

April 27, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs. Gray, Mrs. D. Hill, Mr. LaMuniere, Mr. Picton, Ms. Purnell

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Mr. Bedini, Ms. Coe, Mrs. Korzenko

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Ajello, Mrs. J. Hill

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Sears, Mr./Mrs. Baiocchi, Mr. Fenwick, Atty. Hammer, Mrs. Mitchell, Mr. Williams, Mr. Papsin, Mr. Boling, Mr. Charles, Ms. Paca, Mr. Cook, Mr. Lecher, Ms. Donnelly, Mr. Tagley Mr. Worcester

Mr. Picton called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and seated Members Gray, Hill, LaMuniere, Picton, and Purnell.

MOTION: To add subsequent business not already

posted on the agenda: 1) New Application:

Sarjeant/27 Tinker Hill Road/#IW-05-22/

Single family dwelling, 2)Other Business:

Walker Brook Development, New Milford, and

3) Communications: Pinover/12 Senff Road/

3/28/05 letter re: use of aquatic pesticide.

By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and

passed 5-0.

Consideration of the Minutes

The 4/13/05 Regular Meeting minutes were accepted as corrected.

Page 1: Present: Add initials for D. Hill and J. Hill.

Page 3: End of 7th line under #1: Add "with jute mesh" after stabilize and delete that phrase later on in the sentence. Elsewhere on page 3: There is no e in gully.

Page 4: Line 8: Change "pilot strip area" to "pilot planting done in autumn 2004.

Line 10: Change "the working" to "for working."

Line 11: Capitalize Sweet Peet throughout.

Line 9 under #4: Insert ", the stewardship abstract for knotweed," after "guidance."

Line 9 under #4: Delete "removal."

Line 6 under #5: Add "from the Paca language as a description of the proposed work" after "deleted."

Page 5: Last sentence under Bachelier: Add "and completed in a satisfactory manner" after "approved."

Page 6: Throughout: Change "SE corner" to "east field."

Line 15: Change "asphalt" to "grass" and add "direct" after "little."

Line 16: Add: "on the wetland, but some indirect impact. It was noted that the road area had been wetland before it was filled." after "impact."

7th line from the bottom: Insert "grade" after "driveway."

Page 7: Line 3: Insert: "more than the required" after "from."

1st sentence under Bialobrzski: Correct spelling is "regraded."

Page 8: Line 11 under Washington Art Assoc: Change "the Shepaug River" to "Canoe Brook."

Line 2 under Lake Waramaug Country Club: Correct spelling is "reroofing."

Page 9: Sheinfeld: Should be: check this property "to confirm that the terms of the conservation easement are being met."

Reinhardt: Change to: "Mr. Ajello reported that the water...."

Beck: Change to: "Mrs. D. Hill stated it was her understanding that Mr. Beck...."

MOTION: To accept the 4/13/05 Regular Meeting minutes

as amended. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by

Mrs. Hill, and passed 5-0.

MOTION: To accept the 4/19/05 Town of Washington/

Hinckley Road and Church Street site

inspection minutes as written. By Mr. Picton,

seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 4-0-1.

Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not attended.

MOTION: To accept the 4/19/05 Town of Washington/

6 Bryan Plaza site inspection minutes as

written. By Mrs. Hill, seconded by Mr.

Picton, and passed 4-0-1.

Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not attended.

MOTION: To accept the 4/19/05 Washington Art Assoc./

4 Bryan Plaza site inspection minutes as

written. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Mr.

LaMuniere, and passed 4-0-1.

Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not attended.

Pending Applications

H.O.R.S.E. of Ct./43 Wilbur Road/#IW-04-57E/Construct Sheds and Fence: The applicant was not present and she had not submitted any new information. Mr. Ajello said he had spoken with Mrs. Johnson from the NRCS who said she would be willing to meet on site with the applicant to discuss the proposal. Mr. Ajello was asked to contact Mrs. Johnson and Ms. Wahlers to set up a meeting.

Holly Hill Farm, LLC./87 Whittlesey Road/#IW-05-09/Restoration and Reforestation: Mr. Neff read his 4/25/05 letter concerning stabilization of the gullies on the eastern slope of the property. Mr.

