



## HULL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

253 Atlantic Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

Hull, MA 02045

Phone: 781-925-8102

Fax: 781-925-8509

**TUESDAY, December 18, 2018**

**Meeting held at Hull Town Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**

**Members Present:** Paul Paquin, Chair, Sean Bannen, Paul Epstein, Chris Oliveri, Lou Sorgi  
**Staff Present:** Chris Krahforst, Conservation Administrator; Sarah Clarren, Assistant Conservation Administrator  
**Minutes:** Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to: Approve the Minutes of October 9, 2018 as amended.

**7:30** Call to order

**7:35 Along Nantasket Ave (from Kenberma St to Spring St Intersections) Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability** filed by **John Struzziery** for work described as **sewer pipe and manhole rehabilitation: sewer interceptor renewal**.

Representatives: John Struzziery, Director of Wastewater Operations

Abutters/Others: none present

Documents: "Sewer Pipe and Manhole Rehabilitation" – Woodward & Curran – 09/2018

J. Struzziery presented the proposed project which is part of a larger interceptor renewal project which runs most of the length of Nantasket Avenue. He stated that there are three parts of the larger project that may not fall under an exemption under the WPA. The first is near Hadassah Way where there is a drainage pipe going directly into to a sewer interceptor. The drainage pipe will be removed and the drainage will be redirected down Hadassah Way to Samoset Avenue. At the Lagoon Crossing, near the Yacht Club, there are two pipes and manholes that go underneath the channel. The manholes and pipes need to be accessed and rehabilitated. Lastly, there is an access road adjacent to the seawall near Pt Allerton/Nantasket Avenue that may need to be used for temporary traffic diversion; temporary pavement would be installed and then removed post-construction. C. Krahforst noted that an RDA had been filed for the larger project, but had been withdrawn under the utility exemption of the WPA.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;

It was **voted** to:

**Close** the Public Hearing and **issue** a Negative Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**7:40 12 Lynn Ave., Map 22/Lot0 64 Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability** filed by **Peggy Chaput** for work described as **install 3 sandbags to catch debris onto roadway**.

Representatives: Peggy Chaput (12 Lynn Ave)

Abutters/Others: Joseph and Maria Callahan (19 Russell St); Ray Sarno (296 Newport Rd)

Documents: "[picture]" – n.d.

"[picture]" – n.d.

"[picture]" – n.d.

"[picture]" – n.d.

"20181112\_092128.jpg (2592x1944) [picture]" – 11/14/2018

P. Chaput began by presenting debris she stated she collected from 296 Newport Avenue that ends up on her property and the street. She stated that she regularly cleans such debris and fill from the area in front of her home. She added that she placed sand bags in the area to stop said debris, but received a cease and desist letter. She therefore has filed a Request for Determination of Applicability to place sandbags to catch the debris. She said that there is a drywell in the street that would be clogged from such debris. She said that there is no water coming off of her property—any water is coming off of 296 Newport Road and she wants to stop the issue. The Commission asked her to confirm if her request was to place sandbags in the street to channel the water, to which P. Chaput said yes. She stated that the water is coming down the road and that the proposed sandbags would be placed at a 45 degree angle.

It was added that a berm had been installed by the DPW perpendicular to the street, but was removed per request of the Conservation Administrator. The Commission reviewed a picture of said berm which has since been removed. C. Krahforst asked P. Chaput when said berm was installed, to which she said she did not know and that it was removed after a complaint was made to the Town Manager. C. Krahforst stated that the orientation of the sandbags will be

similar to that of the berm which was removed. P. Chaput provided a picture showing the sandbags in relation to property lines.

A Commissioner questioned if the applicant owned the area proposed for sandbag placement. C. Krahforst stated that per the regulations, anyone can file a Request for Determination of Applicability for anyone else's property, so long as the owner is mailed a copy of the Request and the Request is mailed to the regional office of DEP. C. Krahforst stated that the Town owns the area and the Town Manager's Office did not receive notice of the Request for Determination of Applicability. However, he provided a copy to Phil Lemnios, Town Manager and Jim Lampke, Town Counsel. He added that doing so may not have been the appropriate way for the application to be shared with the property owner, but he is not an attorney. C. Krahforst noted that DEP also did not receive a copy of the filing as required, but he notified Peggy Chaput who has since provided a copy to DEP. C. Krahforst stated that filing simultaneously with DEP and the property owner is stated on the RDA which was signed by the applicant. P. Chaput responded by stating that she will re-submit the application if deemed necessary.

