Town of Griswold

28 Main Street
Griswold, CT 06351
Phone (860) 376-7060, Fax (860) 376-7070

GRISWOLD INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES
CONSERVATION COMMISSION &
AQUIFER PROTECTION AGENCY

REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES **JANUARY 16, 2014** **GRISWOLD TOWN HALL**

I. REGULAR MEETING (7:30 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman C. Kinnie called this regular meeting of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on January 16, 2014 at 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of a Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Stacie Stadnicki, Edward (Jay) Waitte, Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Town Planner WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Also Present: Town Attorneys Mark Branse and Caleb Hammel

Absent: Dean Rubino, Lawrence Laidley, Glen Norman, Alternates Gary Serdechny, Lauren Churchill, Mario J. Tristany, Town Planner,

C. Kinnie appointed P. Merrill to sit G. Norman. There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. Written Complaints

A. **Complaint received from Retina & Patrick Luft (Not Dated) regarding Application: CC 05-14 Rochette, Stephen & Jennifer, 52 Myrtle Road Griswold. CT.** Request approval for residential activity within a regulated area for a deck that was constructed without a permit exceeding the approved site plan of August 19, 2010.

C. Kinnie stated that we received materials as last month's meeting in a written complained. C. Kinnie asked the Lufts if there was any other information. R. Luft stated that there is a map showing the ROW for the neighborhood. Harry Heller, representing Stephen and Jennifer Rochette stated that the issue of the ROW is not a proper matter before the Inland Wetlands Commission; the commission determines whether or not activities in wetland and upland review areas have an adverse impact on the resources that the commission regulates. He asked that any discussion and questions be related to wetland and watercourse issues.

C. Kinnie asked P. Zvingilas to go over the time line for this application and to go over any work that was done along the shore of the pond. P. Zvingilas stated that the original application was in 2010 when the application was granted a permit to construct a floating dock, a ramp, and a 4 by 9 foot concrete area to anchor the floating dock. C. Kinnie asked the time line of what work was done and what was done according to the application. P. Zvingilas stated that the floating dock, and ramp went in at various times and the concrete slab was put in but exceeding the original application of 4 ft. by 9 ft. to be 4 ft by 14 ft. H. Heller stated that they agreed with that.

P. Zvingilas stated that he didn't see that as an issued since it was constructed over existing stones on that section of the property. He explained that he received phone calls from concerned people. He looked at it and now there was a wooden structure that was attached to the structure measuring 4 ft. by 14 ft. in length and what looks like newly-placed rocks in the water and on the shore that supports the structure. He stated there are photographs taken today showing the area. P. Zvingilas explained the photographs to the commission. Photo 1) showing the access to the water with the graveled area to the water to launch a boat; Photo 2) is midway down the walkway; Photo 3) is a close-up of the wooden deck with the stones that support it.

S. Stadnicki asked if the wooden structure was not part of the original permit. P. Zvingilas stated that the concrete was part of the permit but larger than stated. He stated that in November he contacted the owners and a notice of violation was issued to make an application for the permit for this Commission to act upon; the application was received last month and this is the hearing regarding the deck to determine whether it is out over the water or on the shore line based on the letter from DEEP that anything newly constructed along the shore or in the water area of Pachaug Pond requires a permit from DEEP. S. Stadnicki asked if the rocks under the deck structure had been tampered with since 2010.

P. Zvingilas stated that those rocks appear to be new. He stated that there are photographs of preconstruction in the file that show the trees and an area to the water and no dock construction at the time. He stated that the stones there now exceed the stones that were there in the beginning and the concrete is on the stones that were on the shore and stones were placed in the water beneath the deck.

C. Kinnie read the narrative of 2010 application for the record. He stated that there is a sketch with dimensions which showed a 9 ft. by 4 ft. ramp to the dock. P. Zvingilas stated that the ramp goes from the ramp to the floating dock. C. Kinnie stated that it shows the floating dock and the concrete pad. H. Heller stated that what was built was 4 ft by 13 ft. rather than the permitted 4 ft. by 9 ft.

