



City of Peabody
Conservation Commission

City Hall • 24 Lowell Street • Peabody, Massachusetts 01960 • Tel. 978-538-5782

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 8, 2012

PEABODY CITY HALL
24 LOWELL STREET, LOWER LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Francis Lee
Jarrod Hochman (arrived 7:56)
Joel Whitman
Vice Chairman Michael Rizzo
Bruce Comak
Alan Klapman
Charles Denny

MEMBERS ABSENT

Secretary Jared Yagjian

Also Present: Lucia DelNegro, Conservation Agent; Councillor Rico Mello, Ward 3 City Councillor; Brendan Callahan, Senior Planner

CHAIRMAN LEE CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER at 7:02 pm

NEXT MEETING- March 14, 2012 AND April 11, 2012
Lower Level Conference Room - City Hall

REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION

1. A Public Hearing on a Request for Determination of Applicability submitted by William Manuell of Wetlands and Land Management, Inc, Danvers MA for Greenworks Park, LLC (James R. Motzkin), 265 Newbury Street, Peabody MA. There is no work proposed. The applicant is requesting a Negative Determination that the constructed basin is a stormwater management feature and not a protected wetland resource area. The property is known as 5 Lakland Park Drive, Map 69, Lot 9A, Peabody MA.

MR MANUELL: My client purchased 5 Lakeland Park Drive about a year ago. I have a plan on the board here behind me and this is the plan that is included in your packet. This is a blow up of what you have in there. Basically this is an As Built Plan of not only the subject property but the property next door to it, number 3 Lakeland Park Drive. This plan is dated 1990 and it shows a retention basin that was constructed to handle the drainage not only for Lakeland Park Drive but also the lots 3, 5 and 7 all drain into this feature. I want to give you some history about it and bring you up to where we are today. Basically Lakeland Park Drive was a subdivision in 1987. The original subdivision plan shows a drainage easement. This lot was created in circa 1988. The drainage easement carried forward and the buildings on that lot were constructed around 1988. At that time the retention basin for the subdivision as well as for drainage for these lots was also constructed. It has always been labeled as a retention basin. I have given you a succession of plans to show you the history that it has been a retention basin. It was constructed specifically to be a retention basin and to handle the drainage. The blue lines on this plan are the street drainage that exists today. As you can see everything comes from the street into various catch basins. Drains down through the easement and empties into this. It not only collects water from the street and five and three parking lots but to the north there is another building that was built after this plan. There is another basin that was constructed. Excavated out of natural earth with a pipe connecting out of the northerly basin into the basin on site. All of this has a headwall outlet which is then piped underground all the way out to Forest Street and then into the state highway drainage system. So there is no connection at all to any streams or any natural wetlands or anything. The closest natural wetland would be probably several hundred feet away.

Discussion ensued.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a Negative Determination that this is not applicable to our by law or jurisdictional under Chapter 131 and the feature is a retention pond constructed for the purpose of handling the drainage in that area and it needs to be maintained as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Klapman. Adopted unanimously.

NOTICE OF INTENT

2. A Public Hearing on a Notice of Intent Submitted by Horsley Witten Group, Sandwich, MA for Brendan Callahan, Senior Planner, Peabody Community Development Department. The City of Peabody proposes to conduct site remediation activities and construct a park, while restoring the functionality of wetland resource areas and addressing stormwater concerns at 45 Walnut Street, Peabody MA. The property is known as 45 Walnut Street, Map 085 Lot 037, Peabody MA.

Summary: Brendan Callahan, Senior Planner, introduced the project. The city acquired the land in 2009 with Park Grant Funds. In 2010 the city was awarded another Park Grant. The funds from this grant were to be used for design and construction for the redevelopment project. Horsley Witten Group (HWG) is the city's consultant for this project. Amy Ball and Hanna Carlson both of HWG were at the meeting.

