

# CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Date: March 15, 2018  
Time: 7:00 pm  
Place: City Hall, Room 204



**Mayor**  
Ruthanne Fuller

**Director  
Planning &  
Development**  
Barney Heath

**Senior  
Environmental  
Planner**  
Jennifer Steel

**Assistant  
Environmental  
Planner**  
Claire Rundelli

**Conservation  
Commission  
Members**  
Dan Green  
Judy Hepburn  
Susan Lunin  
Norm Richardson  
Ira Wallach  
Jeff Zabel  
Ellen Katz

**Conservation  
Commission  
Alternates**  
Kathy Cade

1000 Comm. Ave.  
Newton, MA 02459  
T 617/796-1120  
F 617/796-1142

[www.newtonma.gov](http://www.newtonma.gov)

**With a quorum present**, the meeting opened with Susan Lunin, Vice-Chair, presiding

**Members Present:** Ellen Katz, Jeff Zabel, Norm Richardson

**Staff Present:** Claire Rundelli

**Members Absent:** Ira Wallach, Judy Hepburn, Kathy Cade (Associate), Dan Green

**Members of the Public:** See sign-in sheet

## DECISIONS

### I. WETLANDS

#### 1. NOI – 93 Vine Street – DEP File #239-800

- **Request:** Addition on a single-family home.
- **Owner/Applicant:** Igor and Alina Berdichevsky      **Representative:** Mikhail Deychman
- **Documents Presented:** colored plans      photos, aerial, draft OOC
- **Jurisdiction:** Riverfront Area
- **Performance Standards:**
  - **10.58(4) Riverfront Area**
    - (c) Practicable and Substantially Equivalent Economic Alternatives.
    - (d) No Significant Adverse Impact.
      - 1. Within 200-foot riverfront areas, the issuing authority may allow the alteration of up to 5000 square feet or 10% of the riverfront area within the lot, whichever is greater ..., provided that:
        - a. At a minimum, a 100' wide area of undisturbed vegetation is provided... preserved or extended to the max. extent feasible....
        - b. Stormwater is managed ...
        - c. Proposed work does not impair the capacity of the riverfront area to provide important wildlife habitat functions. ...
        - d. ... incorporating erosion and sedimentation controls and other measures to attenuate nonpoint source pollution.
- **Presentation (Mikhail Deychman) and Discussion**
  - **Project Summary:** Proposed demolition of 287 s.f. of existing house to be replaced with a 711 s.f. addition. Existing site conditions are lawn and existing patio where the expanded footprint is proposed to be. The applicant also proposes removing 168 s.f. of bituminous sidewalk from the property. There are no stormwater obligations for the proposed project.
  - **Impact Summary:** The proposed project has minimal impact on the Riverfront Area as the construction will take place on the outer edge of the outer riparian zone and has a net increase of 208 s.f. of impervious area. Applicant has volunteered to provide three (3) native shrubs.
  - **Discussion:**
    - Applicant's representative provided proof of abutter notification to Staff.
    - Representative made it clear that the work is occurring at the outermost limit of the Riverfront Area.
    - Questions were raised by Commissioners about the removal of the patio and were informed that the patio would be removed in its entirety due to the backyard being the active construction zone for the addition.
    - The patio area will be replaced with grass.

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton's ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: [jfairley@newtonma.gov](mailto:jfairley@newtonma.gov) or (617) 796-1253. The city's TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

- Order of Conditions is to be mailed to the applicant/owner.
- Consensus: Vote to issue an Order of Conditions with the following special condition: an obligation to plant the three (3) proposed shrubs as per the submitted plans. [Move: Norm Richardson; Second: Jeff Zabel; Vote 4:0:0]

