

Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 8, 2023

Town of Kingston

26 Evergreen Street, Room 200

Kingston, MA 02364

Present: Glen Duffy, Dorothy MacFarlane, Natalie Wiegman, Megan Hickey, Jim Franklin, Kalina Vendetti

Virtual: Vittorio "Buz" Artiano

Staff: Matt Penella, Conservation Agent

Location: Town Hall Offices, Room 200

Commission Meeting Opened: 6:30 p.m.

Chairperson Kalina Vendetti opened the meeting. The date was March 8, 2023 and the time was 6:30 p.m.

BUSINESS:

I. Signing Documents

The Commission signed a bill for Strong Tree Engineering for engineering/permitting services for the Lake Street Culvert Replacement Grant project in the amount of \$2,815.00, two bills for Beals & Thomas, the first was for services relating to the restoration plan for the wetlands at Blackwater Memorial Forest, and the second was for the project where they are identifying and prioritizing habitat restoration options in the Jones River Estuary. Previously approved Orders of Conditions (OOCs) for 23 Spruce Street were signed.

II. Action Items

a) Continued discussion of Commission-proposed warrant articles for Town Meeting. Agent Penella reviewed items up for discussion: list of parcel numbers for tax titles, regulatory articles i.e. the re-write of the Wetland Protection Bylaw and the addition of a land-clearing bylaw. There is time before the Town Meeting warrant deadline to edit the language on the bylaws and have it prepared for a vote at Town Meeting. By the next Conservation Commission meeting in March there should be definitive language for the Commission to make a vote. Jim made a motion to list the two items on the warrant, subject to final edits. (This would be in support of the regulations and in proposing the land-clearing bylaw.) Dot seconded. Vote passed 7-0-0

Agent Penella then went through the list of tax title parcel numbers, as follows: Parcels 1-4 and 1-14 which are two parcels off Pembroke Street and adjacent to Silver Lake Sanctuary, Parcel 11-30-1 off Nottingham Drive, Parcel 27-57 off Brewster Road, Parcel 41-9 West Street, Parcel 34-88, 34-89 and 34-90 all parcels along Clifton Drive, Parcel 38-73 which is the Grandview Road property off the salt marsh, Parcel 32-6 off the Hathaway Preserve, Parcel 42-3 off Wapping Road, Parcel 48-116 on Larson Road, Parcels 56-20, 56-22, 56-24, 56-26 and 56-31 all small parcels at the corner of Main Street and Brook Street on the Jones River, Parcel 58-44 on Howland's Lane, and Parcel 60-28 at 37 McFarland Drive. Matt explained that these are properties that the Town acquired when the owners stopped paying the taxes on them. A lot have been owned by the Town of Kingston for quite some time, some were permitted as open space during the development process and others have been identified as valuable conservation holdings based on proximity or connectivity to existing conservation lands and open space or protection to sensitive resources such as the Jones River and its tributaries. Jim made a motion to approve the list as stated by the Agent, to request these parcels become conservation. Megan seconded. Vote passed 7-0-0

III. Minutes

Minutes for 1/11/2023 were submitted to the Commission to review and approve.

Jim made a motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Glen, Natalie abstained; PASSED 6-0-1.

Informal discussion while waiting for Public Hearings to commence.

- Matt said that the plan revision requested by the Commission for 164 Pembroke Street has been received.
- A question had arisen as to whether or not a new dock had been built on the Jones River, visible from Main Street. If the Commission makes the request, Matt will look into whether this was a previous existing structure or not.

- Matt had a meeting with Beals & Thomas and others about the Blackwater Memorial Forest Restoration Project to ensure that things are going along with the guidelines of the In-Lieu Fee Grant. They are essentially ready with an Existing Conditions Plan. The next step is to come up with the details for the proposal for the restoration, and an engineer is working on that. Some of the details on the restoration proposal plan had previously been discussed with staff from the Division of Ecological Restoration.