MR CALLAHAN: In the fall of 2010 we put together a notice of Preapplication Notice of Intent filing and submitted that to DEP. When they reviewed that application they did not look too favorably on what we were presenting. We had two different departments that we were working with. One was the Wetlands Division and the Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup Division. The Wetlands Division because we are in riverfront area and we do have a small wetland area on the property. The Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup Division was because it is a contaminated site and a known brownfield. We were working with two different divisions and

we needed to satisfy both of them. When we submitted our original NOI they were not very happy with what we were presenting. We had to go back to the drawing board and come up with a new plan. The main goal that the Wetlands Division wanted to ensure was that we were not filling in flood plain. We could not change any of the existing grades on the property. At the same time the Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup wanted to make sure that we cleaned up the property so that it is safe to be used as a public park which is the intended use.

Summary: The proposed cleanup cost raised the project total. Brendan has since secured funds for the cleanup. The new design meets both goals that DEP wanted the city to satisfy. Mr. Callahan introduced Horsley Witten Group (HWG). Discussion ensued.

Amy Ball, Wetland Scientist HWG

MS BALL: The entire property is within the one hundred (100) year flood zone. The project one planning and engineering that has been done so far has established a fifty (50) year flood zone elevation of about fifteen point five (15.5) at this site. The existing grades are somewhere between eleven (11) and thirteen (13). When it floods it floods. Because of the North River you have riverfront area. You also have a very small bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) about two thousand square feet in the southwest corner.

Discussion ensued. The project is two fold. The first project is to conduct remediation on the site. The second part is to develop a park. It falls under a limited project status in the Wetland Protection Regulations.

MS BALL: In order to do so we have to follow to the extent practicable the performance standards for all of the resource areas. With the one exception that we must meet the bordering land subject to flooding (BLSF) standards. In part due to project one and the site originally being identified as an area for additional flood storage DEP did come back at us and say the one thing they are going to hold us to we are not going to exacerbate any flooding in this area.

Discussion ensued.

MS BALL: The project that we have come up with is this (inaudible) where we have sort of a two fold two part remediation area. With approximately a one foot cap on areas that would become grass or paved or boardwalk. And then a deeper three foot pack for areas along the periphery for (inaudible). The cap itself that has gone through review (inaudible). It consists of excavating approximately fifteen (15) inches off of the soil surface and laying down both a geotextile fabric and a geogrid. Twelve inches of clean soil and then placing this product called "grass protecta" on top of the soil. I will pass this around. Then on top of that there will be about three (3) inches of topsoil and loam to create a planting base for the grass and also cover over the grass protective product. We have gotten the okay from DEP. They believe that this cap will result in a site that will no longer pose a threat to human health and environmental safety. However, and this happened yesterday, they came back at us and said "the wetland area that you originally proposed not to touch at all to leave and fence up is not good enough." They would like us also to do remediation of the wetland area itself. Originally we were not proposing that. It just happened yesterday and we have not had time to change the plans. We had an informal discussion with DEP and they are comfortable with the same excavation of about fifteen (15) inches of soil. Maintaining the same elevation in the wetlands area so that it will still receive the same amount of water and function the same way. Instead of putting grass on the top we would remediate with a wetland seed mix. We have a verbal okay from Jill Provencal at DEP.

Discussion ensued.

MR CALLAHAN: We will also have to submit to EPA a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). It explains and outlines how the removal from the site was transported. That has to be approved by the EPA also. The RAM Plan needs to be approved by DEP and the QAPP needs to be approved by the EPA.

Discussion ensued. The LSP that will be on site is from GEI Consultants. GEI is also putting together the RAM Plan and the QAPP as well as the specifications for the remediation. **Discussion ensued.** There were no comments from the public. There were some reservations from the commission because of the severe flooding in the area during storms. HWG explained that the products chosen for the park were not highly corrosive and chosen to withstand high levels of water and flooding. There was also discussion about the funding sources for the project. The breakdown is as follows:

1-**Park Grant-** for the design and construction. (\$320,000.00 from the state and the city had to provide a forty (40) percent match (est \$220,000.00 city funds); [60/40 grant]

2-**EPA Brownfield Cleanup Grant** \$200,000.00 this will go towards the site remediation as well as the site remediation plans and meeting regulatory compliance requirements

3- **Community Preservation Act funds** \$250,000.00 to go towards site remediation;

4- **Mass Development Brownfield Program Grant-** \$497,000.00

The estimated project total is approximately 1.5 million dollars. The city also purchased the property for \$119,000.00 in 2009. An estimate for the entire project is roughly 1.6 million dollars.

Discussion ensued.

