

Salem Conservation Commission
Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time: Tuesday, August 18, 2020, 6:30 p.m.
 Meeting Location: For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch, listen or provide comment during the meeting may do so via zoom or by phone

Members Present: Chair Gregory St. Louis, Tyler Glode, Scott Sheehan, Vice Chair Bart Hoskins (4)
 Members Absent: Dan Ricciarelli, Malissa Vieira, Tom Campbell (3)
 Others Present: Brittany Dolan, Conservation Agent
 Recorder: Stacy Kilb

Chair St. Louis calls the meeting to order at 6:44PM.

I. Roll Call

I. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 70 Dearborn St – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability for Maura Murphy, 70 Dearborn St, Salem, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed tree removal at 70 Dearborn St within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem’s Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Present for the Applicant is Maura Murphy, owner.

- Black locust tree; Commission has photos. Tree is rotted internally. An adjacent tree has already fallen and caused significant damage
- Scott Sheehan wonders about the resource area; their backyard is the North River. There is also some salt marsh and floodplain

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

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

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

A motion to issue a Negative 2 Negative 6 Determination is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by BartHoskins, and passes 4-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

B. 208 Jefferson Ave – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability for Jay and Kendra LaFleur, 208 Jefferson Ave, Salem MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed addition to an existing dwelling at 208 Jefferson Ave, Salem, MA within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem’s Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Brendan Pyburn, Engineer, Bobrick Engineering, presents:

- Addition is described, including demolition of garage and existing dwelling
- All work is within 100' and no work within 50' buffer zone to salt marsh and within 100 year floodplain
- Work will result in 100 square feet of additional impervious
- Will be moving impervious further from resource area

Chair St. Louis notes when building in the floodplain there are certain requirements and insurance requirements regarding first floor elevations; it is important to keep mechanicals out of the basement.

Additional notes/comments:

- Erosion control will follow property line for demolition and access
- Lawn will be restored where the garage was
- Scott Sheehan wonders why this is an RDA not NOI as there are multiple resource areas; Chair St. Louis notes there is typically a single family exemption.
 - Brendan Pyburn notes minimal impact to the area; with improvements of pulling impervious away from area this is better; also notes the single family exemption and that precautions will be taken to protect adjacent resource areas
- Finished floor will be on pier foundations w/lattice work, so as not to affect flow patterns on existing property

Chair St. Louis opens to public comment but there are none.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

A motion to issue a Negative 2 and Negative 6 Determination is made by Tyler Glode, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

C. MBTA ROW Vegetation Management Plan – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability for Clary Coutu, Keolis Commuter Services, 470 Atlantic Ave Suite 500, Boston, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed Vegetation Management Plan for the railroad right-of-way within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem's Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Tim Dermody, Fair Dermody Consulting Engineers, Agent for Keolis, presents

- Required to submit all RDAs in all towns they go through as per 5 year Plan
- No changes to map since 2016; all info for entire Plan available online. Proposed and approved Vegetation Management Plans will be posted
- Keolis tries to constantly improve
- Submitted in compliance with 333 CMR 11 and 10
- This is for Commissioners to review and approve for length of the 5 year Plan, vs. the usual 3 years
- Maps include wetland markings but lack some detail
- 4.5 miles run through Salem; many are sprayed annually or not sprayed. Clear white zone is sprayed as needed; Keolis has integrated Vegetation Management Plan and coordinates w/its Engineering Dept so as not to spray if ties will be replaced since area will be disturbed anyway
- Hired an environmental monitor in the last 5 years to review spray locations and also look for standing water to avoid spraying in

- In some locations spraying is only done on one side of the track, or the length of the ties. Spray boom is customizable
- Various zones and their spray intervals are reviewed; Keolis wants to limit the amount of chemicals used. Vegetation cutting and stump treatment is more cost effective and safer
- Removal of vegetation is crucial for rail visibility and maintenance
- Work closely w/MDAR (MA Dept of Ag. Resources), Board of Health and Water Dept.
- Approved herbicides are used and rotated to avoid resistance

