



CITY OF SALEM CONSERVATION COMMISSION

NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Salem Conservation Commission will be held on **Tuesday, May 17, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. via remote participation, in accordance with Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 and as amended by Chapter 22 of the Acts of 2022.**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Greg St. Louis opens the meeting at 6:36 pm

I. ROLL CALL

In attendance: Tom Philbin, Greg St. Louis, Bart Hoskins, Judith Kohn, Dan Ricciarelli (5)

Absent: Tom Campbell, Tyler Glode (2)

Also in attendance: Kate Kennedy, Chelsea Titchenell (2)

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 9 Franklin Street – DEP# 64-729 – Public Hearing *Continuation* – Notice of Intent - of Patrick Shea, 11 Franklin LLC, for the property located at 9 Franklin Street, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed twelve (12) unit multi-family development and associated site work, located within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Dan Ricciarelli: I will be recusing myself from this one.

Tom Philbin has sent affidavit saying he has reviewed the materials since the meeting was first opened and the applicant is comfortable with his position to vote.

Scott Cameron, on behalf of applicant, shares a presentation:

- Bill Ross, NEEC, and the City of Salem's Engineering Department have done their own review
- C-6 plans shared for all changes made providing:
 - A water management system
 - The City's storm system is surcharged, so the pipe must be looked at as a full condition for worst case scenario situations.
 - Grading adjustments have been made to address runoff from adjacent properties.
 - Includes a more extensive storm water system to collect and convey off site and there are additional adjustments for the flood areas.
 - All adjustments made have been utility based, with no changes to the sight lay out.

Greg St. Louis: Was a tide gate collected in the last manhole

- Scott Cameron: We are above the high tide so there is no need

Tom Philbin: With runoff and heavy rain during high tide, how do you deal with this?

- Scott Cameron: The project is in accordance with the FEMA plan. The nearest habitable space is a full story, or about 10 feet above the flood plain.
- Greg St. Louis: This is one or two applications that are current prior to our review threshold

Bart Hoskins: I am curious about the elevation of the parking area, particularly in respect to flooding.

- Scott Cameron: The flood plain is at elevation 10. It floods into the street. We have included area in the back of the property and it could surcharge back up into the drains that we are adding. For a pedestrian route the entire street would be flooded, not specific to this property, and people would have to leave from adjacent properties. That is solely in an emergency situation.

Greg St. Louis: One of my typical comments is to valve off floor drains. I don't know if that is required though.

- Scott Cameron: Because these are petitioned floor drains a valve is not necessary for this project as they are akin to any other single family home type of garage, but we would be fine with a condition that if floor drains were required, they would be valved.

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

A motion to issue the condition subject to the special condition that, should floor drains be required under architectural revision to the interior of the building, that any floor drains would be valved off is made by in addition to standard conditions is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Judith Kohn, and passes 4-0.

B. Winter Island Shed Relocation – DEP#64-752 – Public Hearing Continuation - Notice of Intent - of City of Salem Harbormaster, for project located at 51 Winter Island Road, Salem, MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed relocation of the Harbormaster shed on the concrete pier at Winter Island, to an upland area at the top of the pier, located within an area subject to the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Curtis Cheney, on behalf of Bill of Bill McHugh, and shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Added debris boom in the water and silt sock for erosion control
- Added in buffer zones
- DEP file number has been added as #064-0752 and there are no comments
- The elevation has been adjusted from 21' to 17'
- Landing added to the top of the stairway

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

A motion to issue the condition subject to standard conditions is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Tom Philbin, and passes 5-0.

C. 13 Cedarcrest Road – DEP# 64-755, DEP# 64-754, DEP# 64-753 – Public Hearing- three Notices of Intent - of Julie Dandreo, Six Progress Corporation, 6 Vernon Street, Salem MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed construction of 3 single family homes, associated driveways, grading, walkway, deck, stormwater management, retaining wall and sewer line, located at Map 21, Lot 59 Cedarcrest Road, Lot 1 (DEP# 64-755), Lot 2 (DEP# 64-754) and Lot 3 (DEP# 64-753), located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

This notice is presented in congruence with the 2 Cedarcrest Road Request for Determination of Applicability application listed below.