A Commissioner questioned why the DPW constructed a berm where the sandbags were proposed, to which C. Krahforst said he did not know. P. Chaput stated that when 296 Newport Road was constructed, fill was brought in and water comes off of the road onto her and abutting properties. P. Chaput continued and stated that the berm was installed after she asked. She stated that fill was removed from the rear of 296 Newport Rd, but not the front of the yard. She added that because of the water, the town installed a berm and a drywell to alleviate the issue. She stated that the asphalt that was installed is being eroded away. She stated that the berm is being reduced in size due to large vehicles being parked on the street. P. Chaput stated that fill was not removed from 296 Newport Road and therefore her property receives more water. The Commission reminded P. Chaput that they had been on numerous site visits and issued a Certificate of Compliance for work at 296 Newport Rd; they restated that per the plans, the fill was removed. C. Krahforst added that due to complaints, the DPW installed a drywell in the street. The Commission stated that the street and the right of way belong to the Town.

R. Sarno of 296 Newport Rd. submitted a picture showing the property lines and the berm. He stated that the asphalt that was installed by P. Chaput has created water issues, as the area used to be grass. He stated that the proposed work would redirect water coming down the street to his yard. He added that the material P. Chaput collected came from his yard, not the area in question.

P. Chaput said that the extra fill that was brought in when 296 Newport Road was constructed goes out to the roadway. She added that 296 Newport Road has a driveway that is also on town property. She stated that there is a water problem.

M. Calahan of 19 Russel St stated that when she installed a swimming pool, haybales were required and no guidance was given. She then asked the DPW who indicated that as long as sandbags aren't obstructing anything, it's alright. She questioned why there is a public hearing, especially if sandbags are proposed on the street. She then asked what the sandbagging policy was. The Commission stated that there is a hearing because someone submitted an application. C. Krahforst stated that the area is within land subject to coastal storm flowage and redirecting or diverting water to abutting properties is not allowed. C. Krahforst then added that in this particular instance, a complaint was made that sandbags were diverting water away from the direct route to the stormdrain and that it was deflecting water into an abutter's property. The Commission added that with climate change, these issues will only intensify and therefore, sandbag guidance is being developed. M. Calahan of 19 Russell St stated that she does not believe in climate change. M. Calahan stated that during the March Nor'easters, the DPW handed out sandbags to residents and many sandbags were placed along property lines and diverting water elsewhere. The Commission added that the March Nor'easters are part of the reason why sandbag guidance is being developed in order to avoid neighbors from harming each other. C. Krahforst stated that proper guidance for sandbagging is being developed and is on the agenda for later in the evening; he added that neighbors can't deflect their issues to their neighbors. M. Calahan said that in situations where there is a tidal storm, she doesn't care where the water goes, as long as it's not in her home. P. Chaput said that water has been deflected for 17 years due to the fill on 296 Newport Road. She stated that the fill is bubbling over. The Commission restated that they have been over the issue with P. Chaput many times and after having fill removed and reviewing surveys showing the grade, a Certificate of Compliance for the construction of the home at 296 Newport Road was appropriately issued. The Commission stated that the plans show the grade is the same, to which P. Chaput stated that is incorrect. The Commission stated that they disagree and surveyed proof supporting P. Chaput's claim has never been provided and therefore, is incorrect.

A member of the Commission stated that the applicant would need to get approval from the Town to place the sandbags on Town property. Another member indicated that sandbag placement can still not redirect water elsewhere. C. Krahforst stated that sandbags could be allowed if the water is redirected and maintained on the property. C. Krahforst stated that the sandbag placement may impair water flow to the stormdrain. The Commission noted that the

DPW did install a berm along the front portion of the property. C. Krahforst stated that the Commission needs to consider the potential for a stormdrain system to be overwhelmed. He added that when an entire street is sandbagged, it pushes the water downstream; if allowed, sandbagging along or near property lines should be reviewed on a case by case basis. A Commissioner noted that most sandbagging is to protect an entryway to a home/business, which is permissible. P. Chaput stated that she wants to install the sandbags to stop the debris; the water won't stop. P. Chaput stated that she wants to collect debris and not water. She added that she doesn't want to clean up the debris, to which the Commission said the DPW should be maintaining the street. The Commission added that if there is a health concern, it should be directed to the Health Department.

