3 MS. PATTEN: To complete my clarification,
4 and I guess my response to that is that, you know,
5 treatment and understory, all those things can be
6 bought in a range of sizes. So it's really all
7 about the level of commitment that the applicant
8 has to protect the neighboring properties, because
9 we all know that --

10 MR. CARTER: Josh, can I speak? This is
11 John Carter. I might be able to shed light on
12 that.

13 MR. BERRY: Sure.

14 MR. CARTER: So, Drake, that was me who
15 made the comment. What I meant was that it would
16 be a time investment on the part of everybody, not
17 in terms of providing maintenance. We can't
18 propose and provide a buffer, a vegetated buffer,
19 that would immediately be as effective as an opaque
20 buffer like a fence. On the other hand, over a
21 timeline, it would be a more effective and, you
22 know, environmentally healthier way to provide a
23 buffer. It would have to be planted. We have to
24 understand that we're using, you know, plants that
25 have to be transplanted and established. Not --

1 and there might be a little loss. And, of course,
2 the applicants are held to making sure that it
3 establishes, replacing a few dead trees or whatever
4 would happen. And I agree with you. The summer,
5 if something was planted this spring, it would have
6 been a disaster. But that's an unusual
7 circumstance. So that's what I meant. So the
8 investment was in time, really.

9 MS. PATTEN: That's a key fact. That's a
10 great clarification. And I can't speak for
11 everyone because, again, we are representing a need
12 to go back and talk with our neighbors, but I am
13 going to expect that a combination of ways to
14 approach this, if people felt that the plan was
15 really taking into account understory, overstory,
16 native plants, I think people would have the
17 stomach for a longer -- I don't know where that
18 response came from. I don't recall that from any
19 of our meetings. Perhaps, you know, people were
20 just concerned at the time, but I don't recall
21 anyone saying that they were disinterested in that
22 because one of our requests in what Mr. Murray
23 fondly calls my manifesto was to have a combination
24 of deciduous, carnivorous understory, you know,
25 everything from high bush blueberry to chads, we

1 really were very specific about wanting to have a
2 naturalized sort of border with this and make it
3 look less border like, but have an integration. So
4 I appreciate that clarification.

5 MR. BERRY: I feel it would be great to
6 have the best of both worlds if we could, you know,
7 to echo some of the comments about the fence.
8 Obviously, the fence as the primary screening tool
9 does not seem to be satisfactory from what I'm
10 hearing to anyone on the committee so far. Correct
11 me if I'm wrong or speak up if I'm wrong, but more
12 of a secondary or last resort once you can find
13 some sort of angles through traversing any portion
14 of any of the property owners, you know, acres on
15 their property, to have a backstop behind that
16 primary buffer, which is the untouched 50-foot
17 buffer, and then a planting strip. So I think it's
18 a combination of things with a fence being the back
19 -- the last -- the last portion of that visual
20 screen.

21 One of the issues that I had when I was
22 reading the plan and trying to understand where
23 that applicant was coming from with this strategy
24 with the note that maybe you can zoom in on the
25 process note. I felt that this language, I think

1 we need -- I wanted to ask Sarah Bradford her
2 professional opinion on this. I think we kind of
3 -- I would suspect essentially more information may
4 be required to either verify this statement or
5 repute it, but I think it's, at least, I'm hesitant
6 to accept it without further information because it
7 completely writes off the ability to, I think, do
8 what we set out to do. If the use of vegetative
9 screening is not a valid option, except in a few
10 limited areas, I think that that would need to be
11 proven out, and I would need to see which areas
12 cannot sustain plantings.

13 MR. ZEVON: But, Josh, this is a tree farm
14 we're talking about, right? It's a tree farm. So
15 to say that trees can't grow in a tree farm, we've
16 got, you know, bigger concerns. You know, again,
17 we talked about this, you know, ad nauseam tonight,
18 but also over the course of the last two plus
19 years, and I think that we know that the heightened
20 tensions that this has caused, to come back with
21 this type of plan, I don't see how this is anything
22 but inflammatory at this point. And if the Rossi's
23 feel good about it and his team of lawyers, God
24 bless him, but this is nothing but inflammatory to
25 come back with a buffering plan that includes no

1 buffering but a few patches here and there.

2 MS. PATTEN: To your point, Josh, I, too,
3 was concerned about that; and as someone who is
4 planting on essentially the same ground across the
5 street and has a farm, I can say that -- a working
6 farm -- I can say that it is possible to plant, and
7 you can't plant everywhere. But as many of us in
8 New England know, you know, ledge is everywhere.
9 Trees grow. Plantings grow. And you can both
10 establish, certainly, sizeable gardens and fairly
11 sizeable wooded areas around ledge. You just have
12 to finesse it, and you can do a grid test where
13 you're looking to see where there is depth and
14 where this isn't, and that frequently happens. And
15 I wonder, Sarah, I looked at a project that you
16 did, the Highland Woods project that your firm did,
17 and I was impressed with the -- at least what I
18 could see from that, you know, the sort of
19 integrated plantings along the edge of an existing
20 forest it looked like, if I was reading that
21 correctly. And I wonder, as a professional, if you
22 could shed some light on how that kind of a
23 planting in our conditions, how plantings might
24 occur at the edge of forest. I realize it can be
25 complex, but we also have incredible native species

1 in New England that do quite well in those
2 situations. So I wonder if you could just shed
3 light on how you establish something like that.

