

**CONSERVATION  
COMMISSION**

148 Peck Street  
Rehoboth, MA 02769  
(508) 252-6891 Telephone  
(508) 252-5342 Facsimile



Robert Materne, Chairman  
David Evans, Vice Chair  
Thomas Nicholson  
Krisna Prachanronarong  
Stephen Choquette  
Matthew Habershaw  
Matt Kershaw  
Scott Pennoyer, Assoc. Mbr.  
Sara Huber, Assoc. Mbr.  
Daniel Roach, Agent

**REHOBOTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes – May 21, 2019**

**Present:** Robert Materne, Chairman, Dave Evans, Vice Chairman, Thomas Nicholson, Krisna Prachanronarong, Stephen Choquette, Matthew Kershaw, Sara Huber, Associate Member, Daniel Roach; Conservation Agent, Stacy L. Vilao; Office Administrator.

**Absent:** Matt Habershaw, Scott Pennoyer; Associate Member.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Materne called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM with the pledge of allegiance.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. 72 Francis Street – RDA - Rodriques**

Ms. Lisa Rodriques was present on her own behalf.

Mr. Materne stated that the applicant proposed to put in a paddock. All the work is outside the 50ft buffer zone.

Mr. Choquette made a motion to issue a Negative 3 Determination.

Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.

**2. 68 Cedar Street – NOI – Prachanronarong – SE60-1139**

Mr. Prachanronarong recused himself.

Ms. Rachel Smith from Otis Dyer's office was present.

Ms. Smith presented plans.

Mr. Materne stated that the replication area should be narrowed but brought to the wall.

Ms. Smith stated that the applicant is trying not to disturb the wall.

Mr. Materne stated that the haybales are right on the property line.

Ms. Smith stated that the berm off the line will need to be installed before the driveway is installed.

Mr. Nicholson stated to make the berm more impervious, it could pool onto abutting properties.

The commission discussed what to install to prevent runoff onto abutting properties.

Mr. Nicholson stated install filter fabric in-between the layers of stone

Mr. Materne stated that the location of plants for the replication area are not on the plans.

Mr. Nicholson stated that the information is listed on the plans.

Mr. Materne stated that New England wetland seed mix is not on the plans.

Ms. Huber stated that it is stated on the plans.

Mr. William Card of 74 Cedar Street was present.

Mr. Card stated that his concerns were the berm. His property has water problems already and the berm will cause more water on his property. Rocky Run goes through the corner of the property. The septic system is questionable.

Mr. Materne stated that the septic system is under the Board of Health. Per state regulations it has to be outside the 50' buffer and it does.

Ms. Smith stated that the septic system meets the 60' set back.

Mr. Materne stated that it is an intermittent stream.

Ms. Smith stated that Mr. Brandon Faneuf of Ecosystem Solutions did a stream status report as requested by DEP.

Mr. Materne stated that the property is a tough site. As long as everything is followed it can be developed. The commission, if the applicant meets all requirements of the Wetland Protection Act, has to approve it. DEP is satisfied with the wetland line. You have the right to appeal our decision.

Mr. Card stated there is a discrepancy with the property lines.

Mr. Materne stated that is not the commissions purview. When I say "line" I am referring to the wetland line.

Mr. Card asked if the commission could post-pone the hearing for the abutters to further review the issue?

Mr. Materne stated that it is not a Conservation Commission issue. It is a civil matter.

Mr. Robert Choate of 67 Cedar Street was present.

Mr. Choate stated his concerns were where the driveway is located. There is no vision to see to get out of the driveway. Someone will need to cut trees down along the road, in the wetlands.

Mr. Materne stated that vision is not a Conservation Commission issue. It is a town issue. The commission has to go by what is on the plan.

Mr. Card stated there is water on the property nine months out of the year. That doesn't matter?

Mr. Evans stated that sometimes a property can be wet or not be wet. Water does not make it a wetland. That is why soils were done. Vista pruning, for safety reasons, is an exempt activity.