Attorney Mark Branse, counsel for the commission, stated that a sketch from 2010 is not adequately hand-drawn, and though the commission is trying not to burdening the applicants, but a site plan by a surveyor or engineer, there should be drawings with details and cross-sections for what is proposed. C. Kinnie stated that what the enforcement officer has related is all that we can consider for this complain. P. Zvingilas stated that there is no evidence of massive erosion and the access to the water has been used so there is less vegetation but it is all stable.

4. <u>Applications</u>

A. CC 05-14 Rochette, Stephen & Jennifer, 52 Myrtle Road, Griswold. CT. Request approval for residential activity within a regulated area for a deck that was constructed without a permit exceeding the approved site plan of August 19, 2010.

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone to represent the applicants. Harry Heller, attorney at 736 Route 32 in Uncasville, CT. He stated that this application meets the right to stand. He stated there is a copy of the deed for 52 Myrtle Road as property owners. He stated that there is correspondence from DEEP that they do not give blanket applications for permits to bring actions on land of the State of Connecticut on Pachaug Pond. He stated that the decking must be determined was on land that was filled or was part of the original shoreline of the Rochette property. He asked Stephen Rochette to explain what was done to construct the deck. Stephen Rochette identified a photograph that submitted for the record as pre-construction as Exhibit 1. S. Rochette explained that the access to the pond was overgrown and had not been used in a while and he showed the shoreline with a rock embankment where the concrete pad is located. He stated that the rocks in questions

were already there and that they removed rocks from in the water when they lowered the pond and piled them up there on the shoreline; it was not extended into the water. S. Stadnicki asked how the rocks were moved. S. Rochette stated that the rocks were removed by hand. He poured the cement pad on the embankment to the water and instead of the embankment we covered it with the deck. He stated that it slopes straight down to the water and the rocks were put on the bank. J. Waitte asked if this is a ROW to the pond for the people to use and if it was blocked by this activity. H. Heller stated that it is not germane to the application. J. Waitte stated that if they exceeded their permit, then it is a matter for the commission. M. Branse stated that if they exceeded their permit, then it is a matter for the commission. S. Stadnicki asked how they can ask for a permit on a ROW that they don't own. H. Heller stated that they own it. M. Branse stated that they own the ROW in fee simple and they standing to apply as long as it is not on land that they don't own. The question is whether they extended out over what had been water; and if so it is on land which is owned by the State. He explained that you cannot apply for a permit on some else's property; so if the rock were piled up past the preexisting shoreline, then the deck is being sought for land that they don’t own; Mr. Rochette is explaining where the shoreline was relative to the photographs.

S. Stadnicki asked if this testimony should be heard now or should it be at a public hearing. M. Branse explained that you can set a public hearing if it is a significant activity or in the public interest. R. Parrette asked for a reference point on the photograph to show the shoreline to a point on a subsequent photograph. S. Rochette explained the photographs to the commission. There was discussion of this matter.

J. Waitte asked that since the Lufts had written the compliant, what happed that allows the Lufts no access to the pond. C. Kinnie stated that we cannot speak about the access. J. Waitte stated that he would like to hear from the Lufts because they wrote the complaint. S. Stadnicki stated that we could ask them why they think that the application is violated. M. Branse stated that they may have knowledge of the original condition of the shoreline.

Patrick Luft, 27 Amy Road, stated that we have deeded access to lot 13 A. He stated that he could not speak to the shoreline for the ROW was altered and built out over the water. He stated that because the structures have been added to the access, it privatizes the area and drops my use to it. J. Waitte asked if he could get to the water. P. Luft stated no and that he was not going to trespass on their structures. R. Luft stated that because of the structures the shoreline has been reduced to 9 feet to the pond and this cannot be access with a boat and trailer. R. Luft asked the date of the Rochette deed. H. Heller stated that it was September 22, 2010. She asked the date of the application. H. Heller stated that the previous owner had signed the 2010 application. There was discussion of this matter including that there are seventeen (17) other homeowners who have deeded access to the ROW and that there are three others who had an issue for this access because it affects their deeds and property sales.

