

Holyoke Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes 04/14/2022 (Remote via Zoom)

Conservation Commission Members Present: Bernice Bowler (Chairperson), Jeffrey Horan (Vice Chairperson), Michael Dodge, Mary Moriarty, John Perdrizet, Chelsea Gazillo, Rosemary Arnold

Conservation Commission Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Yoni Glogower (Holyoke Conservation and Sustainability Director)

Members of the public present: Robert Peirent (Applicant), Melissa Coady (Tighe & Bond), Steve Sroka (Tighe & Bond), Patrick Donahoe (Delorean Power), Rory Jones (Delorean Power)

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Bowler called the public meeting to order. She explained the requirement of a roll call vote, and asked everyone not part of a commission to use Zoom's chat feature to give name and affiliation or address for the attendance record.

2. Item No. 1 - Request for Determination of Applicability (continued) – Filed 2/2/2022

Applicant: City of Holyoke, c/o Robert Peirent, City Engineer

Location: Swale between Fairmont St and Mowry Ave (MBP 153-00-027, 028)

Description: Drain damage repair + replacement

Chairperson Bowler introduced the first RDA filed by Robert Peirent, city engineer for the City of Holyoke. It was for drain damage repair and replacement for the swale between Fairmont Street and Mowry Avenue.

Chairperson Bowler indicated that, when previously discussed, there was an issue whether the project was within the 50-foot buffer, and that Mr. Peirent had since provided updated information for necessary accommodations. Chairperson Bowler stated that the first issue to address would be whether they can allow a variance or not, and asked Director Glogower to display the revised letter from Mr. Peirent requesting the variance.

Mr. Peirent discussed the four pertinent items to verify that a variance may be approved. First, he indicated that they will leave the buffer zone in its existing condition to the extent that they can. He said that they would remove a short piece of pipe and stabilize the channel at its current location as opposed to trying to reconstruct and reinstall a new section of pipe and creating much more disturbance. He expressed intent to keep the equipment brought on site as small as possible, possibly utilizing only a small excavator and a large pickup truck. He informed that part of the project would entail removing a series of small tree pieces from the buffer zone. The large stump in the area would not be removed, but the mass of it would be cut down significantly to reduce the amount of weight leaning on it, preventing future problems. Responding to a prompt from Chairperson Bowler, Mr. Peirent estimated 1,000 square feet as the square footage impact, due to the footprint of getting vehicles in and out of the work area.

For the second item, Mr. Peirent informed that they had already moved forward with an alternative to the original plan, which was to remove the stump and restore the pre-existing pipe. The proposed alternative was to leave everything as is and stabilize it to reduce the chance for future problems, thus having much less impact than what was originally proposed.

For the third item, Mr. Peirent pointed out that the location of that particular lot provides a challenge due to there being an existing drain outlet located in the resource area. He added that putting that outlet in another location would require a large amount of re-piping work, and another location could have more significant resource area impacts. Chairperson Bowler inquired about proposed mitigation, and Mr. Peirent expressed intent to remove material placed in and around the resource area by the adjoining property owner and then re-loom and seed the impacted area with conservation mix to restore it to its original condition.

Chairperson Bowler asked if the Commissioners had any questions, which they did not, and then asked if everyone was comfortable with the four requirements. Vice Chair Horan expressed his contentment, stating that the impacts would be temporary and that it would be an improvement. He did not think it necessary to require mitigation other than to restore the site as effectively as possible.

3. Roll Call Vote - Approve Variance

Vice Chair Horan made a motion to approve the variance for the project at location MBP 153-00-027, 028. Commissioner Moriarty seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the variance.

4. Roll Call Vote - Approve Request for Determination of Applicability

Chairperson Bowler stated that they probably want to do a Negative #3 determination and have conditions on it, and asked Director Glogower if there was anything in particular they should be addressing. Director Glogower affirmed what Mr. Peirent mentioned about having erosion control installed prior to the work, and the proposal of a Negative #3. Chairperson Bowler requested a motion to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability as a Negative #3 with the stated conditions. Vice Chair Horan responded with a motion, and Commissioner Moriarty seconded the motion. But then, Director Glogower indicated he may have misspoke, indicating that they had discussed in a previous meeting that an exemption may apply to the project as a public utility repair, and that the appropriate determination was Negative #5. Vice Chair Horan retracted the previous motion and made a new motion to accept the Request for Determination of Applicability at location MBP 153-00-027, 028 with a Negative #5, all other conditions being equal. Commissioner Moriarty seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability.

