



City of Peabody
Conservation Commission

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

MINUTES

MAY 16, 2018
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES
50 FARM AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Vice Chairman Bruce Comak
Melissa Feld, Secretary
Stewart Lazares
Bryan Howcroft
Travis Wojcik

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chairman Michael Rizzo
Craig Welton
Gerry Kruczkowski

Also Present: Brendan Callahan, Assistant Director of Planning; Lucia DelNegro, Conservation Agent

VICE CHAIRMAN COMAK CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER at 7:06 pm

PROPOSED NEXT MEETING DATES- June 13, 2018 AND July 25, 2018
DPS- 50 Farm Avenue

****Please note meeting location has changed- The Commission will meet at the Department of Public Services located at 50 Farm Avenue, Peabody MA until further notice.**

NOMINATIONS

Chairman- Michael Rizzo
Vice Chairman- Bruce Comak
Secretary- Melissa Feld

Item to be continued until June.

EXTENSIONS

1. A Request for an Extension Permit on DEP File No. 55-785. The request is being made by Brendan Callahan for the City of Peabody. The project is the demolition of a commercial building located at 70 Endicott Street (map 74, Lot 65). The Order expires on 6/25/2018. The applicant is asking for a one-year extension.

(Ms. Feld recused herself from the discussion and vote)

MR CALLAHAN: This is the former PMLP building. The permit we have we are requesting a one-year extension for the demo. We have two Orders of Conditions on that site. One is for the demolition of the building. We have another Order of Conditions for site development for an eight (8) unit townhouse.

MR COMAK: This is the second extension you have asked for, right?

MR CALLAHAN: Second one but I am hoping it is the last one. The reason we asked a couple years ago was because it got appealed. So, it sat in the court for two years. That appeal was withdrawn last year around this time. Over the last year we have just been trying to get ready to RFP it. From what I understand the mayor is getting ready to RFP the site and dispose of the property within this year. We are requesting an extension for the demolition. I will probably be back in the upcoming months to do an extension for the site development also. That expires in September. For now, I am just asking for an extension for the demolition.

Discussion ensued.

MS DELNEGRO: If this was held up in court; that is one of the reasons to allow an extension. If they were just dragging their feet and didn't want to start work we wouldn't have to extend it. Since it has been held up in court I believe in the Regulations that is one reason to allow an extension.

Motion to extend DEP File No. 55-785 one year from the expiration date (extended until 6/25/2019) as made by Mr. Wojcik. Seconded by Mr. Lazares. Adopted unanimously with Ms. Feld recusing herself.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2. Crystal Lake Project-

MR CALLAHAN: I am kind of here for two reasons. The main reason is there is a slight minor change to the plans from the original Order of Conditions with regards to a boat ramp. This was something in the plans that we decided that the mayor had wanted. After we had got our original Order of Conditions. The other reason I am here is I have been requested to give a little more

detail into the park design and some of the amenities for the site. I brought a rendering and I will throw it up over here so everyone can see. As you know we recently completed the dredging phase of the project. We removed I think it was fifty thousand (50,000) cubic yards or square cubic yards of dredged material. It all went up to the landfill and that phase of the project is done. Now we are moving into the park phase of the project. There used to be an old sort of building foundation there and that was removed. During the dredging phase they had cleared out the whole entire area. This used to be wooded and now it is just regraded and relatively flat. Now we are about to redo the site and make it a formal park. The park includes new landscaping, a large grass area, shrubs, bushes, vegetation all along Lowell Street. I believe we will have a wooden guardrail. We will have a gazebo for outdoor entertainment activities and three benches have been designated for the park area. Bike rack, trash barrel. There is the former Giles Corey memorial. He was part of the witch hysteria. There are no bodies buried out at the site. There were only markers. We are actually going to have the markers restored and cleaned as they were in rough shape. We are going to formalize this area with I think the Historical Commission received some money from the Essex Heritage. So, we are going to formalize this area. It is going to match what is similar down the bike path a little way, the veteran's memorial. It is going to be the same basic design. Then we also have two docks. We have a boating dock and it will have a "T" shape to it. We also have the fishing dock. Then a boat ramp as you can see is right in between the two docks. On the other side of the pond there is a little peninsula. We are going to have a formalized path. There is somewhat of an existing trail network system over there. We are going to tie it into the existing bike path (Independence Greenway) and formalize the path to the end of the peninsula. Then we will have a shade shelter, arbor I guess it is called, as well as two Adirondack chairs. We will also have a fountain in the pond. That is the design. The only change is the boat ramp. So, we are here because it wasn't part of the original Order of Conditions. We have notified all the permitting agencies that there was this slight change of the plans. They have all signed off at this point. Per direction from the Conservation Agent we reached out to the northeast region coordinator. Their response was that the agency that did the dredging permitting should be the ones that make the decision. We reached out to that permitting agency and they are okay with it. They are fine with the work that we are doing. They don't see any major impacts and they just thought it was a minor change. So, we are looking for a determination by the commission to agree that it is a minor change and it doesn't warrant a full amendment.