H. Heller asked that he had questions regarding the shoreline for a resident of Myrtle Road. H. Heller asked her to state her name for the record. 50 Myrtle Road. Leeann Roberts. He asked her if she owned the property adjacent to this strip of land. L. Roberts stated yes. H. Heller asked her if she had watched the construction of the structures and if stones were placed out into the pond for the construction. L. Roberts stated no, they cleaned up rocks at the access to the pond. She stated that there was a large rock that made it hard to use it as a boat launch. H. Heller asked if that rock was placed on top of rock that was already there and not placed in the water. L. Roberts stated no. H. Heller asked about the deck construction done was landward of the original shoreline and not out toward the water. L. Roberts stated yes.

S. Stadnicki asked how wide the ROW was. H. Heller stated that it was twenty (20) feet all the way down from Myrtle Road to the shoreline, but shows thirty (30) feet on the shoreline because of the angle. H. Heller submitted Exhibit 2, a photograph of the shoreline showing the drawdown in the Fall. He stated that we should

be discussing whether or not the activities that the permitted applied for had an impact on wetlands or watercourses. H. Heller showed a photograph of the access when the property was purchased showing that the area was inaccessible. R. Parrette asked when the Lufts purchased their property. R. Luft stated that they purchased their property in February of 2011 and the Rochettes property was purchased in October, 2010.

H. Heller stated that the Rochettes have standing to bring this application before the commission and to determine that the work that was done which was not permitted in the 2010 permit complies with the evaluation criteria in acting on this activity to conduct work and maintain structures in upland review areas adjacent to wetlands. He stated that this is an after the fact permit and he would like the commission consider this application as if it was presented before the work was done and determine whether the activities proposed as an impact to wetlands and watercourses. He stated that a permit had already been issued for construction of a 4 x 9 ft concrete deck and that construction was acceptable under the permitting criteria. He stated that the extension of the pad four feet and the construction of the wooden decking on top of the rock shoreline has an impact on wetlands and watercourses.

H. Heller stated that P. Zvingilas testimony that the slope from Myrtle Road to this area is gently sloped. He stated that he concurred with P. Zvingilas that the area is stable and the access was considered when the 2010 permit was granted. He stated that the additional 4 feet of the concrete pad used the same construction techniques as the proposed original 9 feet. He stated that the wood deck has been anchored into the rocky shore but there was no movement of earth product required for construction of the wood decking and there was no propensity for erosion during construction of the deck. He stated that there is no likelihood of irretrievable loss of wetlands or watercourse resources as a result of this construction. He stated that if the commission determines that this activity has a significant impact on wetlands or watercourses, the applicant would have to present that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives. He stated that when the original concrete pad was permitted, no determination was made of significant activity. He stated that this application does not have any propensity for significant activity. He stated that the activity's impact to wetlands and watercourses, and the nature of the construction with respect to the wood deck, no mass movement of earth that would result in sedimentation or erosion to Pachaug Pond. He stated that the Commission should grant a permit for this activity.

S. Stadnicki stated that the original permit states that the dock will be secured to a 4 ft by 9 ft concrete pad. She asked if there was an existing pad. P. Zvingilas stated that the ramp is 4 ft by 9 ft. H. Heller stated that that is not correct. J. Waitte read the town planner's report for the record. S. Stadnicki stated that there are no dimensions for the cement pad; she read the minutes of the 2010 meeting for the concrete pad and that there is a cement pad and a cement pad. S. Rochette stated that there are no boats but for kayaks and canoes because it was a walking path. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Branse stated that there are two separate issues that the concrete pad is larger and that the wooden deck is not there at all. M. Branse stated that the purposes of this application should clarify all the items and to submit a plan the material it is made of and the dimensions and that it will be clear for any approvals. S. Stadnicki stated that she wants specific sizes for everything, the wooden deck, the size and material of the ramp, the cement pad. H. Heller stated that the ramp and the dock have been removed from the water because it is winter.

