

MEMBERS PRESENT –Frank Woodfall, Acting Chairman (FW), Bert O’Donnell (BO), James Kilcoyne (JK), Rick Carberry (PC), Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator (BG).

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT – Robert Conlon, Chairman (RC), Art Lage (AL)

CALL TO ORDER

- FW makes a motion to open the meeting at 7:00 pm. BO second. Approved 4-0-0.

MINUTES

- FW makes a motion to approve the minutes of 6/5/18 and 1/8/2019 as written. PC second. Approved 4-0-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2780 Kelly, 509 Highland Street (Septic).....cont from 12/18/18 (Bert)

- Continued hearing. Hearing Officer FW confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- BG advises he has received a correspondence from NHESP with no demonstrative comments, and the hearing can now be closed. He recommends the standard special conditions for a septic upgrade.
- FW asks for comments from Commissioners and public; none.
- FW makes a motion to close the hearing and issue Orders of Conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. JK second. Approved 4-0-0.

19-03 Marshfield Beaches, Third and Fifth Roads (Beach Access Repairs).....NEW (Rick)

- FW reads legal ad. Hearing Officer PC confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Beach Supervisor Cindy Castro (CC) advises that revetment stones have washed into the Third and Fifth Road pathways during recent winter storms; they would like to move these stones to the side of the path and clear the pathways prior to Memorial Day.
- PC advises he visited the site today, and looks like a straightforward project; the stones need to be moved to create access and enhance public safety.
- FW would like to add a provision allowing them to perform periodic maintenance without having to reappear. PC advises this would apply only for work of a similar scope, and larger projects would still require an appearance. FW adds they should notify the Conservation Office prior to starting any such maintenance and the Commission assents.
- PC makes a motion to close and issue a DOA, Neg. # 3, with special conditions drafted by BG. JK second. Approved 4-0-0.

2774 Aubut, 33 Old Ferry Street (Septic).....cont from 12/04/18 (Bert)

- Continued hearing. Hearing Officer BO confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Terry McGovern (TM), Stenbeck & Taylor, presents for applicant. The project involves the replacement of a septic system. TM notes that the original proposal required filling of the site and construction of a retaining wall adjacent to a neighboring property. The Board of Health has since instructed them to change their design to a tight tank system in keeping with other systems in the area.
- TM advises that the tight tank system is proposed to be the same location. The tank will be completely below ground, so no change in the grade will be needed. The existing cesspool will be filled. Erosion control will be added to the perimeter of the site as well as one conservation marker in the back corner of the lot, near the salt marsh. The cover on top of the tank will be below-grade but uncovered so it can be accessed for pumping. Some concrete will be added to the top of the tank to keep it in place when being pumped out.

- In response to a query from JK, TM indicates the retaining wall is not needed for the tight tank; this addresses the primary concern of the abutter. JK also asks about alarms; TM indicates there is an alarm for pumping, with battery back-up. Once the alarm is triggered, 24 hours of storage remains. The tank is gravity-fed from the house, and will likely be pumped out every 4-6 weeks.
- BG notes that the new system has a smaller footprint and likely will have fewer impacts. He recommends approval with the standard special conditions plus the addition of one conservation marker in the back corner of the lot near the salt marsh.
- JK notes that the 12/28/18 plans were not received at the Conservation Office by the deadline, and asks if the Commission can close without them in hand. BG indicates he and TM had discussed the updated plan, and this appears to be an oversight. FW adds that TM has offered to leave behind his own plan for the Commission file as the drawing of record.
- BO asks for comments from the public; none.
- BO makes a motion to close the hearing and issue Orders of Conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. FW second. Approved 4-0-0.

