

Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 12, 2025

Town of Kingston

26 Evergreen Street, Room 200

Kingston, MA 02364

Present: Jim Franklin (Vice-Chairperson), Marilyn Kozodoy, Megan Hickey, Brian Payne

Virtual: Vittorio “Buz” Artiano, Dorothy MacFarlane

Absent: Kalina Vendetti (Chairperson)

Staff: Matt Penella, Conservation Agent

Location: Town Hall Offices, Room 200 & Via Zoom

Commission Meeting Opened: 6:33 p.m.

Announcement: The Open Space Committee is seeking a new member. Interested residents should call the Conservation Commission at 781-585-0537 or e-mail Assistant Conservation Agent, Julianna Denum at: jdenum@kingstonma.gov

BUSINESS:

I. Signing Documents

The Commission signed a bill from APEX for MS4 support.

II. Action Items

- a) Eversource – Carver to Kingston Reliability Project: Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC)**

Vice-Chairperson Franklin opened a public meeting to discuss the RCOC for Eversource-Carver to Kingston Reliability Project. Agent Penella stated that this is a project that was permitted in 2021 for the replacement and/or addition of utility poles within jurisdictional areas of power line right-of-way; including within Vegetated Protected Wetlands (VPW), Isolated Vegetated Wetlands (IVW), Isolated Land Subject to Flooding (ILSF), Riverfront Area (RFA) and buffer zones. The agent conducted a site visit and reports that despite some snow and ice cover, it appeared that the areas had vegetated well. Eversource had provided a PDF with site photos during the time the work was in process in 2022. There was a Special Condition of backfilling of excavation that only crushed stone would be used in backfilling, the agent could not see clearly if that condition was met due to the snow. When the Notice of Intent (NOI) was submitted with a plan set that had been put together in GIS, the 15-page site plan had not been stamped. When this was brought to the attention of Eversource, they had a Professional Land Surveyor (PLS) stamp and sign the first page. On the most recent filing, there is no signature or stamp on the as-built plan although there is a letter from a PLS. However, the PLS letter does not meet the requirement of certifying substantial compliance with the plans or describing any deviation as it was a very brief letter stating that a PLS was on-site throughout the work period. The agent informed Eversource that this issue would need to be addressed and that the filing would need more certification. The agent stated that Pete Defusco, Senior Environmental Specialist and applicant from Eversource along with Casey Bardier from VHB were present virtually at the meeting. Pete Defusco stated that this project was from Carver through Plympton and into Kingston and that the transmission structures were buffer zone only, with no wetland impacts proposed. Mr. Defusco further stated that the original NOI was the standard for Eversource's overhead transmission line projects. An environmental consultant delineated the wetlands and then included aspects of the project in 11x17" map set aerial figure with points and characteristics included. For point of reference, the overhead utility structure locations are the large, tall steel transmission poles that can be one or two pole H-frame structures. Mr. Defusco stated that while the original filing there *was* the request to have a stamped plan set, VHB, representative for project, took the plan set that Eversource had derived and then certified that all of the dots that indicated where the transmission structures were proposed, were accurate and true to the plan set. At that point, Eversource had a PLS go out to shoot the location of each structure using traditional survey equipment vs. a GPS unit. The Commission received the plan set showing proposed structural location and where the as-built shows the structural location. Mr. Defusco said that the letter the agent referred to certifies that the PLS visited the site, shot the work, and certified where the structures were located. It was also noted that there were no major deviations and while there were some minor shifts, nothing resulted in additional impact. Mr. Defusco summarized that the PLS certified the locations of the structures and their final as-built location. Eversource then took that certified data and dropped it on the plan set that they originally proposed with the NOI.

