

**Salem Conservation Commission
Minutes of Meeting**

Date and Time: Thursday, November 26, 2019, 6:30 p.m.
Meeting Location: Large Conference Room, City Hall Annex, 98 Washington Street
Members Present: Tyler Glode, Scott Sheehan, Malissa Vieira, Bart Hoskins (arriving late), Chair Gregory St. Louis (5)
Members Absent: Dan Ricciarelli, Tom Campbell (2)
Others Present: Seth Lattrell, Conservation Agent (outgoing) and Brittany Dolan (incoming Conservation Agent)
Recorder: Stacy Kilb

Chair Gregory St. Louis calls the meeting to order at 6:38PM.

I. ROLL CALL

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 46 Columbus Avenue Sand Relocation – DEP # TBD – Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for the City of Salem, 98 Washington Street, Salem MA. Purpose of hearing is to discuss an updated proposal to mitigate flooding along the seawall at Juniper Ave and Beach Street, within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Seth Lattrell presents the current proposal on behalf of the Engineering Dept. as David Knowlton cannot be present. This was initially proposed as a sand regrading project to mitigate flooding in the above area, but the process was put on hold due to coordination with DEP (Dept. of Environmental Protection), who thought it was not a permissible project and would not be effective. The Agent and Mr. Knowlton met w/DEP and CZM (Coastal Zone Management) to discuss the proposal; CZM indicated it would not be an effective long or short term solution and would not support the project. The DEP indicated that it was not consistent w/performance standards of the Wetlands Protection Act. Biodegradable sandbags were considered acceptable. These will be placed no higher than 3' above the high tide line, reducing permitting burdens, placing the project out of Army Corps jurisdiction, and it will be permissible under Ch. 91 and the WPA. The DEP is still commenting but generally would be supportive of this plan.

Sheehan asks if a permanent solution was suggested. The City has grant in place to ID a permanent solution, which may include elevating the seawall, which is the only way to provide flood mitigation in such a short space. Hoskins arrives 6:43 PM.

No backfill is allowed behind sandbags; the Commission must include a condition that no sand may be used from the beach and no sand can be added to the beach; sand in bags must come from upland sources. They are very large bags that do not need to be staked, weighing several hundred pounds each. The Commission wonders why loose sand can't be brought to the beach but biodegradable bags can be used. The bags would be removed after storm season or once the seawall is raised. The other agencies wanted to make sure no sand was removed from the beach and wanted to avoid adding sand to the beach if possible. Materials in the bags are slowly biodegradable so if there is a major storm, materials aren't left on the beach.

A time frame should be specified as it is unknown and bags may be made to last one or several years. Bags should be filled with double washed sand of the same sieve rating as that already on the beach. Double washed sand will prevent the spread of invasives.

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

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Hoskins and seconded by Sheehan. Glode asks what the sandbags will prevent. This is an area where overtopping is occurring due to wave runup issues. Flooded areas are discussed. Malissa Vieira asks if sandbags will prevent water from spilling over the place where they stop due to the incline. One issue is that the waves don't just run up there, they overtop the length of the wall, and it is an elevation problem. A deployable gate is in the middle but is rusted out; water comes in through failing drainage as well. This will help mitigate one of the problems but there will still be flooding issues. This is a "band aid" until a permanent solution can be designed. Chair St. Louis comments that the outfall shown should have a sea block in front to prevent sand migration into the tidegate.

The motion passes with 5 in favor and none against.

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions subject to standard and the special conditions noted below is made by Hoskins, seconded by Sheehan and passes 5-0.

- Order is issued pending receipt of a DEP file number
- Biodegradable bags with a timeframe between 1 and 5 years, to be filled with double washed sand product that generally matches existing beach conditions, shall be used
- Any additional DEP comments shall be incorporated

B. 31 Grove Street (Mack Park) – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability by the City of Salem, 98 Washington Street, Salem MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed cultivation of Winter Rye as an interim condition to build soil to support the planting of a future permaculture food forest (subject to future filings) within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Presenting the Application are:

Andy Varella of Maitland Mountain Farm

Patrick Shultz and Matt Buchanan of Homegrown - Urban Abundance Gardening

Kerry Murphy, Health and Wellness Coordinator with the Salem Health Dept.