2782 Ricciarelli, 1203 Ferry Street (Raze & Rebuild SFH).....NEW (Bert)

- FW reads legal ad. Hearing Officer BO confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Terry McGovern (TM), Stenbeck & Taylor, presents for applicant. Applicant would like to demolish the existing SFH, remove debris scattered throughout the site, and construct a new SFH in the center of the lot; this will create some separation to the rear property and wetland lines. They are proposing to add conservation markers along the 25 ft setback to the wetlands, and provide plantings in this area as well as the southwest corner of the lot. In response to a request from BG, they will take out the chain link and wire fences on the lot.
- Impervious area will be decreased by about 80 sq ft. The new house will be elevated on a filled foundation, with smart vents. On the south side of the lot, a 3-bedroom septic system will be installed with a gravity-fed Fast treatment tank that will meet the 50 ft setback both from the rear marsh area and the wetland on the other side of Ferry Street. They will be asking for a local variance from the Board of Health but no state variances. They are appearing before the Board of Health next Monday, and TM suggests that the hearing be continued to February 5 so that any BOH changes can be incorporated into the plan.
- FW asks about the square footage of the existing house; TM indicates 1282 sq ft. In response to a query from PC, TM indicates they are eliminating the paved driveway on the left side of the lot and adding a new one to the right side, resulting in a net decrease in impervious surface about 80 sq ft. JK comments that there may an opportunity for the Commission to get more permeable surfaces on this lot by requiring the use of permeable pavers. In response to a query from BO, BG indicates he is satisfied with the wetland delineation.
- JK asks whether the site as designed will redirect flood waters to neighboring properties. TM states that flood waters will pass around or under the house and into the marsh. JK asks TM whether flood waters primarily come from the river to the marsh or from the marsh to the river; TM feels there is movement in both directions but water more commonly comes from the back part of the yard.
- FW asks TM whether the grades on the south side can be pulled in to keep a five-foot swale along the property line to prevent flooding of the adjacent property. TM feels he can tighten the grade and possibly extend the retaining wall.
- JK asks whether flood water coming from the marsh would hit the retaining wall and be funneled toward the neighboring property. FW reviews the plan and notes there are two swales to channel any flood water.
- All parties discuss the use of pervious pavers on the site. BG discusses the use of such systems with a geo-grid in recent projects, which can be plowed. PC notes that when this area floods, there is water everywhere, and he doesn't think pervious pavers would help much. FW adds that the water table is above the driveway. TM feels that pervious pavers are helpful in dune areas with sandy soil, but the soils on this lot are more clay-like, so their use on this lot would not be effective.
- FW asks TM to add 4 inch deep swales along the south and north sides of the property to help control flood waters in minor flooding events. In response to a query from BO, TM indicates the only trees that will have to be removed are where the septic system will be installed, and one at the corner of the proposed house.

- The Commission discusses mitigation, and a consensus is reached that the proposed reduction in impervious surface is sufficient mitigation.
- BO makes a motion to continue the hearing to February 5, 2019. PC second. Approved 4-0-0.

2781 Joan Garretson Trust, 246 Moraine Street (Septic).....NEW (Frank)

- FW reads legal ad and, as Hearing Officer, confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Terry McGovern (TM), Stenbeck & Taylor, presents for applicant. The project involves replacement of a failed septic system. The new system will be located further downslope, and include a leaching field with hard plastic chambers.
- TM states that the site has been delineated by Brad Holmes, ECR and the system will be located 77 ft from the nearest flag and 192 feet from a private well. The system has been pushed as far to the northeast as possible. The new tank will be installed in the same location as the old tank, and there will be a two-foot change in grading. Erosion control will be placed at the bottom of the slope around the system, and no trees will be removed.
- BG notes that the project qualifies for an exemption on the state level, and feels this type of project could potentially qualify for a local exemption in the future if the Commission were to enact them.
- FW asks if the project will be reviewed by the Board of Health, and whether applicant wishes to continue the matter. TM indicates the Commission can continue if it prefers, but he doesn't believe the Board of Health will require any changes, as Director of Public Health Peter Falabella agreed with him that there was no other viable location for the system.
- BG agrees that the system is located correctly. He walked the line and questioned wetland flags A5-A7. Their placement doesn't affect the proposed project but may affect future projects on the property, as a wetland delineation is valid for three years. He would like to move flags A5-A7 further upgradient. BO doesn't feel applicants would be able to build anything in that location regardless of the placement of these flags.
- JK asks whether straightforward septic projects like this could be handled as an RDA after being approved by the Board of Health. BG would prefer to adopt some of the existing state exemptions on the local level, which would eliminate the filings altogether. TM notes that Pembroke and Hanover typically handle these projects as an RDA. JK feels one advantage of handling such matters as an RDA is the Commission still gets to review the project and can require an NOI as needed. FW feels that any changes to the procedure probably have to be approved at town meeting. BG states that bylaw changes would require town meeting approval but regulation changes can be made by the Commission at a public meeting. FW suggests that this be discussed as a business item at a future meeting.
- FW indicates he would like to close the matter tonight, as the system can't be moved from where it is. BG advises that the standard special conditions will apply, and reads them into the record.
- FW makes a motion to close the hearing and issue Orders of Conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. JK second. Approved 4-0-0.

2776 Murphy, Brewster Road (New SFH)..... CONTINUEDcont from 12/04/18 (Bert)

- BG advises that applicant has requested continuation to provide additional information on the wetland delineation flagging.

2783 Andersen / Kalandranis, 482 Ocean St (Part. Demo Garage & Breezeway; Addition).....NEW (Rob)

- FW Reads legal ad and, as Hearing Officer, confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Chi Man (CM), Hardy & Man, presents for applicant. The project concerns the partial demolition of a garage and breezeway to construct a two-story addition. CM has had some last-minute discussions with BG and states the hearing will likely be continued so they can revise the plan.
- CM indicates the lot is about 6000 sq ft, with an existing building; the lot slopes down to the beach, and is in FEMA flood zone VE18. The addition will consist of a new garage with master bedroom above it, and will be constructed on the existing footprint for the garage/breezeway. He has met with the Building Commissioner, who would like to see the elevation to be two feet above the flood elevation. All work will be done within existing impervious area. An existing concrete walk will be taken out and replaced with a new concrete walk

leading to the new main entrance. Net reduction in impervious area is about 11 sq ft. Silt sock will be utilized for erosion control.

