



TOWN OF WINCHESTER
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
Town of Winchester Town Hall, 338 Main Street
P. Francis Hicks Room – 2nd Floor
January 16, 2019 – 7:00PM
Regular Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Ric Nalette called the meeting to order at 7:02PM.

2. ROLL CALL:

Roll call was completed by Mr. Nalette. Present at the meeting in addition to Mr. Nalette were: Christine Hunter, Chris Kiely, Steve Molinelli, Jackie Mulvey, and Kurt Timmeny as well as staff member, Land Use Assistant Pam Colombie.

It was noted that Russ Davenport and Bob Haburey were absent excused.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 19, 2018:

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Ms. Hunter second, to approve the December 19, 2018 Minutes; unanimously approved.

4. AGENDA REVIEW:

No changes were made to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. IWWC#18-37 Applicant/Owner: W.L. Gilbert Trust Corporation Location: 200 Litchfield Avenue Proposal: Slope Stabilization, Repair Failing Retaining Wall.

MOTION: Mr. Nalette, Mr. Kiely second, to open the public hearing; unanimously approved.

The legal ad was read into the record with it being noted as having run the requisite two times in the Republican American on January 2, 2019 and January 9, 2019. The receipts for the Certificate of Mailings, evidencing that notice of this hearing was provided to the abutting property owners, were provided.

Todd Parsons, PE, of Lenard Engineering appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Parsons reviewed the scope of the project, explaining that the work involves two portions of the school's campus, the driveway area that extends up to the current bus loop and the practice field near the student parking lot. He reviewed the site plans, noting the existing stream that parallels with the driveway and the retaining wall behind it, which was originally constructed in the late 1800s. Mr. Parsons noted that the area slopes back to another segmented block wall and continues up to the bus loop. He noted that the retaining wall has undergone several failures over its history. Mr. Parsons reported the proposal includes removing a large portion of the wall, reducing it to a four (4') foot height, except in the area of the existing stone archway where it will remain at full height. He noted that behind the wall, the land will be sloped back 2½:1 and the segmented block wall will be removed. Mr. Parsons noted that a portion of the bus loop will also be removed.

Mr. Parsons indicated that a new drainage system will be installed including slope drains to collect subsurface water.

Mr. Parsons then reviewed alternatives to the current proposal, explaining why they were ruled out. He noted that one alternative included rebuilding the wall which would involve excavating behind the wall at a 1½:1 slope in order to provide a safe excavating area for the contractors to work. That option would involve removal of a

significant amount of soil that would have to be temporarily stored and then put back which would be both expensive and ineffective as it would not solve an overall stability problem, according to Mr. Parsons. Another alternative was to install a 250' long culvert thereby allowing the soil to be placed against the wall on the downhill side. He explained that this alternative was dismissed because it would result in a more significant impact and deemed less desirable by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. Additionally, Mr. Parsons noted that they had reviewed shifting the stream as close as possible to the driveway, resulting in a smaller amount of fill against the retaining wall, but indicated that DEEP was opposed to this idea, too. Finally, Mr. Parsons relayed that a soil-nailing process was examined. That process includes drilling holes through the masonry wall, rebuilding it, and running steel anchor rods deep into the soil behind it. Mr. Parsons explained that it is an expensive process and without knowing all of the characteristics of the soil behind the wall, it was rejected.

Mr. Parsons reported that they had met with the US Army Corp of Engineers and DEEP on site and it was determined that a permit was not necessary from either of those entities. He noted that they had consulted with the Fisheries Division as there is a legitimate fish habitat in the stream. Mr. Parsons explained that the Fisheries Division's recommendations were largely around the timing of the work and noted that their suggestions have been incorporated into the plan. Mr. Parsons noted that those recommendations have been incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Parsons reviewed the erosion control plan which includes diverting water from the uphill side to prevent as much runoff as possible and working from the top side down to allow the lower portion of the wall to remain in place for as long as possible. He noted the silt fence and filter socks that will be installed along the perimeters. Once the site work is completed, the entire bank will be covered with an erosion control blanket, according to Mr. Parsons.