Ms. Murphy notes the project is part of Salem's Food Policy Council, as well as an Agricultural project with Parks and Recreation approval, to implement community food forest at Mack Park. Mr. Shultz outlines the area to be planted and the resource areas. Native nut, fruit and berry plants would be planted in patches, meant to be self sustaining over time to provide food for all. Another area will be a market farm for distribution to those in need and for sale. The entire site will be used for food production. People will have access to the food farm 24/7 and there will be an educational component.

They are requesting permission to turn under the grass, amend the soil and plant a permaculture food forest. The interim condition (winter rye) is being reviewed, a future RDA will be requested for the food forest. Andy Varella notes that areas will be amended for fruit trees; most will be augered holes w/vermiculite, peat, and perlite added. Dwarf trees soak up 16 gallons of water per day, and full trees 30 gal/day, but there will be no impact on the wetland b/c they will only amend specific sites. No grades changed in this RDA; they are just planting winter rye. Chair St. Louis asks if they know this will area will fully saturate during rains? Yes they are aware.

There are no questions from the Commission or the public.

This area is not mapped as flood plain.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Hoskins, seconded by Glode, and passes with all in favor.

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

C. 72 Bay View Ave – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability by David C. Fellowes TTEE, of 72 Bay View Ave, Salem MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the replacement of a maple tree within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Jan Fellowes and David Fellowes present their request. The tree in question is dying and has been declining for the past decade. The tree is hazardous and could drop on the house or the very large (20') seawall. The tree has been severely defoliated by winter moth in the past. Crane work will need to be done and the stump ground. The seawall has deteriorated and will not support heavy equipment. Estimates included a police detail to block the street. They plan to replant with a smaller red maple. They are not sure where the new one will be planted but it will be in the same general area. The only condition is to grind but not pull the stump.

There are no comments from the public.

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

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

D. 0 Story Street – DEP # TBD – Public Hearing – Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance by Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group LLC, 14 Story Street, Salem MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed delineation of wetland resource area boundaries and their associated buffer zones for the properties located at 0 Story Street, Map 23 Parcel 2.

Attorney John Kelty of 40 Lowell St. Peabody represents the Applicant. The DEP has not given a file number yet; often times they don't on an abbreviated NOI (Notice of Intent). William Manuel of Wetlands Management has filed a thorough examination report of the wetlands. Does the Commission desire a site visit? Moving forward, if the Commission agrees with the Delineation, the Applicant will file an NOI for construction of the roadway, with a definitive subdivision including turnaround at the end of Cleveland St., part of which will be in the buffer zone as will stormwater management facilities. The Applicant is also seeking permission this evening to do soil testing with a backhoe in the buffer zone so they can complete the stormwater management filing with the Planning Board and this Commission. Chair St. Louis notes that soil testing is exempt unless within 50' of the wetland, which it will be so the Applicant should file an RDA separate from this NRAD (Notice of Resource Area Delineation).

Chair St. Louis asks if there are wetland and upland calculations in zoning, as the Applicant may want to review them prior to making subdivision filings. This will be done. Mr. Kelty outlines the A Series flagging. The ZBA (Zoning Board of Appeals) process is discussed.

The Chair notes that the Commission will not make a ruling on the western side of the resource as it was not surveyed though it was flagged; any calculations based on upland vs. wetland resource areas are not being discussed at this time.

Chair St. Louis asks about an intermittent stream; no information is available tonight but Attorney Kelty will get in touch with Bill Manuel, who did provide Stream Stats. These are discussed. The NRAD locks the delineation

for 3 years so wetlands would not be subject to re-review. Flags are still out there but the Chair prefers to make enough comments to approve the NRAD as the wetland is topographically defined and the intermittent stream is likely not upland of vegetated wetland. Glode finds that all areas tend to have some flow rate, albeit low. It is uncertain whether it is worth calculating the intermittent stream based on the report, but the Commission is not concerned.