- FW asks if the existing first flood elevation of 22.2 ft is going to be the same in the addition; CM indicates it will be the same. JK asks if the 11 sq ft figure includes all impervious surfaces on the site. CM indicates the driveway and concrete pad in back are going to stay the same, so the reduction is a result of the proposed work. JK also asks what proportion of the existing structure will be remaining; CM indicates roughly half.
- BG indicates he has talked to CM about plan revisions to accurately show coastal bank and top of bank location, as well as flood zone setbacks. The plan will also be revised to reflect FEMA flood zone VE18.
- JK asks if the house is moving towards the beach footprint; CM indicates the new addition will be entirely in the same footprint.
- FW notes that the flood zone is VE18; the ground is at 20 ft, two feet higher than the flood elevation and the first floor is at 22.2, four feet above the elevation. Given this, FW asks whether the applicant needs flood vents. BG indicates that the Building Commissioner is requiring flood vents. CM indicates he is going to revisit the matter with the Building Commissioner.
- All parties discuss the areas of Commission jurisdiction; BG indicates this includes top of coastal bank, flood zone, and 100 ft buffer zone to the coastal bank; setback will be based on top of bank. CM advises he researched the DEP definition, and agrees with the top of bank basis.
- JK requests that the new plan show the distance from the top of bank to the new foundation, as he feels this is necessary in order to establish that the structure is not moving closer to the beach footprint. BO notes that the new addition is going to be on the exact footprint of the existing garage, so it can't be moving any closer. JK concurs but would like it documented on the plan.
- FW asks for comments from the public; none.
- CM will work with BG to update the site plan by February 5.
- FW makes a motion to continue the hearing to February 5, 2019. BO second. Approved 4-0-0.

2784 Town of Marshfield Airport Commission, 93 Old Colony Lane (AST Install).....cont from 1/8/19 (Frank)

- Continued hearing; FW Hearing Officer.
- Ann Pollard (AP) presents for the Airport Commission (A.C.). Also present are A.C. Vice Chair David Suffredini (DS); Airport Manager David Dinneen (DD); Steven Riberdy (SR1), GZA GeoEnvironmental; Chris Willenborg (CW), Airport Solutions; Russell Barton (RB), Wilcox & Barton; and Steve Riesland (SR2), Airport Solutions Group. Their proposal concerns replacement of an existing underground fuel farm system with an above-ground system for better safety and environmental protection. Two storage tanks, one 12,000 gallons and one 6,000 gallon, will be installed along with a concrete pad, containment measures, and vehicle access. AP indicates the system has been found to be in compliance with guidelines from the National Fire Protection Association and the Marshfield Building and Fire Departments. They have received a grant from MassDOT Aeronautics for construction of the system. The existing fuel farm is near the airport administration building; the new farm will be located in the northwest quadrant of the airport; AP states this location was chosen based on operational, safety, and environmental considerations and will reduce the risk of aircraft/fuel truck incursions. They worked with BG in picking the site. Upon completion of construction, the underground tanks will be removed in accordance with DEP procedures, with continued third-party monitoring until the tanks are removed. The A.C. worked with BG to prepare the NOI paperwork.
- BG notes there have been changes to the site plan due to DPW comments, as well as some wetland flags put up. The updated plans were received and stamped January 19, 2019. DS elaborates on revisions to the original submittal, including the addition of a catch basin upstream from the water quality structure.
- FW comments that the plans being presented appear to be different from the plan set he has in the file. He notes that this plan set was delivered on Friday, but that what is being shown to the Commission is a completely different print. He would like the Commission to have all of the most current plans so they can be properly evaluated.
- BG agrees with FW that there may be a difference in the plans. PC verifies that the revision date on his copy is January 18, 2019 but still appears to be different from what is being shown. FW reiterates that neither he nor the other Commissioners have seen what is being shown to them. He would like a chance to look at the most

updated plans. SR2 states that the only difference between the two plan sets is one drawing on their set that didn't show up on the Commission's copy. FW notes that he is unable to verify that statement with the plans he has. All parties go through their plan sets page by page to identify any discrepancies; sheets C.2.1, and C.3.1 are identified as having discrepancies. After some further discussion, BG suggests that the Commission review those aspects of the plan that they do have in hand.

