



# CITY OF SALEM CONSERVATION COMMISSION

---

## NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Salem Conservation Commission will be held on March, 21, 2023, at 6:30 p.m. via remote participation in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Act of 2022.

Gregory St. Louis, PE, Chair

## MEETING MINUTES

**Greg St. Louis opens the meeting at 6:45 pm.**

### I. ROLL CALL

*In attendance:* Greg St. Louis, Judith Kohn, Bart Hoskins, Tyler Glode, Dan Ricciarelli (4)

*Absent:* Tom Campbell (1)

*Commission Staff:* Kate Kennedy (1)

*Minute Clerk:* Chelsea Titchenell (1)

### II. REGULAR AGENDA

#### NOIS

- A. 50, 52 Circle Hill Road – DEP# 64-764, DEP# 64-765** – Public Hearing – Two Notices of Intent of Patrick Delulis, Pasquanna Developers, Inc. for proposed construction of two single-family homes, associated driveways, utilities, grading, and landscaping located at 50 and 52 Circle Hill Road, subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

*A motion to continue the public hearing to April 18, 2023, is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Dan Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.*

- B. 57 Memorial Drive – DEP# 64-771** – Public Hearing – Notice of Intent of Scott Patrowicz, Land

Development Engineering, on behalf Justin Mattera, 57 Memorial Drive, Salem, MA, location for the proposed construction of a fixed pier, landing, loading area, seasonal gangway and floating dock, steps and site work, within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

*A motion to continue the public hearing to April 18, 2023, is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.*

- C. 67 Derby Street - Salem Wind Port Terminal – DEP# 64-772** - Public Hearing - Notice of Intent of Crowley Wind Services at 67 Derby Street, for the construction of an offshore wind marshalling facility to assemble and deploy turbine components. The work includes construction of a Loadout Wharf and a Delivery Pier Trestle: filling and stabilization of the upland; installation of utilities; and dredging. The project is located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

*A motion to continue the public hearing to April 18, 2023, is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.*

- D. 107 Leach Street – DEP#64-774** - Public Hearing - Notice of Intent for NorthShore Property LLC, for proposed repairs to an existing seawall, fixed pier, new seasonal gangway, seasonal floating dock and site work, located at 107 Leach Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Scott Patrowicz, representing NorthShore Property LLC, shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Looking to put in new gangway and floating dock.
- DEP file number is #64-7044.
- MassDEP and MA DMF both had no comments.
- Site on Leach Street
- Bulge in seawall is present and there are four rotting piles.
- Plan to demolish existing garage and install asphalt to replace it.
- Whole neighborhood under the AE zone
- Eel grass is at least 400 feet away from the pier area, but it is in a shellfish zone
- Construction access through driveway area
- New piles being placed next to the existing piles
- Cross section 1 will require concrete stone wall where seawall bulge is and a proper backfill
- Fixed pier will have timbers removed, with the adding of new piles
- Four new piles will be added in
- Meets DMF requirements for keeping above the mudline with the float

Judith Kohn: Has the Harbor Master weighed in on this project?

- Scott Patrowicz: It isn't an area people can navigate through, but I don't know if he has weighed

in on it at this time.

- Kate Kennedy: The Harbor Master has not supplied any comment since the application. I have not visited this site yet, but this might be a good one to take a closer look at. I know the seawall for that area is pretty jeopardized right now.

Judith Kohn: Is there a plan to have boats tied up there that could sit on the mudflat at low tide? What is the plan for the boat access there?

- Scott Patrowicz: In hightide a boat can come out and be floating, but the idea is to not let it bottom out. There are too many rocks that would cause damage there. The intention is if there is a kayak to bring it on the season dock. During the winter the dock and gangway get hauled away to a storage area, like other season docks there are. The idea though is to not have boats bottom out.
- Judith Kohn: Is that something we can include in the Order to make sure boats aren't tied there in low tide? And the float being taken out during the winter?
- Greg St. Louis: Yes.