Glode asks about the B series flags; those areas will not be used.

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

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Hoskins, seconded by Sheehan, and the motion carries.

A motion to issue the Order of Resource Area Delineation is made by Glode, seconded by Hoskins, and passes 5-0. The Order is subject to the following conditions:

- Include any DEP comments
- Note that intermittent stream boundary is not shown
- B and C delineations are not shown and may affect future upland calculations/resource area impacts

E. 97 Margin Street – DEP # 064-0686 – Public Hearing – Notice of Intent by the New England Power Company (d/b/a/ National Grid), 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss a Limited Project which includes exploratory geotechnical soil borings along the transmission ROW near 97 Margin Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Ms. Marilee Sullivan from VSC Group on behalf of National Grid, presents. She outlines the work to be done behind the Salem Police Dept. The area is entirely graveled so no vegetation will be impacted. Some autumn olive has grown into the graveled surface, mostly around the base of the existing structure. Soil borings are described; soil removed would be used as backfill or removed from the site if it won't fit. The area will be returned to pre existing site conditions after the work is done. A small amount of additional gravel may be added or they may straw and seed the area. There are no wetlands onsite and it is not in a buffer zone, only in a flat floodplain.

Chair St. Louis assumes the soils are contaminated. It is not an AUL(Activity and Use Limitation) site but would be managed onsite; when Nat'l Grid removes soil they test it and bring it to an appropriate facility.

There are no comments from the Commission or the public.

A motion to close the Public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Hoskins, and passes with all in favor.

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions subject to standard conditions is made by Hoskins, seconded by Sheehan, and passes 5-0.

E. 40 First St & 45 Traders Way (Traders Village) – DEP # 64-655 – Public Hearing – Request for an amendment to the current Order of Conditions by Traders Way Residential Holdings, LLC. Purpose of the hearing is to discuss changes in site layout and stormwater design within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Seth Lattrell notes that peer review was received today and they were supportive of changes and felt they were improvements to compliance with stormwater standards; that letter is included. Allen & Majors was NOT the

designer in the first round. Mr. Nick Delacava, PE with Allen & Majors, presents the amendment.

Improvements to the previously approved design have been made.

Layout changes within the jurisdictional buffer include:

- Dog park relocated away from wetland and outside 100' buffer zone
- Existing pathway around wetlands remains in the same location but is pulled farther away from one of the buildings, but does not encroach on wetlands. Wall will be replaced with sloped hillside; infiltration system is different
- Two parallel parking spaces eliminated, more green space, pulled away from wetland, will grade instead of building a wall
- Radius on parking section by First Street tightened, some spaces added, right of way defined.
- Pergola shifted back a few feet, in line with previous disturbance; should be consistent w/setback previously discussed so that lawn creep does not occur
- Cast in place wall against the wetland in one area, again, no additional disturbance
- Blasting has occurred on this site
- Overall 1300 sf reduction in impervious area

Grading & Drainage improvements:

- Same overall watershed study maintained, same square footage as approved
- Still mitigating peak rates and capturing volume and recharge, capturing 1" water quality volume, previously approved was ½"
- This is LUHPPL (Land Use of High Potential Pollutant Loads) which means it must meet 1" water quality volume standards
- Still have not exceeded MEPA criteria, 1000 or 1100 trips per day, criteria is 1000 + 300 trips, State permit criteria are discussed
- Original design had 9 separate underground stormwater systems; 3 or 4 is more appropriate. They have been consolidated into 2 separate systems, both in the same general location as the previous systems
 - Chair St. Louis asks how this was reduced: they are increasing the efficiency of the system, built by ACF, R-Tank, milk crates, lots of open space to hold larger volume vs. shallower systems w/little void space. Water quality units reduced from 11 units to [unspecified], much more efficient design, sized, constructed by ConTek to 80% TSS removal
 - Deep sump catch basins w/hoods will be maintained
- Same outlets remain as originally approved; manhole on First Street is described. Minor improvements such as trap rock were conditioned to be placed; all lines were TV'd and appear to be in good condition; Mr. Delacava is unsure he recalls that condition.
- One catch basin to the southwest of the site was flooding; this may have been a DPW issue but Applicant was going to help with it.
- Shallow bedrock onsite; Glode comments that they were not anticipating much recharge occurring originally; water could weep out of side slopes? This has larger footprint, more open space, will they be causing ponding? No, systems have an overflow control structure, which is described. Clean roof runoff from buildings 30 and 10, plus a small amount from green spaces there, go to the wetlands, but that is all.
- Bill Ross would like to see "belt and suspenders" in form of impervious membrane w/perforations in one location to force water back into the drainage system
- All roof drains connect to perforated pipes
- Treatment train is described; pipes have been sized for a 25 year storm
- Chair St. Louis asks about inlet capacities; this is because some are double catch basins; bypass flow modeling is also discussed. Surcharge, catch basins and ponding are discussed
- Coverage of pipes is discussed

Chair St. Louis has some technical questions:

- 25-year storm closed system submitted previously; full stormwater report was provided, they did 2, 10 and 100. Glode says local ordinance does not require 25 but site is mostly ledge.
- Same precipitation rates? Yes, same hydrocad file but new watershed
- Impervious barrier and water table – vertical offset to groundwater, grades are described
- Underdrain modeling – not done, just a backup. Underdrain is extensively discussed
- Modeled as a detention system but sized to handle recharge volume at 72 hour drawdown, effectively mimicking existing conditions
- Mounding analysis w/increased volume not done, but not required (not done in original report either), same # of units and retail space as approved, trips increased but this was due to wrong previous calculations
- Chair St. Louis is concerned that access to maintain systems may be inferior. Applicant should install as many clean out and inspection ports at corners as possible
- LUHPPL requirements – long term pollution prevention plan previously proposed will be used. O & M has been updated
- Glode asks about the treatment train again, and CDS units and TSS removal are discussed

Chair St. Louis comments that the corner of Traders Way and 1st Street is a public sidewalk on private property, so the Applicant should watch out for liability/water area. Also regarding the dog park, it is unknown if it will still be curbed but has been moved outside of Commission jurisdiction.

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

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Hoskins, and the motion carries.

A motion to issue an amendment to the Order of Conditions, including previously noted special conditions, is made by Glode, seconded by Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

F. 51 Canal Street – DEP File No. 064-0687 Public Hearing – Notice of Intent by Salem Car Wash, LLC, PO Box 554, Westerly RI. Purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed reconstruction of an existing car wash facility at 51 Canal Street within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Mr. Mike Laham, PE with the Morin Cameron Group, presents the project. This is an existing car wash facility with two buildings including the car wash and a detail area. The current site is paved and 100% impervious. Portions of the property is in BLSF (Bordering Land Subject to Flooding) resource area; elevations are described. It is entirely within local jurisdiction. A new facility will be constructed and the site upgraded.

6000 sf of landscaping will be added and the traffic pattern updated. The utility plan is shown and described. The new car wash will recycle water used. Compensatory flood storage requirements will be exceeded. They are doing what is practicable for the site; the City installed leaching catchbasins at the corners; these will remain and Applicant is adding sediment forebays to allow water to flow into the catchbasins. Underdrains flow into forebays or catchbasins.

The Chair notes adjustments to curbstones that should be made so they don't get plowed out. This will be taken into account. "CTS" Curb transition section will be installed. Curbing is vertical granite. Grass and the accessible route to the building are pointed out: Chair St. Louis asks about vacuums and trash cans; these will be against the front of the building. Parking spaces there are extra wide. Landscaping there will not happen if vacuums will be installed in that location.