- SR1 discusses various features and resource areas on the site. There are two wetland systems on the site, including a regularly maintained shrub swamp. The site was re-flagged for this project, and is highly disturbed. The entire site is within LSCSF. They are proposing to repave an existing road and create a paved shoulder for the fuel trucks. The fuel farm will be located on a concrete pad adjacent to the vehicle access. SR1 indicates they have made revisions to reduce the buffer zone impact, including shifting the fuel farm location. The only structure in the 25 ft buffer is a stormwater separator. They have had to change the grading on the site based on comments from DPW, who wanted the site raised 12 to 18 inches to get the stormwater separator to work properly. The total project area is about 18,000 sq feet; there are no NHESP areas in the work area.
- FW asks whether the fuel volumes will change once the new tanks are in. AP indicates they currently have two 6,000 underground tanks, and they are going to one 6,000 gallon Avgas and 12,000 gallon Jet-A tank. JK notes this is a 6000 gallon increase in Jet-A capacity. AP adds this will reduce the number of fuel deliveries and resulting disturbance to neighboring areas. FW asks how the planes would refuel; AP indicates this would be done by mobile refueling trucks which would deliver the fuel from the fuel farm to the aircraft; this is what is done currently and is safer than having planes refuel directly at the farm. FW asks whether there is a berm around the paved area to channel the flow to the catch basin and separator. The site is graded and has a swale to direct the flow into the separator.
- BO asks whether this filing includes removal of the existing tanks; AP indicates this would be a separate filing and grant. BO also asks whether the operations manual for the fuel farm will be developed later; AP indicates this would be part of the construction portion of the current project.
- JK asks whether there is any change in the impermeable surface area; there is new pavement to create the shoulder. A shed containing a non-directional beacon will eventually be removed. JK also asks about timing of the work; AP indicates ideally work will take place before the fall, possibly mid-summer. PC asks about the likelihood of getting grant funding for removal of the old tanks; AP feels this is very likely to happen sometime within the next five years.
- BG comments he would like some conservation markers added around the resource areas. He also notes that applicants worked with the manufacturer of the Stormceptor separator to come up with a design that will work on this site. The filtered stormwater will enter the isolated vegetated wetland (IVW). He suggests the Commission add a special condition that the separator be installed as per the manufacturer's guidance. BO comments that the separator's operation should be in the forthcoming operations manual. BG indicates that other conditions will include submission of an illicit discharge signoff sheet as per performance standard 10, as well as annual submission of a completed stormwater pollution prevention plan checklist for 2-3 years.
- JK asks about containment of fuel in the event of a tank failure. Russ Barton (RB) indicates that the tanks meet the requirements for containment by virtue of being double-walled. FW adds that a rupture would trigger the alarm system. BG advises that the Fire Department inspected the proposed system and provided a letter stating they had no concerns with the system as designed.
- SR2 further discusses the drainage swale that funnels runoff into a hooded deep sump catch basin, then discharging into the Stormceptor, and points out the limits of grading. He indicates they are willing to use whichever erosion control the Commission prefers. They anticipate a short construction period, about 45 days. Installation of the actual tanks only takes 3-4 days.
- FW asks for a specific presentation on fuel system safety and leakage alarms. RB indicates that both tanks will be made of double-walled steel and each has a monitoring system plus sensors to detect any breaches of the internal tank wall. In the event of a breach, an alarm will be sent. There is also a dyke designed to contain spillage from the piping or during fuel transfer. The fuel transfer system is equipped with a dead switch that shuts down the pumping system if the operator lets go of the switch. The piping system from the tanks to the dispensers are connected by electronic valves that are closed when fuel is not being transferred. Both tanks

and the delivery truck are equipped with monitors to avoid overfilling. BO confirms with RB that the valves are closed any time the system is unattended.

- FW asks how the existing tanks will be drained once the new tanks are installed. AP indicates that once the new system is fully operational, the fuel in the old tanks will be removed and the tanks will be decommissioned in accordance with the regulations; these tanks will be periodically inspected until their removal.
- FW asks for questions from the public. Joe Pecevich (JP), Wilson Road, asks if any other Bylaws or Regulatory agency requirements apply to the project. BG believes they may also need a building permit. CW advises they have coordinated with the Building Department as well as the Board of Selectmen. BG elaborates that once they apply for a building permit, the Building Inspector will group a number of town entities into the review for comments and sign-off. BG will also upload the Commission Orders and accompanying documentation once issued to the Building Departments permit system. One condition of the Orders will be compliance with all current building codes and NFIP FEMA regulations. JP asks whether there has been any input from FEMA or ASCE. BG mentions a comment from DPW as to whether or not the tanks would become buoyant, to which applicant had replied. JP questions whether all filings had been timely made; BG indicates that all filings met the deadline.
- BG asks whether applicants will be obtaining permits from the ZBA; AP indicates to their knowledge there is no ZBA requirement. BG notes that the Commission's standard-issue special conditions are designed to ensure projects don't change over time without all departments being aware. An amended NOI may be required for significant changes.
- FW asks whether the system was designed taking into consideration the soils in the area. SR1 indicates it was. JP comments that the biggest risk would be the release of fuel during fuel transfer, especially when transferring fuel into the airport fuel trucks, and would like specifics as to how that operation would occur. FW anticipates that a standard operating procedures manual will be devised prior to turning over the system for operation, but first the system has to be constructed because they don't know the equipment they're buying yet.
- RB states that Federal regulations require that there be a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan for the proposed system beyond the standard operating procedures. One is already in place with respect to the vehicle transfers and fuel delivery currently taking place; that plan will be updated to incorporate the new system, and will specify do's and don'ts as to transfers. Possible spills scenarios are categorized, each requiring a certain degree of response, and on-call spill contractors are specified in the plan, with contact information. The plan will be accessible on the facility in the event of a spill.
- AP specifies that the operations plan will be part of the larger plan that will be updated as per Federal regulations. The formal name will be the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan.
- BG notes they will also be providing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will address annual maintenance; he is proposing, as a special condition, that applicants complete and send in an annual checklist to the Commission for a certain period of years so they can monitor issues on the site.
- BO asks that applicant illustrate refueling procedures and truck routes on the plan; AP does so. RW comments that all connections between fuel offloading trucks and the pipes will be made within the dyke and on concrete. Spillage during transfer to the airport fuel trucks will be channeled by grooves in the concrete pad. BG adds that the fuel hoses typically include internal shut-off valves. AP adds that a third-party observer and monitor also reviews the fuel farm's compliance with the regulations.
- AP indicates that aircraft have to be pulled out of the hangars to be refueled, and will be refueled at the hangar pads. BO verifies that this is how aircraft are currently refueled. AP also shows where the current fuel farm is located and how aircraft are currently refilled.
- CW adds that airport staff responsible for refueling have to go through a rigorous training protocol required by NFPA. AP adds that the fuel crew also go through NATA Safety First training above and beyond the required training.
- BG comments that the plan has been heavily vetted by the Commission as well as DPW, FAA, and other agencies, and a Building Department review is pending. They did flagging at his request, and also responded to DPW comments. He would like to see conservation markers to allow currently grassy areas to re-emerge as wetlands. SR1 states that conservation markers will be placed along the 25 foot no-disturb, but notes that