Greg St. Louis: It looks like the asphalt must drain over the top of the seawall currently?

- Scott Patrowicz: Yes.
- Dan Ricciarelli: There is a small outfall on the wall, does that come from the roof?
- Scott Patrowicz: Yes.

Dan Ricciarelli: Is this asphalt his plan for his parking?

- Scott Patrowicz: I am not sure at this point in time.
- Susan St. Pierre, on behalf of the applicant: I think right now it is a parking garage. Potentially the owners may want to put parking there if that is acceptable to the Conservation Commission.
- Scott Patrowicz: The idea for this is also to meet the existing grades and not change that.

Judith Kohn: Where does the boat launch from?

- Scott Patrowicz: A kayak or something can be brought down the gangway on to the float. The owner might have the boat in something like Palmer Cove Marina and come over and then take off for the day.

Greg St. Louis: Is there a concrete slab under the garage, or is there any other footing?

- Scott Patrowicz: It would be asphalt or concrete. Cars park on it now. It is likely not dirt, and if it is it is very impacted.
- Dan Ricciarelli: Let us just assume the foundation will remain if there is one. It is helping the seawall.
- Scott Patrowicz: If the foundation is at equal level with the asphalt, that would work out just fine. We are not intending to change any of the grades.
- Greg St. Louis: But if there is a sill, you might have to saw cut the sill for the flow.
- Scott Patrowicz: If there is a sill it would almost be a seawall cap at that point.

Greg St. Louis: Is there any opportunity for landscaping here?

- Susan St. Pierre: I don't know, because we don't know what is under it. There might be an opportunity to do a strip of landscaping.
- Scott Patrowicz: I don't want to add extra drainage behind our wall, so it would be better that drainage continues the same pattern it is doing now.

Public Comment:

Bill McHugh, Salem Harbor Master: I applaud the applicant for indicating that the gangway and float will be removed for the season. My concern is that this is getting more difficult to do and the storage is becoming limited due to the increased number being installed. The other item is that even during the season, with the coastal storms and more frequent wind events, the mooring system, even though it is in the back of the harbor, will be paramount. We do get surging in this area. Any vessel that is going to be moored in the harbor does need to get a 10A permit from the Harbor Master Department, and I do not support a vessel being harbored at this dock.

- Susan St. Pierre: This pier already exists. We are just trying to rehabilitate. We would never moor a vessel there 24/7, it would have to be a high tide situation.
- Judith Kohn: The pier is there, but the ramp and the float aren't there, so it isn't just replacing an existing structure. As far as I understand we don't have any rules or regulations for limiting these structures. I don't think we have legs to ask for something else, unfortunately, but perhaps in the future we can ask to limit extending piers.
- Susan St. Pierre: We will be seeking a Chapter 91 License, but it won't license a pier like this without access to a boat. That is why we are proposing a gangway and float.
- Judith Kohn: Does the pier next to it have a gangway?
- Scott Patrowicz: They have a spot for it, but I am not sure if they use it.
- Judith Kohn: I understand we can't limit this work right now, but I would like to look at something the Commission can do in the future to limit the extension of gangways. It is a comment not related to this project.
- Dan Ricciarelli: Do you see an issue if they are permitted correctly?
- Judith Kohn: I do, but as long as they are permitted, we have to approve them.

Greg St. Louis: Is there a reason the existing piles can't be pulled up and removed?

- Scott Patrowicz: It would be more disruptive, and I would see more of an impact to this area to do it that way. We can do either one, but I do worry about it.
- Greg St. Louis: I guess I would prefer the effort to remove it, but I understand it is deteriorated and may break at the mudline.
- Scott Patrowicz: That is fine, we can see what we can do.

Bill McHugh: There has not been a gangway or float on this for a long time, so those are not an existing situation. The mooring system has a reliance on piling guards, but they aren't as resilient. As we see more weather events they will come loose. That is a problem for my department because we do have to secure these and make sure they don't cause damage. These structures do become more of a concern to me.