Motion to close as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Whitman. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a standard Order of Conditions 1-47 subject to receiving the replication documents/plan approved by DEP and adding checklist J and L as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

Mr. Callahan concluded by telling the members of the commission as well as members of the audience that the file can be viewed in its entirety. There is currently a repository with all said file documents available for public viewing during city hall business hours.

(Mr. Hochman arrived at 7:56 pm)

3. A continued Public Hearing on a Notice of Intent by John Crowell of Deer Hill Architects LLC, 40 Lowell Street, Peabody MA for Gordon Realty. The proposed work is the following: repair of existing foundation piers for the building that sits in the existing stream; removal of door and exterior deck and staircase adjacent to stream; installation of 18SF of concrete slab adjacent to stream and repair of existing fire escape. The property is known as 10 Lowell Street, Map 085, Lot 185, Peabody MA.

Summary: John Crowell of Deer Hill Architects was present. He submitted all documents requested at the last hearing. The commission was ready to vote on the project. There were no comments from the public.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Mr. Hochman. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a standard Order of Conditions 1-47 also adding the addendum dated 1/31/2012 (amended to read concrete mixing on Northeast side of brook) also adding conditions **48)** A statement/affidavit from an engineer or a surveyor stating the concrete slab was placed at the appropriate elevation and verifying that the flood plain was not altered is required when requesting a Certificate of Compliance, **49)** The staging of said work must comply with all building codes and all local and state ordinances/codes as made by Mr. Hochman. Seconded by Mr. Klapman. Adopted unanimously.

4. A continued (re-advertised) Public Hearing on a Notice of Intent for 60 Pulaski Street LLC by Hayes Engineering, Inc. 603 Salem Street, Wakefield MA. The applicant proposes to construct a parking lot in the riverfront for bus storage. The property is known as 60 Pulaski Street, Map 53, Lot 85, Peabody MA.

MR LEE: We had a meeting a month ago on this subject. As a result of that meeting we asked for and have received a plan from the applicant.

ATTY KEILTY: At the last meeting we had provided you the information that was provided to us by Dr. Rosen. We had brought the report that Dr. Rosen had provided (inaudible). That report said that this area that runs between where Don Kelly's Wayside storage facility is and where our former factory was that this is river. There is a pipe and a constantly flowing I think brook that suggested to Dr. Rosen that we could not exempt this side of the property from riverfront. He said that the river was all on the nose of our property. Then there was a point where the concrete pipe ended and we located that. This section from the end of the pipe to the street is not riverfront. So now what we have done in the blue is we have delineated all of the area on the property that is riverfront. So riverfront is everything in this area and that area. The plan that you have shows a shelf. That shelf would require some filling and regrading in the riverfront area. It would be in an area very close to where the hydrants are currently located. However that land is fairly low and we have elected to remove the suggestion that we would park out there and built any kind of ret (retaining) wall. So

now our limit of work is back here. Which shows on your plan right here (points). So we are suggesting that this is a plan for which an Order of Conditions can be issued. It requests that you allow us to work within the riverfront area on the basis that the foundation, remnants of the parking lot and hydrant valve are all still out there and that it is clearly a previously disturbed area. We would ask that an Order of Conditions issue to allow us to grade for a parking area. And then bring that grading around to the front. We would limit our work here. We would restore that little section back to loam and seed. We would leave the middle of the property, which is rather low lying, I think the area (inaudible) there historically may have been some water (inaudible) and I don't disagree with him. We would suggest that that area that was disturbed by the 1973 or so Order of Conditions that allowed two feet of fill to be placed on the property. I went out on the site with Lucia. We have installed flags that show this line. It shows you the extent of the riverfront area. We were just asked by the Ward Councillor and I think Lucia asked at a meeting I had with her as to whether or not the buses could be moved to the lower area. If indeed we were given any kind of an order. To that I can say that provided we actually build out this area we could move them and get them off of Pulaski Street. In fact the cost of developing this particular pad will require us to remove the old foundation and the old asphalt. Then we would have to regrade it. That is somewhat expensive to undertake immediately. One of the things we are looking at is what is another viable use of the property. There has been some interest expressed in mini storage facilities. This particular pattern, the shape if you will, would work for several potential alternative uses. We have a year left on the bus. We are currently in Superior Court on the bus issue. We are trying to come away from this meeting with an area that we feel confident can be utilized. So while we are asking for the Order of Conditions for this limited area. We are not positive that within the three years we will be working out here. I don't think you will find us working out there tomorrow or after any appeal period. There is a certain cost with ripping up the foundation and graveling it. We think it might be in the area of twenty five thousand dollars. And frankly the bus lease is not economically viable but we still want to know that there is an area that we can operate out there.

