

**WEYMOUTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION
JUNE 24TH, 2009 MEETING**

PRESENT: John Thompson/Chairman, Scott Coven/Clerk and Jeff Kent.

ALSO PRESENT: MaryEllen Schloss/Conservation Administrator

Chairman Thompson called the June 24th, 2009 meeting to order at 8:00 PM.

Minutes: May 27, 2009 for review and approval

Minutes were tabled to the end of the meeting.

33 Laudervale Road

Public Hearing

Request for Determination

Mr. Eric Abboud, property owner, came before the Board along with his Architect, Reggio White.

Mr. White informed members that the plan was to construct an addition to the existing residence located within 100 ft of the salt marsh. The size of the addition would be 12' x 15' and it would be two-stories constructed on the left side, set back - 85 ft. from the marshes. He described the lot as having a lawn area along with shrubbery and bushes going down to the roadway - 10'-15' from the marsh. The excavation would be approximately 4' slab on grade with the elevation being at the level of the existing basement floor. Any extra material would be taken off site. There will also be hay bales staked at the front of the house and when construction is complete they will be removed from site. He estimated that the project would take about 2 months and that the work was scheduled to start in July.

At this point Mr. White presented the Board members with pictures of the site.

Chairman Thompson felt the project looked pretty straightforward.

Ms. Schloss recommended a Negative 3 Determination with conditions to include:

- the applicant would notify the Administrator when work began
- hay bales would be removed when the project was complete
- the Administrator would be informed when the project was completed

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

Cmmr. Coven moved to issue a Negative 3 Determination, based on the Administrator's recommendation, for 33 Laudervale Road.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

234 King Philip Street - Continued Public Hearing

DEP File #81-1055

This hearing was delayed until the applicant arrived.

DEP File 81-1041 Whitman's Pond

Request to Amend Order of Conditions - Hearing

Cmmr. Kent moved to open the public hearing for DEP File 81-1041/Whitman's Pond

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. Jeffrey Bina/DPW Engineer and Keith Gaizelle, Aquatic Technician/Subcontractor for the work on Whitman's Pond came before the Board.

Mr. Bina informed members that the DPW was working with the WPA/Whitman's Pond Association on the project. He added that the WPA had previously applied for a grant with the Community Preservation Committee and funding had been approved for the purpose of controlling aquatic vegetation in Whitman's Pond.

The proposed work/goal was to remove invasive plant species and nuisance levels of indigenous plant species for the purpose of improving the water quality and wildlife habitat in Whitman's Pond.

Mr. Gaizelle explained that the aquatic growth/excess levels of decayed vegetation in the Pond have been ongoing over a number of years and has been increasing in density. Many studies have been done documenting this. The proposed areas of concentration would include Whitman Pond's Main Basin and West Cove. It was noted that this growth has contributed to the degradation of the water quality and habitat value. He explained that removal of this type of vegetation does not lend itself to mechanical control, because when it breaks up the plants, what is left behind re-vegetates and growth multiplies.

Mr. Gaizelle went on to say that they are requesting an amended Order of Conditions for the purpose of employing a registered aquatic herbicide SONAR (fluridone). This treatment has been used successfully in 2003. They now plan to expand use of the product to the West Cove, adding at this point they don't think they can control the main water body - but did feel that it would work in West Cove because of the reduced water control. In addition to submerged plant control, they want to spot manage West Cove and the Northwest Cove for Purple Loosestrife. They will apply the product 'AquaPro' and 'Renovate' when Purple Loosestrife is in full flower to reduce the seed/density of the plant. They will be doing the work by hand as well as using sprayers to distribute the herbicide. He explained that when the Purple Loosestrife grows with other species, they employ that herbicide because it won't negatively impact the other aquatic plants. He further explained that the herbicide mimics the growth hormone in the plants and exhausts the food reserve. Their plans call for monitoring the vegetation component to help document those plants not targeted.

Chairman Thompson asked about the affect when there is no withdrawal from the secondary water supply (Whitman's Pond).

Mr. Bina replied that the DPW Water Division would be involved in the project and at this point he didn't foresee a withdrawal happening.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that presently there was plenty of available water with the many weeks of rains we have been experiencing.

Mr. Gaizelle wanted to point out that the subject herbicides have been approved under these conditions.

Chairman Thompson said he supported the project then asked about Japanese Knotweed control.

Mr. Gaizelle told him that some recommend the use of the following products: AquaPro, Rodeo or Aqua Master - which is somewhat like 'Roundup' - but not known to be aquatic-friendly like AquaPro is - a Gly-Phosate.

Mr. Gaizelle noted that their strategy was to treat the Loosestrife after the plant flowers - in late August. He explained that the plant stores the herbicide in the root, emphasizing they need to use an aquatic-friendly product.

Cmmr. Kent asked about the effect/life span of the chemical.

Mr. Gaizelle replied Sonar-Fluridone (which is 150 parts per million), lasts 15-20 days, then dissipates quickly. He pointed out that in theory you can actually drink this water directly after treatment, it is that safe.

Cmmr. Coven commented on the great job done by the Whitman's Pond Association and he would be happy to vote for the approval of the amended Order of Conditions.

The hearing was opened to the public.

Town Councilor Arthur Mathews, who had been a past member of the Whitman's Pond Association, spoke informing members that they were getting the 'best bang for the buck'. He acknowledged that this product was very affective, and gave greater dollar value per acre. He further explained that there were only two people in the state licensed to do this type of work and Keith Gaizelle was one. In closing he said that many of Weymouth's residents were concerned about the heavy overgrowth in the Pond and their support would be good news to them.

Cmmr. Kent moved to close the public hearing for File 81-1041/Whitman's Pond.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

DEP File 81-1041

DPW/Whitman's Pond

Amended Order of Conditions

In addressing the request for an Amended Order of Conditions, Ms. Schloss commented that they would need to clarify use of South Cove for the pumping station during the treatment period. She told members that fluridone/Sonar is used over a period of 60-90 days and water withdrawals are allowed if treatment is more than $\frac{1}{4}$ mile from in-take - and based on that she felt they would need to reword some Conditions. She stated that this amendment would expand the Order of Conditions to allow chemical treatment. In her communications with the Division of Marine Fisheries, they have informed her that they had no concerns using the proposed chemical (SONAR) at low doses for fisheries.

Mr. Bina told her that they can reassess their needs if they need to pump.

Mr. Gaizelle noted that, treatment in regard to the pumping station is more flexible - and its use would be limited to Purple Loosestrife.

Ms. Schloss stated that she spoke with Richard Healy about the Sonar treatment and he recommended they comply with the recommendations noted in the State's Generic Environmental Impact Report. She felt they should address that. Further in regard to Purple Loosestrife the words and "prior to application" she asked for a sketch of the area to be treated and/or walk the area (re follow-up mapping) with the applicant. She told members that she spoke about this today with Mr. Gaizelle and he was recommending they remain flexible in regard to the area/timeframe to be treated (3 years).

Ms. Schloss pointed out that the DPW had the ability to keep extending the Order of Conditions after a period of 3 years; all they needed to do is make a formal request for the extension and return before the Board.

Chairman Thompson replied 'that makes perfect sense'.

Mr. Gaizelle had reviewed the conditions and stated that he was only concerned with Conditions #46 to #49; re. time frame for documentation. He noted that logistically 30 days was not adequate - and suggested extending it possibly to the end of the calendar year. Summarily he was recommending they broaden the timeframe.

Ms. Schloss told him that that particular recommendation (condition) came from DEP, but she offered to leave the time frame out.

Mr. Gaizelle said that during the year of management, they would outline the tasks taken to manage specific plants.

Ms. Schloss replied, then maybe Condition 46 is redundant.

Chairman Thompson commented that previously Cmmr. Coven recommended they go with the words "after completion" and all parties agreed to this.

Re. Condition #48:

Chairman Thompson recommended they eliminate the words 'within two months'.

Ms. Schloss agreed to replace those words with 'by the end of the calendar year'.

Mr. Gaizelle next referred to Condition #49 - commenting the condition was not feasible (in regard to hydro raking), and recommended using the words "excepting 1 hydro raking refueling".

Ms. Schloss and the Chairman agreed to this change.

Cmmr. Coven moved to approve the amended conditions as proposed by the Administrator and further amended this evening.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Cmmr. Kent asked what 'species' was being referred to - and was told the verbiage referred to 'human use'.

Mr. Gaizelle commented that boat traffic could enter the pond via the boat trailer ramp to the boat.

Town Councilor Mathews explained that the eutrophication was caused in part due to 30 years of raw sewage overflowing into the Pond, especially the West Lake Drive area. - and that so far they have invested \$18,000,000 for sewer infrastructure improvements, adding it has helped a lot.

Great Esker Park - Hearing

DEP File #81-1061

Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation

Cmmr. Coven moved to open the hearing for File 81-1061, Great Esker Park.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. Bill Kane/MWRA came before the Board. He told members that this has been a long-term project, explaining that the MWRA are under an Administrative Order with Ma. Dept. of Environmental Protection. In regard to the pumping station on Route 3A, they need to replenish 21,000 sq. ft. of wetland and they are presently looking for a substitute site to re-establish the salt marsh. In doing so Great Esker was chosen. They are using AECOM for this work (formerly Metcalf & Eddy). He informed members that the first report done was a feasibility study, which was accepted by DEP. Their second report, to be completed 6/19, is a Salt Marsh Restoration Plan. The next phase will be a Preliminary Design. Presently they are before them for an ANRAD/Abbreviated Notice of Intent. He said that the consultant went to the site and staked out/delineated the wetland. Further he and Ms. Schloss walked the site and spoke about the work involved. He wanted to clarify that he was before the Board this evening for the ANRAD only and that they would be back for the specific work.

Chairman Thompson clarified with Ms. Schloss that she confirmed the wetland line as submitted and she said that she did.

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

Cmmr. Coven moved to approve the ANRAD as approved by the Administrator.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

60 Patterson Street

Continued Violation Hearing

Ms. Schloss informed members that Mr. Dominic Silvestro, owner of 60 Patterson Street, had been present earlier in the evening but has since left as she told him she would update the members on the status of the property. She confirmed that 60 Patterson Street now looks good, specifically noting:

- the erosion control blanket is in place
- plants/shrubs are in
- seed mix is applied

At this point Ms. Schloss reported that was pleased with the progress that has been made and suggested that they could send a letter to Mr. Silvestro acknowledging his spirit of cooperation. She noted that the seed vegetation has not come up as yet, adding she thought it might have been put in incorrectly but she still felt it would work.

Members were in favor of the Administrator sending the positive letter of acknowledgement to Mr. Silvestro.

DEP FILE 81-770

75 Finnell Drive

Request for Certificate of Compliance

Ms. Schloss reported that Mr. Goldman was present earlier this evening, and they both know that 75 Finnell Drive is not ready for a Certificate of Compliance. He wasn't available at this point, but might return.

(This matter was addressed later in the meeting).

DEP FILE 81-994

Shea Memorial Drive

Request for Certificate of Compliance

Ms. Schloss reported that she has received the 'as built's' for Shea Memorial Drive and the project is complete. She also has the storm water data. At this point she was recommending approval of their Certificate of Compliance.

Cmmr. Kent moved to issue a Certificate of Compliance for Shea Memorial Drive, File 81-994.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

DEP FILE 81-980

345 Neck Street

Request for Extension to Order of Conditions

Ms. Schloss reported that this Order of Conditions was for a long dock and she was recommending the one-year extension.

Cmmr. Kent moved to approve a one-year extension for File 81-980, 345 Neck Street.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

1420 Main Street

Continued Violation Hearing

Ms. Schloss reported that this matter would be addressed at the 7/15/09 meeting.

DEP FILE 81-770

75 Finnell Drive

Request for Certificate of Compliance

Mr. Goldman, owner of 75 Finnell Drive, came before the Board.

The Chairman emphasized that there was a serious problem at this property site with regard to unauthorized work.

In response, Mr. Goldman informed members that he was presently working on completing the previously approved Order of Conditions. He explained that he took an area of roadway, which he thought was just a roadway - but now realizes he has encroached on the resource area - acknowledging that it was totally improper - and would now like to rectify his mistake.

Chairman Thompson asked the Administrator if she felt a consultant would be needed to rectify the violation properly.

Ms. Schloss told members that Mr. Goldman currently has someone working for him on rectifying the violation, but at this point she was recommending an Enforcement Order be issued for the record by the Commission. She pointed out that Mr. Goldman would need a specific plan submitted to the Commission, outlining how the land would be restored. She said she was on site yesterday meeting with Mr. Goldman and his consultant and at this point she could confirm that they have a

definitive plan on where to start. Again, she restated the Board should issue an Enforcement Order and then give Mr. Goldman a completion date.

Chairman Thompson urged Mr. Goldman to discuss a time line with his consultant.

Mr. Goldman confirmed that his consultant would be working on this with him.

Ms. Schloss recommended the completion date be the end of July, and at that point they should request Mr. Goldman return before the Commission giving a status report at the 8/12/09 meeting.

Chairman Thompson noted that the wet season would be coming up in the Fall, so the work could possibly be finalized in September with a monitoring period to follow.

Cmmr. Coven moved to issue an Enforcement Order to Mr. Goldman re. 75 Finnell Drive with a plan to be submitted to the Board by 7/29/09 - and that Mr. Goldman be required to return before the Board at the 8/12/09 meeting.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

**234 King Philip Street
Continued Public Hearing
DEP File #81-1055**

Cmmr. Kent moved to open the continued public hearing for King Phillip Street, File 81-1055.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Atty. Watsky, Al Trakimas, PE/Sitec representing the applicant Brian Nelson, who was also present, came before the Board.

Atty. Watsky informed members that since the last meeting they met with the abutters/residents - and they all toured the site and discussed their concerns. He pointed out the driveway location and explained the proposed work included improving the two channels. During their meeting with the residents, the applicant sought their input. Overall, he felt it was a good meeting. Further after the meeting Mr. Trakimas tweaked the plan.

Next Mr. Trakimas spoke, outlining the changes which included the realignment of the driveway - which is now official. He explained that they pulled the driveway out of the wetland, although he noted that it is still within the resource area and it runs through the sewer easement. With regard to the DEP's comments referring to the location of the house encroaching on a sensitive area, they have adjusted the position of the house away from the 100' flood zone. Further they maintained the crossing/existing ditch/sewer easement, which serves as an equalization ditch. He noted that the abutters were concerned with the amount of runoff - so they put an additional culvert in where the existing crossing is now, adding he could understand one of the resident's perception/concerns in this area. Again he noted that they added the culvert back in to maintain the crossing.

Next, Mr. Trakimas spoke about Ms. Schloss' request for specifications - acknowledging that this has been addressed. He went on to say they saw the existing 10" culvert (with trash grate on the eastern side) as a major impediment. They have now addressed the 10" pipe and have a trash grate upstream which, he pointed out was a constant maintenance issue due to its location. They felt it best to open up the 4 ft. wide channel flow which would then allow the DPW access. They also looked at the existing drainage ditch on the east side of the property, which is a live channel with boulders - adding that debris falls in them. He emphasized that the 40 ft. section of channel needs to be maintained. The applicant would like to remove the debris and open up the channel, which they gave agreed to maintain.

Mr. Trakimas continued enumerating the changes/modifications to their plan stating that they propose to add 4" posts with signs and they would replace them in (9) locations around the dwelling in order to clearly mark the no-disturb zone. He said that the rest of the changes are essentially technical changes and are in response to DPW's comments. He also noted that they would be dealing with the unsuitable material. He stated that the sub-division regulations address the

roadway construction, commenting that they incorporated those notes on their detail sheet and confirmed that they plan to comply with sub-division standards. They also plan on using control-density fill.

Lastly, Mr. Trakimas commented, for the future any additional comments could be addressed at Building Permit time.

Cmmr. Coven felt this plan was the same as the last one.

Mr. Trakimas replied that the alignment hasn't changed but more accurately this plan addresses technical changes.

Ms. Schloss spoke next - stating that the applicant is in receipt of her comments, adding that her main concern is the removal of Replication Area A. She said she would like a 3rd party (peer review) to look at it. She was in support of the open channel on the southwest side, but her concern was with the area on the northeast side which involved a 5,000+ ft. replication area (Area A). She felt it was a substantial amount of fill that raises the level of the roadway and that the applicant would need the services of someone with engineering expertise to verify that the additional fill needs to be offset by replication in the same area. She commented that this fill could cause additional flooding concerns. She acknowledged that the applicant is maintaining the opening in the easement, but she said there doesn't appear to be any flow there (as previous residents had commented).

Chairman Thompson asked Mr. Trakimas if he had spoken to Ms. Schloss about her concern(s) and Ms. Schloss interjected 'not really'.

Atty. Watsky said it was his understanding that Mr. Gaskell spoke about this and he was in support. He noted that the filling was going in 3 ft. above the flood elevation - and that the resident's problem is the 10" culvert. He said the applicant was only trying to restore the natural channel and he didn't see the need for peer review.

Mr. Trakimas said they are also offering to clear the channel of any debris and to add another culvert so that if it fails, they would have an additional 18" culvert enabling it to continue to drain.

Ms. Schloss agreed that was an improvement, but she wasn't crazy about Replication Area B, adding she preferred "A" - but reiterated that having peer review was important to her.

Chairman Thompson spoke about the fill and being 3 ft. above the flood elevation.

Atty. Watsky said they went with Replication Area B (to the south), because the area was already disturbed there - adding that fill was dumped there during sewer construction. He described the area to the east as a mature upland forest with huge trees located within the buffer zone - asking 'does it make sense to disturb this area now?'

Mr. Trakimas referred to the 100 year flood elevation on Mill River, pointing out that this area was not within the 100 year flood zone and that the flood zone was confined to the south side of Mill River - not where the driveway is going. He explained that the ditches were dug to allow water to reach equilibrium. The proposed driveway is at elevation 160.25 with the sides at 160 - so they would only be raising the existing area 2' by the sewer easement. There will be no action in regard to the flooding standpoint - and no storage for the wetland system. He then spoke about the driveway going on the fill portion and explained that the runoff flowed out on the southerly portion. He said they were adding fill to the existing fill and it wouldn't affect its storage capacity. He went on to point out that now even with all the rain there is no water in the ditch - and the other water was stagnant. Yet on the east and southerly side it was flowing, so this tells him that is as high as it will get. He explained that it has (2) outlets, and it will only fill to a certain level, then it would flow out.

Mr. Trakimas went on to say that the disturbed area is already bounded by a sewer easement. Their plans call for opening up the 10" culvert area and adding an additional culvert pipe so it won't back up in the area. He felt they were dramatically improving the southern area, stressing that the area of concern has two points for water to egress.

Chairman Thompson asked about maintenance and Mr. Trakimas told him that this channel would require minimal maintenance - as it's an open flow channel. He said that they will put conditions on the homeowner requiring he/she clean it out once/twice a year by placing this Condition on the property.

Ms. Schloss had a question re. the current level of water, stating the applicant shows control by elevation at the outflow - asking 'do we know what that is?'

Atty. Watsky said the present situation is because of a clogged culvert and debris in the southeast corner with two channels being clogged; because of that the flow of water has been blocked there. He wanted to point out with the changes/additional outlets they are actually helping the neighbors.

Chairman Thompson commented that he saw that as a nice gesture, but added that the Commission relies on the Administrator and pays attention to her concerns. In summary, he would like to resolve this with a peer consultant if possible.

Mr. Trakimas told the Board/Administrator that he didn't have the specific elevations Ms. Schloss was seeking re. where the driveway is going, but to date he has not seen the pathway submerged.

Atty. Watsky informed members that Mr. Trakimas and Rod Gaskell have been out there when there has been a lot of water and have never witnessed flowing over the easement.

Ms. Schloss stated that the fill area was 30 ft. wide, and asked "where does the water come from when it goes up that high - a 2 year storm, a 10 year storm, a 100 year storm"?

Mr. Trakimas wanted to point out that the area was not in the 100 year flood zone.

Chairman Thompson asked the Administrator if she was stuck on the fact that the fill could potentially be a problem.

Ms. Schloss responded that she actually wasn't sure, adding "it's complicated". She felt the project had a lot of fill and that is why she would like to have peer review. She asked 'is replication advisable to deal with fill, particularly in the "easement area"'

Chairman Thompson asked about Area "A" and Ms. Schloss replied "I'd be more amenable to that".

Cmmr. Coven referred to the 10" culvert and extending it 7+ ft., commenting that he felt it should be done to alleviate the resident's concerns - and asked 'is it above and beyond to have this area expanded?' He then referred to Replication Area "A" and the need for a depression area for the water to fill - adding 'you need to be sure if it is open 7 ft. it will be able to take care of the problem'. He said that he realized it was a lot of fill and he was not certain that opening it 7 ft. would be the cure all.

Cmmr. Kent referred to the east side easement, noting that area wasn't land locked - that water could flow to the east then into Mill River. To the west you could do the same, adding it is going through an 8" pipe right now. So summarily, he didn't think the fill would displace the water/increase the height of the water, adding that he had a similar experience at his house.

Lastly Cmmr. Kent said that he saw the added culverts as a plus, equalizing the east side to the west side. Overall he said it is all pretty logical to him.

Ms. Schloss told members that at this point she was waiting for DPW's comments with regard to the open pipe. She noted that she only received the new plan about a week ago.

Chairman Thompson asked if there were any further comments.

Ms. Schloss replied that Mr. Boudreau (an abutter) had concerns regarding possible flooding.

Ms. Schloss went on to say that in addition to the tublings, she would like to see the addition of larger plants and would like to have tight oversight of the project - although she commented Rod Gaskell (who works for the applicant) certainly knows what he's doing. Further, she didn't see any seed mix in the replication area. Lastly in regard to the larger fill area,

the applicant would still have to comply with the 401 Water Quality Certificate and the Army Corps of Engineers requirements.

Mr. Trakimas acknowledged this.

Ms. Schloss felt the project could take several months, so at this point she didn't feel she was holding up the process by requesting peer review.

Chairman Thompson asked her if there was anything the applicant could do in place of peer review.

Ms. Schloss replied 'no, I'd like to have it'.

Chairman Thompson noted that the hearing would need to be continued anyway and then opened the hearing to the public.

Town Council Harrington spoke. He said that on May 28th he took a tour of the site with other King Phillips' residents with he, the applicant/representatives listening to their concerns. Further, in the past 4-5 years, due to the wetter weather there was a big concern about mosquitoes and Equine Encephalitis virus that came along. Although a couple of years ago the DPW came in and the culvert was lowered by about 1 ft. at which point the water receded and the mosquito/virus concern became less of an issue. The stream bed on either side of the culvert was lower. Also the stream bed impeded by the sewer line goes over it. He felt by the applicant's proposal would drop the height and possibly reduce it by 8"-10"; which would not necessarily destroy the natural resources, but he believed the problem was because the culvert was too high. Now the proponent wants to take it out and he personally felt it would be a good thing. Further he wanted the members to know that he no longer sees any objections from those in the neighborhood. He felt that once the culvert was removed and the land restored to its natural depth, the problem would be eliminated.

Town Council Harrington went on to say that now they want to move the boulders around and he also sees that as a good thing. Lastly, if the applicant confirms that he won't use the Heather Lane entrance, but would enter by King Phillip - that would be great.

Chairman Thompson asked the applicant, Brian Nelson, if they could approach the site via King Phillip and he responded 'absolutely'.

Town Council Harrington interjected that would make the neighbors happy. Further he felt if a peer review person has to come in and then this raises the cost for the developer, he just might walk away from the project altogether - and he said they wouldn't want to see this happen.

Chairman Thompson said he agreed, adding that he was hoping they could resolve any outstanding issues by the next hearing.

Cmmr. Coven moved to continue the hearing for 25 King Phillip St./File 81-1055 to 7/15/09.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Minutes: May 27, 2009 for review and approval

Cmmr. Coven moved to approve the minutes of the 5/27/2009 as amended.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Other Business

Conservation Report

527 Columbian Street/Quincy Credit Union

Ms. Schloss took a moment to pass out a report on the status of the Quincy Credit Union's new branch office located at 527 Columbian Street. She said they were seeking a Certificate of Compliance but at this point she could only see

approving a 'Partial' Certificate of Compliance. She said they would need them to spray the Knotweed on site and would recommend they use 'Gly-Phosate'.

Members were in agreement.

Pond Street Appeal

Ms. Schloss reported that Harvey Welch/Weymouth resident was appealing the approval of the Pond Street project and that DEP has scheduled a site visit for 7/14/09 at 10 AM.

Chairman Thompson said he would make every effort to be there.

Ms. Schloss next reported that there would be a Notice of Intent for the affordable housing apartments on Pond Street forthcoming - explaining they would be coming back for the sidewalk extension.

Alexan Appeal

Ms. Schloss then informed members that she has received the 'appeal' for ALEXAN re. the Superseding Order of Conditions based on:

- Local Order of Conditions
- State appeal from M/M Marques
- Trammel Crowe appeal re. bond requirement

431 Union Street

Lastly she informed members that she received a Letter of Completion re. 431 Union Street which she will check out - and then report back.

The JULY 15th, 2009 meeting will begin at 7:30 PM in the Town Council Chambers of the Weymouth Town Hall.

ADJOURNMENT

Cmmr. Coven moved to adjourn at 9:55 PM.

Chairman Thompson seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Respectfully submitted,

Susan DeChristoforo
Recording Secretary

APPROVED: _____

DATE: _____