

Salem Conservation Commission  
Minutes of Meeting

- Date and Time: Tuesday, June 16, 2020, 6:30 p.m.
- Meeting Location: Online at  
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83783182099?pwd=S1o5ZEw0R250Sm5mM3lnZHZUUuN2QT09> or  
<https://zoom.us/join>. Enter meeting ID # “837-8318-2099”. Enter password “112040”.
  - Call 877-853-5257 to join the meeting. When prompted, enter meeting ID # “837-8318-2099” and follow the instructions to join the meeting. Password is “112040”.

Members Present: Tyler Glode, Scott Sheehan, Vice Chair Bart Hoskins, Tom Campbell, Malissa Vieira (5)

Members Absent: Dan Ricciarelli, Chair Gregory St. Louis (2)

Others Present: Brittany Dolan, Conservation Agent

Recorder: Stacy Kilb

Vice Chair Bart Hoskins calls the meeting to order at 6:30PM.

## I. Roll Call

## II. Regular Agenda

### A. 38 Bayview Ave (Dep #64-696) - Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Christopher Funk, 38 Bayview Ave, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Installation Of A Floating Dock Within An Area Subject To Protection Under The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Susan St. Pierre Represents the Applicant. A Powerpoint is shown:

- Project Locus, Existing Conditions, Project Site
- Existing conditions: in FEMA flood zone, resource areas outlined. One isolated area of salt marsh. Stairs and sea wall are shown
- Proposed floating dock image and site plan: 30’ gangway, 12’ long x 6’ wide float, supported by moorings.
  - All work in 100’ buffer zone
  - Moorings = 4.44 sf; float = 78 sf
- Float Design based on Army Corps regulations; floats will have legs so that bottom of floats remain 18” above mud flats at all times
  - Float Usage; DMF said 30” but if so can only use at water depth of 3.5’. Hoping Commission will approve 18”
  - Sediment in the area
  - Design detail
  - Pyramid mooring anchors to be used (will sink into mud after a while)

Discussion:

Scott Sheehan:

- DMF came back w/state vs. Army Corps; 30” vs. 18” from bottom; how to make the case for deviation?
  - DEP and Army Corps are both regulatory bodies for wetland areas; Army Corps looks at navigation as well as other resources; DMF only looks at things such as shellfish. Other floats sit on the bottom directly, so lifting 18” is an improvement. DMF will also send a similar letter to the Army Corps, who can agree with DMF or not. As long as float is under a certain square footage and 18” it is authorized under a general permit so they do not need to file w/both
  - This limits homeowners so they can’t use facilities other than mid and high tide, also Ms. St. Pierre has not seen 30” in practice and it may look awkward

- Area bottoms out at low tide, to have a bunch of docks sitting at 2.5' on stilts would be odd
- Are there shellfish in area? Possibly but area is contaminated and closed to harvesting, though wildlife may take advantage
- Patches of salt marsh provide habitat, would prefer to defer to DMF
- Resource areas are further discussed

Additional Discussion:

- Bathymetry of area? This may be where they are coming up with 30". ConCom may not be the authorizing body re DMF. Ms. St. Pierre notes DMF is NOT a regulatory body, so the Commission does not have to follow their comments.
- Sheehan: Feels this is permissible subject to being able to respond to DMF issues, asks if in her experience is 18" vs 30" a significant environmental impact?
- Ms. St. Pierre: float will be elevated 18" above bottom, won't cause shading, and she has never encountered a 30" request before. Sheehan comments that last year there was one that was not 30" and they had to put it on skids. This will be on legs. Guidelines referred to in the DMF letter are very old, some are not valid anymore. Some recommendations were from piers in Florida, with no indication given of why they chose 30". Glode agrees, thinking about shading but there is no valuable seagrass that are impacted
- Sheehan wonders if ConCom approved as is, can DMF stop project? No they can't. She references another project DMF had comments on; they addressed them and ConCom was OK with that.
- Army Corps balances navigation with resource protection so Ms. St. Pierre feels this is a good standard; this is a navigable waterway
- Logistics of the area are discussed; breakwater is covered at high tide
- Discussion of Boston Harbor and its status as navigable waterway (or not)
- Bart Hoskins: Unclear where dock is going; over salt marsh or not? No, it is going off the patio, to the southeast of the salt marsh
- May be willing to move further to East if it will make Commission more comfortable; currently proposed at center of the patio, still on owner's property