The secondary site, the practice field, was reviewed as it is where all the excess material will be relocated after the wall area has been stripped. Mr. Parsons noted that there will be some regrading and replacement of the top soil at the practice field. The field will be taken out of service temporarily but will remain and be about four feet higher. The erosion control plan for the practice field was reviewed. He noted that there will be fill on the downstream side to create a berm so if there is a large rain event, sediments will be trapped in that area. Silt fence will be installed around the perimeter and a filter sock will be installed at the top of the berm area once the grade is reached.

The wetland impacts were noted as 50 square feet of direct wetland impact, 32000 square feet in upland review area near the slope and 49000 square feet in review area near the practice field. The temporary impact, as a product of the temporary timber mats in the stream during construction, is 1130 square feet.

Mr. Nalette requested a brief history of the causes of the failures on the site. Mr. Parsons noted that there are four different areas that failed but noted that there are a number of likely causes for them including the age of the wall and the growth of the tree roots very close to the top of the wall.

Mr. Nalette questioned whether this is going to alleviate any possible ground water blowouts. Mr. Parsons indicated that during construction, the contractor may deal with a little of that but noted that ground water control drains have been included to prevent that from being an issue. He explained that his firm had retained the assistance of a well-qualified geotechnical engineer who had reviewed ground water issues.

Mr. Nalette questioned the number of linear feet of disturbance along the river and the field. Mr. Parsons estimated that it is approximately 300 feet along the wall and 500 feet along the field.

Mr. Molinelli questioned the alternative involving pinning the wall and whether it would reduce the amount of slope disturbance. Mr. Parsons clarified that this option would still require relocating the soil at least on a temporary basis and then returning it.

The hearing was open to the public. No comment was received.

Mr. Nalette noted that the applicant's engineer has presented with alternatives and indicated why they were dismissed as neither feasible and/or prudent. He shared his confidence in the engineering firm opining that if there was a more feasible and prudent alternative, one would have been shared.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Ms. Mulvey second, to close the public hearing; unanimously approved.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. IWWC#18-37 Applicant/Owner: W.L. Gilbert Trust Corporation Location: 200 Litchfield Avenue Proposal: Slope Stabilization, Repair Failing Retaining Wall.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Mr. Timmeney second, to approve Application IWWC#18-37 Applicant/Owner: W.L. Gilbert Trust Corporation Location: 200 Litchfield Avenue Proposal: Slope Stabilization, Repair Failing Retaining Wall, based on oral and written testimony.

Conditions 1-12 are standard Inland Wetland Commission Conditions and the following additional conditions determined by the Inland Wetlands Commission:

1. The permittee shall notify the Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer immediately upon the commencement of work and upon its completion.
2. If the authorized activity is not completed within five years from the issuance date of January 16, 2019 said activity shall cease and, if not previously revoked or specifically renewed or extended, this permit shall be null and void. Any request to renew or extend the expiration date of a permit should be filed in accordance with the Inland Wetlands Regulations of the Town of Winchester. Expired permits may not be renewed and the Inland Wetlands Commission may require a new application for regulated activities.
3. All work and all regulated activities conducted pursuant to this authorization shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit. A copy of the permit and plans shall be on site at all times. Any structures, excavation, fill, obstructions, encroachments, or regulated activities not specifically identified and authorized herein shall constitute a violation of this permit and may result in its modification, suspension or revocation.
4. This authorization is not transferable without the written consent of the Inland Wetlands Commission.
5. In evaluating this application, the Inland Wetlands Commission has relied on information provided by the applicant. If such information is subsequently proved to be false, incomplete, or misleading, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked and the permittee may be subject to any other remedies or penalties provided by law.
6. The permittee shall employ the best management practices, consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit, to control storm water discharges and to prevent erosion and sedimentation and to otherwise prevent pollution of wetlands or watercourses. Permittee will provide a copy of approved plans to contractor which shall stay on site and be available for review or inspection during the duration of work. For information and technical assistance, contact the Wetlands Enforcement Officer. The permittee shall immediately inform the Commission of any problems involving the wetlands or watercourses that have developed in the course of, or that are caused by, the authorized work.
7. No equipment or material including without limitation, fill construction materials, or debris, shall be deposited, placed or stored in any wetland or watercourse on or off site unless specifically authorized by this permit.
8. This permit is subject to and does not derogate any rights or powers of the Town of Winchester, conveys no property rights or exclusive privileges, and is subject to all public and private rights to all applicable federal, state and local laws. In conducting and maintaining any activities authorized herein, the permittee may not cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the inland wetlands and watercourses of Winchester.
9. If the activity authorized by the inland wetlands permit also involves activity or a project that requires zoning of subdivision approval, special permit, variance, or special exception, no work pursuant to the wetlands permit may begin until such approval is obtained.
10. The permittee shall maintain sediment and erosion controls at the site in such operable conditions as to

