

Stockbridge Bowl Stewardship Commission

Friday November 4, 2022

Present: Roxanne McCaffrey (RM), Michael Nathan via ZOOM (MN), John Loiodice (JL), Patrick White (PW), Gary Kleinerman (GK) and Sally Underwood-Miller (SU).

Absent: Jim Wilusz, Mike Buffoni

Present via ZOOM: Pat Kennelly (PK)

The meeting was called to order by Roxanne McCaffrey at 8:04 a.m.

- Approval of October 7, 2022 minutes

Motion to approve- SUM, second PW, approved unanimously.

- Discussion of proposed weed harvesting

RM stated that the Stockbridge Bowl Association has offered to work on the possibility of creating a Notice of Intent (NOI) at their expense to expand harvesting for more than the existing 10-acre limit. PK confirmed the offer and said the draft NOI would be turned over to the Town for review and possible submission, stating this would be a Town NOI.

SU asked if this was additional NOI. DEP doesn't usually like 2 filings on the same project.

RM: Replied no, it would be a single, new NOI

GK where do we stand within the three-year opening on this being the first or second year?

RM: Responded, it's a three year permit with one more year – limited to 10 acres for each time we harvest.

PW: based on the Lycott study and the impact on harvesting of removing phosphorus and nitrogen, harvesting was seen as the best way to remove nutrients. He suggested crafting an NOI more like the SBA's original NOI which is an ecological restoration rather than a nuisance vegetation. Look at it as an ecological restoration not as revision of the nuisance harvesting permit.

MN: before we approach NHSP with a new NOI we should know exactly what their reaction is going to be. What could be the repercussions ?

RM: Clarified that it is a recreational permit, not called a nuisance vegetation permit. Because of herbicide project , the harvester had to avoid certain areas resulting in only seven acres; those restrictions are no longer in play - we can do 10 acres - we no longer need to avoid those areas.

PW: Would like to expand the NOI from the point of view of an ecological restoration.

RM: Stated she had confidence that the Stockbridge Bowl Association (SBA) would come back to the Town Administrator and the Select Board with a plan they think might be acceptable.

SU: Stated that the Fleetwood consultants could help recraft NOI make it more workable and get into the areas where people have encountered some difficulties.

RM: Fleetwood has insight in terms of what ecological restoration (invasive species) implies vs. recreational harvesting (native species). Fleetwood will have their insight that will possibly be very valuable in terms of how to do this.

SU: Mark Stinson is a walking encyclopedia when it comes to the wetlands protection act. They would be a great help.

MN: last year when we were having a problem with harvester sometimes water lilies stop being just a nuisance; they become detrimental to the lake when they cover over a certain amount or percentage of the area, like we have in the outlet. In parts of the outlet we have almost shore to shore lilies and what that does to the ecological well-being of the lake is detrimental in terms of heating up the water, etc.

PK: how do we approach Mark and or David in terms of asking their advice?

SU: Once there is a notice of intent in place or at least the bare bones of 1 and then we can ask them for a peer review.

- LMP: Review DRAFT of Lake and Watershed Management Plan (LMP)

SU: There is inconsistency with abbreviations throughout this document. Acronyms used but not defined WBP in this document that it should be defined in in parentheses that is the water based plan sometimes defined, sometimes not. The water chestnut doesn't tell you what it is; they use the scientific name only.

RM: it's just a matter of consistency both the scientific name and the common name should be included.

SU: Editing comments

p.18 issues with utility transmission lines run perpendicular. should say just utility transmission
Shadow Brook and Duckpond Brook are both defined as perennial streams rivers under the wetland's protection act. It says that they are prone to drying up during summer months and only run during storm events while Lily Brook runs while all year that would defy the definition of a perennial stream and I don't know that that's true.

BCD mentioned in Plan but does not have shore property

Need to define "DWM"

The 2002 report indicated that due to a clogged dam on Stockbridge limited only a tiny trickle to Larrywaug Brook that is in absolute violation of the permit. Shep Evans used to monitor I don't know if he still does. Tiny trickle means Larrywaug brook is drying up

RM: said that is in the state report as of 2002.

GK: stated it was always being cleared out and questioned the accuracy of this.

9 bathing beaches -wrong

Scientific names which I think need to be defined - need common names.

page 24 Stockbridge bowl is a Class B water body what does that mean?