sections of the wetland would have to be cut. BG states they should ask for periodic maintenance. AP adds the airport has an approved vegetation management plan for the area in question.

- JP asks confirmation that the existing underground tanks are to be removed; AP does so. JP asks why the proposed system is closer to the wetland. JK states his understanding is that the proposed site is the best area safety-wise, as it is further away from the runways. SR1 adds that the proposed location is closer to the access road. AP confirms that the site of the existing fuel farm is a very busy area, especially when fuel trucks are present. JP suggests keeping the fuel farm where it is and putting a fence around the site, and comments it seems the wetlands are being put at greater risk for the sake of convenience.
- JP asks about the need for a variance. BG notes that the airport is considered an existing lot and structure; they have to request a variance for any activity inside the 25 foot buffer, and the Stormceptor is in the 25. On December 21, 2018 they provided the Commission a variance request letter. The letter comments that specific effort was made to ensure work was outside the 25 foot buffer, and the only proposed work in the buffer is the Stormceptor, which was placed at the most stable location and in area currently maintained as lawn, and repaving a small portion of the existing apron access road in the buffer. FW requests that SR1 show the location of the buffer zone work on the site plan.
- JP asks where the Stormceptor separator will discharge to; FW indicates it discharges to the IVW. SR1 advises the separator is manufactured by Contech, and has been in use for many years. BG adds that DPW Town Engineer Rod Procaccino inspected the plans today and had no concerns, and the system should function now that the area has the right slope.
- JK reads an excerpt of the narrative stating the tanks will be installed in compliance with fuel storage for FEMA regulation area, as well as FEMA coastal stormwater flowage. SR1 notes that there are no performance standards per se for LSCSF.
- JK asks what happens if a fuel release alarm is triggered when the airport is closed. RB advises that the system is set up to send notifications to on-call personnel offsite. He would like a special condition that notifications be sent offsite when the airport is closed. In response to another question from JK, DD confirms that the Nav-aid shed will be taken down sometime within the next month. JK comments that this could be considered mitigation for the work in the 25 ft buffer. AP advises that MassDOT Aeronautics is responsible for the decommissioning and removal.
- In response to a further query from JK, AP notes they received an accelerated grant, so the project will more than likely take place between the spring and fall of 2019. JK comments that staging and time of season will be additional considerations.
- JP provides a comment letter to BG for the Commission's file. BG reads the letter into the record.
- FW requests that the Commission discuss special conditions associated with permitting. BG reads the standard D1 (before start of work), D2 (during construction), and D3 (post-construction) special conditions into the record and asks Commissioners what additional conditions they would like.
- For D1, BG suggests requiring the following additional documentation within one week: updated plans bearing P.E. stamp and signed illicit discharge worksheet per Standard # 10 (within one week).
- For D2, BG suggests the following additional conditions: SWPPP and SPCC be provided to the Conservation Office, manufacturer's guidelines be followed; conform to NFIP and FEMA regulations and building codes.
- For D3, BG asks whether the Commission would like to require any post-project monitoring. FW comments that the disturbed buffer area will be re-seeded with grass, and doesn't think any monitoring is needed. BG suggests a condition that applicant notify him upon completion of the work, and the Commission assents.
- BG asks the Commission whether it wants additional conservation markers, and if so, where. BG suggests that markers be placed to create a 5 ft ring around the IVW. The Commissioners review the site plan, and agree to the placement of four markers 5 ft upgradient from flags W33, W34, W3, and W4; SR1 will provide an updated plan showing their location.
- The Commissioners also discuss a condition requiring removal of the Nav-aid shed; FW does not want to impose a specific timeline due to uncertainties around MassDOT's timeline to remove the shed. BG notes the Commission can simply hold off issuing the COC until the shed is removed. AP will convey to MassDOT that the shed removal is part of their Orders, and thinks it will probably be done this year.