prevent the pollution of wetlands and watercourses. Said controls are to be inspected by the permittee for deficiencies at least once per week and immediately after rains. The permittee shall correct any such deficiencies within 24 hours of said deficiency being found. The permittee shall maintain such control measures until all areas of disturbed soils at the site are stabilized.

11. The permittee, contractor and/or owner shall conduct all operations at the site in full compliance with this permit, to the extent provided by law, may be held liable for any violations of the terms and conditions of this permit and are responsible for any violation they may have created.
12. Wetland flagging to stay in place during the construction process. Missing flags to be replaced upon the Wetland Agent's request if required for inspection or enforcement.
13. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond of \$8000 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work.

Unanimously approved.

B. IWWC#18-38 Applicant/Owner: Frank P. Bares Location: 636 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: Remove Existing Wooden Retaining Wall and Rebuild with Stone; Moving Wall Back to Create More Patio Area, Install Stepping Stone Walk and Rebuild Stone Steps.

It was noted that a request was received from the applicant for the matter to be continued to the following meeting. No further business was discussed.

C. IWWC#18-39 Applicant: John F. Sliney Owner: John F. Sliney and Christine Sliney Location: 308 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 5'x13' Jetski Lift and Accompanying 16'x4' Walkway; Repair Lakewall (approximately 60').

John Sliney, accompanied by his contractor Joel Jarvis, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Nalette reminded the applicant that it is traditional for applicants who rebuild a lake wall to meet with commissioners and the wetlands agent after the work is complete so that verification is made that the wall has been reconstructed in the correct location. Staff questioned whether an actual post-construction survey is typically required and would be likely in this regard. Mr. Nalette indicated that it would not and that the verification is usually only done in the field by staff and/or the commission.

Mr. Molinelli questioned whether the wall will be able to be pinned to what is out there. Mr. Jarvis confirmed.

MOTION: Ms. Hunter, Mr. Kiely second, to approve Application IWWC#18-39 Applicant: John F. Sliney Owner: John F. Sliney and Christine Sliney Location: 308 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 5'x13' Jetski Lift and Accompanying 16'x4' Walkway; Repair Lakewall (approximately 60') based on oral and written testimony.

Conditions 1-12 are standard Inland Wetland Commission Conditions and the following additional conditions determined by the Inland Wetlands Commission:

1. The permittee shall notify the Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer immediately upon the commencement of work and upon its completion.
2. If the authorized activity is not completed within five years from the issuance date of January 16, 2019 said activity shall cease and, if not previously revoked or specifically renewed or extended, this permit shall be null and void. Any request to renew or extend the expiration date of a permit should be filed in accordance with the Inland Wetlands Regulations of the Town of Winchester. Expired permits may not be renewed and the Inland Wetlands Commission may require a new application for regulated activities.
3. All work and all regulated activities conducted pursuant to this authorization shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit. A copy of the permit and plans shall be on site at all times. Any structures, excavation, fill, obstructions, encroachments, or regulated activities not specifically identified and authorized herein shall constitute a violation of this permit and may result in its modification, suspension or revocation.
4. This authorization is not transferable without the written consent of the Inland Wetlands Commission.
5. In evaluating this application, the Inland Wetlands Commission has relied on information provided by the applicant. If such information is subsequently proved to be false, incomplete, or misleading, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked and the permittee may be subject to any other remedies or

