

**Salem Conservation Commission  
Minutes of Meeting**

**Date and Time:** Thursday, July 12, 2018, 6:30 p.m.  
**Meeting Location:** Large Conference Room, City Hall Annex, 98 Washington Street  
**Members Present:** Chair Gregory St. Louis, Tyler Glode, Tom Campbell, Dan Ricciarelli, Bart Hoskins (arrived at 6:52 pm) (5)  
**Members Absent:** Gail Kubik Scott Sheehan (2)  
**Others Present:** Ashley Green, Conservation Agent  
**Recorder:** Stacy Kilb

Chair Gregory St. Louis calls the meeting to order at 6:30PM.

**Old/New Business**

- **Discussion of the Forest River Conservation Area with Councillor Dibble.**

Councillor Dibble discusses the trail system. Residents of Pickman Park would like to change the trails a bit, so they can access them from their property.

Currently there are two blaze colors, and a third is proposed from Eagle Hill to Intervale Rd., connecting to Swampscott Cemetery and the Vinnin Square clubhouse, which the Conservation Land abuts. This would allow people to hike through.

Chair St. Louis asks if the recent study of proposed improvements to Forest River has been seen by Dibble; this was completed recently, and the Chair wonders if it highlighted these as possible trails. The map presented by Councillor Dibble was a result of that study. 1500 residents are interested; many are seniors and have volunteered. There is no trail going to Vinnin Square currently. The trail to Pickman Park condos does exist but must be improved and widened.

About 50 volunteers could clear the trail in question in a day or day in a half; no trees would be removed. No funding is being requested, just permission to do the work. The entire area is subject to Conservation Commission jurisdiction. No bridges are necessary as the wetlands are in the middle and the path would be around it. Tom Devine, Councillor Dibble and Barbara Warren of Salem Sound Coastwatch walked the property and there were no wet soils outside of the wetlands. Glode mentions trails planned to be closed off due to the railroad crossings and this is discussed.

Bart Hoskins arrives at 6:52PM.

An RDA for trails by the Commission is being sought; Councillor Dibble does not want to be the one to submit the RDA, as he just wants to volunteer. Agent Green can draft an RDA.

Julia Knisel of Becket St. asks if when walking proposed trails, any critical nesting areas that would be in jeopardy were noticed; none were found where they were, only to the South near the Swampscott border.

Barbara Warren of Salem Sound Coastwatch at 12 Federal St., and resident at 4 Hardy St., notes that there is thick cat briar. The main existing trail parallels the railroad tracks but is 30' or so away and is higher. The link would stem from that section. The trail goes into Swampscott but they won't do work on Swampscott land.

Barbara Warren comments that the condo associations want this, but asks if the managers of the swimming pool parking lot would allow hikers to cross. They would exit next to clubhouse on a private road that the public can drive across. The trail cannot dead-end into someone's property who has not given permission.

Chair St. Louis notes that an agreement with the association is desirable. Councillor Dibble describes the route of the loop. Barbara Warren comments that the open space master plan documented properties that abut town and conservation land that might be important for purchase, about 5 years ago, so she suggests looking there. It includes private and public properties that should be considered. That document is online.

**1. Collins Cove Living Shoreline (DEP #64-651)—Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for the City of Salem, 93 Washington St, Salem MA. Purpose of hearing is to discuss proposed Ecological Restoration Project to restore approximately three-fourths acre of salt marsh along an 800-linear foot section of Collins Cove Beach (96 Webb St. and 50-Rear Webb St.) within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Presenting for the City of Salem are Dwight Dunk, of Epsilon and Seth Wilkinson of Wilkinson Ecological Design. Mr. Dunk briefly describes the project. Resource areas are described. Salt marsh patches are all above mean high and mean high high water, but below the wrack line (the line of debris left by the most recent high tide). The project will provide shoreline stabilization via salt marsh restoration. Stones moved by erosion and storms would be consolidated in the stone sill; landward of that would be a coconut fiber coir to keep the sand in place. The area will be planted and a biodegradable geotextile placed on top to stabilize the soil; temporary irrigation will be installed. Snow fence will be temporarily placed on the landward and seaward sides (landward to exclude people while the salt marsh stabilizes, seaward to keep out wrack and debris).