Public Comment: None

Scott Sheehan moves to close the public hearing, is seconded by Malissa Vieira, and the motion passes 4-0 with Campbell abstaining.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Abstain
Malissa Vieira	Yes

Special Condition: If equipment is to be removed for winter storage, all portions must be stored above the high tide line

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard and the above Special Conditions is made by Glode, seconded by Sheehan, and the motion passes 5-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**B. 42 Bayview Ave (Dep #64-698) – Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Robert And Elaine Cook, 42 Bayview Ave, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Installation Of A Pile Held Floating Dock Within An Area Subject To Protection Under The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Presenting for the Applicant is Susan St. Pierre. These are abutters to the previous project.

- Project Locus
- Existing conditions: 100 year floodplain, wetland resources, sea wall described
- Entire area was used for commercial lobstering in 1940's and '50's
- Gangway and float currently come off patio. Images of old dock are shown
- Proposed Pile Held Float Facility:
  - Center on property
  - Add on to existing float to get to deeper water at low tide
  - Proposing installation of piles to secure it
  - 4.75 sf of impact from piles; 192 square feet of impact from float
- Pile Held Float Design; will stay 18" above mud flat. Existing float bottoms out at low tide and covers 240 square feet of mud flat. New piles will occupy less than 5' and new float will be above the mud flat

#### Discussion:

- Scott Sheehan:
  - This is substantially similar to the previous project re DMF comments
  - Address temporary impact of barge? DMF did not want the barge sitting on the flats. They will work around the tides
  - Construction period? Barge will come in and sit until they are done pile driving. Barge cannot be taken in and out; too costly. May take a day or two to drive piles
- Glode comments 3-4 days' worth of work so barge may be out there for a week. Could do when tides are more average than extreme lunar tides? Usually barge is mobilized once then left in place
  - Bob Cook: Re timeframe, scheduled on a moon tide in October, could be done possibly in one tide cycle. Harborwalk in another case had a barge sitting on the mud for a much longer time
- Hoskins: Attempt to not have barge bottom out, at least not for an extended period
- St. Pierre: Make a condition "to extent possible, work with tides and get work done as soon as practicable?"
- Sheehan: We understand potential impacts, but they are temporary. As long as work with the barge is done within 2 weeks, the Commission considers it negligible, but will need to reconsider if longer term. Vice Chair Hoskins agrees, notes maybe a certain number of tidal cycles
- St. Pierre: want to get in and out and move onto the next job.

#### Public comment:

Bob Cook, owner, re timing of barge, notes that the "meter is running" as it sits, so the time frame will be less than 48 hours. Glode states that he is not comfortable with more than 3 tide cycles. Mr. Cook says he wants to do it in a quick change of tides. Glode is comfortable with that. Sheehan agrees but feels the value of the resource area is negligible and flexibility is warranted. Just so they don't have to come back if there is a problem. A week is preferable to 3-4 days.

A motion to close public hearing is made by Glode, seconded by Vieira, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

#### Special Condition:

*Barge presence limited to one week, without relocation, subject to clearance of barge to bottom out in work zone*

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard and the above special condition is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes

Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**C. 23 Congress St (Dep #64-697) – Public Hearing - Notice Of Intent For Andrew Shelby, Boston Gas Company, 40 Sylvan Rd, Waltham, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Installation Of A New Gas Main Within Congress St And Pickering Way Within An Area Subject To Protection Under The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Presenting for the Applicant is Liana DiNunzio from Tighe & Bond

- Installing a new main to 23 Congress St. related to Salem Waterfront Hotel expansion
- Not replacing an existing, so is not exempt
- Approx. 480' completely within Congress St. and Pickering Way
- 60' new from main to 23 Congress St, currently a construction zone
- New line will consist of 4" diameter plastic pipe in 2' wide x 3' deep trench to be backfilled at end of each workday; site will be restored to pre existing condition
- Jurisdictional areas: LSCSF, 200' riverfront area (South River), 100' buffer to coastal bank
- Erosion control measures will be provided
- Temporary impacts will occur within previously disturbed areas and pavement