- penalties provided by law.
6. The permittee shall employ the best management practices, consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit, to control storm water discharges and to prevent erosion and sedimentation and to otherwise prevent pollution of wetlands or watercourses. Permittee will provide a copy of approved plans to contractor which shall stay on site and be available for review or inspection during the duration of work. For information and technical assistance, contact the Wetlands Enforcement Officer. The permittee shall immediately inform the Commission of any problems involving the wetlands or watercourses that have developed in the course of, or that are caused by, the authorized work.
 7. No equipment or material including without limitation, fill construction materials, or debris, shall be deposited, placed or stored in any wetland or watercourse on or off site unless specifically authorized by this permit.
 8. This permit is subject to and does not derogate any rights or powers of the Town of Winchester, conveys no property rights or exclusive privileges, and is subject to all public and private rights to all applicable federal, state and local laws. In conducting and maintaining any activities authorized herein, the permittee may not cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the inland wetlands and watercourses of Winchester.
 9. If the activity authorized by the inland wetlands permit also involves activity or a project that requires zoning of subdivision approval, special permit, variance, or special exception, no work pursuant to the wetlands permit may begin until such approval is obtained.
 10. The permittee shall maintain sediment and erosion controls at the site in such operable conditions as to prevent the pollution of wetlands and watercourses. Said controls are to be inspected by the permittee for deficiencies at least once per week and immediately after rains. The permittee shall correct any such deficiencies within 24 hours of said deficiency being found. The permittee shall maintain such control measures until all areas of disturbed soils at the site are stabilized.
 11. The permittee, contractor and/or owner shall conduct all operations at the site in full compliance with this permit, to the extent provided by law, may be held liable for any violations of the terms and conditions of this permit and are responsible for any violation they may have created.
 12. Wetland flagging to stay in place during the construction process. Missing flags to be replaced upon the Wetland Agent's request if required for inspection or enforcement.
 13. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond of \$1000 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work.

Unanimously approved.

**D. IWWC#18-40 Applicant/Owner: Able Sentry Limited Location: 730 Lake Drive
Proposal: Demolition Existing House; Construct New Garage, Driveway, Landscape Wall, Rebuild Lake Wall, Water Quality Features, Fire Pit w/Patio, Frost Wall w Patio, Bluestone Walk Adjustments to Irrigation System, Flagpole and Utility Connections Between Buildings.**

Dennis McMorrow of Berkshire Engineering, accompanied by Gary Beecher of Northwest Builders, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. McMorrow distributed updated site plans. He noted that 728 Lake Drive was merged with 730 Lake Drive and that the proposal includes demolition of the existing home and replacement with a garage. He reminded the Commission that the garage will be constructed further back from the lake than the existing dwelling with a smaller driveway and a water feature. The plans also include rebuilding the lake wall, the relocation of the docks and lifts, a 10' boat lift, 4' walkway, two 5' jetskis, a 15' trampoline and a 10' fixed dock. The commission questioned the length of the items.

Mr. McMorrow addressed the amount of impervious surface at the site. He noted that the amount is being reduced. He referred the detail sheet for the fire pit and associated patio.

Mr. McMorrow explained that the original jetskis were 5'x7' and will now be 5'x11'. He noted that the width, which is what is counted, has not changed.

Ms. Mulvey questioned the length of the lakefront. Mr. McMorrow scaled out the drawing and calculated the lakefront at 155'.

Mr. Nalette questioned whether the cover on the boatlift is a temporary structure. Mr. McMorrow confirmed.

Mr. Nalette questioned whether the jet ski lift was one unit for two jetskis. Mr. McMorrow explained that they have not been purchased yet, so he was unsure. Mr. Nalette explained that one unit is allowed that holds two items but that two separate jetski lifts are not allowed.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Ms. Hunter second, to approve Application IWWC#18-40 Applicant/Owner: Able Sentry Limited Location: 730 Lake Drive Proposal: Demolition Existing House; Construct New Garage, Driveway, Landscape Wall, Rebuild Lake Wall, Water Quality Features, Fire Pit w/Patio, Frost Wall w Patio, Bluestone Walk Adjustments to Irrigation System, Flagpole and Utility Connections Between Buildings, based on oral and written testimony. Conditions 1-12 are standard Inland Wetland Commission Conditions and the following additional conditions determined by the Inland Wetlands Commission:

1. The permittee shall notify the Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer immediately upon the commencement of work and upon its completion.
2. If the authorized activity is not completed within five years from the issuance date of January 16, 2019 said activity shall cease and, if not previously revoked or specifically renewed or extended, this permit shall be null and void. Any request to renew or extend the expiration date of a permit should be filed in accordance with the Inland Wetlands Regulations of the Town of Winchester. Expired permits may not be renewed and the Inland Wetlands Commission may require a new application for regulated activities.
3. All work and all regulated activities conducted pursuant to this authorization shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit. A copy of the permit and plans shall be on site at all times. Any structures, excavation, fill, obstructions, encroachments, or regulated activities not specifically identified and authorized herein shall constitute a violation of this permit and may result in its modification, suspension or revocation.
4. This authorization is not transferable without the written consent of the Inland Wetlands Commission.
5. In evaluating this application, the Inland Wetlands Commission has relied on information provided by the applicant. If such information is subsequently proved to be false, incomplete, or misleading, this permit may be modified, suspended, or revoked and the permittee may be subject to any other remedies or penalties provided by law.
6. The permittee shall employ the best management practices, consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit, to control storm water discharges and to prevent erosion and sedimentation and to otherwise prevent pollution of wetlands or watercourses. Permittee will provide a copy of approved plans to contractor which shall stay on site and be available for review or inspection during the duration of work. For information and technical assistance, contact the Wetlands Enforcement Officer. The permittee shall immediately inform the Commission of any problems involving the wetlands or watercourses that have developed in the course of, or that are caused by, the authorized work.
7. No equipment or material including without limitation, fill construction materials, or debris, shall be deposited, placed or stored in any wetland or watercourse on or off site unless specifically authorized by this permit.
8. This permit is subject to and does not derogate any rights or powers of the Town of Winchester, conveys no property rights or exclusive privileges, and is subject to all public and private rights to all applicable federal, state and local laws. In conducting and maintaining any activities authorized herein, the permittee may not cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the inland wetlands and watercourses of Winchester.
9. If the activity authorized by the inland wetlands permit also involves activity or a project that requires zoning of subdivision approval, special permit, variance, or special exception, no work pursuant to the wetlands permit may begin until such approval is obtained.
10. The permittee shall maintain sediment and erosion controls at the site in such operable conditions as to prevent the pollution of wetlands and watercourses. Said controls are to be inspected by the permittee for deficiencies at least once per week and immediately after rains. The permittee shall correct any such deficiencies within 24 hours of said deficiency being found. The permittee shall maintain such control

measures until all areas of disturbed soils at the site are stabilized.

11. The permittee, contractor and/or owner shall conduct all operations at the site in full compliance with this permit, to the extent provided by law, may be held liable for any violations of the terms and conditions of this permit and are responsible for any violation they may have created.
12. Wetland flagging to stay in place during the construction process. Missing flags to be replaced upon the Wetland Agent's request if required for inspection or enforcement.
13. Cash erosion and sedimentation bond of \$1000 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work.

Unanimously approved.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

A. IWWC#19-01 Applicant: Robert Geiger, Town Manager Owner: Town of Winchester Location: Lanson Drive Bridge over Still River Proposal: Replacement of Structurally Inadequate Multiple-Pipe Culvert with Single-Cell Reinforced Concrete Box Culvert.

Department of Public Works Director Jim Rollins appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that the existing bridge is over stacked pipes, filled in with concrete over those, and a road on top of that structure. While the bridge has been functioning in terms of doing its job with the hydrology, it is old and failing and in need of replacement, according to Mr. Rollins. He reported that Cardinal Engineering prepared the design and will be present at next month's regular meeting to review in greater detail. Mr. Rollins explained that the proposal is to remove what is there in two stages, allowing for the travel of traffic for the few homes and businesses in that area. Mr. Rollins indicated that half of the bridge on one side will be removed and replaced with a 12'x9' box culvert with natural, stream bed materials installed and followed by the same process on the other side. After that work is completed, bridge rails and wing walls will be completed, according to Mr. Rollins.