Mr. Card stated the berm is going to make matter worse. It will hold water.

Mr. Materne stated that there is an option to not have the berm.

Ms. Smith explained how the water shedded on the property.

Mr. Card stated that the pond will fill up. Everything is going to flood out. Rainwater comes across the street into my yard. It is going to make it worse with the berm. It will block the exit of water from the lot out back.

Mr. Choquette stated that rainwater is rainwater. A septic system built up 3-4' or if you have a flat sight. When rainwater comes down the amount of rainwater is the amount of rainwater. How it's diverted on the site now by a house and septic you are shifting the water in that area to certain spots. As a member of this commission we are here to see if the line is proper, which we did. We have addressed the issue of the berm to protect the overflow onto neighboring yards. To slow the water down, which we did. As far as going into the street that's not our issue anymore once it goes across the street.

Mr. Card stated that he is not talking about rainwater just falling down on something then running off.

Mr. Choquette stated you put a house there and it rains and we have a wet spring like we have had rainwater is going to go across the street. Correct?

Mr. Card replied yes; it is.

Mr. Choquette stated now they are going to put a house and septic in whether the property is flat or high. The water is still going to go across the street.

Mr. Card stated if you put a dam up, it's not going to get worse? Is that what your telling me?

Mr. Choquette stated we're not damming it. We are trying to control the water.

Ms. Smith stated you are trying to say that all the water flows that way?

Mr. Card pointed to the plans and said that the water is going to come from the tributary of the stream.

Ms. Smith stated that she has seen water back here behind the wall corner. But if the water always went across here then you'd have wetland soil.

Mr. Card stated that the whole area has been wet.

Mr. Kershaw stated that it looks to me to be minor displacement. The overall size of this lot it will direct water to the back off the septic system. Because it is raised grade. It's not going to divert it across the road.

Mr. Card stated that he is talking about the whole thing backing up. Because you have effectively put a berm in.

Mr. Card stated that he doesn't seem to be getting anywhere.

Mr. Choquette stated the berm is not a concrete berm. The berm is permeable. We are trying to stop a massive amount of water from flowing that way. But it's permeable, the water is going to leach through. Then leach down.

Mr. Card stated that the house is not permeable. The septic's not.

Mr. Choquette stated of course it's not. It's a solid surface. You were questioning the berm. The berm is not a solid surface.

Ms. Smith stated it will still be able to go around that way, pointing to the plans.

Mr. Card stated the he disagreed. I'm a college graduate. I know a little bit about this stuff.

Mr. Choquette stated I'm a college graduate and know about this. I disagree with you.

Mr. Materne stated there was another comment from the audience.

Mr. Rich Carol of 64 Cedar Street was present.

Mr. Carol spoke to Ms. Smith in regards to the way water flows on the property and how the proposed berm is going to work.

Ms. Smith explained how the water flows and how the berm will work.

Mr. Carol asked you don't do lines?

Mr. Materne replied property lines.

Mr. Carol asked how you can make a determination on a house and septic system if it's beyond the barrier. If the line is 20' one way or another.

Mr. Materne asked are you talking property lines or wetland lines?

Mr. Carol stated that he is a little confused. This is the first time talking about this.

Mr. Materne stated that when we use the word "line" we're talking about wetland lines.

Mr. Carol stated ok. So if it has to be 60' from the wetland line, 60' away would put it almost on the property line or right near the berm.

Mr. Materne stated that then it becomes an issue, not with the commission, but with Board of Health and whatever town body does setbacks.

Mr. Carol stated that in a previous statement you said that it was already done with the Board of Health and is coming back to you to be approved.

Mr. Materne stated that we approved the wetland line, the line was approved, and DEP reapproved it.

Ms. Huber stated the wetland line.