## 2. NOI – 156 Otis Street – DEP File #239-801

- Request: Construction of one single-family home and associated activities on the rear lot of a two-lot subdivision (the front lot is outside wetlands jurisdiction).
- Owner/Applicant: Brian Hickey Representative: John Rockwood, EcoTec Inc.
- Documents Presented: colored plans photos, draft OOC
- Jurisdiction: 100' Buffer Zone to Bank
- Performance Standards:
  - **10.53(1): General Provisions**: “For work in the Buffer Zone subject to review under 310 CMR 10.02(2)(b)3., the Issuing Authority shall impose conditions to protect the interests of the Act identified for the adjacent Resource Area. ... where prior development is extensive, may consider measures such as the restoration of natural vegetation adjacent to a Resource Area to protect the interest of [the Act]. ... The purpose of preconstruction review of work in the Buffer Zone is to ensure that adjacent Resource Areas are not adversely affected during or after completion of the work.”
  - **Bank 310 CMR 10.54**: Work on a Bank shall not impair the following:
    1. The physical stability of the Bank;
    2. The water carrying capacity of the existing channel within the Bank;
    3. Ground water and surface water quality;
    4. The capacity of the Bank to provide breeding habitat, escape cover and food for fisheries;
    5. The capacity of the Bank to provide important wildlife habitat functions.
    6. Work on a stream crossing ....
- Presentation (John Rockwood and Joe Porter) and Discussion
  - **Project Summary**: Proposed project involves the demolition of the existing single-family home on the lot to allow for the creation of a two-lot subdivision and subsequent construction of two single family homes with associated grading, tree clearing, and stormwater management. All invasive work is proposed to be done by hand outside of the proposed limit of work for construction of the house on Lot 1B. Proposed invasive work includes cutting vines, removal of Norway maples and winged euonymus through cut and blot methods.
  - Applicant’s representatives prepared a memo in response to staff comments found in the agenda and received from John Daghlian
    - *Applicant is offering to clean/repair the drainage culvert on the property with city permission and supervision. Ted Jerdee has scheduled a CCTV of the drain easement to determine the problem.*
    - *Applicant is being required to re-do a few test pits by the Engineering Dept. to determine if the large rocks found during the first testing are actually bedrock.*
    - *The drain easement is being shown on the proposed plans as being cleared and seeded, i.e. will likely be maintained as a lawn, not a natural area. Applicant pointed out that the topography of the drainage easement will not allow any mowing or provide usable lawn space.*
    - *Grading is proposed to within 5 ft of the flagged wetland with the erosion control barrier being placed within 4 ft of the wetland. Applicant will move all grading work out of the drainage easement and will pull limit of work back to outside the easement or at least 15’ from the wetland flags. This will increase the size of the enhancement area on the east side of the wetland flags.*
    - *Stockpile locations and concrete washout areas are not shown on plans. Applicant will provide revised plans showing stockpile and concrete washout locations within limit of work.*
    - *Entrenched silt fences will be required due to severity of topography. Applicant suggested a potential monitoring plan for the sediment controls on site.*
    - *Staff have concerns about increased runoff going to neighboring property to the east due to location of infiltration chambers under the driveway along the property line. Applicant is being required to move a portion of the under-driveway infiltration chambers to be moved to under the patio of Lot 1A.*
    - *Proposed site “enhancements” are highly destructive of existing tree canopy. Proposed plan shows the removal of 45 trees associated with the construction of the house on Lot 1B, 28 of those are greater than*

---

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton’s ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city’s TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