Agent Penella read the letter from the PLS to the Commission and pointed out that it is missing some language and should be stamped so that it meets Commission requirements. Commissioner Franklin stated that the letter should match the requirements set out forth by the Commission's standards. Commissioner Kozodoy agreed that the Commission has a standard operating procedure and would like to request that those standards be met and shown, in writing from Eversource. Agent Penella stated that the key term to be included is: "certifying substantial compliance with plans" and so in effect the PLS needs to certify that pole locations and areas of disturbance were followed as set out in the plan of record, to reference the name of the plan set, state that the as-built pole locations as shown were shot by their firm, and to certify that the poles are in the locations where they were permitted. Mr. Defusco confirmed that the additional language could be added to the letter and asked if there was anything else the Commission required. Commissioner Kozodoy inquired if the Special Condition of backfill needed to be addressed. Agent Penella said that a certification from Eversource or VHB stating that all construction on the project followed the Special Condition would be needed. The agent also stated that previously Eversource had confirmed that this sort of practice with handling backfill is part of their SOP, so certifying compliance with the Special Condition should be straightforward. Commissioner Franklin stated that the Commission is looking for a re-write of the letter stating that the locations were installed in compliance with the as-builts and that the Commission would like to request separate statement letter from Eversource confirming the Special Condition had been followed. Commissioner Franklin asked Mr. Defusco how much time would be needed to respond with the requests. Mr. Defusco stated that a month would be needed and offered to wait until spring so that Agent Penella could visit the site once ice and snow had melted. Agent Penella agreed that continuing until March 26, 2025 meeting would be acceptable and if in the meantime Mr. Defusco would send in the two documents.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozodoy made a motion to continue to March 26, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hickey. The motion PASSED 6-0-0.

III. Public Hearings

a) 10 Shore Drive: Notice of Intent: Proposed addition to SFH with covered porch, drywells for roof runoff, and mitigation plantings within a coastal buffer zone.

Chairperson Franklin opened the public hearing for 10 Shore Drive. Chris Sanderson of Merrill Engineers & Land Surveyors, representative of the project and applicant Marion McCarthy, presented the plan for the project. The presented project is as follows: The property, 10 Shore Drive, is bordered by Shore Drive on the south, Kingston Bay to the north, residential properties to the west and east. The property is a small lot, approximately at just over 4,000 square feet with a crushed stone driveway, a SF two-dwelling home exists on the property, there are stone

walkways and a deck at the rear of the property with a rear entrance to the house, small lawn area in backyard with steps that traverse down a revetment down to the beach area, Several resource areas are present on the site; sea grass area, salt marsh area, coastal beach area, a velocity zone for land subject to coastal flowage at elevation 12, and at the top of revetment wall there is a top of coastal bank. A separate plan highlighting buffer zones had been submitted to the Commission. The applicant's proposal has several components, first being a 12x16' 1-story addition off the rear-side of the house as part of a kitchen extension project. The addition is fully encompassed by an already fully-disturbed area by the existing deck. The second component is a 6x12' covered porch at the front of the existing dwelling with a new front door as currently there is no entrance at the front of the building. Proposed forms of mitigation: a couple areas of buffer zone mitigation plantings with a mix of native plantings, a drywell for collection of roof runoff from the proposed addition, and a silt sock to be installed prior to the onset of the work and to remain in place throughout duration of the project.

Agent Penella reported that the addition is proposed within the 50' buffer to salt marsh, within 30' to coastal storm flowage and coastal bank, 12.4' from the top of coastal bank, a small portion of the existing dwelling is within 50' of salt marsh and nearly all of the existing dwelling is within 50' of land subject to coastal storm flowage and coastal bank. The proposed addition is within an area developed as a wooden deck and is called impervious in the narrative. During a site visit, the agent noted that the decking appeared to be less than the mandated 3/8" spacing, which is the standard used when permitting something as pervious. It is unclear what the area underneath the deck consists of and if it is currently pervious then the existing percent impervious cover is less than 38%, as reported. But the increase will be larger than the proposed 2% increase. If it is impervious, then the 2% increase might be reduced by widening the spacing on the decking that's going to remain after the project. The agent questioned if the narrative that claims a 2' rise to meet the land subject to coastal storm flowage standards is at the existing deck height. Mr. Sanderson replied that in the Kingston bylaw it said to anticipate that the velocity flood zone would rise, and since the deck is currently at elevation 12, even if it goes up to elevation 14, it would still be horizontally outside of that velocity flood zone with the addition. The agent also noted that at the front of the dwelling, a portion of the proposed porch is within 50' of land subject to coastal storm flowage and coastal bank, which is pointed out because of the no-structure setback in KWPR. A drywell is proposed with plan detail to prevent roof runoff, and the agent questioned if it is sized properly and if there is any test pit data to show feasibility. He noted that the drywell itself requires three variances being only 9' from top of coastal bank. The agent noted that the proposed 210 square feet of mitigation plantings would be a benefit to the coastal bank resource area near the property. The agent stated that in a separate letter addressing buffer zones and touch setbacks, 9 variances were requested but only 6 are relevant. Upon inspection the agent found that the gravel driveway is pervious with large aggregate. The agent noted that a variance request would be needed specifically for the

