

Thanks to Chase for walking the shoreline and discussing the issues and perceived challenges. All known dock maintainers along Lake Shore Dr. gathered and came to consensus re: several potential solutions.

Most have been identified. 2 of the 8 docks are abandoned by prior residents (foot of Birch & foot of Dogwood). All 6 remaining are supportive of the options we're presenting. One of the 6 docks was planned for removal anyhow, as they no longer use it. There may be 1-2 people interested in "adopting" the abandoned docks.

All are strongly in favor of maintaining docks for Lake access & all support public access. Docks are really no different than the various trail boardwalks in town; just much shorter.

All agreed that the personal liability of a dock for public use is probably untenable (esp. for insurance purposes).

The current number of docks (6-9) seems well suited. We'd like to see most/all of them remain, if possible. That would also preserve the most motivation for continued stewardship. Reducing the number may make location selection for remaining ones difficult.

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| Solutions | #1 - Licenses to Permit Docks to existing abutters | #2 - Licenses to Boat Slips; docks become public | #3 - Hybrid |
| Description | Licenses to Permit private/semi-private docks | Make existing docks public; assign boat slip licenses. ~50/50 slips:open space for launching | Mix of options 1 & 2 |
| Pros | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closest to historic use • Easiest to manage liability and maintenance • Establishes permit process for elsewhere | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum access & equity • Allows continued boating use nearly as-is • Preserves maintenance incentives & recreational character • Relieves pressure on beach & boat ramp • Clearest liability mgmt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best of both worlds • Addresses equity w/o restricting access • Mitigates the “cons” of 1 & 2 • Creates flexibility |
| Cons | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy challenges • Equity perceptions • Eliminates long-standing responsible usage from caretakers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires some management • Unfunded Maintenance (of docks); most dock • Potential to limit maintenance incentive (of parcels) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't fully address all issues |
| Comments | Highest potential to raise funds for lake restoration | Boat slips in exchange for care & maintenance of the public dock is a win/win | Flexibility may address location/topography challenges |

Q&A from the abutters perspectives:

a): Who will be responsible for dock removal and disposal? Town pursue private parties that placed docks, solicit assistance from LLNA, or LCT, or Town perform the work (e.g., DPW).

A: The abutters are prepared to assist or undertake the removal of the two unused/unsafe docks on this parcel. We would request waiver of transfer station fees.

b) What permitting is required to facilitate the removals?

A: The abutters are prepared to request appropriate permits from the Cons Comm, if necessary.

c) How many docks left in place are appropriate?

A: the abutters propose 6, plus any new ones Cons Comm proposes to put in. We believe the existing number illustrates demand to support this.

d) Which docks are allowed to stay and how do we select which ones? May need to assess construction and safety of docks.

A: See note from abutters for specific docks referred to. Minimum standards may be appropriate.

e). What are the appropriate uses of the docks left in place? Temporary uses (e.g.,kayaks or canoe entry/exit, fishing, short term storage) or combo of temporary uses and licensing for extended usage.

A: the abutters agree with the suggestion of temporary uses plus licenses for extended usage. E.g. perhaps one side of each dock for boat slips; one side to keep open for public launching.

f) Source of funds for assessing docks?

A: The abutters propose license fees for either dock or 'slip' usage rights

g) Who will be responsible for maintaining docks left in place, including obtaining their MassDEP licenses?

A: The abutters propose to take responsibility for maintaining the docks, with licenses either applied for individually or through the town collectively

h) Are docks consistent with Conservation uses?

A: the abutters believe the docks are absolutely consistent with conservation uses, for the many reasons laid out in letters previously submitted, and in order to relieve the town beach area from further traffic caused by passive recreation. These are akin to abutting homeowners footpaths onto cons trails.

Similarly, many other Conservation trails have docks or observation platforms over water (e.g. Grassy Pond in Acton, Great Meadows NWR in Concord).