Scott Sheehan

- WPA Form 1: asking Commission to confirm boundaries of resource area, but also requesting a 5 year clearance for vegetation management? Yes, however Keolis reviews and updates maps annually and posts this to the website. Metal plating system is plain but sometimes ties are painted; HDPE infused colored plates are replacing the older ones and are more visible/durable.
- Only a couple maps have changed; resources changed but spray zones stayed the same
- Chair St. Louis comments it is not an NRAD but Commission allowing work as related to resources as present; otherwise Rail could call out an FRA exemption

Chair St. Louis opens to the public:

Mary Whitney 356 Essex St. Unit 2 asks about no spray zones.

- West side has no spray b/c not enough buffer; cannot meet setback requirements. Other side is sprayed annually
- What vegetation does spray kill? Many are listed on the website
- She is concerned about mature trees along the track; if within the right of way, they could be cut as they are regulated at the Federal and State level; any trees within 40' of the rail can be cut. Keolis does its best not to cut, however due to winter storms, some trees have fallen and hit traveling trains. They try to clear enough of their right of way to avoid that. Some lines also handle freight and don't want a derailment with hazardous materials. List in Vegetation Management Plan shows all vegetation to be removed for public safety and safety of Keolis employees
- The website is www.fdcrailroadvegetation.com
- Scott Sheehan asks if any new trees will be cut; this is just continued maintenance. Ms. Whitney asks about trees by Bell at Salem Station along the fence by the train station; Mr. Dermody does not know offhand but notes that this is not Keolis' intent. Some vegetation is desirable as it blocks out invasives. RWC is the herbicide applicator
- This is for blanket permission to cut trees; Ms. Whitney requests that the two tulip trees on the fence not be cut
- Sheehan notes that City constituents are vocal and aware so the Applicant should know that there will be a reaction if trees are cut; Mr. Dermody reassures everyone that Keolis does not wantonly cut trees.

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

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

A motion to issue a Negative 5 and Negative 6 Determination is made by Tyler Glode, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 4-0 in a roll call vote.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes

Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

Scott Sheehan comments to Ms. Whitney that if she sees anything concerning, she can reach out to her City Councilor or to Agent Brittany Dolan. Mr. Dermody notes that people along the right of way even reach out to him directly, and they can be notified personally if they have specific needs.

D. Gas Main Replacements – Public Hearing – Request for Determination of Applicability for the Boston Gas Company d/b/a National Grid, 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed replacement of existing gas mains within Tremont St, Japonica St, Devereaux St, Churchill St, Sylvan St, Dow St, Salem St, Park St, Palmer St and Harrison Ave within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem's Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Jeremy Degler, Tighe and Bond Environmental Scientist, represents the project.

- Gas main replacement is described; cast iron mains installed 1931-1998 will be replaced with low pressure plastic mains
- Exempt under 310 CMR as are within existing roadway but filing RDA as some old lines are 2" and will be replaced with 4" - 6" mains, an enlargement

Chair St. Louis points out issues the Commission has had in the past: staging and storage of materials in roadway and on frontage; sediment/debris - protecting catch basins.

- Also points out his personal pet peeve: every time they cut a sniffer hole in Lafayette St. he drives over 2" depressions and patches so please replace the main on Lafayette St. at some point in the near future.

Bart Hoskins asks:

- The Conservation Commission is aware that we have many gas leaks in the City; many are finding a way up through sidewalk cuts where street trees are, damaging them. Is this an opportunity to inspect as you go along - issues related to mains or tie ins? Many gas leaks around the City affect street trees. Scott Sheehan agrees. Mr. Degler notes National Grid is replacing cracked/leaking cast iron mains w/safer, more durable plastic mains and will be inspecting service ties and replacing as they go/as needed, will make note and be back to address issues.

Chair St. Louis opens to the public.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar St.