LaMunier noted Mr. Childs had recommended the flow of water from Whittlesey Road, down the slope, and to the Shepaug be addressed by redirecting the water around the house. Mr. Picton encouraged the applicant to come back with a well thought out proposal to handle this drainage and noted he did not want to hold up the current application until the drainage problem had been resolved. Mr. Neff said there would be a future application for the house and yard area. The 4/27/05 discussion motion, which was drafted based on the points raised at the last meeting was reviewed and modified. The following action resulted:

MOTION: To approve in part the application submitted by Holly Hill Farm, LLC. for Restoration and Reforestation at 87 Whittlesey Road subject to the following conditions and noting only those activities specifically cited in this motion are approved:

1. Stabilization of the dump area.

A. Work shall be done according to Mr. Childs' 3/22/05 report, page 9, and subject to a review and recommendations by Mr. Neff, to be submitted in writing to the Commission prior to the start of work.

B. Work shall be done under the supervision of Mr. Childs.

C. No further removal of embedded material or organic covering over soil shall be permitted unless specified by an engineer and approved by the Commission.

2. Stabilization of the severely eroded gullies.

A. Work shall be done according to Mr. Childs' 3/22/05 report, page 5, paragraph 1, page 6, paragraph 3, and page 7, paragraph 1.

B. The filter fabric shall be installed with small aggregate to hold it in place, and larger stones on top per Mr. Neff's instructions dated 4/25/05.

C. Work shall be done under Mr. Childs' or Mr. Neff's supervision.

D. Stabilization of one gully shall be completed, at which time the Inland Wetlands Commission shall inspect the work done and determine whether work on the remaining gullies may proceed.

3. Establishment of the wild flower meadow.

A. Silt fence shall be installed along the entire expanse of the 663 contour prior to the commencement of work.

B. Wild flowers shall be planted one strip at a time in a manner that will prevent the slope from becoming erodable per page 3, #1 of Mr. Ajello's 4/13/05 report. However, the existing sod may be tilled if necessary to make the new planting viable, provided that enough coarse organic matter remains in the surface to keep the soil in place. The strip highest up the hill shall be done first so the existing vegetation below will continue to function as a silt trap.

C. The conversion of lawn to wild flowers shall occur in strips no wider up and down slope than 30 ft.

D. No top soil may be spread and no other fine material shall be added to the surface making it unstable as it did the test plot installed in the fall of 2004. "Sweet Peet" and green sand may be worked in to improve porosity.

E. The Commission shall inspect to make sure a stable ground cover has grown in before granting

permission for work to begin on the next strip.

4. Removal of pachysandra and Japanese knotweed and replanting of the disturbed area with wild flowers.

A. The removal of these plants is approved only for plots 3 and 4 per page 6, paragraph 2 of Mr. Child's report. Areas to be managed will be clearly defined on site by the applicant or his agent and approved by the Commission or its agent.

B. Care shall be taken to remove only these invasives, as the blanket removal of all plants would destabilize these areas.

C. No invasive plants, which are contributing to slope or soil stability, shall be removed until a plan to prevent destabilization is approved by the Commission.

D. Replanting shall be done in accordance with page 10 of Mr. Child's report and per the planting plan, "The Restoration and Reforestation of the Slope Leading to the Shepaug River, Prepared for the Washington Inland Wetlands Commission, Washington, Ct." by Ms. Paca, dated 10/1/04.

E. Removal of any other invasives shall require a separate application.

5. Pilot restoration of the native forest and understory.

A. The pilot area shall be limited to an area no larger than 50' X 50'.

B. Mr. Childs will flag the trees proposed for removal.

C. The work shall be done per pages 2 and 3 of Mr. Child's report.

In addition:

1) The applicant shall submit to the Commission a written progress report twice a month until the approved work is completed and a report on the stability of the site and maintenance of the erosion and sedimentation controls after major storm events.

2) Any additional work proposed under the application is denied at this time for all the areas from the river to a line 50 feet up grade from the top of the steeper slopes (those exceeding 20% grade) down to the river and in and within 100 feet of all watercourses, wetlands, and floodplain areas. In these areas, as in all other areas subject to Inland Wetlands jurisdiction, the Commission does not permit the cutting of vegetation, disturbance of soil and its covering of organic material, or the deposition of any material, organic or otherwise, unless specifically authorized by an Inland Wetlands permit. In all the above referenced areas, the native forest understory shall be allowed to regenerate fully. Any work beyond that specifically authorized above shall require a separate application.

