

WEYMOUTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Town Hall Chambers
November 12th, 2008 Meeting

PRESENT: John Thompson/Chairman, Cmmr. Gerald Murphy, Cmmr. Scott Coven/Clerk, Cmmr. Jeff Kent and Cmmr. Adrienne Gowen

ALSO PRESENT: Conservation Administrator, Mary Ellen Schloss

Chairman Thompson called the November 12th, 2008 meeting of the Conservation Commission to order at 7:35.

Motion was made to take the Arbor Hill public hearing out of order.

Seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Alexan at Arbor Hill - Continued Hearing

DEP File 81-1046

Ms. Schloss explained that because Cmmr. Gerald Murphy missed the first public hearing for Alexan at Arbor Hill, it is required that it be read into the record that he missed the hearing and to rectify that he has watched the cable video of the hearing that evening - in order to participate in the vote on the project. This has been done.

Next Chairman Thompson stated that he was recommending tonight's hearing be continued to the next meeting scheduled for December 10, 2008. The reason being according to the applicant was he was not fully prepared to respond to the large number of comments/questions the Commission's consultant, Richard Sweeney, submitted regarding his findings on their proposal. He added that the applicant's representative, Mr. Stuart Clark/Gale Engineering was the person who requested the continuance to December 10, 2008 in order to allow for the Commission's representative Richard Sweeney, from TetraTech Rizzo to look into and respond to some outstanding issues/comments presented by the applicant.

Mr. Stuart Clark/Gale Engineering then spoke informing members that he had some important dialogue in regard to the technical components of the project and sent them to Mr. Sweeney today, but understandably it was not enough time for him to respond/comment.

Chairman Thompson took a moment to thank the many interested residents present for attending the hearing this evening for an update and he apologized for not having enough time to forewarn them that there would be no hearing or new business this evening.

Commr. Kent asked when the Commission was advised there would not be a hearing this evening and Ms. Schloss replied that she thought there would be a brief update given this evening, but quickly added she knew there would be a continuance requested by the applicant.

Commr. Kent suggested that this information could have been put on the Town's website - and this possibly could be done in the future.

Chairman Thompson asked Mr. Clark if in the future (re. 12/10/08 hearing) he could give the Commission/Administrator advance notice (one week) if the applicant cannot be prepared for the December 10th, 2008 hearing - so they in turn can inform the interested parties.

Ms. Schloss explained that the office received a letter today from their consultant, Richard Sweeney, acknowledging that a meeting was held on November 5th, 2008 at the offices of TetraTech Rizzo in Braintree with the applicant's representative Stuart Clark and Ms. Schloss in attendance.

Ms. Schloss went on to say that at that time, preliminary redesign plans were submitted and she noted that some significant design changes had been made by the applicant, including drainage changes. She added that the revised plans would be forthcoming.

Ms. Schloss then asked Stuart Clark to submit a copy of the information discussed at the 11/5/08 meeting to the Conservation office. It was also noted that test pits would be performed on either Friday, November 14th or Monday, November 17th with Richard Sweeney and/or herself in attendance.

The hearing was opened to the public.

Town Councilor Mathews was the first speaker. He recommended that even though there would not be a public hearing this evening the residents be allowed to speak, in case they couldn't be present for the December 10th hearing.

The Chairman agreed to do so.

Town Councilor Mathews then referred to the last hearing and Richard Sweeney's report with the many comments/questions that were listed. He suggested that a copy of the response in writing be made available for all interested residents.

Chairman Thompson confirmed that it would be, explaining this information was a matter of public record and this was customary procedure.

Town Councilor Mathews then asked if all of the Town Councilors could have a copy of the letter that was read into the record and Chairman agreed to make it available, explaining that the Commission works on behalf of the townspeople and their reason for being there was to protect the citizen's rights as well as to protect the Town's resources.

The next speaker was Town Councilor Harrington. He noted that at the last hearing Chairman Thompson had recommended that the applicant hold off their next hearing until December due to the large amount of questions that were asked by Mr. Sweeney, yet at that time the applicant chose not to wait until the December 10th meeting. Now they are not ready this evening to respond as promised and many of the residents came out to attend the hearing but now for no purpose. At this time he was recommending that the hearing be continued until January instead of December to insure that all parties would be prepared at that time.