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

- D. 2 Cedarcrest Road** – Request for Determination of Applicability – application of Julie Dandreo, Six Progress Corporation, 6 Vernon Street, Salem MA, for the proposed construction of a walkway and grading, located at 2 Cedarcrest Road, Map 21, Parcel 82, located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.

Dan Dandreo, representative of the applicant, shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- This is a 4-lot project, developed for a 4-house development with the hope to have it occupied by Christmas time.
- Conservation area is maintained well
- Four separate filings have been made since four people are funding it on their own, however all work will be done at one time.

Jay Polakiewicz, representative of Hancock Association, shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- This was previously 3 lot but an A&R allowed for a revision to the plotlines to increase build ability
- Steep slop with exposed ledge and wetlands on the lower end
 - Lot 1
 - The proposal includes a house with a driveway into the garage, a walkway to the house, and a deck on the rear side of the house
 - Water service through water main on road and will be connected to all 4 houses
 - Storm water mitigation has been included. Each lot has a drainage system of 1 inch over and will be at or below a 100-year storm
 - The retaining wall, will generally be about 4' tall. This will flatten the existing 2 to 1 slope. Flattening and covering the slope will reduce erosion.
 - An invasive species management plan has been drafted about what plants should be removed, how to remove them and where. Native species are then outlined. Hay scented fern and white wood aster would be included as some of these species.
 - There have been revised plans that the commission has not seen as of yet which includes additions of wetland flags and the wall being moved out of the 25' no disturbance zone Lot 1
 - Lot 2
 - This proposal includes a house with a driveway to the garage, a walkway to the house, a deck in the rear, a storm water infiltration system, a forced main connection with water going to the water main.
 - All applicable design features have been done in this one as well
 - Lot 3
 - This lot follows the same build as Lot 2.
 - The wall is about the same 4' height throughout, with it flattening out at the slope.
 - Lot 4
 - This will have a paver walkway with grading.

Kate Kennedy summarizes a site walk that took place on Friday, May 13, 2022:

- The existing wetland is fairly degraded with a lot of invasive species, so taking care of invasives and cleaning it up would be an improvement of that area. There was wildlife there, and decent canopy cover.
- Greg St. Louis: There is also a lot of typography here. The wetland line itself is straightforward and there are not shrubs outside of shrub brush. There looks like a possibility with the center and western lot for the retaining wall to not be required and I would anticipate a special condition allowing the grading across boundaries if it proves beneficial.

Judith Kohn: Are your proposing working within the 25' zone?

- Jay Polakiewicz: Not anymore. We have decided it is best to move the plan outside of the 25' Zone as is seen in the plan provided today.

- Judith Kohn: There are a lot of steep slopes that would be interrupted.
- Jay Polakiewicz: We added a silt fence in addition to and the straw waddle, which is included on the updated plans
- Judith Kohn: Will you be planting grass for stabilization of the slopes that will be disturbed?
- Jay Polakiewicz: Correct, and we generally try to keep it 3 to 1 at most for disturbance.

Tom Philbin: Do you have a long-term maintenance and management plan for this?

- Jay Polakiewicz: We do not
- Tom Philbin: Invasives comes back quickly, so you should look to plant natives that can at least compete with that. It would be good to get an expert there to recommend what you can do to enhance the property for the community and the environment.

Kristen Farr, Wetland Scientist representing Hancock Association: Hay scented fern spreads by rise zones which is good for the slopes and we have wood aster to add in spots between that. New England Wetland Plants has a couple of mixes that we will use on site with the specifications attached to the invasive management plan sent in today, which would also enhance the conservation value of it. Storm water management has been provided on each of the sites. It is on a hill, so climate change and sea level rise are most likely not relevant but we can monitor it to ensure that the invasives stay away as much as possible and the native seeds come up.