By Mr. Picton, seconded by Mr. LaMuniere, and passed 4-0-1.

Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not

been present for much of the previous

discussions.

The Private Mortgage Fund, LLC./61 South Fenn Hill Road/#IW-05-12/ Construct Driveway

The Private Mortgage Fund, LLC./61 South Fenn Hill Road and 4 Shinar Mountain Road/#IW-05-18/Lot Line Revision: Mr. Neff submitted a revised map, "Proposed Site Development Plan-Boundary Line Revision," by Mr. Neff, revised 4/26/05," which showed a proposed .6 acre deed restricted conservation area. Mr. Picton and Ms. Purnell again asked for verification that the existing parcel at 4 Shinar Mountain Road is a legitimate lot of record. Mr. Picton noted the Commission did

not want to approve a lot line revision that would make two building lots possible if two did not already exist. Mr. Neff offered to have perc tests done to prove the lot is buildable and Mr. Picton said he would consult with the Commission's attorney. The potential impact of converting the grass farm road to a gravel driveway was discussed. Mr. Ajello asked if the mortar walls for the crossing would require footings. Mr. Neff said no, there was an existing stone headwall. Mr. LaMuniere thought the driveway could be built with minimum damage to the wetlands. Mrs. Mitchell, adjoining property owner, said she had hired an attorney, engineer, and environmental consultant to help the Commission protect the wetlands. She said the engineer and consultant had raised concerns about the proposed driveway and so she requested a public hearing be conducted. She submitted 1) the 4/27/05 report by Mr. Loureiro of Loureiro Engineering Assoc. and 2) the 4/27/05 letter to Atty. Hammer from Mr. Logan and Mr. Gadwa of REMA Ecological Services, LLC. Mr. LaMuniere and Mr. Fenwick, contractor, pointed out the Commission has approved wetlands crossings in the past, but Mr. Picton noted they had been approved only when there were no feasible alternatives. Mr. Neff stated the proposed crossing was located at the point where the wetlands were constricted, said it was not known for sure the farm road had been constructed over wetlands, and said the existing culvert was reinforced concrete pipe and there was no material stronger that could be used. Mr. Picton said he was concerned about the driveway crossing because it would extend 80 to 100 ft. along the wetlands. Mr. Neff responded that erosion and sedimentation control measures would be installed on both sides. Mr. Picton said the application would have been "easier" to approve if mitigation such as a 50 foot buffer or a deed restriction to prevent the future mistreatment of the wetlands had been shown on the map. Mr. Neff said 1) a minimum amount of wetlands would be disturbed, 2) the concrete culvert was stronger than either steel or double wall plastic, and 3) the culvert was properly sized. Ms. Coe noted maintenance of the driveway and the use of sand and salt could impact the wetlands. Mr. Picton said it was not known how much gravel there was under the road surface and so he was concerned about use by heavy construction equipment. Mr. Neff said this was a minor problem and that geotextile mesh could be installed on top of the subgrade to address it. He asked for a vote on the driveway. Atty. Hammer submitted his letter to the Commission dated 4/27/05 and a Notice of Intervention. He urged that both applications be declared significant activities. He said the following information was missing from the applications and/or map: 1) wetlands and watercourses were not fully delineated, for example, the spring on the northern portion of the property was not shown, 2) setbacks from wetlands on adjoining properties were not indicated, 3) the depth of the covering and the bearing capacity of the farm road were not provided, 4) the true scope of the proposed work was not specified, and 5) the status of 4 Shinar Mountain Road had not been verified. Atty. Hammer asked for public hearings on both applications because he thought they were integrally related and he informed the Commission that in cases when a proposed activity is likely to impact a natural resource, the Commission may not approve it if there are feasible and prudent alternatives. After a lengthy discussion, it was decided to hold a public hearing to consider Application #IW-05-12 for the driveway on Wednesday, May 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. in the Land Use Meeting Room, not because this is a significant activity, but due to the public interest shown and to provide the applicant with an opportunity to respond to the reports submitted by Mrs. Mitchell.

