

**Salem Conservation Commission
Minutes of Meeting**

Date and Time: Thursday, February 8, 2018, 6:30 p.m.
Meeting Location: Third Floor Conference Room, City Hall, 120 Washington Street
Members Present: Tom Campbell, Dan Ricciarelli, Vice Chair Bart Hoskins, Scott Sheehan, Tyler Glode (5)
Members Absent: Chair Gregory St. Louis, Gail Kubik (2)
Others Present: Ashley Green, Conservation Agent
Recorder: Stacy Kilb

1. Bridge Street Reconstruction Project— Continuation of Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for the City of Salem, 120 Washington Street, 3rd Floor, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss proposed roadway and intersections improvements along Bridge Street from Boston Street to Flint Street and along Goodhue Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Present for the Applicant are:
Chuck Dam, City Engineering Department
Rick Azzalina, Stantec Consulting Services
Steve Chapman, Stantec Consulting Services

Chuck Dam presents, describing the project and the Applicant's studies of the area. Some areas of the project are only improvements, while others involve reconstruction, including drainage and bike paths. The project includes the area in front of the Community Life Center.

Steve Chapman describes the study on the North River. The Notice of Intent (NOI) classified the project as Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage (LSCSF). However, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) commented that they consider it to be Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), so the Applicant is putting together a supplement to their filing to outline their modeling work that backs their resource designation. If LSCSF there is no need for compensatory flood storage, but if BSLF there is a 1:1 compensatory storage requirement.

The Applicant outlines their modeling results that support their resource designation. The Applicant feels that their work demonstrates that this is LSCSF, not BSLF. The Commission is in the process of retaining a peer reviewer to review the Applicant's modeling work. The peer reviewer will present at the next Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Hoskins asks about data gathering for the models and whether it includes actual field measures during various tidal cycles. All data is compiled by NOAA of continuous tidal information. The Applicant did not do additional data collection.

Vice Chair Hoskins asks for clarification on the modeling effort and Mr. Chapman describe the process, which entailed using elevations but not direct observation.

Glode notes that ice flows are another indication in favor of argument of this as LSCSF. He wonders about their benchmark for NOAA data; there are various data sources which are described, as are the locations of data collection and elevations. How NOAA gathered their data in the 1970s is also described. At one point on the project they are looking at a 3/10 increase between mean high and mean high high tide. The project area is bounded by a concrete wall built in the 1990s, at elevation 10. Worst case conditions are what were explored.

The timing and process of the peer review is discussed.

A motion to continue is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes unanimously 5-0.

2. **441 Lafayette Street Dock and Float Repair—Continuation of Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for Mark Mazuzan, 441 Lafayette Street, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss proposed repair and replacement of a dock, float, and mooring at 441 Lafayette Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Applicant requests to continue to the March 8, 2018 meeting.

A motion to continue is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 5-0.

3. **Kernwood Country Club Tree Removal, Brush Clearing and Vegetation Planting—Continuation of Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for Kernwood Country Club, 1 Kernwood Street, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss proposed removal of trees, brush clearing, and planting of vegetation at 1-9 Kernwood Street and 2 Kernwood Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Presenting for the Applicant is Attorney Scott Grover. Also present on the Applicant's behalf are:

Susan St. Pierre, Wetlands Consultant
Kevin Bobrek, Arborist,
John Eggleston, Course Superintendant, Kernwood Country Club
Frank Cole, President, Kernwood Country Club
Tony Sasso

Attorney Grover thanks the Commission for their site visit. The purpose of this project is to remove trees that are unhealthy and pose a risk to golfers and create issues for nearby healthy trees. Good course management and maintenance are also objectives. Some areas on the course also require cleanup of brush and invasive species.

Ms. Susan St. Pierre describes the work.