IV. Public Hearings

a) 8 Silver Lake Drive- Notice of Intent (NOI) for replacement of retaining wall. Parties were not present, to be continued at a later date.

b) Cushman Farms LLC. (Map 66-Lots 29, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47. Map 73- Lots 5 and 7)

Chairperson opened a continued hearing for Cushman Farms LLC for an NOI for exploratory test borings along the Thomas Street Right of Way (ROW) and adjacent parcels and along the Cushman Drive ROW. The applicant is Rick Lincoln of Cushman Farms, LLC and the Representative is Lori MacDonald of Coneco Engineering and Scientists. Lori MacDonald gave a presentation to the Commission for approval of borings and test pits within buffer zone in a riverfront area as well as access through Isolated Land Subject to Flooding (ILSF) in order to complete some of the borings. The project location is north of the MBTA Station, near the Kingston Elementary School and the Route 3 Corridor. There are 12 borings within buffer zone and resource area. In order to access the resources areas and test pit locations, they will come in from two locations; one from Marion Drive where equipment will be brought in along a 10'-wide natural soil access path (along Thomas Street to each of the borings). Eventually they will come into the 100' buffer zone and within 50' of the ILSF. Four of the test pits are located within 50' of ILSF and approximately two pits are within the 100' buffer to the ILSF. Lori noted a possible error in the map provided by FEMA, a section of the ILSF does not appear to get any water at all. On the map it shows there to be a stream system there, but upon a site location, no stream system was found. Therefore, she will be submitting a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) to FEMA requesting them to re-designate this area. The test pits are going to be installed within the buffer zone. Prior to completing the test pits the sedimentation controls will be installed, the test pits will excavated, and soil will be placed to the side of the test pits, the reading of soils will be completed, and then soil will be returned to the test pits within the same day as the work began and the area will be restored. Equipment will move out from the test pit location along the same access path and move down to the next test pit and repeat the work. After work is completed at each test pit, the area will be seeded with a native conservation seed mix and straw in order to avoid any erosion. To access the other part of the site, they will

need to cut a path through isolated wetland; i.e. cutting and clearing vegetation. When they do pass through this ILSF, the contractor will attempt to avoid as many mature trees as possible, in an effort to minimize impacts. Once the path is cleared, they will continue to the next boring which is outside the 100' buffer to Test Pit #7 and then on to #5 and then continuing on the Thomas Street ROW to the riverfront area associated with inland bank. There is a perennial stream that runs from the Thomas St. ROW to the MBTA ROW, under the railroad track and then down along the railroad track. Test Pit #29 is within riverfront area associated with the inland bank. The same methodology will be used with sedimentation controls installed, soil readings, and soil then being returned back into the test pit. The next two test pits are located within 100' of riverfront area as well as 100' buffer zone and all the same measures will be applied as in previous test pits. Then the path and test pits will be graded back to existing grades and the area will be loamed and seeded. To work on Test Pits #12 and #13, access will go down Cushman Drive. Test Pits #12 and #13 are separated from the resource area by the elevated MBTA rail line, so they are not proposing any sedimentation or erosion controls at that location. The area is very flat at the riverfront area. The contractor will move along the 10'-wide path, avoiding as much vegetation as possible, excavate down to beneath the soils, read the soils, return the soils and go on to the next test pit. As they are backing out, they'll re-grade, seed, and straw the path. While working within the riverfront area, best management practices will be put in place: minimizing impact to vegetation where possible, no gravels or gravel augmentation are proposed, fiber rolls will be used around the boring and test pits sites in order to minimize erosion and sedimentation, no fueling of equipment within the no-disturbance zone, no fueling or washing of vehicles on site, all fuel and hazardous materials will only be stored *in* vehicles, access paths will be re-graded to pre-construction grades and seeded with native seed and covered with straw mulch, test pits and borings will be backfilled on the same day. They have tried to determine if it would be possible to do all of this work while avoiding the resource areas altogether. Unfortunately, there are very steep grades down to the ILSF and the equipment needs to maintain a perpendicular path on those grades to avoid tipping. So, there are very limited ways to get the equipment from one side of the ILSF to the other without going through the resource area. Another way would be to bring the equipment down in and through the Thomas St. ROW and construct a temporary bridge over the stream and stream banks; but that would still impact Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW) on ILSF.

