TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2020 6:30 P.M., SELECTMEN’S HEARING ROOM
TOWN HALL, 870 MORaine ST., MARSHFIELD, MA

MEMBERS PRESENT – James Kilcoyne (JK) Chair, Bert O’Donnell (BO) Vice Chair, Arthur Lage (AL), Frank Woodfall (FW), Craig Hannafin (CH), Bill Grafton, Conservation Administrator (BG)

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT – Rick Carberry (PC)

CALL TO ORDER  JK motions to open the meeting at 6:30 pm.  FW second.  Approved 5-0-0.

MINUTES
- The minutes of the January 21 meeting were presented for approval.  No suggested changes were received on the floor or by e-mail.  BG made one change.
- JK motions to accept the January 21, 2020 minutes as edited.  FW second.  Approved 5-0-0.

CHAIRMAN’S ADDRESS
- JK thanks Town Administrator Mike Maresco for making the Selectmen’s Hearing Room available for the Commission meeting.  He will poll the Commissioners at the end of the meeting as to whether they prefer this room’s layout and facilities for meetings.
- JK notes that the Commission is in the process of trying to find a new farmer for Mounce’s Meadow.  He will be meeting with two members of the Norwell Conservation Commission to discuss their farm field leasing practices.
- JK, PC, and BG met with Harbormaster Mike DiMeo to discuss dock projects and waterways, with a view to providing clearer guidance to applicants proposing such projects, as well as roles and responsibilities of engineers involved with such projects.  The goal is to guide applicants through the permitting process as well as making it faster and less expensive.
- JK is reviewing solution approaches for non-permitted work requiring the filing of an After-The-Fact Notice of Intent (NOI).  There has recently been an increase in ATF NOIs due to noncompliance with wetland regulations.  The Commission will be working with Town Counsel (TC) to benchmark against other towns and try to reduce their incidence.
- In order to reduce the time spent voting on repeated continuation requests, JK suggests that longer-duration continuances be moved to a “parking lot” until applicant has all the information to proceed, at which point applicant can request to be heard at the next meeting.  He is working with TC as to details, but would like initial Commissioner feedback; all Commissioners are okay with the concept.
- JK feels there has been an influx of repeated “business items” from residents wanting initial guidance on a project before presenting a formal application; he would like to reduce their occurrence and duration, as he feels this is not the intent and purpose of a business item, and limit feedback to what kind of filing would be required for a project.  With the earlier start time, JK would like to move most business items to the start of the meeting, before public hearings are opened.
- JK would like to reduce applicant cost and paperwork burden in situations where small changes are made to permitted projects, while still capturing such changes for the legal protection of all parties.  In situations where a project change has little to no impact on a resource area, JK would like to allow BG to review such changes with any two Commissioners.  If both Commissioners agree that the changes have little to no resource area impact, JK would like applicant to document the changes in an as-built plan without having to reappear before the Commission, with such approval to be ratified at the next
Commission meeting. JK will review the procedure with TC prior to its implementation, but would like Commissioner feedback; all Commissioners support the concept.

- At the January 21 discussion for 251 Damon’s Point, the Commission voted 5-0-0 for a third party to assist with the restoration plan. BG recommends one of the following consultants for the third party review: Bob Gray, John Rockwood, John Rockwell, and Steve Ivas; he feels that Gray or Ivas would be the most available, in that order.
- JK motions that the Commission designate Bob Gray, or Steve Ivas if Mr. Gray is not available, as the third-party consultant for the restoration plan at 251 Damon’s Point. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.