4 MS. BRADFORD: Well, I think what you have
5 been talking about is there being a variety of
6 different plant materials that are available. I
7 think that one of the things that we have in our
8 favor here of getting some screenings is that there
9 are some cleared edges that are going to get some
10 good light. So that will be in the favor of
11 getting some plant materials that work for us.
12 That particular project you're talking about is in
13 Tiverton, and it's a natural area and was intended
14 to stay and look natural, and those would be plant
15 materials chosen in the master plan, sort of a
16 sense, were layering of native plants, and I think
17 that's sort of the thing you're looking for here.

18 MR. VINCENT: This is Fred Vincent. I
19 think one of the comments that I heard earlier, I
20 think it was Drake, I don't think we understand
21 enough of existing conditions. They were not
22 sufficiently explained, other than we have a
23 50-foot vegetated buffer and, you know, with
24 selective clearance, what does that mean? Have you
25 gone out and tagged the trees that we're going to

1 maintain? Do we know that in advance? Shouldn't
2 we, as a group, know the quality of the existing
3 plant material and where we can improve it or -- I
4 mean, we're not starting -- it seems like we're
5 just starting with transects, and I was on the site
6 along with the entire commission, and I agree. You
7 can see very clearly through the existing
8 vegetation. He has disturbed that site greatly.
9 So, you know, there's some work to be done here to
10 come up with a good plan and not just a series of
11 lines. I appreciate what the intent was here to
12 see, you know, a visual corridor, but I was
13 expecting more of a discussion on what's there now,
14 the areas along the borders that need supplemental
15 plantings and what the thinking for those plantings
16 would be based on the goals that, you know, we set
17 in this agenda, a variety of plantings, and I don't
18 see that with this plan. As a commissioner member,
19 I do not see that.

20 MR. ZEVON: Fred, thank you for your
21 comments. The other question I have to add on to
22 Fred is, like, what makes the particular, you know,
23 point where the intersections come together on my
24 home, for example, who deems that as the point that
25 needs to be the distance from, you know, the -- to

1 the solar panels or to anything? Why would it not
2 be -- I've never heard -- why would it not be from
3 my property line. I mean, since -- I never heard
4 -- why is from wherever I can see on my property,
5 any vantage point through the woods, I shouldn't
6 have to -- I'm not going to be, you know, standing
7 on a tree and looking, you know, like I'm deer
8 hunting. I'm talking about just walking around my
9 property, the huge elevation differences and the
10 land that he has disturbed immensely over the last
11 couple of years. There's tanks rolling back there.
12 There's heavy equipment. There's trucks going back
13 there daily, okay. So it's deeply disturbed.
14 Whether it's farming or not, I don't know. But I
15 know there's a lot of activity back there.

16 MR. BERRY: -- comment that I think
17 showing the cross-sections from property lines
18 would be appropriate. Showing that from primary
19 residences is helpful, and I wouldn't suggest that
20 you delete the information, but supplement it with
21 transects from -- and cross-sections from property
22 lines.

23 MR. CARTER: Can I speak up, Josh? This
24 is John Carter. So just to clean up a few things.
25 So in term of the comments on existing conditions,

1 I think that when I presented, I tried to explain
2 existing conditions. I made it clear that it's a
3 farmed -- working farm. It's primarily deciduous.
4 It's primarily oak. Primarily oaks in the --

5 MR. ZEVON: John? John? Can I interrupt
6 for a second. Let's refer to the 17-acre farm in
7 Mr. Murray's legal letter that was sent to me from
8 the Rossi's lawyer that -- when they got litigious
9 and started going with lawyers, it points out that
10 there's 17 acres. So let's just talk about where
11 the farm is and let's differentiate from what
12 you're talking about in the solar farm project
13 because there's no farming that's gone on over
14 there in the last hundred years.

15 MR. PEZZULLO: Mr. Zevon, let's -- let
16 John Carter finish what he was just saying so that
17 we can --

18 MR. ZEVON: Let's talk about the facts,
19 though. It was in your letter that there's a
20 17-acre parcel of the farming operation not --

21 MR. PEZZULLO: Mr. Carter, please
22 continue.

23 MR. CARTER: Thank you. So my -- yeah.
24 My point was that it's not unmanaged. It's been
25 managed. But to the point of the project narrative

1 and the comments about the process and so forth,
2 and also what I'm hearing about some diversity and
3 interplanting and that type of stuff, we came in at
4 the master plan level, and that's what we were
5 suggesting. You know, we talk about developing
6 some kind of natural habitat with an integrated
7 planting, an overstory and understory, and native
8 plants and so forth, that -- I'm not convinced
9 that's going to provide a visual buffer. It would
10 be an environmentally positive exercise, but I
11 don't think it would provide a visual buffer, and
12 it would take a lot of efforts and a lot of work to
13 ultimately develop something that probably didn't
14 provide that which we're looking at, which is a
15 visual buffer. We're not suggesting that building
16 this out here is being done to create some kind of
17 environmental benefit. We're simply focusing on --
18 the view of this from neighboring properties. And
19 I think that the transects, if you look at them,
20 show the property -- we show the house, the
21 property line, and so forth, the purpose of them
22 was to study what this -- what the topography was
23 between the house, the property line, and the
24 panels so we could address it properly with
25 whatever method we chose to address it.

