



MEETING NOTICE POSTING & AGENDA

TOWN OF HULL

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25 all Meeting Notices must be filed and time stamped in the Town Clerk's Office and posted at least **48 hours prior to the meeting** (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays). Please be mindful of the Town Clerk's business hours of operation and make the necessary arrangements to ensure this Notice is received and stamped in by the Town Clerk's Office and posted by at least **30 minutes** prior to the close of business on the day of filing.

TOWN CLERK'S STAMP

Board or Committee	Conservation Commission
Date & Time of Meeting	TUESDAY, May 24, 2022 at 7:30 P.M.
Meeting Remote Location	Remote Call-in meeting with Zoom: https://zoom.us/j/91596914880?pwd=M2t3OUhXdVYySWJGTGdwSEM0YjhlQT09 Meeting ID: 915 9691 4880 Passcode: 112542 Or Dial: +1 929 205 6099

Members Present: Paul Paquin, Chair, Tammy Best, Katherine Jacintho, Sam Campbell, Lou Sorgi

Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Chris Krahforst, Conservation Administrator, Renee Kiley, Conservation Clerk

Staff Absent: none

Minutes:

Consideration of Minutes of 4/26/2022 Motion by Sorgi to approve the minutes as amended, 2nd by Campbell Roll call: Campbell- aye, Best-aye, Sorgi-aye Jacintho- aye, Paquin-aye

Consideration of Minutes of 5/10/2022 Motion by Sorgi to approve the minutes as amended, 2nd by Campbell Roll call: Best-aye, Sorgi-aye Jacintho- aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell- aye.

AGENDA

7:30 Call to order

Review of Agenda, Meeting Procedure, and approved permit guidance
Minutes

7:35 48 J St., Map 15/Lot 013. Opening of a Public Hearing on the Request for Determination of Applicability filed by J. Eric Doherty for work described as install 12'x16' shed. Abutter Notification: RDA not needed. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'** (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Site visits done: 5/23.**

Representatives: J. Eric. Doherty

Abutters/Others: None

Documents: Proposed Site Plan

Doherty described project above. A shed is to be placed in the corner of lot as shown on plan, elevated on blocks with gravel underneath. Shed will be located 6 feet from the back and side property lines.

Motion to issue a negative determination by Sorgi, 2nd by Campbell Best, Sorgi-aye, Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye

7:40 Fitzpatrick Way and Nantasket Ave Maps 08&09 / Various Lots (SE35-1680) Continuation of a Public Hearing on the Notice of Intent filed by Town of Hull for work described as replace and upgrade shoreline structures protecting Fitzpatrick Way and Nantasket Ave. Notification: proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Coastal Dune** (storm damage prevention, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Buffer to a Coastal Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: FEMA AE 13'** (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Subject to Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LiMWA); Within c.91 Jurisdiction. Site Visit done: 5/8 and 5/9.**

Representatives: Russell Titmuss

Abutters/Others: John Hitchner, Christopher Sweeney, Chris Markus

Documents: Photos of the area submitted as part of the NOI, proposed plan, staging plan.