- Asks about timing, especially regarding the Point/parking, as vehicles get displaced. Advance notice is needed. She urges the Commission to alert the Tree Warden of work as well as gas leaks, as these can impact tree planting. Mr. Degler notes that National Grid can be conditioned to notify. Re replacements = 1-3 days of construction so quick turnaround

Scott Sheehan notes that 1-3 days of no parking is significant in this area; it is outside the Commission's jurisdiction but he asks the Applicant to please let the City know so that the neighborhood liaison can be informed and possibly provide alternate parking.

Bob Provencher, 17 Barnes Rd., asks about discussion of the Overlook property. This is next.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes

Scott Sheehan Yes

Bart Hoskins notes that Conditions have been placed on negative Determination in the past and asks if the Commission wishes to add any conditions; many of these issues are outside Commission jurisdiction.

A motion to issue a Negative 2 and Negative 6 Determination is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

E. Overlook Acres – Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Peter Lutts, Overlook Acres, LLC, 5 Biscoe St, Beverly, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the proposed 290-unit, multi-family apartment complex consisting of four apartment buildings, a clubhouse, and a commercial/retail use building located at 383, 379, and 387 Highland Ave, 4, 10, 14, and 16 Barnes Rd, and 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 18 Cedar Rd within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem’s Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Present for the Applicant:

Rich Kirby, Senior Wetland Scientist, LEC Environmental
 Peter Lutts, Real Estate Agent, Herrick Lutts Realty Partners
 Paul Herrick, Real Estate Broker, Herrick Lutts Realty Partners
 Scott Cameron, Civil Engineer, the Morin Cameron Group
 Property Owners Pavel Espinal, Chris Koeplin

- Existing site conditions
 - PUD undergoing SPR and Special Permit with Planning Board; undergone storm water and traffic peer reviews, and several community outreach meetings have been held since 2019
 - Buffer zone to BVW; filed an NRAD in June, Commission issued an ORAD
 - Site size and location are described; NRAD covered 11 parcels; 3 are non jurisdictional but are included in NOI
 - Resource areas are described
 - Main area is emergent marsh dominated by phragmites, outlined by forested wetland. Another isolated BVW is non-jurisdictional
 - Most of area of land along resource areas includes invasive plants which are listed
 - Topography is shown and described; historic alteration, fill and grading has occurred. Debris such as concrete, bricks, white goods on Eastern portion of site is present
- Proposed Site Conditions
 - Buildings 1, 3 and 4 partially located in buffer zone to wetland
 - 2 main roadways to access the site are described
- Scott Cameron outlines site design and Plan development & review
 - Changes resulting from Planning Board review are outlined; a large portion of surface parking is now subsurface
 - Buildings in general are closer to Wetland with parking on other side, except for Building 1
 - Topography/grade changes are outlined
 - Attempted to preserve buffer along Building 4, including restoration
 - Stormwater management design is described; offsite areas contribute and will be maintained/accommodated
 - Not looking to add or remove water from wetland
 - Treatment systems are described
 - Erosion control is described

- Sewer/gravity main is described
- Remediation is described; Planting schedule is intense, will be healthier than it is now
- Walking trail is described

Scott Sheehan needs to step out at this point to deal with a matter at home.

- Imported soil is being explored; limit and content of fill is described
- Upland restoration and plantings are described; mostly an open meadow area for ecosystem diversity
- Mr. Kirby further describes the state of the site as a “dumping ground” and outlines future cleanup attempts; isolated wetland will see improved function and value. The restoration process is described
 - Distance between wetland and Building 3 has changed over time
- Planning Board plans are more robust and can be provided if desired

Chair St. Louis:

- Water going to isolated wetland, compares USGS map to existing topography, wonders about ES3 watershed capture from what comes off 107 ridgeline. Could be more offsite drainage heading into property. Proof by dropping on USGS contours. Site walk was completed in Spring and again w/Peer Reviewer Bill Ross. They are confident of limits of watershed but these can be reexamined
- Carrying flow path of ditch created between gravel dry and flow from abutting land: there is a catch basin but on the site side of retaining wall, more of a yard drain vs. carrying flow under bldg 1? Scott Cameron clarifies location. Looking w/stormwater design to collect runoff from adjacent properties; this is described. Chair notes that it looks like wall is pushing water to a private way to be collected in the road system vs. going into wetland PS8 to PS6?
- Like to wait and see peer review input before Commission gives further thoughts

Chair St. Louis opens to the public.

