



TOWN OF WINCHESTER
INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
Town of Winchester Town Hall, 338 Main Street
P. Francis Hicks Room – 2nd Floor
December 19, 2018 – 7:00PM
Regular Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Ric Nalette called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

2. ROLL CALL:

Roll call was completed by Mr. Nalette. Present at the meeting in addition to Mr. Nalette were: Russ Davenport, 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 Bob Haburey was absent.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 14, 2018:

MOTION: Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Kiely second, to approve the November 14, 2018 Minutes; unanimously approved.

4. AGENDA REVIEW:

The agenda was modified to add *Discussion Regarding Sucker Brook Dam* under Other Business.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. IWWC#18-35 (Modification of IWWC#15-21) Applicant/Owner: Keith Becker and Nancy Becker Location: 523 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 25'x4' Floating Dock Attached to 8'x15' Concrete Poured Cap.

It was reported that this application was withdrawn.

B. IWWC#18-36 Applicant/Owner: First Bay Holdings Location: 228 East Lake Street Proposal: Install Above-Ground Fuel Tank; Install a Deck Over Existing Concrete and Ground; and Reinstall Retaining Wall for Flood Control.

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 December 5, 2018 and December 12, 2018. The receipts for the Certificate of Mailings, evidencing that notice of this hearing was provided to the abutting property owners, were provided.

Jordan Moore and Eric Richard of First Bay Holdings appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Moore noted that a permit was being sought for an above-ground vaulted fuel tank, to relocate a small storage shed, and to reinstall a flood control wall. Mr. Nalette questioned the size of the proposed fuel tank. Mr. Moore noted the capacity will be 2000 gallons. Mr. Nalette questioned what precautions are included to prevent fuel spillage into the lake. Mr. Moore noted that the proposal includes a double wall, "Convault" tank, similar to the one in size and appearance as the one the Department of Public Works utilizes at Rowley Street. He noted that it is a two-hour fire rated tank and part of a self-containment system.

Mr. Nalette indicated that there should be no problem with this commission relative to the relocation of the shed. He thanked the applicant for the proposed work with the flood control wall.

Mr. Nalette questioned how folks will dump their waste from the boats, noting that many boats have bathrooms. Mr. Richard explained that overnight mooring is not allowed at Highland Lake. Mr. Nalette questioned what type of precautions will be taken for emergency fuel spills. Mr. Moore explained that they intend to have a containment area with an absorbent boom. He noted that the Fire Marshal has also requested that fire extinguishers be on the site. Mr. Molinelli recalled from last month's meeting that Mr. Moore had indicated that the pumping of fuel would be limited to employees of the marina. Mr. Molinelli questioned where the fuel tank will be located. Mr. Moore indicated that it would be adjacent to the street and that the length of the hose would not be more than fifty (50') feet.

Mr. Nalette noted that while it has been indicated that forty slips were approved in 1993, he had no recollection of the approval process from that time. He noted that he had hoped for more feedback from the State regarding the fueling portion of the application. Mr. Richard noted that Fire Marshal Steve Williams had indicated that once the Town approves the proposal, no other approvals are necessary from the State. It is merely a registration process at that point.

With regards to the proposed deck, Mr. Nalette questioned why the applicants had not considered removing the existing concrete. Mr. Moore explained that the concrete borders lake water on three sides and that to remove it would be an enormous disruption to the lake. Mr. Nalette questioned whether the deck will be extended over the water. Mr. Moore indicated it would not.

Mr. Nalette questioned the proposed parking. Mr. Richard noted that there are eleven parking spots proposed for the land across the street from the dock slips. He noted that both Lake Street and East Lake Street have public parking along both roads. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the additional parking further down the road is part of this project. Mr. Moore indicated it was not. Ms. Mulvey questioned whether there is a minimum rental period for the boat slips or whether shorter terms will be accepted. Mr. Moore indicated that there will be no restriction on the length of the term. Mr. Davenport questioned whether the launching area is open for boats. Mr. Moore indicated that there would not be any launching beyond the boats that are moored at the marina. Mr. Nalette questioned whether any improvements or work was proposed for the preexisting launch. Mr. Moore indicated that there would not be. Mr. Kiely questioned the excavation/prep work necessary for the new fuel tank. Mr. Richard indicated that they would pour over the existing slab.