- Tom Philbin: Is removal all mechanical?
 - Kristen Farr: My understanding is it is all hand pulled. We can cut the bittersweet vines low and brush herbicide on the ends so it kills the plant more.

Dan Ricciarelli - On Lot 1 is there a way to back off on the paving occurring on the driveway and limit the trees moved?

- Jay Polakiewicz: The driveway has been set up for fire safety vehicles per the City requirements, so that has been done with safety in mind. It will be a slope down with first floor elevation at 90 with the outside being 88 and a few steps to get to 89 ½ and then 6" up to the first-floor elevation.
- Dan Ricciarelli: And for trees, is the whole backyard being cleared?
- Jay Polakiewicz: We will have to cut down some but we are trying to retain as many as possible.

Tom Philbin: Will there be any wetland signage put up or posts to designate the wetland area?

- Jay Polakiewicz: We can make that a condition for approval.
- Greg St. Louis It is hard to tell what the exact scale of it would be, perhaps three signs per a lot attached to the fence.

Greg St. Louis: Does the Commission agree with invasive removal being outside of the 25' zone and leaving the inside of the zone natural?

- Bart Hoskins: It might make sense to cut the bittersweet and paint the ends with the herbicide in the zone to keep it back.
- Greg St. Louis: I would also require the standard inspection be included

Public Comment:

Erin Britt, 32 Cedarcrest Avenue: Why is Lot 1 not showing that it is abutting Forest River Conservation? Does that mean these homes and the retaining walls will be well over the 100-foot buffer zone and 25 feet from the wetland?

- Greg St. Louis: The original application had it at the 25-foot zone and it was asked to be pulled from the 25-foot zone

Erin Britt: We have a number of animals seen in these areas all the time, so there is a large concern here. What does this do to the wildlife? Why are we building here instead of improving the conditions that are there?

- Jay Polakiewicz: we are trying to improve the site as a whole. We can't change what is in the wetlands but we

are improving from the 25' zone to the street.

Andy Varela, 23 Cedarcrest Avenue, Ward City Councilor and Councilor to City Commission: We had a delineation report done and there was some movement of the retaining wall on building number 2. This spring has been fairly dry and it doesn't reflect what is happening in the resource area. On behalf of the neighbors, we had to request a wetland scientist and there is cause for concern that they are in the resource area. The homes there are not my concern but the impact of the actual construction is concerning, so it might be beneficial to move closer to the street, but that brings other concerns such as the narrow street and the possible need for sidewalks. We need to look at all of our resource areas as the hydrology shows that this is an entrance into the Forest River Conservation Area.

- Jay Polakiewicz: As for moving the houses forward, we can't since they are set on the front set back lines. The right of way line will not change and the set back lines won't change if the road is widened. For blasting, the basements are shown generally around the existing grate with a net zero site generally without blasting. The wall follows contour 74 for the most part near the 25-foot zone in the lower area, with more in the slope. The A & R was done to move the lot line over
- Andy Varela: This has historically been a concern in this neighborhood where the lot has been built in the zone. It is appropriate that we continue to look at projects outside the buffer zone, especially considering that a new Wetland Protection Act was passed. Furthermore, after talking to the Tree Commission, there will be a request for an updated tree survey as there are trees, specifically in Lot 1 that are the jurisdiction of the Tree Warden. We need to be cautious about this subdivision.

Kimsheska Suazo, 40 Cedarcrest Avenue: I am an abutter to the single-family homes proposed. My concerns match much of what has been said. There are trees that help drain and it remains unclear how they intend to build on steep inclines where they will have to navigate on this incline. We believe that this would have a negative impact on the Forest River Conservation Area. I would hope there would be considerations made to build closer to the roadway instead of the protected area.

- Jay: As previously stated we can't move the houses due to them being on the setback. We do believe that we are helping with mitigation. There should be no concerns about flooding in this area.

Cindy Jerzylo, 17 Bayview Avenue: I am surprised by the councilors comments when he was speaking for a 5-story building in wetlands and conservation area near the Willows. I feel he is doing a disservice to the family and I am in support of the project as a citizen of Salem. Thank you.