5. Item No. 2 - Request for Determination of Applicability (continued) – Filed 2/2/2022

Applicant: City of Holyoke, c/o Robert Peirent, City Engineer

Location: 640 Homestead Avenue (MBP 162-00-002)

Description: Emergency generator installation of paved area within buffer zone of unnamed intermittent channel

Chairperson Bowler introduced the request and confirmed that it does work within the 50-foot buffer. She requested that Mr. Peirent discuss information for a variance. Mr. Peirent began by stating that the proposed emergency generator would be located in the existing paved area on the south side of the fire station, and that there would be no new impervious service. He estimated that the impacts of the project would extend about 10 feet into the 50-foot buffer. He provided a series of safeguards to protect against any temporary impacts, which included sudden erosion control measures for the intermittent stream, and mitigation of potential fuel impacts with a dual-wall fuel tank, leak sensor, overflow alarming and a spill containment tank. He estimated about 100 square feet of impact within the 50-foot buffer zone. He informed that the generator could not feasibly be located inside of the building because of electrical code requirements. He discussed the problems with alternative outside locations next to the fire station, and assured that there is not much to mitigate since the project should not have much impact.

Chairperson Bowler pointed out that the Commission's aim is to see where footage is affected. She quoted Mr. Peirent's measure of 100 square feet, and stated the Commission tries to go with three times that in having

mitigation or restoration improve the area around it. Mr. Peirent then mentioned the possibility of doing some type of vegetative enhancement to the slope leading down to the channel, using native plantings to be placed along the slope to return it to a more natural state. Chairperson Bowler asked if the lawn would be removed in that process, and Mr. Peirent answered that they would be planting through the lawn with the idea of backing away from mowing of that area, that the native plantings would be adjacent to the intermittent stream, serving as a buffer, causing the area to go fallow and return to a more natural state. He added that the process would take a couple of years.

Chairperson Bowler asked if there were any questions. Commissioner Moriarty asked if the spill containment tank was a response to a question from a previous meeting about a containment arrangement in the event of a spill. Mr. Peirent clarified that it was containment to overflowing of the tank. Commissioner Moriarty asked if Mr. Peirent meant that there would be no chance of fuel escaping into the environment in some way, and he replied saying that such an event is always possible unless a wall were to be built around the installation, which would cause problems with rainwater. Commissioner Moriarty asked if there is a berm on the right side of the driveway, and Mr. Peirent replied that he did not believe so. Wondering about the possibility of a spill, Commissioner Moriarty asked if the driveway would be sloping down and out towards the street. Mr. Peirent answered no, that the driveway slopes down toward an intermittent brook.

Vice Chair Horan spoke up and stressed how small of a project it was, and that mitigation may not even be required. He suggested that a mulched area could serve as mitigation through absorption in the event of a spill. Chairperson Bowler asked if others were comfortable with that, and Commissioner Moriarty voiced that she was. Chairperson Bowler asked if the Commission wanted to condition it so Mr. Peirent worked with Director Glogower to get an approved planting plan for the area, and Vice Chair Horan gave his approval. Director Glogower asked the Commission if they wanted to see the plan when possible. Vice Chair Horan and Chairperson Bowler said that they did not think that would be necessary.

Commissioner Moriarty asked if a vote was needed for the variance. Chairperson Bowler first asked if there were any questions, and there were none.

6. Roll Call Vote - Approve Variance

Commissioner Moriarty expressed her desire to vote to approve the variance, and confirmed with Chairperson Bowler that it was not necessary to put in the business of conditions. She then made a motion to approve the variance for the project at location MBP 162-00-002. Commissioner Arnold seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the variance.

7. Roll Call Vote - Approve Request for Determination of Applicability

Before the vote, Chairperson Bowler first double-checked what the Commission would do about conditions. She cited the plantings and then asked if there was anything else, to which Commissioner Moriarty replied mentioning mulch. Chairperson Bowler asked Director Glogower if there was anything else to add, to which he replied mentioning the installation of an erosion control device. Chairperson Bowler asked Director Glogower if it would be a Negative #3, and he confirmed. Chairperson Bowler asked for a motion, and Commissioner Moriarty made a motion to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability, a Negative #3 for the location of Fire Station No. 6, the emergency generator project, with conditions. Commissioner Arnold seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability.

