

MEMBERS PRESENT – Robert Conlon, Chairman (RC), Chad Haitzma (CH), Frank Woodfall (FW), Bert O'Donnell (BO), James Kilcoyne (JK), Rick Carberry (PC), and Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator (BG).

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT – Art Lage (AL)

CALL TO ORDER – RC motioned to open the meeting at 7:00 p.m. JK second. Approved 6-0-0.

MINUTES – RC motioned to approve the 4/17/18 minutes as revised. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2729 McCall, 35 Nathaniel Way (coastal bank stabilization).....(cont from 6/5/18) (Chad)

- Continued hearing, CH hearing officer.
- CH asks for comments from the public. None.
- CH notes the matter was heard at the previous meeting, and was continued only due to lack of a DEP number.
- PC confirms he has reviewed the case file and signed a Mullin declaration, and thus is eligible to vote on the matter.
- CH makes motion to close and issue an Order of Conditions as drafted by BG. BO second. Approved 6-0-0.

18-21 Town of Marshfield DPW, 60 Regis Road (softball fields).....NEW (Frank)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, FW Hearing Officer; No tax status to confirm as this is a Town project.
- BG advises that Jason Zimmer, the project engineer, and the Superintendent of Public Works were unavailable to attend the hearing. He advises that the Governor Winslow School is looking to expand the softball fields, adding a new playing field. This will involve some minimal disturbance in the 50 foot buffer to BVW, with shrubs and some overgrowth removed.
- CH expresses support for the project; he is surprised the area is a little elevated above the marsh.
- FW asks for comments from the public. None.
- FW makes motion to close and issue a DOA, pos # 2A to confirm the wetland delineation and neg # 3 with special conditions drafted by BG. RC second. Approved 6-0-0.

2728 Barbara E. Place Nominee Trust, 1 Macomber's Ridge (driveway, partial grading, septic).....NEW (Frank)

- Continued Hearing
- RC advises all present that the hearing has been continued.

2731 Sheehan, 193 South River Street (barn & parking area).....NEW (Frank)

- RC Reads Legal Ad; Hearing Officer FW confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Bob Crawford (BC), EET, representing applicant. Subject property is a ¾-acre lot on the westerly side of south river street. They propose to tear down a 450 sq ft barn and build about 1100 sq ft barn in its place, with paved parking area and driveway. The slope in the parking area will be flattened from 10% to 5%. There will need to be a variance due to about 90 sq ft of fill being added within the 25 ft buffer zone. On the plan, the parking is on the SW side of the plan, 29.7 ft from the wetland line.
- Erosion control barrier will be installed at the limit of work. About 6 inches of maximum height in the fill area, tapering down to zero.
- Wetlands flagged by John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental, and by prior Conservation Administrator, Jay Wennermer in a previous filing.
- FW asks for comments from the public. None.

- CH would prefer a non-paved driveway.
- BG would like to know the changes to the 50, 75, and 100 ft setbacks, particularly brand new impacts. BC states that it would be about 1300 sq ft of new impacts. BG notes that the lawn is cut up to the wetland line in spots; there is also some green waste in the wetland area. BG would like permanent red and white “no disturb” conservation markers in the lawn area, 10 feet from the wetland line, to prevent any further encroachment into the wetlands.
- The Commissioners discuss how many markers to install. FW would like markers on the two property lines and about every 30 ft. on the wetland line as opposed to 10 feet from the line. BO thinks the markers themselves are sufficient to prevent further encroachment. BG states that installing the markers on the wetland line would effectively grant permission to cut wetland areas that haven’t been cut yet. RC has no problem having markers 10 feet from the line. Commissioners settle on placing five markers, 10 feet from the wetland line, every 30 feet.
- The Commissioners also discuss the slope from the parking area towards the wetlands. BC indicates there is a 2 ft drop; CH adds that the parking area is not close to the wetland.
- CH asks BG if paved parking is detrimental to the area; BG feels permeable parking is preferable, but the area is already compromised due to the previous parking area; this is offset by the addition of conservation markers, which will protect the wetland.
- FW makes motion to close the hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. RC second. Approved 6-0-0.

