

## Sunset Committee Meeting Minutes

**Location:** Island Hall  
**Date:** 10/19/2015  
**Present:** Donna Damon, Paul Belesca, Susan Stranahan, Mary Holt (chair), Peter Pellerin  
**Absent:** Carol White, Sam McLean, Thor Peterson  
**Public:** Carol Sabasteanski (also Secretary), David Stevens, Jane Frizzell

Chair, Mary Holt, called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM

### Minutes of Previous Meeting

Following, a **MOTION** was made, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2015 meeting with minor corrections noted.

### Committee Activity Report

Mary had asked Carol to prepare a summary of activities for the committee. The summary was distributed prior to the meeting and read by Carol at the meeting. The summary highlights major actions by the SC and BOS. (See attached). Mary thanked Carol for preparing the summary.

### Wind and Wave Report

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve the Wind and Wave Report (Draft 7/23/2015) submitted by RACE. In the subsequent discussion Paul stated that he would vote for approval but strongly disagreed with the assumption that Basket Island “interfered with waves and the fetch was not extended beyond this point”. (Page 11, paragraph 2) Carol White asked via email if the Wind & Wave study suggested Sunset was suitable for a ferry landing. (It only reports the data, they were not asked to draw conclusions as to suitability).

The **MOTION** was unanimously approved.

### Eel Grass Report

A **MOTION** was made, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve the Eel Grass Report.

### Archeological Report

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve the Archeological Report. In the subsequent discussion, Paul objected to the comment on page 22 “A 1967 plan of the property undertaken for Mrs. Russell Sawyer depicts what appears to be the current access road across the parcel and a cabin which generally correlates to the location of the existing cellar hole (CCRD 2015j) (Figure 13)”. Paul stated that the cabin is quite a distance and is not related to the cellar hole. He requested that this be investigated and corrected before the report is sent to the State.

The **MOTION** was unanimously approved.

### Revised Base Map

Mary had asked for comments on the Baseline map by 10/16/2015. Only Donna responded. Based on her responses, Mary submitted requested changes to Dustin. Dustin quickly made changes and Carol S. picked up new maps on 10/19 and brought them to the meeting. Mary distributed new maps to the committee at the meeting. Paul commented that he felt that M&M did a “terrible job” on the 10/19 base map. For example, Sunset road is shown in the water. He also said the map presented was an improvement with what was presented at the last meeting. Paul questioned why the paper streets (including Elizabeth Street) were depicted on the map since he believes that Nadeau said in September 2014 that paper streets should not be depicted because they were “status uncertain”.

**Note:** after the meeting Paul provided the reference - an email from Jim Nadeau to Mary on 9/17/14 stating the following: “My recommendation is to also have existing conditions/topographic contour lines on the plan and not paper streets due to status uncertainty. We acknowledge the Stewarts' request to not trespass, but will have time to flag site-specific paper streets, if desired, please specify.”

Donna said she believed that Nadeau surveyed Elizabeth Street. Discussion followed confirming that the Committee had requested that M&M show the paper streets that intersected or were on the parcel.

**Note:** after the meeting Donna provided the following information: “I went back to the Dec 1 2014 minutes and found that although we didn't have a quorum those present felt that all of the paper streets that intersect our parcel should be shown not just Elizabeth Road. This reinforces my opinion that the Committee wanted Elizabeth Road shown on the base map, which is why the committee approved it in May. While looking for a survey of a road at the Town Office I found a survey of the Stewart property which showed Elizabeth surveyed through the Stewart property.”

Paul made the point that the final approved base map should only have data that is “concrete”. The base map can reference other maps that contain data that is not concrete.

Carol White submitted several comments via email (based on the prior map – Carol did not have the 10/19 map). Several of Carol’s questions were addressed in the 10/19 map. The committee addressed her questions/concerns as follows:

- a. Title: shouldn’t it be called Sunset Landing Existing Conditions Map?
  - a. The committee is comfortable with the title “Existing Conditions Plan”.
- b. Needs a legend; vertical and horizontal datum reference
  - a. These are provided in the 10/19 map
- c. Needs notes that identify source of the information depicted on the map such as boundary survey, paper streets, topography, eelgrass, etc.
  - a. These are provided in the 10/19 map
- d. Needs notes for any limitations related to the data on the map
  - a. These are provided in the 10/19 map.
- e. Suggest they use color to distinguish features such as eel grass, wetlands, wells, cultural features, boundary lines, etc.
  - a. Per Paul, colors should be on CD.
- f. Needs to identify who prepared map; should be signed, dated & stamped by Project Manager.
  - a. It is on the 10/19 map.