Mr. Nalette questioned how the stream bottom will be reestablished. Mr. Rollins noted that after the complete box culvert is installed, the contractor installs by hand whatever was excavated out of the river bed or whatever material is consistent with the location.

Mr. Nalette questioned what would be necessary in terms of diverting the water. Mr. Rollins noted that Cardinal Engineering will address this at the following meeting.

Mr. Nalette questioned whether the area of disturbance requires any other permits from DEEP or US Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Rollins indicated that it did not as the area of disturbance is relatively small in that regard.

MOTION: Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Nalette second, to accept Application IWWC#19-01 Applicant: Robert Geiger, Town Manager Owner: Town of Winchester Location: Lanson Drive Bridge over Still River Proposal: Replacement of Structurally Inadequate Multiple-Pipe Culvert with Single-Cell Reinforced Concrete Box Culvert find the activity to be in the public interest and to schedule a public hearing for February 20, 2019; unanimously approved.

B. IWWC#19-02 Applicant: Town of Winchester Public Works Owner: Town of Winchester Proposal: Remediate Violation: Vegetation Disposal in Review Area; Restore to Condition Acceptable to IWWC; and Possibly Remove Old Earthen Materials.

Mr. Rollins noted that the Commission had requested remediation of an area along the wetlands in Forest View Cemetery where over time, vegetation debris such as leaves, and brush had been pushed in over banks in one area. He noted that it appears this has been going on for some time. Mr. Rollins explained that there are also piles of soil located in the upland area that appear to be heavily vegetated already. He noted that these could be hauled away to DPW's yard where they store piles of various material for different purposes. Mr. Rollins noted that the area at the cemetery, however, is completely loaded with bittersweet, an invasive weed.

Discussion ensued over how to remediate the site and to what extent it should be disturbed for that purpose. It was agreed that the applicant should remove as much of the debris in order to remediate the violation as possible without further disturbing the natural habitat of the site.

MOTION: Mr. Nalette, Ms. Hunter second, to accept Application IWWC#19-02 Applicant: Town of Winchester Public Works Owner: Town of Winchester Proposal: Remediate Violation: Vegetation Disposal in Review Area; Restore to Condition Acceptable to IWWC; and Possibly Remove Old Earthen Materials finding that the proposed activity is not significant; unanimously approved.

8. AGENT ACTIONS:

A. Determinations.

None.

B. Warnings/Violations.

i. Tarringford Street.

It was noted that no application had been received but that staff would attempt to contact Scott Bachand.

ii. 237 Colebrook Road.

It was noted that an application had still not been received.

iii. 348 East Wakefield Boulevard.

It was noted that the water items that are expected to be removed by Spring time.

iv. 344 East Wakefield Boulevard.

Staff reported that the property owners are expected to submit an application for this location and that an engineer had been inquiring about the site. Mr. Nalette requested that a Show Cause Hearing be scheduled if an application is not forthcoming. The Commission requested that the neighbor that owns the property along the streambed where the vegetation had been removed also be contacted.

10. Other Business.

A. Discussion Regarding 205 West Wakefield Boulevard – Clarify Boom Requirement.

Matthew Closson, representing Steve Valigorsky of 205 West Wakefield Boulevard, appeared before the Commission seeking to clarify the boom requirement included in the wetlands permit for the construction of his boathouse. Mr. Closson questioned at what point the boom can be removed from the lake. He explained that prior to the lake freezing solid, the boom broke apart and floated across the water. He noted that he retrieved it and the boom is now in place as required through

Mr. Nalette noted that the boom should remain in the water until the work is completed. Mr. Closson was advised that he contact the Planning Department once the work is completed, and the lake is thawed enough to remove the boom, so that the site can be revisited.

B. Catch Basin Cleanout Schedule.

Mr. Rollins noted that GPS data on every catch basin, every headwall, every endwall and every outlet has been accumulated. He noted that the next step is getting that data put into the layers of the GIS. He relayed the issues that have been encountered with the software.

Mr. Rollins questioned what projects the Commission may deem as maintenance and which ones that might need an application and formal review.

11. ADJOURN:

MOTION: Mr. Nalette, Mr. Kiely second, to adjourn at 9:34PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela A. Colombie
Recording Clerk