A cross section is provided and described. The marsh is proposed up to the current wrack line, a bit high but this will accommodate sea level rise as the beach migrates landward. This is presented as an ecological restoration, limited project. All standards were reviewed and in general, the purpose is to allow work in resource areas to restore ecological resource areas, and this project will improve the ability of the area to enhance the protection and interests of the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA). Fisheries and wildlife habitat provided by the salt marsh will be improved, as will storm damage prevention via shore line stabilization. No adverse impact will be had on any other aspects of the Act.

This was noticed in the Environmental Monitor prior to tonight's meeting; copies of the Notice of Intent (NOI) were provided to The Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) and Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program.

Chair St. Louis asks about a manhole; it is a South Essex Sewerage District (SESD) Sewer Intercept, which will be left in place and can be accessed as needed. The Chair comments that SESD is analyzing its system re sea level, but Agent Green replies that SESD doesn't have any work on this line in the works and that the City will work with them regarding their easement in that area.

Chair St. Louis asks about the cross-section steepness and Mr. Wilkinson describes; the slope will mimic existing conditions but will increase elevation, so contours will be the same but with additional elevation, which is probably the most important aspect of salt marshes. Coconut fiber rolls are described. Depth of fill will go from no fill to 12-16" of fill at the coconut fiber roll. Existing salt marsh patches will be retained. Mr. Wilkinson notes that existing salt marsh will be overtopped with some sand, as this has been studied and 2-4" of covering is tolerable by all salt marshes, so that amount of covering will be installed. The DMF has done thin layer depositional restoration projects, which new to this area but have been proven successful farther south.

Campbell asks about maintenance and this is outlined; there will be monitoring of the area and removal of invasive species twice a year for the first three years, then annually thereafter. Invasives would be removed by hand if necessary. A small patch of phragmites would have seed heads cut to prevent its spread. Chair St. Louis asks if this was vegetated historically or was rocky intertidal. All of Collins Cove once had a fringing salt marsh.

Hoskins asks about irrigation and Mr. Wilkinson describes. Watering is more important for the high marsh areas, as these are inundated less frequently than the low areas. Full colonization occurs within 2-3 years and after that, irrigation is not necessary. Some neighbors have offered to help with irrigation. Irrigation would be seasonal and both that equipment and fencing would be removed in the winter. Watering  $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 1" twice a week would be sufficient. The substrate is sand, so Hoskins asks how water will be retained; Mr. Wilkinson mentions that desiccation during the heat of summer will be addressed by the biodegradable erosion control blanket, which will last those first 2 years. Large scale soil amendments are avoided but some organic products are used, including a yucca derived soil amendment can be used to form a biodegradable gel around plant roots. This is inoculated with beneficial mycorrhizal fungi as well. There is also a blanket underneath the sediment that will help retain the sandy soil. They hope to complete the project in the spring of 2019.

Barbara Warren of Salem Sound Coastwatch notes that the City has applied for a grant but has not yet heard back. Other required permits have also been submitted but it will take time to complete those processes, especially Chapter 91. Chair St. Louis asks about winter seasonal high tides and ice development on the high marsh; will the plants be able to handle that? In fall, after plants are dormant, a contractor should weed whack them to cut off above ground growth to avoid ice forming on the exposed plants, which can be pulled out if roots are not yet well established (such "ice jacking" can be avoided this way).

Chair St. Louis opens to the public. Residents' main concerns center on providing habitat for greenhead flies and the limitation of their access to the beach. They are used to being able to access the beach directly from their homes and do not appreciate losing access seasonally for three seasons, having to travel 400' or more to either end of the restoration, where there will be a gap. Several of them indicate that local residents will probably tear down any fencing meant to protect the area as it is being stabilized.