Mr. Materne stated they agreed with what we had approved. You saw the green line at the top of the plans and the orange line. The orange line is siltation control. The septic system is 60' or more away from those flagged lines. So that meets our regulations.

Mr. Carol asked who would determine how far a septic has to be off a property line?

Ms. Smith replied the Board of Health. The health agent approves the septic.

Mr. Carol asked if they have a public hearing on this?

Ms. Smith stated that the health agent, Karl Drown, approves all septic systems. Anything that meets all the requirements does not require a public hearing. The only time there is a public hearing is if there is a variance required and variances are not given on new construction.

Mr. Carol stated so right now you said it's already been approved.

Ms. Smith stated I believe it's been approved by the Board of Health subject to the Conservation Commissions approval.

Mr. Carol asked is it possible to get a stay until we can re-approach Mr. Drown with the property lines.

Mr. Materne stated we are reviewing the plan according to how they are drawn. If everything fits in with the Wetland Protection Act, state law, and the 60' setback town by-law, which it is. The course of action if you wanted a stay you would have to go for an appeal.

Mr. Choquette stated you would have to appeal our decision.

Mr. Materne stated according to the plans, which have to be recorded, everything fits in the way it should.

Mr. Carol asked when is your intent to make a decision on the plan and on the septic?

Mr. Materne states our review right now is basically everything is fitting in the lot.

Mr. Evans stated with respect to the wetlands only.

Mr. Materne stated we are only concerned about the wetlands. That is the only thing we deal with. If everything meets the requirements and regulations of the MA Wetland Protection Act, and our town by-law for the septic. Then we have to approve it. We can't deny it. The only time we can deny it is if it doesn't meet the regulations of the Wetland Protection Act.

Mr. Carol asked if it was possible to request a stay so they could contact their own land surveyor.

Mr. Materne stated no. You can appeal the decision. It will go back to DEP. Explained what happened with the ANRAD appeal. The same process would happen again if you disagree and felt that our decision, if approved, was not satisfactory. Remember an appeal requires valid facts. The DEP will not listen to you if you say "I don't want a house next door."

Mr. Carol asked how do we find out the actual property lines?

Mr. Nicholson replied you would need to hire a land surveyor.

Mr. Choquette stated you might need to hire an engineer.

Ms. Smith stated that there is now a recorded survey of this property. So if you disagree with the survey, which was recorded by a registered surveyor, you would have to hire your own surveyor to dispute it.

Mr. Materne stated that is not the purview of this meeting. We have to stick to the Wetland Protection Act.

Mr. Carol asked where would I have to go for that, the property lines?

Mr. Materne stated that Ms. Smith should be able to help you with that after the meeting.

Ms. Alicja Prachanronarong owner of the property was present.

Ms. Prachanronarong stated that her question was to the commission. Did we satisfy all the rules and regulations required by you to approve the plan?

Mr. Materne stated we will decide that.

Mr. Evans stated we haven't voted yet.

Ms. Prachanronarong stated to the abutters. With regards to the run off or increase of water pouring onto their property, because they were very concerned about that. Within the last couple of years there is a new building code that requires every builder to make sure that they don't create anymore runoff that there already is at the time that you start building. So, whoever it is that would build a house on the property will have to follow those rules and regulations and follow the law. This would be brought up at the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Roach stated that this application would not be before the Planning Board. Just the Building Inspector.

Ms. Prachanronarong stated the builder would have to answer to the Building Inspector. If the builder creates some type of hardship- or increase the water. This shouldn't be a concern. There are rules and regulations protecting the abutters from that.

Mr. Choquette stated they would have to abide by the plan.

Mr. Card stated we are not worried about the run off from the septic system. What we are concerned about is it's a low area. When it rains that area floods out. That area sucks up all the water. It is like a wet meadow. Our concern is if you go and put a berm in. The water is going to come on my property.

Mr. Materne stated I have to be honest with you. I think that what you are going to have to do is appeal it and let DEP decide. They have more scientist than we do. If they agree with you then it will be addressed by them.