Agent Penella stated that no DEP file number has been issued on this proposal yet, so the Commission will need to wait on that before making any final decision. He said that the closest impact to resource areas in terms of actual digging is about 9' from the ILSF, which is a 20' deep test boring, and also the access path goes directly through the ILSF. Until FEMA considers and acts on a map revision, the Commission cannot confirm that there is no ILSF present, and so the Commission should continue to protect it as they would any other ILSF. Commissioner Jim

Franklin asked if this path is the same location as the potential vernal pool, Matt said no, that that is in the north of the location. For clarification, Matt said it is being called a "*potential* vernal pool" because it is not on the natural heritage vernal pool GIS layer, rather when visiting the area it was noticed that there was an area of BVW that looked like it had potential to be one. Matt said that narrative that is being presented claims Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) exempt minor project status for essentially all activities other than crossing through the ILSF and claims that the access through that ILSF qualifies as a limited project under the WPA. He made note that that part of it is only true if there is no reasonable alternative means of access, which is the reason why he inquired as to why going around the ILSF is not an option. An in-person site visit would be needed to see the topography to make that determination. He concurred with Lori MacDonald that it is not safe to operate heavy machinery while parallel with a steep slope. However, he would like to see if there are any other potential alternatives. He highlighted that page 28 in the narrative details measures to ensure no negative impact on Eastern Brook Trout breeding habitat; and that area in the section of erosion control below a test pit to prevent sedimentation from entering that stream complex, which leads to First Brook, which is a cold water fish resource area. He recommended that the Commission schedule a site visit to see if the access routes make best use of the topography within reason in order to minimize erosion. He mentioned that the application claims temporary impacts. However, due to local habitat and thin top soil, "temporary impacts" can last a long time, if things aren't done correctly. Matt stressed that the ILSF should be protected under Kingston Wetlands Protection Regulations (KWPR) and the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) as a resource area until any letter of map revision is received and determine whether this proposal protects ILSF to the maximum practical extent. He also noted that KWPR resource area boundaries need to be confirmed since in the narrative presented, the KWPR boundaries are the same as WPA boundaries with the only difference being the buffer zones. Matt further stated that they need confirmation that no part of said BVW retains water, an appropriate depression for a vernal pool, or obligate species. If such indicators are found, then the appropriate boundaries and buffers required under KWPR, that being that the resource area ends 100' from the mean high water and has a 100' buffer from that point. Matt would like to know if the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program has been contacted in order to ensure best practices are followed to avoid impact to the local Box Turtle population since a Box Turtle was found by a peer reviewer on the abutting parcel and KWPR allows the Commission to ensure protection of rare species even in the absence of priority habitat. As part of the Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD) process, the applicant did agree to confirm with NHESP as necessary to ensure protection of Box Turtle habitat. Matt questioned if the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) needs to be notified in advance of test borings adjacent to the rail line. Matt would like specific descriptions of the seed mix to be used. It would need to be a mix appropriate for southeastern Massachusetts, containing *only* species native to

southeastern Massachusetts. He recommends continuance as the DEP file number, any DEP comments, and a Commission site visit are still pending.

Jim said that prior to the Commission site visit, he would like to see the center of the path or road staked, as well as the test boring pits and he would like the wetland resources for local versus state flagged. Matt replied the typically ILSF isn't flagged as it's based on FEMA.

However, if someone is going to putting flags down based on the engineering in the proposal, then it should be easy to also flag the extent of the ILSF. By doing so it will be more feasible to see if there is a better place for an access path. Dot asked a question of Lori, she wondered what the purpose is of digging a test pit so close to the in riverfront areas. Lori replied that it is for planning purposes, the designer needs to know what the soil type is and the depth to ground in said areas. Lori also said that this is the BVW line that was approved and is up-slope from any pond area, she also pointed out where the buffers are on the map. Matt stated that if the potential vernal pool is confirmed, than that would change the buffer characteristics of the site. Jim asked for clarification that from the KWPA and town by-law perspective, if everything is included on the map, with the exception of the potential vernal pool; Matt that confirmed yes, it is. Matt said that it is the Commission's obligation to make sure there is not a vernal pool on the site so that it isn't overlooked during the permitting process. Dot said it is her understanding that regardless of the construction that is done, KWPA standards must still be met and that it is only the zoning bylaws that don't need to be adhered to in a 40B project. Matt said that depends on the permitting pathway, and that the Commission would submit information to the Zoning Board of Appeals stating that the Commission does not support any waiver of any wetland protection regulations. He said that either the State or the ZBA could overrule such a waiver and that there is legislation before the State right now to make it so that 40B projects cannot trump local wetland regulations, but that has not yet been approved. So, until the State instructs otherwise, 40B projects do have the ability to request a waiver from the provisions of local wetland regulations. Commissioner Glen Duffy asked if there is a specific date in the spring when vernal pools can be identified. Matt said it is based on the year and the weather. At this time of year, fairy shrimp are found in vernal pools, and so if fairy shrimp are present than that's an indicator of a vernal pool. Otherwise, it would be necessary to wait until later in the spring for breeding obligate amphibians, i.e. Spotted Salamander and Wood Frog, and when there is a warm rain above 50 degrees. Glen also asked for clarification about what test pits have already been dug. Matt said the southern portion of the site, close to Marion Drive some distance from the ILSF, is where excavators did the digging over the winter. The Zoning Enforcement Officer went out to stop the work, as they were accessing industrial-zoned land from a residential property. Then the excavators went to another industrial property and went in and cleared a path and made some test pits, but they stayed out of jurisdiction. Hence the filing that is now proposed is to complete the test pit work. Lori responded that they completed up to Test Pit #22 which is outside the 100' buffer from the ILSF and then they also