P. Chaput then stated that DEP informed her that sandbag placement is outside the Wetlands Protection Act jurisdiction and is a local matter as it is in the street. She questioned why she was at a hearing for three sandbags, especially because she was given the sandbags by the DPW. The Commission responded by stating that the DPW may have provided the sandbags, but that permission was not expressly given for them to be placed in the street.

M. Calahan of 19 Russell St said that where the water is coming from has not been addressed, to which the Commission stated that water comes from a variety of places including rain, snow, watering gardens, washing cars, etc. S. Clarren asked if the sandbags would be permanent or not, to which P. Chaput said that they would be installed only during storm events. P. Chaput said that she just wants to stop the debris, not water. The Commission responded that the sandbags will also divert the water.

P. Paquin moved that the proposed work is not a permissible act as filed, as it redirects water. Sorgi then questioned if the Commission has enough information. It was suggested that the Town weigh in on the proposed work, as the water may just be deflected to the street. Another Commissioner questioned if the drywell could handle the water.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Paquin **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 4-0-1 (Sorgi abstained);

It was **voted** to:

**Close** the Public Hearing and **issue** a Positive Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**8:22 296 Newport Rd., Map 22 /Lot 038 Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Request for Determination of Applicability** filed by **Peggy Chaput** for work described as **use of sump pump to empty stormwater and debris on Newport Road and Lynn Ave.**

The Commission determined that because notice of the Request of Determination of Applicability was not sent to the owner of 296 Newport Road, the Request was invalid, as per the Wetlands Protection Act.

**8:24 Graves Island, Map NA/Lot NA. Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Request for Determination of Applicability** filed by **David Waller** for work described as **repair and replace existing walkway and pier; add retractable aluminum gangway and lower landing.**

Representatives: David Waller; Michael Count (representative)

Abutters/Others: Joe Berkley (55 Pt. Allerton Ave)

Documents: "Plan Accompanying Petition of Graves Lit and Fog Station, LLC" – 5/25/2018

D. Waller said that the proposed project would rebuild the pre-existing structure that the Army Corps of Engineers constructed in 1903. He added that due to climate change concerns, the project would include elevating the existing walkway and pier and adding a retractable gangway. C. Krahforst stated that the drawings that were submitted were incredibly detailed and the project is undergoing a Chapter 91 License review. M. Count, engineer, went over the plans. He stated that the site is approximately a 10 acre parcel that was granted to the government by the Commonwealth of MA in 1902. Between 1902-1905, the lighthouse and various structures were constructed. In 1991, the No Name storm destroyed and/or damaged much of the structures. He stated that the proposed work will occur in the pre-existing footprint. He stated that the project received an ENF Certificate through the MEPA process. The project was also reviewed by MA Historical Commission, Coast Guard, ACOE, and is about to receive a Chapter 91 License. He then added that during the Ch. 91 License process, DEP reached out to Boston to see if Grave Light fell under their jurisdiction, to which it didn't; Boston suggested the applicant check with Hull. C. Krahforst noted that the Town has two atlases showing Graves Light within jurisdiction, but there is still some uncertainty remaining. Therefore, to be safe, an RDA was filed with the Hull Conservation Commission. He added that it has received a lot of review when it underwent permitting under other agencies. J. Berkley of 55 Pt. Allerton Ave stated that D. Waller's restoration projects are very well done.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;

It was **voted** to:

**Close** the Public Hearing and **issue** a Negative Determination of Applicability. The Determination of Applicability was **signed**.