Mr. Card stated I'm just trying to make a point. We're not worried about the run off. It is like a natural flood plain when it rains. There are springs out there. There are ducks in the field because it's so flooded. That's our concern. You put a berm right on the property line that water has nowhere to go.

Mr. Choquette asked would you rather they didn't put a berm in?

Mr. Materne stated Mr. Choquette brought up a good point. Would you rather they didn't put in a berm at all?

Mr. Card stated that he would rather it be a meadow.

Mr. Materne stated that you can't do that.

Mr. Card stated I know. I can't stop progress. We get that.

Mr. Materne stated our question to you is, and this is the time to ask, if you have the option to ask. If you feel the berm is worse, we can suggest they remove it.

Mr. Card stated you are going to build the lot up 6 feet regardless for the septic.

Ms. Smith stated the septic system is only going up 5 feet.

Mr. Materne stated my question to you is do you want the berm removed or not?

Mr. Card replied yes.

Mr. Materne stated you are the neighbor. Now we will discuss it.

Mr. Materne asked the commission if they want to remove the berm?

Mr. Choquette stated I can tell you the pros and cons of the berm. The pro is it will slow down the water. The way it's going to be designed some of it will go into the ground. Granted we have had a very wet spring. The ground can't take it and it will bubble up. Is it going to leach up and divert your way? It may. If it was a normal season it would stop it. Another advantage to the berm is it also filters the water because it's going through stone. Any kind of contamination is stopped. The way we asked that a piece of NOS fabric be put on the top and then go over it with stone to try to help the water slow down even more. The gravel will absorb some of the water. If you want it removed you will get whatever is going to flow. With the berm it directs it, controls it, and also filters it. So, there are pros and cons to it.

Mr. Card stated I understand what you are saying. Again, were they are putting the driveway they need to put a culvert in. You have to build the lot up to put in a house.

Mr. Nicholson stated they are allowed to do that.

Mr. Card stated I understand that. When you build it up the water has to go somewhere. There is only one way to go.

Mr. Nicholson stated that he is sure that Ms. Smith did her no net increase runoff calculations that are required for a project like this.

Mr. Carol asked what is the berm?

Mr. Nicholson stated along one side of the property they are proposing an 18' trench the whole west side of the property going north to south and fill it with 1 ½" crushed stone to grade at the surface. They would cap it with a 1' of gravel so when water came down it would flow down into the ground, through the gravel and up. If it came in under a rapid pace it may pool behind it but will slowly seep under the gravel.

Mr. Carol asked and head to the back of the property?

Mr. Nicholson stated yes.

Mr. Carol stated that's my property. It's not to impede more than what is already it is now. As you just stated, going to run it right to the back.

Ms. Smith stated the trench is pretty flat. So, it's not necessarily going to run it to the back either. Some of it goes to the front. Some goes to the back.

Mr. Carol stated the berm is 1' tall and your going up 5', is it going to have a 5' valley?

Mr. Choquette stated there is a distance. Water flow with speed of water over the length is slows down the longer the distance. It does not go 5' to a 1' berm. From the top of grade, it slowly gets to the area. Because distance slows water down.

Mr. Carol replied ok.

Ms. Smith stated the septic system will have grass.

Mr. Choquette stated grass slows the water down.

Ms. Smith stated the grass will help it be absorbed also.  
Mr. Card stated when we get heavy rains it floods out. By building a house it's just going to push the water somewhere. That is our only concern.  
Mr. Materne asked the commission what they wanted to do. Take the berm out or leave it?  
Mr. Materne spoke to Mr. Card if you want the berm to be taken out, we can vote to take it out.  
Mr. Card replied do whatever you want. It's a questionable lot.  
Mr. Choquette and Mr. Nicholson both stated to keep it in.  
Mr. Materne asked, keep the berm as drawn?  
Mr. Nicholson stated no. Changing the cap to NOS paper.  
Mr. Choquette stated we are going to put gravel on top of it. To stop the leaching of silt from plugging it up.  
Mr. Materne stated we are also going to change the replication area.  
Ms. Smith stated moving it closer, against the wall.  
Mr. Nicholson made a motion to close the public hearing.  
Mr. Choquette seconded the motion. Motion passes.  
Mr. Nicholson made a motion to issue Order of Conditions with revised plans.  
Mr. Choquette seconded the motion. Motion passes.  
Mr. Materne stated you have 10 days to appeal the decision.