impervious coverage as one was not included in the application. The agent stated that like many Rocky Nook properties the area abutting the coastal bank is in poor condition from a wetland protection standpoint as there is nothing stopping storm water runoff from entering the bay untreated, snow and ice prevented inspection of the downspouts but it is likely they run over land as well. This is an issue needing attention in the area since it's clear that development and property maintenance practices are affecting habitat and water quality in the bay. On the plus side, there is not much turf on the property between the deck and the top of coastal bank.

The agent's recommendations are: the Commission could approve the filing through issuance of 6-7 variances. Cumulative affects should always be considered since the area is very close to the shoreline and as it's already heavily developed, caution is always required when permitting further alterations so close to resource areas. Mitigation and limitations on contaminants entering Kingston Bay should be highly prioritized and scrutinized. Mitigation plantings should be protected by conservation posts with perpetual conditions. A mitigation planting plan and schedule should be prepared by a PWS or landscape architect for Commission approval. The agent questioned what happened to the large tree that had been in the backyard. The property is just landward of a designated shellfish growing area that is currently closed due to contamination, so every effort should be made to limit runoff in this area. If the project is approved, there is a list of Special Conditions, i.e. conservation posts in perpetuity, a detailed allowance for maintenance of the mitigation area, the proposed additional stockpile of the silt sock should be reviewed as part of the pre-work ESC check, any dumpster used for the project must be covered, outdoor chemicals and fertilizers will need approval.

Commissioner Artiano brought up that the cross-section of the drywell detail on the plan will need more specific measurements. Mr. Sanderson said that they will clarify that. Commissioner Artiano also stated that he would like calculations proving that the drywell has sufficient capacity to handle substantial rain flow into it. Commissioner Artiano asked that details on what sort of foundation will be poured when the old deck is removed be provided and as for the deck piers, something to minimize the disturbance will be needed, such as a ground screw or diamond pier. Mr. Sanderson said that the plan was to use Helical piles, but he would confirm that. Commissioner Artiano also requested detail showing how the 3/8" spacing will be maintained on the decking. Commissioner Artiano requested that an engineer document and stamp a previous-built and an as-built showing that the footprint of the deck does not increase with the new addition. Lastly, he offered suggestions on rearranging part of the walkway to gain a few square feet of space. Agent Penella stated that in other projects, in order to avoid an increase in impervious surface, changes were made to include pervious pavement or pavers. Mr. Sanderson welcomed the recommendations and will look into all of it.

Commissioner Franklin questioned what had happened to the large tree that had been on the property. Mr. Sanderson said that it had posed a substantial threat to both Ms. McCarthy's and the neighbors' houses. Ms. McCarthy spoke to say that the tree had been overhanging the roofs of both homes. She spoke to the Tree Warden's assistant and was told that she could have the tree taken down as it was on her own property. Commissioner Franklin requested that the removal process of the tree be added as a note to the as-built plan. Commissioner Franklin asked if the downspouts would be going into the drywell, Mr. Sanderson confirmed that they were. Commissioner Franklin asked that the drywell pick up additional areas in an effort to control the runoff as much as possible since this project and others around it are within a resource area. Agent Penella stated that that is also the reason why the removal of a large tree was a concern, as it no doubt had done a great deal of work taking up storm water. The agent also stated for the record that the Commission has an administrative review policy that is used very frequently for trees; and that after a call is made to his office, the Tree Warden and the Conservation Agent will visit the property to assess the tree and make a decision on how to best handle the situation in each case. Commissioner Franklin stated for the record that their concerns are heightened as this project is on the seaside of a disturbed area in a resource area. Mr. Sanderson stated that he would need until March 12, 2025 to make the requested changes to the plan.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozodoy made the motion to continue the matter to March 12, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hickey. The motion PASSED 6-0-0.

b) 20 Marion Drive (1 Royson Drive) : Request for Amendment of Order of Conditions (OOCs) for the proposed installation of a sediment forebay and rain garden within the 200' riverfront area of Smelt Brook.

