



Town of Boylston Conservation Commission conservation@boylston-ma.gov
221 Main Street, Boylston MA 01505 ** Telephone (508) 869-6127 ** Fax (508) 869-6210

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MAY 18, 2020

Members via Remote: Joe McGrath, Chip Burkhardt, Dan Duffy, Mark Coakley

Members Absent: Jeffrey Walsh

Others Participating Remotely: Atty. Matthew Watsky, Matt Marro (Matthew Marro Environmental Consulting), Vito Colonna (Connorstone Engineering), Kevin Howley, Becky Weisman (SWCA), Brendan Kearns, Mike & Tricia May, John Grenier

Recorder: Melanie Rich

Joe McGrath, Chairman of the Conservation Commission, opened the virtual meeting at 7:00 p.m. and announced it is being held via video conference. He informed everyone that they can email him at (jmcgrath@boylston-ma.gov) with any questions which will be answered during the meeting; they can dial in as well.

Commissioner Roll Call: Dan Duffy, Mark Coakley, Joe McGrath, Chip Burkhardt

PUBLIC HEARING (continued) – 11 French Drive (Tower Hill Botanic Garden) – Notice of Intent Application and Stormwater Control Permit Application to redevelop the Tower Hill Botanic Garden main entrance off French Drive (DEP#115-425)

The applicant requested an extension via email to continue the hearing to June 2020 in order to complete the DCR Variance process. Mark Coakley made a motion to accept the request for continuance to 7:00 p.m. on June 22nd; Chip Burkhardt seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

PUBLIC HEARING (continued) – 70 Reservoir Road-Lot 2 (Kevin Howley) – Notice of Intent Application to construct a single-family house. Work within the buffer zone & riverfront area includes the proposed house, utility connections, private well, landscaping and associated site work (DEP#115-426)

Vito Colonna (Connorstone Engineering) said the letter from Paul McManus (EcoTec) dated May 7, 2020 agreed with the delineation. The only change was to extend the line from bank flag 13 up to 290 to show the connection. It changed the riverfront area by a few feet, and the calculations minimally. Comments from last meeting were addressed regarding the well, labeling the limit of work to coincide with the erosion control line, and adding conservation markers at the four angles points of the limit of work; roof runoff will go to a dry well. The driveway was pitched to the north and flows away from the wetland. A stone infiltration trench (2'x2' deep crushed stone) was added along the edge of the driveway located just inside the 200-foot riverfront line and just inside the buffer zone. Any other overflow would go through the wooded buffer and the rear before it would get to the wetlands. Mr. McGrath asked if there were any abutters on the call or any other interested parties who had questions. Hearing none, Chip Burkhardt made a motion the close the public hearing; Mark Coakley seconded; all voted in favor;

motion approved. Mark Coakley made a motion to issue an Order of Conditions with standard conditions; Joe McGrath seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

PUBLIC HEARING – Perry Road (Map 13/Parcel 21-K AND Map 18/Parcel 3-2) (Security Monitoring Holdings, LLC) – Stormwater Control Permit Application to construct a single-family house, septic system and associated site work, with a driveway off Perry Road (SCP#2020-2)

Mike & Tricia May and John Grenier (J.M. Grenier) attended remotely. Abutter notification was received. Mr. Grenier said it was part of what used to be a separate lot that the Mays owned, gaining frontage off Perry Road when it was constructed. There was a federal wetland that was flagged to the western side of the property. They have reviewed the filing for Perry Road when that permitting was done and it was an isolated wetland that was a federal wetland, non-jurisdictional, not bordering on anything. Mr. McGrath said it was confirmed that Paul McManus did certify it as federal non-jurisdictional wetland at the time the Perry Road project was proposed.

Mr. Grenier said a large amount of fill was needed. When Perry Road was being constructed there was a retaining wall along the right side where Mr. May acquired the fill. Erosion controls were installed, slopes were stabilized with stone, and wood chips were used for stabilization where it was rutting. They designed a small infiltration basin along the front of Perry Road which will capture the sheet flow from the proposed driveway and the yard area and infiltrate back into the ground. They reduced runoff of site through a 25-year storm event. In addition, they are capturing the roof run off and recharging it into the ground as well; they meet the volume and infiltration.

Mr. May said he did additional work which included wattles at grade with wood chips in front of the wattles and stone retention on the hill that connected at a lower grade. Seepage was noticed through the rocks, woodchips and wall. Neal Stowe put additional wood chips along the retention area and built out from that to slow and filter at the top. Subsequent to that he brought he installed 400-feet of silt fence almost up to the driveway; there are now two layers of wattles and 25-feet of woodchips. A temporary construction apron is proposed. There is a slope upgradient to the east. To prevent water from running through the site, it will be swaled to the front right portion of the property; a culvert pipe goes under the driveway so they can bypass a lot of water and get the most treatment of the impervious areas of the driveway.

Mr. McGrath asked what stabilization is being proposed pre and post for the back upper area where they are re-grading the hill behind the house. Mr. Grenier said it would be mulched and stabilized and maintain it once it grows in. Dan Duffy had concerns; the plan clearly states that all disturbed areas will be planted with a minimum of 6" top soil, all slopes should be stabilized with erosion control fabric, upgraded areas will be landscaped and loamed as soon as they are at final grade. The plans must accurately represent what the applicant intends to do on the property so the Commission can understand and evaluate the project. Mr. Grenier it would definitely be stabilized, but it would be up to Mr. May how he wants the backyard to look. Mr. McGrath said we don't want anything coming off the slope to the back of the person's house. Mr. Grenier said Note 10: all graded areas to be landscaped to be loamed and seeded as soon as practical to reduce any potential erosion is a note for where they want grass. He said he could add more specifics on the slope; he will work with Mr. May to see how he wants it to look; they want to make sure it is stabilized so nothing is washing out. Mr. Duffy said that they proposed something to us and before the Commission even approves it that may not be what they are going to do. They need to be very clear what they proposing and what they are going doing. Their plans are the Commission's expectation.

Mr. Coakley said the wetland across the street was on the NHESP map; is the federal jurisdiction wetland also on the map? Mr. McGrath reviewed all the Perry Road plans. The area that was under the jurisdiction of NHESP was a little less; the area on the other side of Perry Road adjacent to this lot is not part of the endangered species area. He did question; however, now that there is a culvert connecting the wetland area, if that expanded the nature of the wetlands to the point that might need to be reviewed. He measured and it was still under the threshold of the area and believes it is still a federal non-jurisdictional wetland (he checked with Paul McManus to make sure he was using the correct criteria).

Mr. Coakley asked what they were doing with the stormwater from the driveway (which was not depicted); he wants to see the detail on the plan. Mr. McGrath asked about the 12" pipe that goes to a small swale area, is it being put through the wall and down into the wetland area, is there an end point, riprap, etc.? What happens when it comes across? Mr. Grenier said it would daylight near the bottom of the stone lined slope; he will add additional stone to the plan as well. Mr. Coakley asked if we need a peer review; it was agreed it was not needed. Mr. McGrath wanted to clarify that there is an exemption in the Stormwater Control Bylaw for a single-family home, but because this single-family home continues into a subdivision that is in the jurisdiction and contributes water and uses structures as part of that subdivision, it does require a permit. Mr. McGrath told Mr. Grenier that when he does revise the construction notes on the plan, specifically outline which areas are getting which stabilization methods. Mr. McGrath asked if there were any abutters on the call or any other interested parties who had questions. Hearing none, the applicant requested a continuance. Joe McGrath made a motion to accept the request for continuance; Chip Burkhardt seconded; motion approved. It was continued to June 22nd at 7:20 p.m.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

Regarding Graves Engineering letter dated May 12, 2020 "Tower Hill Botanic Garden Peer Review #4". Tower Hill may need to submit a modification to the Stormwater Permit. Item 7 proposes to reroute through the parking area rather than directly to the building. Without seeing the plans, it is difficult to see if it impacts the Stormwater Permit that was issued. An additional SWPPP was presented for comments; not sure if it was what the Commission viewed. There are some additional changes to the riprap we did not see, but Graves is not concerned. Item 19 related to TSS (the worksheet was missing but seem correct). Mark Coakley made a motion to request the engineer Patrick Burke (WDA Design Group) come to the next meeting to review the amendments that they want to finalize; Joe McGrath seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

Compass Pointe Update and Bond Status – After the last meeting and at the request of the Chair, Dan Duffy contacted Town Counsel regarding the issue of the bonds being reduced and read the email response from Attorney Madaus. In part it reads... if the Developer "(iii) fails to complete the Work in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Order, then the Conservation Commission shall send written notice of default to the Developer." If the Conservation Commission is now learning that the required method of slope stabilization was not properly completed, the Conservation Commission should send written notice to the Developer that such failure to adhere to the terms and conditions of the Order is a default and the Developer must submit a plan showing or explaining how it will comply with the Order within 10 days. Failure to do so will result in the Conservation Commission drawing on the Letter of Credit... Attorney Madaus said the Commission should take it under discussion this evening and if we vote to send such a letter to the developer, he will draft it for the Commission's signature. Joe McGrath made a motion to request content from Attorney Madaus and draft a letter requesting the re-

establishment of the bonds be sent to Mr. Haynes; Mark Coakley seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

Mr. McGrath noted that we received Mr. Marro's Stabilization Plan and the Compass Circle Plan showing the lot numbers. Mr. Coakley visited the site last Friday with the Compass Circle map (Exhibit Plan for Cheryl's Way 1 / 2, Boylston CP, LLC dated May 13, 2020). The site is generally temporarily stable. There was some work going on; hydroseeding the woodchips. He was concerned if that was the appropriate thing to do. We need to get to the agreed upon construction requirements of loaming and seeding and we need to get to basic general acceptance criteria of 70% of the native grass plantings to be suitable in order to stabilize the project. There was a lot of square feet of bark mulch with nothing on it. That is temporary stabilization, not permanent stabilization.

A PowerPoint presentation of the lots was viewed. Mr. Duffy and Mr. Burkhardt visited the site Saturday morning and walked the same areas as Mr. Coakley. Mr. Duffy reviewed the information provided in the NOI and the Order of Conditions. All Cheryl's Way lots have an Order associated with them except for lots 7A & 7B; the Orders were issued 7-18-2017. All of the plans associated with NOI state that all graded areas be landscaped, loamed and seeded to reduce any potential erosion. In addition, some of the lots had a detail called permanent slope stabilization which included a specified erosion control blanket. There is also a plan that was marked up during a public hearing and made part of the Order. There were concern during the public hearing for the lots that the structures and the work proposed was different from what was part of the original subdivision and there needed to be an evaluation of the overall stormwater flow to the subdivision infrastructure since the structures that were proposed were larger (duplexes with two driveways), a lot more impervious surface than the approved plans associated with the subdivision. Instead of delaying the Order of Conditions, the Commission allowed the applicant to work with our engineer to evaluate the impact of the additional impervious area and propose a solution. Mr. Duffy spoke with Graves Engineering who said the only communication they had was with the applicant who said they would have roof infiltration, but there was nothing submitted to the Commission (an open item associated with those lots). There were several roof leaders coming from the lots on Cheryl's Way that are causing erosion on the slopes when they discharge. He explained the plan that was reviewed and made part of the Order. It detailed where the wetland boundary markers were to be installed on each of the lots, and it detailed seventeen 6-8-foot tall white pine trees that were to be installed on lots 7A&B and 8A&B Cheryl's Way. Some of the sloped areas have a hatching to them which was indicated where the erosion control fabric would be installed; the lots represented by those slope areas are the ones that had the detail as part of the plan included in the NOI. It was clear walking the site there has been no topsoil placed in any of these areas. There is one section of where there was erosion control fabric laid down but no vegetation; the soils are eroded and there are portions with no wood chips. The proposed scope of work in the NOI is what the Commission approved (minimum topsoil and seed on all disturbed areas, erosion control fabric on steeper slopes). None of that work has been completed.

Bart Laganelli (8A Cheryl's Way) emailed and disagreed with Mr. Marro's report. Mr. Coakley agreed; there were areas on 8A & 8B Cheryl's Way that show exposed subsoil with no vegetation on the slope. Mark Anttila emailed today saying that additional hydroseeding on hills (See Note 1) that was not done when they visited over the weekend was being done today. Mr. Coakley commented that those that were to be turned over by hand; he did not see any evidence it was done before the hydroseeding (4A&4B area). Mr. Burkhardt said some hydroseeding was done; there were slopes with bark mulch (some started to decay but not known if it will support a substantial growth). He also saw bark mulch on top of gravel (not sure if it will hold and grow). There is a history of sloughing on 1A&1B Cheryl's Way; there is gravel exposed; he has concerns with that and also the top of the slope. Mr. Coakley said it is

nowhere near permanent stabilization and the Commission has serious concerns about the logic of spraying hydroseed on bark mulch. Mr. Burkhardt said none of the slopes are uniform, there will be areas where there will be gullies and believes there is substantial opportunity for future erosion to happen. Mr. McGrath said we have identified that there is a lot of work still to be done. There also inconsistencies in Mr. Marro's report and asked comments from him and Mr. Grenier on how we will continue to move forward to address the areas that Mr. Coakley, Mr. Burkhardt and Mr. Duffy pointed out as well as correct the report.

Atty. Watsky said the areas just discussed are areas where Mr. McManus identified as areas to be stabilized and were hydroseeded today. The decomposed bark mulch was turned over like Mr. McManus said it should be done. Mr. Marro said the rationale was based on site walks with the owner and Paul McManus. He said he and Mr. McManus seemed to be in agreement and said it could be turned over. Mr. McGrath commented that he is pleased that we are moving forward. One big concern is the discrepancy with what Mr. Marro reported and Bart Laganelli (8A& B Cheryl's Way) said. Mr. Duffy said to accept something that is not compliant with our Order of Conditions and not compliant to what was proposed to us, at the same time the applicant without our approval is reducing the bond for us to be able to act in the event it does not work and the Commission has to take responsibility for it, asked Atty. Watsky what his thinking is on the bond on the bond reduction and what they intend to do to about it.

Atty. Watsky said he talked to Atty. Madaus today. He agrees that there is no specific provision for the release of a portion of the bond in the performance agreement, but said Atty. Madaus considered it appropriate for them to offer and request to amend the bond agreement be modified with a bond reduction in it. He said the Bylaw doesn't say anything about bonds and securities, but Section 10 of the Rules and Regulations reads in part... If the project is phased, the Conservation Commission may release part of the bond as each phase is completed in compliance with the Plan but the bond may not be fully released until the Conservation Commission has received the final inspection report as required by Section 11 of these By-laws and issued a Certificate of Completion...He thought that was appropriate. He didn't think it was as black and white as Atty. Madaus told the Commission.

Mr. Duffy asked if Atty. Madaus agreed that it was appropriate for his client to reduce the bond without approaching the Conservation Commission, doing it on the basis of what our engineer provided being sufficient. Atty. Watsky said no; he agreed that the procedures were not followed; it happened, it shouldn't have, how do we move forward. He suggested the consultants evaluate it; he knows there was a mistake made. Mr. Duffy said his opinion is that if he accepts the fact that the project stabilization includes all disturbed areas and the bond be established based on the cost to do what was approved, and that the estimate that gets prepared is based on going into the backyards and taking down fences and doing all work necessary to comply with the design plans and Orders of Condition, then he will be satisfied with something that may not work, as long as we have the security to make sure that what was approved can be completed by the town if the applicant refuses to do anything. Atty. Watsky said he hasn't seen anything from the consultant that would suggest the site needs a whole scale regrading of what is there already. All of the areas that have been called for in the yards have been sodded. Mr. McGrath pointed (from what was in the minutes two months ago) the letter that Graves Engineering sent that was used as the basis to reduce to the bond without our review, basically stated that certain conditions were acceptable that were contrary to what had been specified in the Order of Conditions. The Commission is willing to work under the regulations to address the amount of the bond as work progresses; however, we are not sure that the bond in place will get us to what is stipulated and agreed to by Mr. Haynes in the Order of Conditions. He asked Atty. Watsky if he was okay with the Commission having a review of that verifying again what the proper amount of the bond should be; Atty. Watsky

agreed. Mr. Duffy said it needs to be noted that there was a scope of work that was approved. They may be able to demonstrate something different will work, but until that is proven, the amount of security needs to be approved by the Commission. We need to have assurance that if it is not working, we have funds to go in and do what was approved by the Commission. He further said that Mr. McManus and Graves Engineering are consultants to the Commission, they do not make decisions on behalf of the Commission. Atty. Watsky said the Commission is not in a position to disagree with professional opinions, but do have the right to make discretionary decisions. Mr. McGrath said the Commission would be happy to make those decisions based on what applicant committed to in the original Order of Conditions, the complete restoration of the site, not some different measures that are being incorporated now. Mr. Burkhardt said when it comes to talking about the amount of the bond, if whatever measures the developer is taking are not sufficient, there has to be a bond in place to go in and do the work that was approved in the original Order. The work that was approved in the original Order was loam and seed. The applicant's representative agreed to reevaluate the money required to make sure we have a sufficient bond in place. Mr. Marro, Mr. Grenier, Graves Engineering and Mr. McManus will be consulted. Mr. McGrath thanked them for continuing to stabilize the slopes.

5B Cheryl's Way (Oni Wartenin) said the builder hydroseeded the south side of Cheryl's Way from Units 3A-3B to Units 7A-7B. An individual with a plastic rake was on the slope trying to rough up what was there; additional damage was done. The majority of the original mulch is gone; pine needles and oak leaves are deteriorating. The hydroseed was sprayed on everything. He doesn't believe there is temporary stabilization. The mulch has deteriorated on 7B; there is runoff to the hay bales in the back. He cautioned Mr. Marro's report; there was no soil spreading or vegetative planting, only hydroseeding. Mr. McGrath commented that was consistent with what the Commission saw on the site visit.

Mark Anttila (46B Compass Circle). The report says "the area is already established with a canopy of excellent growth"; there is no existing growth. Mr. Marro was asked for his comments on the report discrepancies and the pictures that show a discrepancy between a full canopy, and also his comments on page 2 of the stabilization report that woodchips may now be raked over by hand, have loamed spread on them, and have seeding spread. Mr. Marro said he referenced the plans that Mr. Grenier gave him. The areas behind 46A&B have a tree canopy that hasn't been removed; there is decent growth; he does not see huge erosion hazards. The area referenced in the photo is a very small area with an extremely small slope from 1A & 1B to 3A&3B. There is sufficient mulch. He said the he and Mr. McManus agreed the area could be turned over and loamed and seeded. Mr. Coakley said the general process is hydroseeding the chips as they lay, without any additional loam. Mr. Marro said when he toured the site with Mr. McManus, they agreed there were areas where the mulch had decayed enough that would act as loam and take. Mr. Coakley asked if just hydroseeding the mulch they saw on site without adding any additional mulch should yield 70% permanent growth. Mr. Marro said that's what he and Mr. McManus agreed to. He was told it was up to him to meet the performance standards, not Mr. McManus. Mr. Duffy clarified that Mr. McManus' report submitted refers to temporary stabilization. He doesn't agree that turning over bark mulch in those areas and putting hydroseed down is adequate. Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Grenier's opinion on some of the slopes, specifically on 2A&2B and 4A&4B that are extremely steep as to whether it is a permanently stabilized condition. Mr. Coakley said no loam was spread over the bark mulch or turned before they hydroseeded. Mr. Duffy said regarding 46 Compass Circle, Mr. Marro's notes read in part...the area appears completely stable...recommends nothing else be done in those areas, they appear to be fully stable and compliant with the plans submitted. Mr. Duffy said the plans submitted required topsoil, seed and erosion control fabric, correct. Mr. Marro said yes; 46A&46B is not what is pictured. The co-owner said it is her backyard, 46A, and it is approximately 30-40 yards of hill space.

5B Cheryl's Way (Oni Wartenin) said the stone work was put there because of the improper grade above; active water is on the side of the tree; it is important for that slope to be permanently stabilized. Bart Laganelli (8 Cheryl's Way) had issues with Mr. Marro's report. Mr. Marro said there were errors on his part in the report. Because of the inconsistencies from the abutters and what was observed on the site visits, Mr. McGrath suggested we have our consultant develop a restoration plan. Mr. Burkhardt said the developer has the responsibility to do the restoration; his opinion is they are taking on the risk, we need monitoring. Mr. Coakley would like Graves to review some structural items, issues associated with the suitability of what they are doing in terms of hydroseeding the mulch (there is nothing on how to stabilize it), and discharge of stormwater into the pond. The Commission will contact Graves Engineering and Ecotec to tell them what we need to do. Atty. Watsky suggested coordinating with Mr. Grenier and Mr. Marro also.

Compass Pointe Request for Certificates of Occupancy (Lot 11 Unit 15; Lot 46D Unit 39; Lot 46D Unit 40)
– The lots will be included in the upcoming conversation about the bond. Once that conversation takes place and the value of the bond has been addressed, they can potentially be released unless there is some other issue.

Dragon 88 Update – Scott Heim contacted the office and said he would not be ready for this meeting, but will be ready for the June meeting.

Eversource Energy (Minor Modification to Determination of Applicability issued 12/18/2019) – Becky Weissman (SWCA) and Brendan Kearns (Engineer for Trimont) participated remotely. She explained that they were before the Commission in December 2019 for a proposed gas main extension on Sewall Street. It was going to cross the brook via horizontal directional drill (HDD); they received a Determination of Applicability. Eversource decided instead of using an HDD, they are going to bore through the culvert. There is an existing water main that was constructed in a similar manner. They provided a request for a minor modification. Mr. McGrath said Ms. Weissman did contact him and he asked if there would be any additional impact to the resource area as part of the change. She said flow will be negligible due to the fact that the culvert will cross parallel to an existing water main that also crosses the culvert itself; it is part of Sewall Brook, there is an existing 12-foot wide concrete box culvert. There would be crossing through the culvert where the brook crosses the street. Mr. Kearns said if the volume is a concern, it is about a .5% increase. The proposed pipe is 12" a few inches smaller than the water main; 11-feet of pipe is required for crossing the brook. Mr. Kearns said they have been in contact with Steve Mero. Ms. Weissman said they will be seeking a road opening as part of this. Mr. Kearns was asked to add a compost sock to the plan. Ms. Weissman said Eversource will use an environmental compliance monitor for inspections; there will be post-construction monitoring as well. Mr. McGrath said it looks less impactful. Mr. Duffy thinks the HDD is less impactful than this method. Mr. Duffy wants to see a plan prior to the start of work that shows the erosion and sediment controls locations and detail, and to have their environmental monitor send us their report. Joe McGrath made a motion to accept the request from the applicant to modify the work involved in the Request for Determination but that the Commission notes there is no change with our decision to issue a Negative Determination. Prior to prior the start of work, a plan will be submitted that shows the erosion and sediment controls locations and details as well as the environmental monitor report. Mark Coakley seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

81 Shrewsbury Street (Parking Drainage Improvements) – Site of Clinton Savings Bank, Boylston Pizza, Anytime Fitness. There was an issue with the trench drain. J.R. Grady and Sons proposed that they will remove the existing trench drain; two precast catch basins will be installed in place; water will be directed to them; hay bales will be used for erosion control. The Commission agreed at the last meeting

that they could proceed because it was in the best interest of the town, an exemption to the Stormwater Control Bylaw because it was an emergency road repair.

Vote to Close Out 53G Account for 313 Main Street (Ricciardi) & Return Funds (\$2,500) – Mark Coakley made a motion to close out the account number 409-171-5700-000, 313 Main -Ricciardi; Dan Duffy seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

Electronic Signing – Mr. McGrath has a DocuSign account that could be used for signing going forward.

Mr. McGrath has been approving the vouchers.

Correspondence/emails were reviewed: Dan Hill (Goddard Consulting Engineer) emailed asking for clarification regarding questions the Commission had about plantings near the road and parking near the wetlands at LEI (200 Shrewsbury Street). Melanie will email Mr. Hill to let him know the members noticed there was some planting being done at the front of the site and will take a look at it; if there are any questions, they will contact him.

Scott Rossow (20 Oak Hill Lane) he is now looking to put in a drainage swale and dry well to catch additional material. It was suggested he file a Request for Determination. Mark Coakley said it should be in a document that reflects the original documents and on an as-built plan.

Mike Trotto emailed saying that on Friday 5/15/2020 Yankee Engineering will do the compaction testing. Saturday 5/16/2020 Worcester Sand and Gravel will finish spreading the topsoil - weather permitting. Hydroseeding will follow in the next 10 days. The site will be finished by May 30, 2020. Bruce Haskell will be doing an inspection at some point.

Dan Duffy made a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes dated April 27, 2020; Mark Coakley seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved.

June 22nd was confirmed at the next meeting date.

Joe McGrath will set up zoom meeting with Graves & EcoTec to relay the instructions that were discussed earlier with Atty. Watsky and Mr. Marro.

Mark Coakley made a motion to adjourn; Dan Duffy seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.