A guide describing the project is handed out re type of tree being removed, reason and method of removal, and replacement and mitigation plan. The table is keyed to the aerial photograph, which also contains notes. In general, trees will be replaced in the vicinity, though not the exact location, of the originals. They may also not be replaced in a 1:1 ratio, as, in both cases, some of the original trees were poorly sited, too many were planted too close together, or they were not the right type for the area. Most trees being removed are unhealthy, and many are causing maintenance issues as well.

The 200' Riverfront Area is shown. The Applicant would like the Commission to allow them to immediately remove all vegetation discussed below, with the Condition that they then return later with more detail on the mitigation plan, as that is not ready yet.

The course is 120 acres. Only the areas of focus are shown.

- A, B, and C: Remove and replace trees
- D (near clubhouse) is overrun by invasives and next to a tee green; the healthy Oak there will be removed and the slope cleaned up with invasives replaced by native species. Mitigation there will include native species being planted, using the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) list of preferred species for coastal bank

- Area E is riverfront area, and while some items fall outside Commission jurisdiction, the entire area will be cleared of fallen trees, broken branches, invasives, and shrubs that interfere with the view between tees
- F, G: Golf course would rather cut these down, and though they will leave them up for now at the Commission's request, would like to reserve the right to remove them
- H, N, O: Large trees are on an eroding coastal bank, in poor health, to be removed and replaced with mitigation planting along the bank and one low growing specimen tree in the vicinity but further back
- I, J: Two trees close to cart path and bank, pose a danger, to be removed, replaced with one small tree, mitigation planting along bank
- K, P, O: diseased trees, to be removed and replaced with four trees total
- L: Really two trees, L(a) and L(b), which have cavities, are diseased, and those areas have been added. Birch will be removed, bank mitigation done in the area, Pin Oaks will be planted
- M: (6) Norway maples, invasive, too close together, damaged and diseased, to be removed and replaced with a couple of red maples

No replacements or bank mitigation were originally planned or presented; now they are planned but details not available yet. The mitigation of the removals described above is part of this filing, and a completely separate project from the upcoming Notice of Intent for Bank Stabilization.

It is unclear whether some of the trees in question are causing the bank to erode as they are no longer alive, or if the bank is eroding and damaging them. The permissions previously granted by this Commission are discussed.

Ms. St. Pierre notes that trees do affect Course maintenance and play, so replacements are being placed more thoughtfully. The existing greens are not changing. Much of the course is jurisdictional as it is surrounded by water.

There is extensive discussion about the tree in area D near the clubhouse. It is jurisdictional, and the Applicant would like to remove it, though it is healthy, as it is impacting maintenance. No replacement is planned for that exact area, and the Applicant is open to suggestions. The Commission suggests a swale in the area to prevent erosion, and Glode comments that the tree should be replaced somewhat in kind, as water will no longer be taken up by that tree, and the Applicant will see a difference. Vice Chair Hoskins recommends being more aggressive with the removal of nuisance plants and invasives such as Oriental Bittersweet and Japanese Knotweed in that area, and replacing them with natives, to prevent them from coming back.

Additional discussion of the types of replacement trees occurs

- The Commission suggests that replacements should be equivalent in size of root structure and water quality benefits, though this cannot be quantified like caliper can. However, in general, if a 12" caliper tree was removed, it could be replaced by three 4" caliper trees
- Roots will not be totally removed, but stumps will be cut to grade, or ground down to prepare the site for replanting in those cases
- Vegetation, canopy, roots and ground stabilization are discussed
- It is noted that replacement trees, if healthy, will provide more ecosystem services than diseased trees
- Ms. St. Pierre notes that the number of trees planted in mitigation should not have to include replacements for trees that are already dead, and that shrubs will also help with mitigation
- Work is to be done by an arborist

Ms. St. Pierre again notes that the list of removals presented is finalized, but that the Applicant needs flexibility with mitigation. How to achieve this is discussed. Timing is discussed; planting would occur in the spring and/or fall, and the Applicant would not be allowed to proceed with mitigation until the Commission has approved the plans. Tree removal will be allowed to proceed before full mitigation plans are presented. In lieu of an as built plan, photographic documentation or a site visit will be conducted once mitigation vegetation is established.