completed Borings #1-6. Member of the public, Rob Antoine of 10 Copper Beech Drive, reiterated Matt's earlier point that the area has a very shallow top soil as well as Type C, low-stability soil, alongside the proposed area. He asked if the test pits that would be done would that affect the stability of the soil. He also asked if they would do some additional test borings to determine if there are Type C soils on the property. Lori replied that they have not yet prepared or submitted a site plan in regards to that. Matt asked if anything had been submitted to the State for eligibility. Lori thought so and she would check with the designer. Mr. Antoine also asked if there is any consideration for hand auguring where there is to be limited disturbance to FEMA regulated areas. Lori said that they are going down to significant depths in the soil and so machinery is required and hand auguring would not be feasible. Matt asked Mr. Antoine if to his knowledge, does Second Brook stop on the other side of Copper Beech Drive, or if there is any sort of intermittent stream that goes between his property and the adjacent property. Mr. Antoine could not answer definitively. Commissioner Buz Artiano asked if anyone from the Town would be on site to witness the test pits. Lori said she could talk to the designer to see if that is a possibility, but usually it is just a certified soil inspector on site, to assess the soils as the test pits are being dug. Matt asked Lori for an approximate timeline of the site being flagged as the Commission requested. She said she'd check with the survey team and their availability, once they begin work on that it should be finished in about a day. Matt said once Lori provides a date that everything will be flagged, then the Commission can schedule a site visit. Buz would like the Commission to have the opportunity to speak with the person who will be doing the digging. Lori said that they will have a copy of the Order of Conditions on site and will be required to adhere to the conditions. She said a site meeting with the Conservation Agent could be arranged before starting the work and if the Commission wishes, there could also be an environmental scientist present as the holes are being dug. Buz said having an environmental scientist on site would be a good idea. Lori said they she has visited the ponded area in person several times, and has never seen the water more than 4" in depth, which would not qualify the area as a vernal pool. She said there is an inlet that feeds the pool and then there is an outlet, and the outlet does not allow for the area to stay ponded for a long period of time. Due to the depth of the ponded area and the existence of the outlet she does not believe it is certifiable as a vernal pool. A member of the public, online via Zoom, named Marianne ?, said that she lives at Parcel 66-24 and that to the right of her property is a wetland area with some river water. Jim moved to continue the hearing to April 12th, Section A. Megan seconded. PASSED 7-0-0

c) 8 Smelt Pond Road- Notice of Intent for proposed addition to single-family house within jurisdiction, adjacent to Smelt Pond. (Map 89, Lot 18)
Chairperson opened a continued hearing for an NOI received for the construction of an addition to an existing dwelling, within 100' of a wetland resource area. The applicant is Dan Pepe and