Orrey Mansy 56 Webb St. Salem, is against the project, feels that it is not needed and stone aggregate would be a better solution. He is concerned about the changes to vegetation and ecology of Collins Cove, insects and restriction on the use of the land.

Chair St. Louis asks if when SESD installed the sewer line if they were conditioned to maintain anything. This is unknown. The Applicant notes that an existing area breaks through the rocks that is used for kayak launching, which will be maintained, with no grass being planted there. Upland grass is there now, and that cannot tolerate salt spray, which is why it was lost, so the grasses proposed are salt tolerant. He reiterates that the snow fence will not be permanent, and will be in place only during growing period so that the plants can get established.

Regarding mosquito control, salt marshes are not breeding habitat as they prefer salt pannes. Soil is pervious with no depressions designed so no open water is expected to pool. With regards to greenheads, New England Mosquito Control has a fact sheet on greenheads. These breed on vegetation at high tide line and can fly more than a mile for feeding, and there are salt marshes within less than a mile of this site. Thus, there is the potential for them to already be in this area, yet they are not. The reason for their absence is uncertain, but it is unlikely that they will start breeding and inhabiting this particular area if more desirable habitat is nearby.

Campbell asks about access; the kayak area will be kept open, and snow fence will only be installed during the growing period; once established, snow fencing will go away. Campbell asks why the snow fence on the seaward side with the rock wall is needed. Mr. Wilkinson comments that, in larger tides, flotsam and jetsam get deposited, acting as mulch and smothering young plants, so the snow fence would prevent that. The Applicant can actually use either construction or snow fencing, as the Commission prefers. Wood and wire fencing, typical dune protection, seasonal, is proposed. It is reiterated that it will be removed during winter and after establishment, which could be as short as 2 years.

Kay Vernatter of 71 Webb St. asks if funding is available to restore the plantings if it gets eroded during storms. Mr. Dunk replies that the sand will be encapsulated to prevent it from washing away, and coir rolls will not allow sand to pass through and wash away, whereas rocks do allow this. The project will be monitored twice yearly for the first three years, and remedial action taken if necessary. Two to three seasons will allow growth and establishment. Ms. Vernatter is also concerned about greenheads and Mr. Dunk reiterates his assertion that adding salt marsh in this location will not draw them in, away from whatever desirable habitat they are currently living in, that would be within a mile of this one. He also notes that an ecological restoration project provides habitat for all wildlife, and greenheads are part of the ecosystem.

Chair St. Louis asks if there is a warranty on plantings; Mr. Dunk notes there usually is but would need to discuss this with the City. Typically it is for one year, sometimes two. Agent Green comments that this is proposed as a volunteer project, so will probably not come with a warranty, but financially it will still make sense for the City to do it. Even if three times as many plants as installed are lost, it would still be cheaper for volunteers to replant.

Nancy May of 99 Washington St. concerned about the beach; this will remain.

Rick Vegas of 106 Essex St., who picks up trash and debris that come in with the tide in this area, asks if the marsh will capture that material, and how can it be cleaned. Once established, it will be a natural salt marsh, and the incoming material will be the same. At that point, he would be walking through salt marsh instead of the beach to clean out trash. In the meantime, snow fencing will capture detritus during the growing season. Barbara Warren notes that SSCW will help the City with the planting, under guidance from an ecological restoration specialist, and monitoring and replanting will occur if needed, so if there is a problem, they can address it.

She describes the Commercial St. rain gardens. SSCW will also be monitoring for invasives and promptly removing them, as well as cutting seed heads of the phragmites. An adaptive management plan will be used.

Amy Vandorn of 1 Essex St. asks about similar projects done within the past 5 years that the public could visit. Mr. Dunk lists the Neponsett River in Dorchester, and the Pope John Paul II Park near the Keystone Apartments. The park near there was a City landfill and the Neponsett Drive In movie theater. There were two acres of restoration along several thousand feet, with no irrigation. Tidal forces were similar. The River also had flows that the Cove does not have. This project was installed 18 years ago. The public agency there did not control phragmites but other useful plants have colonized as well.