**8:35 220 Nantasket Road., Map 31/Lot 005 (SE35-1455) Opening of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by John Joyce for work described as proposed 36' revetment wall.**

Representatives: John and Cathy Joyce; David G. Ray (Surveyor)

Abutters/Others: none present

Documents: "Fwd [email] – John Joyce – 11/14/2018

"Existing and Proposed Conditions Plan" – Nantasket Survey Engineering, LLC – 12/5/18

D. Ray presented the proposed project. He stated that the proposal involves restoring a pre-existing structure which was damaged in the March Nor'easters. In front of the wall, a sloped rock revetment-like structure is proposed in order to decrease erosion. On top of the wall, vegetation is proposed.

C. Krahforst noted that there was a previous filing, but it did not specifically address a wall. C. Krahforst stated that he reached out to Rebecca Haney from CZM regarding this filing, who ultimately questioned the need for a hard engineering structure at the site. It was added that the home is not in danger from erosion, so the Commission questioned the need for a hard solution. The Commission suggested that a cobble berm may prevent scour and help protect the property. C. Krahforst then noted that the wall was likely damaged in the Nor'easters due to a large piece of debris that wasn't removed from the shore. D. Ray stated that a sloped revetment-like portion in front of the wall would help prevent such debris from destroying the wall. D. Ray then stated that the wall would be restored as it was prior to the storm. The Commission expressed concern over armoring a coastal bank for a home constructed post-1978. D. Ray stated that the coastal bank on-site is not providing sediment. The Commission said that a property in the vicinity of the site replaced a wall with a cobble berm. C. Krahforst noted the site has experienced erosion and therefore is providing sediment to resource areas, to which D. Ray disagreed. The Commission expressed concern that work had begun prior to a permit being issued and then expressed concern over the difference of length and size to what was pre-existing to what is proposed. C. Krahforst noted that DEP does not look favorably on augmenting such a structure; repairs, depending on the extent, are allowed. C. Krahforst then added that just off shore, there is a marsh system that may be receiving sediment from the area and therefore it is possible that armoring the coastal bank would starve the marsh system of sediment, which is not permitted under the WPA. It was then added that revetment projects are reviewed by engineers, to which D. Ray stated that it is not a revetment; it is buried. The Commission agreed that the toe of the wall should be protected, but a softer solution should be utilized. J. and C. Joyce agreed that a softer solution to protect the tow of the wall could be developed. D. Ray asked if the wall could be approved prior to the softer solution, so the coastal bank could be protected over the winter, to which the Commission agreed. D. Ray stated that an Amended Order would be requested at a later date.

Two Special Conditions were added as follows:

- 1) The height of the wall shall match the pre-existing height. Prior to an issuance of a Certificate of Compliance, as-built spot elevations of the wall shall be provided to the Commission.
  - 2) This Order does not include a revetment, as originally indicated in the Notice of Intent.
- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to:  
**Close** the Public Hearing and **approve** the Order of Conditions. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

**9:15** Along the coastal bank adjacent to 26-30 Marine Drive, Map 60/Lot 900 (SE35-1451) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Tony Susi for work described as proposed rock revetment for coastal bank stabilization. **On 12/18/18, the applicants requested a continuance to January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019.**

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to:  
**Continue** the Public Hearing to 01/08/2019 at a time to be determined.

**9:16 189 Nantasket Ave., Map 37/Lots 002 & 004 (SE35-1453) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Chris Reale for work described as the demolition of a portion of the existing building and construction of a retail and entertainment facility with concession areas and outdoor amenity and recreation spaces.**

Representatives: Chris Reale; Karlis Skulte (Engineer)

Abutters/Others: none present

Documents: "Paragon Boardwalk Redevelopment Set of Plans, 16pp" – Karlis Skulte (Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc.) – 11/20/2018

Since the last hearing, a DEP file number was assigned. The Commission then discussed special conditions.

Four Special Conditions were added as follows:

- 1) Inspections of the stormwater management system as a whole, and of the individual components of the system, will be carried out on a routine basis and in accordance with the schedule identified in Section 6.3 of

the Operations and Maintenance Plan. Each will be inspected for sediment buildup, presence of oil, color, and structural damage. The results of each inspection will be entered into an inspection log and shall be provided to the Conservation Department. At minimum, the property owner shall provide the inspection log to the Conservation Department at the following intervals: 6 months - with estimates of material accumulation rates, 1 year - with estimates of material accumulation rates, 2 years and 3 years. Depending on performance, the Commission reserves the right to require further inspections to protect the resource areas. As stated in the Operations and Maintenance Plan, records of inspections and maintenance shall be up to date and available for review and inspection. This condition is ongoing and will not expire after three years.