1 So I think that -- that -- I just want to
2 remind that we did come in with that. That was the
3 earlier concept, and we're -- kind of the feedback
4 we're getting, like, no, we don't want to see this
5 and we don't want to wait. When I said, you know,
6 invested as I said, I meant invested in time. And
7 so to do a type of planting where you're going to
8 do an understory, an overstory, native plants, and
9 so forth, that's a long-term commitment, and it may
10 provide some wildlife habitat, but I don't know
11 that it's going to provide a buffer that we're
12 trying to address. So evergreen plantings along
13 the limit of clearing, as Sarah pointed out,
14 there's some areas that are clear already, that are
15 thin in the 50-foot buffer, and we can try to
16 interplant in them. But when I said that, you
17 know, the use of the screening, when I refer to it
18 as not being practical, that was because we were
19 being -- said well, why don't you plant inside the
20 50-foot buffer, and I think Sarah Bradford pointed
21 out early on when we were talking about the
22 screening for Ridgewood Road, it's not practical to
23 go in to an established forest, dig holes, and put
24 trees in and expect them to survive. And that's
25 what we were talking about in that note.

1 MS. PATTEN: You know, one component of
2 this, and I think we all need to just acknowledge,
3 is that, you know, you're talking about a huge
4 commercial use in the middle of a residential
5 community. So you know what, this is going to be
6 real hard, and we need to do the best job that we
7 can and, yes, I hear you, you can't just put trees
8 in the middle of the forest, but it is possible and
9 there are projects across this country that are
10 successfully doing integration planting and I
11 understand, I really do, John, that you think
12 that -- I think it was John that said this, that
13 you know, the community pushed back. The community
14 of almost two dozens abutters I think we are, you
15 know, we're a little traumatized, and you bet we
16 pushed back. So now we are in this advisory group
17 to try to figure out a real plan to move us
18 forward.

19 So I want more language that's about what
20 we can do, I guess, because that's why I'm here and
21 that's why I'm taking the time, and I'm committed
22 to this. And, you know, as we talk about what's
23 there, yes, we realize what kind of force it is.
24 But there's a difference between saying what's
25 there and doing something like mapping our assets

1 and our constraints. What are the assets that we
2 can work with? What are the constraints that are
3 provided, and they could be -- the roadway, they
4 could be, you know, bad soil in that area. They
5 could be ledge. But right now, I totally feel like
6 we've put our blindfolds on, and we're walking out
7 there and poking the donkey's tail on. And I think
8 this, unfortunately or fortunately, needs a much
9 more precise and almost curated approach because
10 this is an important piece of land, and we are
11 committed to doing something right for it.

12 So I just -- I just am asking us all to
13 step back a little bit and, you know, really take
14 the time this is going to need. I think we all
15 could do some learning. I think we have a lot to
16 learn from Sarah. I'm sure we have a lot to learn
17 from everybody. But, please, do it. So I just
18 need to say that.

19 MR. VINCENT: I'll speak to that because
20 as a member of the commission, I recommended a peer
21 review process, and it was to bring in different
22 perspectives and really address in a detailed way
23 which, as planning board members, we can't sit
24 there in a five-hour meeting and hope to cover all
25 of the issues, legitimate issues, raised by

1 abutting property owners affected. So having this
2 advisory committee to have this dialogue and to
3 have a better understanding of what's there and
4 where we need to make improvements, we're
5 professionals, and, John, I understand where you're
6 coming from. That was one approach, but I agree
7 more with Drake that it's not surgical enough. We
8 need to be more grounded in what's there and know
9 what we're working with and what we can do, because
10 I guess the assumption here, as I read your note,
11 is that it's not feasible because we have an
12 existing forest, and that we have the 50-foot
13 buffer. But those of us that have been on the site
14 know that that's not an adequate buffer, and I
15 think -- I'm not alone in that in terms of other
16 commission members.

17 MS. PATTEN: Perhaps the next step might
18 be to actually have, you know, a sort of good site
19 visit, a thoughtful site visit, where we start to
20 look at some options and start to look at what kind
21 of native material there is. Certainly, on our
22 property, we are constantly transplanting things
23 out of the edges of our woods. We're pulling
24 things out of our fields. We use what we have to
25 establish new areas on our farm. And that is also

1 an approach that we could be taking here. There
2 are so many ways to approach this, but I think we
3 really need to have some site time, and we need to
4 have conversation and in the pandemic, we can be
5 outside. So that's a positive thing.

6 MR. ZEVON: And, you know, speaking of
7 being outside, with regards to the generator on the
8 site, well, I know the Rossi's, they have a big
9 legal team, we need to find out what the legal
10 rights are for us now from these generators because
11 you can see, like, the generators closest to my
12 home. I believe those boxes are generators. Is
13 there sound buffering that is also included in this
14 buffering, lack of buffering?

15 MR. VINCENT: Yeah. That was addressed.
16 The city zoning code prescribes, you know, the
17 noise, and I think that came up during public
18 meetings, and I think the applicant addressed what
19 the noise would be measured. Josh, you can jump
20 in, but didn't we have a discussion on what the
21 noise levels would be, the decibel levels in these
22 units?

23 MR. ZEVON: The only reference I heard was
24 that it was no larger than a washing machine, and
25 that came from Bob Murray in the initial community

1 meeting. That didn't say anything about the sound
2 or which size washing machine we're talking about.