2721 Karen Campbell, TR., 3 Marion Street (sfh).....(cont from 6/5/18) (Chad)

- Continued hearing, Hearing Officer CH confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- CH verifies taxes have been paid, abutters notified, and DEP number issued.
- BG mentions that the holdup was BG saw some pickle weed in the area. John Zimmer, South River Environmental, examined the area and provided a letter confirming the plant presence was minimal and did not meet the criteria to be considered a wetland under the bylaw. He thinks the project otherwise looks good and if the hearing officer is comfortable with the conditions talked about last hearing, a motion can be made to close.
- PC confirms he has reviewed the previous hearing and signed a Mullin declaration, and thus is eligible to vote on the matter.
- CH makes motion to close the hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions as drafted by BG. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2722 Milton Corporation, 1180 Ferry Street (pier & dock)(cont from 6/5/18) (Jim)

- Continued hearing as per written request by applicant’s representative.

2727 Digan Jr., 1327 Union Street (pier & dock).....(cont from 6/5/18) (Jim)

- Continued hearing; pending receipt of additional information request.

18-20 Friends of South River Park, 2154 Ocean Street (walkway improvements).....NEW (Bert)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, BO Hearing Officer; No tax status to confirm as this is a non-profit Town project.
- Susan Caron (SC) representing the Friends of South River Park; they would like a DOA on the walkway for routine maintenance. The park has lost its ADA compliance due to overgrown weeds; they will hire a professional landscaper to burn the weeds, apply new stone dust, and level the path to restore ADA compliance. Dave McDonald (DM), Summit Landscaping, will undertake the work and is familiar with the procedures for working in resource areas.
- BO asks for comments from the public. None.
- BG advises that SC met with him prior to the meeting; he reviewed the project and found it to be eligible.
- BO makes motion to close and issue a DOA, neg # 3 with special conditions. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2730 Bardizian, 150 Sawyers Lane (septic).....NEW (Bert)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, Hearing Officer BO confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Bob Crawford (BC) EET, representing applicants for replacement of a septic system on a 3-acre lot. They propose to construct a new leaching area to replace the failed one in front of the house. Two test pits were dug in front of the house, both of which indicated poor soils. They propose to construct about half the new field within the 100 ft buffer; closest point to the wetland would be about 86 feet. The lot is in an area of NHESP, and they have received a letter indicating the system meets their performance standards. The system will be gravity-based.
- BO was on site today and felt the area looks straightforward. FW had no issues.
- BG went to the site and noticed that work had started prior to the hearing tonight, so he issued a verbal cease and desist. He is satisfied with wetland line, but they need to post a DEP sign and file with the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds. He also observed a large quantity of green waste in the back of the driveway and property that should be removed. The house is being sold, so he recommends the installation of conservation markers along the tree line to prevent further encroachment by the new owners.
- JK asks about the work they had started; BG states they had started work in the back; they were under the impression that they could begin because they had Board of Health approval.
- CH asks if there was any damage done. BG notes that they began digging in the area where they system would have to be placed due to the poor soils in front. The proper procedure would have been to file an NOI with the Commission prior to digging the test pits. He feels the installation of conservation markers would be sufficient mitigation.
- The Commission discussed placement of the markers. BG feels they should be placed along the tree line. FW would like (2-3) of them along wetland flags 2, 3, and 4; he feels strictly using the tree line would unnecessarily limit use of the yard. BO suggests placement of the markers along the 25 ft no build area, but BG feels this would encourage disturbance of a previously undisturbed area; also, the markers may not be visible, at that location, to new owners. FW notes there is an area on the lot where the tree line tapers out. After further discussion, FW and BG mark out the location of the markers on the site plan. FW explains to the homeowners where the conservation markers will be placed.
- BO makes motion to close the hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2733 Rugani, 10 Dog Lane (septic).....NEW (Bert)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, BO Hearing Officer
- James Garfield (JG), Morse Engineering, representing applicant. NOI is related to septic repair.
- Resources on site include inland bank to perennial river which runs to culvert under garage, then off site. Plan shows 25, 50, and 75 ft setbacks as well as 100 ft inner riparian zone and 200 ft riverfront area.
- Existing septic is failing title IV cesspool, right inside the 25 ft setback. The new septic system will be routed out the side of the house and will be 75 back from the wetland. Septic tank and pump chamber will be located under gravel driveway. Effluent will be pumped uphill, under existing lawn, to the side yard leaching field. Closest edge of the leaching field will be 75 ft back from the wetland. They will remain outside the 50 ft setback. The septic system and tank will remain outside of the 100 ft buffer zone. Straw waddle will be used for erosion control.
- BO asks if the bank needs to be flagged; BG indicates he looked at the site, but didn't require the flagging because the bank is recognizable from the visible slope change.
- BG notes the house is being sold and proposes conservation markers to follow the beyond patio line about every 50 ft so as to prevent encroachment by the new owners. JK asks if the markers would be placed by the straw waddle. BO indicates they would be roughly at the 25 ft setback. FW and RC concur with placing the markers along the 25 ft setback. FW adds the markers to the site plan.
- BO asks for comments from the public. None.
- CH recommends that the Commission develop a better protocol in the future regarding the placement of conservation markers to minimize discussion during meetings. FW feels that every situation is different and it is

hard to create a one-size-fits-all formula for the placement of markers, but there are opportunities to shorten discussions in the future.