- 2) The property owner shall keep the stormwater management systems in good working order (per the Operations and Maintenance Plan). The Commission and/or designee has the right to confirm, clarify, and require compliance with said Operations and Maintenance Plan. This condition is ongoing and will not expire after three years.
- 3) If the project goes through the Special Permit process and any changes are thus adopted, the project must be reviewed by the Conservation Commission for consideration to amend the order of conditions.
- 4) The sand for the recreational area shall be sourced from an approved state vendor and shall meet uncontaminated sand standards.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to:

**Close** the Public Hearing and **approve** the Order of Conditions. The Order of Conditions was **signed**.

**9:26 36 Clifton Ave., Map 31/Lot 003 (SE35-1454) Continuation** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Raymond Delmonico** for work described as **proposed revetment wall**.

Representatives: David Ray (Surveyor)

Abutters/Others: none present

Documents: None presented

D. Ray stated that he wanted to request a continuance to 1/8/19. He stated that the applicants will be examining softer solutions for the next meeting.

- Upon a **motion** by P. Epstein **2nd** by S. Bannen and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to:

**Continue** the Public Hearing to 01/08/2019 at a time to be determined.

**Certificate of Compliance Requests**

76 Atlantic Ave (SE35-1367) – the Commission noted that the work appears to differ from the approved plan, including additional fill. It was added that an as-built is required prior to an issuance of a Certificate of Compliance. No action.

**Continued and New Business**

Discussion on Order of Conditions SE35-1431 – Order issued on 9/04 to: regrade and repurpose accumulated overwash material to minimize channeling impacts to abutting homes. Overwash material to be used to fill eroded like-material at the base of existing revetment along Channel St:

Abutters/Others: Candace Barone (1149 Nantasket Ave.); Geneveve and Edward Sartell (1132 Nantasket Ave); Kathy Lynch (1141 Nantasket Ave); Randal Gould (2 Cushing St); Gary Kimball (1147 Nantasket Ave); Ryan Kimball (1143 Nantasket Ave).

Documents: "Relative Elevation" – n.d.; "Elevation to Horizontal Distance" – n.d.

Discussion: C. Krahforst stated that given the feedback he received at the last meeting, he compiled further information regarding the project, including transects of the site. He stated that the site is within the LiMWA. He did a transect along the road line and eight transects perpendicular to the street. The along-the-road-edge transect show that the road is fairly flat. T0 (as shown on "Elevation to Horizontal Distance") is vegetated and is located outside of the area of work. T3 is the area of that is the highest section of the berm. Transects show that there is channeling occurring due to the berm. The channeling is exacerbated the further east one goes along the berm. There will be little to no material that will be repurposed elsewhere, as suggested by Coastal Zone Management. The Commission stated that vegetation should not be disturbed. No material is to be taken anywhere else. The area of work should be vegetated.

J. Sartell questioned what the area of work is, to which C. Krahforst stated that no work is being proposed further west of T1. C. Krahforst then said that the berm would be tapered to meet the elevation at the Sartell's property at a distance of approximately 5'. C. Krahforst stated that properties further to the east experience flooding first and for a longer time than other properties in the area; the project will hopefully reduce such experiences. J. Sartell then asked what the height of the berm would be, to which C. Krahforst said the material volume won't be reduced, the plateau of the berm will be approximately 4' (at highest existing point it is approximately 6').

G. Kimball (?) said that the area gets a lot of material on it and the DPW can't keep up. He added that the berm has been there for a long time. The Commission stated that there is no certainty when and where storms will hit the worst. C.

Krahforst stated that the berm was man-made; from now on the DPW will not be allowed to continue creating the berm. G.

Kimball (?) asked why mini-berms could be allowed, to which the Commission stated that water cannot be channeled. C. Krahforst noted that there is no maintenance plan proposed; the project involves addressing a channeling problem. He added if problems emerge from coastal storms, it is not under this permit (SE35-1431).