3 MR. BERRY: That's definitely something
4 that's going to be handled with the preliminary
5 plan application, and we can take a real deep dive
6 into the sound generated from their transmitters or
7 electrical equipment. We may require them to be,
8 you know -- we can require sound mitigation
9 absolutely. We can be mindful, at this phase,
10 while we look at the landscaping plan, of what
11 impact a fence would have or plantings would have
12 on that, but I don't think our scope to address it
13 really is within the landscape plan portion of the
14 review, not that I want to be blind to it either,
15 Mr. Zevon, but definitely believe we have ample
16 time to address that through the development plan
17 review process of the preliminary plan, as well as
18 the actual preliminary plan application, which has
19 not yet been submitted. We have obvious decibel
20 levels that are in our sound -- in our noise
21 ordinance for the city. They will certainly either
22 comply with that, but as this is an unusual amount
23 of noise from an A80 parcel -- been looking at it
24 really closely now that we have operating solar
25 installations in the city, we can take lesson

1 learned from those and visit those and understand
2 the sound with personal experience and site visits,
3 best informed how we want to mitigate the noise and
4 make sure it's not a nuisance to you and the other
5 abutters.

6 MR. PEZZULLO: I actually have a question.
7 John, let me just be clear about what you're saying
8 about the buffer plan. You're saying that the
9 existing buffering, which is existing forest,
10 you're saying that if we try to bolster plantings
11 within this mature forest area, that the plants, in
12 your opinion, the plants are not going to do well,
13 they're not going to serve any purpose. Is that
14 what you're saying on the plan?

15 MS. BRADFORD: In Section C?

16 MR. PEZZULLO: I'm going back to that note
17 because I think that that's the bone of contention
18 right now. I just want to -- I just want to be
19 clear what we're talking about so that when we move
20 forward, there isn't any misunderstanding. You're
21 saying that -- the -- that adding -- adding --
22 adding additional vegetation to the forested buffer
23 area, that, you know, we intended to keep untouched
24 would actually be a hindrance --

25 VOICE: He did not say that.

1 MR. PEZZULLO: Excuse me, who's talking?

2 VOICE: Sorry.

3 MR. PEZZULLO: Who's that? Would it hurt
4 the vegetation that's there, or we're saying it
5 just wouldn't take and it would die? I just want
6 to be clear. I'm not a -- I'm not a plant
7 scientist. I don't understand these things.

8 MR. CARTER: This is John Carter, and,
9 yes, what we're saying is that to go into an
10 established forest, an overstory and an understory,
11 it's got compacted soils, it's thick with roots.
12 There's a lot of competition for light, for air,
13 and for water. And to go in the middle of that and
14 digging a bunch of holes and putting in plants,
15 those plants would have to compete with the mature
16 plants, and there would be a very low success rate
17 doing that. And that's what we were saying because
18 that was in response to us being asked in the
19 beginning about planting inside the 50-foot buffer.
20 The 50-foot buffer is an established growth of
21 mostly oaks, but mature oaks, and it would be very
22 difficult to establish plants underneath them.
23 That's what we said.

24 MS. BRADFORD: And they would have to be
25 started small.

1 MR. CARTER: And they would have to --
2 thank you, yes.

3 MR. PEZZULLO: Sarah, I have a follow-up
4 on that. Now, again, I don't understand plant
5 science like you folks do. Is that -- are we all
6 in the same basic understanding of planting within
7 this 50-foot buffer strip that even if we did
8 plantings, you're saying -- John is saying that
9 they probably won't do very well, and I think what
10 you just said is that they'd have to start very
11 small.

12 MS. BRADFORD: That's in part just because
13 they'd have to be planted manually. You can't
14 bring a backhoe in there. So you have to -- if
15 we're going to plant within that buffer, you have
16 to be able to access it from the service road and
17 kind of work at the end of the service road is your
18 best chance.

19 MR. PEZZULLO: And, like, how tall are we
20 talking? It would be, like, three feet, six feet,
21 something like that?

22 MS. BRADFORD: If we're at the edge of the
23 service road, we can certainly go above the
24 ten-foot fence line. But if we're going to go back
25 inside where it says the -- it's indicated as "C,"

1 those are small. Those are probably under five
2 feet.

3 MR. PEZZULLO: How many years would they
4 take to grow beyond the fence line, do you think?

5 MS. BRADFORD: In that C area, they may or
6 may not even -- they still have a lot of
7 competition for light, and they may or may not do
8 anything other than become very spindly. So may
9 not be very effective in screening.

10 MS. PATTEN: So one thing that I would
11 like to mention, and maybe, Jason, this is partly
12 in response to your question in a different way, is
13 that, you know, understory in a forest, we're not
14 looking for everything to -- if you think about how
15 we look into the world, we don't see a flat line or
16 one place. We see -- as we look out, we see layers
17 of foregrounds, backgrounds, et cetera, right?
18 That's how our vision works, and that's true when
19 we look out into nature. So when we talk -- when
20 those of us who do a lot of native planting talk
21 about that, we're also looking at things that
22 actually thrive and do okay and want to be an
23 understory. There are numerous species that
24 actually embrace that. And some of them, I think
25 Sarah would agree, will actually work in shaded

1 spaces and will work in what I would call, you
2 know, competitive situations or less than ideal
3 situations. So we're not talking about, you know,
4 somebody's imported species, like, in front of a
5 generic place. We're talking about forests that
6 already have these guys happening. So if we think
7 about that -- that viewscape and we think about how
8 we see. We see up. We see down. We see deep. We
9 see forward. It's complexity. So a screening plan
10 that allows our eyes to engage again with that
11 complexity would be something that many of us feel
12 strongly about, and, again, yes, you're not going
13 to plant and it's going to fail. But there are
14 many species that are hearty and capable of what
15 are considered in subperfect conditions because
16 that's where they come from.