8. Item No. 3 - Request for Determination of Applicability (continued) – Filed 2/2/2022 Applicant: City of Holyoke, c/o Robert Peirent, City Engineer

Location: Rail spur behind 49 Garfield Street (MBP 056-00-002)

Description: new drain installation within buffer zone of existing pond

Chairperson Bowler began by mentioning a previous issue with the 50-foot buffer zone. She stated that a site visit had been conducted with multiple commissioners. She also introduced the issue of whether this had to be dealt with as an RDA or whether an abbreviated NOI would be necessary. Chairperson Bowler first expressed her wish to discuss the site visit first, and asked those who visited to give their opinion on whether to consider the project an RDA or NOI. She asked whether it was Vice Chair Horan and Commissioner Perdrizet at the site visit.

Commissioner Perdrizet confirmed that he and Vice Chair Horan were the ones at the visit, and deferred the first speaking opportunity. Vice Chair Horan expressed that it would be beneficial for the site to be separated out of the sewer system and drained to the river. He commented on how strange the area is. He stated that he did not think an NOI would be appropriate. He said that they had talked about only including the area of the project that was within the buffer and separating out the rest of it, and that it could be technically approved as written. He asked Director Glogower for comment.

Director Glogower said that, in the last meeting, they discussed why the other drainage repair fits under an exemption and the current one does not. He stated that it was clear that the actual resource area is actually upgrading it from where the excavation would be taking place, that Mr. Peirent said the disturbance would only be a matter of a week or two, and that it is clear work is taking place within the buffer zone as defined in the regulations. He assured that the commission is still in power to issue a Negative #3 determination. He pointed out that the site is disturbed with many invasive species, and a condition may be added for using native seed mix as a form of mitigation. He gave the opinion that, after the installation of the pipe, it would be unlikely to have to be dug up again anytime soon. Commissioner Perdrizet gave his total agreement, saying the site is very disturbed and that there is not much to worry about.

Chairperson Bowler asked if there were questions about the issue of being an RDA or an NOI, and there were not. She then requested that Mr. Peirent go over the variance request.

Mr. Peirent confirmed that the impacts to the buffer zone would be relatively limited because everything flows away from the resource area, and that they would be temporary. He claimed the work would take a short time, with the pipe being installed in a couple days and a little bit more time for planting. He also expressed intention to work with Director Glogower to delay or prevent the movement of invasives back into the area. Chairperson Bowler requested the square footage, and Mr. Peirent indicated it may be in the range of 2,000 to 3,000 square feet. Vice Chair Horan reiterated that the reason why it has to parallel the resource area is because, otherwise, it would have to go under the railroad siding. Mr. Peirent agreed, explaining how there is not a lot of space in the location, and describing the space that is available.

Mr. Peirent pointed out the next item being the issue of where to put the pipe. He said that they plan to intercept the drainage before it connects to the sewer system so that it stays clean water. He claimed the north side of the building is the only feasible place to put the pipe. He explained that they originally looked at connecting directly into the pond and that such a plan would have much more disruption.

Chairperson Bowler inquired about the mitigation. Mr. Peirent described that they would be preserving the cleanliness of about 100,000 gallons of water per day that had been getting mixed with sewage, and that the project was about having a positive environmental benefit. Vice Chair Horan also pointed out that it would benefit the swale in the area that the pipe will be installed, and Mr. Peirent agreed. Mr. Peirent detailed another benefit of the project, that 12,000 square feet of paved surface alongside Tsubaki's building would be

replaced with lawn due to them not wanting that area for parking anymore. He then described how half a dozen catch basins would also be redirected to the new drain line.

Chairperson Bowler asked if there were further questions about the variance request, and there were none.

9. Roll Call Vote - Approve Variance

Vice Chair Horan made a motion to approve the variance for the project at location MBP 056-00-002.

Commissioner Dodge seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the variance.