BUSINESS
B1 39 Eagle Road-Restoration Closure Presentation – John Rockwood/EcoTec
- John Rockwood (JR), EcoTec, appears before the Commission to discuss the restoration work at the above-referenced property in response to the Commission’s May 2016 enforcement order for work within resource areas and buffer zone. The EO required erosion control measures to be installed, as well as a restoration plan to remove fill brought on-site and restore vegetation. A restoration plan was subsequently approved by the Commission the same year. As the work occurred in NHESP priority habitat for Eastern Box Turtle, the restoration plan was also reviewed and approved by NHESP.
- JR presents a sketch plan and pictures of the work done and discusses details, including location and nature of erosion controls and characteristics of the property. The affected area was in forest, wetland, and buffer zone. JR initially visited the site in June of 2016 and observed a 100 ft long by (12-14) ft wide stone-dust driveway. Overall impacted area was estimated to be between 4200 and 4600 sq ft, including fill, excavated area, and soil displacement; JR observed just one tree removed as a result of the work.
- JR notes that the restoration work involved removing the road base and underlying geotextile fabric, with disposal of all materials offsite. They were able to bring the area back to grade without the need for additional soil introduction. Several logs and boulders were spread about on the property to provide habitat. The restoration area was seeded with native seed mixes as well as saltmarsh hay; native trees and shrubs were planted in 2017. The area was subsequently monitored for two years; JR shows several “after” pictures of the property showing the restoration work. The area was observed to be well vegetated and stabilized, and erosion controls were removed before the 2019 inspection. JR notes that the area is surrounded by forest, expects the area to continue to fill in as forest, and asks that the Commission to issue a letter rescinding the enforcement order.
- BG thanks applicants for their cooperation and comments favorably on the restoration work. He and Conservation Administrative Clerk, Liz Anoja have drafted a “dissolution of enforcement order” form model after the Town of Needham existing form for use in this and other cases. JK notes that EOs in the past have been rescinded by vote only, but feels the form will be useful for all parties for documentation purposes, and recommends adoption of the form. A copy of the form dissolving the EO for 39 Eagle Road is circulated for Commissioner signatures. JK thanks JR for his detailed presentation.
- JK motions to accept the dissolution of the enforcement order for 39 Eagle Road. BO second. Approved 5-0-0.

B2 The Terrapin Race - Carolina Hill Wilderness Race – Sean Jackson & Wolkpack Founders
- Governor Winslow Phys. Ed. Teacher Sean Jackson (SJ) present with Wolfpack founders. SJ appeared before the Commissioner about a year prior to discuss organizing a race. Since then, he and several
fellow runners have organized into a company called the Wolfpack, and further looked into the details and logistics of putting on a wilderness race in town.

- SJ shares a presentation giving details of the proposed race. He and the Wolfpack already utilize the trails in preparation for races in other locations, but noted that some trails need to be upgraded to handle a race. They are proposing the name “Terrapin Race” as a nod to Carolina Hill’s being a habitat for the Eastern Box Turtle (Terrapene carolina carolina). The race would include three levels, and are working with town veterans to organize an opening ceremony with honor guard. He would also like to honor former Conservation Agent Warren Harrington.

- BG notes that the proposed race route will go through the Carolina Hill and Furnace Brook Watershed Conservation properties. The organizers have been following the proper approval procedure, and will be meeting with Police and Fire. They are also looking to create a wilderness response team to assist with any injuries in the field. BG notes that the proposed race date is June 30, and applicants are eager to publicize.

- AL supports the concept. JK notes that applicant has provided a large volume of information and would like to know whether the Commissioners would like to approve the event now or take more time to review the materials. JK supports the event but is uncertain as to Commission liability if the event is approved and something goes wrong, but is okay if the other Commissioners want to approve the event tonight. SJ notes that the company will carry insurance which will protect every participant and all staff. AL is unsure who the ultimate approving authority for this event would be; JK believes it is the Commission, as it has stewardship of the land. BO suggests that BG discuss further with Town Administrator (TA) Maresco; BG agrees that additional discussions with TA, Police, and Fire would be beneficial. BG and JK will discuss further with TA Maresco and possibly Town Counsel. FW feels that SJ needn’t appear once these discussions have been had; BO and JK concur. BG suggests that a formal vote be taken when and if the project is cleared by Police, Fire, and TA Maresco.

- JK moves that the Commission support the race proposal pending (1) approval from all necessary Town departments and (2) the securing of any necessary permits and insurance, without need for a follow-up appearance before the Commission from applicants. AL second. Approved 5-0-0.

**B4 Village Green/Estoppel Certificate – Town Counsel & Commissioners**

- Colleen Ferguson (CF) present; she is Executive Director of the Village at Proprietor’s Green, which co-manages the Village Green with Commerce Realty Trust and Roche Brothers. The owner of Village at Proprietor’s Green is changing, and a condition of the purchase is that the Commission sign off on a new Estoppel Certificate for the Green; they are not looking to make any other changes.