17 MR. PEZZULLO: Okay. Do we have any
18 particular suggestions, Drake? I -- again, I'm not
19 a plant person whatsoever. Like, what types of
20 plants are we talking about that we can explore?

21 MS. PATTEN: Well, I do. I'm not sure
22 that's where we are, but, certainly, I'd be looking
23 at things like chad. I'd be looking at Witch
24 Hazel. I'd be looking at certain viburnum, and
25 then for really sort of low and perineal plants,

1 I'd be looking at Jack-in-the-Pulpit, cohosh,
2 Solomon's seal, coneflower. I'd be looking at a
3 variety of ferns that are already native to our
4 area. So, you know -- and these -- I'm talking
5 some of those things can handle full shade. And
6 these are small to medium trees and shrubs. You
7 sort of get into partial shades, you're looking at
8 certain Dogwoods can handle that, American
9 Hazelnut. Again, your chad can move back and
10 forth. Red buds, Laurels, rhododendrons,
11 elderberry. We have elderberry over here in all
12 kinds of situations that are compromised. I live
13 on the same landscape. So I'm speaking from what I
14 know happens over there. And you guys know that I
15 have forests here, too, and I have ledge. So I'm
16 just trying to put out there that we do have
17 possibilities. I'm not a landscape architect. I'm
18 a farmer gardener, but I learn by doing. And
19 that's what I learned on this land. So that's the
20 best I can offer. But, yes, I do have plants that
21 I can suggest and people with more education than I
22 have in this area could probably suggest many more
23 and better ones.

24 MS. BRADFORD: I think those are good
25 suggestions. Most of them are not evergreens. So

1 the screening issue in the winter is still going to
2 depend on the density of this understory, I think.

3 MS. PATTEN: Yes. I hear you.

4 MR. CARTER: The other thing -- this is
5 John Carter -- that you have to keep in mind,
6 Drake, is that, you know, the term succession, I'm
7 sure you're familiar with that, and, you know, land
8 restores itself through a successional process. So
9 the understory doesn't appear when the overstory is
10 forty years old. They kind of grow up together and
11 take turns, whoever is the strongest survives and
12 so forth. So the plants you mentioned, as Sarah
13 said, you know, again, I'm kind of trying to bring
14 the focus back to screening, and, you know, my
15 comment about investing, what you just said,
16 bolstered that comment. That would take an
17 investment in time to actually have that do
18 something. So I think a cleaner solution is to use
19 native plants, use White Spruce. Use White Pine,
20 but have them be evergreen, have them be planted
21 where we can, pocket plant if there's clearing in
22 the 50-foot buffer. And if not, plant them along
23 the perimeter of the 50-foot buffer with an eye
24 towards them establishing and then providing a
25 year-round screen from the neighbors because I

1 think that's what we need to keep our eye focused
2 on.

3 MS. PATTEN: Well, I appreciate that and I
4 think your comment on succession is very important,
5 but with that note, I think mapping our assets and
6 our constraints would be important because I don't
7 know because I haven't spent that time in
8 Mr. Rossi's woods, but he could be coming to the
9 end of a number of his trees. They could be at the
10 termination of their life. And if that buffer zone
11 is that termination, then we actually don't have a
12 buffer zone. And that's a whole other thing that
13 we need to consider because if those trees are
14 naturally going to go because of succession, then
15 whatever we're doing needs to take that into
16 account. So I'm glad you brought that up because
17 that's really another thing we do need to think
18 about.

19 MR. VINCENT: So -- so as a next step,
20 is -- it seems like we need to have a better
21 understanding. We're coming back to our assets and
22 knowing what we're dealing with. John, what is a
23 reasonable way to map those and to identify those?

24 MR. CARTER: Well, honestly, I'm not quite
25 sure. I'm grasping the notion of assets. I think

1 that -- that what we need -- what we could do, if I
2 could offer, is there needs to be a meeting of the
3 minds and a firm agreement on what it is that's
4 proposed. I could do that with Sarah Bradford and
5 look at it. I think Ron Rossi would let Sarah and
6 I walk on his property and look at it along the
7 property lines where the views are critical and
8 maybe come up with some specific plantings in
9 specific areas, but I don't think that spending a
10 whole lot more time walking around the site is
11 going to be any more illuminating than the time
12 we've already spent out there. I personally have a
13 very good understanding of it.

14 MR. VINCENT: Sarah, what do you think
15 about that approach?

16 MS. BRADFORD: I think it certainly is
17 useful for me to see some more of the edge, the
18 north edge, if that was possible to get along there
19 and to be -- at the moment -- is it all stone
20 walls? Is that property line reasonably clear?

21 MR. ZEVON: Sarah, I'd love to have you
22 over to my house. Josh was here this week. This
23 is Dan Zevon. I'd be more than happy to show you
24 the northerly property, and the Swansons are my
25 next door neighbor. So you can see -- and you can

1 see where the boulders were removed and so forth.