- BO makes motion to close the hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2648 Sturgis, 246 Canal Street (Amended NOI; addition).....NEW (Bert)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, Hearing Officer BO confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Francis Sturgis (FS) states they lifted their home last year, and in doing so discarded an existing deck in front of the home. They would like to replace it with a (12x18) ft addition with an entryway off to the side that lies between the (75 and 100) ft setbacks.
- BO states the structure is in a previously disturbed part of the lot with existing structures, so the setback is 25 ft. He would like the concrete slab to be removed during construction. BG will make this a special condition.
- CH notes the addition is further away from the wetland than the house is, and has no issues.
- BO notes that the conservation markers were on the original Order of Conditions so he does not feel they need to be added to this set of Orders. FW states that removal of the slab was also on the original Orders, so its removal doesn't need to be specified on this one.
- BO motions to close hearing and issue amended order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2723 Rum Island Condominium Trust (Trouant's Island Causeway).....(cont from 6/5/18) (Jim)

- Continued hearing at applicant's request.

2732 Town of Scituate, South River (dredging).....NEW (Rob)

- RC Reads Legal Ad, BO Hearing Officer; No tax status to confirm as this is a Town project.
- Christine Player (CP) Foth/CLE Engineering, representing applicant. Applicant is Town of Scituate, but project is being funded concurrently by both Scituate and Marshfield, as the dredging will take place in both towns. The project was heard and approved by the Scituate Conservation Commission last night. The dredging area consists of three regularly maintained areas regularly maintained on a 10-year basis. Dredging was last completed in 2017. Recent storms have caused significant shoaling and hazardous conditions to navigation, especially in Area A, near the mouth of the river, where 10,000 cubic yards need to be dredged. 30,000 cubic yards in total will have to be dredged, about 10,000 from each of the three areas. They are looking to obtain the local authorizations first; they will also need a special permit from the ZBA. They are also waiting on various other permits, including MassDEP, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and MassCZM, before the project can move forward. The towns may phase the project due to funding concerns, focusing on the mouth of the river first. If possible they would like to complete the entire project in one season. Means and methods consist of barge-mounted excavator. The dredged material would be placed in a dump scow and towed offshore. There is a regulated dredge dump site for offshore disposal that is regulated by the DEP.
- There is a time of year restraint window to the dredging due to winter flounder spawning periods. The dredging is projected to take place from early October to February 1st.
- BO asks why the material has to be dumped offshore. CP notes that initially it was proposed to use the materials locally for beach nourishment, but the quantity dredged would not be sufficient to restore eroded areas; additionally, this alternative would require a public access easement from property owners on Humarock to allow the material to be dumped on the beach. The Town of Scituate tried to secure such easements but was unable to do so. They also considered U.S. Air Force property on Fourth Cliff as a nourishment site, but ran into time constraints. Hydraulic dredging has been tried in the area but didn't work due to the substrate composition including cobbles. To deposit non-hydraulically dredged material onto a beach is significantly more expensive.
- BO asks Harbormaster Mike DeMeo (MD) about the placement of dredged material from Green Harbor onto Green Harbor Beach? MD mentions this in process. FW notes that the material from Green Harbor is

predominantly sand as opposed to that from this project. MD also mentions that the dredge project in Blue Fish Cove was run by the USACE and the material was placed on the beach with the approval of the neighbors.