The Chair notes a high point between exit aisles and drywells; there should not be any other way for soapy water to enter drainage system; it goes to the sewer. Trench drains at the door will capture soapy runoff and divert to the reclaim, except some components like tire shine that do not get reclaimed. Glode asks how reclaim occurs and this is described. The Applicant must ensure that manholes are watertight and outside the floodplain.

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

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Sheehan, seconded by Hoskins, and the motion carries.

A motion to issue an Order of Conditions is made by Sheehan, seconded by Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

B. 79 Columbus Avenue Home Reconstruction – DEP # TBD – Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Eric Cormier, 20 Cutter Street, Waltham, MA. Purpose of hearing is to discuss proposed reconstruction of a single-family home at 79 Columbus Avenue, within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Note: Meeting anticipated to be continued pending receipt of site plan from Proponent and issuance of file number from DEP.

This item is not opened. Seth Lattrell provides an update on the enforcement notice. Erosion controls have been installed but the Commission is still waiting for a site plan from Applicant.

A motion to continue this item to the December 2019 meeting is made by Hoskins, seconded by Glode, and passes 5-0.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS, cont'd

A. 10 White Street – Enforcement Notice/Project Update

Tom Pozerski from Merrill Engineers, and GM of Hawthorne Cove Noah Flaherty are present. Seth Lattrell notes that the Commission received a complaint from an abutter that the wall was being constructed, and she did not think it was improved. The Engineering Dept visited, found a number of failures in erosion control measures, and also observed changes to the retaining wall and a tidegate. The Commission issued an Enforcement Order to repair erosion controls, clean the site, and provide an update w/changes to the project from what was previously approved.

Mr. Pozerski met with the Agent and conducted a site visit. It was confirmed that the wall that was not permitted was put in, erosion control was not maintained, etc. All site work did cease, and current photos as of today are provided. Erosion controls are installed, floating turbidity barrier redeployed, and a catch basin w/out bales is at the entrance.

Mr. Flaherty notes a lip of stone around the catch basin on White St. Stone was put on the site to stop the tracking of sediment offsite. Concrete on an outlet revetment has been removed. The stockpile there will be removed once there is a receiving facility; it will be covered and straw baled before then, erosion to be inspected weekly. The tidegate valve was to be a reflex inline valve, but the manufacturers wanted Mr. Pozerski to certify that their product worked but that is not his job. Instead, the contractor installed a stainless steel heavy duty flapper gate valve on the outlet side. The area it is in is a protected area of the bay, and can be further protected. The problem is that the tidegate valve was supposed to be inline as specified, but a steel flap

was put on. The Chair has never seen one on a culvert pipe, but they do exist. What was planned was not functioning due to logistical reasons/ongoing construction.

Mr. Pozerski notes that this is permitted with a Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan as the responsibility of the Applicant. Inspection ports are now installed on rooftop infiltration systems. Chair St. Louis would defer to the Engineering Dept. on the type of tidegate.

Regarding the foundation wall, survey work was done on it. Seth Latrell notes that an updated plan was received today; the full size plan is outdated but there were only minor changes from it. Water main improvements will be made on White St. but the garage wall option was given to the Applicant to remove the wall, who will take part of it down as it is too high. The site is flat, and they cannot correct all the drainage issues onsite. They want to minimize digging as there is contamination on the site. The bulk of the site is gravel. The abutter with the complaint was unable to attend this meeting but her issues are outside of ConCom jurisdiction, so that dialogue will continue outside of this meeting. All Commission items from the Enforcement Notice have been addressed.

Chair St. Louis is concerned that if riprap at the outfall is moving, the stones would need to be upsized. Mr. Flaherty feels this is not a problem, it was just a lack of attention at the time. A large boulder was placed. What will happen moving forward is described.

Chair St. Louis asks about the material of the last leg of pipe and mounting the flapper valve; this is described. There is no history of erosion where the existing revetment is.