10. Roll Call Vote - Approve Request for Determination of Applicability

Chairperson Bowler requested to discuss conditions. Director Glogower confirmed that it would be a Negative #3. Vice Chair Horan stated that, based on Mr. Peirent's statements, the swale area would be graded and returned to a gently sloping swale with an appropriate conservation mix. He asserted that the 12,000 square feet would be included as consideration for mitigation, and that it would not be impervious. Mr. Peirent pointed out that it is property the city does not own, and that they have received the right to enter and hope to obtain a long-term easement to allow pipe maintenance. Director Glogower asked Mr. Peirent if he would put silt fencing or silt sacks along the resource area. Mr. Peirent stated the plan to put silt sacks in the catch basins.

Chairperson Bowler requested a motion. Vice Chair Horan made a motion to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability with a Negative #3 for the Springdale Pond along Garfield Street. Commissioner Arnold seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to approve the Request for Determination of Applicability.

11. Item No. 4 - Public Hearing (continued) – Notice of Intent WE 186-0293 (continued from 3/10/22 Meeting)

Applicant: Holyoke Water Works

Representative: Tighe & Bond

Location: Whiting Street Reservoir (MBP 213-00-006)

Description: Dam improvements within Bordering Land Subject to Flooding, Land Under Water Bodies, Riverfront, and Inland Banks

Chairperson Bowler introduced Holyoke Water Works, represented by Tighe & Bond, for the dam improvements within bordered land subject to flooding. She announced that Ms. Coady would be first to speak.

Ms. Coady introduced herself and project engineer and project manager Mr. Sroka, also from Tighe & Bond. She stated that they had conducted a site visit with the Commission on March 22, attended by Chairperson Bowler, Vice Chair Horan, Commissioner Moriarty and Director Glogower. She said that she had requested a continuation of the meeting on March 24 without attending, because they had been waiting to hear from Natural Heritage, who had not completed their review under the Wetlands Protection Act and MESA. She explained that correspondence was received dated March 30, which stated that the project must be conditioned in order to avoid adverse effects and a prohibited take. Ms. Coady clarified that the project may proceed under these conditions and would not require a conservation or management permit. She said that one thing Natural Heritage had been waiting for was comments from the state fisheries biologists relative to the requested drawdown. Ms. Coady requested Director Glogower that she have permission to share her screen over Zoom, first to show the Commission a relevant email. She explained that one concern related to the rate of discharge to the existing stream channel from the reservoir. Ms. Coady showed a map over Zoom to explain the route of the previous site visit and also the flow of the channel. The diagram showed comments from the Mass Wildlife Fisheries in blue. Ms. Coady discussed that one of the concerns had to do with the rate of discharge, and explained the desired rate limit. She explained that Holyoke Water Works been discharging through the low

level outlet for many years so the spillway does not overtop, because the impoundment is in such poor condition. She assured that the proposal for the draw-down to facilitate construction was less than the discharge that occurs during a one-year storm event. She stated that the plan was to start draw-down no later than April 15, and that the goal was to achieve the target draw-down depth by May 1, with fisheries and Natural Heritage advising refill should not begin until after November 15. She assured that there were no conditions in the Natural Heritage letter that were inconsistent with the proposed activities. She also explained that the letter is valid for five years, and that the city's goal was to put the project out to bid by next winter with construction commencing in 2023, with the goal to conduct this during one season. Ms. Coady then asked for questions or comments regarding the Natural Heritage letter.

Commissioner Moriarty inquired about something not related to the letter, hearkening back to a question from the site visit about whether the stones and dinosaur tracks would merely be put in a stockpile. Ms. Coady answered that the city had not yet decided on a final resolution, but that they would be preserved. She recognized the importance of the issue but had to explain that it is outside the purview of the Wetlands Protection Act regulations and not the priority of the project, limiting the amount that they can be involved with it.

Vice Chair Horan asked Ms. Coady the crow fly distance from the spillway to Route 91, and Mr. Sroka answered that the perpendicular distance is about 1,900 feet.

Chairperson Bowler posed a question about Item #2 on Page 2 of the National Heritage letter, about the rare vertebrate protection plan, asking Ms. Coady how they would apply with the division and get permits. Ms. Coady replied stating that the habitat is one of several data-sensitive species. She assured that the protection plan consists of a narrative description of the options that will be implemented by a Natural Heritage-approved biologist prior to commencement of any work on site, and potentially daily during construction, to ensure that the work area is clear of any of these particular species, and that the protection plan will be submitted to Natural Heritage for their review. She clarified that Tighe & Bond would not do this work, but that it would be subcontracted to a specialists who would handle the wildlife and report to Natural Heritage.