Stacia Kraft, 140 Federal Street: I want to second what the last caller said. I also want to make a comment on this new ordinance. It seems like for the past year or more the Commission and Planning Board asked for stricter guidelines and instead got more power, which is the opposite of what seemed to be wanted. It seems like the rules should be stricter and it is unfortunate.

- Greg St. Louis: We do consider on a case-by-case basis. The site is loaded with invasives which we are asking to be moved, they are not in the 25' zone, and there is a list of other items that I plan to condition along with this application.

Dan Dandreo: This is not a Planning Board plan or subdivision plan. The lots are all 1,700 sq. feet and conform to the 25 zone. We are within all of the requirements and the way this plan is designed, the wall line is on elevation 74 and when we do the wall it will stabilize the whole area. The retaining wall will have vents on top with no cars or trucks driving into that area. I think this is a good plan for my kids, niece and nephew, and the City of Salem. We have all walked the property and we try to keep it simple. Thank you.

Andy Varela: I am making my consideration as a Councilor and not a resident. My capacity is advocating for neighbors here. I appreciate everyone on the board willing to serve here and thank you for your time.

Tim Keller, 32 Cedarcrest Avenue: My concern is that it seems to me like the homework has not been done and it seems to be like the questions about the migratory and wildlife pattern seems unknown. It seems detrimental to disturb this

area any more than it already has been.

Greg St. Louis discusses a peer review letter received. Highlights include:

- Recommends flags be added to the intermittent stream delineation and ledge outcrop that defines the landscape
- Hydric soils upland sand and gravels and ledge outcrop that defines the landscape

Dan Ricciarelli: Was this done by the residents?

- Greg St. Louis: This was done by John Dick, Wetland Scientist, who was engaged by the Council.
- Dan Ricciarelli: Can the applicant respond to this?
- Greg St. Louis: There does not seem to be any response needed. It appears in support of the delineation. From my observation there were no signs of buttress trees or flooding and the water was murky at best and was not flowing.

Judith Kohn: I do think that there are changes to the plan that we haven't been able to see and there are several questions that need to be answered here then we should have the applicant do a continuation.

- Greg St Louis: If this were to be continued, special conditions to reference would be:
 - Referencing the letter received by John Dick
 - Requiring flag numbers where necessary in the field and on the plans
 - No blasting associated with the foundation of the retaining walls
 - Three-year monitoring associated with the bases
 - Installation of the inspection port and the drainage system
 - Grading on Lot 1 and 2 to be combined if appropriate
 - Wetland signage with three plaques per a retaining wall
 - Expanding the invasive management plan to include the cutting of bittersweet throughout the properties discussed

A motion to continue the public hearing to June 21, 2022 is made by Judith Kohn, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

- E. 1 and 2 Lee Fort Terrace – DEP# 64-### – Public Hearing- Notice of Intent – of BC Lee Fort Terrace LLC, 2 Center Plaza, Boston MA. The purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed replacement of 50 apartments with 124 apartments, associated garage, surface parking, outdoor community space and new public open space at the property located at 1 and 2 Lee Fort Terrace, Map 41, Lots 242 and 249, Salem MA. The proposed work is located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

Ann Morton, LEC Environmental, shares presentation: We are before Zoning Board for the 40b with joint a joint hearing from the Zoning Board and Planning Board. There will be an engineering peer review and the Zoning Board has continued the appeal to June 15 of this year. The DEP file number is 0756 and there were no DEP file number comments.

Cathy Hooq, Executive Director for the Housing Authority of Salem: This is one of the oldest properties in the housing authority and it is for elderly and disabled. They are garden style and on ground level. They are not doing well these days as they are functionally and financially obsolete. We are seeing this project as a rescue mission and we are looking to save the apartments that we have and work in harmony with the natural and social systems that surround it.

