

Conservation Commission Meeting  
Virtual Meeting  
September 3, 2020

Roll call was taken of members and staff present: Peg Arguimbau, Chair, Meredith Avery, Keevin Geller, Alan Westman, Stephen Cr  mer and Colin Barbera were the members present. Not Present: Jon Wasserman. Staff present, John Thomas, Conservation Administrator

Arguimbau opened the meeting by reading Governor Baker's Executive Order of March 12, 2020. Per guidance from the State, Arguimbau noted that all votes would be taken by roll call.

The remote meeting started at 7:30pm

**7:30 P.M - Floating Dock Installation**

*74 Massapoag Ave – Abelson*

John Thomas provided Commission members with background as to how this came to his attention. In passing by the property, Thomas noticed a new floating platform. He issued a violation notice. The property owner, Abelson, upon receipt of the notice, contacted the office. Thomas asked Abelson to attend the next Commission meeting via Zoom to discuss the floating docks and the potential permit needed to be in compliance with the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Thomas also showed a photo of the dock as it currently stands, which was put in about a month ago. He has asked Abelson to discuss any activities which have previously been done over the years regarding the installation of the dock. Thomas also noted that he has looked through prior aerial photos and that he did not notice any dock in any of the photos.

Abelson explained that her family has owned the home across the street and the beach since the early 1960's. The property has passed from her grandfather to her. Abelson explained that for the past 60 or so years that there has always been a dock of sorts. She noted that in 1999 a new dock was purchased. In looking at the photo being shown, she explained that the front portion of the dock (closer to land) was part of the dock her family had around 1992. She further explained that additional pieces of the dock (on land) were originally the end piece of the dock. Of the remaining two pieces, as shown in the photograph, one piece is on posts and the other piece is floating. Abelson explained that she divorced in 2001 and did not put the dock in that summer. She then developed health problems so the dock was not put in for several years, though one year she explained that a friend did put the dock in. She has purchased a pontoon boat and again, a friend put in the dock. Arguimbau noted that it looked like there are two new pieces to the dock. Abelson explained that she had those pieces for a while but that they were too heavy for her to install.

Arguimbau noted that most residents do not realize that there are regulations associated with putting in docks. She then asked Abelson if it was her intention to remove the dock at the end of the season, to which Abelson replied yes.

Arguimbau explained that regulations for the installation of docks are currently being worked on and that for those who have existing docks, they will be able to be permitted and approved. Arguimbau asked Thomas about timing, and about retro filing. She also mentioned that the dock looks longer than what has previously been in place at that location. Abelson explained that most of the dock is older, but that the piece near the boat is new.

Arguimbau is hopeful that by next spring, paperwork for permitting docks in a great pond will be available for residents. Thomas has been surveying the lake and tabulating the number of docks and platforms to get a base line of the number of and characteristics of the docks currently in Lake Massapoag. The Commission will be working over the winter months on permitting, however, at this time, a way of monitoring and controlling the installation of docks being put in is needed.

Abelson apologized to the Commission saying that she thought she was just replacing what had existed there previously. Geller understands that there had been a dock there previously and believes Abelson made an honest mistake and believes that she has been subjected to unwarranted abuse by a neighbor. He thinks that we should help move this thing along.

Arguimbau would like to bring into compliance the installation of the dock. Explaining that Abelson has been cooperative both in the past and now, believes we can move forward. There will be an expectation that the larger section of the dock will be removed and the Commission will be working on regulations to assist in this process.

**7:40 PM Discussion: 40 Harold Street, Oxbow Associates**  
*Current Status and alternatives within buffer zone*

Mr. Costa and Jonathan Shuster were present and are representing the property owner. Arguimbau asked for an update of what has been going on and where both gentlemen believe things stand at this time.

Brief background: in 2013 a second story addition and deck area (which is currently in question) was approved by Conservation Administrator, Greg Meister. In 2019, Mr. Costa's client hired a contractor to enclose the existing deck and to make the deck into a three season porch. The existing deck is approximately 308 square feet. No addition was proposed, only an enclosure, adding walls and a roof to the existing deck. The addition of the roof now made the structure impervious. When the Town Building Inspector, Joe Kent, was informed of this building, a Stop Work Order was issued. The property owner then hired Oxbow to delineate the wetland line of the property and went in front of ZBA for permission to enclose the deck. Meister submitted a letter to the ZBA requesting that the project not be approved siting that approval would set a detrimental precedent of a wetland resource. The ZBA complied with Meister's request and permission to enclose the porch was denied. The property owner would like to submit the project again with the ZBA. The case is currently in land court and Costa believes that guidance from the Conservation Commission will enable an equitable solution to be achieved with mitigation that would be beneficial to the town. A statement from the Commission, reflecting new information which is being presented would be of great assistance as they meet with the ZBA. Approval of the project from the Commission is not being asked for, the property owner is just asking for permission to bring the project in front of both the Commission and ZBA.

At this time Costa is looking for support from the Commission in the form of a letter to the ZBA indicating the proposed work and enclosure of the existing deck is viable. He is not asking for approval of the project but rather, permission that his client can file a Notice of Intent to enclose the porch. Costa reviewed with the Commission the proposed mitigation.

He noted that the proposed project is within fifty feet of the buffer. A plan of the proposed project was displayed.

Costa reiterated again that his client is not looking for approval for this project, but that the Commission believes there is viability this project can move forward. Costa believes the letter written to the ZBA by Meister did not include reference to parts of the by law or Wetlands Protection Act that were not met.

Arguimbau asked if all Commission members received a copy of the Oxbow letter. The existing home resides within the buffer. The area is sensitive. In 2013, an expansion of the home was granted within the 100 foot buffer. Arguimbau asked Costa for clarification for the reason they are present this evening, and if the applicant would like to file a Notice of Intent.

Costa explained that they are not seeking approval of the project at this point, but rather that they are seeking an opportunity to pursue this project further with town departments. Costa believes that the ZBA denial of this project was predicated upon the letter they received from Meister. With the denial of the proposed project by the ZBA, the property owner believes they were not allowed to file a Notice of Intent and present a mitigation plan and narrative to address any concerns the Conservation Commission may have had. Costa again reiterated that his client is looking for a written letter from Conservation to the ZBA noting that the proposed project is viable. He and his client understand this is not an automatic approval from the Commission, and that the project could be denied, they would just like to present additional information to the Commission which has never been seen.

Arguimbau explained that the property owner is free to file a Notice of Intent with the Commission. She also noted that the recent construction to enclose the porch came to their attention as no building permit was filed. Arguimbau explained that the Commission is more than happy to entertain any filings anyone would like to put forth.

Costa noted that a Notice of Intent could be prepared and submitted for the next meeting, but believes that the issue is to avoid a costly hearing challenging the ZBA. They would prefer a letter from the Commission stating that this project is viable. Costa understands the project could be denied but a letter from the Commission would also allow the ZBA to take a second look at the project with additional information and input from the Commission.

Arguimbau asked if the deck will be living space to which Costa responded that the deck would be converted into a three season room.

Avery asked if Commission would withdraw Meisters letter to the ZBA. Don't mind if the property owner files a Notice of Intent, but concerned withdrawing a letter which has been sent to another Board.

Thomas has not been confronted with this situation in his line of work, but suggested an addendum to the existing letter could be written, noting the property owner would be filing a Notice of Intent, but not sure if this would be helpful.

Westman understands why property owner is asking for a letter from the Commission, but is not sure such a letter is needed. If there is new information to be presented, he believes that the ZBA would be willing to review.

Costa believes that the letter written by Meister to the ZBA was so strongly written that it may have implied the Commission would deny the project if brought before them. Costa believes that if the Commission would write a letter to the ZBA it would open the door to allow for his client to file.

Arguimbau explained that there is a parallel process. 1) File with the ZBA and 2) file with the Conservation Commission. Arguimbau noted that the property owner did not file with the Commission and that enclosure of the deck began without a permit.

Costa apologized. He explained that his client met with both Meister and the Building Inspector Kent. The intent was to file and follow the permitting process. The decision was to file with ZBA first, and they had assumed a special permit allowing them to proceed with the project would be granted. The intent was not to avoid the Conservation Commission.

Arguimbau again informed Costa that they could file a Notice of Intent with the Commission with the understanding the filing does not equate approval. The Commission entertains anyone who would like to present in front of them.

Consensus of Commission is that a Notice of Intent should be filed. The Commission has no jurisdiction over the ZBA but can rule on applications presented to them. Arguimbau said if they would like to file, they could be heard at the first meeting in October.

#### **7:50 P.M - Retail Sale of Gasoline and Diesel Fuel**

*Sharon Gallery – Bob Shelmerdine*

Bob Shelmerdine, Steve Rafsky and Randy Muse representing Sharon Galleries.

Rafsky explained to Commission that the developer would like to bring in a new tenant to the development. Slide show was shared by Rafsky.

Rafsky provided a quick update as to how we got to where we are and why they are here this evening. Three years ago this project went before Town Meeting. A lot has happened during the past three years. Market Basket agreed to become a tenant. Environmental Zoning Board site plan review and road design was performed.

A member of the Zoning Board resigned so the developer had to withdraw the project. In March, Covid came along. In the interim, some of the tenants who were originally interested have decided to move on. At this time, a major anchor like BJ's is interested in becoming a tenant.

The master plan for the project is currently being reviewed by the ZBA. Rafsky showed map of the proposed project which showed three sections: retail, (where Market Basket will go); residential and third, another section. The other section is why developer is here this evening. The interested tenant requires a fuel station as part of its model. In order to move forward, two zoning articles (Article 21 and Article 22) will need to be passed at Town Meeting to allow for the retail sale of gas and diesel fuel, and for the storage of gas and diesel. Plans of the proposed project were shown.

Representatives for the development have been meeting with various town boards including Zoning, Finance Committee and with Arguimbau. A meeting is scheduled with the Planning

Board. Developer is before the Commission this evening seeking support and guidance for this project and support for the passage of the change to zoning articles which will allow a retail gas station storage for fuel.

Regarding the overall project, the developer has been looking for long-term tenants that would be beneficial for the Town. A review of the traffic plan shows no increase with the addition of a BJ's like store.

Shelmerdine spoke noting that this proposed development was in Business District D. This district currently does not allow for gas stations. There is only one business district in the Town which allows for the sale of gas, which is within Business District B. Those retail gas stations which currently exist in Town have been grandfathered in. Shelmerdine believes that the opportunity being presented to the town is too good to pass up and would provide for long-term survivability and success of this shopping center. Shelmerdine explained the developer needs passage of the proposed Articles allowing for the sale and storage of gasoline. They are trying to keep this simple. Another Article being requested for passage is not a zoning article, but a groundwater protection law which needs an amendment to allow for the sale and storage of gasoline. Town consultant Tom Houston has drafted such article and has included protection criteria.

Arguimbau informed Commission members that she and Thomas attended the recent Finance Committee meeting regarding proposed zoning changes. Given the location of the proposed gas station and storage, the developer was asked if the tanks could be above ground rather than beneath. (Limiting tanks to being above ground could not be included within article as Houston explained, to do so, would result in the language for all above ground tanks to apply throughout all districts within the Town.) Arguimbau explained she asked for such changes on her own as things were moving forward quickly and she did not want the developer to have to go backwards.

Shelmerdine explained that the red language on the proposed draft articles is what his client is seeking to change. The yellow highlighted areas are changes made by Houston, who incorporated Arguimbau's concerns.

Shelmerdine discussed the three options. A and B are being proposed by the developer and include underground storage tanks. Option C, above ground tanks, is what was proposed by Arguimbau.

Andy Muse of GZA Engineering was present to answer any safety and compliance concerns.

Arguimbau asked what Shelmerdine was expecting from the Commission this evening. Shelmerdine responded that his client is looking for the Commissions reaction to the proposed articles as well as providing the Commission with information. If the Commission could provide their concerns, the developer would like to address them. The developer will be meeting with the Planning Board on September 24<sup>th</sup>.

Avery was concerned with underground storage tanks and their proximity to sensitive wetlands and the water protection district. She noted it would be better for the tanks to be above ground, but also understands this may not be the direction the developer wishes to go in. She asked if there would be any restrictions to the overall volume of fuel being stored as well as the positioning of the pumps.

Rafsky answered that his client had no intention of putting in above ground tanks. Randy Muse, of GZA noted that he has been working with the project team for a long time. He explained that the focus of his involvement has been the design and installation of petroleum. He has been working with the Sharon Gallery Team, but he is not with Sharon Gallery, but with GZA Engineering. His expertise is about the product being proposed and the design and that is what he can provide answers on.

Muse explained that he has extensive experience working for retail gas facilities and is familiar with the warehouse club mode. Typically they install three 20,000 gallon tanks. These tanks are heavily regulated, both at the federal level as well as the state. Many owners of these retail establishments also tend to put in additional safety measures. Muse then discussed materials used for the tank and how they are anchored and put in place. Muse explained that all lines are monitored at the control panel and are monitored on a continuous basis. An outside monitoring firm also provides monitoring to ensure all systems are continuously monitored. The pumps will be self-service and measures will be put in place to prevent and limit leakage of gas into the ground.

Geller expressed his concerns with the location (near cranberry bogs and wetlands) of the proposed retail gas station and fuel storage facility. He is also concerned about the potential traffic.

Rasky noted that a traffic study has been conducted. Though a change in usage, he does not believe there will be an increase in traffic as indicated by the prior traffic study report. An updated traffic study will however be done. The plan shown tonight is only speculation. The developer will work with the town to identify the best possible location, with the least amount of impact to the wetlands and resource areas, as possible.

Avery is concerned with change of ownership of the proposed retailer of gas. The current tenant is proposing numerous safety precautions and she would like a condition put in that any future owners of the retail station will need to follow all safety precautions put in place by this condition.

Thomas will be meeting with a wetland scientist who will be delineating wetland line on September 11<sup>th</sup>. They will also be looking at the bogs.

**8:00 P.M - Hearing Continuation - Request for Determination: 2395 Bay Road**  
*Building of a playset/tree house – Sarah Krajewski*

Property owner is not present this evening and the hearing will be continued

**Motion:** to continue

Cremer: Westman (Motion Passes 7-0-0)

Wasserman- Aye, Geller- Aye, Cremer- Aye, Barbera- Aye, Arguimbau - Aye, Avery-Aye, Westman - Aye

**8:10 P.M. – Hearing Continuance: Notice of Intent: 164 Beach Street**

*Proposed construction of an in-ground swimming pool with deck and retaining wall,  
Norwood Engineering*

David Johnson , Michael D'Angelo, and Paul Liberman

A revised plan for the project was presented. Changes to the project were discussed. Suggestions by the Commission were listened to and incorporated as much as possible. The pool and deck have been repositioned and have been pushed further back. The pool contractor worked on capturing spillover of water from bathers exiting and entering the pool. A drainage system has been put in to capture this water and will exit into a catch basin and will be recirculated back into the pool. The pool is no longer a saltwater pool, but a low level UV ozone pool which gives off the least amount of chlorine residual as possible.

Barbera asked about the UV System and was curious if there were other pools located close to the lake. Arguimbau could not think of any other pools so close to the lake. Barbera was concerned about the chlorine entering into the lake. Johnson explained that this pool design had the least amount of chlorine possible for a pool. Arguimbau asked the process to be followed if the pool needed to be drained. Johnson explained that in the case the pool needed to be drained, the water would be pumped out and into a truck.

Cremer asked about the position of the pool and was concerned about water from the pool going down the hill into the lake. D'Angelo explained that there was drainage put in place and a two-foot-wide catch basin to capture spillage of water from the pool. This water will then be recycled back into the pool.

The decking surrounding the pool is open with crushed stone below. Arguimbau asked why there was so much towards the left of the pool. The response was that due to the grading of the yard, this was the best design for the pool. A photo showing the stairs leading down from the house was shown. The lot is a sensitive lot and grading of the lot was taken into consideration when designing the pool and decking.

It was noted that when pool was put in, that the depth of the pool should be above groundwater. Arguimbau asked that Conservation Administrator be present when digging begins, and this condition should be included in the Orders.

Thomas asked if the Commission was granting this variance.

**Motion:** to close hearing, issue Orders with reference to the Special Conditions covering the comments made at this evenings meeting, including: reference to groundwater, the location of the pool, if pool to be drained, will be done via pump truck; catch basin to capture splash over of water, UV pool, etc.

Meredith, Barbera (Motion passes 6-0-1)

Wasserman – Aye, Geller – Aye, Cremer – No; Barbera – Aye, Avery – Aye, Westman – Aye; Arguimbau - Aye

Special conditions should be written and distributed to Commission members prior to being issued to the applicant.

**8:20 P.M. – Hearing Continuance: Notice of Intent: Princeway/Bay Road Roadway  
Birch Hill development**

Wasserman, Cremer (Motion Passes 7-0-0)

Wasserman – Aye, Geller – Aye, Cremer – No; Barbera – Aye, Avery – Aye, Westman – Aye; Arguimbau - Aye

**8:30 P.M - Request for Determination: 31 Everett Street – TTOR**

Josh Hasenfus was present and representing the applicant.

Thomas met Hasenfus at the site and confirmed the wetland boundaries.

The property is part of the old whaling museum. The proposal is to demolish and remove the old barn and garage. The area is wooded. The erosion control and planting plan were shown to Commission. The plan showed the two buildings to be demolished. Arguimbau asked Hasenfus if the Historical Society had been contacted and Hasenfus informed the Commission that a meeting has been set.

Hasenfus explained why the buildings were being proposed to be demolished. The cost to refurbish the buildings was estimated to be over \$100,000. The Trustees believed it was better to demolish and restore the buffer zone. A machine will be brought in to assist with the demo, and all rubble will be removed from the site. The existing driveway will be used for access to the property. The slope of where one of the buildings is set into will be rebuilt and the area will be revegetated with both natural vegetation and White Pine, Sweet Fern, Red Maple, Oak and Hickory, Black Birch, etc. The area will also be reseeded with New England wetland mix.

**Motion:** to issue Negative Determination per plan

Avery, Geller 7-0-0 (Motion Passes)

Wasserman-Aye, Geller-Aye, Cremer-Aye, Barbara,- Aye, Arguimbau-Aye, Avery – Aye, Westman-Aye

**8:40 P.M. 2 Cobbler Lane - Florio**

*Above-ground pool and accessory deck*

Property owner is not present this evening and the hearing will be continued

**Motion to continue hearing to 9/17**

Cremer, Westman 7-0-0 (Motion Passes)

Wasserman-Aye, Geller-Aye, Cremer-Aye, Barbara,- Aye, Arguimbau-Aye, Avery-Aye, Westman-Aye

**8:50 P.M. ANRAD 61 Eisenhower Drive, Goddard Consulting**

*Approval of wetland resources boundaries*

Tim McGuire and Nicole Hayes, Goddard Consultants. presented for confirmation of delineation of property. He is accompanied by Nicole Hayes

Commission members were shown the proposed ANRAD Delineation plan.

Just north of the property, an intermittent stream was flagged and bordering vegetated wetland with buffer that extends onto locus property. Flagging was based on wetland vegetation and hydraulic soils of the existing conditions at the site. The current existing conditions of the site were confirmed by Thomas. McGuire asked respectfully to grant an ORAD and close the hearing.



Arguimbau noted that this site was a problematic site long before this current delineation and explained that it was her belief that the site was still under a violation notice.

Arguimbau continued that while the existing conditions may indicate certain things, she is also aware that McGuire was in the office reviewing the property files of past filings/violations/enforcements. At this point Arguimbau is not sure if this request will be closed this evening. Many of the current Commission members are not aware of what has transpired previously at this site and will be helpful for them to be brought up to speed and review the past filings and plans.

McGuire presented his thoughts of the history of the property. Ten years ago an Enforcement Order for filling in of a wetland was issued. McGuire does not think the area was delineated accurately, as upon his inspection, he saw bright orange upland soils throughout the majority of the area, and although he noticed some wetland species such as sweet pepper bush, it is his opinion the area did not have soils to make it a wetland. As a result of the Enforcement Order, a Superseding Order was issued which conditioned construction of a replication of wetland area. Replication of the wetland was constructed in the area that was probably mis-flagged as a wetland and for that reason McGuire believes the area did not thrive. The area was planted and left alone with a proposal to build home which was never built, and there was never any monitoring of replication area. McGuire believes that due to the conditions of the site, over the years it has reverted to what is there today which is not a wetland. There are no conditions in SOOC for this wetland replication area that it would be managed in perpetuity, and Commission has not acted upon or managed the site in ten years. McGuire is happy to close out previous superseding orders during time filing Notice of intent.

Arguimbau explained that there are a lot of extenuating circumstances which have led to what is being seen now. Does not distract or dismiss the fact that wetland violations occurred at the lot, even prior to ten years ago. Arguimbau expressed concern that there were problems with the lot prior to ten years ago.

Arguimbau believes that it will be helpful for the entire Commission to see the narrative of and files for the property so they have a better understanding of what has transpired. She would like to continue this hearing to September 17<sup>th</sup>. Arguimbau is concerned about setting precedent if this application is approved. Thomas was asked if Fletcher had submitted a report of his findings to which he responded that both a sketch and report were submitted. The ground right now is rocky. If geo tech work, then a machine will be required.

Avery concerned that the soils have been disturbed enough to not show historic hydrology and if what is being looking at is what should have been restored to get back to what was there prior to violation order, then the fact that restoration failed, does not negate the fact that is where the wetland is. Further, if no Certificate of Compliance or closeout has occurred, then she believes that this is still an open issue.

Westman inquired, that if this is considered to still be open, then would it not have to be resolved?

McGuire is willing to perform whatever work is necessary up to the issuance of the SOOC.

Arguimbau explained that she is not willing to make a definitive decision this evening. She is willing to continue the hearing once Commission members have had an opportunity to better

understand the history of the site. Information from the files will be scanned and forwarded to Commission members. Arguimbau is concerned that if a violation occurs on a site and that no work was done and another person comes along who benefits from violations made in the past and which have not been corrected or addressed and which should have been addressed, then she believes that to be problematic.

McGuire asked to receive documentation which is sent to Commission.

**Motion:** to continue to the hearing to September 17<sup>th</sup>

Cremer, Westman (Motion Passes)

Wasserman-Aye, Geller-Aye, Cremer-Aye, Barbara,- Aye, Arguimbau-Aye, Avery-Aye, Westman-Aye

**Certificate of Compliance – 90 Massapoag Ave**

**Motion:** to Issue Certificate of Compliance and circulate for signatures

Cremer, Geller 7-0-0 (Motion Passes)

Wasserman-Aye, Geller-Aye, Cremer-Aye, Barbara,- Aye, Arguimbau-Aye, Avery-Aye,<sup>h</sup> Westman-Aye

**Certificate of Compliance - 3 Tracey Lane and circulate for signatures**

**Motion:** to Issue Certificate of Compliance and circulate for signatures

Cremer, Geller 7-0-0 (Motion Passes)

Wasserman-Aye, Geller-Aye, Cremer-Aye, Barbara,- Aye, Arguimbau-Aye, Avery-Aye,<sup>h</sup> Westman-Aye

**Turf Moratorium discussion – Debbie Tatro**

A Citizens petition for a moratorium on turf fields in the Town will be taken up at Town meeting. Tatro has been working with the Chair of the Finance Committee regarding this petition. She is hoping that the Commission will provide a vote supporting this petition for a three year moratorium on building turf fields in town. Tatro explained that PFAS is relatively new, with information coming out this past October. At present there is nothing definitive and there is no published data. She is concerned about artificial turf in general, and specifically at the high school, given its proximity to the lake. She believes that it is prudent to have a moratorium which would allow time for additional information to come out. Tatro also said she is disappointed that the decision on the Turf Field at the High School by the Commission was being appealed.

The Selectboard voted 2-1 to support the moratorium and Tatro was looking for the Commissions support. Arguimbau explained that the Commission has not yet received an official letter from the Standing Building Committee regarding the High School turf field and closing of the hearing.

Town meeting is scheduled for October 12<sup>th</sup>. The Finance Committee is finalizing material for the warrant.

Avery is concerned with the Commission taking a position on this petition as she does not believe this to fall under the purview of the Commission. The vote regarding the turf field at the high school was appropriate as the Commission was asked to review an application which was within the wetland resource area. To sign onto a petition that may affect areas

outside of the wetlands, Avery has concerns. Tatro mentioned that the Selectboard voted on the petition to which Avery responded that the Selectboard has jurisdiction over the whole town, while the Commission has jurisdiction over issues falling within their authority over administering the Wetlands Protection Act.

Arguimbau indicated that individual members of the Commission may speak at Town meeting as residents of the Town. As a Commission however, she does not believe the Commission need to take any action. If any filings come before them regarding the installation of turf fields, they can take up at that time but for the time being, she does not believe a vote is needed. Other Commission members were asked their thoughts on taking a vote. Avery, Westman, Barbera, Wasserman, Cremer and Geller were all fine with not taking a vote.

#### **Lake Update**

Thomas informed Commission that the lake was still at 9.5  
Lake testing results at both the Community Center and Memorial Beach came back high. The lake will be closed to the public and the water will be retested. Not sure of the high bacteria count, but the geese in the lake could play a part of the high count.

Cremer asked Thomas if he knew anything about stones being piled on the dock and if Thomas could look into.

#### **Motion to adjourn**

Cremer, Westman (Motion Passes)

Barbera – Aye, Westman – Aye, Cremer – Aye, Geller, - Aye, Avery – Aye, Arguimbau – Aye

Meeting adjourned at 10:06pm