- MD states that, in this project, the cost of trucking some of the material for beach nourishment is too great; it's a hard ask to ask Town Meeting for dredging funds. CP adds that the current dredging project will cost 2.5 million dollars disposing the spoils off shore. If the spoils were to be trucked to Town beaches, this cost would double.
- FW would like to know the timeframe for the dredging; he notes that the need in Area A is critical and asks whether some assistance would be available for that aspect of the project. CP notes that both towns are in the process of seeking funding. State funding for dredging is limited; there is some dredge funding assistance that is starting up through MA Housing and Economic Development, and is a possibility for the Towns to pursue. They are hoping to start in Area A in the Fall.
- MD notes that the town does not want to put the job out to bid out before all permits are in hand. Contractors won't bid until then. This project will be a challenge and qualified contractors are limited.
- JK asks MD about conditions at the mouth; MD indicates it's getting to be a safety concern. NOAA surveyed the channel in 2012, and there are constant changes in the area. He asked about federalizing the channel but was turned down. There was a delay associated with Scituate trying to get the access easements, but this may help with grant funding going forward. FW notes that the longer the delay, the more the shoal is going to move up and down the channel and the more work will have to be done. He is in favor of moving forward and doesn't see any major impacts.
- BG asks about various features shown on sheet 1 of 4. CP states the hatched areas are the area that has been previously dredged. BG notes he raised the question because he's been asked about ways to minimize impacts of dredging on adjoining salt marsh without endangering public safety. CP briefly discusses the standard dredging procedure and techniques, including box-cutting, which allows the bank to fall on its own. Anything that is hatched is above the -6 authorized channel depth; anything that is not hatched is deeper. The shape that we are seeing is the authorized footprint which has been dredged several times in the past. None of this is new dredging. BG states that he has been asked in the past about what can be done to minimize damage to the salt marsh so his interest is in not expanding the existing footprint which will potentially undermine the salt marsh which is also under pressure from ocean/surge impacts. CP states all of the work is subtidal and this technique doesn't really encroach on the marsh. She notes that this project will take place entirely in previously dredged areas.
- BG would like to know if they have received a NHESP response letter. CP indicates everything has been filed, but they have not received the letter yet, and asks if this would be a cause for continuance. BG would like the NHESP Letter to close the hearing, as he anticipates they may have some comments the Commission may want to hear or include in special conditions. After further discussion, it is agreed to add the submission of the NHESP response letter as a special condition of approval.
- JK notes there is a dogleg forming at the river mouth hindering navigation. MD states the water level is getting higher and the buoys in the channel have to be moved reflecting changes in the area. This should happen sometime this year. The area is similar to Chatham Harbor as both areas are subject to significant shifting bars.
- CH would like to know how compromised the area is. CP and MD characterize the areas as about 2/3 compromised. CH asks who makes the final call that the area needs to be dredged. MD and the Scituate Harbormaster make that decision based on navigation and safety. Both Harbormasters are in agreement as to the need for dredging.
- CP mentions the survey was done in 2013, with some areas re-surveyed in 2016.
- MD mentions the typical dredge cycle is (10-15) years and is guided in part by feedback from fishermen and complaints about conditions in the channel. MD characterizes the new inlet by the North and South Rivers as one of the two worst in the state; barge crews have told him the area is worse than Chatham Harbor. CP notes that unlike the North/South Rivers, the mouth of the Merrimack River is a federal channel.
- CH asks what post-project data they will be able to show the Commission to demonstrate it was a success. CP and MD state there will be a pre- and post-dredge survey; the post-dredge survey is done as soon as possible after completion.

- RC asks for comments from the public; none.
- After further discussion, the Commission decides to close the hearing subject to the standard MCC special conditions and the following special conditions: that applicants comply with any NHESP and Division of Marine Fisheries recommendations, register both Scituate and Marshfield orders with the Commission, and coordinate as necessary.
- RC makes motion to close the hearing and issue an order of conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. JK Second. Approved 6-0-0.

2710 Brown, 7 Branch Street (addition and deck).....(cont from 4/17/18) (Frank)

- RC makes motion to continue the hearing to 7/10/2018. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2724 Ethier, 165 Winslow Cemetery Road (addition).....(cont from 6/5/18) (Chad)

- RC makes motion to continue the hearing to 7/10/2018. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2713 Krusell, 0 Careswell Street (SFH).....(cont from 5/1/18) (Bert)

- RC makes motion to continue the hearing to 7/10/2018. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

2684 Bethanis, 1184 Ferry Street (found. rest. driveway recons).....(cont from 10/03/17) (Jim)

- RC makes motion to continue the hearing to 7/10/2018. FW second. Approved 6-0-0.