The Neponsett River project was the same scope as the one proposed here, and is three years in.

Ms. Vandorn asks about funding for the project. Funding for construction is being provided via a grant, with the City paying 25% and the State 75%; the Conservation Commission would pay for some maintenance, and would seek other sources if necessary. They have also applied for an Army Corps grant for additional monitoring and maintenance, and this could be matched by the State as it is Federal funding. Julia Knisel of Beckett St., who works for Coastal Zone Management (CZM) notes that she has helped the City apply for Army Corps funding over a 5 year window to buy plants and fund SSCW staff time to help with monitoring. Applications are being reviewed by Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff, who should reply in about six weeks.

Jenny Spanberg of 1 Essex St. asks about disruption to the neighborhood. Mr. Wilkinson describes work as following the tidal cycle. Work should take 2-3 weeks, using two small machines, with planting done by hand.

Mr. Vegas asks about the walkway. The Salem Dept. of Public Works (DPW) has done spotty restoration, but this project will not touch that, as the limit of work stops before the path. The status of the DPW path project is

unknown.

Jessica Herbert of 70 Webb St. asks if snow fencing will be along the walkway. Seasonal snow fencing will be installed along the walkway after plantings are done, to be removed in the fall and replaced in the spring. Barbara Warren comments that neighbors may be able to use water from the hydrant for the season to water the plants, if a connection can be made. Grass is planned to come up to the path edge, with no rock border. Ms. Herbert asks if dog walkers and other pedestrians coming into the restricted area will be a problem; it would be. Ms. Herbert thinks this project may be eligible for CPA funding, and Agent Green can look into it. Hoskins is not sure, but notes that it could be a park restoration. Ms. Hebert is concerned about erosion from the crumbling path going into the new planting area.

Kay Vernatter asks about grass going to the sidewalk, regarding winter maintenance, noting that the City must be careful during snow removal to protect its investment.

A letter from the DMF is read into the record; this is a beneficial project to enhance shoreline protection while maintaining habitat, and the Agency has no concerns.

Other correspondence received made points that have already been discussed.

Mike Bucco, Webb St. resident, is concerned about residents losing access to the water in all but one area for three seasons. He asks if other alternatives have been considered. The Mass Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) filing included the options of taking no action, this project as proposed, and adding stone. Alternatives were provided in the NOI. The purpose of project is to provide a living shoreline to stabilize soils. To that end, if no action is taken, erosion would continue, so that option was not selected. Adding stone is not permissible by state agencies, so the living shoreline project was chosen.

Lengthy discussion ensues regarding residents' access to the water. There is a break in the rocks where many kayaks put in. Residents would like additional access points, however, this defeats the purpose of the project. A fragmented salt marsh is very susceptible to erosion, and the project would not be effective in the long term. After the grass has established, residents can cross wherever they wish. To obtain the grant, Applicants must demonstrate that the shoreline will be successful and self sustaining.

Chair St. Louis provides personal perspective, as he lives along a steep gradient of salt marsh. He opines that grasses will take once a week or once a month abuse, but group traffic needs a dedicated area to pass through if it will be more intense.

Julia Knisel asks for clarification on the position of fencing. One path through the rock sill will be maintained, and nothing will restrict people from getting to sandy beach. Other areas will be wide open and are outlined. Glode asks about the linear footage from the path to the restoration; the entire length is 800 linear feet.

Donna Bupo of 72 Webb St. is also concerned about access to the water and greenhead flies, and feels that the project does not take needs of residents into consideration. Mr. Dunk reiterates that long term access will be provided. Ms. Bupo feels that residents will ignore the fencing and trample the grass.

Bob Seaman of 73 Webb St. also concerned about greenheads and access to the water.