Mr. Moore explained that they also are seeking permission to repair a portion of the existing seawall. Mr. Moore noted that a few stones have fallen off and may need to be mortared in.

Mr. Nalette questioned what materials would be used for the proposed dock. Mr. Moore indicated that pressure treated lumber would be utilized. Mr. Nalette questioned whether Trex® decking would be considered. Mr. Richard noted that it had been considered but ruled out as they thought it would stain and get marked.

The hearing was open to the public.

Candy Perez of 605 West Wakefield Boulevard, noting that her family have been residents of Highland Lake since 1963, agreed that the marina is grandfathered for forty slips. She relayed the history behind how the slips came to be, as a means of addressing the many buoys that were there previously. Ms. Perez indicated her concern that no additional docks are added to this location beyond the forty.

Mike Declément of 379 East Wakefield Boulevard addressed the Commission generally about the lack of wetlands enforcement.

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

The agenda was modified to take up consideration of *IWWC#18-36 Applicant/Owner: First Bay Holdings Location: 228 East Lake Street Proposal: Install Above-Ground Fuel Tank; Install a Deck Over Existing Concrete and Ground; Reinstall Retaining Wall for Flood Control and Minor Seawall Repair* as the first item under Old Business.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. IWWC#18-36 Applicant/Owner: First Bay Holdings Location: 228 East Lake Street Proposal: Install Above-Ground Fuel Tank; Install a Deck Over Existing Concrete and Ground; Reinstall Retaining Wall for Flood Control and Minor Seawall Repair.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Mr. Molinelli second, to approve Application IWWC#18-36 Applicant/Owner: First Bay Holdings Location: 228 East Lake Street Proposal: Install Above-Ground Fuel Tank; Install a Deck Over Existing Concrete and Ground; Reinstall Retaining Wall for Flood Control and Minor Seawall Repair, 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 December 19, 2018 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.

Motion passed with Mr. Davenport, Ms. Hunter, Mr. Kiely, Mr. Molinelli, Ms. Mulvey, and Mr. Timmeney voting aye while Mr. Nalette was opposed.

The agenda was modified to take up *Other Business: Discussion Regarding Sucker Brook Dam* ahead of the remaining items under Old Business.

Other Business: Discussion Regarding Sucker Brook Dam

Lee Rembeck of LR Enterprises appeared before the Commission regarding the work underway at the Sucker Brook Dam. Mr. Nalette reminded commissioners about the major failure of the stormwater management system at Sucker Brook Dam recently, resulting in a large deposition of material in the stream bed, detention pond and Highland Lake. Mr. Nalette noted that the US Army Corp of Engineers was on site at once along with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection.

Mr. Rembeck noted that his company was summoned immediately after the failure and have been contracted to keep up with rain events to prevent additional sediment from moving into the lake. He thought it very likely that DEEP will have a full repair project prepared in the next couple months.

Mr. Rembeck referred to the drawings of the site, pointing out the location of the check dams that have been installed to function to slow the water. He opined that there was not likely a great deal of sediment that had moved into the lake. Mr. Rembeck explained that he had dredged a section of the stream in 2010 and he observed that he noted no substantial additional sediment in that area. Both Ms. Perez and Mr. Nalette disagreed with that assessment.

The lower check dam had larger rocks installed, according to Mr. Rembeck. He noted that he has been on site and will continue to be, to monitor the check dams.

The meeting briefly recessed at 8:07PM. The Commission reconvened at 8:10PM.

B. IWWC#18-29 Applicant: Alan P. Gravel Owner: Alan P. Gravel and Lorie Warner Location: 200 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Repair Lake Wall and Modification of Stairwell.