Chairperson Bowler asked if there were other questions. Director Glogower said no, but commented on the poor condition of the spillway and that this project seems timely and expedient. He reminded the Commission that all seven conditions that were specified in the Natural Heritage letter would be added to special conditions and the order of conditions.

Chairperson Bowler raised the issue of whether or not to close the public hearing at the current time. She explained that they may want to leave it open for the purpose of asking the applicant questions while working with the order of conditions. Director Glogower confirmed that leaving it open would leave it to be discussed at the April 28 meeting. Vice Chair Horan asked if a variance request may be needed, and Director Glogower said that it would be. Vice Chair Horan suggested that they could possibly vote on and approve the variance without closing the hearing, but Chairperson Bowler was unsure whether or not that was the case. Chairperson Bowler asked if they should go through the variance request in case there was any pertinent additional information, and Vice Chair Horan opined that it would be wise.

Chairperson Bowler requested that Ms. Coady go through the four items required for the variance. Ms. Coady reiterated that the project qualifies for limited project status under the Wetlands Protection Act, 310 CMR 10533I, maintenance repair and improvement, but not substantial enlargement of a dam. She continued that the spillway is increasing, but the dam itself is not, so the spillway is increasing into the dam, and this is necessary because there is no way to address the dam relative to the relevant performance standards. She stated that, under the city's ordinance, there is work within the inner 50-foot buffer zone relative to spillway replacement and the installation of the culverts. She assured that they prepared an alternatives analysis

addressing the existing infrastructure, and that to address the spillway capacity issues limitations to the existing lot is dictated by the existing dam and office of dam safety regulations. She informed that they had proposed during construction to use proper erosion and sedimentation controls to protect water quality, and that they will restore disturbed areas with native live stakings and tubelings. She commented on the impact of the project, stating that work has been in the inner 50-foot buffer zone and that there is overlap with the work in BLSF at several locations, which they intend to view as a singular footprint. She pointed out that alternatives are summarized in Table 4.1. She explained that dam removal is not a viable option, because the reservoir is still technically an emergency surface water intake as a public water supply, and that they cannot cite the project outside the 50-foot buffer zone. She affirmed that this is a necessary project to maintain or bring the dam back into compliance with dam safety regulations, and that they are proposing enhancement with native species following the completion of construction.

Chairperson Bowler asked if the Commission was comfortable with the given information, and Vice Chair Horan answered yes. Chairperson Bowler suggested that they save the vote until next time and keep the hearing open. Vice Chair Horan asked Director Glogower if they are missing anything, and he replied assuring that he will send the draft conditions as discussed.

12. Roll Call Vote - Continue the Public Hearing to 4/28/2022 Meeting

Chairperson Bowler requested a motion to continue the public hearing to the 4/28/2022 meeting, and Commissioner Moriarty moved. Commissioner Perdrizet seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to continue.

13. Item No. 5 - Public Hearing – Notice of Intent (DEP File # pending)

Applicant: Delorean Power

Representative: BL Companies

Location: 361 Whitney Avenue (MBP 176-00-036)

Description: Construction of a battery energy storage system within the 100-foot buffer zone of bordering vegetated wetlands.

Chairperson Bowler asked Director Glogower if they had received the abutter notification confirmation, and Director Glogower confirmed that they had, and that legal notice had been posted within the five-day required period. Chairperson Bowler also asked if they had a DEP file number yet, and Director Glogower answered that they had not.

Chairperson Bowler announced that they were ready to open the hearing, and asked who they would be speaking with. Mr. Donahoe introduced himself and Rory Jones from Delorean Power. Chairperson Bowler requested an explanation of their project. Mr. Donahoe announced the proposal to install a 5-megawatt battery energy storage project at 361 Whitney Ave, adjacent to the Baystate Medical Facility, for two purposes, to provide back-up power to the facility and to provide grid services to Holyoke Gas & Electric when not providing that back-up power. He provided additional details to the project, that it sits on just under 8,000 square feet, that it is a lithium ion battery project, and that it ties into the grid and the transformers that serve the Baystate Medical building. Lastly, he stated that what brings them here was the fact that part of the project is within the 100-foot wetlands buffer zone, approximately 5,290 square feet. Chairperson Bowler requested a description of the project and the work involved. Mr. Donahoe shared a visual of the project area to describe where everything will be located and connected, including four battery containers, two transformers, communications and switchgear equipment, and an underground cableway that runs to a transformer. He described how their trucks will get in and out of the facility. He continued and detailed potential disturbance in the area. Commissioner Perdrizet asked about the particulars of a crushed stone footprint, and Mr. Donahoe pointed out a fenced area that they plan to fill with the crushed stone. Chairperson Bowler requested detail on the type of