---

- 8" in diameter, though some are in poor health. 17 trees to be removed for "enhancement." Applicant stated that only 14 trees were being removed that would require replacement under the Newton Tree Ordinance and that all of those trees, plus more, are proposed to be added to the site.
- Applicant proposes leaving several Norway maples in the enhancement area so there will not be a long-term change in ecosystem. Applicant's representative suggested a long-term invasive control plan for the site to slowly remove the entire population of Norway maples.
  - Because of the existing rugged topography, the proposed tree cutting activities will likely destabilize the "enhancement" area. Applicant is not planning on removing any of the roots of the Norway maples proposed to be cut in the enhancement area. Commissioners brought up the fact that this will only make it harder to plant the proposed 2.5-3" caliper trees.
  - The applicant is proposing to plant 14 2.5"-3" in saplings and 16 1"-1.5" saplings. Staff thinks that sourcing and planting such large trees will be difficult given the site conditions. Applicant will reduce proposed tree plantings to 2" and 1" caliper saplings.
  - Staff has not received a plan showing proposed locations of trees and shrubs. Given challenging site conditions, planting based on field conditions and best practices may prove impossible. Applicant stated that proposing locations for trees and shrubs planted in the enhancement area on the west side of the wetland flags would be counterproductive as many locations may change based on site conditions. Applicant will provide a planting plan showing proposed tree locations within the limit of work for Lot 1B.
  - Include bounds for permanent protection of staff recommended 25' buffer. Applicant does not think a 25' buffer is necessary but is willing to bound the limit of work on Lot 1B to show the limit of the enhancement area.
  - Public Comment:
    - Roni Conghlin (abutter): Asked if the proposed restrictions placed at the limit of work would be perpetual or just for the duration of construction. Applicant and Commissioners confirmed that the restriction, should it be placed, would be perpetual. Also asked how the city would access the drain easement after the construction of the proposed homes. Joe Porter responded saying that the city can access the easement from its terminus at any public ROW. Asked about the height of the retaining walls on either side of the driveway and was reassured that the retaining wall is between 3-4' and will maintain existing grade between the lots.
    - Joanie Kelly (abutter): As the owner of 170 Otis, which is where the location of the catch basin that access the drainage easement is located, wanted to ask about the origin of the drainage easement and the process of fixing the drainage easement completely and not just on 156 Otis. Applicant explained that any work on the easement would require another filing with the joint homeowners whose property would be affected.
    - Andrea Levin (abutter): Asked about the whether the drainage easement is working at all and when they could expect the drainage easement to be fixed. Applicant responded that they have heard water trickling though the pipe on various site visits, but they do not know when the repairs could be expected.
    - Matt Hathaway (abutter): Asked about screening plantings that will be put in between his property on Walden and the project site. Applicant reassured abutter that they will be planting screening materials along the property line. Applicant also proposed removing the chain link fence and replacing it with another type of fence to prevent the dogs who live on Walden access to 156 Otis.
  - Consensus: Continue the hearing until 4/5/18 to allow time for applicant to provide revised materials, including:
    - Revised plans with a planting plan showing updated enhancement area sizes and proposed tree locations for within the limit of work
    - Revised narrative
    - Invasive species management plan

### 3. NOI (cont'd) – 73 Beaconwood Rd – DEP File #239-791 – teardown SFH/ rebuild duplex

- Request: Demolition of existing SFH to construct duplex with drainage, landscaping, grading, and 12" culvert to create hydraulic connection between "mitigation storage area" and Cold Spring Park wetland complex
- Owner: William Haney (PZ Realty Trust) Applicant: Desheng Wang (Creative Land & Water Engineering LLC) and PZ Realty Rep.: Desheng Wang
- Documents Presented: revised colored plans site photos, draft OOC
- Jurisdiction: Buffer Zone
- Performance Standards:

---

The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton's ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city's TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.