### 3. Town Wide – NOI – Rehoboth Highway Dept. – SE60-1138

Mr. Michael Costello Highway Superintendent was present.  
Mr. Costello presented the request.  
Mr. Materne asked if there would be any fixing of bridges?  
Mr. Costello replied no. Ditches and things like that. If I need to fix a culvert, I would get in touch with the Conservation Agent. If any major construction we would file a Notice of Intent.  
Mr. Evans made a motion to close the public hearing.  
Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.  
Mr. Evans made a motion to issue Order of Conditions.  
Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.

### 4. 78 County Street – RDA - Burtan

Mr. Dean Monsees of OSD Systems was present on behalf of the applicant.  
Mr. Monsees presented plans.  
Mr. Materne stated that the wetland line is accurate.  
Mr. Evans made a motion to issue a Negative 3 Determination.  
Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.

### 5. Perryville Road – RDA - Cynary

Mr. Bob Berube of Proline Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant.  
Mr. Berube presented plans.  
Mr. Materne stated make an arc around the well.  
Mr. Choquette stated use straw waddles instead of silt fence.  
Mr. Evans made a motion to issue a Negative 3 Determination.  
Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.

## **GENERAL BUISNESS**

### 1. Shad Factory Pond – Bill Dalpe – Discussion

Mr. Bill Dalpe of Rocky Hill Road and Ms. Wenlyn Ferguson of Save the Bay were present.

Mr. Dalpe stated that recently he had a meeting with the Division of Marine and Fisheries, Bristol County Water Authorities, and Save the Bay. The past 2 years have been doing studies on the pond and talking about dam removal.

Ms. Ferguson gave an overview of what has taken place. Provided data on the health of the pond. There is more vegetation in the pond over the last few years. Explained the data sheets. From our assessment we would like to look at removal feasibility.

There was discussion regarding where the water samples were taken and why.

Ms. Ferguson stated that the water quality is poor.

Mr. Materne asked how this fell under the commission's jurisdiction?

Mr. Dalpe stated because the properties will be turned over to the Conservation Commission at some point.

Mr. Materne stated so, until the property is turned over to the commission, we really have no say.

M. Ferguson stated DEP, Army Corp of Engineers and local Conservation Commission permits dam removal.

Mr. Jay Crandall was present.

Mr. Crandall had a question about up stream of Shad Factory Pond. Wouldn't the water testing of that area be just as important as testing in the pond. So, you can try to determine where the problem is and the major cause.

Ms. Ferguson asked if what you are bringing up is the nutrients downstream?

Mr. Crandall replied yes. Where the source or the majority of the source is.

Ms. Ferguson stated that this is protocol for Division of Fisheries.

There was discussion regarding the potential impacts of up stream and the area tested.

Mr. Nicholson stated that they are trying to figure out if there was a problem.

Ms. Ferguson stated we are trying to rule out what might be wrong.

Mr. Ted Ballard from the Water Commission was present.

Mr. Ballard stated that we have a jurisdiction problem. The water district has authority over the water level affected by this pond. The groundwater table are affected by the water level in the pond. If you remove the pond you will affect the groundwater that recharges the wells in that area. We need to have a clear understanding of where the responsibilities lie and what the issue is. No knowledge of groundwater wells in that area or not. It's clear that this issue has a way to go before anything happens. Need Town Counsel to determine whose jurisdiction it falls under. Is the study complete and can the Water Commission have a copy?