Discussion ensued regarding parking, pedestrian access, bollards, lighting etc. Mr Lazares recommended for safety reasons that the gazebo has lighting.

MR CALLAHAN: We are trying to see if you guys think this is a minor change to the plan and we don't need to move forward with an amendment.

MR COMAK: Basically, it's a pervious surface that is going in to become the boat ramp, right? It is pretty insignificant. The only thing is they have to build a coffer dam to do it. I think that it insignificant as well. I don't build cofferdams so.

MR CALLAHAN: I think I can describe it. I read it. I don't know the schedule or the time it is going to take. I can say as part of the construction bid documents and awarding the contractor for this project it was heavily weighed on the experience of firms or contractors that had experience with cofferdams. I will give a quick description of the cofferdam. They are going to install very large sandbags that are basically impermeable. It will be around the shore and around this area. Then they put a layer of tarping over that. Then there is sandbags to weigh everything down. So, it has this containment area. Then they will pump that water just right over the wall until it gets down to about a foot right into Crystal Lake. Then when it gets down to maybe a foot or they possibly see the turbidity then they will pump it upland to a large dirt bag. The water goes into the dirt bag. It will treat any solids that go through. The water will drain gravity flow back into the pond. I did talk to Tighe and Bond which is the city's engineering firm. I said we would coordinate a site visit

when they are installing the cofferdam. We will coordinate to make sure they are on site and I will be on site. We can have Lucia join us on site as she is more than welcome. That is essentially the project.

Discussion ensued regarding the location of the fountain.

MR COMAK: We aren't making a motion or anything?

MS DELNEGRO: I thought it would be smart for Brendan to come so no one can say they didn't know what was going on. I wanted a dewatering plan because the boat ramp was added. I wanted to make sure that we had the dewatering plan and all the things that I think DEP would ask for if this was to get amended. If we were to go through the full-blown amendment process. It sounds like DEP, the person I have written down as the reviewer, doesn't want to talk to us about it. I am assuming everything is fine with DEP the wetlands division. If they are not that is why I am keeping all these things that I have. I have in our file the dewatering plan, I have minutes from a contractor meeting. A preconstruction meeting where the consultant Tighe and Bond states we do not need any other permit from the state or the department for any of the floating docks. We don't need a section 10A authorization. We don't need anything for them. Those are the things that I wanted in our file.

Discussion ensued. No motion was made. The commission verbally approved said changes and did not recommend the filing for an Amendment to the existing Order of Conditions.

1. Request for discussion by Richard Sumner of Sumco Holdings, LLC regarding 51 Jubilee Drive and proposed clearing on site. (Pending submission of plan showing ALL resource areas and all associated buffer zones.)

Present: Richard and Travis Sumner

MR SUMNER: We are the owners of the property here. I think last meeting you were giving a Certificate of Compliance on the same parcel. That wetland up front that is kind of what cleared the sale. So now we are trying to figure out what we have to work here. You have the delineation from Bill Manuell that you guys had seen before. These other two delineation points are from Mary Rimmer. We went out and flagged it. Chris did a survey of these points and he did not have permission for access onto this property when he went out for his survey. These are approximate locations of the off-site property resource areas. The lines I highlighted in green are on those plans as well. They are just not highlighted. The hundred-foot buffer zone from all of those resource areas. What we are looking to do is preliminary access. I guess informally come and talk to you folks. To see if there are any issues or things that we should talk about from a conservation standpoint. As far as accessing this part of the property that is outside all the buffer zones. It is fairly open right now but clearing potentially to the limit of those buffer zones for storage and site prep and future development.

MR COMAK: What do you plan on putting there?

MR SUMNER: On the site at large, we are not sure yet. Nothing hazardous. Our office just got moved over to 2 Centennial Drive right across the street. We are in the Goldberg building there. Primarily we need some equipment storage.

MR COMAK: You want it to be a construction yard?

MR SUMNER: Yeah.

MS DELNEGRO: Have you talked to building?

MR SUMNER: We haven't yet but we will be. From a jurisdictional standpoint we wanted to make sure we weren't doing anything out of line.

MR COMAK: Is there access to the site?

MR SUMNER: What they have right now is this driveway easement that comes up on the right side there. It dead ends and there is asphalt up to where that line ends and a couple concrete blocks there. There is actually a trail network throughout the site. There is a cleared area and a ramp that comes up into this open area. Then there is another gravel path that comes up around and through the buffer zone in this area. You can see these really tight grade lines. It is steep. It is thirty feet high in the back. It is a pretty steep site. In general, the site comes from this lower level up onto a flat level. Up onto another level in the back here. So, there are some pads in place right now. Kind of cart paths. They haven't been used in a long time. Particularly this one that has some small saplings and scrub growth that has grown in. There is a fenced in area here that has green slats in the chain link. There is an old storage container (trailer). Up here it is pretty open.

MR COMAK: Why are you here?

MR SUMNER: We want to do this and we don't want to run afoul. We want to access the site through the buffer.

MR COMAK: So, you are going to access it to do what? Are you going to store stuff there now?

MR SUMNER: We probably will.

MR COMAK: Okay so you want to store some stuff and you want to make sure you aren't doing anything wrong.

MR SUMNER: We will probably do a little leveling but nothing impervious at this point. Outside of the buffer.

MS DELNEGRO: The only thing you are doing in the buffer zone are those orange hatched lines that already have a slight path. They are slightly overgrown. All you are doing is reestablishing those (interrupted).

MR SUMNER: This one is a little more loamy so we will probably do a stabilized construction exit. So, we are not tracking anything back out. This one is already gravel so we won't be doing anything. Just traveling over, it. We can put erosion controls on either side to define the limited area.

Discussion ensued. The commission gave permission to conduct work as discussed and submitted in writing.

REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY

2. Public Hearing on a Request for Determination of Applicability submitted by Mark Smith. The proposed work consists of the construction of an 18'x24' addition to the rear of the existing single-family house. The property is known as 18 Douglas Street, Map 83, Lot 101, Peabody MA.

Present: Mark Smith

Discussion ensued. There were no comments from the public. Mr. Smith submitted two letters from neighbors in support full support of the project.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Ms. Feld. Seconded by Mr. Wojcik. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a Negative Determination with the following conditions: 1) Work must be done according to plans submitted and approved, 2) Erosion controls must be inspected and approved before any work can commence, 3) Staff must be notified in writing (email is sufficient) 48 hours before work commences & concludes as made by Mr. Lazares. Seconded by Ms. Feld. Adopted unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

3. A request for a FULL Certificate of Compliance made by David Kelly (Kelly Engineering Group Inc.) for Centercorp Retail Properties (Richard Newburg) and Nicholas Decoulos on DEP File No. 316-43 (the Order of Conditions was issued on 1/10/1979. The property is known as 250 Andover Street, Map 30, lot 13, Peabody MA.

Motion to continue as made by Ms. Feld. Seconded by Mr. Wojcik. Adopted unanimously.

NOTICE OF INTENT

4. A Public Hearing on a Notice of Intent submitted by John R Keilty for Joseph Cannata (property owner). The proposed work is the construction of a single-family dwelling with appurtenant driveway, deck, walkways and utilities. The property is known as 0 Arnold Avenue, Map 73, Lots 102, 103 & 104, Peabody MA.

Present: Attorney John R Keilty (legal counsel) and Christopher Mello (ELSAI)

ATTY KEILTY: I appear here this evening on behalf of the land owner Mr. Joseph Cannata. He has submitted a Notice of Intent in which we intend to build a single-family dwelling in a single-family zoning district. We do not need a variance or any kind of relief from any other board. Our wetland resource area is shown in green. We have shown our hundred-foot BVW. In this particular area we are building in a protected area. A swale that will treat stormwater and release stormwater into a city of Peabody area that is largely wetland. We have paid our fees. I have submitted my affidavit. I have my green cards if you would like. Along with several letters that have been returned unclaimed. We have given notice to our abutters and we are here to answer any questions that you may have in respect to this project.

Summary: Ms. DelNegro handed out pictures she took on a site visit as well as pictures submitted by a neighbor. **Discussion ensued.** Ms. DelNegro read a memorandum from DPS aloud as drafted and submitted by William Stansfield (Environmental Engineer).

MS DELNEGRO: *“The DPS has the following concerns and recommendations for the above subject matter. Number one the applicant will conduct several (at least three) soil test pits on the proposed single-family lot. A DPS engineer shall be present when digging the soil test pits. The results of the soil test pits shall be submitted to DPS for review. Number two in addition to the proposed basin the applicant should have a certified landscaper architect and or a certified wetland scientist design a rain garden for the southwest corner of the lot to control any water or runoff from the site. The rain garden plans shall be submitted to DPS for review and comments.*

ATTY KEILTY: We have two comments with respect to the memorandum. One is we did not conduct soil tests. Nor did we submit them. In as much as we are not proposing any kind of infiltration. We are collecting water through the swale system which will then extend to another collection area. Then we are letting it run out. So, we are really are not looking for groundwater

absorption or any kind of infiltration in the project. With respect to the memo we do understand that the water table is fairly high here. With respect to the rain garden; we have seen these multiple times in the past. Almost exclusively with respect to commercial properties. We did not design a rain garden. Rain gardens require a certain amount of maintenance. Whatever is on this particular property would have to be maintained by the homeowner. My personal opinion is that rain gardens are somewhat inappropriate for single family homes.

MS DELNEGRO: A raingarden is just a bunch of plants that are planted.

Discussion ensued.

MS DELNEGRO: If you notice in the pictures I think there is five (5) pine trees in the front of the property. They are pretty significant. How many of those trees are coming down? The plan doesn't show it. Or at least I didn't see it. How many of those are coming down? If we are taking those down we are going to lose a lot absorption of those trees sucking up all that water. That is why I think we need definitely need more plants on this property. Isn't Submarine Village right here? This is one of the neighborhoods that are affected the most by flooding in this city.

Discussion ensued. The item was open to the public for discussion.

Jennifer Morrical, 20 Arnold Avenue

MS MORRICAL: I am a direct abutter downslope from where this is going. There was no meeting or get together with the attorney or the developer of this plan. I turn to the city now, the zoning commission, the conservation commission to please explain exactly what this ramification means to somebody that is downslope and who is abutting the property behind it. It retains water all year already. In the height of the summer it already has water in it. I am not an engineer. I am just a long-term resident and tax payer in Peabody. I turn to you to explain exactly if this is going to work. If they cut all these these down and they take away half of this lot and put concrete. Then the driveway it is all sloping towards my home. I want to know that it is being built correctly. Mr. Stansfield has been at the site and spoken with me. That group in conjunction with yours is their process to inspect that this is going to get built correctly. What are the ramifications if in a year and a half between this property and the basin here and the house that is going uphill. It is all going to come back down. How does this work?

MR COMAK: Chris can you explain? Are you changing grades on the property?

MR MELLO: The plan before you on the 15,000-foot lot is one single family home and half of it is in the buffer. Acknowledging it is an area of high ground water. The resource area all around is pocketed and some bigger ones that they reach. We have taken this portion of our lot and we have acknowledged that we do have some water issues. We are asking the commission to look at the infiltration trench on the westerly side of the house. Which will intercept the groundwater and also the service water from the driveway. We are also looking at a roof system that will come across the back of the property and the front of the property and will go into that interceptor trench. It will go down to a ponding area. Which will retain water in various events in a storm on surface. It will hold it as a little ponding area and it will drain out through a dissipater into the resource area that is on the south of the property. It was flagged by Mr. Manuel. We originally thought we would do some soil testing. On further inspection we understand that the groundwater or the physical water or the mottling is almost at the surface. Groundwater changes seasonally. There is no possible way we are going to do any infiltration or stormwater. Normally on a single-family house we don't do anything like this. We know we have a sensitive area. We have established this impoundment area on the surface that will take the increase runoff from the roof, driveway impervious area and put it in there. We have not designed a rain garden. Raingardens

are normally on a commercial or industrial property. Certainly, the impoundment system, which has a very flat bottom, can be planted. I don't think it is going to change much on the way of stormwater because of the high groundwater. That is how the system works.

MR WOJCIK: Why is there a cellar? If here is a high-water table why is there a cellar?

Discussion ensued.

MR MELLO: We feel the structure can be built. It is a large lot given the neighborhood. It will take care of itself. It is going to increase runoff, absolutely. We are taking a lot that is fenced in and as these people said it is a lawn.

Discussion ensued regarding the trees on the site and why they were not shown on the plan.

MS MORRICAL: I don't know this for a fact but my neighbors that live across the street and a few are here. I don't know if they need to research what is under the ground but what happens to that stream? My neighbors can hear it in their basement across the street that is running across the ground. What happens to that water? When you put a house there and you dig all that out?

MR COMAK: I don't want to cut anybody short. I just want to say right now after what I heard I want a site visit. Nothing is going to be decided tonight as far as I am concerned. I do not know about the rest of the commission members but I want to go out and look at it myself.

Discussion ensued.

James Retos, 20 Farnham Avenue

MR RETOS: I live directly behind where they are proposing to build it. My concerns are a little different. My kid's bedroom is there. My deck is there and pretty much the building itself is going to be directly in front of my home. I would like to see it moved fifteen feet to the side. We bought the house with nothing there so we can enjoy the open area. Because of this building we won't have that anymore.

MR COMAK: That is not what we do.

MR RETOS: That was my next thing is how is this infiltration going to work? I look at the water and those pictures are from my yard. We have nothing but water in this area. I don't see how building this house I going to help with the water. I think the water underneath is huge.

Discussion ensued.

MR LAZARES: As far as I am concerned someone developing a piece of land can not adversely affect their neighbor's downstream. That is what this is all about. As far as I know that is the law.

MS MORRICAL: Something of this nature could have a potential affect for across the road. Coming up if it floods here. Could it back up into the homes on the other side of the street?

MR COMAK: I want to go out to the site. I am not saying they should or shouldn't develop it. One single family home is pretty insignificant in the scheme of everything thing. Remember that they are not putting a shopping center in there. They are not paving a parking lot. On the other hand, if we go out there and wonder how are they going to put a house in here? Then we will look at it that way too. It is pretty insignificant in general. That is why I want to look at the site.

Dana Shorey, 15 Arnold Avenue

MR SHOREY: If they remove the pine trees. Do they have to equal out some plantings?

MR COMAK: They might have to do some. They are in the buffer. I am not sure exactly but they might have to do some plantings. That might be something that is negotiable anyways.

MR WOJCIK: That would definitely be my recommendation.

MR LAZARES: Isn't there something about two trees per lot.

MR WOJCIK: That is on new subdivisions, right?

MS DELNEGRO: I do not know about subdivisions but normally if someone wants to take down one tree; we normally have them plant at least one tree in its place or two or three shrubs.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Mello stated he would locate the trees on a revised plan and submit it the commission.

Mr. George, Arnold Avenue

MR GEORGE: I understand that not all the projects that have been planned in our neighborhood haven't actually been completed. Some were funded but have not been completed yet. Can you verify any of that? Drainage?

MS DELNEGRO: As far as the detention basin, the Scouting Way Disc Golf, that is done as far as I know. I don't know about any of the engineering. If they are supposed to be upgrading? I know the guy that was just here for 18 Douglas Street reached out to the city engineering department. He had one catch basin in front of his house and he could see the water literally come down and go around the catch basin. They ended up putting in a second catch basin. Now it actually gets caught and goes into the catch basin rather than into his neighbor's house. I would suggest calling someone at DPS if you have questions.

MR LAZARES: Does Arnold Avenue still flood?

The audience replied yes.

MR LAZARES: They did put in Scouting Way. I was told and I have also gone out there during heavy rainstorms and I saw no water on the street.

MR COMAK: People have told us that since Scouting Way it was a big improvement.

MR LAZARES: I was there at the site visit for Scouting Way. I went with a friend of mine to Arnold Avenue to talk to neighbors. We were told that there would be a couple of pipes run from Arnold Avenue directly into Scouting Way to alleviate all this water. I have been told that it was done. People have told us that it helped. Maybe there is a maintenance issue and not a design issue. Another thing you can probably do to get some help is talk to your ward councillor.

Discussion ensued. There were no more comments from the public. Ms. DelNegro sent a sign in sheet for the residents that would like to be notified of a site visit on said property. Ms. DelNegro will coordinate with the attorney and the commission. She will also notify neighbors via email of the date and time of such site visit.

MR HOWCROFT: Would the owner consider forgoing the basement? That could maybe allow for more water space.

MR MELLO: I honestly don't think that affects any of the project itself. I will discuss that with him but it is displacement of material that doesn't really change the alteration of the groundwater in my opinion. We will certainly consider it.

MR LAZARES: One of the things that would happen, I think, if you put a swimming pool under a house and the home owner wants to live there; they will pump the water out through the swale you are creating. There will be more water discharged. It will come up through the ground not just from the sky.

Discussion ensued regarding a basement and groundwater levels. The applicant is willing to discuss the elimination of a basement in the future if needed.

Motion to continue as made by Ms. Feld. Seconded by Mr. Wojcik. Adopted unanimously.

5. A Public Hearing on a Notice of Intent submitted by Robert Ricco (property owner). The proposed work is the construction of an addition to an existing single-family dwelling. The property is known as 20 Broad Street, Map 46, Lot 84A, Peabody MA.

Present: Robert Ricco

Summary: Ms. DelNegro passed out pictures of the property. The property owner is proposing to construct an addition to a single-family house. There were no members of the public that wished to comment.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Ms. Wojcik. Seconded by Mr. Howcroft. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a standard Order of Conditions 1-32 as discussed as made by Ms. Feld. Seconded by Mr. Howcroft. Adopted unanimously.

6. A Public Hearing on a FIVE (5) Notice of Intents submitted by Michael Solimine (MJ-11 Realty Trust). There are five separate NOIs associated with this request. The proposed work consists of the construction of five (5) single family dwellings with driveways, decks, walkways and utilities in the Boulderwood Subdivision. The properties are known as Tsitsinos Drive (Parcel 114-143-Lot 95B); Tsitsinos Drive (Parcel 114-138-Lot 91B); Tsitsinos Drive (Parcel 114-140-Lot 93B); Tsitsinos Drive (Parcel 114-141-Lot 94B); Tsitsinos Drive (Parcel 114-139-Lot 92B), Peabody MA.

Present: Michael Solimine

Summary: MASS DEP issued a Superseding Order of Conditions for all stormwater on this subdivision. However, the property owner still needs to file for each lot in a buffer zone with the local commission per discussion with Michael Abell the DEP reviewer.

Motion to close the public hearing as made by Mr. Wojcik. Seconded by Ms. Feld. Adopted unanimously.

Motion to issue a standard Order of Conditions 1-47 for each lot as discussed adding the following condition to each Order: A granite post with a conservation sign shall be installed in the back yard. (location to be determined by agent). The granite post must be set three (3) feet in the ground and three (3) feet above the ground (total height 6 feet). The sign should read "Conservation Area-No Disturb Zone-No lawn waste/No dumping" or a similar phrase. The wording shall be approved by the agent prior to fabrication as made by Mr. Wojcik. Seconded by Mr. Howcroft. Adopted unanimously.

ENFORCEMENT ORDER

7. A continued Enforcement Order issued to Carpenter & Costin, Cedar Pond Village Condominiums and Crowninshield Management for the property known as 1200 Salem Street, Lynnfield MA. The mailing address is Lynnfield however the actual location of the violation is in Peabody located behind the townhouses along Brookside Path (map 98, Lot 500T). The violation is the removal of 35+ mature trees as well as vegetation along a portion of Goldthwaite Brook. All work was done in close proximity to or on said bank of brook. A valid Order of Conditions has never been issued for said work.
ITEM CONTINUED UNTIL SPRING OF 2018

A representative will be at the July hearing requesting a withdrawal of the EO.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8. MINUTES- April 11, 2018

Motion to approve as made by Mr. Howcroft. Seconded by Mr. Lazares. Adopted unanimously.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- Land Acquisition Committee- Chairman Rizzo NONE
- Flood Mitigation- Stewart Lazares NONE

OTHER

- . Any other matter presented to the commission at this time. NONE
- . Adjournment

Motion to adjourn as made by Mr. Wojcik. Seconded by Ms. Feld. Adopted unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm

Respectfully submitted-

Vice Chairman Bruce Comak

Filename: 5.16.18 MINUTES.doc
Directory: C:\Users\scott.west\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache
Template: C:\Users\scott.west\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title:
Subject:
Author: lmd
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 6/11/2018 3:20:00 PM
Change Number: 51
Last Saved On: 6/19/2018 1:03:00 PM
Last Saved By: Lucia DelNegro
Total Editing Time: 394 Minutes
Last Printed On: 8/1/2018 11:37:00 AM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 11
Number of Words: 4,765 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 27,167 (approx.)