- FW asks about timing of the removal of the old tanks once the new system is operational. CW advises that the airport at that time will have to file paperwork to DEP to initiate the underground storage tank closure process; once the paperwork is submitted, it generally takes five years for the tank to be removed. He indicates that a special condition requiring that they start the tank closure process with DEP would be acceptable; BG adds this to the special conditions. AP adds they will want to make sure the new system is working properly before filing the DEP papers.
- After further discussion with CW and RB, BG adds a condition requiring annual reporting for three years equivalent to a spill management plan, inspection and maintenance log, and operations & maintenance review checklist; also annual reporting related to the SPCC. AP suggests that they provide an annual report from the third-party monitor of the fuel farm, currently Dependable Petroleum.
- At JK's suggestion, BG adds a special condition requiring a 24/7 monitoring plan for tank breach alerts with remote notification.
- BG will circulate the draft Orders for Commissioner signatures at the next meeting.
- FW makes a motion to close the public hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. PC second. Approved 4-0-0.

2754 Hanlan, 72 Bay Avenue (Raze & Rebuild SFH).....cont from 9/11/18 (Bert)

- FW advises that applicant has requested a continuation.

2727 Digan Jr., 1327 Union Street (Pier & Dock).....CONTINUED.....cont from 6/5/18(Jim)

- FW advises that applicant has requested a continuation.

2772 Snyderman, 26 Littles Lane (Pier, Ramp & Float).....CONTINUED.....cont from 10/2/18 (Jim)

- FW advises that applicant has requested a continuation.

REQUESTS FOR CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE & EXTENSIONS

2499 Calkin (Knox), 58 Littles Lane [COC]

- BG recommends granting a waiver as to the elevation certificate, as the new structure is smaller and was moved further away from the wetlands above the flood zone.
- FW makes a motion to issue a COC for the property with waiver as noted. BO second. Approved 4-0-0.

ENFORCEMENT ORDERS

Smith, 38 Liberty St **(11/19/18 KS will set early Dec visit)**

Drosopoulos, 7 Lady Slipper Lane **(8/15/18 TC Final Notice)**

White, 180 Atwell Circle (Escalation letter in Process)

Digan, 1327 Union Street **(1/11/19 Rec'd App. Rest. Plan)**

Tamara Macuch, 237 Webster Avenue

Levangie, 3 Cove Creek (Communication in Progress)

New Owner, Winslow Avenue Ext.

Mahaney, 46 Preston Terr **(12/12/18 BG met with TC)**

Stifter, 102 Bartlett's Island (unpermitted revetment wall)

Bednarz/ Nouza, 65 Ireland Road (Unpermitted Cutting <= 50 ft)

Jogi's Liquor Store, 915 Ocean Street **(12/04/18 Con Com accepted Revised Rest Plan 11/15/18 due Spring 2019)**

Susan Sullivan, 176 Beach Street **(1/16/19 Consultant will provide restoration plan for 1/22/19 Hearing)**

BUSINESS

B1 Conservation-Harrington Wilderness for Trail Running Race (Cross Country) - Sean Jackson

- Sean Jackson (SJ), Phys Ed teacher at the Governor Winslow School, discusses a proposal to hold a trail-running race through the Harrington Wilderness. He has competed in a number of such races personally, and his training is mostly done in town. He is looking to organize a trail race somewhere on the South Shore, possibly with different distances for different classes of runners. He thinks this could tie in with upgrades to the trail system on Commission properties. BO notes that the Recreational Trails Committee is addressing some of the trail issues.
- In response to a query from BO, SJ indicates that the proposed race would be one day, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. He would also need access to the race site the day before and after. Portable restrooms would need to be delivered to the site, and wire race signage would need to be added.
- JK asks how the race would be funded. SJ indicates there would be an entrance fee of \$35-\$55, and is looking at additional fund-raising possibilities. He could possibly get the insurance he needs through the American Trail Owners Association. He would like to donate 10% of all registration fees to a Conservation Stewardship fund and has talked with BG about this. BG notes that net race proceeds could be donated to a number of causes.
- SJ discusses the proposed parking and race entrance, which would be the Eames Way trail head. BG notes that parking is limited at most Commission properties. The Police, Board of Selectmen, and other Town entities will also need to be notified. BO comments that the Police and Town Administrator already have experience with other road races in town, and could have useful insights. The Commissioners assent to BG working with SJ to further flesh out the proposal.
- PC asks about publicity; SJ thinks social media is the most powerful avenue; he will also reach out to the Marshfield Road Runners and the American Trail Runners Association; ATRA can publicize the race on their Web site.
- BO requests that BG keep the Commission updated. JK thinks the race is a great idea as long as it is properly vetted and insured.

B2 Conservation Commission support letter/DCR Trails Grant Application / Bill Grafton & Bert O'Donnell

- BG and BO are working with the Recreational Trails Committee on a DCR Trails Grant Application to purchase stone dust and other trail improvements for the Bridle Path; the RTC would like a support letter from the Conservation Commission.
- BO adds that the grant will help pay for safety crosswalks. The Commission does not manage the Bridle Path, but it passes through conservation jurisdictional areas.
- BO makes a motion to authorize BG to write a support letter for the RTC's Trails Grant application. FW second. Approved 4-0-0.