Chairman Thompson responded to Town Council Harrington stating that he respected his comments, but explained that according to the Wetlands Protection Act, the applicant is the one to decide on the date for their next hearing - not the Commission, again clarifying that it was a matter of law. He continued to explain that they can't have selective enforcement.

Town Council Harrington replied that he has respect for the law, but not necessarily for the applicant or their proposal. He also wanted assurance that they would be ready for the December meeting.

Chairman Thompson told Town Council Harrington that the applicant needs to have the information that will be addressed at the December 10th hearing, to the Commission/Administrator two weeks prior to that hearing date.

Cmmr. Murphy clarified that it appeared Town Council Harrington wanted to know if the information would be to the Commission by a date certain - which has been one week before.

Mr. Clark assured members that the information would be to the Commission/Administrator one week before the hearing date, adding that they planned on working closely with Richard Sweeney.

Ms. Sydelle Miller, 110-R Burkhall Street spoke next. She stated that she wanted to protect the Town's natural environment, now and for future generations - and she felt that altering or changing the wetland would generate negative affects to the wildlife/birds. Lastly she commented that it would be a tragedy to fill the wetland and encouraged the developer to protect the wetland and to do right by those that live there.

Mr. Clark said that they would be revising their design and how it works - and their response to Mr. Sweeney's comments would explain this in detail.

Mr. Harvey Welch/Weymouth resident spoke next and asked if the applicant would be addressing all the points in Mr. Sweeney's report.

Mr. Clark responded that some of Mr. Sweeney's points were now moot, but those that weren't would definitely be addressed in his presentation. He added that he would be looking at making his presentation via PowerPoint.

Ms. Schloss asked if she could have his written response in PDF format, if so she could post it on the Town's website.

In response to Mr. Welch's question about Mr. Clark's background, he confirmed that he was a Professional Engineer listed with the state.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to continue the hearing for Alexan at Arbor Hill, File 81-1046 to December 10, 2008.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Lot 29 Greenvale Ave. - Continued Hearing

DEP File #81-1047

Cmmr. Murphy moved to open the public hearing for Lot 29 Greenvale Avenue, File 81-1047.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Ms. Schloss announced that this proposal is for construction of a single family home on the shore of the West Cove of Whitman's Pond. Further she informed members that the applicant has requested a continuance while they pursue trying to purchase the adjacent parcel to Lot 29.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to continue the hearing to December 10, 2008 at the request of the applicant.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

41 Tayla Drive - Continued Hearing

DEP File #81-1049

Cmmr. Murphy moved to open the public hearing for 41 Tayla Drive, File 81-1049.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. Paul Tyrell, PE representing the applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Flanagan, came before the Board. He explained that the proposal was for a pool, basketball court, retaining walls and fencing. He pointed out that since the last hearing their file number has been received (File #81-1049). Additionally, since the last hearing they have outlined the storm water recharge and provided back-up calculations.

Mr. Tyrell went on to say that the site was located in the buffer zone, adding that no wetland work was proposed. Additionally there would be no work beyond the haybale/silt fence line. He informed members that the local contractor they hired was familiar with the area. He also noted that the proposal calls for an increase in the impervious surface, adding they would be providing mitigation. He noted that the storm water storage has been provided for a 2" storm event. He described the property as having a sloped grade, adding that the majority of the area has already been cleared. Plans are for direct recharge.

Ms. Schloss told members she had visited the site. She requested Mr. Tyrell to flag the trees that have a greater than a 6" diameter. She noted that their plans called for removing 16 mature trees, which she viewed as pretty significant, but added she realized it was necessary to do so.

Mr. Tyrell told her that he flagged the site just prior to the last hearing.

Ms. Schloss then asked if 2" of rainfall was less than a 2-year storm and he replied 'yes'. adding that it was actually 2.9".

Ms. Schloss told him it was 2" for Norfolk County. She then told Mr. Tyrell that he stated he would be improving the present conditions, but she took issue with that stating she didn't see it that way. She realized that construction of a single-family house was exempt from Storm Water Storage requirements, but informed him that the local regulations require they calculate peak flow. She said that she now needed to know the difference between the pre and post figures. She pointed out that there was some flooding down gradient. She noted that the proposal/house would cover most of the upland area. She told Mr. Tyrell that she was appreciative of the addition of the drywell, adding that she has seen some improvement since the last meeting.

Cmmr. Murphy also felt the drywell would help. He then asked about the pool discharge.

Mr. Tyrell said it would be a cartridge located off to the side of the pool.