- BG notes that he performed a site visit observing no issues and reviewed the documents with TC to verify there were no other changes to the certificate.

- The certificate is circulated for Commissioner Signatures.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- Prior to the start of the hearings, JK advises that the hearings for 922 Summer St RT (2842), 613 Careswell RT (2841), Holbrook (2816), Gomes (2829), Curtis (2825), Deprossino (2847), Marsh (2849), and Tedeschi Trust (2850) are being continued. Continuations are also posted outside the entrance to the meeting room.

**2852 DPW, Union Street (Couch Cemetery Expansion).................................................................NEW (Frank)**

- JK reads the legal ad and confirms that administrative requirements are complete.

- Dana Altobello (DA), Merrill Engineers, present along with Town Engineer Rod Procaccino (RP). The filing is a Notice of Intent (NOI) for expansion of the Couch Cemetery. The majority of the work will be
in the northern portion of the property, in about 60 acres of upland. Wetlands were delineated by John Zimmer (JZ), South River Environmental, in September of 2018, and an ORAD was issued in January of last year. Sections of the property are in NHESP priority habitat area. As part of the expansion, they are proposing to create a new entrance 400 feet north of the existing one, along with new driveways to access new grave locations.

- DA notes that the existing cemetery has maintained lawn areas up to the BVW, as well as paved driveway within 10 feet of the BVW. At the pre-filing discussion at the September 17, 2019 meeting, all parties discussed possible clearing and grading in the 25 to 50 ft buffer to free up additional grave sites. The current filing does propose this grading, with revegetation with native seed mix and placement of conservation markers at the end of the work. All new driveways will be outside of the 50 ft buffer except for a small connection to the existing driveway. A continuous silt sock erosion control line is proposed downgradient of all work adjacent to resource areas.

- DA also notes that the site has been designed in compliance with the stormwater management handbook, and the system is designed to provide 89% TSS removal rate. They received a letter from the Division of Marine Fisheries and Wildlife, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) last October, indicating that the smaller proposed expansion area was exempt; DA indicates that NHESP doesn’t see any major concerns regarding the remainder of the project on the north side of the property.

- In response to a query from FW, DA indicates that the clearing limits will be the erosion controls at the bottom of the slope. FW asks if jute netting could be used to prevent the slope from failing and having to be reconstructed; DA feels it is possible but costly. FW feels there is a risk of soil migrating into the 25 ft buffer given the steep slope. BG walked the area in question with JZ during the ANRAD, and feels some of the area is altered and overgrown with knotweed but the rest is well vegetated; DA agrees that the area has been manipulated over the years. FW would like to see biodegradable matting anywhere there is a greater than 3-to-1 slope; BG concurs, and RP indicates he has no issue with the matting.

- BG asks whether the soils will support the wetland species noted in their planting proposal. DA indicates that Ryan Associates, the landscaping firm, will evaluate the soil as the planting is implemented in collaboration with JZ.

- FW asks why applicant is seeking variances to grade within the 25 to 50 buffer when there are 99 acres on the property to work. DA notes that there is a shortage of grave sites in the town, and they would like to maximize the available area for grave sites, while maintaining the 50 ft buffer once the grading is completed. RP adds that Couch is the largest remaining land in town available for grave sites, about 150 sites a year are occupied, and additional expansions in the property are likely as funding can be secured.

- FW expresses concern that the fertilizers/herbicides and other agents referenced in the landscaping plan will end up in the wetlands, and asks if applicants would consider foregoing the use of these agents. DA indicates he did discuss the use of alternate agents using nitrogen rather than phosphorus. FW notes that nitrogen isn’t necessarily a safer alternative, and would prefer that no agents be used. RP notes that the Town typically fertilizes the cemeteries twice a year, in the Spring and in the Fall, but it may be possible to limit the area in which the agents are used. FW suggests that they not be used within 100 ft of the buffer zone. JK suggests that JZ or another qualified wetland scientist as to usage and/or setback limits for the use of these agents at the next hearing. BO notes that the Commission could specify the use of natural fertilizers or certain agents as a special condition.