A **MOTION** was made by Damon and seconded to ask Nadeau if he surveyed Elizabeth Road. An amendment to the motion was made by Belesca and seconded to clarify with Nadeau that he surveyed Elizabeth Road and that he stands behind his report on the location of Elizabeth Road and to clarify with Nadeau that he recommended that paper streets not be depicted on the final base map because he felt the paper streets were a “status uncertain”.

The **MOTION** was unanimously approved.

Final approval of the base map was tabled.

### Phase Two Report

The Committee will request a Phase Two final report from M&M which will summarize the findings of the studies performed.

Carol White comments: “Needs a summary letter which discusses the information shown on the composite map and what it means in terms of the site suitability.” Items that should be discussed in the summary letter include: Results of the boundary survey and paper streets and current status; any limitations on future development of property; Access, Archaeological and historical features, Wetlands, Topography, bathymetry. Ferry landing suitability – Given the information collected to date - is the site suitable for a ferry landing? How do the findings related to access, wind & wave, topography, bathymetry and eelgrass affect the suitability of the site as ferry landing? What else would we need to know to evaluate the site suitability? Conclusions & recommendations.

The Committee is not focused on a single use of the property. Rather, we want to know if there are any “show stoppers” for any particular use. Therefore, that is what the Phase Two report should report. The Phase Two report should not be limited to Phase Two only. It should include conclusions from both Phase One and Phase Two findings.

### Bathymetric Survey

Mary will follow up with the State to see if they can return to extend the study closer to shore and, at the same time, survey the Stone Pier.

### Public Comments

Dave Stevens asked for a copy of the Committee’s charge, which was provided. He stated that he thought this was a meeting to receive public comments. Mary explained that the joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen (BOS) had been cancelled due to schedule conflicts within the BOS and this was provided to the Town for posting.

The Sunset Committee meetings will now be held at the Hall because the Committee is receiving more public participation and we need to have a suitable site.

David Stevens asked if the Committee started with a list of “possible uses”. Mary and others responded that we did not. The purpose of Phase One (land) and Phase Two (water) was to determine if there were “show stoppers” for any use.

David asked what Phase 3 would involve. Mary explained that Phase 3 was meant to be the phase during which we would solicit input from the community on best uses of the site and make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



10/19/2015

**FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET OF THE SUNSET COMMITTEE SINCE ITS ORGANIZATION IN DECEMBER 2013.**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
September 2013	CREATED	TOCI created Sunset Committee with a term of 3 years. Task List: -Evaluate property and develop a long range plan for the property that best serves the community -Develop a research plan in conjunction with the BOS -Hold public meetings to solicit input -Involve committees, organizations and other interested parties in all phases of the plan development and implementation -Submit interim plans to the Capital Planning and Finance committee and the BOS for their December meeting each year for the purpose of raising and/or expending funds in the following fiscal year -Submit the long range plan to the BOS who shall bring it before Town Meeting for adoption.
2/12/2014	MEETINGS BOS ACTION	Since its first meeting on 12/12/13 the committee has met twenty one times. BOS advance \$5,000 from Contingency Fund and \$10,000 from Paper Streets fund to the Sunset Committee
3/24/2014	VENDOR SELECTION	Unanimous committee vote to recommend Milone & MacBroom to as contractor for the project for \$16,500
3/26/2014	BOS ACTION	Awarded contract to Milone & MacBroom, take another \$1,500 from contingency. (To a total of \$16,500)
4/18/2014	CONTRACT	TA signs Phase One contract for \$16,500
6/7/2014	TOWN MEETING	Town authorizes \$20,000 for Phase 2 work.
8/4/2014	PUBLIC MEETING	Phase One results were presented to community.
9/10/2014	BOS ACTION	BOS authorizes TA to enter into contract with M&M for \$24,800 for Phase 2 from memo received from M&M
9/15/2014	BOS ACTION	TA signs contract with M&M for \$40,000.
12/1/2014	MEETING	SC members present agreed the 12/1 report from M&M was acceptable to present to BOS
1/16/2015	MEETING	Damon reports that the BOS has included a budget "placeholder" \$20,000 for 2015 work by the Sunset Committee. This includes \$12,000 carried over from 2014 and \$8,000 from either the matching grant fund or a direct appropriation by the BOS,
3/2/2015	MEETING	APPROVE TETRA TECH PROPOSAL
5/4/2015	MEETING	COMMITTEE APPROVE PHASE ONE DELIVERABLES
8/4/2015	PUBLIC MEETING	Phase Two results were presented to community.