Cmmr. Coven asked if the removal of the trees would change the calculations and the applicant replied 'no'. He then asked if the drywell would require maintenance and again Mr. Tyrell replied 'no', adding you just need to keep it clear of debris - and then commented that making it a Condition would be prudent.

Commr. Kent suggested they might also want to add a berm.

Mr. Tyrell replied that the site is graded to go right into the drywell - and based on that he didn't feel a berm would serve a function.

Members felt that overall the applicant did a good job with the proposal.

Cmmr. Coven said he would like to see a special condition that would regular maintenance.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to close the public hearing for 41 Tayla Drive, File 81-1049.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

41 Tayla Drive

DEP File #81-1049

Order of Conditions

Cmmr. Murphy moved to issue a Standard Order of Conditions for File 81-1049, 41 Tayla Drive, plus one special condition that requires the catchbasin grate be kept clean.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

22 Martin Street - Hearing

Map 33, Bl 425, Lot 4

Gary Gabriel

DEP File # not available

Notice of Intent

Cmmr. Murphy moved to open the public hearing for 22 Martin Street, File number to come.

Cmmr. Gowen seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

The applicant Gary Gabriel came before the Board.

Chairman Thompson recapped the problem with the site, which included a failed wall that was rebuilt closer than acceptable to a No Disturb Zone.

Cmmr. Murphy noted that the applicant has had a difficult time with the wall and Mr. Gabriel acknowledged this, adding it was the second time the wall had come down.

Chairman Thompson wanted to point out that Mr. Gabriel is coming in for the necessary approvals after the wall was put up.

Mr. Gabriel acknowledged this was correct. He went on to say that the last time he was before the Board he replaced the pipe and plantings. Then when cleaning the site up he found that the entire ledge underneath kept failing. Further he explained that a stacked wall was suggested, so he brought the plan back in to the Administrator and tried to do it, but it failed again.

Chairman Thompson noted that a new and different plan was drawn up by Vine Associates. He then asked Mr. Gabriel if he was requesting a Variance.

Mr. Gabriel acknowledged that he was looking for a Variance, adding that his engineer was unable to be present this evening. He then noted that Ms. Schloss visited his property today.

File Note: At this point he submitted the green cards verifying notification of the abutters.

Ms. Schloss noted that the Notice of Intent was for a proposed slope stabilization. She referred to the plan, different from the original plan, and the toe of slope which was 4'-8' from the wetland, adding it was actually more like 15'-18' - still within the Commission's jurisdiction. She told members that because a different retaining wall had been constructed without the necessary approvals, she wanted Mr. Gabriel to meet with the Board. She noted that he should also submit an 'as built' plan for the record, as well as a plan with an accurate toe of slope. She commented that she was not thrilled with how it turned out.

Ms. Schloss went on to say that the Building Department discussed the project with Mr. Gabriel and they told him they would like an affidavit from the engineer who designed the wall, adding she would like one too. Further she said the plan should be accompanied by the engineer's statement that the wall was built in accordance with the plan. She commented that possibly the second wall shouldn't have been allowed, adding she felt it could be a lot more stable.

The hearing was opened to the public.

Christine Lynch, abutter spoke and told members that she had attended a previous hearing for this same house, which she noted was built on a cliff/ledge. She told members that she didn't recall being notified about the barrier wall. She said the swamp could be 15'-18' away depending on the time of year, adding when the second house was constructed there wasn't much space left on the lot and they had to blast. She said her house was built on a ledge. She commented that blasting made the wall come down again. She told members that she sees a hose there draining into the swamp/wetland. Presently she doesn't see anyone at the site checking it out and she is concerned.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to continue the hearing for 22 Martin Street until December 10, 2008.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

0 Healy Road - Hearing

DEP File #81-1023

Request to Amend Order of Conditions

Cmmr. Murphy moved to open the hearing for File 81-1023, 0 Healy Road

Commr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. Al Trakimas, PE from Sitec Engineering, representing the applicant, came before the Board. He said that he was before them this evening to request an amendment to the Order of Conditions for O Healy Road, explaining that the applicant would like to modify the location of the road/arborvitae.

Mr. Trakimas went on to say that his client asked if they could take a closer look at the wetland line - and that their Wetland Scientist has spoken to Ms. Schloss about it. He noted that he viewed the location of their wetland flag #66 as highly conservative. He said he would like to straighten out the row of arborvitae and he felt once that was done they would still be 25 ft. from the wetland. At that point they would be able to provide a side yard, adding there would still be buffer zone work.