Chairperson Franklin re-opened the hearing for 20 Marion Drive, also known as 1 Royson Drive, for a request for Amendment of Order of Conditions for the proposed installation of a sediment forebay and rain garden within the 200' riverfront area of Smelt Brook. Agent Penella stated that the issue had been continued from the last meeting in order to put the project out for peer review by the Horsley Witten Group. The applicant delivered the payment by check to the Conservation Office within the deadline, but there was a delay in the check being deposited. Agent Penella got a rough timeline from Horsley Witten Group who then said March 26, 2025 would be sufficient time with the caveat that an alternatives analysis has not yet been done; and one of the specifications that Horsley Witten Group was to look at *was* the alternatives analysis for work in a riverfront area. The applicant is going to follow up with Rick Grady of Grady Engineering. The agent recommended continuing to March 26th.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozody made the motion to continue the matter to March 26, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hickey. The motion PASSED 6-0-0.

II. Action Items (Continued)

b) 120 Country Club Way : Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC) SE #037-0850.

Chairperson Franklin opened a public meeting to discuss the RCOC for 120 Country Club Way. Agent Penella commented that the project involves the construction of a new single family house that had been permitted prior to his time as agent. The project is involved in the same vernal pool buffer clearing as 110 and 114 Country Club Way. The previous owner of the property was responsible for restoring and protecting the 100' buffer to a certified vernal pool that had been cleared. Side note, it was revealed during the as-built process that the conservation posts were put in the wrong location by the previous owner. Therefore, the current owner had to install new conservation posts and placards in the correct locations. In February 2023, a minor change was approved administratively by the agent, reducing the structural footprint of the building within jurisdiction from 28 to 16 square feet, as it had no apparent detriment to resource areas. Administrative approvals were allowed in 2020 and 2023 only because the project should have only been in local jurisdiction, not the State. The red line on the plan of record details the former approved building layout that was changed through the administrative approval. Changes that the agent noted between the as-built and the plan of record are as follow: a box fireplace on the east side of the house is not in the original plan and the corner slightly overlaps jurisdiction; the as-built does not show any of the front yard changes such as driveway and septic system (though these are out of jurisdiction, it may be of concern to the Commission and a septic as-built on file could satisfy that concern and the owner said they could provide that); originally the as-built showed no grading though grading was proposed and distances to the resource area or limit of work were not shown, which were requirements of the Special Conditions- the plan update does show 2' contours but there is no detail as to how the contours were determined or whether they represent a true as-built; the rear deck was approved out of jurisdiction and was installed further to the east and now overhangs the outer 100' buffer to the IVW and the southeast portion where it overhangs is cantilevered (the developer did communicate with the Conservation office about the potential of amending the permit to put supports in jurisdiction, but chose instead to put cantilevers - the agent is uncertain if the deck is pervious or whether this change warrants amendment, the abutting property had similar issues but it was within the no-touch vernal pool buffer whereas this is not); the updated as-built shows that new conservation posts were reinstalled to correct location and lists 8 posts installed correctly at the edge of the 100' from the mean high water line, a site visit was conducted by the agent and the new posts are confirmed to be in correct locations but the old posts are still in place; there is an unpermitted 1-2' boulder retaining wall installed at the extent of the 100' vernal pool area within jurisdiction that was installed by the contractor as part of additional erosion sedimentation control measures to guide the front and side yards from stormwater flow away from the wetlands to ease pressure on the ESC (while

this is a beneficial change it should be noted it was not on the original plan; also it could be considered landscaping); an irrigation well was installed outside of jurisdiction and was not on the plan of record but permitting is not required on that; the restoration area appeared to meet the requirements of the EO and restoration plan and a memo from ECR confirmed that; the developer confirmed that they completed all three maintenance items that were detailed in the compliance memo and the agent confirmed this during his January site visit. The project appears to be mostly built in compliance, with several minor issues being detailed. The agent stated that the applicant should respond with any updates and the Commission can weigh in as they deem necessary. The agent saw the main issue to be the conservation posts, but that has been dealt with. The Commission should determine whether the old, improperly placed posts should be removed, cut off or just remove the placards. The Commission might also issue a COC in the meantime and set a deadline for that. The agent noted that the new property owner may need guidance on posts and wetlands as it was noted during the site visit that an old Christmas tree half-wrapped in plastic had been left on the ground between the new and old conservation posts. Perpetual condition of any COC would be the permanent conservation markers and this should extend beyond the COC with post markers remaining in perpetuity.