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Wednesday, May 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. in the Land Use Meeting Room, Bryan Memorial Town Hall to consider Application #IW-05-12 submitted by The Private Mortgage Fund, LLC. to construct a driveway at 61 South Fenn Hill Road. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. LaMuniere, and passed 5-0.

Stiteler-Giddins/198 Tinker Hill Road and West Shore Road/

IW-05-13/2 Lot Resubdivision: It was noted a public hearing had been scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 11, 2005.

Town of Washington/Church Street and Hinckley Road/#IW-05-15/ Drainage and Paving: Mr. Sears noted the catch basins, which already exist, would not be changed. The plans, "Preliminary Plan Depicting Proposed Road Drainage Improvements, Overall Plan," 4 sheets, by Stuart Somers Co., LLC., dated 11/1/04 were reviewed. Plans for proposed new catch basins and sediment traps on Sheet P-3 were studied. Mr. Ajello recommended a "silt sack" be installed at the existing catch basin during construction, but otherwise thought the erosion control measures proposed were adequate. Mr. Picton said Mr. Ajello, Enforcement Officer, would monitor the work while it was in progress and would specify any additional erosion control measures that were needed. It was the consensus that the work description provided was adequate. It was also noted the spoils would be kept to a minimum and the drainage trenches opened and closed as quickly as possible.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-05-15 submitted by the Town of Washington for drainage and paving on Church Street and Hinckley Road per the plans, "Preliminary Plan Depicting Proposed Road Drainage Improvements - Overall Plan," 4 sheets, by Stuart Somers Co., dated 11/1/04, as submitted. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. Picton, and passed 4-0-1. Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not been present for the previous discussion.

Town of Washington/6 Bryan Plaza/#IW-05-16/Replace Bridge: The plans, "Proposed Bridge and River Bank Stabilization," by Land Tech Consultants, Inc. dated 4/6/05 were reviewed. Construction materials were discussed. It was noted the specs called for glued laminated beams of compressed, pressure treated pine. Mr. Picton recalled that on the site inspection, the Commission had asked that some other material be used for the decking. Ms. Purnell did not support the use of pressure treated wood over any waterbody. Mr. Picton again recommended the Town look into non pressure treated elements for the bridge or if pressure treated wood had to be used, then it look into a sealing method to ensure the chemicals would not leach into the brook. Mr. Sears said the bridge was premanufactured and so he did not know if the specs could be altered. The Commissioners explained to the First Selectman why they thought it was important not to use pressure treated wood and suggested alternate building materials such as cypress, lotus, cedar, and plastics.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-05-16 submitted by the Town of Washington to replace the bridge at 6 Bryan Plaza per the plans, "Proposed Bridge and River Bank Stabilization," by Land Tech Consultants, dated 4/6/05 subject to the following conditions"

1) either A. no pressure treated material

be used at all or B. if A. is not possible,
then pressure treated material may be used
only for the structural elements with the
non structural elements composed of non
pressure treated material and

2) all pressure treated material used must
be prestained off site.

By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. Picton, and
passed 5-0.

Washington Art Association/4 Bryan Plaza/#IW-05-17/Streambank Stabilization: The plans, "Proposed Bridge and River Bank Stabilization," by Land Tech Consultants, Inc., dated 4/6/05 proposing a gabion wall along the banks of Canoe Brook were reviewed. Mr. Picton questioned why the gabion was needed for the sections where the banks were more gradually sloped with trees and still functioning naturally. He did not think these sections needed to be changed as they showed no evidence of erosion. He preferred the natural areas remain natural. Mr. Sears noted the Town's engineer had designed the gabion as the best solution to the problem and so was not certain whether it could be shortened. Mr. Picton directed Mr. Sears to ask the engineer why the gabion was needed beyond the first 45 feet. He said he would need a compelling reason to approve more than that. Ms. Purnell noted if the gabion was going to be shorter, the Commission would have to see revised details regarding how it would be tied in to the banks. Further discussion was tabled to the next meeting.

Private Mortgage Fund, LLC./61 South Fenn Hill Road and 4 Shinar Mountain Road/#IW-04-18/Lot Line Revision: Mr. Picton said he would like to see a feasibility plan for this parcel to show it could be developed and meet all Health Department, zoning, and wetlands requirements. Mr. Neff noted the state health code requires only a 25 foot setback from wetlands for septic systems, whether for new construction or repair.