(Note: Class B- inland body of water-high quality -not a reservoir)

p29: LMP: calling out insignificant paved places. not significant.

p34- Mohican Brook what is it? Is it a perennial stream? PW: map shows it by the boat club.

p35: grammatical correction as far as CO2 at bottom of lake.

p39: We should mention that the removal of plant material via harvesting certainly contributes to the lessening of nutrient loading due to dead and dying material.

p40: We should somehow mention the proliferation of phragmites etc. everywhere we go around the lake. the Somehow that should be part of lake management plan including removal of the of the land based invasive species.

Bullard Woods has an issue with barberry plants which harbor ticks – they are creeping into Gould meadows.

PK: The SBA is working on this with Jess Toro.

p.46 -Make consistent bullets vs sentences

p49 drawdown does not show why we don't drawdown:

SU also pointed out mussels' health as vital to Stockbridge Bowl health.

Use of herbicides: no data on impact on some critters (i.e. snails).

Concerned about benthic barriers negatively impacting fish and invertebrates RM: asked if there were guidelines regarding their use

SU: they have not been used

RM: stated more research should be done to determine what constitutes safe usage.

PW:

Expressed concern about climate change impacting the lake RM: Commented that climate change is one variable among many and a paragraph stressing that this is a living document which should be reviewed annually.

Fund raising/grant money helped by addressing Climate change

Make the case for climate narrative and how it impacts lake

SU:

Con-com concerns:

- Use of chemicals around Bowl...fertilizers including organic fertilizers.
- Salts on roads and driveways
- Over development concerns-limitation on build outs should be considered.
- Tree health must be a priority -need to replace them if cut down.
- 35 ft vegetative buffer around the lake- lawn to the lake not a good thing and is violation of the LOPD.
- Homeowners need to be stewards of lake and need to respect the processes and protections in place. Citizens are encouraged to ask the Conservation Commission before embarking on any project within 200 feet of the lake.
- Docks require filing for a Chapter 91 license.
- Erosion of and into lake needs to be controlled.

RM: Many of these items are potential discussions regarding bylaw changes.

MN:

In Executive summary:

add "Stockbridge Bowl not just for Stockbridge residents but for the whole Berkshire community at large.

Important for raising funds and emphasizing it is a most important natural resource for the Berkshires.

RM: People come from all over to Stockbridge Bowl. We can beef up the Executive Summary by copying where we have already included the extensive usage of the lake.

Page1: adding. We are dredging to keep the bowl ecosystem healthy (as much as for recreational issues). It cannot become a bog like Lily Brook.

P23: Include silting in of outlet.

P25 in watershed 2nd paragraph:

Refers to Lily Brook pond filling in and then adds “plans to dredge outlet channel”. No connection of outlet issues to Lily Pond unless we state that we do not wish what happened to Lily Brook to happen to the outlet and that is why we are dredging.

P26: Additional goals:

When we voted the primary goal was dredging.

Recommend take out the word “Additional”.

Voted to take out the word “Additional”; unanimously approved.

Need to mention “why it is so important to state why restoration is so important to the health of the bowl. How Tenneco pipelines has caused these unnatural eutrophication and unhealthy current situation.

SU: Improved flow of the outlet will improve oxygenation.

PW: Water flow keeps water cooler which is climate issue.

GK: Improved flow will help sediment leave the lake.

RM: GZA left water flow in the document as an important issue.

MN: table of contents: where can the Plan be easily located.

RM: This is meant to be a technical document.

RM: Expressed her appreciation to everyone for their input. Being a diverse group gives varying points of view to be discussed.

- Stakeholder updates

- Board of Health – Jim Wilusz – no updates

- Water Dept. – Mike Buffoni – no updates

- Water and Sewer Commission – John Loiodice – no updates

- Conservation Commission – Sally Underwood-Miller

- Stockbridge Bowl Association – Michael Nathan – no updates

- Select Board – Patrick White – no updates

- Stockbridge Harbormaster – Gary Kleinerman – no updates

- Stockbridge Sportsman’s Club - Roxanne McCaffrey – no updates

- Public comment – PK suggested the addition of a glossary

Meeting adjourned at 9:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Nathan/Roxanne McCaffrey