---

- **10.53(1): General Provisions:** “For work in the Buffer Zone subject to review under 310 CMR 10.02(2)(b)3., the Issuing Authority shall impose conditions to protect the interests of the Act identified for the adjacent Resource Area. ... where prior development is extensive, may consider measures such as the restoration of natural vegetation adjacent to a Resource Area to protect the interest of [the Act]. ... The purpose of preconstruction review of work in the Buffer Zone is to ensure that adjacent Resource Areas are not adversely affected during or after completion of the work.”
- Presentation (Desheng Wang) and Discussion:
  - **Project Summary:** Demolition of a single-family home to be replaced with a duplex with a stone dust parking area in the buffer zone. Fill is proposed to be placed within buffer zone on the property. Applicant proposes a replication area on the adjacent lot (signed off by owner) to replace the filled area and has proposed the installation of a 12” culvert, connecting the bordering vegetative wetland on the other side of Beaconwood to the replication area on the property.
  - Applicant’s representative summarized the changes that were made on the revised plan including the existing grading faded out on the proposed plan, the planting plan for the replication area, and the scale addition to the cross sections.
  - Proposed tree cutting is a bit unclear, though definitely calls for the removal of many large deciduous trees. *Representative agrees that it is unclear and will clarify on revised plans.*
  - Proposed mitigation planting plan doesn’t include any deciduous canopy trees. *Representative stated that he included willows and red maples on the proposed planting list. Staff did not notice upon review due to the confusing list order of proposed plants. Representative will clarify on revised plans.*
  - Execute the planting plan shown in the approved plans with the addition of 8 1.5” caliper red maple trees. *Commissioners would like the willow plantings to be replaced with red maples, staff will clarify what they want based on revised materials. Representative has no issue revising the chosen plant materials to the Commission’s wishes.*
  - John Daghlian has required that the O&M plan for the culvert to be included in the Order of Conditions from the Commission.
  - Staff had concerns about how applicant will access the constructed wetland area since no vegetation removal along Beaconwood is shown on the plan. *Representative plans to access from Beaconwood according to their agreement with 71 Beaconwood. Applicant stated that the trees marked to be removed on the existing plans show the trees to be removed in that area that are over 8”. He will provide updated plans showing the construction access on that side.*
  - Staff had concerns about the ownership of the rear parcel where the constructed wetland is proposed. *Applicant clarified that the parcel in question is owned by Capasso and the file is mis-named in the registry. Staff took down the book and page number provided for proof to confirm.*
  - Staff had concerns about tracking onto Beaconwood therefore allowing sediment into the wetland at Cold Spring Park. *Representative will provide revised plans with full construction access details.*
  - Staff had concerns about stockpiling on site. *Representative cited his construction sequence plan, showing that they plan to construct the proposed wetland after the house is demolished but before the house is constructed. However, the construction of the house is not mentioned in the construction sequence on the plans. The developer will use the proposed house area as the stockpiling area. Representative will provide revised plans showing stockpiling locations.*
  - Commissioners had concerns about the construction sequence mentioned in response to the last concern. The idea of excavating and vegetating the constructed wetland before the construction of the house may cause damage to the constructed wetland during the construction of the house. The area will also not have a hydraulic connection yet (culvert construction is proposed after vegetating the constructed wetland) and the wetland plants may have a hard time surviving. *Applicant agreed to provide a more detailed construction sequence and provide fencing around the constructed wetland after it is vegetated.*
  - Staff had concerns about the protection of the trees proposed on the plan to be protected. *Representative stated that standard black corrugated pipe would be used to protect the trees. Representative will provide detailed tree protection note on the plans and in the narrative.*

---

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton’s ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city’s TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

---

- Staff re-iterated concerns about the trees proposed to be protected that are shown on the plans in the area of proposed grading changes. Commissioners echoed these concerns and stated that their standard request is to protect out to the drip line. *Representative will meet with Tree Warden again to discuss the proper protection methods for those trees and provide a report back to the Commission. If the Warden states that these trees cannot be saved with the proposed work, the applicant will have to mitigate for those trees as well which may prove a problem due to the lot size constraints.*
- Consensus: Continue public hearing until 4/5/18 to allow applicant time to meet with the Tree Warden and provide the Conservation Office with revised materials.