Discussion:

- Sheehan feels that given the approval of the hotel, the gas line has no impact, so should be approved

Vice Chair Hoskins opens to the public but there are no comments.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Glode, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard Conditions is made by Glode, seconded by Sheehan, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**D. 20, 25, 30, 40 Colonial Rd (Dep #Tbd) – Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Brandon Kelly, Colonial Road Owner Llc, 55 Cambridge St, Burlington, Ma. Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Site Preparation To Accommodate A Change In Use From Chemical Manufacturing To Warehouse And Distribution At 20, 25, 30, And 40 Colonial Rd Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem's Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

This is DEP File Number 64-699, issued yesterday. Present for the Applicant is Ann Marton with LEC Environmental. Scott Cameron from the Morin Cameron Group is also present.

Ann Marton:

- Aerial view of site
  - Demolition 2 outbuildings, repaving parking, stormwater, lighting, perimeter fence improvements,

interior improvements.

- 10.5 acres on 4 parcels East of Jefferson, West of Canal. Site locus is described
- Parcel, wetland boundaries are outlined. Resource areas: Part of North River so Mean Annual High Water Line of that is outlined; BVW (Bordering Vegetated Wetland) (phragmites/fringe of shrub/scrub), Floodplain elevation 11 but LOMAR issued in 2017 that lowered it to elevation 10, which is what is shown. 2 areas separated b/c in 100 year storm flood water system comes up through catch basins creating islands
- Characterised as BLSF (Bordering Land Subject to Flooding) and LSCSF (Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flooding)
- System in relation to tide gates and culvert system; depending on event, could be inland Bordering LSSF or LSCSF so is described as both, but below Elevation 10 must meet storage calculations as per BLSF
- Existing buildings are reviewed; 2 outbuildings will be demolished, parking lot regraded
- Site Grading Plan
  - Site has 2 AUL's (Activity and Use Limitations) limiting work that can be done; perimeter is outlined

#### Scott Cameron

- Stormwater management report submitted
- Site is mostly paved, surrounded by a fence
- One strip is not part of campus
- Will reconfigure the site area for 3 vehicular use categories:
  - Close to building for loading docks (large trucks)
  - Employee parking (layperson vehicles)
  - Distribution vehicles (small vans, etc.)
- Overall pavement is being reduced by 12,000 sf, most removal on perimeter of project, closest to wetland resource areas. Office building to be demolished will become a sediment forebay; several areas drain directly to the wetland. Treatment systems are described
- Outfalls are eroding, two will be eliminated, one reconstructed
- Runoff/Outfalls:
  - Calculations provided for decrease in runoff
  - Glode: Is AUL currently open/treatment plan? Limitations? Applicant will be removing impervious areas over AUL of concern to groundwater, is area capped and sealed already?
  - Most focus will be on treatment/retrofitting existing systems, all outfalls will be retrofitted. Sheetflow will be captured, sent to treatment. Outfalls have gates installed, one will be maintained, some retrofitted
  - Catch basins to be retrofitted with hoods
  - Roof drains to be tied to drainage so as not to pick up runoff from pavement
- AUL: Material is and must remain capped; where excavation must be done, an LSP (Licensed Site Professional) will oversee and area must be lined as if it has a cap on it. Where pavement removed/vegetation replaced, there will be a liner to cap, material stockpiled onsite in AUL footprint and capped. Ledge conditions on site within 3'-10'
- Usage is changing; high traffic but less intense, however meets higher stormwater standards. Designed to exceed 1000 vehicle trips per day.

#### Ann Marton

- Resource Area Impact illustration, current conditions and proposed conditions
- Reduction in pervious surface in riverfront area since pulling work further from river
- Table shows cut and fill to ensure adequate compensatory storage in parking lot