B3 South Shore Outdoors/Conservation Trails Sponsorship / Bill Grafton & Eric Goodwin

- Eric Goodwin (EG), owner of South Shore Outdoors (SSO), present to discuss a proposal that he maintain the Webster Wilderness trail system through his company, as a sponsor. He feels this would save both the Commission and the RTC time and labor maintaining the trails. It would also serve as a pilot program for the RTC's sponsorship program and lay the groundwork for additional sponsorships.
- BG notes that this request is distinct from his previous request to organize walks, through his company, on Commission properties. He feels the proposal is similar to when Goodwill Hunters sponsored a kiosk and trailhead sign for the Rail Trail near the CVS parking lot.
- JK notes that the Commission's budget is limited for trail maintenance. EG pointed out it took over 250 hours of volunteer time to clean up the Corn Hill trail system.
- BO feels that allowing EG to go forward will allow the Commission and the RTC to fine-tune the program and create guidelines for other sponsors. FW notes the Commission has talked about implementing a sponsorship program for several years. BG comments that EG did a lot of the work at Corn Hill, and he has confidence in EG's ability to responsibly maintain the trails. RTC has already approved his sponsorship of Corn Hill as well as DWW, but he would like Commission approval as well.
- EG elaborates that he is willing to check the trail system twice a year to make sure encroachments are trimmed back and remove fallen trees. Through his company, he will also offer 1-2 free guided events that

are open to the public. He is open to other projects in the future, and is willing to abide by any procedures put in place by the Commission or RTC related to the sponsorship.

- In response to a query from FW, EG notes that his company provided about 27.5 hours of labor at Corn Hill, and purchased several hundred dollars of equipment to do the work. He would like Commission to support the sponsorship program, and of SSO being the sponsor for Webster's Wilderness.
- JK indicates support provided that the RTC provides oversight.
- EG also advises there are three upcoming sessions of the Trail Rangers Program, with the Furnace Brook Middle School interested in getting involved. The previous session introduced several families to the trail system in town.
- BO makes a motion to approve the trail sponsorship by South Shore Outdoors. FW second. Approved 4-0-0.

B4 Beach Street 176, Sullivan (Coastal Dune Alteration) SE42-18-05

- Dave Newhall (DN), Merrill Engineers, presents a restoration plan for the coastal dune on the property prepared by Brad Holmes of ECR. The plan includes 6,450 sq ft of restoration plantings.
- BG reminds the Commission that pursuant to the public discussion at the December 18, 2018 meeting, he issued an enforcement order requiring the submission of a restoration plan by January 21, 2019 and the plan was timely received. BG reviewed the plan with Dana Altobello, the P.E. overseeing the project, and feels the proposed planting plan is robust.
- BG asks if Brad Holmes, ECR had advised when the plantings would take place. DN points out that BG specified having a pre-construction meeting which would deal with these details.
- Contractor Frank Marino (FM) notes that at the previous meeting, they discussed making revetment wall repairs prior to or concurrent with performing the restoration work so as to protect the plantings. They would also like to repair a fence that is falling down and presents a safety hazard. He would like to avoid having to walk over the new plantings to do the revetment wall work.
- BG notes that the restoration does not include a deliverable date. JK thinks that the applicant should now provide their construction as part of a new Notice of Intent. The sequencing should not result in the applicant restoring the dune and then destroying the restoration work with heavy equipment for the proposed revetment wall repairs. BG states that there is access from the beach for this work and this is a common practice for DPW. FW and JK ask why should the Commission require the applicant to access the revetment wall from the beach when they can access from their own property.
- BG references the performance standards in 310 CMR 10.28 Coastal Dunes and the potential for the proposed work to impact the existing adverse effects. BG references the proposed structures on the top of the dune and hardening the dune with an increased revetment wall will have direct impacts to the dunes on the site and offsite. BG cited an example at 7 Richard Street where the applicant vegetated the entire top of his dune and maintains the existing revetment periodically. The results are impressive. BG advocates for a similar hybrid approach. FW states that they can restore what is there but not go higher or wider. BG reiterates that the properties immediately adjacent on both sides of the site will be impacted by any hardening of the site. FM states that the wall and fence fell down in the last winter storms. FM states that the fence is about 6 feet. JK states that they own to the mean high water so they own a good portion of the beach. Further discussion about the property boundaries. JK states he will not support hardening of the beach as it is detrimental to the beaches. It prevents migration of the sand. Fences can slow the migration of sand. FW notes that the beach in front of the site is armored. JK asks if the existing revetment is permitted. FW states that a new NOI is needed for the revetment repair work. BO states that Town operations include seaweed burial so the access has been accomplished for these activities. BG references recent projects off Cove Street that included beach access across beach properties owned by multiple owners. BG believes the existing dune will be damaged by the heavy equipment working from the top of the dune. BG states that there are remains of beneficial plants that have established root systems which anchor the sand and soil sediments. If these are factored into the restoration then the plantings will benefit from the introduction of new plants amongst the remains of existing plants as they recover. BG cites 7 Richard Street again. BG notes that there is beach access near the site where construction equipment can enter the beach and traverse into the limit of work. FW notes that there is public access but private beaches need to

be traversed. FW prefers that the applicant's approach should be from the owner's property. BG notes that the armorment of this site is the only one in the area and this will have impacts on the neighbors and eventually all homes in the area will want to armor like what happened in Bluefish Cove. BG notes that the jetty protects much of this area from severe wave impacts and it would be a great area for beach renourishment. BG suggests that stabilizing the top of the dune under the restoration plan is primary so as to anchor the sand and soil sediments. FW and JK discuss the access from the beach versus dune.