#### 4. NOI (continued) – 56 Farwell Street – DEP File #239-793

- Request: Construct six single-family homes & driveways. Construct private road. Increase flood storage capacity. Implement restoration planting plan along river.
- Owner: Turtle Lane, LLC Applicant: Stephen Vona (Turtle Lane, LLC) Rep.: Brian Nelson (MetroWest Engineering, Inc.)
- Documents Presented: revised colored plans full list of expected revisions, site photos
- Jurisdiction: Riverfront Area, Flood Zone, Bordering Vegetated Wetlands
- Performance Standards:

- **10.58(5) RFA: Redevelopment within Previously Developed Riverfront Areas; Restoration & Mitigation**

- ... work improves existing conditions.
- Redevelopment means ... reuse of degraded or previously developed areas.
- A previously developed riverfront area contains areas degraded prior to August 7, 1996....
- Work to redevelop previously developed riverfront areas shall ...:
  - (a) At a minimum, work shall result in an improvement ...
  - (b) Stormwater management is provided according to standards
  - (c) Proposed work shall not be closer to the river than existing conditions or 100', whichever is less
  - (d) Proposed work...shall be located... away from the river, except in accordance w/ 10.58(5)(f) or (g).
  - (e) ... proposed work shall not exceed ... degraded area ... except in accordance w/ 10.58(5)(f) or (g).
  - (f) despite what it says in 310 CMR 10.58(5)(c), (d), and (e), more alteration at the RFA outer boundary may be allowed if an applicant proposes restoration ... of at least 1:1 ...
  - (g) despite what it says in 310 CMR 10.58(5)(c), (d), or (e), more alteration at the RFA outer boundary may be allowed if an applicant proposes mitigation ... of at least 2:1
  - (h) ... a continuing condition in the COC ... under 10.58(5)(f) or (g) prohibiting further alteration within the restoration or mitigation area....

- **10.58(4) Riverfront Area**

- (c) Practicable and Substantially Equivalent Economic Alternatives.
- (d) No Significant Adverse Impact.

1. Within 200-foot riverfront areas, the issuing authority may allow the alteration of up to 5000 square feet or 10% of the riverfront area within the lot, whichever is greater ..., provided that:
  - a. At a minimum, a 100' wide area of undisturbed vegetation is provided... preserved or extended to the max. extent feasible....
  - b. Stormwater is managed ...
  - c. Proposed work does not impair the capacity of the riverfront area to provide important wildlife habitat functions. ...
  - d. ... incorporating erosion and sedimentation controls and other measures to attenuate nonpoint source pollution.

- **Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (10.57)**

1. Compensatory storage shall be provided for all flood storage volume that will be lost ...
  2. Work shall not restrict flows so as to cause an increase in flood stage or velocity.
  3. Work in those portions of bordering land subject to flooding found to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat shall not impair its capacity to provide important wildlife habitat functions.
- "Compensatory storage shall mean a volume not previously used for flood storage and shall be incrementally equal to the theoretical volume of flood water at each elevation, up to and including the

100-year flood elevation, which would be displaced by the proposed project. Such compensatory volume shall have an unrestricted hydraulic connection to the same waterway or water body.

- **FEMA Crawlspace Regulations**

1. Crawlspaces that have their floors below BFE must have openings to allow the equalization of flood forces.
2. Recent FEMA guidance now allows crawlspaces to have their floors up to two feet below lowest adjacent grade under certain circumstances although this is discouraged. Below-grade crawlspace foundation walls are exposed to increased forces during flood conditions, such as hydrostatic and saturated soil forces. Guidance on the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) minimum requirements for crawlspace construction in the SFHA is given in FIA-TB-11.
3. Buildings that have below-grade crawlspaces will have higher flood insurance premiums than buildings that have the interior elevation of the crawlspace at or above the lowest adjacent exterior grade.”

- **FEMA Basement and Newton Floodplain Regulations**

- The NFIP Floodplain Management Requirements and the Newton Floodplain Ordinance state that basements must be above the BFE (see below) or flood-proofed.