Lake Waramaug Country Club/22 Golf Links Road/#IW-05-19/Renovate Beach House: It was noted this application had been discussed at the last meeting and that as proposed on the map presented, there was little likelihood of impact to the wetlands or to the lake.

MOTION: To approve Application #IW-05-19 submitted by

the Lake Waramaug Country Club to renovate

the beach house at 22 Golf Links Road as submitted per the map, "Site Plan of Lake Waramaug Country Club," by Mr. Lecher, revised to 4/11/05. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr. Picton, and passed 4-0-1.

Mrs. Gray abstained because she had not been
present for the discussion at the previous
meeting.

New Applications

Rosen/304 Nettleton Hollow Road/#IW-05-20/Reconstruct Accessory Building: Mrs. Donnolly represented the owners. The map, "Property/Boundary Survey - G.C. Project 2," by Mr. Alex, dated June 2002 with the footprint of the accessory building attached, was reviewed. Photos of the existing

building were circulated. The building now houses an accessory apartment and would be converted to a studio/recreation room. The applicant proposed to add fireplace, which would extend the foundation by 4 ft, and to square off the existing deck, which would also require footing work. The work would be within the upland review area. The silt fence would be the limit of disturbance, approximately 35 feet from the wetlands. The Commissioners will inspect the site on their own prior to the next meeting. Ms. Purnell asked the applicant to address why this configuration had been chosen over others due to the resulting additional encroachment and asked for a review of feasible and prudent alternatives. Mrs. Donnolly noted the existing deck has six sono tubes and needs repair whether or not it is extended. She said there would be no additional footing drains and that she would add gutters and leaders and where they flow to the map. Mr. Picton asked for 2 copies of the map.

Town of Washington/11 School Street/#IW-05-21/Sprinkler System and Well: Mr. Cook, Park and Rec. Commissioner, represented the Town. The site plan by Mr. Alex, revised to 5/24/04 was reviewed. Mr. Cook explained Ted Alex field has an existing irrigation system that uses a hand dug well, but that it would not be adequate to also serve the Martin and Ayres softball fields. The Town proposed to drill a well approximately 20 to 30 feet from the Shepaug River and to install pipes, a small holding tank, and pump. The pipes would typically be buried 18" underground. Mr. Picton noted the Commission would prefer the well be located in the grassy field and not in the wooded area and that silt fence be installed prior to commencement of the drilling. It was noted the application was incomplete; there was no DEP form or letter of authorization for Mr. Cook. Ms. Purnell remarked that the proposed erosion controls and construction sequence appeared to be OK. Mr. Cook was urged to complete the application, which will be taken up again at the next meeting.

Sarjeant/27 Tinker Hill Road/#IW-05-22/Single Family Dwelling: The map, "Proposed Sanitary Disposal System," by Mr. Howland, revised 3/28/05 was reviewed. It was noted the proposed house site was more than 100 feet from Lake Waramaug, but the property was steep and sloping towards the lake. Mr. Ajello pointed out the location of an intermittent stream on the adjoining property. Mr. Picton noted there would be filling, regrading, excavation, and building on site and asked if the erosion controls proposed were adequate. Mr. Ajello said he had asked for more and in response, Mr. Sarjeant had submitted a letter dated 4/27/05 listing additional measures that would be implemented. A second copy of the map was requested. A site inspection was scheduled for Tuesday, May 3, 2005 at 4:00 p.m.

Other Business

Myfield, LLC./7 Mygatt Road/Condominium Development/ Preliminary Discussion: The maps of the 13.54 acre property, "Site Analysis Plan," by Mr. Alex, dated 1/2005 and "Property/Boundary Survey," by Mr. Alex, also dated 1/2005 were reviewed. Mr. Boling and Mr. Worcester gave a brief presentation of the goals of the development and asked the Commission to identify any wetlands concerns and to list any additional information required. Mr. Picton asked that the upland review areas be shown on the map. Ms. Purnell asked for information about alternatives plans considered and why this one had been chosen. Erosion controls, limit of disturbance, drainage, and buffers were briefly discussed. Mr. Picton said the applicant would be asked to explain why some of the yards are located so close to the wetlands and to discuss feasible and prudent alternatives. Mr. Boling informed the Commission some of the property will be protected by conservation easements.