2 MS. PATTEN: If a member of the advisory
3 committee are going to go, we should all be a part
4 of that, as long as we can be. I think that's
5 quite important. So we should go together.

6 MR. VINCENT: Jason, speaking of, you
7 know, having an on-site committee meeting, what, if
8 any -- this is not an elected body. We're not
9 officially appointed by the mayor. So does the
10 open meetings law even apply for the advisory
11 committee?

12 MR. PEZZULLO: It does not because it's
13 a -- it's a -- it's not a quorum. It's not an
14 official body. We're having this meeting for,
15 like, in this format for transparency purposes.
16 But any site visits to the property would require
17 the consent of the landowner.

18 MR. VINCENT: All right. But we're not in
19 violation of open meetings. So we could meet as an
20 advisory with the consent of landowner. Or as John
21 said, maybe John and Sarah look at what's there and
22 make a report to us because I think we're -- from
23 my point of view, we've hired Sarah as our
24 professional for the commission to critique and do
25 a peer review. So this is not the final plan by

1 any means. So I think it would be helpful if you
2 would give Sarah that opportunity to walk with the
3 applicant on the site.

4 MR. ZEVON: And for the abutters on their
5 site, too, Fred, I think that would be appropriate
6 because I know that on the site visit that took
7 place on the property in the van, Mr. Rossi said I
8 was on his property. So if I'm on my property and
9 he's misleading the people that are looking at what
10 they think is the site and I'm actually on my own
11 property, they're being misled as to what the
12 property line is. You know what I'm saying? So I
13 would like the site visit, if the City of Cranston
14 would allow that, for the residents to be able to
15 have the site from the abutters, and so you can see
16 what the situation is, or so that Sarah could see
17 it.

18 MS. PATTEN: I often wonder if we could,
19 for the purposes of the next meeting with this
20 group, which I, again, think would be nice if the
21 advisory group could meet, you know, fewer
22 additional voices, just so we could have a
23 conversation. I just want to restate that. I
24 think it would be great if we had some examples of
25 projects that perhaps have tackled a similar

1 situation. I mean, I'm sure we won't find
2 something identical, but I certainly have looked at
3 some projects just in my own curiosity about this
4 question of planting along the wooded area, and
5 trying to understand ways that this has been
6 approached by others. So perhaps we can do some
7 kind of a, you know, sort of a small little folder
8 of these are some projects that have tackled a
9 similar project, you know, problem, and come up
10 with a good resolution. Would that be of interest
11 to the advisory group?

12 MR. VINCENT: I think it's helpful to show
13 it to us; but, again, I mean, I think that what
14 John and Sarah -- we have to, you know, from my
15 perspective anyway, rely on their recommendations.
16 And if, in that recommendation, they want to show
17 us how it has worked at another site and,
18 therefore, it could work here, that's great. But,
19 you know, the other thing is, in fairness to the
20 applicant, we want to focus on this resource, on
21 this area, and spend the most time, I think, and
22 someone said that earlier, I think John was not
23 entirely wrong when he said we really should focus
24 on the areas that are going to be most impacted and
25 what we can do to those for that buffer -- to

1 buffer those impacts. And maybe, you know, I don't
2 think, as a nonprofessional, walking out to the
3 site, Drake, that I'm going to get that much more.
4 I would get a lot more if Sarah was describing what
5 could be done in certain areas and why. But just
6 to, you know -- that's where I think we need to
7 focus on.

8 MR. MURRAY: Jason, this is Bob Murray.
9 Could I just offer two thoughts? First, John
10 Carter will meet Sarah Bradford if she'd like at
11 the site. We would have no problem, and -- I'm
12 using that as an example, and Ron Rossi would
13 certainly allow Sarah and John to spend as much
14 time as necessary on the property, and we would
15 welcome that.

16 Secondly, Drake keeps suggesting about
17 that this committee just talk. We will not
18 participate in any backroom deal. We want full
19 transparency. We want other people to be aware
20 what's going on. So we will not participate in
21 anything that precludes public awareness of this
22 discussion.

23 And, lastly, it is important that on
24 behalf of the developer and the applicant and the
25 property owner, we'd like to move forward with

1 this, and we're not looking to drag this on for
2 months. We're talking about getting this wrapped
3 up in the short term, and we will commit ourselves
4 to working with the committee to do that, but I
5 want to be clear that this is, you know, this is
6 just one -- one preliminary step in a process that
7 has to go on. Thank you.

8 MS. PATTEN: Mr. Murray, let me be
9 perfectly clear with you. I don't appreciate any
10 indication that what I suggested was about creating
11 backroom deals. You have to be very careful with
12 your language, sir. So what I'm suggesting is an
13 advisory group that was put together and agreed
14 upon should have a chance to meet. That is not a
15 backroom deal. That is no more than what we were
16 asked to do. So I encourage you to be very careful
17 with that language.

18 MS. BRADFORD: Can I suggest that one of
19 the things that we need to move forward with this
20 and also understanding the project is to have a
21 better plan that shows existing contours with the
22 proposed grading so we know -- so we have a better
23 understanding of how much grading is being done and
24 that would -- is really a precursor to going any
25 further with any of the landscaping on site.

1 MR. PEZZULLO: I just wanted to ask David,
2 Dave, has the final grading been completed with the
3 DEM permit and the RIPDES permit?