Greg St. Louis: Special conditions were to not park a boat here, not resting a boat on the mudflat, endeavoring to move piles, and seeing if there are minor landscaping opportunities that don't introduce stormwater behind the seawall.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to issue an Order of Conditions, subject to special conditions as discussed, is made by Dan Ricciarelli and seconded by Tyler Glode. Judith Kohn abstains, and the motion passes 4-0.*

- E. 266 Canal Street – DEP#64-775** - Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Canal Street Station, LLC, Notice of Intent Canal Street Station, LLC, for the construction of a 250-unit apartment neighborhood consisting of five apartment buildings, two access drives, parking areas, utilities, and associated infrastructure, located at 266, 282, 282R, and 286 Canal Street, and 2 Kimball Road, within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance

Chris Koeplin of Canal Street Station LLC speaks. Highlights include:

- This project reaches several housing goals, with 20% that will be at AMI
- Activation of sizeable, underutilized, flat site, at the head of a new railway and is a large objective for the City.

Richard Kirby of LLC Environmental Consultants shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Southeastern portion has a lot of pavement, compacted gravel, boat storage, a former restaurant, and used car facility.
- Previously submitted a letter of map revision that changed the elevation from 11 to 10
- Undergoing a land unit development review by the Planning Board
- Rear 9.2 acres is part of the property but not part of the project
- Vegetation growing through concrete and pavement in areas.
- Three main existing structures with several auxiliary ones
- Invasive plants have colonized adjacent to the development.
- Demolition and reconstruction of the developed portion of the site
- Five resident buildings proposed, housing 250 residential units.
- Building A will have a commercial retail component
- All buildings will have 1<sup>st</sup> floor ground level parking.
- Access from Kimball Road to parking in Building A, and from Canal Street, for access to buildings B-E
- Wetland boundary extends around the boat yard currently in place and towards Rosie's Pond.
- Wetland delineation also goes around areas of historic fill, and areas of this are being proposed to restore to offset the impacts.
- Comprehensive erosion control program, with compost filter tubes, material stock piling areas, construction access to keep sediment from going to Canal Street, catch basins, etc.

- Sidewalk and pedestrian access throughout the site
- Small park proposed with seeding along Canal Street
- Connection to the rail trail from the Northeast portion of the site that will go over the drainage ditch by way of a box clover that meets DEP standards.
- Proposing a retaining wall along much of the development
- Land being elevated to be more climate resilient. Most of the site is at 10 and will rise garage slabs to 13.2.
- First level of living space will be 12' above the elevation.

Scott Cameron, Engineer from Morin Cameron Group, continues the presentation:

- Property historically used for industrial uses and heavy vehicular loading
- Through analysis it was found that there are no stormwater controls on the property at this time
- Existing surface value is pavement buildings and compacted gravel, with curb number value of about 92 in this condition.
- Goal is to reduce imperviousness by 1,600 sq ft.
- Resiliency design will bring cleaner fill to absorb runoff, converting pavement to roof area
- New outfalls that will capture the land and run it through a treatment system
- Including low impact stormwater management techniques
- Adding bioretention swale along Kimball Road, and treating run off from surrounding area
- Curb number stays the same, but that is due to building roof areas
- Creating more absorbent soil to hold more water on site
- This has been contributing sediment to Rosie's Pond over the last century and this redevelopment will make this stop almost entirely.
- Eliminating areas of standing water on site, specifically at the end of Kimball Road, to have better drain out

Richard Kirby continues the presentation. Highlights include:

- 2,400 sq. ft. of alteration for retaining wall proposed along wetland with an area that has some existing degraded wetland would be filled. Area contains historic fill and invasive plants.
- 57 sq. ft of alteration for stormwater outfall, which is required for the pipework
- 126 sq ft. associated with commuter rail access
- Temporary area of construction access along wetlands will all be replaced in kind
- Proposing a 2.31 ratio of wetlands replication in areas that are historically filled through restoration work
- Proposed wetland will have higher functioning value than that being altered
- Ask Commission to accept that the limit of disturbance of the project is the limit of disturbance on the ground
- Impervious area being removed by approximately 1,600 sq, ft., removing fill, restoring wetland areas, providing modern stormwater management system that will improve the quality of the stormwater coming off site

Greg St. Louis: I believe the agent and I have talked about a peer review on this site. I don't know how

the rest of the Commission feels on that.