K. Lynch of 1141 Nantasket Ave asked what the planting would entail. S. Clarren added that the hearing has been closed; this is just discussion. C. Krahforst stated that the Order would have to be amended to include planting and to the new proposed grade (the original permit was to return the area to the 2007 grade).

R. Gould of 2 Cushing St said that he doesn't know when the berms were created, but the Town did it. He questioned what the point of the work is and then questioned how seawalls are permitted if the flow of water is so important. He then stated vegetation won't stop anything. The Commission stated that plantings help stabilize soil and it may not last forever. R. Gould asked if the material is going to be moved to Chanel St., to which the Commission said the material won't be repurposed.

#### 353 Beach Ave – change of plan; Amended Order of Conditions?:

Abutters/Others: Leif and Christa O'Leary (owner); David G. Ray (Surveyor); Jesse Kropelnicki (engineer); Al Kearney (architect); Adam Williamson (builder)

Discussion: L. O'Leary said that when the project was originally reviewed by the Commission, the Commission suggested that it be raised further than proposed. At that time, they decided not to, but have since elevated the home 4' further than approved. His structural engineer has developed a connected pile/pillar foundation with strip footings. C. Krahforst said that they are present asking whether or not they needed to amend their Order of Conditions. The footprint hasn't changed, but the foundation on file has. C. Krahforst stated that per the building code, there should be unconnected open pilings when there are erodible soils. He added that there can be changes to that based on sufficient evidence on if the soil is erodible or not. The Commission unanimously agreed that the soil is erodible, especially given its location. D. Ray stated that it is an open pile system and it will look identical to what was approved by the Commission, with the exception of a buried connected base and 4' higher piles. He added that the connected pile system is located in what used to be the basement. D. Ray stated that the only non-erodible soil is bedrock. S. Clarren pointed out that it is not a public hearing and therefore the abutters have not been notified; the Commission should determine if an Amended Order is required. She added that the project is also before the Zoning Board of Appeals. L. O'Leary said that there is no erosion on-site and that the Commission is acting illogically. The Commission stated that no coastal geologist's opinion has been provided on if the property contains erodible soils on the property. The Commission stated that evidence needs to be provided and an Amendment to the Order of Conditions needs to be requested. The Commission then discussed that a peer review may be needed for the project. C. O'Leary stated that the home is currently in the air and expressed concern over extending the process further into the winter. C. Krahforst stated that work was done without a permit. S. Clarren then added that what the Commission is requesting is not out of the box—similar projects have had similar requirements.

Re-sign 95 Clifton Ave (35-1405): The Commission re-signed the Order of Conditions for 95 Clifton Avenue which was approved on 11/27/2018.

DEP Snow Disposal Guidance: The Commission received correspondence regarding Snow Disposal from DEP.

Permit Extension Request for SE35-1303 Construction of synthetic turf field, 180 Main St.: – P. Epstein **Motion**, S. Bannen **2<sup>nd</sup>**, **vote** 5-0; OoC extended for 3 years.

Marginal Road Flood Mitigation (new): C. Krahforst stated that homeowners have expressed concern over flooding in the area and questioned if placement of jersey barriers is acceptable in the area (from base of pump house to the first property). He relayed that placement of jersey barriers will exacerbate erosion. He suggested that perhaps sand could be placed in front of the jersey barriers and planted; eventually the jersey barriers could be removed. Rebecca Haney of CZM thought such a solution may work.

Sandbag discussion review of mailing notice: The Commission reviewed and made edits to the drafted sandbagging guidance letter.

Rockland Circle (new): P. Paquin recused himself. C. Krahforst stated that he sent a letter regarding the lack of timely compliance with the Amended Order to address drainage issues. He has since heard back from a representative who relayed that they are still waiting on a contractor. The representative asked if a silt sock could be used to prevent runoff to the abutting property, to which the Commission agreed was permissible, only in the short term. P. Paquin returned.

#### Violations and Compliance issues

315 Beach Ave: C. Krahforst stated that an Enforcement Order was issued for removal of grass. The homeowners worked with the Conservation Department and have since planted beach grass. However, more is needed. C. Krahforst stated that he will follow up in the spring.

**11:02** Upon a **motion** by L. Sorgi and **2nd** by P. Epstein and a **vote** of 5-0;  
It was **voted** to: Adjourn.