#### Discussion:

- Glode feels peer review is warranted; Planning Board requires floodplain special permit. ConCom will

require Peer Review

- Sheehan comfortable with that but asks: Area along Canal St. and Jefferson is one of the most significant issues the Commission deals with; all projects have public interest, i.e., “if you put in fill, will it flood my property?” Please explain how this is subject to coastal flowage and how their proposal will not impact neighbors, in layman's terms
  - This is both BLSF and LSCSF, Ms. Marton references flood mapping study. Appendix A shows FEMA flood map, in a 100 year storm event water goes up the South River, across Rosie's pond, Jefferson Ave, this site from Salem Harbor. This is coastal flooding in a storm event with tide gates shut
  - Coastal flooding behaves in the same way as inland flooding, and could cause flooding on this site or adjacent ones, similar to tides along a shoreline, so for this project, the characteristic is coastal and inland, so behaves like inland flooding, hence they provided compensatory storage for anything below elevation 10 (in the floodplain). Treated as if it was all BLSF and also provided excess storage by 9401 cubic feet. That is in addition to what is currently available
- Campbell: Soil removal? Intent is to keep all material onsite and in limits of the AUL
- Curbing is discussed
- Rail spur will remain as it is owned as MBTA
- Landscaping? No, outside of where pavement is being pulled away from wetland, there are issues with landscaping in AUL, so it is all outside of AUL. No landscape that won't be capped over AUL is planned
- Sediment forebay is further discussed. Basin liner is discussed but will require further input from LSP. Perimeter areas where removing pavement that won't be paved will have a minimum of 1' of clean topsoil underlined by orange Mirafi no dig fabric, geogrid cap under that. Glode notes cap MUST be impermeable due to coastal storm flowage. Speaks to his request for peer review
- Cameron: Planning Board (PB) has been requiring peer review; will be before them; will use the same person, so ConCom can coordinate with PB re peer review. PB will require full peer review. Brittany Dolan and Mason Wells will coordinate. Peer review will probably go before PB but ConCom can comment. PB package is roughly the same as this one

A motion to continue to the July 21 meeting is made by Sheehan seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**E. B154s Flyover Switch – Waite St (Dep #Tbd) – Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Corey Schutzman, New England Power Company, 40 Sylvan Rd, Waltham, Ma. Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Installation Of A Flyover Switch And Associated Foundation Along The B154s Transmission Line Off Waite St Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem's Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Alexandra Echandi, BSC Group, represents the Applicant

- Describes the function of the flyover switch, allows for greater utility efficiency
- Location of flyover switch; pad and structure are described. Concrete foundation will require excavation of the surrounding area, an additional 7' all around the structure. Area excavated will be restored to pre existing conditions
- BVW (phragmites) and LSCSF; all work will happen in an existing gravel pad however will need space for equipment, will need temporary construction mats, in place only during installation of concrete foundation and flyover switch
- Equipment will be staged overnight outside of wetland area
- BMP's: Sediment erosion controls will be installed around work pad and matting, catch basin protections

used; will use concrete washout basin

- Work should be completed in less than 2 weeks though mats may be there a little longer
- Permanent impact is 176 sf of concrete for switch structure, in gravel previously disturbed area
- Minimizing permanent impacts to wetlands, shifted structure to outside the wetland
- Photos of existing switch and work area
- Glode: Wetland matting: Drive over/operate on top of? Yes, 16 x 4' timber mats placed on wetland, can drive and operate on top, used to displace weight of equipment to prevent compression of wetland.
- Large area of wetland matting? What will it be used for? Minimized work pad, they requested that it be bigger b/c they need a crane to get switch structure up, this is as small as it can get
- Sheehan: Upgradient there has been public interest in the way that these areas are restricted/flooding into neighborhoods; impacts to flood plain? This is LSCSF, so will impact 704 cubic feet with permanent foundation of 22' x 8'. Will be some displacement but there are many wetland areas to capture flooding; not much you can do to LSCSF to manage water, but they are minimizing concrete foundation. This is not FEMA floodplain, related to Danvers River confluence w/ Atlantic ocean tides
- Glode clarifies there is BVW as well.
- Brittany Dolan comments that as there is no DEP file number yet, the hearing cannot be closed Sheehan suggests letting the public comment. Hoskins opens to public comment there are none.

A motion to continue to the July 21 meeting is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5- in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**F. Palmer Cove Park (Dep #Tbd) – Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Kathleen Winn, City Of Salem, 98 Washington St, Salem, Ma. Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Proposed Improvements To Palmer Cove Park Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C131§40 And Salem's Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Scott Sheehan recuses himself from this project. DEP File Number 64-700 was issued today.