Titmuss represented the project above. The project is on the north shoreline in Hull from the Stony beach revetment to the seawall at 1 Pt Allerton. The project site is about 1670 linear feet, includes the seawall and revetment to the Pt Allerton seawall near 1 Pt. Allerton. The area of impact also includes the roadway landward along the sea wall. Project plans shown. Moving from south end on Stony Beach towards Pt. Allerton exists a low wall about 300 linear feet without an adjacent shore revetment. From Fitzpatrick Way along Nantasket Ave to Pt. Allerton, the end the sea wall construction changes, the existing wall is at elevation 18 ft above mean low water. Once you get to the section of higher wall the top elevation is 20.5 ft. That same high wall runs parallel to Nantasket Ave until it connects to the Pt. Allerton Seawall. A coastal beach is adjacent to the wall; high tide line is up against the wall, mean high water is at the wall foundation, mean low water is a long way off shore. The beach is all surface material of sand, gravel, and cobbles; the coarser material remains, not much sand remains. A typical cross section of wall was shown. Also shown is a revetment at elevation 18 ft. relative to mean low water. Existing road elevation varies 14-15' on a mean low water data. Fitzgerald Way is slightly higher at plus 16'. Photos shown of 1 Pt Allerton and of nearby beach conditions consisting of sparse cobble, gravel, and sand. The problems of the existing wall along Nantasket Ave were noted: higher wall is in poor condition, foundation has been patched with concrete, sections of the wall have rotated, and severe cracking at the joints. At the lower wall, the 1st 100 feet is in poor condition. The revetment is scattered in this area. The concrete is falling away on both faces. Staging plan shown. The proposed construction has been designed for a 50 year project life and to include projected sea level rise. Wave analysis helped determine wall elevations that would limit overtopping and protect adjacent roads. Sea level rise used in the design is 2.9 feet by 2070. The proposed construction is to build a new wall landward of the existing wall. A new wall will be closer to Fitzpatrick Way. The existing road width will be maintained. The proposed top of wall will be 4 feet taller than the current high wall. Plans showing cross-sections, concrete wall, and reconstruction of revetment were shared. The new revetment will be within the existing footprint extended all the way to the new wall. Beyond the existing revetment end, the construction changes and the wall will be located 11 feet back from the existing wall. The lower half of existing wall will stay in place. The new wall will be 2 feet higher than existing. The new wall and existing wall will be connected via a flexible connection so the structure will not be compromised if the old wall gets undermined and shifts. Photo shown new seawall will be built 11 feet landward and filled with armor stone. The wider structure design allows for a lower wall design. With this design, the waves will break over the old wall first and reduce the over-topping rate. In addition, Nantasket Ave (road) will be raised 3 ft and converted to a one way street. The road base flood elevation is 13 and by adding 2 feet we can raise Nantasket Ave above that still water elevation and can serve as an alternative evacuation route. The armor stone in the last 20 feet (Pt. Allerton side) will be filled with concrete and the revetment from the Pt. Allerton seawall will be extended to meet the remnants of the old concrete seawall. The wall elevation will stay the same until the house at 948 Nantasket Ave where the wall height will be increased to 2 feet. Top elevation will be 24 ½'. This project has gone through the MEPA permitting process; CZM asked for a beach monitoring plan and maintenance. The beach will be monitored for 30 feet seaward of the old wall at 3 locations annually and after major storms. If erosion occurs, the beach will be nourished with existing like material: cobble, gravel, and small boulders to match the pre-erosion grades. The nourishment strip extends the full length of the project to where the low wall revetment begins.

Commissioner: In the area where you are taking the old wall off but leaving the bottom, are you proposing new armor between the new wall and existing? Some of that old wall was already damaged. Titmuss: The intent is making sure that the wall can't migrate seaward. A new concrete sea wall and pad with a flexible foam connector and stainless steel rods will be used to connect the existing wall with the new. The concrete components can flex and limit damage to the new wall and will prevent the wall from rotating if it gets undermined. The flexible connection allows for some settling and slope change. A Commissioner asked about the cross-hatched section on the plan. Titmuss: This is the beach nourishment area. CZM didn't want any armor there. We will place rounded cobble and gravel. Commissioner: Why are they making you do it this way? And not to add a revetment along the whole project? Titmuss: CZM pointed out that as you extend the structure seaward it shifts the erosion seaward. Commissioner: On the beach there are large boulders. Will you gather them? Titmuss: It is not within the scope of this project. Commissioner: Nourishment material has to go through grain size analysis. What will be the source material be? Titmuss: I don't know where the town will source it. There are companies with pits in Plymouth that have rounded riverbank material that appears to be suitable. It will have to be cleaned. Nourishment material will probably be an engineered material but not crushed. Commissioner: Does the NOI address where the nourishment placement is to occur? Titmuss: Nourishment material would be placed within 10 feet of the wall. The idea is to mound it in this area and let nature redistribute. Commissioner: Thinking long-term, what is the access of equipment needed, will material be placed over the wall, or is access proposed to be on the beach? Titmuss: They should be able to reach over the wall with an excavator because the road will be raised. Commissioner: Will all work be landward? Titmuss: 95 percent of the project will be. Setting the toe stone on the beach side and excavation for that will need to be done beachside. Staging plan shown. A section of the wall will be down and there will be temporary access for installing the toe stones. Commissioner: The town appreciates the elevated road and added evacuation route potential. Another Commissioner: Can you highlight aspects of the proposed restoration along the lagoon? Titmuss: Because we are raising the road the embankment will receive the runoff which will be captured by a vegetated strip. It will be planted with salt marsh type vegetation. It will be an engineered planting soil. So it will percolate through. This whole road way is on sand. C.Markus asks if the road will be a one- or two- way, asks for details regarding pedestrian access, and if burying the power lines were considered as part of the design. Titmuss: Power lines rests with the town. Currently utility poles are proposed to be relocated to the other side of the street as an overhead line. The design is for a one-way street headed from