Chair St. Louis acknowledges that an 800' walk is not acceptable to residents, and asks about a stone walkway or some alternative path. Ms. Bupo describes another current natural break in the rocks. Julia Knisel asks her what a reasonable distance would be, to access the water, but Ms. Bupo declines to answer the question, instead reiterating her objections to the project.

Chair St. Louis notes that additional access in the area of the SESD manhole cover would be approximately halfway, so residents would not need to walk more than 400' and this break would double as access to the manhole. He wonders if some sort of stabilized path would be feasible. Mr. Wilkinson reiterates that, from a design standpoint, additional breaks are vectors for degradation. There will not be as much vegetation at any stabilized access point.

Glode notes that, realistically, the manhole will need to be accessed within the 2-3 year growing period, so this is the best choice. Bart Hoskins notes it is important to consider purpose of project: asphalt, the beach and the grass are all eroding due to the high tide. Control options are very limited, and there are questions of legality and feasibility. A living shoreline is coastal flood protection, and this project does not represent a malicious closure to residents, so while some accommodations can be made, and appealing to them is important, he feels the greenhead fly issue is overblown. Juniper Cove has extensive salt marshes but no one is bothered by greenheads, as is the case in the Forest River as well. If greenheads are not currently in that biome, it is unrealistic for them to expand into it, notes Glode. Shoreline protection is far more aesthetically pleasing than asphalt washing down beach, though access is still important. This project is a positive move for the future of even having a shoreline.

Hoskins asks about rock line and flora; this is not good greenhead larva habitat as water will infiltrate into the sand, which will stay in place as the water flows out, so no standing water will remain after the tide goes out. Species at each tide level are discussed.

Mr. Wilkinson notes that he has never seen an increase in greenheads in two decades of work in this field. He does not like them and does not see this as a greenhead habitat restoration project, but it is an ecological restoration project. He understands concern but there is no evidence, either hard or anecdotal, that this will happen.

Ms. Herbert notes that there are sand flies in the wrack line and asks how a pathway cut in the center would affect the project. The Chair notes that a break in seawall reduces the effectiveness of other portions of seawall, and this is the same. The possibility of areas to put such a path are discussed.

A potential condition is suggested. The City could work with the neighborhood to determine if a center break compromises the integrity of the project. Grant timelines are discussed. The grant for design has ended, and the City would have to apply for another phase of design funding if the project does not move forward as planned. Mr. Dunk comments that one option would be to condition that this issue be addressed and any plan changes be submitted to the Commission. If no changes are made, a reason for the lack of change can be submitted. This would give the Commission time to read the assessment, notes Glode. Barbara Warren is hesitant as additional funding has already been applied for, and submissions to the Army Corps and Chapter 91 under this plan as designed are in play already. Mr. Dunk notes that during the construction process, there may be field changes during that phase, the Order of Conditions and funding issues can be addressed via field changes that can be put on a drawing for contractor to follow, then submitted to the agencies involved as a minor plan change. This can be conditioned in the Order, that the Applicant would come back to the Commission upon evaluation.

Hoskins summarizes for the public: This Commission only has jurisdiction over aspects of projects pertaining to the Wetlands Protection Act. Public access is not jurisdictional, but since the Commission wants to see the project succeed, it is willing to consider incorporating some public comments. However, the design is already complete, so the suggestion is that, when the construction phase is close, the Applicant can make a minor modification without going through the whole permit process again. Thus, the Commission would condition that there must be a moment when a field change would be considered to create an additional public access point. Glode asks if the project is still under review. It is, and incoming comments could potentially affect its design. Those changes would have to come before Commission, but the project meets performance standards

as set forth in the WPA and Chapter 91, so design changes are unlikely.

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

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard and the following special conditions is made by Ricciarelli, seconded by Glode, and passes 5-0.

Special conditions as discussed: Applicant shall review mid break public access with neighborhood groups and SSCW pre-construction to determine the feasibility of project with said added public amenity.