- JK is concerned that Barrier Beach and Coastal Dune are being impacted and he will support further armorment. He discuss the pool excavation, concrete structure in the dune with an apron around it as not being beneficial to the Barrier Beach. JK suggests that there might be a better place for a pool. This is why he asked about staging.
- BG asks FM about the deck. BG notes that there will be multiple support posts and coverage that will shade out plants that are not shade-tolerant. JK notes that the deck will be a big impact to a Barrier Beach. BO asks SS if that is where they want to site the pool? SS stated that the deck is rotting so it made more sense to put the pool and pool house, guest house where the deck is located. SS is flexible on the location of the pool. JK states that he knows we are here to discuss the plantings but prefers discussing the other activities as well so that they don't waste money. BG reminds that there is an Enforcement Order that involves plantings beginning this Spring. SS looking to move this along since the beach season is approaching.
- BO asks BG about red area outlined as the disturbance. BG agrees. BO notes that there were previously disturbed areas as well. BG states that some of these areas have been altered by the recent activities so this would be treated as new now. SS plantings were overgrown and growing into the house. FM the circular driveway was unpassable. SS planning on planting new plants. BO suggests that the disturbed area is the decking area and gravel driveway. The proposed work should be considered closer to the house and not to exceed the square footage of these areas.
- PC asks whether the primary objective is to stabilize the wall and fence? Why not stage the work to get the plantings established while leaving access ways to the wall for equipment to traverse? SS concerned that a big storm would wipe out the plantings without protection from the repaired revetment wall. JK asks if the wall is permitted. BO states that the wall is remains of the property when it used to be a public parking lot. FM notes that the wall has recently collapsed and the fence is dangling precariously. SS is concerned that someone might get hurt on the fence. FM suggests that the owners will need an access way to the beach.
- FM suggests that they will comply with requirements for the revetment wall. Also, wants to ensure that the public is not wandering onto the owners property or getting hurt.
- BG introduces pictures of 7 Richard Street as an example of a well-established coastal dune. BG suggests that SS has selected a team that is capable of achieving the same results at this property. BG suggests that the revetment wall work would damage any of the restoration work. SS loves the results of 7 Richard Street and thinks it's pretty.
- BG also notes that there are weak spots in the revetment wall but it cannot be expanded. BG discusses the periodic maintenance of the revetment. Any future repairs to the revetment wall would create damage to the restoration area so an access plan needs to be established. BG suggests that the repair cannot cause any damage to the neighboring lots and coir logs secured with metal cables might be necessary to provide a foothold for new plantings to stabilize the upper reaches of the wall up to the dune. JK mentions that a similar vegetative stabilization was permitted for Pomerantz on Bartlett's Island. FW notes the velocity difference between Beach Street and Bartlett's Island. JK agrees but mentions that the ideas are the same so this serves as a good example. SS is excited and cannot wait to see how it comes out. She wants to show it to her kids.
- BG states that the applicants are looking for direction. They currently have a demolition building permit that is on hold until an After-The-NOI is filed. Now the Commission has the restoration plan that was required in the Enforcement Order. Lastly, the Commission is suggesting that the restoration should be incorporated into a new Notice of Intent for the revetment and fence stabilization and the structures. PC suggests looking at the Richard Street property. BG suggests that the Commission either require the new NOI by February 5th so they could be on the February 19th agenda or invite them back to further discuss under the business section. JK doesn't want applicant to waste a lot of money on proposed work that might not get approved.

JK suggests that the applicant return under the business section. BG suggests that DN should come prepared as if discussing a Notice of Intent but the formal filing will come later. BG is directed to sign off on the building permit.

- SS states it has always been her dream to own a beach home and will share it with her children.
- JK states that good examples for ideas are Richard Street/Hammond and Bartlett's Island/Pomerantz. BG suggests using rosa rugosa as no one will pass through a stand of rosa rugosa. JK mentions it's got a lot thorns but is like an old Cape Cod wild beach rose.
- PC acknowledges that it is kind of SS to let the former owners stay at the house while the work is happening.

AJOURNMENT – FW motioned to close the hearing at 10:38 pm. BO second. Motion approved 4-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Liz Anoja, Conservation Administrative Clerk
Marshfield Conservation Commission

Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator
Robert Conlon, Chairman
Frank Woodfall
Rick Carberry

Bert O'Donnell
James Kilcoyne
Art Lage