Pemberton Point to Fitzpatrick Way with plenty of space for pedestrians and a 7 foot vegetated strip on the lagoon side. John Hitchner expressed flooding concerns from elevating Nantasket Ave and asked about construction timelines. Titmuss: The roadway will slope back down eventually to meet existing Nantasket Ave grade and drainage will occur in the street. There won't be a steep grade at the driveways. Construction timing is dependent on funding. Construction may start as early as this fall. Christopher Sweeney: Did they do a study for a breakwater in the ocean? Commissioner: No. Christopher Sweeney: There should be a breakwater out there for the nor'easters especially with the low land and roads. Titmuss: There is no plan to put a break water in the water, because it is difficult to permit. A breakwater was discussed but there was no study. Sweeney: I think that it would be better. Titmuss: The challenge is the wall needs to be rebuilt. And the break water would be massive. It would have to be 200 feet offshore and over 2500 feet long. The cost is very expensive. The area of impact would be huge and would be very difficult to permit.

Motion to issue an order of conditions with special conditions (1) a monitoring plan be done annually of the 10 foot beach nourishment strip and reported to the Commission, (2) if raising of the road causes adverse flooding the town will address it 2nd Campbell., Sorgi- aye, Jacintho-aye Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye, Best-aye

- 8:28 18 Gun Rock Ave., Map 52/Lot 069 (SE35-1681) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Richard Hulverson** for work described as **extend rear deck 30'x10'**. **Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 17 and 15'**, (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Subject to Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LiMWA).** **Site Visit done: 5/23**

Representatives: Richard Hulverson

Abutters/Others: None

Documents: Hand Annotated Proposed Plan, FEMA Flood Map shown.

Hulverson presented project to include extension of existing deck by 10' x 30'; stairs at street level. A commissioner asked if they propose to remove existing stairs which Hulverson confirms. Krahforst: The plans indicate the extension is very near the VE Zone. This deck is proposed to be elevated and level with the existing deck at about 8 feet.

Motion to issue an order of conditions with the special conditions that (1) the deck cannot be enclosed under the deck and (2) no material be stored beneath the deck by Campbell 2nd Sorgi, Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye, Best-aye, Sorgi-aye

- 8:40 189 & 193 Nantasket Ave. & 0 George Washington Blvd. Map 37, Lots 002-004 (SE35-1614) Continuation** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Nantasket Dune Holdings, LLC** for work described as demolish existing building and construct five-story building, after-the fact clearing of 0 George Washington Blvd., and construction of a parking lot; demolish golf course and construct parking lot. *The scope of work the Notice of Intent has been amended to only include: construction of a parking lot.* **Abutter Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 10'/X'** (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). Site visit done: many times. **On 04/24/22, the applicant has requested a continuance to June 14th at a time TBD**

Commissioner: What are they waiting for? Krahforst: They are wrapping up the peer review. They are wrapping up plans and will address it at the next meeting.

Motion to June, 14th TBD continue by Sorgi 2nd by Campbell Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye, Best-abstain, Sorgi-aye, Jacintho-aye

- 8:42 9 Pt. Allerton Ave., Map 09/Lot 049, (SE35-1682) Opening** of a Public Hearing on the **Notice of Intent** filed by **Chris & Eleanor Pariseault** for work described as **raze and rebuild garage, add pool, patio, and associated hardscaping and landscaping.** **Notification:** proof provided. **Resource Areas:** **Barrier Beach** (storm damage protection, flood control, wildlife habitat); **Coastal Dune** (storm damage protection and flood control, likely wildlife habitat); **Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage: AE 13', AO (depth=2') VE 21'** (storm damage and pollution prevention, flood control). **Subject to Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LiMWA).** **Site Visit done: 5/23.**