- Third Party Consultant, Pat Brennan (PB), Amory Engineers, notes that he reviewed the stormwater management and erosion control plan. With respect to FW’s comments about matting, PB points out that the plan set states that slopes steeper than 3-to-1 will be stabilized with erosion control matting.
or an approved equal; FW indicates this will satisfy his concern in that area. PB verifies to BG that the matting specified is biodegradable. PB also notes that a large portion of the remaining property is wetland; FW asks if a conservation restriction will be added to the wet sections of the property. DA notes there is already a conservation restriction line on the property, heading towards the North River, as mitigation for the playing fields on Rockwood Road.

- BG adds that a Conservation Management Plan will also be required for the property; DA believes this will be ready for the next hearing.
- BO comments that the narrative specifies no structures within 100 ft of the BVW but then states the closest proposed structure is 64 ft from the BVW. DA states that an updated narrative was submitted that addressed the discrepancy.
- Steve Moraski (SM), 551 Union Street, asks about erosion control measures at the smaller area of work, near his property. DA indicates there will be erosion controls at the bottom of the slope to capture runoff during construction; after construction, the runoff will be directed towards the wetlands. SM asks if this will enlarge the wetlands around him. DA notes that the soils in the area are relatively sandy, and feels that most stormwater will infiltrate into the soil as it flows down the hill. JK asks DA to review the plans and provide a comment letter with respect to SM’s concerns. After further discussion, the matter was continued pending receipt of the NHESP comment letter.
- FW motions to continue the hearing to February 18, 2020. JK second. Approved 5-0-0.

2857 Martin, 200 Oak Street (replace existing in ground pool)...........................cont from 1/21/20 (Frank)

- JK reads the legal ad. Hearing Officer FW confirms administrative requirements are complete.
- Rick Servant (RS), Stenbeck & Taylor, presents for applicant. Applicant would like to replace an existing in-ground pool behind the house; the new pool is 130 sq ft larger and is located in roughly the same area. They are proposing to remove the existing paver patio, replace the pool, and then restore the patio. Wetlands were delineated by Brooke Monroe, Pinebrook Consulting.
- BG notes that the proposed work is in previously disturbed area; conservation markers may help prevent incursion into the buffer to the wetlands.
- FW asks for comments from the public; none.
- BG notes that the standard of conditions of approval will apply.
- FW motions to close the hearing and issue Orders of Conditions with special conditions drafted by BG. CH second. Approved 5-0-0.

2847 Deprossino 556 Holly Road (Lot 8) (New SFH).................................cont from 1/21/20 (Bert)

- The hearing is continued until the public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on March 3, 2020.
- JK motions to continue the matter to March 3, 2020. CH second. Approved 5-0-0.

2849 Marsh, 110 Bartlett’s Island Way (Revetment)...............................cont from 1/21/20 (Jim)

- The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
- JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. AL second. Approved 5-0-0.

2842 Summer St. R.T. / Julie Tweed, 922 Summer St (Pier, Ramp & Float)......cont from 12/03/19 (Rick)

- The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
- JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.
2841  613 Careswell St. R.T., 613 Careswell St. (ATF Fence & Veg Removal)......cont from 11/26/19 (Bert)
   • The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
   • JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. BO second. Approved 5-0-0.

2816  Holbrook, 26 Cove Street (Revetment Repair)........................................cont from 7/30/19 (Jim)
   • The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
   • JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.

2850  Jan M. Tedeschi Trust, 100 Marginal Street (Pier, Ramp & Float).............cont from 1/21/20 (Rick)
   • The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
   • JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. CH second. Approved 5-0-0.

2829  Gomes, 76 Carolyn Circle (Pier, Dock & Float)..........................................cont from 10/15/19 (Rick)
   • The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
   • JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.

2825  Curtis, 3 Cove Creek Lane (Dock Repair)...................................................cont from 10/1/19 (Rick)
   • The hearing is continued until the next public meeting of the Marshfield Conservation Commission on February 18, 2020.
   • JK motions to continue the matter to February 18, 2020. CH second. Approved 5-0-0.