4 MR. RUSSO: Yeah. It's all set. It's
5 actually on the landscape plan. I can see how
6 Sarah had a hard time seeing the existing contours.
7 They're light color. We could clarify that on the
8 plan just to make it a little clear. We can also
9 extend out the topography so he goes beyond the
10 perimeter of the property. I think that's what
11 she's getting at.

12 MS. BRADFORD: And that would help us and
13 maybe draw some, I guess, east/west sections would
14 help. So we can really understand how much
15 regrading is being done.

16 MR. RUSSO: Okay.

17 MR. PEZZULLO: Dave, are we able to
18 produce a plan without taking the aerial off so
19 that we can see a little bit better because the
20 aerial makes it really hard to see the contours.

21 MR. RUSSO: We can. We can give you both.
22 The aerials just help with the context of the
23 surrounding area, but that's no issue.

24 MR. PEZZULLO: All right. Thank you.

25 MS. PATTEN: We haven't heard tonight from

1 you, Lindsay, and I believe you are the applicant's
2 representative on the committee. So I was
3 wondering if you have any thoughts.

4 MS. MC GOVERN: Drake, I think a lot was
5 said tonight, and I think what the recommendation
6 we think is best is that the experts, Sarah and
7 John, meet on site and look at it together and work
8 collaboratively and come back with something that
9 they both think will solve everything that was
10 heard tonight.

11 MR. BERRY: Is there a reason why you
12 would want to preclude myself, Drake, or Mr. Zevon,
13 or Fred from being on site with Sarah and John?

14 MR. MURRAY: Josh, this is Bob. For
15 reasons that I really -- just separate and apart
16 from this committee, you know, the property owner
17 is not willing to allow other than the landscape
18 architect and the peer review landscape architect
19 on the property. I think you're intimately
20 familiar with it. Drake Patten is. Mr. Zevon is.
21 Fred has been there. And the -- as far as Miss
22 Swanson or Mr. Zevon allowing them on their
23 property, if asked, we'd certainly participate in
24 that. But we're not -- at this point, we think
25 everybody's familiar with it, and we're looking to

1 get the experts to talk to the experts on this.

2 MR. ZEVON: Yeah. No, I don't have any
3 inclination to ever want to set foot on that
4 property. But I would like, Sarah, if you would be
5 able, to get a different perspective from the
6 northerly side of the property on my property.

7 MS. BRADFORD: If we're at the property
8 line, I think we have a pretty good sense.

9 MR. ZEVON: And, again, that's, you know,
10 another bone of contention on exactly what is the
11 property line because when they had the busboy from
12 Spain Restaurant doing their site measurements,
13 they were going off of wrong site marks that are in
14 my deed. Okay. So that's another thing that we're
15 going to have to talk about at another future call.
16 But, again, I don't believe that the property
17 markers that they have are correct.

18 MR. MURRAY: First of all, I don't know if
19 that was a racial comment or what, but DiPrete
20 Engineering has qualified engineers --

21 MR. ZEVON: No. It was a guy named
22 German. See, I was working in my backyard right at
23 the wall, and a man named German was doing the --
24 supposedly the engineering, the site work, and he
25 told me that he's a bar back at Spain Restaurant,

1 but he's doing it, and that's when I pointed out
2 that you're measuring from the wrong cemetery.
3 There's a cemetery on my property and there's a
4 cemetery on the Manocchio property, and he didn't
5 note that, okay. So I'm pointing out -- now, I
6 have to go out and hire surveyors, my own surveyor
7 now, but I'm saying that when you're saying on the
8 property, the property line is still -- and Josh
9 Berry understands what I'm talking about. So we'll
10 talk about that, Bob. Thanks.

11 MR. RUSSO: Well, German does work at
12 Spain's, but he also has been a surveyor for 30
13 years, and a professional land surveyor stamped the
14 plan as a Class I survey. So that property is
15 accurate to a Class I standard.

16 MR. ZEVON: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. RUSSO: So unless you have a survey
18 plan that's different, that's a Class I survey.

19 MR. ZEVON: Right. So, like, the lawyers
20 that I've had to hire for the past two years, I'd
21 have to hire surveyors, and I've got two kids in
22 college. I'm just trying to get by. But thanks
23 for your comments, John.

24 MR. CARTER: That was Dave Russo.

25 MR. VINCENT: So to wrap up, folks, I

1 think -- I think Sarah needs to be on the property
2 and needs to have that discussion with John, and
3 I'm comfortable with that. I mean, I want to
4 benefit from her observation and her
5 recommendations. That's why we brought her.
6 That's why this committee exists to do a peer
7 review. So I'd like to have at least an action
8 step that we all agree on as part of our, you know,
9 the agenda for the next meeting, to have that site
10 visit, to have some recommendations or some
11 thoughts or preliminary findings that we can have
12 before the meeting, and then have a discussion at
13 our next meeting. I'd be better informed.

14 MS. MC GOVERN: I agree, and I think what
15 my suggestion would be is if we can set a date for
16 Sarah and John to meet on site so we can continue
17 to move this forward, and Dave Russo and John will
18 get the revised plans over to Sarah tomorrow
19 morning. If that works, I don't know, John will
20 make himself available any day, Sarah, your
21 earliest convenience, if we can select a day.