P. Zvingilas asked the date of receipt of the application: C. Kinnie stated that it is November 18, 2013. M. Branse asked if it was the first regular meeting after the date of receipt. M. Branse stated that you have 65 days from the last meeting. H. Heller stated that an extension will be required from the applicant.

C. Kinnie stated that a more detailed application is needed and a specific site plan with existing dimensions of the ramp, the deck and the cement pad. R. Parrette stated that a hand sketch will not be accepted.

R. Luft stated that S. Stadnicki had asked her why she thought it was under false pretenses. R. Luft explained that the permit was requested without mentioning that it was a ROW and that the deeds of the others for the rights and that it was built prior to the permit application. M. Branse stated that the ROW and rights of the individuals and the deeds is not a wetlands issue and that the rights of the various deeds cannot be determined. R. Luft asked if this then has to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a building permit. M. Branse stated that it does not go to the Planning and Zoning Commission. M. Branse stated that it is not an issue of the Municipality; the deeds and the ROW is an issue that is adjudicated in the Superior Court.

M. Branse stated that there was an issue of holding a public hearing for a significant activity or if it is in the interest of the public. He read Page 4 of the Inland Wetlands Regulations for the record for the definition of a significant activity or major effect. C. Kinnie asked the commission if there was significant activity for a public hearing. There was consensus that a public hearing was not required. He stated that in the public interest would be for items that are not in the jurisdiction of this Commission. S. Stadnicki stated that there be a delineation of the property lines. J. Waitte asked counsel needs to know what the access to the pond was before the activity and what the access is now and who would do that. M. Branse stated that a criteria if it the activity diminishes the natural capacity for the public and does not define deeds. J. Waitte stated he has not seen the deeds but the people have access to a certain amount of the waterfront and I think that it should not be violated. M. Branse stated that it is not a wetlands issue. M. Branse stated that it is a quiet title action brought to the Superior Court by counsel representing the deed owners.

P. Zvingilas stated that we have never issued a building permit for a residential recreational dock. He stated that the deck with railings may be considered a structure would require a building permit which then the setbacks for the zone and if a principle use can be constructed on the property. P. Zvingilas stated that he would require an opinion from town counsel whether the deck is considered a structure and would require a building permit. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie asked if the applicant was willing to grant an extension. H. Heller stated yes. He submitted a letter granting an extension of time for action on the application to the regular meeting in March. R. Parrette asked if he could go out and look at the site. H. Heller stated yes. P. Zvingilas stated that he wanted a detail showing how the ramp is attached to the dock.

H. Heller stated that he is not available for the February meeting and suggested the March meeting. C. Kinnie stated that he has received an extension for CC 05-14 signed by Stephen and Jennifer Rochette to render a decision at the March 20, 2014 meeting.
MOTION: J. Waitte moved to accept the request for an extension and to table application CC 05-014 to the March 20, 2014 meeting. R. Parrette seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

C. Kinnie recessed the meeting at 8:50 and called the meeting to back order at 8:59 p.m.

5. <u>Additional Business (New Applications)</u>

A. CC 06-14 Osga, Martin J. & Elizabeth, 71 Osga Lane, Griswold, CT. Request approval for residential activity within a regulated area and wetlands and watercourse to demolish existing 2-bedroom residence, paver patio removal, abandon existing septic system, remove existing stone retaining walls, clear vegetation from proposed development area in order to construct a new 2-bedroom residence with porch, code compliant septic system, fill and grade development site per grading plan; and to construct a versa-lock retaining wall at shoreline and installation of 30 ft. long floating dock. The property is zoned R-60.

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone to represent the applicants. John Faulise, Boundary LLC, was present to represent the Osgas who are out of town. He submitted an authorization letter dated December 18, 2013 from the Osgas to act on their behalf; A letter dated December 13, 2013 from Uncas Health District. There was discussion of the form sent from Uncas Health; a copy of the FIRM map identifying that the property is not in the AE zone below 159; a web soil survey data showing Hinckley gravel and Windsor sands on the site which is primarily in the Hinckley gravel zone.