disturbance around a particular area where there will be temporary work. Mr. Donahoe explained that it would be a temporary trench disturbance to lay an electrical line, and that it would be restored to the prior condition.

Chairperson Bowler inquired if there were additional questions. Vice Chair Horan asked about where the site drains. Mr. Donahoe shared the estimate of about 1,400 square feet of impervious area to be created, and that they had spoken with Mr. Peirent, who does not have jurisdiction over the pertinent drainage or storm water controls. Vice Chair Horan asked what direction it drains to, and whether it would be into the 50-foot buffer. Mr. Donahoe replied that they do not have any drainage infrastructure plans to be built in, and that they plan to manage some of the storm drains with hay bales and silt fence. Chairperson Bowler asked how long the installation is expected to take, and Mr. Donahoe answered that it would likely be a couple months. Chairperson Bowler asked if there were any other commissioner questions. Commissioner Moriarty thanked Mr. Donahoe for including the requirement of a pre-construction meeting with a representative of the conservation commission and asked what other agencies in Holyoke will be permitting. Mr. Donahoe said they would have to get a multiple principal structures permit with the building commission. Commissioner Moriarty asked why Mr. Peirent said the city has no control over storm water in the area. Mr. Donahoe clarified that the square footage of the new impervious area and the total disturbance area fall well short of the thresholds. Commissioner Moriarty asked what the fire department says, also expressing surprise that they will not be involved with the project. Mr. Donahoe explained the typical procedure of meeting with the fire department pre-construction, and that they would plan to do so in this case. Commissioner Moriarty asked who will be the owner, and Mr. Donahoe answered that the facility will be owned by Delorean Power. Commissioner Moriarty asked if there is a take-down agreement, and Mr. Donahoe explained that, as part of their lease with Baystate, at the end of the useful life cycle of 20 years, they would remove all equipment and restore the site to its original condition. Commissioner Moriarty asked if they could see the wording of it, and Mr. Donahoe gave his intent to follow up with it. Commissioner Moriarty asked to clarify something on the diagram, and Mr. Donahoe was unsure as it was not associated with their project. Commissioner Moriarty asked why the Baystate parking lot couldn't have been the site of the project, and Mr. Donahoe answered that it was not feasible due to the requirement of clean flow in the parking lot for both patients and staff. Director Glogower announced that a site visit is to take place before the next meeting, and the Commission agreed to schedule it for Monday, April 25 at 8:30 a.m.

14. Roll Call Vote - Continue the Public Hearing to 4/28/22 Meeting

Vice Chair Horan made a motion to continue the public hearing to the 4/28/22 meeting. Commissioner Moriarty seconded the motion. Commissioners then voted unanimously to continue.

15. Item No. 6 - Discussion – Upcoming Items for 4/28/22 Meeting

Chairperson Bowler asked what else is on the agenda for the 4/28/22 meeting, and if any new items had come in. Director Glogower answered no, but that a new Notice of Intent for the Jones Ferry dock improvements and an RDA for storm and water improvements for roadways around Holyoke Community College would be submitted for a following meeting. Commissioner Moriarty asked whether the Holyoke Community College would be an NOI or RDA, and Director Glogower answered that it would be an RDA with some supplemental details. Commissioner Moriarty asked the same about the Jones Ferry project, and Director Glogower answered that it would be an NOI. Commissioner Moriarty asked if the NOI they just heard was with BL Companies, and Director Glogower confirmed that it was. Commissioner Moriarty asked whether another NOI was coming or not, and Director Glogower answered that an RDA would be coming for Freight Farms to move their hydroponics, for a meeting in May. Commissioner Perdrizet asked what happened to a certain Dunkin' Donuts locations, and Vice Chair Horan indicated that there is a lawsuit and that it is not their commission.

16. Adjourn

The Commission adjourned the meeting.