- 2. 132-144 Canal Street Redevelopment (DEP #64-644)—Continuation of 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.**

Dan Ricciarelli recuses himself from this item.

Greg Hochmuth of Williams & Sparages and Steve Feinstein of Symes Associates present.

Existing site conditions are shown, and the area is mostly paved or built, with a fringe of vegetation along the rail. Three buildings and several outbuildings will be demolished and replaced, not in the same footprint. A demolition plan is shown. This is Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage (LSCSF.) A Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) file number was received and the DEP had no comments.

A grading and drainage plan is shown and there are 15,000 fewer feet of impervious surface, and the project will have an active stormwater management system. Drainage calculations prove there will be no increase to offsite drainage. Drainage is described. Access to the rail trail in two locations will be added. A bike rental location will be provided. Benches and green space are described.

A landscape plan is shown. Native species have been incorporated into the plan. More than 70 shade trees will be installed along with groundcover and shrubs. Drainage details are shown. Subsurface infiltration units are shown; soils are well draining. Sewer lines are shown. The Planning Board has approved this project, which has been peer reviewed. Changes that occurred during the Planning Board process are discussed. Steve Feinstein notes that they are working directly with the Engineering Dept. regarding utility cutoffs, etc. because of the urgency of paving on Canal Street.

Glode asks about the proximity of the sewer line to the infiltration system. This is about 6'; Glode opines that they need 10' for Title V. Structures and requirements are discussed. Chair St. Louis asks about offsite improvements along the rail trail. This is further described. An easement will be provided to the City through both those spots, which will be maintained by the City. This is the preferred location for a South Salem Commuter Rail station, which would also be accessed through this site. Pavement on the park side was a City requirement to get emergency vehicles to the rail trail. Mr. Feinstein notes that they are seeking an easement from the MBTA for parking. The Applicant has donated the rail spur to the City for use as a rail trail connection, and is also seeing an easement where their parking encroaches onto MBTA land. The City and AECOM will build the trail and landscape next to it. That area will be grass and wildflowers.

The Chair asks where the South River culvert is; it is not on this project property. They are not connecting to

the drainage system in the rail, but to the one in Canal St.

Chair St. Louis notes that when the Planning Board engages a peer reviewer, he does not peer review, otherwise there is overlap. He will read through the project, and if supplemental peer review letters are available, he asks that they please be provided to the Agent and himself. Chair St. Louis will issue comments prior to the next hearing. There are not any performance standards for LSCSF. The Chair will forward comments to the Applicant and the Agent.

Site changes are described. Environmental testing has been done; there are groundwater issues coming from contamination offsite. A Release Abatement Measure (RAM) plan is in place, and a vapor barrier on the new building on the south end of the site is proposed. There is no Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) on the site. The source of the groundwater contamination is unknown. Trichloroethylene (TCE) *may* be the contaminant, but the Applicant is unsure and can send an environmental report to the Commission. Existing buildings would not have to be modified. Outgoing dirt will require testing, but they are not planning to move any offsite. Vapor is the issue, as it comes up from groundwater. There is a question as to whether the infiltration areas in the plume of contamination is a problem. GZA Engineering had no concerns/issues regarding this. The concern would be not expanding the plume. Low points on the site are described.

Flood insurance is on two buildings below 10'. Topography is an issue; retaining walls will be used to create walkways. It is reiterated that soils are sandy so water will drain fast. The Applicant will provide an environmental report to the Commission.

Chair St. Louis will contact them if he has a question for the LSP.

Chair St. Louis opens to the public, but there are no comments.

*A motion to continue to the August 9, 2018 meeting is made by Hoskins, seconded by Campbell, and passes 4-0 with Ricciarelli recused.*

- 3. 116-118 Leach Street (DEP #64-650)—Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for 116/118 Leach Street Condo Association, 116-118 Leach St, Salem MA. Purpose of hearing is to discuss proposed construction of a new 100-ft long soldier pile bulkhead adjacent to existing bulkhead at 116-118 Leach St within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Applicant has requested a continuance to the next meeting.