Written comments from Linda Farra Rasso 67 Aurora Ln are read into the record. She does not approve of the project but her comments are not related to the Commission’s jurisdiction, having mostly to do with traffic. However the latter parts of her comments are jurisdictional, noting Wetlands Protection Act Violations in the n Civil Plans.

- w/in 100’ buffer zone is prep work
- large portions buildings of 3 and 4 in buffer
- 45 parking spots, all roadways are in buffer; runoff will enter wetlands
- Site prep w/in buffer
- Impact to Forest River; BVW is hydrologically connected
- Proposing to eliminate buffer zone
- Notes importance of maintaining wetlands
- Chair St. Louis notes the limits of Jurisdiction and review to Conservation Commission items; other things must be taken up w/relevant bodies i.e. density, traffic, parking, etc.
- What stood out to him: This is a project off a state highway, are they applying for MEPA review? Mr. Cameron indicates they have filed an application w/MEPA
- Mr. Cameron replies:
 - WPA outlines guidance to ensure that Applicants protect resource areas, feels this project is a development and is change but is an improvement; if it was a completely virgin property never impacted by human activity, the conversation would be different but they will be mediating several concerning items that are impacting wetlands today such as fill, which is still under evaluation. Color of wetlands in spring indicates rust/iron oxide, also trash/debris. Site walk may be beneficial to the Commission. Water quality will be improved and that supports the wetland system
 - Public access will also be provided

- Other matters are technical; they are in compliance w/WPA
- Stormwater management is under Peer Review
- Rich Kirby: Adds that WPA regulations outline the discretion the Commission has; there are no direct impacts proposed though there is work in Buffer Zone; commission will review site/project to see if this will impact the resource area. Preventative measures such as erosion and sedimentation control should be taken into account as well as 3rd party review. Also take into account both good and bad existing conditions; trying to preserve native areas and focus changes on already altered/disturbed/nonnative areas. Also eliminating some steep slopes and will remove fill material/debris and restore/improve buffer zone function and wetland function

Robert Provencher, 17 Barnes Rd.

- Feels project does not belong
- Catch basin off Highland Ave.
- 60-70 years ago fill occurred, then stopped, property has been dormant since then b/c he thinks there is contaminated soil deep into property
- Many wetlands were filled
- Concern about impact of trucks
- Chair St. Louis notes they will file w/state Agency that will have additional eyes re contamination, traffic, environmental including dust
- Chair asks if anyone is aware in City/Ownership re enforcement actions that halted filling of wetland?

Polly Wilbert 7 Cedar St.

- Considers it top of “watering can” for Salem Woods; concerned about water flow
- Snow is to be removed in winter, yet is valuable so enough snow storage should be available onsite for retention of woods
- 2 year maintenance program, but urges the Commission to create maintenance Plan go be given to property owners to continue on
- Scott Cameron: snow storage areas are called out in C4 Plan series (site layout)
- Richard Kirby: 2 year monitoring is WPA standard to make sure wetland is successful; there is a long term and short term pollution prevention plan in place along with O&M Plans

Chair St. Louis

- Detention system will be in Parking Area 1 for slowly releasing water as there is bedrock onsite and soils there would not support a pure infiltration system
- South end building 3 infiltration system/standards are discussed
- Isolated wetland pre/post construction runoff receipt

Mary Whitney, 356 Essex St. Unit 2

- What is allowed by right onsite?
- Re invasives & trash, removal & replacement w/natives is good but project will still be eliminating habitat
- What is Neg 2, 6 and 5?
- St. Louis clarifies the process RDA vs. NOI
- Common area fenced in? Between buildings 3 and 1 is fenced in trash disposal area (Scott Cameron)
- She is concerned that trash receptacles will not be used
- Feels they should stay out of buffer zone; this is part of “Salem’s Emerald Necklace”

Stephen Kapantais, 23A Wisteria St.