the representative is Dylan Brady of Grady Consulting, LLC. Dylan Brady presented the changes that had been made to the plan. The proposed plantings in the back, 1,052 square feet, which is an approximate 2-to-1 mitigation area, was slightly shifted up to leave access to the dock and the steps. They are also proposing a septic repair, pumping and filling the existing leaching pit, and installing a 26' long by 11' wide by 2' deep Leaching L-6 chamber; i.e. three chambers at 3'x 6'. The system is now farther away from Smelt Pond and closer to the adjacent BVW associated with an abandoned cranberry bog, with the closest distance to the bog at 60.9'. The existing leaching pit is about 32.8' from Smelt Pond, so 28.1' further from any resource area. The existing system has no elevations on the provided as-built, but the location has about 125.7 elevation, about a foot down. The as-built says: "top chamber about 124.07" and the proposed system has the top chamber at 125.8. Also, the leaching pit, at approximately 6' deep, would be down to 118.7 elevation, and the proposed bottommost system is at 123 elevation, which is 4.3' higher comparatively. There is no proposed dry well because with the proposed septic system as there is no place to fit it without potentially causing more issues. Agent Penella said that there had been some discussion about alternative technology and the Commission had asked for an improvement regarding the septic system on the plan. He agreed that moving farther away from Smelt Pond is beneficial, however that does bring it closer to the wetland overall. It is a good thing to move 20' further from any wetland and not having an older system perched right on a slope leading down into Smelt Pond, but as far as interpreting some of the elevations, Matt said he had difficulty seeing the benefits of increased elevation on the plan and the leaching pit not being as deep. He asked the Commission for their input on the septic plan. Commissioner Jim Franklin said that there is much wrong with the existing septic system. With the proposal for a new septic system, he does not see any information on a test pit. He would like to see the numbers needed to evaluate this. Also, Jim said that the plan is not outside the 100' buffer to the wetlands and the pond, which puts the Commission in a precarious position where they are contemplating permitting something that could be seen as detrimental to the resource area. He recalled a recent filing where the Commission required a jet system because the alternative technologies turn the effluent into water, and there is no worry over nitrates or phosphates entering the Smelt Pond system. The State seems to be moving in the direction of requiring jet systems for septic systems. He is concerned that the applicant would be in the position of replacing the septic again in 5-10 years. He says that since they are within the 100', he feels that alternative technology would offset that. Jim asked for clarification on the location of the wells on the property and the adjacent lot. Mr. Brady indicated it on the map and said that there is no well on the adjacent property. Jim reiterated his misgivings on the proposed septic due to the 100' buffer. Mr. Brady said that the proposed plan offers many improvements and mitigation to the system and would benefit the resource area. Jim said that while the proposal is an improvement to the existing system, it also increases the flow. He said if the flow wasn't increasing and the system was just being moved

back then it would be more acceptable. Buz asked if no test pits had been done as of yet, then is the proposal an onset plan for a septic system. Mr. Brady said they are proposing digging the test pits at the time of construction. Matt asked if the Board of Health (BOH) approved the plan without knowing the location of the well on the adjacent property. Mr. Brady said that it was approved by the BOH on Monday night. Buz said that he is fine with a regular septic system, but that a test pit ahead of time would be needed to know if the soil suits the septic system. Mr. Brady said that since they had done other work in the area, they were going on the assumption that the soil was correct. He further said that if when the test pit was dug, at the time of construction, any issues would be reflected. Buz said that he would like to know that if there are additional separations to the water table. Without said data, he did not want to comment on the plan with confidence. He agrees that it is an improvement to the existing system but is not sure that it is at the point where an alternative system is not warranted. He understands the need of the applicant and asked again why a dry well would not be installed by the shed. Mr. Brady said there is a setback issue for dry wells, and it is too close to the shed. Buz asked for that to be indicated on the next plan. Matt said that the waiver and affidavit are all set, but that a formal waiver request for construction within 50' is still needed and the stockpile area should be identified on the plan. Matt also acknowledged that the mitigation area had been shifted on the plan to take care of the issues the Commission had previously raised, however he would like details on what is being proposed for mitigation other than just the area designated. Buz commented that the plan should include a statement for the reason of an absence of dry wells, and a mitigation planting plan. He also wants a test pit done ahead of construction with a report on existing soil conditions and where the water level is, provided to the Commission. Jim asked that the applicant and the representative, Mr. Brady, review Section 10 of the local bylaws. He said that the regulations state very definitively that since water moves, if there is not enough distance (100' setback), then it is a detriment to the adjacent resource areas. Jim made the motion to continue the hearing to March 22nd, Section B. Dot seconded the motion to continue; PASSED 7-0-0

CLOSING REMARKS

Chairperson Kalina Vendetti made closing remarks at 8:14 PM. The next meeting will be held on March 22, 2023 at 6:30 PM in Room 200.