There is some discussion of engaging a peer reviewer for the mitigation plans. Vice Chair Hoskins understands that the Applicant will be using the CZM guide to coastal plantings, however he finds this resource to be less than ideal. For example, it lists Black Cherry as an option, yet that species does not last more than 30 years, and get diseased immediately; also he considers some species listed to be upland rather than coastal.

Attorney Grover notes that a memorial grove planting program will be implemented.

Brief further discussion of plantings occurs, and the habitat values of trees vs. grass are noted.

Vice Chair Hoskins opens to the public and Joyce Kenney notes that one of the trees may house the Northern Long Eared Bat, an Endangered Species, but they migrate for the winter. Trees may not be cut from April 1-October 15 in Massachusetts, as during that time they are considered habitat. Winter is in fact an ideal time to cut trees.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Campbell, seconded by Sheehan, and passes with all in favor, 5-0.

Glode makes a motion to issue an Order of Conditions with the following Special Conditions:

- *Approval granted for immediate removal of vegetation as described*
- *More aggressive removal is approved for invasive species*
- *Erosion control measures to be maintained throughout construction and until land is stabilized, including straw bales if land will be barren, following Massachusetts handbook requirements*
- *As built plan is waived; photographic documentation being provided in lieu of that*
- *Mitigation:*
 - *Plan with numbers, species and locations to be presented within six months of today's meeting*
 - *Mitigation work cannot proceed until Mitigation Plan is approved by this Commission*
 - *Mitigation work to be completed by end of June 2019*
 - *Monitoring shall occur concurrent with mitigation*
 - *Mitigation to proceed only with Commission approval, but removals may begin immediately*

The motion is seconded by Ricciarelli and passes unanimously 5-0.

4. **132-144 Canal Street Redevelopment—Public Hearing— Notice of Intent for Canal Street Realty LLC, Canal Realty Development LLC, Canal Street Warehouse LLC, and Canal Furniture LLC all of 50 Dodge Street, Beverly, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed redevelopment of the properties located at 132-134 Canal St, 142 R. Canal St and 144 Canal St including razing of the buildings at 134 and 144 Canal St and constructing three new buildings with associated driveways, 240 parking spaces, landscaping, utilities, and drainage systems for**

stormwater runoff within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Applicant requests to continue to the March 8, 2018 meeting.

A motion to continue is made by Sheehan, seconded by Glode and passes 4-0 with Ricciarelli recused.

- 5. 7 Riverbank Road Garage Addition—Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for Alexander Brown, 7 Riverbank Rd, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed construction of addition to an existing single family house, expansion of an existing driveway, and associated site work at 7 Riverbank Rd within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Tony Capachietti with Hayes Engineering represents the Applicant, and describes the 420 square foot footprint garage with associated living area above. The driveway is also being expanded and proposed work is shown. There will be an increase in impervious surface. The site is in the Riverfront Area as well as in the buffer zone to salt marsh and LSCSF. Proposed work is 30' from the river's edge, further away than its closest current disturbance. The existing wood fence will remain; erosion controls will be installed. As the site is within 100' of the river it does not comply with the Local Ordinance, but the footprint of the work will be no closer than the existing facilities.

There is some discussion of the total increase in impervious surface.

Sheehan asks if a pervious surface was considered; it has not been due to maintenance issues. Existing grading will be maintained. Catch basin function is described; a stone trench could be installed adjacent to the driveway and the driveway pitched to provide recharge. Some compensation is necessary as this property is higher than those adjacent. Belgian Block could be placed on top for aesthetics. If water quality and volume are agreed upon, that could be helpful.

Ricciarelli asks about, and Mr. Capachietti outlines, existing and planned pavement; landscape treatment could be specified for the walkway. Elevations and recharge are discussed at length; Glode would be comfortable with an infiltration trench connecting to the catch basin system if volume calculations are provided.