REQUESTS FOR CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE & EXTENSIONS

2499 Calkin Knox, 58 Littles Lane – Tabled; not ready.
 2057 McNulty-McLaughlin 5 Trouant’s Island – Tabled; not ready.

ENFORCEMENT ORDERS

Smith, 38 Liberty Street (Email Response 05/06/18)
 Mahaney, 46 Preston Terrace
 Drosopoulos, 7 Ladyslipper Lane (TC Letter 11/18/17)
 Jogi’s Liquor Store, 951 Ocean Street (unpermitted cutting)
 White, 180 Atwell Circle(Escalation letter in Process)
 New Owner, Winslow Avenue Ext.
 Levangie, 3 Cove Creek (Communication in Progress)
 Tamara Macuch, 237 Webster Avenue
 Stifter, 102 Bartlett’s Island (unpermitted revetment wall)

BUSINESS

Christmas Cove CR Discussion – Matt Watsky/Jack O’Leary

- Attorney Matt Watsky and Jack O’Leary, Senior Project Manager with Sitec Engineering appeared before the Commission to discuss a CR being placed on a 12-acre open space parcel to the north of the lots. NHESP prefers CRs that are granted to a nonprofit or municipal entity. The Commission had title to the property immediately to the west, and New England Forestry Foundation (NEEF) owns property that abuts to the north and east. NEFF was not satisfied with the CR as proposed because it is not consistent with their purpose, which is to grow and harvest trees; they would want it mowed (1-2) times per year to provide habitat for Eastern Box Turtles.
- MW suggests that the open space parcel could possibly facilitate access to the Commission property to the west.

- FW would like to know if the Commission property area abuts land owned by Wildlands Trust. BG indicates it does. The Wildland Trust property “landlocks” the Commission property. All parties view a map of the area, and discuss existing and proposed access to the existing Commission property through an existing dirt path.
- CH asks whether New England Forestry can prove they own the cart path access to their land. FW notes it’s been 8-10 years since NEFF has harvested trees there and asks how previous harvests were brought out.
- FW notes that the Commission would need an easement from NEFF to access a CR in the open space parcel. MW offers to facilitate an access easement with NEFF, or arrange for Commission access to the parcel from the Christmas Cove development. CH states they would need proof that NEFF owns the cart path through which access is proposed. MW states he could ask NEFF if they had title to the path, and if so, would they be willing to grant an access easement to the Commission.
- FW adds that he owned property in the area. It was salt marsh converted to farmland, and it is difficult to determine the owner of several properties in the area.
- JK asks how many CRs the Commission currently holds? BG indicates approximately 74, (55-60) of which the Commission manages directly.
- JK asks why the Commission would want this CR? FW points out that the Commission asked for this CR a year ago.
- BG states that the Planning Department has required that the applicant have a CR on the property. The applicant has offered the CR to Wildlands Trust and NEEF, both of which declined. They then approached BG and Town Counsel (TC) Bob Galvin.
- BG notes the Commission has challenges related to the stewardship of the CRs it already holds, so it needs to be careful about taking on any new CR.
- JK would like to know how much maintenance would be required. MW states the NHESP permit conditions they have obtained for the area to be mowed once or twice a year in order to maintain the turtle habitat. He has arranged for the homeowners association to undertake this mowing, so the Commission would simply hold the CR. He suggests BG could simply check up on the property once or twice a year.
- JK asks whether BG or the Home Owners’ Association (HOA) would arrange for the mowing. MW envisions the HOA handling this; he believes the NHESP permit will have strict restrictions on time of year constraints for the cutting.
- JK also asks what the repercussions would be if the HOA does not do the cutting. MW states in that case the Commission should advise the HOA to arrange for the cutting; if they remained noncompliant, he states the Commission could bring action against the HOA. He feels the HOA, at eight units, would be of sufficient size to meet its obligations. Because the property is designed as an open space development, there is an open space parcel; they are factoring in the Planning Board and Zoning Board regulations for Open Space Residential Developments.
- JK asks what happens if applicants can’t find a taker for the CR? MW indicates they would likely place deed restrictions to maintain compliance with NHESP conditions, but NHESP prefers a CR as opposed to deed restrictions. MW notes that permitting agencies like to condition permits on there being CRs, but getting a governmental or nonprofit entity to accept one is a challenge.
- The Commission then discusses next steps. BO, FW, and RC would like to consult with TC as to how the Conservation Commission can handle the conservation restrictions. BG feels the CR would add the land to the open space, which is a good thing, but stewardship is burdensome, and there may be potential liability issues with falling trees. CH thinks the Commission should not be afraid of taking ownership of properties, but would like the CR to be conditioned that the HOA be established before the CR is signed.
- BG will reach out to TC for guidance.

