

Sunset Committee Meeting Minutes

Location: Island Hall
Date: 12/7/2015
Present: Donna Damon, Paul Belesca, Mary Holt (chair), Peter Pellerin, Thor Peterson
Absent: Carol White, Sam McLean
Other: Marjorie Stratton, Town Administrator

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 October 19, 2015 meeting.

Deliver Final Eel Grass, Wind and Wave and Archeological Reports to Town Administrator

Mary provided the final reports to Marjorie Stratton on disk and on paper. She said another disk would be received with the corrected existing conditions map... Marjorie asked if these were final reports that could be submitted to the State – and Mary said yes. (Marjorie needed the final reports to get the grant payment from the State). Marjorie will submit reports to the State for grant disbursement.

There was some discussion about what was missing from the maps.

Review/Discuss/Approve Final report from Dustin Roma's Summary for Phase 1 and 2 (December 3, 2015) and

Review/Discuss/Approve modifications of Phase 2 Existing Conditions Plan

Mary read the report to the committee.

Discussion of Roma's report and the existing conditions plan was held at the same time.

Committee questions/comments:

- Do we really have no access to the property as Dustin said?
- Number of cellar holes – Dustin only talks about two, but aren't there three or four?
- Wetlands survey – the explanation was helpful.
- Committee needs more understanding of the zones.
- Bathymetric needs some discussion.
- LiDAR data is not depicted on the plan correctly
- Would like to include archeological on the existing conditions plan. They are the only thing that is not included.
- Overlays are inaccurately placed
- Boundaries are missing
- Do we have a detailed explanation of what the archeologist found? Are there 3 places and are they defined in the report.
- Configuration of ledge is inaccurate – does not project North

The committee discussed the need to read the report and review before final approval. However, we do not want to hold up getting reimbursement. Marjorie read the requirements for submission for grant reimbursement. Committee feels it needs an updated map and doesn't feel it can approve Dustin's report until it is reviewed.

Approval of Roma's report and the Existing Conditions Plan were tabled.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to request that Marjorie scan Roma's final report, circulate to the Committee by Wednesday and by Friday the committee members send their vote to Mary. The motion was unanimously approved.

A **MOTION** was made for Mary to contact Dustin for the following:

- Ask clarification on cellar holes (are they homes, etc.)
- Depict cellars on existing conditions map
- Correct places where contour lines and border don't come together
- Clarify questions about the ledge.

The motion was not seconded.

Paul agreed to send an email to the Committee with a list of his issues with the existing condition plan.

Note: On 12/9/2015 Paul sent the email in Attachment A.

Review 11/10/15 Email from Nixon Relative to Bathymetric Survey

The committee discussed the email from Matt Nixon. Mary will request Matt to return at high tide in the spring and give usable data.

Review/Discuss 11/9/15 email from Dustin Roma of DM Roma Consulting Engineers

Dustin would like to continue working with the Committee in his new company DM Roma. The committee discussed the impact of his leaving M&M.

It was agreed that the Committee should contact M&M and determine who the project contact is now. Mary will contact M&M to determine who the project manager is.

Review/Discuss Possible Next Steps

Marjorie will send bill to the State for the grant, hold the M&M bill for existing conditions plan, and send Roma's final report to the committee. Marjorie will call M&M regarding the outstanding invoices.

Mary shared her discussion with Chris Loder. He suggested that the committee has two to three meetings before the beginning of April so that something could be submitted for the warrant for the June town meeting. Chris would like us to poll voters on their thinking of what we should do about Sunset landing. If there are two or three options, can you present those options to the public?

The Committee discussed the next steps for this project. Donna mentioned that bonding would be needed. The community will want to know what the cost of Sunset vs. redesigning the Stone Pier would be. The committee feels that it cannot present to the community until these things are resolved.

Review/Consider email from Jimmy Stewart re: 9/21/15 Minutes

A **MOTION** was made and seconded that we approve comments received from Jim Stewart and add an amendment to that effect to the on the 9/21/2015 minutes. The motion was passed unanimously.

A **MOTION** was made, seconded and unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Carl Sebastiani". The signature is written in a cursive style with a clear first name and a last name.

(Minutes created from a tape recording of the meeting)

Attachment A

Those attending the meeting on Monday also had a chance to see another hard copy version of the Existing Conditions Plan for the Sunset property. This 12/4/15 revision from M&M was a signed, stamped document presented as a final version of their deliverables for Phase 1 and 2 support. The group was unable to approve this document because once again it contained a number of glaring errors or questionable information. My observations include:

- *The easterly property boundary line for the locus parcel is missing.*
- *The property lines shown for the locus parcel do not meet two of the boundary markers/pins. Comparison with a progress print from Nadeau indicates the surveyor had the lines intersecting the points.*
- *The band of clear space or missing data just outside the locus parcel on the north, south, and east sides appears to be caused by the utilization of two different topographic standards. The contractor indicates the topography of the parcel was obtained by an on the ground survey by Nadeau (1ft contours) and the other land topography was obtained from Maine State Office GIS (2ft intervals). To avoid the confusion resulting from this situation, the plan should terminate the odd numbered elevations at the property boundaries and connect the even numbers that extend beyond, into the abutters. Leaving a wide blank space around three sides of the locus parcel creates a high level of confusion regarding the integrity of the data displayed on the document.*
- *There are irregularities in the intertidal topography shown on the Existing Conditions Plan based on personal observations of this shoreline and a quick comparison with the Nadeau land survey.*
- *The delineation of the CFMA zoning boundary extends outside the locus parcel into the land of Belesca. This is not correct.*
- *The delineation of the limited residential zone boundary extends outside the locus parcel into the land of Belesca. This is not correct. Both zoning definitions should terminate at the southerly property line of the locus parcel.*
- *Discussion by the committee indicates a desire to see the sites evaluated by Tetra Tech in their Archaeological Survey Report displayed on the Existing Conditions Plan. The plan has the wetland boundaries and test pits from Frick, eelgrass boundaries from Normandeau, bathymetric data from the Maine Coastal Program, etc. It should also have the three (not two as noted in the final report from Roma) cellar holes and any additional historic features described in pgs. 33-39 of the Tetra Tech report.*
- *The legend displayed on the Existing Conditions Plan contains line styles and weights that do not appear to match the depiction of features on the drawing.*
- *According to the letter report from Roma, M&M kept Elizabeth Road on the plan because Nadeau completed adequate deed and plan research. The committee asked M&M to clarify if*

the location of the road was displayed based on Nadeau's field survey work. In short, did they survey the road and display it based on that effort?

- If one accepts the explanation of the location of Elizabeth Road in the M&M summary letter, then the presentation of that material does not match the display on the Existing Conditions Plan. They are not showing on the plan what they say they found in the deed research and plans. The 1907 Sunset Beach subdivision plan shows Elizabeth Road terminates at the intersection of Sunset Avenue (the one that runs along the shore). This is confirmed by the 1990 Titcomb survey of the Sunset Property done by the Town of Cumberland. For those who are trying to picture this, Elizabeth Road runs basically east to west, from the North Road towards the shore. Any depiction of another north south paper road at the termination of Elizabeth Road is inconsistent with Nadeau's findings and M&M's explanation.