REQUESTS FOR CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE & EXTENSIONS

1728  Rotondo, 256 Ocean [COC]
   • Sarah Dunn (SD), a realtor representing potential buyer Tom Murray (TM), present. Pursuant to a motion at a previous meeting, BG solicited and received a revised building location plan plus comment letter from Bob Crawford (BC), RPE. With respect to Special Condition G within Orders of Conditions/SE42-1728, BC’s comments were that the existing openings/vents would adequately handle a flooding event, and in fact offer more capacity than needed for the structure based on contemporary standards. BG also received a comment letter from Building Commissioner Jim Folkard concurring with BC’s comments.
   • BG visited the site and confirmed that the paver patio had been removed and the driveway returned to gravel, as requested by the Commission. Based on his observations and BC/JF’s comments, BG recommended issuance of a completion COC.
   • JK motions to issue a completion COC for the property. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.
   • BG requests that the COC be recorded immediately, and that proof be provided to the Conservation office.

2664  Dacey (now Lawson), 62 Marginal Street [COC]
   • BG states that the new owners have removed the dock and float material left on the salt marsh by previous owners, and recommended issuance of the COC.
   • JK motions to issue a COC for the property. CH second. Approved 5-0-0.
2749  McGowan, 18 Paddock Way [COC]
- BG advises that he observed incomplete special conditions and recommended that the request be tabled.

2789  Flashner, 206 Carolyn Circle [COC]
- BG advises that he observed incomplete special conditions and recommended that the request be tabled.

ENFORCEMENT ORDERS
Smith, 38 Liberty Street (11/19/18 KS will set early Dec visit)
Drosopoulos, 7 Lady Slipper Lane (08/15/18 TC Final Notice)
New Owner, Winslow Avenue Ext.
Mahaney, 46 Preston Terrace (12/12/18 BG met with TC)
White, 180 Atwell Circle (Escalation letter in Process)
Bednarz/ Nouza, 65 Ireland Road (Unpermitted Cutting <= 50 ft)
Tamara Macuch, 237 Webster Avenue
Stifter, 102 Bartlett’s Island (unpermitted revetment wall)

BUSINESS (Continued)
B6 Harlow Road Written Complaint Citizen Concern - Hanane Nacri
- Hanane Naciri (HN), 4 Harlow, present to discuss dumping issues on Conservation land near her property. Much of what is dumped is grass and branches, but much trash is dumped as well, which she feels attracts rodents to her house. Additionally, branches from the property are falling in her driveway.
- BG notes that Board of Health Director Bob Vallery inspected the property and provided a written response that he did not find the green waste to be a health hazard.
- BO asks whether the trash appear to have been brought there or blown in from adjacent properties. BG feels that the trash was deliberately dumped, likely hauled in by hand from nearby.
- CH asks if there is any signage on the property denoting it as Conservation land; BG indicates there is none presently. AL suggests that a “no dumping” sign be posted as a first step. BG feels that a sign may be effective if it encourages awareness and monitoring of the property by neighbors.
- JK suggests that BG send a letter to neighbors advising that dumping on conservation land is illegal and encouraging them to report any violators. BG is concerned he will have to do the same for many similar sites in town. JK suggests that BG consider drafting a form letter for such situations.
- HN would like the trash to be cleaned up, as it frequently blows into her yard. BG states that most of the material is green waste. JK feels the ideal solution is to catch the violator and make that person pay for the clean-up. BG agrees that he needs the violator’s identity in order to enforce the regulations in this case.
- After further discussion, per Commission consensus, BG will post two “no dumping” signs on either end of the property. BG suggests that HN try to obtain a picture or plate number so the violator can be identified.
- HN also asks about a leaning tree adjacent to her yard. BG inspected, and feels the tree will fall naturally in the wooded area behind the property and is more of an eyesore. HN is concerned about the safety of her kids. BG is uncertain about the ownership of the property. JK asks that HN provide information about the location of her property line in relation to the tree. If the tree is on town property, a ranger can cut it.
B7 31 Island Street/ SE42-2703 / Tim Boyd and Commissioners

- Homeowner Tim Boyd (TB) present to inquire about a possible deviation from the Order of Conditions issued for SE42-2703. He would like to change the second-story deck in back of the house to an enclosed storage area at the bottom with living space upstairs. The work area of the proposed change is in an AE 16 flood zone. He would like to know if change can be captured in an as-built plan during the request for Certificate of Compliance, or whether an amended Notice of Intent will be required. In comments to the Commission, TB feels the proposed changes to be a betterment to the property.