- Asks Board to reach out to Beth Rennard re losing quorum during meeting when Mr. Sheehan left; cannot conduct business until he returned. It was not noted when he did return
- Encroachment on wetlands by impervious surface affects wetlands negatively and this project will encroach; questions are unanswered

- Peer review notes many items are incomplete or missing, these are listed
- Not enough info provided to decide on effects of project on wetlands
- Requests public meeting continue or they vote no on project so Peer Reviewer can complete work for a well informed decision
- St. Louis notes he is awaiting Peer Review comments and Applicant noted Commission and Public have been offered a site walk/these items are ongoing
- Scott Cameron:
 - Peer review consultant requests have been submitted; prospect is iterative and is described. Mr. Ross is doing Peer review and most comments have been addressed; a few are outstanding esp. drainage
 - Public will not be able to attend Commission site walk as Owner has not given permission
 - Chair St. Louis wonders if this is due to MCP issues. This is due to owners not giving Applicant permission and also walking around on property is not safe, not contamination issues but terrain is not easily traversable. Not all areas can be seen well

Yoleny Ynoa, 53 Clark St

- Project will be next to his backyard
- Peer review: if permits granted, Developer can disturb soil from wetlands, concerned about contamination
- Feels Commission should not allow disturbance of wetlands, project is too big

Alvi Ibanez, 2 ½ Barnes Rd.

- Is pond part of Forest River? In 2018 USGS map was done and Mass DEP considers when doing evaluations, considered this pond part of river; if so, wouldn't pond be subject to riparian zone of 200'?
- Developers claim that encroachment on wetlands is b/c of what wetlands look like but he feels it is b/c the more they build the more money they make; they could build outside of buffer as Mary Whitney suggested
- We must protect open areas even if degraded, to protect natural areas and enhance life for residents
- Project will set tone of future development on Highland Ave. What happens upstream will have effects downstream
- Asks Commission to weigh in re protection of wetlands vs. development, keeping in mind quality of life of residents and wetland
- Chair St. Louis: USGS map calls out a perennial stream; riparian designation did not include ponds but he will ask Applicant to look into this (if standing water falls under riparian guidelines)
- Rich Kirby, Wetland Scientist, notes USGS map shows perennial tributary to Forest River that flows out of pond. When rivers flow through ponds, when pond exhibits riverine characteristics, extends from other side but if linear w/perennial stream in and out. In this case pond is source for perennial stream. USGS stream stats were run; where perennial stream exits, contributing watershed is .06 sq mile, far below 1 sq mile threshold so Applicant opines there is no riverfront area onsite. USGS shows stream 200' away. So does not occur onsite

Farwas Abusharkh, 4 Harrison Rd.

- Water, sewage will be sent back to Highland - concerned that it is too close to wetland, too big
- Soil may be contaminated
- Natural disasters will overwhelm pump station and sewage will wind up in river, downstream, etc.
- Hold off on approving this project until more information is provided

Chair St. Louis does not see a common pump station; is there one per building? Mr. Cameron notes there will be one common pump station for the facility, sited between buildings 2 and 4 as noted on C6 series utility plans. Chair notes many systems have storage capacity and safeguards built in; reviewing the Plans noted, it is a subsurface enclosure, submersible. Mr. Cameron describes it in more detail though the full design is not yet complete. The Construction Drawing Process would encompass pump station design. It would include several layers of redundancy to account for failure/catastrophe. As a last resort trucks could be onsite to pump it out. Pumps could be down for 24 hours with enough capacity to handle everything. City of Salem Engineering Department scrutinizes

all connections as well. Infrastructure capacity analysis is ongoing, notes Chair. Do they anticipate sewer/utility work in Highland Ave? Unsure as of yet. Inspection process is described.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal St.