Ms. Ferguson stated that the data collection is complete. There is just no narrative.

Mr. Materne asked what the next step is?

Mr. Dalpe stated that a public hearing would need to be held.

Mr. Evans stated he would like to see more data.

Ms. Ferguson stated she agreed. She was hoping to have the final data. She is waiting on the Division of Fisheries.

Mr. Materne asked what is the true goal? Who is the lead on this?

Ms. Ferguson replied the Division of Marine Fisheries.

Mr. Dalpe replied to rejuvenate the herring run.

Ms. Ferguson stated and the shad. The goal is to improve the habitat for the shad and herring.

Mr. Dalpe stated to Mr. Ballard that he had taken some core samples and it was clay. I believe the whole pond is impervious, it's not recharging the wells. At a later date there will be core samples done to determine how much clay is there.

## 2. Plain Street – Vieira – Extension Request – ANRAD

Mr. Eddie Vieira the property owner was present on behalf of himself.

Mr. Materne stated Mr. Vieira is here to extend the ORAD.

Mr. Evans made a motion to issue a 3-year extension for the Order of Resource Area Delineation.  
Mr. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion passes.

3. 1 Linden Lane – Martel – Request for COC

Mr. Evans stated that the commission had gone out to the site and the property owner would not let the commission stay on the site. We are unable to issue a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Materne stated the water system out wash is in the wetlands. There were some other issue.

Mr. Roach stated that Mr. Martel had come into the office today. He purchased wetland buffer signs and wants to be on the next sitewalk list.

Mr. Evans stated we need a request.

3. Close Escrow Accounts

1) 247 Homestead Ave - \$106.22

2) 149 Pleasant Street - \$211.63

3) 47 Francis Street - \$273.13

4) Rocky Hill Road - \$142.72

5) 97 County Street - \$380.41

Mr. Evans made a motion to close the above-mentioned escrow accounts.

Mr. Prachanronarong seconded the motion. Motion passes.

4. 10 Brook Street – Lift EO from 1988

Mr. Materne stated that this is an old Enforcement Order.

Mr. Choquette made a motion to lift the Enforcement Order.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion. Motion passes.

5. 237 Brook Street – Pennoyer – Request for Extension – OOC

Mr. Choquette made a motion to issue a 3-year extension to the Order of Conditions.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion. Motion passes.

6. 26 Homestead Ave – Request for COC – Issues

Mr. Joe Carlson of New England Gravel was present.

Mr. Carlson stated that the project has been started and completed without an Authorization to Proceed.

Mr. Materne stated that everything has already been installed. We will go out and check on the property at our next sitewalk.

## **CONCERNS & COMPLAINTS**

1. 42 Fairfield Street – Concern

Mr. Brandon Faneuf was present on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Collins of 42 Fairfield Street was present.

Mr. Faneuf stated that he would be going into the field and will delineate the wetlands for Mr. Collins.

Mr. Collins explained his situation.

2. 21 New Street - Concern

Mr. Materne stated that since it has been so much rain and the site is wet the commission will visit the site on June 2, 2019.

3. 79 Blanding Rd. - Concern

Mr. Ryan DuVally was present on his own behalf.

Ms. Diana Dumin of 81 Blanding Road was present.