- Dan Ricciarelli: I would agree.
- Greg St. Louis: One item that needs more discussion is how Rosie's Pond, which is an inland flooding scenario, interacts with this, which is also in a coastal flooding scenario, and making sure Rosie's Pond is not exacerbated by any fill in this location.
- Tyler Glode: What is the bioretention area size volume wise?
- Scott Cameron: 1". It is designed to operate under a 100-year storm event and not hold water for more than 72 hours. It is shallow but fully complies with the standards.
- Tyler Glode: What volume retention do you have total?
- Scott Cameron: The 1" is about 2,640 cubic feet and the pond holds 3,201 cubic feet up to the outlet, so it holds the 1" storm plus.
- Tyler Glode: And does roof runoff discharge directly to a manhole and then adds clean runoff straight to the outlet point?
- Scott Cameron: Yes, to a stabilized outlet.

Richard Kirby: Since Bill Ross is the peer reviewer under the project for the Planning Board review, is it possible for him to be the Commissions reviewer as well since he is already familiar with the project?

- Greg St. Louis: We can take that under consideration.
- Judith Kohn: What are his qualifications?
- Greg St. Louis: He is a Civil Engineer.
- Judith Kohn: Is he reviewing the stormwater for the Planning Board?
- Scott Cameron: Yes

Tyler Glode: How long would you be monitoring the bank replacement?

- Richard Kirby: We committed in the NOI application for a period of two years after they are restored. That is typically what we do. We supervise the replication installation effort, inspect all the plants, site the plants in the replication area. Once they are in, we would monitor for the rest of that growing season, supply a report, and then monitor it for the second season with a final report.
- Tyler Glode: The box covert would be a standard one?
- Scott Cameron: Yes, we put the application as a three sided, as that is the worst-case scenario, but that design is somewhat in the works and wanted to get through a meeting with you before pulling the trigger on that.
- Tyler Glode: What is the clearance you would be looking for?
- Scott Cameron: I don't have the exact clearance but there would be passage. The way we are building it, it does slope down to the rail trail, so we expect to have at least a bit of clearance for the normalized water elevation.
- Tyler Glode: Do you have the ratio?
- Scott Cameron: We are waiting on that, but we will exceed it.
- Richard Kirby: It will be 1.2 the bank full width and the openness ratio will be at least 8.2.
- Tyler Glode: And what loading where you planning?
- Scott Cameron: They only come in H2O. Even in a drought there is water that stays in the swale, so we don't expect a lot of shoulder in this.

- Tyler Glode: Are you going to stone the bottom?
- Scott Cameron: We actually have effectively put a sandier soil in place and with such a low velocity swale it will form a natural substrate over time.

Dan Ricciarelli: Are the transformers a place holder location and do they have a containment system?

- Scott Cameron: That footprint is sized for a containment pad that is a 13x13 box. We would not be able to get the answers from the power company before permitting. We do our best guesses, but we know our final design is contingent on what they give us. This footprint is a worst-case scenario.

Judith Kohn: Do you have a cross section for parking and the wetlands on the site?

- Scott Cameron: No, but if you are interested in a certain area, we can put that together.
- Judith Kohn: I would like to see something between say D and E and the wetland. I want to see what sort of measures you are putting in place to protect the wetlands from cars and trash.
- Scott Cameron: In general, one of the driving factors for the site planning was to make it pedestrian and bike oriented. We must provide vehicle storage, but we have been working with the Planning Board and when we receive the peer review back, we do expect to do one polishing adaptation of these plans to see how it is more oriented for pedestrians.
- Judith Kohn: But if someone's car is parked there, what stops are there at the parking spaces and the wetland to stop trash and people walking down there from disturbing the wetlands?
- Scott Cameron: We can provide those.