Chairperson Franklin opened the discussion up to the commissioners. Commissioner Kozodoy would like the old conservation posts removed or cut down.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozodoy made a motion to close. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hickey. PASSED 6-0-0.

VOTE: Commissioner Hickey made a motion to issue a COC with the conditions discussed, i.e. actionable item of the old conservation posts removed or cut down. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Payne. PASSED 6-0-0.

**c) 23 Spruce Street : Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC)
SE#037-0932**

Chairperson Franklin opened a public meeting to discuss the RCOC for 23 Spruce Street. Agent Penella stated the conservation posts were installed behind the restoration area rather than in front of it. In early January, the agent received photo documentation showing the posts had been moved and appeared to be in the right location. The agent then emailed the applicant to inform them that an updated as-built would be needed and that the as-built that had been received previously incorrectly showed the locations of the posts. The as-built showed the posts to be in correct place, but in actuality they were 30' away from the correct location, in fact they were on the opposite side of the restoration area. The builder replied that they would follow up with the engineer on the issue, and the agent is still waiting to hear back. While the posts now appear to be in the correct location, official stamped and signed documentation is needed.

VOTE: Commissioner Artiano made a motion to continue to February 26, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kozodoy. PASSED 6-0-0.

d) 18 Old Mill Road : Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC) SE #037-0653

e) 18 Old Mill Road : Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC) SE #037-0772

Chairperson Franklin opened a public meeting to discuss the RCOC for 18 Old Mill Road. The applicant has requested a continuance to March 12, 2025.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozodoy made a motion to continue to March 12th. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hickey. PASSED 6-0-0.

IV. Updates

a) Wetland restoration at Blackwater Memorial Forest

Agent Penella reported that the full restoration project at Blackwater Memorial Forest has begun and he conducted a site visit that morning. The agent presented the Commission with site photos. On the east side, the lateral ditches are being filled in (about 20' from perimeter ditch will be filled in and the rest will naturalize) other ditches will be filled in with wood chips and then caved in with the banks to make a gradual edge. The wood chips are used because they absorb phosphorous and nitrogen out of the water. There is a water control structure that will be replaced by a notched-log weir. The water will flow through a natural stream channel and be directed back to the middle. The water table will be raised throughout the area to achieve better wetland soil characteristics. All of the in-water work will wrap up on March 15th due to fish restrictions (eel and herring). During April, work will be done to resurface walking areas; the goal being to have the equivalent of an ADA accessible path around the old bog, so there will be one loop that is flat, wide, and passable. Commissioner Kozodoy asked what surface would be used. Agent Penella replied that the surface will be crushed stone dust which was the only viable option. Commissioner Franklin asked which species of trees were left and Agent Penella reported that White Pine and Red Maple are remaining while the invasive Grey Willow will be treated. Bog boards are being used for machinery to traverse without compacting the soils. A few areas have very dense White Pine saplings growing and so micro-topography work will be done to rip the trees out, making a pile out of them for habitat and then taking the soil and turning it over to create a pit and mound topography; this promotes more wetland soil and plant growth. A 15-20' strip of the regenerating pines will be left along the trail for the time being and as the interior re-vegetates and fills in, the pine trees along the edge will be girdled. On the west side, the perimeter ditch has been filled in. When the in-water work is complete, the engineer will assess the perimeter road to determine whether it needs a sub-base. The plan called for an 8" base of crushed stone with 4" of stone dust on top of that. The existing road has been driven on for decades, so the stone base may not be needed. Two

footbridges will need to be built to complete the trail loop. The agent has contacted the Eagle Scouts to see if they are able to take on the footbridge project.

b) Grant Updates

1. A grant was received from DER Dam Removal Program to do a feasibility and preliminary design on the Maple Street dam on Stony Brook and the project has already begun. DER handles everything from choosing and paying the contractor.
2. An application for the NOAA Fish Passage Grant for the Lake Street culvert has been submitted. However, it is uncertain if the application will be accepted as due to recent changes a second online federal account is needed to be eligible.
3. The Conservation office will be applying for MVP for the Lake Street culvert which is the same program that gave \$1.6 million to purchase the Correia bogs property (that they were unable to buy).