Alan Gravel appeared before the Commission regarding this application. Mr. Gravel noted that there had been more information sought relative to how far the stairs protruded into the water and how far back he was proposing they will recede. He noted that they currently jut out six (6') feet and he is currently proposing the stairs to recede six (6') feet. Mr. Gravel explained that he has sixty-two (62') feet of lake frontage. In response to how the stairs will be removed, Mr. Gravel indicated that his contractor had explained that he will utilize probably twelve men to do the labor. He confirmed that no equipment will be used in or near the lakebed.

Mr. Gravel indicated that he would like the work to be done prior to the spring thaw.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Mr. Davenport second, to approve Application IWWC#18-29 Applicant: Alan P. Gravel Owner: Alan P. Gravel and Lorie Warner Location: 200 Perch Rock Trail Proposal: Repair Lake Wall and Modification of Stairwell, 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 December 19, 2018 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 \$500 to be submitted to the Inland Wetlands Office prior to the commencement of work.

14. Applicant to submit an erosion and sedimentation plan to the Inland Wetlands Office for approval by the Commission prior to work commencing.

Unanimously approved.

C. IWWC#18-35 (Modification of IWWC#15-21) Applicant/Owner: Keith Becker and Nancy Becker Location: 523 East Wakefield Boulevard Proposal: 25'x4' Floating Dock Attached to 8'x15' Concrete Poured Cap.

This application had been reported as withdrawn.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

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

Todd Parsons, PE, of Lenard Engineering appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He reviewed the site plan including the existing conditions. Mr. Parsons explained that the proposal is to remove the majority of the wall and slope that area back so that what will remain is less than four feet tall except for the area in the old arch bridge. Mr. Parsons explained that the old arch bridge was part of the original driveway to the old Gilbert home.

The temporary construction mats providing construction access across the watercourse were depicted in red that will function to provide a platform. A portion of the bus loop will be removed, according to Mr. Parsons. He explained that the material removed from this area will be relocated to the practice field which will then become four (4') feet higher. He explained that area is within the upland review area. Mr. Parsons reviewed the erosion control plan.

Mr. Parsons reviewed the amount of impact to both the wetlands and regulated area. He noted that there is approximately 1000 square feet of temporary impact for the construction mats and 1.8 acres of surface area impact within the upland review area. Mr. Parsons noted that both DEEP and the US Army Corp of Engineers have been contacted and no permits are needed from those agencies. The DEEP Fisheries were also contacted who had made recommendations including one that work be completed during the summer months between June 15th and September 30th, so the stream would be as dry as possible and not supporting fish during that time.

MOTION: Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Nalette second, to accept Application IWWC#18-37 Applicant/Owner: W.L. Gilbert Trust Corporation Location: 200 Litchfield Avenue Proposal: Slope Stabilization, Repair Failing Retaining Wall, deeming the proposed activity as significant and to schedule a public hearing for January 16, 2019; unanimously approved.

B. IWWC#18-38 (Modification of IWWC#15-06) 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.

Gary Goulet of Goulet Masonry appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that his client had recently demolished and rebuilt his home and would now like to rebuild his retaining wall along with demolishing the existing steps and rebuild new steps. Mr. Goulet explained that the retaining wall that is part of this proposal is the one currently near a Tiki Bar and that the proposal includes rebuilding it with stone. He confirmed that the dimensions of the patio will change in that it will get larger. Mr. Goulet was advised that he will need to confer with the Zoning Enforcement Officer regarding what type of material is proposed for the patio as it will be changing the coverage at the lake if it is not constructed of pervious pavers or grass. He questioned whether he would need a different application if he were not to change the location of the patio. It was noted that if more patio is not added, he would not need a different application. Mr. Goulet indicated that he would like to check with his client.

Mr. Nalette noted that because the proposal includes regrading, he would like to see an elevation study or engineered plans to see what the existing conditions are and what the proposed grade will be. He also requested information on the volume of material being relocated.

MOTION: Ms. Mulvey, Mr. Kiely second, to accept Application IWWC#18-38 (Modification of IWWC#15-06) 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, deeming the proposed activity as not significant; unanimously approved.

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. He explained that he would like to repair his sixty (60') foot lakewall and add a jetski lift and accompanying walkway. Mr. Sliney explained that both the floating walkway and jetski lift would be attached to the lakewall. Mr. Molinelli questioned whether equipment will be used to access back there. Mr. Sliney indicated that there would not be.