A revised plan will be submitted providing those calculations. Glode recommends using at least a 1% pitch toward the trench, to try to not generate runoff offsite, but keep and it treat onsite before pumping it into the system. Thus a hip before runoff goes offsite should be installed in the grading of the driveway onsite. Trenches on one or both sides are an option. Mr. Capachietti will consult the owner, and perhaps use Belgian Block to break up driveway at the end of the road, and install a slot drain and tie it back.

Calculations, flow and LSCSF are further discussed, along with drip edges. The existing building has a drip edge, and a standard one can be installed around the addition, but one alongside the driveway would need to be engineered. Mr. Capachietti describes his usual setup, which Glode approves of. If sloped appropriately a trench drain may not be needed. All infiltration could be used, instead of connections, which would be ideal but depends on soils. Mr. Capachietti notes that proximity to groundwater must be considered. 1" will capture 90% of the storms we actually see.

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

The Applicant may also need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals; it is uncertain if the Building Inspector has seen these plans, which could lead to changes. The Applicant would like to build as soon as possible, but more information is needed from the Commission. The Applicant will submit revised plans next week, and would like to continue to the next meeting.

A motion to continue is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

6. 9 Winter Island Road Landscaping, Patio Replacement, and Seawall Repair—Public Hearing—Request for Determination of Applicability for Joel Votto, 2 Morgan Dr., Danvers MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed repointing of a seawall, fill and restoration of lawn, removal of tree stumps, replacement of fence, replacement of a patio, and additional landscaping at 9 Winter Island Rd within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Mr. Joel Votto presents, describing his project; the property has been neglected for at least two years. There will be no excavation or work that will be detrimental to the wetland.

He would like to prevent the future need to majorly repair the seawall; cement is starting to come loose and he wants to prevent water from infiltrating. The grade has also gone down behind the seawall and he would like to fill it back in. Green has not yet done a site visit. Mr. Votto thinks water coming over the wall is pooling and changing the grade. The wall is not being undercut. He is not aware of the condition of the seawall on neighboring properties.

He describes his effort to make the house habitable, and would like to do this work as soon as possible. Where the garage sits now, the entrance is off of Winter Island and the driveway is pitched; though not on the plan, he would like to move the driveway and garage doors to the side so there is no slope; with almost two acres, there is enough setback to do this. He has spoken to the Building Department and has their approval. Glode says the main idea is to maintain the footprint of the existing driveway. However, the existing would be dug up and replaced with grass; to move the driveway they would also need to go to the Planning Board for a Flood Hazard Overlay Special Permit. The procedure for changing the driveway and required permits are discussed. Ricciarelli asks about patio blocks; they are being removed. A lot of impervious surface is being removed. Drainage will be provided where there is none right now. No materials will be stockpiled.

Sheehan asks about the backyard level and backfill and Mr. Votto elaborates; there will be no major changes. He thinks the sea wall has been repaired before, having deteriorated; a new cement sea wall was installed, but the area needing repair is original. Whatever material is used to backfill must not erode; Mr. Votto will ensure it doesn't as it will be below the level of the wall.

The changes to the driveway are not being included in this RDA. The Commission feels that an engineer should advise Mr. Votto on more extensive repairs to the seawall, as repointing it may be a cosmetic improvement but not structurally sufficient. Mr. Votto notes that the wall itself is in great condition.

Vice Chair Hoskins opens to public and a neighbor on Columbus Ave. states that he has no comments.

Procedures are outlined so that Mr. Votto is aware of the criteria for coming before this Commission again for additional work.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.

A motion to issue a Negative 2, Negative 3 and Negative 6 Determination is made by Ricciarelli, seconded by Glode, and passes 5-0.