Upcoming projects include a re-write of the Regulations to match with the Bylaws and to clear up any areas that don't make sense.

The Commission will need to have a follow up discussion to determine dock standards and a game plan to reach out to residents who have unpermitted docks and giving them a grace period to meet standards and get permitting.

Storm water regulations need to be passed and implemented. Each year the Commission asks for money at Town Meeting to contract Environmental Partners, now APEX, to manage compliance with MS4, an EPA program that is administered through DEP. EPA sent an email inquiring why Kingston does not have storm water regulations. There is a storm water bylaw from 2013 but it does not have regulations. EPA requires all MS4 communities to have storm water regulations that are enforceable and guide the development process. The agent just learned that the project was supposed to have been done in 2021, before he worked for the town. APEX bought some time by presenting all the things that Conservation has been working on, but the regulations must be completed by the end of June 2025. APEX is taking some of the year 7 MS4 support money, deferring a few tasks to next year and then putting together a couple of regulations from comparable towns that pass EPA's standards. The Commission will then be able to review these and have a joint meeting with the Planning Board to vote on the regulations and there will be a public hearing as well. Commissioner Franklin asked if there will be an opportunity for public input and review prior to the meeting. Agent Penella stated that once a good draft has been constructed, it can be published on the website for the Commission, Planning Board, and the public to view. EPA supplied the model for regulations from Lincoln, MA and so that will be a good model to look. However, he also noted that Kingston has issues that other towns may not have, such as the coastal river. Commissioner Hickey suggested

looking at the Town of Scituate's model as they have flooding issues and their master plan won a state award.

CLOSING REMARKS

Chairperson Franklin made closing remarks at 8:13 p.m. The next meeting will be held on February 26, 2025 at 6:30 p.m. in Room 200.

VOTE: Commissioner Kozodoy made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Hickey. PASSED 5-0-0.

Note on Voting Format: In the vote tallies mentioned in these minutes, the format used is "Yes-No-Abstain".



KINGSTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION



26 Evergreen Street, Kingston, MA 02364

SIGN-IN SHEET

PLEASE NOTE THIS MEETING IS BEING VIDEO & AUDIO RECORDED

DATE: 2/12/25

NAME	INTEREST	ADDRESS
Jeff Marcel	Bu 1/2	120 Country Club Way
MARIAN McARTHY	10 SHORE DR/OWNED	10 Shore Dr.
CHRIS SANDERSON	10 SHORE DR/REP	362 COURT ST. PLYMOUTH
Rich Donnan	120 Country Club	1 11 11

TELEPHONE: 781-585-0537



TOWN OF KINGSTON **NOTICE OF MEETING**

BOARD:	Conservation Commission
DATE & TIME:	Wednesday, February 12, 2025 @ 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 the Local Seen on Comcast 9 or Verizon 42 and streamed on YouTube at www.youtube.com/@kingstonmeetingsLS

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 the Local Seen. 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:

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Request for Certificate of Compliance: Eversource- Carver to Kingston Reliability Project
2. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 120 Country Club Way
3. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 23 Spruce Street
4. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 18 Old Mill Road SE 037-0653
5. Request for Certificate of Compliance: 18 Old Mill Road SE 037-0772

ENFORCEMENT:

MEETING MINUTES:

UPDATES:

1.
 - Wetland restoration at Blackwater Memorial Forest
 - Grant updates
 - Upcoming re-write of Regulations
 - Upcoming dock discussion

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. 10 Shore Drive: Notice of Intent: Addition to SFH, with covered porch, drywells for roof runoff, and mitigation plantings
2. 20 Marion Drive (1 Royson Drive): Request for Amendment of OOCs. This hearing will be opened and continued to a date certain while the peer review process progresses.

ADJOURN:

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:FEBRUARY 26, 2025

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://pactv.zoom.us/j/96816332793?pwd=WmZRUWhTc0dsWUxrNGhSSiBNdDFldz09>

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 or remotely. All Town Board and Commission meetings are required to provide remote participation. If there is a technical problem and remote participation cannot be provided, the meeting will end and be rescheduled.

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.