Judith Kohn: You have a stormwater system going between buildings. What will that be?

- Scott Cameron: It is a mix. You will see pavers, landscaping, trees. We have renderings that we can bring before we meet again.

Tyler Glode: How many outfalls are proposed?

- Scott Cameron: Five.
- Tyler Glode: Are you exceeding 80% TSS removal at all 5?
- Scott Cameron: Yes, I believe it is 90% at all of them. We are using hydrodynamic separation, which receives 85 to 90% TSS. We are using an edge of pea stone filter, a grass filter strip, and then the bio retention.
- Tyler Glode: Are you using a separator system in the sewer system in the garage?
- Scott Cameron: Correct.

Bart Hoskins: I have a question about the wetland application areas. I see there is mention of invasive species control and monitoring it for a period of two years. What is the contingency if you haven't achieved the 75% cover?

- Richard Kirby: We do recognize that, in particular, this area is vulnerable to phragmites and will do our best to keep them out. That can be challenging. That is part of the reason we are at the 2.3 area for alteration. During that monitoring period, if we do see invasive plants colonizing, we will have the landscape contractor remove those. The phragmites will be controlled in the two-year period, but if it comes in it might be unmanageable.

- Bart Hoskins: Some of those trees and shrubs have a chance if they have a head start and I don't know if two years gives them that.
- Richard Kirby: It is challenging to get these restoration plants at size. We can plant an October Sky Red Maple, or Glory, but it wouldn't be native. Often, I will recommend about 20% more plants than what we specified to overhead some of that die off and so forth.

Greg St. Louis: I have a number of comments that are storm water related that I think the peer reviewer will end up making comments on. I will share them and coordinate with the peer reviewer. Things like showing more than the 10 year to confirm things like velocity discharge are on the list.

Dan Ricciarelli: Did you mention what the retaining wall construction would be?

- Scott Cameron: We are anticipating modular.
- Tyler Glode: And with the wetland being right up against it, how deep of a footing will that require?
- Scott Cameron: We are doing some exploratory work to get a better feel for that. For modular construction we just need to get to a natural soil, which we found it a foot or so below. It is a shallow excavation for this construction.
- Tyler Glode: And you don't think it will sink over time?
- Scott Cameron: It is only a 4-foot wall, so they are shorter and will all be engineered.
- Judith Kohn: And the wall is within the building footprint?
- Scott Cameron: The edge is the interface with the wetlands, and then there is a section about 12 feet wide, that will be planted with a meadow of a wildflower mix, and that will go up to the building. At the building itself, there is then the 4-foot structural wall and that contains the parking area.
- Judith Kohn: Is the rest of the garage open?
- Scott Cameron: Yes, it is an open-air garage.
- Richard Kirby: We can include the wall footings and so forth in the cross section we provide.

Dan Ricciarelli: Do you need any approvals before the peer review is done for exploratory work?

- Scott Cameron: No.

Dan Ricciarelli: Should we go with New England Engineering, or can we decide that later for the peer reviewer?

- Greg: We can decide later. We naturally try to plan up with the Planning Board when we can.

*A motion to engage a peer reviewer as discussed is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Tyler Glode, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to continue the public hearing to April 18, 2023, is made by Judith Kohn, seconded by Dan Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.*

## **RDA's**

- F. 115 Derby Street, Request for Determination of Applicability** - for the House of Seven Gables, for proposed test pits, repointing and backfill to an existing seawall - located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Ryan McCoy, Assistant Regional Manager of Collins Engineer, speaks. Highlights include:

- Retained to evaluate condition of the existing wall
- Looking at structural capacity and resiliency of wall
- Performing geotechnical evaluation and borings
- Test pits will help determine the geometry of the wall
- Fill some sink holes that are in the back of wall

Dan Ricciarelli: This is for the exploratory work?