It was noted that the existing dock that Mr. Sliney has currently is a deck dock that has been grandfathered. Mr. Kiely questioned how this is fastened currently. Mr. Sliney explained that it sits on the rocks. Mr. Jarvis explained that he believes there is a footing currently under the lakewall. He noted that if there is not, then they plan to pour one. It was clarified that the proposal is for a rebuild of the lakewall, not a repair. Mr. Kiely questioned whether the wall would be done in sections or whether it would all be done at once. Mr. Jarvis confirmed it will all be done at once.

Mr. Nalette explained that with a complete rebuild, this Commission often seeks a pre-construction survey and a post-construction survey to assure that there has been no expansion. Mr. Davenport pointed out the need for erosion control, with it being noted that erosion control should be done between the work and the lake.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Ms. Mulvey second to accept 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; Remove and Replace Lakewall (approximately 60') deeming the proposed activity as not significant; 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.

Dennis McMorrow of Berkshire Engineering, accompanied by builder Gary Beecher, appeared before the Commission regarding this application. He explained that most of the proposed work is for the recently acquired adjoining property, formerly known as 728 Lake Drive. Mr. McMorrow explained that his clients are seeking to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a new garage with associated driveway. The existing retaining wall will also be relocated, according to Mr. McMorrow. He reviewed the plans and drawings to rebuild the lake wall, relocate the dock, boatlift, and jetski lifts as well as construct a fire pit with a patio and a flagpole. Mr. McMorrow also reviewed the plans for the construction of a frost wall with a patio on the existing home and associated improvements to the bluestone walk. He reviewed the work necessary for the utilities and the irrigation lines on the site, too.

As with the home, the proposed garage will not have gutters, according to Mr. McMorrow. He noted the proposal includes infiltration trenches to handle the runoff. He reviewed the construction sequence, noting that while construction is likely to begin in 2019, the rebuild of the lakewall will need to wait for a deep drawdown.

Mr. Nalette questioned the existing impervious coverage and the proposed impervious coverage. Mr. McMorrow did not have those numbers handy but noted that he would provide them at the following meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Kiely, Mr. Nalette second, to accept 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 the Buildings, deeming the proposed activity as not significant; unanimously approved.

8. AGENT ACTIONS:

A. Determinations.

None.

B. Warnings/Violations.

i. Tarringford Street.

It was noted that Scott Bachand had visited the Planning Office and is likely going to present with an application to this Commission.

ii. 257 Colebrook Road.

It was noted that there is in fact not silt fence located at this property, contrary to the response given by the owner last month when Mr. Kiely had questioned if there was. He will be reminded to install silt fence and that no activity should be conducted within the wetlands or review area until he has received approval from this Commission after their review of an application.

iii. 348 East Wakefield Boulevard.

It was noted that this property is technically still in violation until such time that one of their boat lifts is removed but will continue to be monitored.

Department of Public Works Director Mr. Rollins appeared before the commission regarding a noted violation of pushing a pile of brush into a wetland area at Forest View Cemetery at 80 Rowley Street. He explained that after having it brought to his attention, he consulted with his staff who had confirmed putting it there. Mr. Rollins agreed that he had advised the staff not to do this and why it was not an appropriate place. He noted that an application will be forthcoming to handle the remediation.

Additionally, a report was provided by Ms. Colombie regarding a violation at 344 East Wakefield Boulevard. She reported that the front yard was excavated and replaced with crush stone within ten feet of an inlet to Highland Lake. It was also noted that the vegetation along the inlet had been clear cut, too. The owners of the property had been advised to obtain an updated survey and to submit an application to address the work already done and to include any future proposed changes, according to Ms. Colombie.

8. COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS:

None.

9. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Sewer Basin Clean-up Schedule.

No business discussed.

10. ADJOURN:

MOTION: Mr. Molinelli, Ms. Hunter second, to adjourn at 10:12PM; unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Pamela A. Colombie
Recording Clerk