MR OGREN: We actually forgot to remove this from the plan when we sent it to Lucia. I have some plans tonight. What I would like to do if the commission issues an Order of Conditions on this I will give you a clean plan that has that removed. We had intended to remove any reference to buses. We know that it is in superior court but we are calling it a parking area for now. If we come back with some alternative use we would be back before the commission within this area to show what is going to go on. If there is going to be asphalt pavement, stormwater management.

MR LEE: I am going to suggest since we heard evidence pros and cons on these issues eons of time now that we just focus on the plans. We have already gone through and discussed all of the issues from all points of view so let me just ask the commission if they have any questions on the plans.

MR HOCHMAN: I have a question about note number eight. It is about the Historic Mill Complex. Why is that there?

MR OGREN: We still think that it is an historic mill complex. We realize that you don't but we still do.

MR HOCHMAN: We had a vote on that specific issue. It affected what you would present to us.

ATTY KEILTY: Are you asking that it also be removed from the plan? It doesn't make a declaration. It just says something as it's on the plan is based on the definition.

MS DELNEGRO: No it is saying that the area is exempt [read aloud] "This formerly mill area is exempt from the requirements." So if you accept this plan or another plan with that on it you would in essence be saying that it is an historic mill.

Discussion ensued.

MR RIZZO: That was one of my questions also. It seems like the plan still is not a complete plan. It is not what we asked for.

Discussion ensued. The hearing was open to the public for comments.

MS DELNEGRO: I was out on the site on Tuesday with Jack. I wanted to tell you what happened on the site visit. First the plan you noted that number eight is still on the plan. I noted that as well. I want to reiterate,

you sort of mentioned it, but I am not sure if everyone here heard. On this plan that we are looking at right now there is a proposed boulder retaining wall. He said tonight and he told me on Tuesday that they are planning on taking that off. Right now this plan is inaccurate. When I did go out to the site I was a little frustrated because it was flagged. There were blue and orange flags on stakes for the riverfront. Those flags are not on this plan. I tried to do what I could while I was on the site. So what I did was over in the shaded area where we made them put the jersey barriers down. I wanted to make sure that this pipe was there and that the perpendicular line was correct. There was one flag and I tried to walk a straight line to the pipe. Which I did and seemed to match up correctly. When I went down here though and this is so you know what is down here. I do not think everyone here walked the site. If you did want to make a motion for an Order of Conditions there is tons of trash down here. There is evidence of historic fill. It is similar to what is going on at Spinelli's with the asphalt and the vegetation growing around it. It is a stable slope so I would say it has been there for a long time. Some of things I saw were shingles, tires, pieces of concrete, more asphalt, 55 gallon metal drum. The ones I saw were rusted so they have been out there for a long time. Then there were other random pieces of metal and rebar. It looked like there was some fresh fence piping (the metal rods). Obviously it is not only a problem on this property but throughout the city and other parts of the state as well. People illegally dump so I don't necessarily think it was the owner that did it. If you did want to condition this I would say that this area needs to get cleaned. Also over by wetland flag 13 and 7 there was evidence of wildlife. I believe the residents asked through the chairman last meeting to have some sort of wildlife habitat evaluation. I did not receive any submittals. There was evidence that some animal, I am assuming it was an otter, was eating shellfish. There was a nice little staging area. Then over I think by wetland flag 16 or 17 or somewhere around there. I did go down this slope again. When I was just about to the bottom there was tons of debris. Litter that I am assuming is coming in from the tidal action. It looked like it was getting deposited in the little inlet. It appeared to be hard ground and when I stepped on it it was actually a layer of trash. The trash was floating on top and I stepped in four inches of water. It looked like solid ground. There is a lot of debris and litter. My other comments are that I thought this plan was extremely confusing. The legend is not accurate. You have to look at some of the arrows that are pointing. Sometimes there are three things that the arrows could be possibly be pointing to and it is not in the legend. For example the little circles. I am assuming that it is limit of "previously disturbed." Then up on the top it says "proposed siltation control". It was just a very confusing. Those are my comments.