Kathleen Winn from the Planning Department presents. Naomi Cattrell, Landscape Architect, has been hired for this project. Ms. Cattrell Presents:

- Community Outreach process described; PARC grant received for renovations
- NOI submitted w/entire Master Plan in mind to show final reconfiguration of park
- Tonight will show more detail from Phase 1 which currently has funding and approval from Parks & Rec; will go for Chapter 91 once Conservation Commission approves
- Project Location: USGS Map
- Coastal Bank, Elevation 11, Park floods
- Existing Conditions: Limited connectivity across Park; Activity along waterfront is desired along with passive recreation
- Future of baseball questionable at first but City has committed to construct high-school sized baseball field at Gallows Hill, so will no longer be needed here
  - Waterfront occupied by Community Gardens, no waterfront improvements other than lawn/gardens
  - Not within 100' buffer of water, existing defunct tennis Court on Salem St., on Point Community Center, w/Active basketball court, baseball field
- Proposal increases impervious area by 14,000 square feet due to impervious asphalt from introducing walking and crossing paths
- Proposed Master Plan includes two options:
  - 1) Replace baseball field w/universally accessible recreation field

- 2) Men's softball sized field. Calculations remain the same either way
- Phase 1 and overall improvements: Community Gardens moved to Salem St. Amenities such as plantings, benches placed on water. Extension of some areas to pull off the main walk/promenade. Areas to picnic
  - Installing network of paths to connect from Salem St. to On Point building
  - Adding trees
  - Center of Park remains lawn and functions as it does currently for stormwater recharge; impervious surfaces drain to center of park
  - Introducing new parking spaces along Salem St. to serve community garden and, according to Master Plan, there was community interest in changing entrance from Congress St. Parking lot there serves On Point Building; would like to re-allocate spaces to Salem St. side
  - Active recreation added around On Point Building
- YMCA Green space is near current community gardens, want to move all that off of the waterfront
  - Waterfront walk proposed as concrete, includes benches, picnic tables, sculptures, senior fitness equipment w/pervious rubberized play area surfaces
  - Trees to be added along waterfront and new path network
  - Plant list is presented
  - Erosion Control Details

Parking at Salem St.: build out community gardens, remove tennis court

- Pervious surfacing w/Raised beds throughout. May maintain as lawn or be mulch
- Proposing some stone dust areas for accessibility. Accessible parking spaces, beds, gathering areas. Terrace proposed off of main path will be paved to provide gathering place for YMCA Green Space Program to distribute food
- Parking at Salem St.
- Drainage/grading

Glode asks about stormwater management: what is the treatment proposed?

- One area (new parking area along Salem St.) has catching and treatment consisting of through mechanical drainage system, no rain gardens proposed
- Glode notes that redevelopment means they can avoid stormwater standards
- Stone dust path instead of asphalt? Have done them before in Salem, concern currently is about maintenance, so asphalt was chosen but could revert to stone dust if it is a deal breaker. Recent struggles w/maintenance. Glodes suggests concrete instead of asphalt as asphalt releases bituminous oils in rain events
- Crossing paths on interior are 5' width but waterfront area will have all existing asphalt removed, and is proposed as concrete
- Moving Community Garden part of phase 1? Yes. Need to do this in order to make room for further improvements
- Glode suggests a TSS unit add on w/in catch basin or move forward w/additional CDS unit before tying into the existing system, to provide something instead of nothing, meets standards as a redevelopment program. This is do-able under the Grant

Public comments:

Lucy Corchado, 1 Chase St., asks about the phases of the project. Why does one show a softball field and one not? This was streamlined to one drawing, but will happen in subsequent phases. The first phase allows softball the field to be used but the Applicant must go back to Parks and Rec to determine which active recreation will actually be planned for Phase 2, but this does not change what happens environmentally. This is a Parks and Rec question, not a ConCom question.

John Linger owns C & T's garage by the big parking lot between Leavitt and Congress; one plan will remove a large part of that parking lot, which leaves him only 25' from the building to the edge of the parking lot, not enough to make a turn into the garage to continue to run the business. Can the Planner reconsider and make it 50' instead?



Curb and landscaping get in the way. The intent of the master Plan is to allow him to have access, so the City will work with him on that. They don't want to encourage parking on the side of On Point, so it may be as simple as taking up those spaces; the City will work with him in Phase 2.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Glode, seconded by Campbell, and passes 4-0 in a roll call vote with Scott Sheehan recused.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Recused
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions for Phase One, with additional TSS removal either in line, in proposed catch basin, or CDS unit or equivalent, prior to entering the City's municipal system, is made by Glode, seconded by Campbell, and passes 4-0 with Scott Sheehan recused.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Recused
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

A PARC Grant for \$400,000 was received along with \$100,000 from CPA (Community Preservation Act). The cost is \$800,000 for the first phase, and they are hoping the second phase is as financially successful, but it is the City's intent to build the project in the next 2-3 years.

#### **G. 0 Story St Subdivision Lots A, B, & C And Construction Of Roadway (Dep #'s Tbd)**

**Continuation Of Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group Llc, 14 Story St, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Construction Of A Roadway With Utilities And An Onsite Stormwater Management System With Grading At 0 Story St An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C.131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

**Continuation Of Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group Llc, 14 Story St, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Construction Of A Single Family Dwelling Located At 0 Story St, Lot A (Map 23, Parcel 2) Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C.131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

**Continuation Of Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group Llc, 14 Story St, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Construction Of A Single Family Dwelling Located At 0 Story St, Lot B (Map 23, Parcel 2) Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C.131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

**Continuation Of Public Hearing – Notice Of Intent For Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group Llc, 14 Story St, Salem, Ma. The Purpose Of The Hearing Is To Discuss The Construction Of A Single Family Dwelling Located At 0 Story St, Lot C (Map 23, Parcel 2) Within An Area Subject To The Wetlands Protection Act Mgl C.131§40 And Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Note: These Items Will Be Continued As It Has Not Been Approved By The Planning Board Yet.

A motion to continue to the July 21, 2020 meeting is made by Glode, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

### III. Old Business

#### A. Discussion And Final Approval Of Forest River Pool And Bathhouse Dep #64-693.

This item was continued so the Chair could review the supplemental information, but he is not present tonight. The Applicant was seeking a Decision tonight but the Chair had questions.

Tom Scarlata:

- Erosion Control Item 27: Disturbed areas to be stabilized. They are asking within 30 days during the growing season, b/c they are unsure of the schedule, and work may be done in multiple phases so w/in 30 days may not be conducive to growing anything. Thus they can stabilize but may not be able to plant. They do have a landscape architect
- Glode has not reviewed stormwater management. There has been no input from the Chair via email
- Scott Sheehan has no concerns as long as temp erosion controls remain in place until the area is stabilized. Glode agrees.

*Special conditions: erosion controls to remain in place during planting and stabilization, to be removed after planting and stabilization*

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard conditions, pending any special conditions by the Chair, is made by Glode, seconded by Sheehan, and passes 5-0

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

### IV. Adjournment (not yet!)

A motion to adjourn is made but some old/new business must be concluded first.

#### Old/New Business

Colonial Rd. Certificates of Compliance

Ann Marton:

- There are open Orders on the project site; procedures are described. An NOI has already been filed for Colonial Road.
- **DEP 64-270** from 1997, were going to tear down an existing warehouse or part of it, then build a proposed office building, add pavement, and landscape. After the last hearing, Applicant discovered that the Order of Conditions expired in 2000. Viewing a Dec. 2001 Google Earth, it appears no work was done. No mitigation performed b/c work did not happen, so they are requesting a Certificate stating, "Work never completed and permit lapsed."

A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance - work never completed/permit lapsed is made by Glode, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

**64-573 NOI 25 & 40 Columbia Rd.**

- Remediation at the site: removed asphalt, excavated, removed chromium impacted soils and repaved the area
- Boulder & Associates Plan is shown. Shed and trailer highlighted for orientation. Footprint of remediation is outlined, this is associated with the 2nd AUL on the above Plan
- 9400 sf in permit; Google Earth image shows new pavement
- Release Abatement Measure statement from LSP is included, saying it was done

A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance - work completed as described on Plan and in Order of Conditions, is made by Glode, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

A motion to adjourn is made by Campbell, seconded by Glode, and passes in a roll call vote with all in favor.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes
Vice Chair Bart Hoskins	Yes
Tom Campbell	Yes
Malissa Vieira	Yes

The meeting ends at 9:25PM