7. Gas Main Replacement Within Sutton Avenue, Columbus Avenue, Beach Avenue, Star Avenue, and Island Avenue—Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for Andrew Shelby of Boston Gas Company d/b/a National Grid, 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed replacement of 3,150 linear feet of gas main along the paved right-of-way within Sutton Ave, Star Ave, Beach Ave, Island Ave and Columbus Ave within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Hannah Raddatz from Coneco Engineers and Scientists presents, summarizing the project. There will be 3,150 linear feet of gas line replacement, but only 284 linear feet will result in an increase in gas main size from 1.5” to 2” diameter, and that is located only within Island Ave. All other replacements will entail a reduction in or maintenance of size. There will be 324 square feet of temporary impact in the 100 foot buffer zone, and the entire project route is within the FEMA flood zone or 100 feet of that. There will be a total temporary impact of 5,464 feet. Utility trenches will be repaved to the existing grade, and there will be no loss in flood storage. The Applicant believes the project is exempt under the Wetlands Protected Act. The trench will be 1 foot wide and approximately 2.5 feet deep.

Straw wattles are proposed as erosion controls, and their locations outlined. Silt socks will be used in the roadway and contractors will actively inspect and maintain all erosion controls. The reason for the increase in size is not known.

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

Ms. Raditz requests relief from the provision of an As Built Plan; National Grid views As-Built as a security issue. Procedures for informing Dig Safe are discussed.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard conditions, waiving the As-Built requirement, is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

8. Old/New Business Cont.

- **Boston Gas Company, Pierce Ave and Waite St, DEP #64-280, Request for Certificate of Compliance.**
- **New England Power Company, S-145/T-146 NEPC Right-of-Way, DEP #64-377, Request for Certificate of Compliance.**
- **Massachusetts Electric Company, 25 Peabody Street, DEP #64-425, Request for Certificate of Compliance.**
- **Boston Gas Company, Pierce Ave and Waite St, DEP #64-443, Request for Certificate of Compliance.**

Lindsey Carle, Coneco Engineering, is requesting all four Certificates.
DEP 64-280, Boston Gas Co.

This was the Beverly Harbor erosion control project. Tracy Duarte, Professional Engineer has certified that work was completed as proposed. Photos are presented for this and the other projects. Work was done in 1998 and there are no current signs of erosion. All are old Orders being closed out.

DEP 64-377, New England Power Co. Right of Way

The project is described. Tracy Duarte has again certified that work was completed as proposed. Photos are also provided. Green did not visit the sites. This one was from 2004. Green notes that ~75-80% of Conservation Commission files have open Orders of Conditions, lacking a Certificate of Compliance.

DEP 64-425, MA Electric Co.

Tracy Duarte, Conico Engineer, has certified that work was completed as proposed.

A motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance for each of the three above projects is made by Sheehan, seconded by Glode, and passes 5-0.

DEP 64-443, Boston Gas Company

This project is different. Boston Gas Co. was previously Keyspan, and the property, which was to be a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility, was never built. The Order of Conditions was recorded at the Registry of Deeds in 2007, so an Invalid Order of Conditions must be issued to remove it from the deed.

A motion to issue an invalid Order of Conditions for DEP File Number 64-443 is made by Sheehan, seconded by, Glode, and passes 5-0.

- **Discussion of adoption of land use regulations of lands under the control of the Conservation Commission.**

The need for this discussion has become obvious as there was a request for permission to set traps for various wildlife in the Forest River Conservation Area. While the Commission is allowed to regulate trapping on its land, no such regulations – or regulations of any type – exist for Conservation Commission land in Salem, though there is a sign posted outlining allowed and prohibited activities. Green notes that Northampton's regulations are a good example, but the Commissioners have not yet reviewed them. In the meantime, she has declined the individual's request because the signage at the FRCA states it is not allowed, but informed him that the issue would be on the agenda for discussion.