- Ryan McCoy: We wrapped in the repointing of the wall and filling of the sink holes as well to loop it all together.

Judith Kohn: To be clear, are you proposing to do the repair work as part of this RDA?

- Ryan McCoy: Yes, the existing masonry wall has had a lot of the mortar deteriorated over the years. This is looking at a wider spread repair. The sinkholes are minor now, but we are trying to address it.
- Judith Kohn: How is that done?
- Ryan McCoy: It will be behind the wall. A small excavator will help with the cleaning with use of some hand tools. It will remain a landscape area, but this will help clear out some of the debris. The area behind the shed will be hand dug and backfilled with wheelbarrows. We really are just looking to address the sinkholes at the top and stabilize the area.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Tyler Glode, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to issue a -2 -6 determination is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Tyler Glode, and passes 5-0.*

- G. Swampscott Conservancy, Request for Determination of Applicability** - for Forest River Conservation Area proposed construction of two boardwalk stream crossings within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Toni Bandrowicz, President of the Swampscott Conservancy, shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Found donor willing to fund materials needed and Frank Lane as a contractor has agreed to do this at no cost.
- People are currently crossing on rocks in wet season and there is a fear of injury, so this is also considered a safety measure

Judith Kohn: Have you documented the wetlands and if there are any vernal pools in that area?

- Toni Bandrowicz: It is part of a stream that runs across the trail in two places. It is an intermittent stream though and does dry out in the summer.
- Greg St. Louis: There is ponding capacity that would meet the intermittent threshold and it is on a hill. The low point really is from where all the foot traffic has beaten it down. It isn't a "stream," but it is some flowing water that happens. So, there isn't issues in the areas we are talking about.

Dan Ricciarelli: Would be driving piles into something for this or does it bridge across?

- Chris Burke, of Friends of Salem Woods: I think we would do supports on blocks that sit on the ground, and in the middle two we would put a post hole digger, fill it with rocks, and put the post in there. We have done that in similar looking areas in the woods and it has held up well.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Judith Kohn, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to issue a -2 -6 determination is made by Tyler Glode, seconded by Dan Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.*

Dan Ricciarelli: Is there a way the Commission can help monetarily?

- Toni Bandrowicz: I think we are in good shape with this donor. And Frank Lane is not looking for compensation.

**H. Marblehead Water and Sewer, Request for Determination of Applicability** - for the Loring Ave Transmission Water Main Replacement and fence relocation in Salem, MA- located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Bethany Ordong of Haley Engineers and on behalf of the Marblehead Water and Sewer Condition shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Undeveloped site
- Loring Avenue booster station increases the water pressure coming in
- Looking to replace the water main from the booster area to the road
- In October 2022, there was a water main break, and an emergency repair was done, but the pipe was significantly deteriorated.
- Exempt from Wetland Protection Act
- Proposing to replace the water main with a PVC pipe and install a fence around the perimeter of the site.
- Looking to prevent damage, and address issues of trespassing
- Water department will keep a cleared area for equipment access, but it will not be open to the public
- Proposing to maintain a 30' path along the route, with it being mowed once or twice a year and a cleared way along the perimeter of the fence

Dan Ricciarelli: Are there openings for the passage of wildlife?

- Beth Ordong: The intent is to break the fence at Lake Hill Pond and then the rest would be enclosed. There will be gates for access, but we don't anticipate any other openings.

Beth Ordong continues the presentation:

- Contractor has been in the site and installed the 12" filter socks along the route of the pipe.
- High urgency of project to be done before the water demand peaks in the spring.

Tyler Glode: Is the fence going to run through WS1? Does it make sense to bump it through the clearing?

- Beth Ordong: I think we are open to bumping it out. I tried to make it as straight as possible. I would prefer if we did a site visit to see if that is something you really want.
- Judith Kohn: I would like to see the fence bump out. It isn't a lot of additional length to the fence, and I don't want to chip away at the wetland areas.