J. Faulise explained the location of the site off of Bethel Road on Osga Lane which runs parallel to the pond. He stated that the existing structure was built in 1952 and has a well and septic system. He showed the location of the well and septic system. He stated that the existing structure will be demolished and a new 2 bedroom house will be built and located in the middle of the lot for the zoning setbacks. He explained the limitations of the lot regarding the wells of adjacent lots are close to the property and the well radii overlap so the septic cannot be in this location and that the lot is small. He explained that a utility easement for a pole line that bisects the property limiting the house and septic locations.

J. Faulise explained the house in the proposed location meets the setback requirements for the zone and is clear of the utility lines. He explained the limits of the regulated area running through the front portion of the house and encompasses the entire existing house, the entire existing septic system and the proposed septic system. He stated that the proposed septic system has concrete galleys that were approved by Uncas Health District and is in a similar location as the existing septic system. He stated that this will require 300 cubic yards of fill material to elevate the septic system and achieve the appropriate cover.

J. Faulise explained that the retaining wall and shoreline in the detail and an area will be cleaned up and replace failing existing retaining walls; the detail shows the total width for 12 feet and a 7 foot wide access are and an additional 12 feet for a total of approximately 30 feet that already in the access to the pond. The areas to the south and north of the access area are to remain vegetative with trees along the shoreline to remain intact. He submitted photographs of the treed areas for the record. P. Zvingilas asked if the proposed retaining walls are the same size as the existing retaining walls. J. Faulise stated that the existing retaining walls consist of loose stone and some telephone poles. P. Zvingilas asked if the proposed wall will be the same length as the existing wall. J. Faulise stated that it will be the same length. S. Stadnicki asked where the proposed well will be located. J. Faulise state that the existing well will be abandoned and showed the location of the new well and the well's radius. There was discussion of this matter including that a site can be required to field stake the site by the Commission. J. Faulise submitted other photographs of the site for the record.

S. Stadnicki asked if the existing structure will be removed. J. Faulise stated that it will be demolished by permit and removed from the site. P. Merrill asked about the existing system. J. Faulise stated that the tank will be dug up, crushed and abandoned in place or excavated and removed. C. Kinnie asked the tank is a dry well, will it be crushed in place. J. Faulise stated that the proposed septic system will be elevated. He stated that the flood zone at the 159 elevation and the bottom of the proposed septic system is at the 162.20 elevation. S. Stadnicki asked the slope of the area. J. Faulise stated that it is gently sloped going from the 159 elevation at the pond and finished grade of the system area is 164 elevation and the finished floor of the house is at 167.90 elevation and a crawl space at 162 elevation.

P. Zvingilas stated that the lines were to close together and it was hard to read. J. Faulise stated that he can print it at 10 scale. S. Stadnicki asked about the proposed gravel driveway. J. Faulise stated that the current driveway is gravel but has grass and pine needles in it; it will be loamed and seeded and the proposed driveway will go straight to the house.

J. Faulise presented the versa-lock detail of the retaining wall for the record. C. Kinnie asked what the limits of clearing were. J. Faulise explained that it will be the driveway and at the location of the well and the location of the septic system and sediment fence will run north to south across the lot limiting the activity. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie asked for any other questions from the commission. He asked for a motion.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to accept and table CC 06-14 to the February 20, 2014 meeting. J. Waitte seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

John Faulise stated that he was working with American Industries to complete the necessary reports that are required with the APA registration. .

J. Waitte left the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

6. Reports from the Enforcement Officer

C. Kinnie asked for a report from the Enforcement Officer. P. Zvingilas stated that he looked at the Timber Harvest on the Waterman Trust by Hull Forest Products on Sam Chikan Road. He stated that they did some work in November and early December, took a break and are back to work. He showed the photographs of the landing areas for the logs that were harvested to old Crary Road extension. He stated that the skid road looks good but he did not look at all of the 100 acres. They will be at the Bethel Road entrance in the spring. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Zvingilas stated that the work at Exit 86. He had to remind them to put the silt fence back up. C. Kinnie stated that the fence is up all the way to the highway. P. Zvingilas stated that there may be a problem with the State because if it is over 2 acres of clear cut a review by the state is required.