Chairman Thompson asked about its proximity to the old line and Mr. Trakimas replied if you look at Area A, the wetland line is at the top of the "P" area - but, he said, they didn't want to ask the Board to approve the modification of an already accepted line.

Cmmr. Coven stated that he visited the site and got wet doing it. I could see that the line could be further back, but if they extend it, it would then be closer to the wetland area and he was concerned about encroachment.

Chairman Thompson asked the number of feet they were talking about - and Mr. Trakimas replied that it was approximately 10 ft. Chairman Thompson said he understood the applicant was not trying to change the wetland line, just the planting line and asked Mr. Trakimas if that was reasonable.

Mr. Trakimas said he would give 15 ft. of usable grass area and bring the line of arborvitae further from the wetland. He was looking into splitting the difference on the arch so that they would have more of a straight line.

Chairman Thompson asked about the number of feet and Mr. Trakimas replied "approximately 10 feet".

Cmmr. Coven wanted to clarify that he was previously referring to the arborvitae line.

Chairman Thompson then noted the house was within 10 ft. of the 'No Disturb Area' and was concerned about encroachment. He said they could consider the applicant's request, but for possibly less than 10 ft.

Ms. Schloss told members that Rod Gaskell provided a report that included the vegetation, but omitted mention of the Spice Bush. She agreed with the location of Flag #66, adding she felt it was a little conservative. She then referred to a swale area coming down from the south. She said she would like to preserve the integrity of the swale. Additionally, she noted, the existing retaining wall was not shown on the plan. Today she measured the distances from the existing erosion control line - from Flag 66 to erosion control is 13.3' as opposed to 25' - or 13' to 17' from the house. She saw 12 ft. between the house and the silt sock. She felt that area between the house and the silt sock could be used as lawn. She stated that she could support some adjustment, but not what's being proposed.

Ms. Schloss then reviewed the number/type of trees on the site. She commented that she was a bit hesitant because it was a tight site, with trees within 7 ft. of the house.

Mr. Trakimas was supportive of Ms. Schloss suggestion, adding he could meet with Ms. Schloss in the field and they could discuss the details to meet her satisfaction.

Ms. Schloss asked 'when?' and Mr. Trakimas said he would first need to check with the applicant, then get back to her with a date.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to approve the amendment to the Order of Conditions for File 81-1023, with the understanding that Mr. Trakimas meet with the Administrator at the site to finalize the details.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

**Weymouth Woods, Performance Drive
Request for a Certificate of Compliance**

Ms. Schloss told members that the applicant has requested a Certificate of Compliance. She described the site as a replication area with an over engineered detention basin. There was also a well located quite close to the facility, which she commented seemed to be doing a tremendous job - but she wasn't sure how it would function over the long-term as a wetland. She then distributed a report submitted by the applicant's wetland scientist, George Mariano.

Nick Thomas told members that this is the second growing season and over that period of time a few plants were lost but they replaced them.

Ms. Schloss noted that there were 100 planted.

Chairman Thompson commented that 5 out of 80+ died.

Ms. Schloss felt that 18 or so were stressed, adding she didn't see an issue with the vegetation cover. She didn't know if the Commission wanted to wait until June to see how many of the plants survive before issuing a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Thomas interjected that for financial reasons, the owners needed the Certificate of Compliance now. He said they have a diligent operation and maintenance program in place now as well as an on-site manager.

Chairman Thompson suggested they replant the dead shrubs that died in June or they could post a bond until the second growing season.

Cmmr. Murphy concurred; adding that he realized the Certificate of Compliance was necessary because of financial issues.

Ms. Schloss assessed the Performance Bond at \$2500.

Cmmr. Murphy moved to approve a Certificate of Compliance for Weymouth Woods, File 81-977 after the posting of a Performance Bond in the amount of \$2500.

Commr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 431 UNION STREET/CLANCY UPDATE

Minutes: September 24, 2008, October 8, 2008 for review and approval.

Chairman Thompson recused himself from approval of the minutes, as he did not participate in part of the meeting.