Ingrassia/135 East Shore Road/#IW-0407/Request to Amend Permit/ Landscaping Changes: Mr. Neff explained the owners proposed to eliminate the grid reinforcement behind the barn. He said it was not needed because the configuration of the barn had been changed and there would no longer be a storage area on the lower level. A grassed surface, he said, would be able to handle the little traffic anticipated. Ms. Purnell read Mr. Neff's 4/25/05 letter.

It was the consensus to allow the elimination of the grid, but if the slope did not remain stable,

Commission approval of an engineered solution would be required.

MOTION: To approve a revision to Permit #IW-04-07

requested by Mrs. Ingrassia to delete the grass

paving reinforcement on the pathway behind the

barn shown on the "Erosion and Sediment Control

Plan, Revision 2" by Mr. Neff dated 4/23/04 at

135 East Shore Road. By Mr. Picton, seconded

By Mrs. Hill, and passed 5-0.

Enforcement

Catlin/East Street: Mr. Ajello asked that the owners stop clearing near wetlands and they did so. A citation will not be issued because the activity was not clear cutting or excavation.

Parent/197 Tinker Hill Road: Mr. Parent is clearing a construction site where no application is necessary because there are no wetlands according to the subdivision map. Mr. Ajello said he had driven by and did not see any wet areas.

Whalen/138 Baldwin Hill Road: Mr. Whalen has hired Mr. Alex and Mr. Temple to help him prepare the required application.

Reinhardt/10 Perkins Road and Cremona/8 Perkins Road: Mr. Ajello prepared a separate detailed report on these two properties. He stated he had inspected the site with Mr. Jontos of Land Tech and would soon conduct an inspection with Mr. Dirienzo. Mr. Ajello recommended a report from Mr. Childs, too, but Mr. Picton thought Mr. Jontos' report should be reviewed prior to making a decision to hire a forestry consultant.

Roselli/27 Birch Hill Run/Agent Approval: Ms. Purnell stated she was uncomfortable with agent approvals for activities in the upland review area. Mr. Ajello stated the proposed pole barn would have no possible affect on the wetlands as there is a fence and a vegetated buffer between the construction site and the wetlands and the land slopes away from the wetlands. Mrs. D. Hill noted the legal notice for the agent approval had been incorrect and so the legal requirements had not been met; renoticing would be necessary. Mr. Ajello reviewed the conditions of approval, which he said he said were referenced on the approved map. Mrs. Korzenko said whenever an application is approved with conditions, the conditions must be sent to the applicant in writing.

Carter/292 Walker Brook Road: The Commission has been waiting a long time for an application.

Fowler/Nichols Hill Road: The required planting plan has not yet been submitted. Mr. Ajello was asked to check with Atty. Kelly.

Greenfield/Ives Road: The required application has not yet been submitted. Mr. Ajello was asked to contact Mr. Ross, contractor.

Walker Brook Road Subdivision/New Milford: Mr. LaMuniere noted the N. Milford Inland Wetland Commission had continued its public hearing to mid May. He noted Ms. Purnell's excellent letter to that Commission was in the file for anyone wanting to review it. Mr. LaMuniere and Ms. Purnell agreed the Kings Mark study was not well done. Mr. LaMuniere noted WEC was willing to hire a consultant to make sure the outstanding drainage issues that could impact Washington were addressed. Ms. Purnell noted, however, the consultant would need the property owner's permission to access the property and said she thought it was premature for WEC to hire a consultant at this time. Ms. Purnell will draft a

follow up letter to New Milford to raise additional questions and concerns. Mr. Picton appointed Mr. LaMunier and Ms. Purnell to serve as a subcommittee to monitor this matter.

Pinover/Senff Road/Aquatic Pesticide Application: Mr. Picton noted he had received a letter from Mr. Pinover. He said the Pinovers were knowledgeable about the causes of pond growth and were considering the herbicide as a last resort. Mr. Picton will inspect the pond.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Mrs. Hill.

Mr. Picton adjourned the meeting at 11:12 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill

Land Use Coordinator