*A motion to continue to the August 9, 2018 meeting is made by Hoskins, seconded by Glode, and passes 4 -0 with Dan Ricciarelli not yet back in the room.*

- 4. 1 Jefferson Avenue (DEP #64-653)—Public Hearing—Notice of Intent for 1 Jefferson LLC, 1 Jefferson Ave, Salem, MA. Purpose of hearing is to discuss proposed demolition of a portion of existing building, construction of 7,553 sq ft addition to rear of existing building, associated utility work and stormwater improvements at 1 Jefferson Ave within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Presenting for the Applicant is John Bobreck of Bobreck Engineering. He describes the project. Todd Waller, building owner, is also present.

The existing structure will be rehabilitated, after demolishing and reconstructing the rear portion of the structure. The entire site is in the FEMA flood zone, flood elevation of 10 and average grade is 7.5-8. This is



LSCSF. The proposed addition is described as a garage with mezzanine level. The addition will have flood vents along the perimeter. A stormwater management system will mitigate runoff even though they do not have to meet performance standards. The site is half paved, half gravel currently. They are proposing to fully pave the site with four catch basins installed, plus one contact unit prior to discharge. Currently there is no stormwater management and all flow pitches toward the police station.

The rear driveway is not shared with the police station. A fence will be installed. The police station is lower. Water will be directed through grading to the catch basins; curbing is not proposed around the area. The site is 21E clean. Soil grades are described. This is not under Chapter 91 jurisdiction.

Glode clarifies grading. There is no green space onsite now, but some small green spaces will be added in front and in back as snow storage. The project already went through the Board of Appeals. The project will also undergo Site Plan Review through the Planning Board. This site will be for contractor use, and no cars will be stored.

Chair St. Louis asks if there will be automotive use; it is allowed, but probably not. A gate valve on the drainage system has been required so if there is a spill, it is isolated. Annual catch basin cleanings are part of the Operations & Maintenance (O & M) plan along with inspecting the infiltrators, etc. Infiltrators are described. There is no existing drainage onsite.

Chair St. Louis has the following comments:

- Have watertight sewer manhole if in floodplain; they will be using existing sewerage, only tying into fire and domestic
- Drainage system – rear 2 catch basins may be in series, but additional manhole should be added for numbers 3 and 4 to break up run
- Inspection ports or end manholes/cleanouts should be installed (will be done by manufacturer)
- Addition of shutoff valve before CDS unit

Just a deep sump catch basin is proposed. The CDS unit is 2015-4. No soil will be removed or added, just moved. A backflow valve is discussed.

There are no public comments.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Hoskins, seconded by Campbell, and passes 4-0 with Ricciarelli recused.*

*A motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard and the following special conditions is made by Hoskins, seconded by Campbell, and passes 4-0 with Dan Ricciarelli recused.*

*Special conditions as discussed:*

1. The rear two catch basins (CB-1 and CB-2) can be in series, but additional manholes shall be added at CB-3 and CB-4.
2. Inspection ports or end manholes in the infiltration system shall be end cleanouts.
3. There shall be an addition of a shutoff valve before the Continuous Deflective Separation (CDS) unit.

**Old/New Business Cont.**

- **Ratify Enforcement Order issued for 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Ferris Junk Yard).**

A motion was made and passed at the last meeting; this is just to ratify the Order. The violator has submitted a

stabilization plan to address the violation. Chair St. Louis will review and give any comments to the Agent.

- **Meeting minutes—March 8, 2018 and April 12, 2018.**

*A motion to approve both sets of minutes is made by Hoskins, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to adjourn is made by Ricciarelli, seconded by Campbell, and passes 5-0.*

The meeting ends at 9:35PM.

*Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-2028 through 2-2033.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Stacy Kilb  
Clerk, Salem Conservation Commission