Courtney Koslow, Development Director of Beacon Communities:

- Permitting is expected to start in 2023 with construction that August and opening in 2025
- Acknowledgement that climate change and sea level rise will have an impact
- Reduced initial units from 200 to 124, with 3 and 4 story buildings having lower portions closest to the abutter

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

and two building wings around the courtyard.

- All electric and near net zero carbon neutral

Ann Morton:

- The entire site is mapped by FEMA at elevation 10, with some areas slightly above 10
- Commonwealth Tidelands will not be built upon
- Adding 100 parking spaces, with 86 under the building and the remaining on the surface in the courtyard.

Mark Wixted, Civil Engineer representing Bohler:

- Grades follow south to north.
- Elevation at Fort Avenue is at 10 and goes to 7.5 elevation
- Road currently going through the site goes to 5.8 elevation
- Proposed grading on the ground floor is at 10.5 and generally everything at the building is 10.5 or higher. The lobby and office spaces are designed at 13.5 with flood elevations out to 2070
- Impervious areas for storm water would be reduced by 9,000 sq. feet.
- The driveway off of Fort Avenue would have rain guards in the middle of the parking lot.
- Paved surfaces and sidewalks have bio-retention cells, creating high levels of TSS removals.
- Stock piles will be located in the middle of the site to keep from Collins Cove and the abutters.

Monique Hall, BSC Group, continues presentation. Highlights include:

- There are large mature trees that will be preserved and plans have been redesigned around them so they can remain intact.
- Pine trees will be under planted.
- Lawn areas will be minimized to two areas and a 6-foot-wide pedestrian path will be included.
- Multiple seed mixes planned with intent to overseed
- There would be plans for a woodland shade garden on the North side and victory garden on the South side.

Ann Morton:

- The site is in the 100-year floodplain at elevation 10. Projection for 2070 ranged 3.5 to 4.5 feet.
- Elevation levels have the garage at 10.6, lobby at 13, and residential area at 21.

Greg St. Louis: I would like to request of peer review of the application against the new regulations for storm water requirements.

- Ann Morton: Would you be doing the storm water in congruence with the peer review from the Zoning Board or would it be done separately?
- Greg St. Louis: I would request that they be done separately for legal clarification.

Judith Kohn: I think this application is a bit premature given that you are still going through the Zoning Board review and the plans aren't stamped. Can you tell us why we should be considering at this stage instead of at later stage when you have ZBA approval?

- Ann Morton: We like to run parallel so that we can incorporate input and comments from both boards at the same time. We can work with the City staff to work on the timing of the peer reviews so that it is the best use of everyone's time.

Public Comment:

Cindy Jerzylo, 17 Bayview Avenue: Nobody has talked about getting any soil samples of the area as that used to be a leather factory and there was a lot of dumping, as there was King's Kelly Dump there before. Is that in your jurisdiction

to have soil samples done of that whole area?

- Greg St. Louis: Soil samples would need to be done.

Leslie, Niccolini, 14 Fort Avenue: I feel that this is rushed and when they are speaking about the trees and what will not be ruined, I look out there are trees, a beautiful view, and there is plenty of space for people to sit in the park. I do not feel they have worked with any of the abutters here. They will be taking away views, adding traffic and a lot of cars. We have one or two cars that come down a day and they said one car a minute. I think there is so much they are trying to build and it is money, rushed, and they aren't working with any of the neighbors around here. They are adding something we already have here.

Shannon Bailey, 42 Lee Fort Terrace: In respect to the conservation area, I want to speak in regards to the flooding that I have seen occur. I can confirm that I have seen soil samples being done here. There are not as many trees as people think, most are at the abutting the school with a few in between the buildings with some of them still remaining. I also want to comment that the flooding that happens is consistent and has slowly been degrading and settling us underneath that the street is dipping and flooding goes to the height of the fire hydrants. This has been an ongoing issue that is going to keep getting worse. I have seen the project and I believe it would help the wildlife. There are mostly seagulls and a mice problem, as well as some ducks. I think this plan will bring better wildlife and keep rodents away from our homes. It was wetlands prior and filled in 1998.