7. Old Business

A. Discussion of letter dated November 30, 2013 from Eastern Connecticut Conservation District, Inc. requesting a donation. – see copy of budget page.

R. Parrette asked how many more donation requests we will get. There was discussion of this matter.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to send ECCD, Inc. $30. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

8. New Business

A. Discussion of letter dated December 12, 2013 from Rivers Alliance of Connecticut requesting a donation. – see copy of budget page

There was discussion of this matter to determine the donation amount for inland wetlands and for conservation groups.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to send Rivers alliance $30. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion all were in favor. The motion was carried. R. Parrette moved to send $30 to Avalonia Trust and CACWAC when requested. All were

B. Election of Officers

C. Kinnie asked for nominations for officers from the members. There was discussion of this matter. P. Merrill moved to elect the existing slate of officers: C. Kinnie as chair, R. Parrette as vice chair, and S. Stadnicki as secretary. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

9. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 19, 2013

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to approve the minutes of December 19, 2013.
MOTION: C. Kinnie moved to approve the minutes of December 19, 2013. P. Merrill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

10. Communications

A. Rivers Alliance of Connecticut requesting a donation.
B. Avalonia Trails Newsletter, Winter 2013-2014.
C. Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies Quarterly Newsletter, Winter 2014, Volume XVII Issue 1
D. Connecticut Wildlife, November/December 2013

The above matters were discussed.

11. Reports from Members

S. Stadnicki stated that she has classes on Thursday nights until May. She will let Donna know. There were no other reports.

12. Conservation Commission Matters

R. Parrette stated that something was needed to penalize applicants who exceed the scope of the approved permit such as a bond. P. Zvingilas explained that a bond is to stabilize when a developer doesn't finish a project. C. Kinnie stated that how you can put a bond on a project if they have overstepped the permit and a bond amount would not cover any excesses that must be removed. There was discussion of this matter including that wetland bonds are limited in scope to cover the environmental issues.

R. Parrette asked about the clearing of the trees to the highway at Exit 86 and if we approved that clearing. P. Zvingilas stated that it was approved because it was a gravel excavation. S. Stadnicki asked how far back they were going if they will be filling in the ponds. P. Zvingilas stated no, it has been cleared and stumped and that the planner thought that a state permit should have been applied for; but that is up to the State.

C. Kinnie stated that we should ask the town attorney what can be done regarding fines or bonds. P. Zvingilas stated that this would go to court and the plaintiff would pay court fees and any fines. R. Parrette stated that the application fee should be $300 when someone does work without a permit or exceeds the scope of the original permit. P. Zvingilas stated that we did a notice of violation rather than a cease and desist for the application since a cease and desist requires certain legal requirements within a specified time. There was discussion of this matter. P. Zvingilas will check with Attorney Branse on fines and bonds.

13. Adjournment

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to adjourn. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

III. Aquifer Protection Agency

1. Call to Order

Chair Courtland Kinnie called this regular meeting of the Aquifer Protection Agency to order on January 16, 2014 at 9:55 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Stacie Stadnicki, Edward (Jay) Waitte, Dean Rubino, Alternates Clarence (Pete) Merrill, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Lawrence Laidley, Glen Norman, Alternate Gary Serdechny, Lauren Churchill, Town Planner Mario J. Tristany,

C. Kinnie appointed P. Merrill to sit for G. Norman There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. Matters Presented for Discussion

A. Discussion of information received from Kim Czapla, Aquifer Protection Area Program in phone conversation on December 20, 2013 and subsequent letter to delinquent registrant.

D. Szall explained that she has talked with K. Czapla in this matter and D. Szall emailed M. Tristany with the suggestions made by K. Czapla at DEEP. There was discussion of this matter including Stormwater Management Plan and Best Management Practices reports for American Industries APA registration. C. Kinnie asked that M. Tristany get in touch with J. Faulise in this matter.

4. Adjournment

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn. R. Parrette moved to adjourn. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary