

'Town Clerk'

**WEYMOUTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION
McCulloch School - Conference Room
August 18th, 2010 Meeting**

PRESENT: George Loring/Chairman, Adrienne Gowen, Steve DeGabriele, Scott Dowd and
Laura Harbottle

ALSO PRESENT: MaryEllen Schloss, Conservation Administrator

Chairman Loring called the August 18th, 2010 meeting of the Weymouth Conservation Commission to order at 7:05 PM.

Minutes: July 21, 2010 Review and Approval

Due to all members not being in receipt of the minutes, members agreed to table approval of the 7/21/2010 minutes until the next meeting.

169 Randolph Street

Continued Violation Hearing

Mr. John Eliffe

Map 48, Bl 547, Lot 18 & 19

Discussion of this agenda item was continued until later in the meeting as Mr. Eliffe had not arrived.

Request for Determination of Applicability - Public Hearing

56 Mansfield Street

Mr. Leif Thornton

Map 55, Bl 613, Lot 73

This item was also continued until later in the meeting as the applicant was not present.

Lot 24 Neck Street

Notice of Intent - Continued Hearing

John McCaffrey

Map 5, Bl 13, Lot 24

DEP File 81-1076

Cmmr. Harbottle moved to open the public hearing for DEP File #81-1076, John McCaffrey, Lot 24 Neck Street.

Cmmr. DeGabriele seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. Shawn Hardy, PE representing the applicant John McCaffrey (who was not present) came before the Commission and presented the abutters' notification receipts to the Administrator. He began his presentation by explaining that the previous plan has been slightly modified with a noted

revision date of 8/16/2010 (this is noted as Exhibit 1, DEP File 81-1076, 8-18-2010 Hearing). He explained the proposal was for a Single Family Home located on Lot 24 (presently an empty lot), at David's Island Road and Neck Street. He described the lot as within the buffer zone to Isolated Land Subject to Flooding and within Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage (the 100-year floodplain). He commented that the new plan shows a significantly smaller dwelling. The proposed size will be 28' x 36' and will include an attached garage 24' x 24'. He noted that the basement floor must be 1 ft. above the flood elevation and that new concrete foundation would be located at elevation 19 with a 1,000 sq. ft. footprint. Additionally it will collect 1-1/2" runoff, which they will be mitigating with (4) leaching galleys. He wanted to point out that the revision was based upon staff comments. He said that they brought the hay bale line 30 ft. from the resident's property and for less impact they shortened the grading.

Mr. Hardy then referred to the trees on the property, noting that some of the trees, which are larger in the rear, will not be removed and the applicant also has plans to plant additional trees. Further they will be removing the scrub brush/vegetation.

Ms. Schloss asked about the 1,000 sq. feet of disturbance - and if he was referring to the house/garage.

Mr. Hardy confirmed that this was correct, adding that any disturbance will be within the limit of the silt fence. He told members that their surveyor has lived in the area for 37 years and has experience with the weather conditions. He stated that when there is flooding in the area the water comes up through the catch basins - further down by the beach, adding that he saw no problem with a storm surge.

Ms. Schloss explained that she spoke with the applicant at the site in regard to preserving the land and that was the reason for the plan revision.

Cmmr. Harbottle questioned the flood plain and the FEMA designated area/Flood Zone - and asked 'why use fill?'

Mr. Hardy explained that it was needed for the concrete foundation - which he wanted to point out was similar to others in the neighborhood.

Cmmr. Harbottle interjected 'but she would like to see current standards applied', with Mr. Hardy confirming 'it does' and referred to coastal zone flowage.

Cmmr. DeGabriele asked if there would be a slab foundation.

Mr. Hardy replied 'yes' and then spoke about the fence/location.

Mr. Cmmr. DeGabriele asked if it would go into the next lot and Mr. Hardy told him "it's existing" and referred to the location of the fence. He also asked if he had any plan to mark the 25 ft. buffer line - and how he would keep the work out of the buffer area.

Mr. Hardy replied, if required, they could mark it with a post/rail fence, adding that currently the buffer zone is marked by the lawn.

At this point Ms. Schloss wanted to point out that the applicant still has to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a special permit re. the flood plain.

Mr. Hardy acknowledged this.

Chairman Loring opened the hearing for public comment.

Mr. James Garren, 9 David's Island Road (abutter) asked if they would be notified about the next hearing (Zoning Board of Appeals) and Mr. Hardy confirmed that they would, adding it is required by law.

Paula Gerard, 301 Neck Street asked if the fence was permitted and it was explained that they would have a silt fence for erosion control to be used for protection of the resources during construction.

Pat Sullivan commented that she used to live at 294 Neck Street (for 27 years) and wanted members to know that in the past there was flooding in that area - commenting that the applicant might want to increase the elevation of the concrete foundation from 19 ft. to 20 ft.

Cmmr. DeGabriele suggested that they might want to include in the Order of Conditions specific fence requirements along with no cutting of vegetation.

Mr. Hardy wanted to point out that Ms. Schloss had asked that they not cut back the vegetation - and he agreed to that.

Cmmr. Harbottle said she was supportive of keeping the natural vegetation.

Mr. Hardy referred back to the fence and said he saw no problem in putting the fence where recommended at the shrub line adjacent to the ILSF - which he said would be 'hand' dug.

Donna Shiner, 274 Neck Street (resident there since 1965) asked if the land across the street was designated as conservation land, adding that is what she was told when she wanted to put in a pool.

Chairman Loring replied that the land is privately owned now.

Ms. Schloss, in an effort to explain the possible misunderstanding re. the use of the word 'conservation land', told Ms. Shiner that some people use the term improperly, thinking an area that is protected under the law cannot have any activity is viewed as conservation land - when in actuality its use of the land is permissible under certain guidelines.

James Garren asked if there was vegetated wetland on the lot.

Ms. Schloss told him that she walked the area, specifically the area under the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction and which is part of the 100-year flood plain - and noted that it was not comprised of marsh/swamp.

Frank McKiernan, a 10 year resident of 301 Neck Street and abutter, told members that the land there was marsh. He said that in the past the area housed a drive-in and was filled, adding that with a full moon tide the water comes up to the street - and when there's a rain storm it floods which can take up to a week to calm down. He said that there was no drainage there whatsoever. Further, when they added the sewer/drain pipe it got covered with salt water, emphasizing they couldn't get the fresh water to come up. Additionally where the hay bales are located, he said, it fills up with salt water. Lastly, on March 1st it flooded and he believed this was connected with the salt marsh.

Cmmr. Harbottle said it was her understanding that the Conservation Commission is the last agency in the approval process. Further it was her understanding that the proposed project is not to interfere with the drainage pattern/flow. Based on that she would not have an easy time supporting it.

Mr. Hardy stated that when they go before the Zoning Board of Appeals, they will not be asking for a variance or a waiver. He explained that the idea is to come before the Commission first in case the members want to see some changes - then they go before the Z B A with an approved plan. He went on to say that in respect to meeting regulations - similar residences were built in this area and that meet the code. He said it goes back to Performance Standards, emphasizing that they are dealing with the ocean here and not increased flow on the adjacent lots.

Cmmr. DeGabriele said another possible Condition could be to request the applicant not to clear the brush on the property - specifically referring to the vegetation shown on the plan.

In response to this suggestion, Mr. Hardy replied 'as long as it's not within the excavation of the foundation'.

Ms. Schloss asked if the area beyond the hay bales will be left as is and Mr. Hardy replied 'yes'.

Cmmr. DeGabriele also recommended including the post/rail fence in the Conditions.

Mr. Hardy confirmed to Mr. Garren that the applicant wouldn't be touching the property beyond the fence, acknowledging that the property belonged to Mr. Garren.

Cmmr. Gowen moved to close the public hearing for DEP File #81-1076, John McCaffrey, Lot 24 Neck Street.

Cmmr. DeGabriele seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Order of Conditions - DEP File 81-1076

Lot 24 Neck Street

John McCaffrey, Applicant

Map 5, Bl 13, Lot 24

Members discussed the conditions for Lot 24 Neck Street.

Ms. Schloss asked Mr. Hardy where the water would go if the water collects and Mr. Hardy clarified the elevation she was referring to was 14-1/2 ft and they were at 15 ft.

Mr. Hardy also wanted to clarify that there was no grading proposed.

Cmmr. DeGabriele moved to approve a Standard Order of Conditions including the Special Conditions that were discussed for File #81-1076, Lot 24 Neck Street, Mr. John McCaffrey applicant.

Cmmr. Dowd seconded.

SO VOTED 4-1 (Cmmr. Harbottle was opposed)

Ms. Schloss wanted to clarify that it would be a Standard Order of Conditions for a project in the Flood Plain.

(File Note: the following are two items for the same applicant and were resolved in one hearing)

151 Wessagusset Road
Notice of Intent - Public Hearing
Elizabeth Skafidas
Map 4, Bl 36, Lot 7
DEP File # not available

DEP 81-974
151 Wessagusset Road
Request for a Certificate of Compliance
Elizabeth Skafidas

Before beginning discussion of this Notice of Intent it was noted that Ms. Schloss received new Ma. Emergency Legislation passed on 8/04/10 by the Massachusetts Legislature. Known as Chapter 240 of the Acts of 2010, "An Act Relative to Economic Development and Reorganization", Section 173 extends all permits in effect from August 15, 2008, to August 15, 2010, for a period of two years.

Ms. Schloss noted that this act covers the project at 151 Wessagusset Road - so the refiling of a Notice of Intent will not be necessary. She further explained that this project received a one year Order of Conditions and has previously been extended twice - the last time on 1/10/2008 with an expiration date of 1/17/2009 - and it is now covered under this Act.

Mr. Sean Barry, PE representing the applicant Elizabeth Skafidas, came before the Commission. He addressed the status of the project with regard to the application for an N O I as well as a Certificate of Compliance (2 different file numbers) - which at this point had become null and void based on the new Emergency legislation.

Ms. Schloss reconfirmed that the new legislation extends the Order of Conditions for a 2-year period or up to 2011, so again a Certificate of Compliance would not be necessary nor would the new Notice of Intent - which would be withdrawn.

It was noted that the proposed project was for a 3-season room addition/porch and a 2-car garage (a bit smaller than the original proposal, so that size of the garage will be reduced from 24' x 24' to 20' x 24').

Mr. Barry stated that the Notice of Intent included a smaller footprint for the garage, as it was determined that the previous survey may not have been as accurate as it should have been - but there will still be a 26 ft. offset with the 20' x 24' garage (it was noted that the Building Permit will reflect this).

Cmmr. Harbottle asked whether "constructive approval" would be granted if the Commission did not act on the N O I, and whether this would be the better way to proceed, rather than withdrawal of the new N O I.

Ms. Schloss said she would research that terminology further.

It was suggested the Mr. Barry should send in the appropriate paperwork that would be labeled 'revision' for the files.

Mr. Barry agreed to do this.

Ms. Schloss reaffirmed that the extension on File 81-076 would be in affect until 2011.

Some residents in the audience questioned the original approval of this project, which took place in 2006 and Ms. Schloss stated that the present members were not on the Commission at that time but she would be happy to help any of them with further details of that hearing/approval if they would contact her at the office.

169 Randolph Street - Continued Violation Hearing

John Eliffe

Map 48, BI 547, Lot 18 & 19

Mr. Eliffe came before the Board

Chairman Loring said that he noted some work has been taking place at the site since the last meeting and Mr. Eliffe confirmed this.

Ms. Schloss recapped the present status of the violation, stating that she sent out the letter on 8/11/10 based on the request of the Board at the 7/21/10 meeting outlining items agreed upon at that time which included:

- putting erosion controls in place
- submit information on the plantings
- a report on the status of current and future plans re. work at the site

Ms. Schloss went onto say that she made a site inspection today and found the erosion control fabric there, although it was not laid out or entrenched, adding it was in the back of the lot in the wrong area.

Mr. Eliffe replied that he thought it was all wetland - and wanted members to know that he has 300 ft. of the erosion control fabric.

Chairman Loring pointed out that he only needed to encompass the pile of work in the rear.

Ms. Schloss again emphasized that it needs to be 'trenched', adding that he also needs some more plants.

The Chairman stated that he was also present at the site inspection and found that all of the brush had grown back, adding at this point you can't see across the river. Further he didn't see adding any plants now would prove to be beneficial.

Cmmr. DeGabriele questioned the location of the plantings - asking if they should be closer to Randolph Street. He then asked the Administrator where she wanted to see the plants.

Ms. Schloss replied that she drew something up for Mr. Eliffe, but had no reaction from Mr. Eliffe. She recommended 4-5 Red Cedars on the side of the house near the river - and she had other suggestions for the back lot. She noted that the most that were cut were small shrubs and they have now grown back. At this point the east side of the river is her recommended location.

Cmmr. DeGabriele emphasized that a plan from Mr. Eliffe was still in order. He also wanted to point out that he had requested Mr. Eliffe commit to having all of these items finalized by this meeting, which he thought was understood - and this has not been done.

Ms. Schloss stated that there was one other request from Mr. Eliffe at the last meeting; i. e., a summary of the status of the site. She noted for the record that the Determination of Applicability was issued back in 2008. She agreed with Cmmr. DeGabriele's understanding about the Commission having an update by Mr. Eliffe for this meeting. At this point the additional work to be done is not clear, for instance, does it include the driveway parking area in the front of the barn? She noted that Mr. Eliffe wanted the driveway on the other side of the house, which she sees as the better situation. She also wanted to know if the driveway would be built - would there be improvements in the back of the house?

Cmmr. DeGabriele again stated that he was hoping for a written report/description by Mr. Eliffe.

Mr. Eliffe responded by informing the Commission that he has a list (rough draft) of things he wants to do which includes:

- a fence on the river side
- clear the trees upland
- extend the back garage
- build a knee-hi stone wall near the road
- add a hedge near the road
- replace the evergreens near the road

Mr. Eliffe then asked if he could take what's presently there out and replace them with evergreens?

Cmmr. DeGabriele reminded Mr. Eliffe that first they need a plan/detailed description of the proposed mitigation work before the members could comment on this new request.

Ms. Schloss then accepted Mr. Eliffe new sketch for proposed work and designated it as Exhibit #1/Eliffe/169 Randolph Street/ Violation Hearing.

At this point Mr. Eliffe wanted affirmation that he had the right to put a fence around his property?

Ms. Schloss replied 'yes within the buffer zone', but clarified there were some exceptions - referring in part to the restrictions of working within the Riverfront Area. She said they would need to take into consideration 'wildlife passage'. In further review of his plan Ms. Schloss told Mr. Eliffe that additional permission from the Commission might be in order.

Cmmr. Harbottle told Mr. Eliffe that she would like additional detail re. the trees.

Cmmr. DeGabriele agreed that a lot more discussion would be in order, adding that possibly Ms. Schloss might meet again with Mr. Eliffe. At this point he asked the members 'has Mr. Eliffe complied with what was requested at the last meeting?' He felt that he had taken some steps but overall he had not complied. He didn't feel that they should continually be going back and forth with the diagram - it is not the proper way to go.

Ms. Schloss said she agreed to work with Mr. Eliffe, but realize some of the issues may need to come back before the Commission. She said we need to separate what needs to be done and what Mr. Eliffe would like to do. She referred back to the trees, commenting that Cmmr. Harbottle would like a site inspection.

Cmmr. DeGabriele reiterated that the plan Mr. Eliffe presented goes beyond what was requested, adding once again that they need to go back to what was originally asked for. He then read from the letter that was forwarded to Mr. Eliffe from the Administrator - reiterating the points, which included (1) installation of erosion controls and (2) a plan for the plantings. He pointed out that Mr. Eliffe has been in non-compliance for 2-1/2 years. He wanted Mr. Eliffe to provide the status of what was there currently and the planned work, emphasizing that he now wants to do work that is not covered in the letter.

Cmmr. DeGabriele went on to say that since Mr. Eliffe has been forewarned (at the 7/21 meeting) about the Commission assessing a penalty if this work was not done in the time allotted - and he planned to make a motion regarding implementation of that penalty tonight.

Mr. Eliffe responded that the posts are up and the ground has been cleared - 4 to 8 hours work. He told Cmmr. DeGabriele that to say I haven't complied is not true.

Cmmr. DeGabriele clarified 'you did not fully comply' and Mr. Eliffe responded 'so you want to fine me?'

Cmmr. DeGabriele once again recapped the issues and the time limit given to Mr. Eliffe by the Commission to address them (which was not done).

Mr. Eliffe said that he is having personal issues right now and cannot afford to fully comply, but added I did spend \$50.00.

Chairman Loring interjected that he would like to see it resolved without fines imposed - or court dates. He told Mr. Eliffe that he has not done all that was asked of him, even though he did some work - it was not enough.

Ms. Schloss noted that the erosion control fabric was there and the posts were half way up - explaining to Mr. Eliffe that he did not have to go all the way to the back of the property. She said if he could do it Sunday, then she would go and check it - if he could install the fence she could check it. With regard to the trees, she suggested that maybe they could be planted by the next meeting. She pointed out that a lot of his plan is outside the scope (of the Determination) so Mr. Eliffe might have to come back with a Notice of Intent.

Cmmr. Harbottle asked how long it would take to finish the erosion control fence and Mr. Eliffe replied '2 weeks'.

Ms. Schloss stated that the next meeting is scheduled for Sept. 8th, 2010.

It was agreed that Chairman Loring and Ms. Schloss would make a site inspection on 8/26/10 at 4:15 PM.

Cmmr. DeGabriele moved to assess a fine of \$50.00 to Mr. Eliffe, 169 Randolph Street effective this date and to inform him in writing that continued non-compliance of an Enforcement Order issued March 20, 2008 may be subject to additional daily penalties from this date forward.

Cmmr. Dowd seconded.

SO VOTED 3-2 (Chairman Loring and Cmmr. Harbottle were opposed)

Ms. Schloss asked Mr. Eliffe to call the office to let her know when the fence is installed.

Mr. Eliffe asked if he could clear the upland and Ms. Schloss replied 'no, not without approval'.

Cmmr. DeGabriele then clearly stated for Mr. Eliffe's understanding that the following needs to be complied with before the next meeting:

- silt fence installed
- submission of a specific plan re. the plantings
- detailed plan re. the construction proposed

If these items were not in by the stated time, then additional fines might be appropriate.

The meeting with Mr. Eliffe concluded.

56 Mansfield Street

Request for Determination of Applicability - Public Hearing

Leif Thornton

Map 55, Bl 613, Lot 73

Cmmr. Harbottle moved to open the Request For Determination public hearing for Leif Thornton, 56 Mansfield Street.

Cmmr. DeGabriele seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

(The abutter submitted the certified abutter notification receipts).

Mr. Thornton came before the Commission and informed members that his plan was for a 24' above ground swimming pool with a drywell for backwash adhering to the Town regulations - as well as a 8' x 10' or 12' deck and shed. He offered to put up a silt fence if required. Re. the filter, he said it would be an earth filter and again would include a drywell as recommended by the Administrator.

Cmmr. Harbottle stated that she was at the site on Sunday and told Mr. Thornton that she would like to see a survey plan. She further stated for the Board/Administrator that she would like to see the inclusion of a survey plan become a requirement/policy with all applicants for the future.

Cmmr. Dowd commented that he would need to backwash with the system, but added there was an alternative system which treats and recovers water, sending it back into the pool so there would be no need to discharge chlorinated water back into the resource area. He also noted that it had the added advantage of being a cost saving measure too.

Cmmr. DeGabriele commented that he would also need to level the land a little.

Mr. Thornton clarified for the members that the pool would be located down in the flat area.

Ms. Schloss said it would probably be a good idea to have an erosion control in place between any proposed work and the top of the slope - she added, he could possibly use a trenched silt fence.

It was noted that he was using a dry well, which also acts as a filter system.

Mr. Thornton told members he would be using a flexible PVC pipe, which would be dispersing into the dry well.

Ms. Schloss asked about the pool shed and Mr. Thornton replied that the Building Inspector said it was okay if located 25 ft. from the house.

Ms. Schloss wanted to clarify that there would be no cutting of vegetation and Mr. Thornton confirmed this was correct.

Ms. Schloss told him that when on site she saw a pile of wood stored partly in the wetland.

Mr. Thornton said that it was a wooden boat that he would be getting rid of - his plan is to cut it up and remove it hopefully this week.

Ms. Schloss said she saw the boat there and a scraping of paint - and Mr. Thornton told her he would put a tarp under it.

Ms. Schloss explained that she was concerned with activity close to the wetland.

Mr. Thornton stated that the area was like that when he moved in 12 years ago.

The hearing was opened to the public. No one spoke.

Cmmr. Gowen moved to close the public hearing for Leif Thornton, 56 Mansfield Street.

Cmmr. Dowd seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

56 Mansfield Street

Leif Thornton

Map 55, Bl 613, Lot 73

Determination of Applicability

Cmmr. DeGabriele moved to issue a Negative 3 Determination with conditions including:

- installation of a silt fence
- removal of old boat and tarp
- vegetation will not be cut
- construction of a dry well as noted in the applicant's plans

Cmmr. Harbottle seconded.

Discussion: Ms. Schloss wanted to clarify that the conditions would include the standard pool conditions and these will be included.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Request for a Certificate of Compliance

DEP File 81-1020 78 Prospect Hill Drive

Ms. Schloss explained that this project was for construction of a private dock and pier. She told members that she made a site inspection and found everything in order - and she has the 'as-built', which is consistent with the approved plan.

Cmmr. Harbottle moved to issue a Certificate of Compliance for 78 Prospect Hill Drive, DEP File 81-1020.

Cmmr. Dowd seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Enforcement Activities

Continued Discussion

Ms. Schloss referred to the status of the Enforcement activities as noted on the spreadsheet she had prepared for the members. She said she spoke with Town Solicitor George Lane who has authorized the assessment of fines. She clarified that under '21D', the Commission has the authority of non-criminal enforcement powers, adding that the issuance of fines is done at a hearing.

Ms. Schloss went on to say that Atty. Lane also recommends no ticketing. He further recommended that the party in violation should be informed that they are subject to a \$50 fine, which can be enforced on a daily basis if the violation is not addressed in the appropriate manner in a timely fashion. Lastly he told her that this should be documented in writing.

Cmmr. Harbottle questioned the \$300 a day fine, with Ms. Schloss clarifying that amount was for a 'criminal' complaint - one which is filed with the courts.

Ms. Schloss reminded members that she has sent them all the info on the Town Ordinance.

Cmmr. DeGabriele wanted to point out that a fine of \$50 a day could run into \$350 a week if assessed daily. He noted if that was the case with Mr. Eliffe's fine at this time (\$50 assessed daily) would be \$43,500.

Mr. Russ McAdreus in the audience took a moment to commend the Commission for its patience and professionalism in dealing with that matter.

It was noted that the Mayor (as well as the Commission) had asked also for a list of outstanding enforcement cases and their status.

Cmmr. DeGabriele urged the Commission to begin scheduling enforcement hearings.

Cmmr. Dowd asked how many fines the Commission has issued and Ms. Schloss replied none prior to tonight, but added that one past offender was required to pay for a consultant (which he did).

Cmmr. Dowd felt that publicizing them could be helpful, with Ms. Schloss responding 'not yet'.

Cmmr. DeGabriele commented that he felt the fines would speak for themselves.

Ms. Schloss recommended they schedule 328 North Street for an upcoming agenda, noting that the violation dates back to 2006. She felt a fine would be justified in this case, adding she would be sending a letter.

Site Visits

Ms. Schloss stated that the Commissioners might want to do site visits in a group of at least (2) two, particularly for Enforcement cases if they expect there might be some hostility.

Cmmr. Dowd asked about the members have Conservation Commission ID's and Ms. Schloss replied that she was told this is being done by the Town's Boards and Commissions.

Cmmr. DeGabriele said he would like the Commission to come up with a schedule of additional fines; i.e., based on the size of the project - adding he understood other Towns have done this. He informed members that he would be meeting with the Administrator further about this.

Meeting Locations

Cmmr. DeGabriele said he would like to pursue use of the Town Council Chambers for future meetings (as they have in the past). He noted that at Town Hall meetings could go as late as 11 PM, but here at the McCulloch School they are supposed to end by 10 PM, which he felt at times might not be adequate.

Ms. Schloss said that they possibly could pursue this further with Town Council in the future.

Whitman's Pond - Continued Discussion

Ms. Schloss reminded members that she had given them a handout regarding the treatment for Whitman's Pond, adding that the handout included a small list of potential attendees (to a future meeting), which would consist of in-house stakeholders. She then spoke about possibly holding a future meeting on this subject and suggested holding one some time in September.

Recommended attendees/designees included:

- Whitman's Pond Association
- Herring Run Warden
- DPW
- Back River Watershed
- Mayor Kay
- Planning & Conservation staff (Jim Clarke and MaryEllen Schloss)

Cmmr. Harbottle suggested the meeting be part of a future Conservation meeting, with Ms. Schloss adding they could possibly hold it prior to their regularly scheduled meeting (possibly 6:30 PM).

Cmmr. DeGabriele asked what they would expect as the outcome and Ms. Schloss said they could review all issues and concerns pertaining to the Pond.

Cmmr. Harbottle suggested they begin with the policies.

Ms. Schloss told members she could put together a 'draft' invitation.

Chairman Loring suggested that the members could also email the Administrator with their suggestions of items to be discussed.

It was agreed that the matter of Whitman's Pond Treatment would be scheduled for Wednesday, September 22nd (their second meeting of the month).

Other Business/Conservation Report**Herring Alliance Group**

Cmmr. Dowd wanted to address the Herring Alliance Group. He informed members that Tuesday, September 21st they would be hosting a free sunset cruise of Boston Harbor to discuss the herring/related issues. He asked any member who was interested in attending to make sure they RSVP by tomorrow: Thursday 8/19, adding that the cruise would go from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM.

At this point Ms. Schloss distributed a handout to the members and referred to work being done on the N-Star Right of Way.

Ms. Schloss reported that a letter has been received from the Weymouth Braintree Recreational Regional District in regard to Weymouth Landing.

Ms. Schloss updated members on Legion Field - stating that work is presently being done to the Memorial Wall.

Adjournment

Cmmr. Gowen moved to adjourn at 9:55 PM and to meet again on Wednesday, September 8th, 2010 at 7PM at the McCulloch School-ROOM 12.

Cmmr. DeGabriele seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Respectfully submitted,

Susan DeChristoforo
Recording Secretary

APPROVED: _____

Laura Harbottle, Clerk