Cmmr. Murphy referred to the September 10th, 2008 minutes, specifically to the discussion regarding the Enforcement Order/Mr. Clancy - 431 Union Street. He noted that the minutes of that meeting and the letter (from Ms. Schloss to Mr. Clancy) was issue-based - and that the actions taken at the 9/10/2008 meeting were not in agreement. He then enumerated the differences as he saw them:

- A request for an Notice of Intent
- Discussion on infiltration

Cmmr. Murphy said that he wanted to see the entire 431 Union Street file and referred to the 10/22/08 instructions as outlined in Ms. Schloss' letter, adding at this point he would like the Board to assist with clarification on this issue.

Commr. Kent said, in regard to his statement/comments, he found the minutes to be accurate. He also referred to the work done at Whitman's Pond, which he said had not been done appropriately.

Cmmr. Murphy then cited Page 13 of the minutes, which stated in part that the Commission requested Mr. Clancy to submit a Notice of Intent for the purpose of restoring the property to its original condition.

Ms. Schloss commented that she didn't realize that.

Commr. Kent said he recalled that he recommended that Mr. Clancy go through the full procedure, commenting that he realized it was a pain. He added it was his understanding that this was the proper way to do it.

Ms. Schloss cited the Stokes violation, noting that they (the Commission) didn't request a Notice of Intent under those circumstances, adding that DEP said it was voluntary. She noted that a similar situation took place re. 60 Patterson St.

Cmmr. Murphy said he just wanted it to be clear for all concerned parties. Further, in fairness to Mr. Clancy it would be important for him to know what he needed to come back in here with; i. e., some kind of plan. Further, he commented, in regard to coming in with an engineer that would be up to him. He noted that is what we do with protocol, plans come with a Notice of Intent. He went on to say that he didn't think Mr. Clancy would know what would be expected of him, adding he found that at present he saw the situation as floundering. He asked Cmmr. Coven and Commr. Gowen what they expect when Mr. Clancy returns.

Commr. Gowen said that she believed protocol should be followed and Mr. Clancy should come in with an Notice of Intent.

Cmmr. Coven said he knew they discussed an N O I, but, he added, when then they recommended putting it off for two months (at the Mayor's suggestion). His recollection of that discussion was that Mr. Clancy was to be at the December meeting with an engineer and a plan. He didn't recall if an N O I would be needed as yet. He said he would be willing to go that way.

Cmmr. Coven went on to say that again, discussion alluded to two months and during that discussion it was felt it should be sooner. Again he stated that he recalled they wanted him to come in with an engineer, then at that time if the Commission required a plan they would address it then.

Cmmr. Murphy said he would like Mr. Clancy to be notified right away that he will need to come in with an N O I to restore his property.

Ms. Schloss said it was her understanding it was to ratify the Enforcement Order.

Cmmr. Murphy said he was expecting him to come in with an Notice of Intent, but now he sees conflict on that with the Board - now it is 3 in favor and 1 in conflict.

Cmmr. Murphy further commented for Mr. Clancy to come in and say he would put the stones back is unfair to him and to the Commission - if they are expecting an N O I in December.

Cmmr. Murphy then referred to the letter Ms. Schloss sent to Mr. Clancy, which stated in part that Mr. Clancy develop a plan of action and to supply a simple narrative. Additionally it was strongly recommended that Mr. Clancy hire a consultant - in addition, the Wetlands Protection Act was cited.

Cmmr. Kent felt it was just short of a request for a Notice of Intent.

Cmmr. Murphy said that the delay in clarifying what was needed was a concern for him, adding "and now there is snow on the ground".

Ms. Schloss commented 'unfortunately these things take time', adding that she strongly disagreed with the need for an Notice of Intent at this time. She felt the new request could be counterproductive. She offered to call Mr. Clancy to see if he had a plan and/or an engineer.

Cmmr. Murphy responded that his concern was Mr. Clancy was going to come in and not be prepared with what the Board is expecting.

Cmmr. Coven noted that this meeting took place after the 'Silvestro' violation - adding that he regretted giving Mr. Clancy two extra months - but at this point he felt the Commission should continue on the path that they were presently proceeding on.

Cmmr. Murphy agreed, but quickly clarified that he was specifically referring to the need for an N O I. He felt strongly that they should move forward now. He went on to comment that the matter was so open-ended, but so simple just to request that Mr. Clancy come in with a Notice of Intent. He noted that Mr. Clancy was present when this was discussed in September.

Cmmr. Kent told Ms. Schloss that if she didn't hear from Mr. Clancy by December 1st, we would need to take action - as is stated in the letter. He felt they needed to tell him that he must come in with an approvable plan by December 1st - one approved by the Administrator, adding 'we don't want to waste any more time'. He continued with 'if not an N O I, then we will need to get into a penalty phase'.