Representatives: Chris & Eleanor Pariseault, Brendan Sullivan, Sean Paptich-Landscape architect

Abutters/Others:

Documents: proposed site plan, planting plan, FEMA Flood Map

B. Sullivan represented the above project noting the following: AO depth of 3', VE 21 on the northern portion. LiMWA is not shown on the plan but is located along the VE and AO flood line, and does not extend into the AE 13, Most work is located on the south west side of property and includes an 18'X36' pool, a patio, spa. In addition, the existing garage will be razed and replaced with a new garage which will be attached to the house at elevation 16'. The garage foundation will have 4 flood vents. In addition there is proposed landscaping (see landscaping plan) with stepping stones. Commissioner: The spa appears to be within the LiMWA. Is the proposed fire pit area to be gravel or cement? Sullivan: There is a gravel area and there is a hardscape patio. Commissioner: Is there a wall being built? Sullivan: There is a wall proposed to hold the grade that will be altered to be level. The patio does not extend to the wall and will include a vegetative buffer between the patio and proposed wall. Paptich provides landscaping details. The wall is

3 -4 feet along the property line and -5' along the street line. There is landscaping proposed in between the patio and the wall. The retaining wall is shown on the plan as a solid gray bar. The patio shown by the paver symbol, plants are proposed in between. Commissioner: Is there a fence around the pool proposed? Sullivan: yes. Discussion ensued regarding fences in AE/AO/VE Zone. Applicant was not sure if a fence is required by either building code or Public Health code. Commissioner: A fence is not allowed in a VE zone, as it is an obstruction. In an AE zone, the Commission prefers a fence to be 6 inches off the ground and 50 percent flow through. The Commissioner raised issues associated with seasonal drainage of the pool and spa. Sullivan describes pool and spa to be emptied into a small infiltration system. The drawdown will go to a drywell. It will be UV filtration system, trace amounts of chlorine. Commissioner: The filter system for the pool and spa will have to be a cartridge system and no backwash into the ground or into town stormwater system. Another Commissioner: for the landings and other permeable surfaces, will gravel or pea stone be used? The project proposes ¾ inch chip stone, which provides better drainage, and not to use stone dust. Krahforst: There is a proposed cobble stone apron for the driveway. This type of apron damages the plows. I suggest that DPW look at the plan. Sullivan: We proposed to use asphalt 2-3 feet at the intersection of the street and then it will be cobble.

Motion to issue an order of conditions with special conditions that the fence be kept out of the VE zone, that any fence it is in the 50 percent flow through if approved by other town departments, no drainage on the property site or town stormwater system, the pool and spa be a cartridge type so there is no backwash, proposed driveway apron plan be approved by DPW 2nd Campbell., Sorgi- aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye, Best-aye, Sorgi-aye, Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye

Recess until 9:21

9:28 125 Main St. Map 02/Lot 005 (SE35-1672). Review of Revised Plans to be considered as Plan of Record for Order of Conditions.

Representatives: Adam Brodsky, David Ray

Abutters/Others: Chris Sweeney

Documents: "Proposed Storage and Parking Plan Parcel B" Revision 05/11/2022

Commissioner: This is not a hearing. It is a review. Krahforst: After the commission issued the Order of Conditions (SE35-1672), a revised plan was submitted as requested in the OOCs. The applicant submitted this plan (revision 05/11/22) electronically to be considered for the plan of record (POR). It is my interpretation that this plan was different from the Commission's intent. Is this the appropriate plan to be considered for the Plan of Record? Commissioner: I have reviewed the minutes and the recording and I've read the motion. It is clear that this walkway or pathway has to go behind the boat storage and the parking and not through the middle of the lot (as shown on the 5/11 revision). It was clear in the motion that the middle area was to remain undisrupted. In the minutes, the applicant's representatives clearly agreed that the accessway would be to the south and west lines of the proposed boat storage area. If something had to be moved to accommodate it, that it would be; I will not approve this plan as the POR. Also the proposed dune restoration should be on this plan. Another Commissioner: I agree this is not my understanding of where the accessway would be on the plan. Commissioner: This is not the plan that was approved in the motion. Brodsky: We would like to work with the commission on this. Commissioner: I do think that there was some discussion about the west side. There was going to be an open area, a dune restoration area, and the pathway will be 12 feet along the fence line. I believe that is the east side of the parcel. Commissioner: This road was not in the NOI. The NOI was for parking and boat storage. Ray: It's not a road. It's an accessway. Lampke: I would suggest that you allow the representative to speak and hear from all the parties. Commissioner: Can I ask the administrator's point of view? Krahforst thanked the Commission and read from a prepared statement describing the Administrator's dissent of the Commission's decision to issue an OOC based on (1) the NOI submitted was to permit after-the fact boat storage and parking. Adding an accessway during the 2nd hearing on this project, with no plans showing this addition, is a substantial addition to the project and should require, as the Commission has done in the past, a new NOI with new abutter notification, (2) the Commission denied a recent NOI from the same applicant and representation requesting the placement of a structure in the same area because there wasn't enough information provided by the applicant for the Commission to appropriately condition the project to meet the performance standards of the Act and to insure the interests of the act be protected. Note, the Commission's earlier decision to deny was upheld in Super Ceding Order of Condition from DEP. This new NOI did not provide any new information. The NOI used the same information that the Commission deemed incomplete. The Commission's decision to approve this project is inconsistent with its previous decision and with DEP's Superseding Order of Conditions. This project needed to be evaluated by the commission with respect to wetlands resources of the area and the performance standards of resources as described in the Act. Note that the applicant's representative agreed to consider this area as a coastal dune. When considering this area as a coastal dune, it is my opinion that creating a 12 foot wide accessway and storing boats in the coastal dune are activities that negatively impact the coastal dune resources. I disagree with the applicant's statement that the proposed project meets the performance standards for a coastal dune. (3), the applicant's need for a timely decision by the Commission on this project and an issuance of an OOC because of an impending purchase and sales agreement should have no bearing on the commission's decision. It is not relevant to the procedure reaching a decision outlined in 310 CMR 10. There are no provisions in the Act for urgency of sale. Further, the threat by the applicant's representative of 3 years of litigation if the Commission fails to

provide an OOC, should not be a factor in the rendering of the Commission's decision. In my opinion I think that both did. I will provide this narrative for the file. Chris Sweeney stated that he overheard at the last meeting Krahforst stating his disappointment with decision after the close of the opening hearing. Brodsky stated that this proceeding is highly irregular. The Commission closed the public hearing and voted to issue an OOC. The conditions are reflected in the minutes. No where did the Commission condition submitting a revised plan. After the public hearing, I received a request from the agent, Mr. Krahforst, if we could provide a plan that shows the location of the walkway. It is not an accessway. We are going to walk to the pier. As a matter of courtesy, to the commission, not because it's required as a condition, we submitted this plan. I didn't go back and listen to the recording of the opening hearing again. As a matter of courtesy, I asked David Ray to go back to the applicant and to provide the additional plan. I've never been involved with a discussion on something that was provided as a matter of courtesy, and then be subject to a statement from the agent that is a dissenting opinion of the Commission. I think that you are so far a field on the open meeting law. The Commission is required under the statute to issue the OOC within 21 days. You didn't request a substitute plan for the POR as part of your decision and is an interpretation of the Conservation Agent. We are trying to work things out with the town. It seems that there is a concerted effort by the minority of people here to subvert the decision of the Conservation Commission. David Ray will relay the walkway plan to you. It was not a new element to the project; it was a request from the Commission to show where we are going to walk to the pier. The Commission is at risk of going a little far. I'm trying to resolve the issues with the town and not to pick any additional fights. This is unprecedented. I'm going to have David Ray speak on where the client presently walks to the pier and where they will continue to walk to the pier. There are no vehicles that will drive in the area. They are carrying stuff to the pier. Ray: The location is as shown on the plan. Ray asks for the planting plan to be shown. The planting plan fits along the edge of the proposed accessway. It is not a built highway, it's just a location. I wanted to make it easy to define. It is following the planting plan along the side, and out to the pier. Commissioner: Are we talking about only a walking accessway? I understood that this accessway was for boat access and moving things around. I'm not hearing the same stories. Why does the walkway need to be 12 feet wide if it's just a walkway? Ray: This is not just a walking path. They use a small ATV to carry things out to the pier. Commissioner: How will the boats be moved to storage and out of storage? Ray: Even with a 12 foot access way they will have a difficult time moving a 30 foot boat. Commissioner: There wasn't supposed to be any activities outside the areas being permitted. What you are showing is the whole area is going to be disturbed except for the planting area. I don't think that that was the premise of the Order of Conditions. It wasn't my understanding. Ray: I will move the access way, where it parallels the fence going down. I'm going to move the trailers to the other property line side and adjust the parking to accommodate the new layout of the accessway. Commissioner: The final plan should include the dune nourishment area. Commissioner: Is the intent to be operating equipment beyond the access way? What is the limit of impact? Ray: We were asking to define the access way. It will be 12 foot wide and wont access anything to the other side. At the 5/10 hearing on this matter, the approved minutes show that the applicant's representative agreed to submit a revised site plan showing the 12 foot accessway on the southern and western boundaries (of the boat storage area). Krahforst: In order to issue an OOC, the Plans of Record must be specified. No plan was available at the time of the Commission's decision. It appeared that the plan submitted for the record after the 5/10 meeting does not reflect the Commission's intent. The only thing that is being approved here is the Plan of Record for OOC. Brodsky: You closed the public hearing you can't accept any additional information or plans. Krahforst: That is incorrect; one condition required by the Commission on 5/10 was to provide a revised set of plans. Brodsky: I didn't see that reflected in the minutes. The Commission stated above where the accessway is to be located and adjustments to boat storage and parking be reflected in new revised plan that can be used as the Plan of Record. The Commission agreed to a new hearing to approve a revised plans that shows the 12' wide accessway to be parallel to boat storage area and include the dune restoration area for 5/27/22 at 3 PM.

Certificate of Compliance Requests

85 Highland Ave (SE35-1575) Revegetation of the embankment. Many varieties looked great.

Motion to issue a certificate of Compliance by Sorgi 2nd by Campbell. Roll Call Sorgi-aye, Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye Best-aye

Continued and New Business

Dune Invasive species, 3 potential candidates for the removal. Someone did cut down the batch in the alphabets. It was not DPW

97 Bay St SOC (DEP-SE-35-1611) DEP issued SOOC Home will be on stilts. The plans will be added to the record. To address the concerns of the Commission, the applicant is required to do salt marsh monitoring and maintenance. The landward portion will intersect with the bank, the seaward side will be elevated, it will decrease stormwater runoff. Commissioner: Please send it to every Commissioner.

Motion to adjourn by Sorgi 2nd Campbell Jacintho-aye, Paquin-aye, Campbell-aye, Best-aye, Sorgi-aye

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR REMOTE MEETINGS

1. All or any of the members of the public body may choose to participate in a public meeting via remote access. Meetings may be virtual, in their entirety. All members who participate remotely must be clearly audible.
2. If due to special circumstances members of a Board are meeting in person, for everyone's safety, the public will not be allowed into a Board/Committee meeting, even where there are any members of the public body and/or town staff or official(s) physically present at the meeting location during the meeting. Remember also that Town Hall is closed to the general public.
3. However, the public will be provided with alternative access through which they can watch or listen to meetings "in real time," and meeting notices will specify the manner in which members of the public may access audio or video of the meeting as it is occurring.
4. If, despite our best efforts, our technological capabilities do not adequately support public access to virtual or remote meetings, the town will ensure that an audio or video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of the proceedings at the meeting is posted on the town's website as soon as possible after the meeting.
5. Notices for public hearings will contain additional information about how the public may participate via electronic/technological means.
6. For executive session meetings, public access to the meeting will be limited to the open session portion(s) of the meeting only. Public access to any audio, video, internet or web-based broadcast of the meeting will be discontinued when the public body enters executive session.
7. Where individuals have a right, or are required, to attend a public meeting or hearing, including executive session meetings, they will be provided with information about how to participate in the meeting/hearing remotely.
8. Meeting notices will still be posted at least 48 hours in advance (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays), unless it is an emergency meeting as defined under the Open Meeting Law. Minutes will still be taken.