Kathy Wells, 22 Westview Circle

MS WELLS: I just wanted to know between here and here how much footage is there between those two spots? Between the end of your proposed area and the actual riverfront?

MR OGREN: Well that is not the riverfront that is the wetland line. It is all in the riverfront. We already explained that.

MS WELLS: I know but I don't understand. I am trying to find out if you were to build this and park buses down here (cut off).

MR OGREN: It is about forty feet to the edge of the river. It is all in the riverfront. You asked how far it was to the riverfront.

MS WELLS: Thank you. The reason I ask that is because of a couple of reasons. Lucia brought up the 32.30 in the Peabody Wetland and River Regulations. I am concerned about the wildlife. You suggested that Mr. Keilty would have an answer to this at this meeting. I am bringing it up again. As neighbors we would like an analysis on how it would effect the wildlife in that area (inaudible) if the buses were parked there and there is oil runoff any fluids from the buses or any kinds of vehicles. I looked up online (inaudible) groundwater fluids travel between seventy five and three hundred feet. So if you are only forty feet from the river I don't care if you put up bales of hay you will have runoff into the river. Also in the Peabody Wetlands Regulations 32:33 I want to bring up that it says "no permit issued hereunder shall permit any activities unless the applicant in addition to meeting the otherwise applicable requirements of this chapter has proof by a preponderance of evidence that there is no technically feasible alternative to the project with less adverse effects and that such activities including proposed mitigation measures will have no significant adverse effects on the wetlands values protected by this chapter. The closer an activity is proposed to the resource area the more scrutiny will be given the potential impacts of a proposed project." This is only forty feet. That is something that I hope you all consider. Even though they are discussing the possibility of having storage facility down the road that is not what we are here for tonight. The NOI is for a parking lot and I guarantee you there will be buses parked on it within forty feet in a short time. I wanted you to take that into consideration. Thank you.

Councillor Rico Mello, Ward 3 City Councillor

CLLR MELLO: Buses do not belong here. The issue about the plans is that again it is inaccurate and it is missing information. We talked about the application of the land. Here we are now the buses (inaudible) and they are asking to make a decision based on no understanding of how that property will be used.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. hochman. Adopted unanimously.

FLIP TAPE ONE

Motion to deny the project in accordance with 310CMR 10.05(6)(c) and in accordance with the Peabody Wetlands & Rivers Protection Regulations Chapter 32 § 22 Denial of Permit **§A, §B, §C, §D, §E**; Chapter 32 § 33 No Disturb Zone Presumption; Chapter 32 § 35 Rivers and Streams- **§A**; Chapter 32 § 54 Generally as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Hochman. Adopted unanimously.

There was discussion on Enforcement regarding the debris mentioned earlier by staff.

Motion to issue and Enforcement Order with the following action items: **1)** Cease and desist all activities within the Riverfront Area and associated Buffer Zones (BZ) until further notice from the PCC staff; **2)** The jersey barriers must be moved to reflect the 200 foot Riverfront Area and the 100 foot BZ as shown on plan entitled "Site Plan of Land No. 60 Pulaski Street Peabody MASS Showing Proposed Bus Storage Area" drafted by Hayes Engineering, Inc. with a final revision date of 2/1/2012. . Buses shall **not be parked** in the Riverfront or associated BZ until a valid Order of Conditions is issued. The jersey barriers must be moved on or before February 29, 2012. **3)** A site visit with the Conservation Agent and a representative for the property owner is mandatory to discuss debris that must be removed under this Enforcement Order. The debris must be removed by hand picking. After the site visit a deadline for cleanup will be discussed; **4)** A Bill of Lading is required showing that said debris is removed off site; **5)** A Restoration plan of the Riverfront and Buffer zone must be submitted on or before March 14, 2012 as made by Mr. Hochman. Seconded by Mr. Rizzo. Adopted unanimously.