Tyler Glode: The active Zone 1, what is that being utilized for?

- Beth Ordong: This well is there for emergency use, but it isn't currently in use. It won't be hydraulically cut off though.

Dan Ricciarelli: Is the idea that the existing pipe will be removed or is it being abandoned in place?

- Beth Ordong: We will be cutting and capping it on each end and abandoning it in place. Hopefully it will fill up with water material.
- Tyler Glode: What was the existing material?
- Beth Ordong: Cast iron.

Greg St. Louis: Is there any reason the original alignment was maintained as to shortening the length to avoid working in a wet area?

- Beth Ordong: From a constructability standpoint it would be more straightforward to follow the existing route, and honestly, I didn't really consider changing the route of the pipe across the site.
- Greg St. Louis: Are you leaving the main line while you do this work?
- Beth Ordong: The intent is to keep the existing main connected in case there is a fire or water emergency while we are constructing the new pipe. But the valves will be closed, there will not be water flowing during construction. It would only be turned on during an emergency.
- Greg St. Louis: For that reason, I would ask you to consider a different layout, so you don't potentially hit the existing pipe.
- Beth Ordong: We are proposing the installation 10' from the existing pipe, so hopefully that would not be an issue.

Amy McHugh, Marblehead Water and Sewer Superintendent: We are following the existing lines also because this is laid out with the wells. To change it would be a question of how much more we would have to do, and we don't want to change those existing wells. This pipe was very deep, but the new one won't be.

Judith Kohn: What is the area of wetland impact?

- Beth Ordong: I have not measured it yet.
- Greg St. Louis: It looks to be about 80x20 from the scaling of the plan, so not a large area. If we can advocate for a wetland flower mix or something to stabilize the area.
- Beth Ordong: We would be open to what the Commission recommends for that.
- Tyler Glode: A conservation mix or wildflower would be good, though a conservation mix may be tougher since it will be more species.
- Greg St. Louis: I would go for the wildflower mix.
- Judith Kohn: Can we ask you replaced the hydric soils on top that have been excavated?
- Beth Ordong: Would we be able to move them out of place and put them back after construction?
- Judith Kohn: I think so.

Dan Ricciarelli: How tall is the fence?

- Beth Ordong: 6 feet.
- Dan Ricciarelli: Chain link?
- Beth Ordong: Yes
- Greg St. Louis: Normally we ask that to be 4" off the ground for small animals.

Beth Ordong: There is a fence partially encompassing the site. It does not fully go around the site, but there is at least a portion we are replacing.

- Tyler Glode: Are you removing the fence or leave it in place and put a new fence in?
- Beth Ordong: We would propose to leave it in place because the existing fence is on a section of the road that the City is planning that would cut into the fence and it would be removed at that time.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Judith Kohn, and passes 5-0.*

*A motion to issue a -2 -5 determination is made by Tyler Glode, seconded by Dan Ricciarelli, and passes 5-0.*

### III. OLD | NEW BUSINESS

Greg St. Louis: We haven't had a full Commission in a while.

- Judith Kohn: Have there been applicants?
- Kate Kennedy: Not yet.
- Judith Kohn: Maybe we need a ConCom appreciation day. A lot of the public doesn't know what we do.
- Dan Ricciarelli: How many members do we need?
- Greg St. Louis: Seven. We can pass something with two people voting in the affirmative, but it is not pretty. Having dealt with this before, I have voted negative on a project, but did sign on the project since four people need to sign it.

- Judith Kohn: I thought we needed a quorum and to vote with one.
- Greg St. Louis: It needs to be held by a quorum and a simple majority to pass. We can change the voting language for it to be the majority of the unseated board, but that is not the default.

#### **IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES**

February 21, 2023 Meeting Minutes

*A motion to approve the meeting minutes from February 21, 2023, is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Judith Kohn, and passes 5-0.*

#### **V. OTHER UPDATES**

No other updates are discussed.

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting adjourns at 9:15 pm.