B. Presentation by Paul DiBiase on proposed access change at Strongwater Crossing.

Mr. DiBiase provides background; phases 6-10 are upcoming and the current development is described. Phases 1, 2 and 3 are built and the roadway complete. Phases 4 and 5 are under construction, and the roadway for phase 5 has been paved. Bridges were swapped for box culverts previously and those were completed. Wetlands replication was also required; a retaining wall separating the roadway from the wetland has been constructed. There will be some improvements to the connection between phase 5 and Phases 6-10.

The original and new access change are described; DeAndra Drive will be eliminated and the land area converted to open space. There would have been a cul de sac at the end, all green on the Plan is open space owned by the Association, with the potential of the City taking ownership later. Two bridges will be eliminated and a new less intrusive access to the upland will be sought.

Summary of changes:

- Come off of phase 4
- Eliminate DeAndra
- Eliminate 2 bridge crossings
- Add a culverted crossing
- Relocate 12 houses from DeAndra onto roadway network as cluster subdivision

There is RC zoning on the upper portion; This requires 2 acre lots w/125' frontage; lots originally proposed are very large and lots of land goes to each individual home. They are proposing to do the same thing but to R1 zoning standards, which will require a ZBA (Zoning Board of Appeals) variance. Instead of land going with the lot (undesirable), extra land will be used as open space, undisturbed.

Open space will increase by 36% or 30 acres. Roadway length is being decreased by 15% or 861 linear feet and two bridges are being eliminated. The total number of lots is not changing.

An NRAD was approved by this Commission a couple of months ago as it had not been delineated. The NOI

may have assumed a delineation but the previous one would have expired anyway.

Chair St. Louis asks to see the R1 constructed development. He approves of additional open space, but wonders if families want to add on jacuzzi, pool, porch, etc. how the Commission will avoid winding up with a plethora of individual applications for fences, decks, pools, etc. There is no buffer zone on one side of the street, but there is on the other. They are giving themselves enough land for homeowners to do reasonable DIY projects. Documents are in place. The Developer could entertain deed restrictions on jurisdictional lots. In previous phases, some homeowners have done work w/out permission. This is the subdivision with recharges incorporated throughout. In phase 4, all lots in the buffer zone have recharge systems. That condition will be continued in subsequent phases. There is no clubhouse/common amenity existing or proposed.

Mr. DiBiase hopes to be back formally, and is working on plans for the Planning Board that they will bring before this Commission for review. They are going before the ZBA soon, and have Planning Dept. and Building Inspector approval. It is uncertain whether this will count as a modification of the existing subdivision, or a new preliminary subdivision. Inclusionary housing may come into play. The Applicant feels it is a modification,

New prelim subdivision or modifying existing? Unsure, suggested to come in with ... more than revised layout, inclusionary housing, etc may come into play. Applicant feels it is a modification, but if required they would not be able to adhere to inclusionary zoning but could be anything else, says Chair. Sounds big, but not change number or density of lots, just taking a different route to upland. City will be taking over subdivision so it will be a win win.

Chair asks if habitat study was done originally. Mr. DiBiase does not recall if an investigation was done; this should be verified especially if a new path for the road is used.

C. Review Previously issued COC's:

i. 140 Bayview Ave, DEP # 64-661, Request for Certificate of Compliance

Two COC's issued at the last meeting were sent to homeowners, but the mailboxes lost. A recap of projects is provided. This was a seawall. This is a re-issuance, administrative in nature, so all commissioners sign the relevant document.

ii. 92 Orne Street, DEP # 64-503, Request for Certificate of Compliance

This Certificate is being re-issued and the action is administrative only. All commissioners sign the relevant document. This was the dredging project; the post dredge survey was consistent.

Meeting Schedule for 2020:

The 3rd Tuesday of each month is available for meetings, as is the space. Commissioners agree to switch to this schedule.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 12, 2019 / October 10, 2019

A motion approve the Sept. 12, 2019 minutes is made by Hoskins, seconded by Glode, and passes unanimously.

A motion approve the Oct. 10, 2019 minutes is made by Hoskins, seconded by Glode, and passes unanimously

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Glode, seconded by Hoskins, and passes unanimously.

The meeting ends at 9:09PM.

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