ORDER OF CONDITIONS

5. A continued public hearing on an Amendment to an Order of Conditions (DEP file No. 55-670) by John R. Keilty Esquire for Gilbert Aleixo-Filho, Trustee of 18 Carell Road Nominee Trust. The applicant is asking for an amendment to increase the size of the approved dwelling, add a deck, a two garages and a swimming pool. The property is known as 18 Carell Road, Map 57, Lot 72 & 74 (portion), Peabody MA.

Motion to continue as made by Mr. Whitman. Seconded by Mr. Klapman. Adopted unanimously.

ENFORCEMENT ORDER

6. A continued Enforcement Order issued to Spinelli's LLC for the property known as 10 Newbury Street, Map 88, lot 1, Peabody MA. The EO work is mandated under Order of Conditions file No. 55-757. The EO work must be complete and approved by staff before any approved work can start under the current OoC.

CONTINUED UNTIL APRIL 11, 2012 HEARING.

7. A continued Enforcement Order issued to RTW Realty LLC (Fran and Rick Tower) for the property known as 119 Rear Foster Street Building 13, Map 094, Lot 006C, Peabody MA. A large section of a retaining wall associated with Goldthwaite Brook was in severe disrepair. A portion of the front walkway to the building has eroded into the resource. The impaired retaining wall poses a risk to public safety and could impede flood waters.

Motion to withdraw the Enforcement Order as made by Mr. Klapman. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

8. A continued Enforcement Order on DEP file No. 55-742 for the property known as 18-20 Pleasant Street, Peabody MA. The applicant is not complying with conditions as cited in the Order of conditions of file 55-742.

Summary: Staff was asked to call the applicant/owner and request they file a certificate of compliance immediately. At a minimum, they must appear at the March hearing.

Motion to continue as made by Mr. Whitman. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

9. A continued hearing on an Enforcement Order issued to Arthur Yiakas. The property is known as 181 Lynnfield Street, Map 100, lot 143, Peabody MA. A concrete block retaining wall along Goldthwaite Brook is in disrepair.

Motion to continue as made by Mr. Whitman. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

10. A continued hearing on an Enforcement Order issued to Michael Chiaradonna. The property is known as 119 Foster Street Rear, Building 10, Map 04, lot 007B, Peabody MA. The illegal activity is storing pallets of Wet Blue Chrome Scraps (old leather hides). The leather hides are also piled on the abutting property. The property is bounded to the north by a channellized section of Goldthwaite Brook. This site is located entirely within the Riverfront (RF) associated with Goldthwaite Brook. The wet blue scraps are being stored in RF without a valid Order of Conditions.

Motion to continue as made by Mr. Whitman. Seconded by Mr. Denny. Adopted unanimously.

11. Enforcement Order issued to Lamb and Vila Pino both of 501 Lowell Street, Peabody MA. the alleged illegal activity is work within the 100 foot buffer zone to a certified vernal pool.
CONTINUED UNTIL APRIL 2012 HEARING.

12. An Enforcement Order issued to James Kaloutas for the property known as 34 Railroad Avenue, Map 085, lot 236, Peabody MA. A large section of a retaining wall associated with Proctor Brook is in severe disrepair.

Summary: Mr. Kaloutas was present. He stated that the brook is on his property but he believes the failing wall is not on his property. He did not bring any supporting information to the hearing. Ms. DelNegro stated according to aerials and the city's GIS it appeared that the wall was on his property and that is why she issued the EO to him and not any other abutters. Discussion ensued. The owner was told to wait until Ms. DelNegro contacts him.

Motion to continue as made by Mr. Hochman. Seconded by Mr. Rizzo. Adopted unanimously.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Land Acquisition Committee- Chairman Rizzo**
- **Flood Mitigation- Chairman Whitman**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Minutes- 1/11/2012**

Motion to approve as made by Mr. Hochman. Seconded by Mr. Whitman. Adopted unanimously.

OTHER

- **Any other matter presented to the commission at this time.**

Chairman Lee was appointed as the alternate member of the CPC (Community Preservation Committee).

Motion to appoint Chairman Lee as the alternate voting member for the CPC as made by Mr. Rizzo. Seconded by Mr. Whitman. Adopted unanimously.

Page 9 – 2/8/2012

. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn as made by Mr. Whitman. Seconded by Mr. Comak. Adopted unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted-

Francis Lee, Chairman