- JK would like to know if the changes would be more impactful to the resource area. BG states that the proposed deck is a raised deck. The footprint of the footings would change in order to support the storage area and enclosed living space. BG has reached out to Building Commissioner Jim Folkard, who indicated that the storage area would have to be (1) flood compliant and (2) not habitable space.

- TB adds that they are proposing to remove an old wooden garage on the property, and the proposed storage space will take the place of the storage lost with removal of the garage. JK comments that removal of the garage is a positive, but the changes in aggregate seem to be major; the proposal is likely to be approved given the removal of the garage, but an additional filing may be required.

- AL agrees that the proposal seems to be a major change requiring a new filing. BG notes that consensus is clear that the change is too major to be captured on an as-built, but that filing a new NOI would result in the recording of four liens in total on the property. BG suggests that the Commission allow the changes to be captured in an amended NOI, which would not require an additional lien; JK concurs. AL wants to make sure that the abutters would be notified of a hearing for an amended NOI; BG confirms they would.

- TB asks if the additional filing could be avoided if they took away the storage area under the deck. JK feels the enclosure of the deck constitutes an increase in impervious surface requiring the filing of an amended NOI. JK feels that allowing the changes to be captured in an amended NOI constitute an attempt at compromise on part of the Commission. BG notes that the Commission is limited in what changes the Commission can allow without additional filings.

- TB comments on the time lost waiting to receive the feedback that an additional filing would be required. BG notes that his original meeting with TB was on January 13th, and believes that both parties selected the February 4th meeting for this hearing, as January 21 was full as of January 13th. JK adds that the Commission provides feedback in business items as a courtesy as opposed to a requirement, notes the influx of applicants seeking feedback prior to actual filings, and apologizes for any delay.

- BG notes that TB already has a plan showing the proposed changes and suggests that if the Commission grant a 24-hour extension of the filing deadline, the amended NOI could be heard at the next meeting on February 18 provided abutters are notified quickly. JK notes that the entire lot falls within Commission jurisdiction.

- JK polls the Commissioners as to whether to grant a 24-hour filing extension for an amended NOI: AL yes, BO yes, FW yes, CH yes. BG advises TB that he would need to receive the amended NOI form plus filing fee tomorrow.

B5 RTC/Kiosk Designer-Introduction & Orientation / Angela Scieszka

- Angela Scieszka (AS) present to receive feedback from the Commission as to the design of updated kiosks and signage for conservation properties. AS distributes mock-ups and images for the Commissioners to review. She would like the new signage to include features of the property including points of interest, locus maps, logos, corporate partners, rules and regulations, and public health messages.
JK would like to know if the locus maps would be available on the Commission or RTC Web site; AS feels the maps will eventually be available. JK feels it would be useful to have the maps available on the Web, and that the style of the updated signage is greatly improved. He would also like to see codes as to trail difficulty added to the maps. CH suggests that the trails be color-coded to reflect the difficulty of the trail.

The Commissioners broadly discuss the delineation of Commission and other committee responsibility. BO wants to make sure the updated signs are released in a timely manner. BG notes that other committees have primarily been involved in this initiative to date, and now it’s time for the Commission to review and provide feedback, but the process is moving forward. FW wants to make sure the process continues to move forward, but JK would like to make sure that the Commission is looped into the process early enough to be able to suggest changes.

AS notes that trails are already distinguished by color; there may be other ways to denote difficulty, such as shapes or notes as to trail characteristics. Additional information can be made available on the Web site.

BO would like to see the URL or a QR code to the Town Web site on the signs. All parties discuss what should or should not be included in signage given space constraints.

BG suggests that the Commissioners review and provide any additional feedback to him for forwarding to AS. AS would like to know about any endangered species on the various properties.

**B3 Review Current State NOI with Ch. 294 & 505 dated 02/08/2018 – Commissioners**

- All parties review a packet containing an updated WPA Form 3 (NOI) that includes the new DMF address dated 2/08/2018. BG notes that applicants using the current forms for dock projects are sending them to the old address, causing delays in the review process; no other changes are proposed. FW feels that when the state issues a new form, the new form should automatically be used. BG prefers that a formal vote be taken.
- JK motions that the Commission approve the proposed update to the WPA Form 3. AL second. Approved 4-0-1, FW having abstained.

**ADJOURNMENT** – JK makes a motion to close the hearing at 9:05 PM. FW second. Approved 5-0-0.