- **Stormwater Standards 10.05 (6)**

- Presentation (Corey Van Wyhe and Joe Porter) and Discussion

- Joe Porter noted that the second round of test pits show much higher groundwater than the original testing. This led to the infiltration chambers being moved from the rear yards of the houses to the front yards collecting run-off from the roof liters.
- Stephen Vona and team met with MWRA two weeks ago to discuss their approval. MWRA is asking for some more information including some more map layers. Their main concern is heavy equipment and construction management. Stephen is very optimistic that they will receive approval soon.
- Corey Van Wyhe discussed the expanded planting area for the Riverfront enhancement and showed the added permanent markers for that area, which area also marked on the plans.
- Corey discussed that they have included a more detailed wildlife habitat assessment in the narrative.
- Staff mentioned the old “base” map on the planting plan that was submitted with the 3/6/18 revised materials and Corey acknowledged the issue and will be submitting a revised plan.
- Commissioners requested the revised materials submitted on 3/6/18 and Staff said that they would be sent out.
- Commissioners were concerned about the double retaining walls between house lot 1 and 2. Joe Porter explained that in order to meet the existing grading and preserve space for the public access easement either two walls are needed, or one larger wall is need but any walls over 4’ are prohibited. Residents have access to their yards via staircases. Staff said they would ask John Daghlian his opinions on the double wall.
- Commissioners asked for clarification on what the scouring strip was on the plans. Joe Porter clarified that it was stone rip-rap to prevent scouring of the foundations.

- Public Comment

- Joanne Polci (abutter): Expressed concerns over the size of the subdivision, saying that 6 houses are far too many and they will destroy the open space present their n. Staff and commissioners stated that it is private property and that the open space has never been protected but that we are reviewing the alternatives analysis to determine if 6 houses is the correct number for the lot.
- Sally Malloy (abutter): Was confused about how the retaining walls were marked on the plans and wanted clarification of their locations. Joe Porter pointed them out on the plans and staff stated that based on the 100-year flood elevation given from FEMA they are outside the flood zone with their retaining walls.
- Mia Jepsen (abutter): Wanted to express that the flood waters will exceed the retaining walls based on photos from the 2010 flooding and concern over the number of homes.

- Consensus: Continue the hearing to April 5, 2018 to allow Pat Garner and staff time to review the revised materials received on 3/6/18 and create a draft permit (with special conditions if the plans meet regulatory requirements and Commission interests).

## 5. RE-SIGN Certificate of Compliance – 74 Longwood Road – DEP File #239-398

---

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton's ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city's TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

---

- Request: Resign Certificate of Compliance because original, signed copy never reached property owner, and so was never recorded.
- Owner: Michael and Roxanne Field                      Applicant: Michael and Roxanne Field
- Vote: Issue a resigned COC [Move: Ellen Katz; Second: Norm Richardson; Vote 4:0:0].

## II. ALL CONSERVATION AREAS

### 6. Norumbega Slope Stabilization Project

- Request: Staff met with Appalachian Mountain Club on 2/28/18 to discuss the restabilization of the hill side leading down to the Charles River at Norumbega Conservation Area. Staff received an estimate from AMC for the project on 3/14/18 for \$53-55,000. The scope of this project includes: fencing restoration area, design and installation of a 6x6 box staircase, loaming and seeding the hillside with compost socks for support, the removal of the chain-link fence on existing trail, water bars for existing trail. Staff are requesting permission to put together an RFP package based on the AMC estimate and send it out for bid.
- Vote: Approve the creation of an RFP package for the Norumbega Slope Stabilization project [Move: Ellen Katz; Second: Jeff Zabel; Vote 4:0:0].

## III. ADMINISTRATIVE

### 7. Discussion of Commission Roles.

- Staff Notes:
  - There is an interest in codifying roles based on discussion at prior Commission meetings.
  - Staff asked several colleagues and were provided with this information:
    - Newton Historic Committee (NHC): Elections occur for a new Chair every January with no term limits. There is no Vice Chair position for this Commission.
    - Newton Community Preservation Committee (CPC): Newton Ordinance requires officers to be elected annually and imposes a limit of two consecutive 3-year terms for all (not just officers) CPC members. Early fall the Vice Chair takes the place of the Chair and the Committee elects a new Vice Chair. Most members only serve as an officer after being on the Committee for a full 3-year term.
- Staff Recommendations:
  - Ira Wallach proposed amendments to the Article 5 of the Rules and Regulations of the Con Com. – his comments were not available in time for inclusion in this packet and so will be sent by email.
  - Staff proposal:
    - Elect Chair and Vice Chair for 3-year terms (no more than 2 consecutive 3-year terms). Terms shall be initiated on (or about) July 1.
    - Elect Clerk annually.
    - Liaisons to other Commissions (NCGC, Farm, CPC) represent obligations over and above those of membership on the Conservation Commission. Commission members should volunteer based on personal interest and availability. The minimum commitment should be 2 years, but engagement could be indefinite. Annually, all members should be asked to help fill these positions as interest or need dictate.
  - Commission should discuss both proposals and plan to vote when more commissioners are in attendance.
- Consensus: Continue this discussion until the 4/5/18 meeting to allow for full participation from Commission members.

### 8. Minutes of 2/22/18 to be approved.

- Documents Presented: draft minutes    draft minutes
- Vote: Approve 2/22/18 minutes. [Move: Norm Richardson; Second: Ellen Katz; Vote 4:0:0].

## IV. ISSUES AROUND TOWN – nothing to vote on

## UPDATES

### V. WETLANDS

- 2018 Invasive Pull Leaders will be provided with summary of invasive control best management practices (see sheet included in packet) and hard copies of a “look alike species” identification guide. Invasive pulls within wetland jurisdiction or buffer zone have received administrative approvals based on submitted maps showing work areas.

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton's ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: jfairley@newtonma.gov or (617) 796-1253. The city's TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

- Norm Richardson had concerns that the approval for granting Administrative Approvals for invasive pulls had not been voted on at the 2/22/18 meeting. Staff re-listened to audio recording from that meeting and determined there was a vote of 4:0:2.

#### **VI. CONSERVATION AREAS**

- Conservation staff attended a meeting with Appalachian Mountain Club staff about a project to stabilize the slope of the hillside going down to the Charles River at Norumbega Conservation Area. Proposal expected soon.
- Conservation staff and several volunteer stewards had a site visit to the newly acquired Kessler Woods Conservation Restriction area to begin trail planning. Please see the maps available in your packets.

#### **VII. ISSUES AROUND TOWN**

- Two Bridges Project (recipient of the 2017 RTP Grant) will have its kick-off meeting, with several municipal departments represented, on 3/15/18.
- The Webster Woods Advisory Committee members have been chosen.
- MACC AEC Annual Conference was on 3/3/18 and was attended by Conservation Staff, Ellen Katz, and Kathy Cade.
- Commissioners who paid for their attendance to the MACC AEC can submit their receipts for possible reimbursement. It has been determined that wetland filing fees can be used for training in the future.
- Mass. Land Conservation Conference is 3/24/18 in Worcester.
- Charles River Watershed Association is having their annual Charles River Earth Day clean-up on 4/28/18 from 9-12.
- Newton Serves will be on 4/29/18.

#### **VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS – no updates**

---

#### ***OTHER TOPICS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED BY THE CHAIR 48 HOURS BEFORE THE MEETING***

**ADJOURN** Vote: To adjourn at 9:50 [Move: Norm Richardson; Second: Jeff Zabel; Vote 4:0:0]

---

*The location of this meeting is wheelchair accessible and reasonable accommodations will be provided to persons with disabilities who require assistance. If you need a reasonable accommodation, please contact the city of Newton's ADA/Sec. 504 Coordinator, Jini Fairley, at least two business days in advance of the meeting: [jfairley@newtonma.gov](mailto:jfairley@newtonma.gov) or (617) 796-1253. The city's TTY/TDD direct line is: 617-796-1089. For the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS), please dial 711.*

---