22 MS. BRADFORD: I think he and I have to
23 talk and figure out how this works without
24 schedules.

25 MS. MC GOVERN: Okay.

1 MR. CARTER: We can do that.

2 MR. VINCENT: And then you can just let
3 Josh know and then, Josh, you can -- you know, you
4 have our mailing, you have our e-mail. So you'll
5 be sending --

6 MR. BERRY: Yeah. I would say that, yeah,
7 I definitely appreciate Mr. Rossi allowing the site
8 visit for the master plan. That was a long time
9 ago, and my memory is not as sharp as I would like
10 it to be, and I wasn't looking at the property with
11 the same lens that I would be now, and I definitely
12 think that I would glean some -- some experience
13 from visiting the site again, and the condition
14 requires the applicant to take an inclusive
15 approach with direct abutters. So denying them to
16 come on the property doesn't seem to be the right
17 spirit of that inclusive approach, and to this -- I
18 wouldn't want that to get in the way of us doing
19 what we are conditioned to do.

20 MR. VINCENT: Well, maybe it's an issue of
21 timing, though, Josh, because I know what you're
22 saying, but I would want to have Sarah and John's
23 findings and some initial thoughts and
24 recommendations, and then as an advisory committee
25 you show that to the owner and say look, this is

1 the direction we're looking at, this is some of the
2 areas of concern. We want to go out as a committee
3 and make final decisions. I mean, we couldn't be
4 more transparent than that. So maybe it's -- maybe
5 it's not the next step, Josh, but the step after
6 the professionals do an assessment. Bob, is that
7 something you can facilitate?

8 MR. MURRAY: I can facilitate a meeting
9 immediately with Sarah and John. I'd urge them
10 tomorrow morning to get on the phone and coordinate
11 their calendar. And, you know, Josh, you know,
12 with all due respect, you obviously were out there
13 with Mr. Zevon apparently recently. So I think you
14 have a good handle on the situation there. So --
15 but, you know, if, you know, Mr. Zevon has
16 expressed no interest in going on the property,
17 which I respect, you know, we're just not in a
18 position to open up Mr. Rossi's property and,
19 therefore, I'd ask that we restrict it to the
20 experts that are helping this committee right now.
21 Is there anything else, Jason? Are we pretty much
22 done for tonight?

23 MR. PEZZULLO: Does -- is there any final
24 thoughts, comments from the -- from the rest of the
25 committee before we wrap this up tonight?

1 MR. VINCENT: I have just one final
2 comment, and I think Drake mentioned it and Josh
3 mentioned it. We have a mission statement. It's
4 clear from all of the public meetings what we
5 wanted to accomplish here. So I don't -- you know,
6 I, for one, feel like that's the guiding principle,
7 and, you know, hearing hours of testimony of
8 concerns, that came from those hours of testimony.
9 So I'm comfortable with that, and I think, you
10 know, the applicant knows that very well.

11 MR. PALUMBO: So, Fred, this is Ralph, and
12 I can respect that, but the inclusive approach does
13 not give me control over Mr. Rossi's property, and
14 we'll do our best to cover the ground. Other than
15 that, I do not have control over his property.

16 MR. PEZZULLO: I'd like to --

17 MR. VINCENT: We understand that, too, but
18 Mr. Rossi has a lot at stake here, and he's a
19 member of the community. So he needs to -- he
20 needs to respect the community, and we're not out
21 to penalize him. We're out to get the best
22 landscape buffer that we can that's fair to you and
23 fair to the neighbors. So I don't think Mr. Rossi
24 really should be objecting to that goal.

25 MR. PALUMBO: You know, I get it. But

1 it's his property, and it's his choice. It's not
2 my choice, and he does have a lot at stake and he
3 is a multi-generational community member here. So
4 he understands everything about this community, and
5 he, and he alone, knows what's best for him and his
6 property, and I have to respect that.

7 MR. PEZZULLO: I just want to say that
8 this condition was unprecedented. We've never had
9 a condition like this on the -- on a master plan,
10 and we've worked pretty hard to try to put this
11 committee together, get the plans together, get
12 everybody in one place, you know, couldn't have
13 anticipated Zoom calls like this. But us doing
14 this step is unprecedented. We've never done this.
15 There's 31 people on this call right now. We're
16 going to have an additional meeting after this, and
17 then whatever the recommendations are, we're still
18 going to have development plan review where the
19 landscape plan is going to be an issue and we're
20 also going to have the full blown public hearing
21 process for preliminary plan. So, you know, we're
22 going to keep refining whatever comes out of the
23 work of this committee, but I think that, you know,
24 I think there's a good step right now and, you
25 know, I'm looking forward to seeing what John and

1 Sarah come up with, and then moving on from there.
2 That's it.

3 MR. VINCENT: And I think that's how you
4 present it to Mr. Rossi that in the end this is
5 going to facilitate the better -- a better review
6 and outcome for all parties.

7 MR. MURRAY: All right, Jason, we want to
8 thank everybody for their time and once John and
9 Sarah hook up tomorrow, I'll let you know what
10 their plans are and you can -- and we can go from
11 there.

12 MR. PEZZULLO: All right. Thanks, Bob.

13 MR. MURRAY: Have a good night.

14 MR. PEZZULLO: Good night. Thank you
15 everyone for showing up.

16 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:14 P.M.)

17 *****

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 2d day of October, 2020.

Ronald M Ronzio, Notary Public

RONALD M. RONZIO, NOTARY PUBLIC/CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: July 24, 2021

IN RE: Cranston Planning Natick Solar advisory Committee

DATE: August 25, 2020