Richard Stafford, 30 Boyment Street: Is the developer planning to use permeable pavement on this project? How many mature trees would be cut down? What water would be retained on site

- Monique Hall: There are currently 30 trees on site. We will preserve 5 of the large canopies, preserving 5 and planting 120 new trees.
- Mark Wixted: We do not have permeable pavement proposed at this point. The percent of water retained on site we are treating is .5 inch of water retained on site and that does not include the extra rain impervious to production.

Barbara Warren, Salem Sound Coastwatch, 20 Federal Street: This is one of the first projects I have seen that will move construction out of the Chapter 9 tidelands and I think they are taking this seriously;

Cindy Jerzylo, 17 Bayview Avenue: Who will do the peer review? Does the company or City pick someone?

- Greg St Louis: The Commission will pick a few proposals and choose a consultant which would then be funded by the applicant.
- Cindy Jerzylo: That run off water goes into the sanitation sewer and goes through the plant and as residents we will be charged an extra fee for that run off water. Will we be compensated and who will pay for this?
 - Mark Wixted: Within the building footprint the parking goes into the sanitation sewer. It is a small percentage of the flow that would be coming out of the building and I don't think it would have a meaningful impact but we can talk to the Engineering Department in case there is another way they would like us to handle this.
 - Greg St. Louis: Their approach is consistent with past applications and code.

Angie, 29 Lee Fort Terrace: It is an adjustment and I am not happy about the situation. I was wondering if you would still work with the power plant and the pole where Verizon connects and does repairs and wiring and if it would be removed. Are people living here going to have to rely on a certain company for wiring?

- Greg St. Louis: Unfortunately, those are not subject to our jurisdiction and they would have to communicate with those providers directly.

A motion to continue the public hearing to June 21, 2022 is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

- F. 429 Highland Ave – DEP# 64-### – Public Hearing – Notice of Intent – of Maryann Coletta, Inspiration Donuts, 80 Boston Street, Lynn MA. Purpose of this hearing is to discuss the proposed drainage improvements located at 429 Highland Avenue, located within an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act MGL c.131§40 and Salem Wetlands Protection & Conservation Ordinance.**

David Kelley, Meridian Associates, shares a presentation. Highlights include:

- Parking lot floods during decent rain events
- Proposing to take the existing low point and pipe onto property piping into the manhole
- This would replicate what was previously constructed
- Have been working closely with the abutter to ensure separate water systems and ensuring that if issues were to arise, we would know the source and responsible party.
- Easement has been verbally agreed upon but has not yet been drafted
- Intent is to construct this summer while the abutting property has construction taking place.
- Not seeking to expand

Dan Ricciarelli- Is the Life Storage facility on an order of condition currently and how does that work?

- Greg St. Louis If work is subject to another order it would need to be amended but since this is a different property it would be a separate filing.

Tom Philbin: So, this was built this way, someone capped it and you are putting it back?

- David Kelley- Yes, with an improved system

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

A motion to issue the order with standard conditions, contingent upon receiving the DEP file number is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

III. OLD | NEW BUSINESS

- A. 200 Fort Avenue – DEP# 64-731 – Request for Certificate of Compliance**

Seth Latrell, Planning Department and Port Authority discusses the request. Highlights include:

- Occurred December into early February
- Pilings from pier extracted completely and no timber was left on the sea floor
- Larger project still in progress but the demolition is complete.

Dan Ricciarelli: Kate were you able to visit the site?

Kate Kennedy: Yes, and everything looked good.

A motion to issue the certificate of compliance is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Bart Hoskins, and passes 5-0.

- B. 132 - 144 Canal Street – DEP# 64-644 – Request for Certificate of Compliance**

Rich Williams, Williams & Sparages: We have a comprehensive as built plan and a letter outlining the minor changes with notes that the minor changes do not impact the resource area or the interest of the act

A motion to issue the order of compliance is made by Bart Hoskins, seconded by Judith Kohn, and passes 5-0.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Dan Ricciarelli, seconded by Greg St. Louis, and passes 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:38 pm.