Shepherd’s Path status of beach access stairs – BG update

- BG updated the Commission on the status of access stairs off Foster Avenue on a damaged revetment wall. He has heard from several residents who would like the staircase to be repaired. The March winter storms caused significant damage to the area, and DPW Superintendent Tom Reynolds indicates they will not repair

or maintain the stairs going forward. BG has inspected the area, and the revetment wall would have to be repaired to safely restore the access stairs.

- JK also looked at the area; the old stairs are gone, and there are many large stones scattered along that area of the beach. There is another beach entrance a short walk away. Some neighbors and they told him they do not use the stairs because all the sand in that area of the beach has washed away; they walk to and use the nearby entrance.
- BG does not have the details of who owns the stairs. The stairs had been historically maintained by the Town prior to the revetment wall's deterioration. To repair the stairs, the Town would have to repair the wall.
- CH feels the stairs are the property owner's responsibility. BO feels this would be a DPW project and therefore their decision and responsibility. CH suggests that BG advise the residents to hire a project engineer and apply for a permit if they want to repair the stairs.

2 East Street – Linda Daichman

- BG notes that this street is privately owned. LD and Ron Bizzozero (RB) appeared before the Commission last year to receive a minor activities permit for road repairs
- LD states that the ocean continually washes away parts of the street. When they permitted last year, she was under the impression there were ongoing conditions allowing them to repair the street. When she called BG about making additional repairs this year, BG extended the permit for one year after consulting the minutes from the previous meeting, but indicated he would like an additional filing going forward.
- CH asks what was minor about the work? FW believes the work mostly involved adding gravel to the road. LD stated that this was augmented with excess material donated by the Town. LD states that DPW cleanup from recent storms removed some of the road material, leaving it with an abrupt drop-off.
- BG states he consulted with Town Counsel, who recommended that they file an RDA for work going forward, as a minor activity permit is not recognized by DEP. He would recommend approval Determination of Applicability, Negative No. 3 with special conditions permitting periodic maintenance in perpetuity. In response to a query from CH, BG indicates he views the ongoing road work as maintenance.
- RC advises LD that the Commission needs the RDA so DEP is aware of the ongoing work and has a chance to comment on it. JK adds that the Commission is no longer granting minor activity permits, and FW states the RDA with the proposed condition will allow for ongoing maintenance without further filings. BG is willing to help with the paperwork.
- LD adds that a lot of material fell behind the revetment wall and got pushed up against her house in the recent storms; she would like to redistribute the material behind the wall. Her contractor indicated that a permit was not needed for this work, but recommended that she advise the Commission.
- The Commission discusses with LD the nature of her Certificate of Compliance for her revetment wall work; LD claims the COC includes an ongoing condition permitting future work provided 7 days advance notice is given to the Commission. She didn't think a filing was needed to move the storm debris but BG advised she did; this causes her to lose her time slot with the contractor. BG believes LD has a COC without an ongoing maintenance provision.
- LD notes that she lives out of state most of the year, and asks how she can keep aware of Emergency Declarations impacting her property. FW notes that Emergency Declaration are issued by the state; BG adds that such declarations are rare, and are posted on the Commission Web site when issued. He characterizes the RDA filing as a way to allow LD to perform maintenance going forward, without an additional filing.
- BG recommends that future orders of conditions and certificates of compliance include provisions allowing for ongoing periodic, minor maintenance. He will check LD's COC to see if it already includes this provision. The Commission discusses the process by which special conditions can be extended after three years, and whether this requires repeated filings with the Registry of Deeds. BG indicates the better solution is to close out the Orders with ongoing conditions allowing maintenance. He will work with LD on the proper filings to allow her to conduct periodic maintenance on her revetment wall and on the street.

Complaints:

- BG advises the Commission that the Town Administrator and Town Counsel have requested that all complaints be submitted in writing, and asks the Commission to endorse his establishing a policy to that effect.
- RC notes that anonymous complaints are already generally ignored. FW questions if this would apply to urgent matters; BG indicates in such cases, he would act on the verbal and request a follow-up e-mail or letter. Commission consensus favors establishing a policy requiring complaints to be submitted in writing.

ADJOURNMENT – RC motioned to close the meeting at 9:34 pm. FW second. Motion approved 6-0-0.

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

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

Bert O'Donnell
James Kilcoyne
Art Lage