- Thresholds that the project exceeds to trigger MEPA (Mass. Env. Policy Act) process?
- Scott Cameron: impervious thresholds, traffic thresholds, land disturbance of 5 acres
- MCP Issues? Unknown yet, no LSP hired yet. Environmental study will be done b/c will have to clear property to allow habitable use (MCP = Mass Contingency Plan)

Robert Provencher 17 Barnes Rd. (second comment)

- Notes property can be seen from Animal Shelter
- Land will be filled and contamination buried

Mary Whitney

- What is allowed by right? Planning Board jurisdiction
- Quorum?
- Reiterates importance of protecting wetland/riparian area from humans

Councilor Patti Morsillo

- What can be done by right within buffer zone, specifically Building 3?
- Chair St. Louis: Salem does not have an Ordinance beyond the State criterion which is zero setback, meaning the Applicant has stated that they are maintaining 50 or more feet in a number of cases where they have room, no riparian areas on site, not to say there is not buffer throughout, but as far as what allows size/unit counts, these are Planning Board issues
- Scott Sheehan: State rules allow you to go within wetlands and fill them in as long as they are replicated elsewhere; there is no hard requirement to avoid wetlands
- Chair St. Louis cites a project where local ordinance prohibited building w/in 50' of resource area, so Applicant filled in 50' and put building on what was the original wetland boundary, and this held up in court; people appealed City's decision and the state upheld it. Can get worse results upon Appeal so the Conservation Commission tries to condition Projects to protect resources and high value wetlands where present

Logistics of the Commission site walk are discussed and it will be scheduled by the Agent.

A motion to continue to the Sept. 15, 2020 meeting is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by Tyler Glode, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

F. 0 Story St Subdivision Lots A, B, & C and construction of roadway (DEP #'s TBD)

Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group LLC, 14 Story St, Salem, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the construction of a roadway with utilities and an onsite stormwater management system with grading at 0 Story St an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group LLC, 14 Story St, Salem, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the construction of a single family dwelling located at 0 Story St, Lot A (Map 23, Parcel 2) within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group LLC, 14 Story St, Salem, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the construction of a single family dwelling located at 0 Story St, Lot B (Map 23, Parcel 2) within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Continuation of Public Hearing – Notice of Intent for Stephen Lovely, Castle Hill Group LLC, 14 Story St, Salem, MA. The purpose of the hearing is to discuss the construction of a single family dwelling located at 0 Story St, Lot C (Map 23, Parcel 2) within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Note: All items under item F will be continued.

A motion to continue to the Sept. 15, 2020 meeting is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

II. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. 12 Nurse Way – DEP #64-617 – Request for Certificate of Compliance

B. 14 Nurse Way – DEP #64-615 – Request for Certificate of Compliance

Sean McDonnell presents for Griffin Engineering

- Slight modifications to building footprint = slight increase in impervious areas, otherwise in accordance to Plans
- Roof leaders from house lead directly to catch basin at 12 Nurse Way
- Scott Sheehan asks about building layout leading to decrease of 100' of impervious area? #14 had decrease, #12 had slight increase.
- Wetland boundary markers have since been installed

A motion to issue the two Certificates of Compliance (#12 and #14 Nurse Way) is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

C. Discussion and vote on use of Conservation Commission funds for MACC dues

- Budget was cut; \$200 allocated but need \$600

A motion to approve the use of \$400 for dues is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode	Yes
Bart Hoskins	Yes
Greg St. Louis	Yes
Scott Sheehan	Yes

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. June 16, 2020

b. July 21, 2020

A motion to approve both sets of minutes is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Scott Sheehan, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode Yes

Bart Hoskins Yes

Greg St. Louis Yes

Scott Sheehan Yes

Chair St. Louis notes that all Commissioners are volunteers and appreciates their efforts and their showing up for long meetings.

Scott Sheehan wonders about reviewing the recording - a link will be sent for him to review and an affidavit sent in the mail.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Scott Sheehan, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 4-0.

Tyler Glode Yes

Bart Hoskins Yes

Greg St. Louis Yes

Scott Sheehan Yes

The meeting ends at 9:25PM