Ms. Dumin asked what she is allowed to do once her property is restored? Can I put up a fence?  
Mr. Materne stated you can run a string for a simple fence. The fence can be done without a filing. Mr. DuVally needs to level off the ground, that was disturbed on your property, put down top soil and wetland seed mix.  
Mr. DuVally stated he has direction where to buy the wetland seed mix. Do you want straw waddles on either side until it stabilizes?  
Mr. Materne replied yes. Ms. Dumin do you want the straw waddles removed once it stabilizes?  
Mr. Choquette stated just cut them open.  
Ms. Dumin stated I will just let them disintegrate on their own.  
Mr. Choquette stated take a knife along it and cut it. Let it decompose naturally.  
Mr. Materne stated when Mr. DuVally is done you can put up your fence. Contact the commission if you are not satisfied. Mr. DuVally wetland flags need to be maintained until a Certificate of Compliance is issued. Where is the DEP sign?  
Mr. DuVally replied that it went up today. The flags are being done.  
Mr. Materne stated that the wetland buffer signs are not up. There was issue with the culverts rip rap.  
Mr. Nicholson stated that pipe is broken and needs to be fixed.  
Mr. Materne stated there needs to be siltation control there.  
Mr. DuVally stated it is done now. I didn't do the driveway. I considered it complete.  
Mr. Materne stated there were none where the replication area facing the house on the left-hand side.  
Mr. Choquette asked who was in charge of the project?  
Mr. DuVally replied me.  
Mr. Materne stated there was no slurry pit required for the well instillation. You will have to get the slurry up off the ground.  
Mr. DuVally explained that what is on site is grindings not slurry.  
Mr. Materne stated that New England wetland seed mix needs to be put down. Silt sock needs to be put in. You need to have siltation installed according to the plan.  
Mr. DuVally stated that in the back of the garage to the left they effected straw waddles when pulling out trees and where the driveway crossing was installed.  
Mr. Materne stated there are gaps in the silt fence. The siltation control is missing around the replication area.  
Mr. DuVally stated so, don't take them out until the area is stabilized.  
Mr. Materne stated the flags need to be surveyed.

#### 4. 47 Francis Street – Concern

Mr. DuVally was present on behalf of himself.  
Mr. DuVally stated that the flags are being re-hung and the replication area is being marked.  
Mr. Materne stated that it looks like the silt sock was run over.  
Mr. DuVally stated material had been dumped on it. It needs to be cleared back.  
Mr. Materne asked who laid out the replication area?  
Mr. DuVally replied I did it in the field with the site contractor and the plans. I didn't get it laid out properly.  
Mr. Materne stated it was 3000 ft in the field. It should have been 6000 ft. It is not up to the wetland line.  
Mr. DuVally stated he is going to have a wetland scientist go out and verify it and certify it.  
Mr. Materne stated to check the road width. There are flags knocked down. All flags need to be up. You were working in the wetlands.  
Mr. DuVally replied he disagreed.  
Mr. Evans stated to reestablish the C series flags with replication.  
Mr. DuVally replied correct.  
Mr. Materne stated flags C17-2 and C17-R.  
Mr. DuVally replied flags C5 and C5-R were down.

Mr. Materne stated I don't want to have to go out to the site and then have to go back out again.  
Mr. Choquette asked are you over extended? Mr. Habershaw and I have offered to help.  
Mr. Materne stated Matt Habershaw has offered. Mr. Choquette and Mr. Roach will go out once everything is done to check on it.  
Mr. Choquette stated quality control.

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **7. Replication Areas – Seed Mix – Discussion**

Mr. Materne stated on Order of Conditions New England Wetland Seed mix will be required unless otherwise noted.

### **8. By-Law – Rewriting – Discussion**

Mr. Materne ask the commission to think about a time and day to start the process again.

## **CONCERNS & COMPLAINTS**

### **5. 181 Winthrop Street – A Class Glass – Debris in Wetland**

Mr. Roach stated that the property owner would like to be on the next sitewalk.

Mr. Nicholson stated gravel for the parking area and crushed stone for the berm. He needs to fill the breaches with stone.

### **6. 53 Water Street - Concern**

Mr. Materne states that this site is all set. It can now come off the concerns list.

## **MINUTES**

### **1. May 7, 2019**

Mr. Nicolson made a motion to accept the above-mentioned minutes with edits.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion. Motion passes.


## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Nicholson made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion. Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned at 9:08 pm.

For the Conservation Commission

  
Robert Materne, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Evans, Vice-Chairman