Ms. Schloss stated that they would need to give him some guidance before issuing penalties.

Cmmr. Murphy wanted a new letter to go to Mr. Clancy listing exactly what he needs to come in with on December 10th - and to have this information to the Commission/Administrator by December 1st. He said it would have to be an appropriate plan that would meet the Administrator's approval.

Ms. Schloss said that in the past they have typically issued another Enforcement Order with specific directions as to what to do and by what date.

Cmmr. Murphy asked Ms. Schloss if Mr. Clancy had called her and she replied 'no'.

Cmmr. Kent wanted Ms. Schloss to send a letter right away to Mr. Clancy clarifying what the Administrator would be expecting to review before coming before the Commission which would include a completed, approvable plan -done by the book.

Cmmr. Murphy asked about the pipe issue and Ms. Schloss said it was discussed at the hearing.

Ms. Schloss offered to put together a package based on the file/property (including pipe, wall - which had been handled by the previous Administrator), that would comply with all applicable regulations and at that point would call Mr. Clancy explaining what would be expected of him at the December 10th meeting.

Cmmr. Coven said he disagreed with that, because he saw time constraints. He went on to say that he agreed with the remainder of the letter in reference to what the Commission was looking for; i. e., that he come in with an Engineer. He felt making any changes at this point would muddy the waters.

Ms. Schloss agreed with Cmmr. Coven, adding that any changes now could bring the Mayor back into the picture, etc. She told the Commission that she would ask Mr. Clancy to give her a call.

Cmmr. Gowen moved to send a new letter to Mr. Clancy with regard to the 431 Union Street Violation confirming the elements of the Commission's request for restoration of the property at 431 Union Street, which would include:

- A narrative
- An approvable plan of action, that complies with all regulations, to be into the Conservation office by 12/01/2008.

Cmmr. Gowen seconded.

Discussion: It was requested that Mr. Clancy call and speak with Ms. Schloss for clarification of exactly what would be needed.

It was strongly urged that Mr. Clancy hire an engineer/consultant to appear with him at the 12/10/08 meeting.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

At this point the Chairman took a motion on the September 24, 2008 minutes.

Cmmr. Coven moved to approve the minutes of the 9/24/08 meeting as amended.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Cmmr. Coven moved to approve the minutes of the 10/08/2008 minutes as amended.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

File 81-998 - 184 Hibiscus Avenue

Request for Certificate of Compliance

Cmmr. Gowen moved to approve a Certificate of Compliance for 184 Hibiscus Avenue, File 81-998 based on the Administrator's recommendation.

Cmmr. Kent seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Conservation Report

Algonquin Gasline Update

Ms. Schloss reported that she spent most of Friday conducting a site walk with the applicant re. the Algonquin Gas Pipeline. The company has filed an Environmental Impact Statement for this project. She walked the line from Weymouth Neck to Braintree with Algonquin and a representative from DEP. She saw this project as having some significant temporary impacts. She is expecting a Notice of Intent from Algonquin in the next few months. She told members that, due to the sensitivity of this project, they would probably want peer review. She further reminded members that she received a resume from a person who has expertise in this area and would like to be considered for that position.

Meredith Way

Ms. Schloss told members that she visited the site on Monday and reviewed the erosion control measures, adding the project calls for a lot of site preparation, blasting, rock crushing, etc.

Columbian Street

Next Ms. Schloss advised members that the Quincy Credit Union construction project in South Weymouth is moving along, adding they have done a lot of restoration - (2) areas. She noted that they did not plant the seed mix when required and are now looking for her to sign off, but she wants to wait until the Spring. She noted that someone else owns the property.

60 Patterson Street - Silvestri Violation

Ms. Schloss reported there is an issue with the erosion control; i. e., it is blocking Mr. Silvestri's access. Presently she is working with him and the DPW on rectifying the violation. As of today, she has heard nothing from his consultant (TetraTech Rizzo).

CPC Update

Cmmr. Coven reported there was nothing new to report at this time.

Adjournment

Cmmr. Coven moved to adjourn at 9:45 PM and to meet again on December 10th, 2008 at 7:30 P. M. at the Weymouth Town Hall/Town Council Chambers.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Respectfully submitted,

Susan DeChristoforo
Recording Secretary

APPROVED: _____
Scott Coven, Clerk

DATE: _____