Discussion of the request ensues. The purpose and type of trapping were unspecified, but the individual is licensed by MassWildlife and is a Problem Animal Control (PAC) agent. He would like to trap raccoons, skunks, possum, muskrats and coyotes for management and to determine their status as furbearers. Wildlife issues on Conservation Commission land are discussed

This item is tabled for Green to do further research.

- **Forest River Conservation Area Trail Upgrades, DEP #64-625, Request for Certificate of Compliance.**

Tom Devine presents, describing the work that was complete. It is phase one of recommendations made in a 2016 assessment, and included the main trail to Volunteers Bridge, a distance of 1/3 mile. A footbridge was replaced, bank stabilization done, and drainage issues addressed. Trails are now stable and passable even in wet times. Handicapped spaces in the parking lot were marked and trail signs refreshed. The Certificate of Compliance is being requested on behalf of the Conservation Commission.

A motion to issue the Certificate of Compliance is made by Sheehan, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.

- **Discussion on potential proposal for 2018 Massachusetts Recreational Trails Program Grant.**

Tom Devine provides background information for this request. This was the grant program that funded the first

phase of improvements for the trail. He is looking to apply for another grant for the next phase and is considering replacement of Volunteers Bridge. He describes the condition of the trail, particularly the bridge. This project would benefit the entire swath of Marblehead and Salem conservation land. The total cost of replacing the bridge would be \$200,000-\$300,000.

Funding for this project could come from the grant program listed above, Community Preservation Act (CPA) funding, and Capital Improvement Project (CIP) funds, but Devine is also requesting that the Conservation Commission make a contribution to the project, preferably committing to cover about 10% of its cost. Devine feels very strongly that this is an important project to connect both sides of the trail system. If the Commission also feels that way, it should weigh in on whether this project is a priority, as there is competition for all potential funding sources.

Trails would be upgraded to meet ADA requirements, but these are different for off road trail accessibility. Ricciarelli asks if the boardwalk/bridge in question could be made more direct, which would make upgrades more economical. The possibility of realignment is discussed. This bridge and the one under it were built by volunteers. The hope is to have the next one be durable, easily maintained, and last longer. This Commission is willing to support the project and appear before City Council and CPA to request funding if necessary.

Procedures are discussed. A feasibility study is desired and the Commission would like more information on the current condition of the bridge. Options and other projects are further discussed. How to proceed is discussed at length as are the chances of actually being awarded the grant for this project. The Commissioners debate earmarking some of the \$25,000 they will commit to the feasibility study before allowing any other assessments to go forward, but ultimately decide to just allocate the funding.

Devine would like a letter outlining the Conservation Commission's commitment to submit with the grant application, which is due next Thursday.

A motion to file the Grant Application and match that funding, if awarded, with \$25,000 from Conservation Commission funding, is made by Sheehan, seconded by Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.

- **Discussion on potential volunteer project with Salem State University's Center for Civic Engagement at Forest River Conservation Area.**

Tom Devine describes the event that occurs every September. Salem State University conducts a Service Day, where last year 20-30 freshman under Councilor Dibble pruned the trails and marked new blazes for the yellow and blue trails. As of yet there is no set date for 2018, but Councilor Dibble is coordinating another day of work and is also interested in creating a new trail, which is described and would help provide access for seniors in an adjacent complex. However, Vice Chair Hoskins notes that the "new" trail described is actually an existing, overgrown trail that must be re-cleared. Councilor Dibble would also like to place 3-4 granite benches along the route. An RDA will be submitted if enough volunteers sign up and if this Commission approves. Work should only take 1-2 days. Tom Devine notes that for the last Service Day the Commission provided equipment. Supplies are being requested again this time; funding can be requested with the RDA at the next meeting. Salem State University provided lunch last time as well.

- **Meeting minutes—November 16, 2017 and December 13, 2017.**

Tabled until the next meeting.

A motion to adjourn is made by Ricciarelli, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0 with all in favor.

The meeting ends at 9:36PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb
Clerk, Salem Conservation Commission

Approved by the Conservation Commission on May 10, 2018.