VOTE:

Jim made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Natalie; PASSED 7-0-0



KINGSTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION



26 Evergreen Street, Kingston, MA 02364

SIGN-IN SHEET

PLEASE NOTE THIS MEETING IS BEING VIDEO & AUDIO RECORDED

DATE: March 8, 2023

NAME	INTEREST	ADDRESS
DILLON BRADY	BSMELT POND	
THOMAS ANDRINE	THOMAS RD DEV.	10 COPPERBEECH DR.
KEITH HANSON	WET LAND THOMAS RD	1 COPPER BEECH KINGSTON
Robert Antoin	Thomas Rd Dev	10 Copper Beech
Cheryl Hurlburt	Thomas Rd Dev	9 Copper Beech Dr
PAUL TADDOUS	CUSHMAN FARMS	6 Copper Beech
Steve & Beth Opachinski	Cushman Farms	15 Copper Beech Rd
Daniel Pepe	8 Smelt Pond	2 → N



TOWN OF KINGSTON **NOTICE OF MEETING**

BOARD:	Conservation Commission
DATE & TIME:	Wednesday, March 8, 2023 @ 6:30 PM
MEETING LOCATION:	Town House-26 Evergreen St. Room 200 & VIA ZOOM
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE:	Matt Penella, Conservation Agent

This meeting notice is being posted on the Official Town House Bulletin Board, pursuant to General Law Chapter 30A, Section 20. Said notice and agenda must be filed in the Office of the Town Clerk at least **48 HOURS** prior to such meeting. Such filing and posting shall be the responsibility of the officer calling such meeting.

For those who want to watch this meeting, it is being broadcast by PACTV on Comcast 15 or Verizon 42 and streamed on YouTube at www.pactv.org/stream.

For anyone wishing to speak during the meeting, you are welcome to join us in person in room 200 or to join the Zoom call.

This meeting is being recorded by PACTV. Anyone intending to make an audio or video recording of this meeting should notify the Chair.

AGENDA

6:30 PM – CALL TO ORDER – ROOM 200

SIGNING DOCUMENTS:

1. Strong Tree Engineering - \$2,815.00 for engineering/permitting services re: the Lake Street Culvert Replacement Grant project (ongoing)

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Continued discussion of Commission-proposed warrant articles for Town Meeting

ENFORCEMENT:

MEETING MINUTES:

1. January 11, 2023

UPDATES:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. A: 8 Silver Lake Drive - NOI for replacement of retaining wall
2. B: Cushman Farms LLC - NOI for test borings along the unimproved Thomas Street ROW and adjacent parcels, as well as along the Cushman Drive ROW.
3. C: 8 Smelt Pond Road - NOI for proposed addition to single-family house within jurisdiction, adjacent to Smelt Pond.

ADJOURN:

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

1. March 22, 2023

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://pactv.zoom.us/j/96816332793?pwd=WmZRUWhTc0dsWUxrNGhSSjBNdDFldz09>

Meeting ID: 968 1633 2793

Passcode: 756156

Or, dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

This meeting of the Conservation Commission will be held in-person at the location provided on this notice. Members of the public are welcome to attend this in-person meeting. Please note that while an option for remote attendance and/or participation is being provided as a courtesy to the public, the meeting/hearing will not be suspended or terminated if technological problems interrupt the virtual broadcast, unless otherwise required by law. Members of the public with particular interest in any specific item on this agenda should make plans for in-person vs. virtual attendance accordingly.

The Town of Kingston advises its employees and the public that it does not discriminate based on a person's disability in employment or in access to its programs, services, and activities. This meeting location is accessible to people with disabilities. The Town of Kingston has designated Paul Armstrong to coordinate efforts to comply with the requirements of Executive Order 526, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the federal Rehabilitation Act and various other federal and state laws protecting the rights of people with disabilities.

If you have a disability and require a reasonable accommodation to fully participate in this event, please contact the ADA Coordinator no later than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the event by phone at 781-585-0505 or email parmstrong@kingstonma.gov to discuss your accessibility needs. Requests for accommodations or modifications made within the forty-eight (48) hour window will be honored to the maximum extent feasible, but it may not be possible to fulfill them.