

December 8, 2004

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

MEMBER ABSENT: Mrs. Gray

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

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

ALSO PRESENT: Atty. Fisher, Mrs. Gatto, Mr. Neff, Press, Mr. Churchill, Mrs. Kraft, Mr. and Mrs. Klein, Mrs. Pullaro, Mr. J. Fiorilla, Mr. M. Fiorilla

SHOW CAUSE HEARING

Gatto/155 Woodbury Road/#IW-04-01/Unauthorized Deck

Mr. Picton called the hearing to order at 6:45 p.m., noting the purpose was to give the property owner an opportunity to show why the 11/30/04 enforcement order should not remain in effect.

Atty. Fisher represented the Gattos. He briefly reviewed the history of the approvals granted and work done at 155 Woodbury Road. In particular, he noted that 1) during its site inspection conducted on 1/26/04 the Commission had no apparent problems with the deck, 2) in its 1/28/04 motion of approval there had been no condition that the deck must be removed, and 3) minutes in the file incorrectly stated that the deck overhangs the stream. Ms. Purnell noted in its current configuration and during normal water levels the existing deck does not overhang the stream.

Atty. Fisher presented before and after photos of the deck; 1) the deck as it was when the Gattos purchased the property and 2) the deck after it was rebuilt. He noted the Assessor's card had the deck size listed as 6' X 12' and the rebuilt deck is 5' X 12'. He then summarized the Inland Wetlands and Zoning Board of Appeals application procedures that the Gattos had gone through to obtain approvals for the second story addition.

Ms. Purnell asked if the deck had been shown on the plans approved by the ZBA. She stated that the plans submitted to the Wetlands Commission did not show the deck and if they had, there would have been a more careful review. She noted Mr. Gatto had indicated the deck would be removed, that the Commission had considered this a trade-off for approval of the second story, and it had been noted for the record the deck would be removed.

Atty. Fisher asked the Commission to take a common sense approach. He noted the old deck had been pressure treated wood and the new deck was mahogany with only the supports being pressure treated so there would now be little leaching into the watercourse. He asked what the potential harm was from the new deck and why a pre existing deck was a concern to the Commission.

Mr. LaMuniere said the Commission had approved the second story addition with the understanding the deck (and its associated maintenance) would be removed. He said it was clear that the plans submitted to the Commission did not include the deck and the minutes stated the deck was to be removed.

Atty. Fisher maintained it was not clear that the Gattos would remove the deck, pointing out that Ms. Purnell's timeline indicated Mr. Gatto said he would "probably" remove it.

Ms. Purnell said the Commission had discussed whether to condition the approval on the removal of the deck, but since the deck had not been part of the plans submitted, it was noted for the record it would be removed, rather than made a condition of approval. She said it was a trade off in the Commission's opinion; approval of the second story, "a lesser evil," for the removal of the deck, which if it remained would continue to leach into the stream. She noted it was the Commission's job to minimize both long term and short term impacts to wetlands and watercourses.

Mr. Picton agreed, saying that structures located so close to the wetlands almost certainly have a negative impact, and therefore, the Commission's policy has been not to allow structures that close to streams.

Mrs. Gatto noted the Commission had asked Mr. Gatto to make three revisions to the application, and asked why removal of the deck was not also specified. Ms. Purnell responded that it had not been necessary because Mr. Gatto had informed the Commission the deck would be removed. Because it was being removed, there had been no need to discuss it or to make stipulations.

Mrs. Gatto remarked that no one on the site inspection had commented negatively regarding the deck. She said that they thought they were improving the deck by eliminating the pressure treated wood. It was noted that during earlier discussions about this deck, Atty. Fisher had stated the wood used was not be pressure treated, but Mr. Ajello said he had checked the tags on the wood, and in fact, it was the old type of pressure treated wood with the application of a sealer that had been used.

Mr. Picton again pointed out that the deck had not been shown on the plans submitted with the application. Mrs. Gatto responded that her architect had been focused on interior work and so had not been concerned about the deck. Mr. Picton noted the Commission had based its decision on the documents in the file, which did not include a deck. Mr. Ajello pointed out that not only did the plans submitted show no deck, but they also did not show a doorway to lead to the deck.

Regarding possible impacts of the deck on the wetlands and watercourse, Mr. Picton noted that shade affects the growth of vegetation, which is essential to the ecology. He also pointed out that maintenance work for the deck would involve chemicals to control mold and paints or stains and that during maintenance work the exposed soils would be compacted, which would also affect plant growth.

Atty. Fisher again noted the 4/7/04 approval made no stipulation that the deck must be removed.

Ms. Purnell stated the tapes of the meeting definitely reflect the fact that the deck was not shown on the plans, and therefore, was not an item for discussion. Mr. LaMuniere agreed the Commission acted based on the plans submitted.

Mr. Ajello noted the site plan submitted, dated 11/20/03, did not show the deck, either.

Ms. Purnell said if the Commission had realized a deck was proposed, it would have discussed feasible and prudent alternatives, such as alternate locations and materials.

Mr. Picton advised Mrs. Gatto the Commission would consider whether to uphold the enforcement order later in the meeting under Enforcement.

There were no further questions or comments from Mrs. Gatto, Atty. Fisher, or the Commissioners.

MOTION: To close the Show Cause Hearing for Gatto/ 155 Woodbury Road/#IW-04-01/Unauthorized Deck. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 4-0.

Mr. Picton closed the hearing at 7:15 p.m.

This hearing was recorded. The tape is on file in the Land Use Office, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington Depot, Ct.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Picton called the Meeting to order at 7:17 p.m. and seated Members Hill, LaMuniere, Picton, and Purnell.

Consideration of the Minutes

The 11/23/04 Regular Meeting minutes were accepted as amended.

Page 3: next to the last line under Holly Hill Farm: There is no e in Sharp.

Page 4: in the 12th line under Matthews: Change crossing to flow path.

Page 4: end of 4th line under Ross: Change "notice of violation" to enforcement order and in the 5th line after Land Records add: "and wants the enforcement release filed on the Land Records."

Page 5: in the 8th line from the top: Insert a semi colon after house, and combine this sentence with the following one.

Page 5: in the 2nd line under Carter: Change the beginning of the sentence to: Mr. Picton requested an engineer's as-built and report....

MOTION: To accept the 11/23/04 Regular Meeting minutes

as amended. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mr.

Picton, and passed 4-0.

Pending Applications

H.O.R.S.E. of Ct./43 Wilbur Road/#IW-04-57E/Construct Sheds and Fence: Mr. Ajello placed the property boundaries on the USDA soils map and pointed out the wetlands soils. It was noted water tests at the Montessori School had indicated high level of contaminants from the horse farm, but to address this problem, Ms. Wahler had since begun to take the manure off site. The Commission scheduled a site inspection for Tuesday, December 14, 2004 at 3:30 p.m.

Stiteler-Giddins/198 Tinker Hill Road and West Shore Road/2 Lot Resubdivision: Mr. Neff, engineer, submitted the map, "Proposed Site Development Plan," by Mr. Neff, revised to 12/8/04, which added a 41.5 ft. long intermittent watercourse west of wetland flag #128. He said this was a relatively small watercourse that did not change the proposed construction plan. He also noted he had previously submitted the four conservation deeds, which had been requested at the last meeting. Ms. Purnell said she would review them. Mr. Neff also submitted his analysis of alternatives, dated 12/8/04. Mr. Picton noted the contours dip to indicate a swale within 20 ft. of the house site and then the swale continues along the driveway. He asked if the swale would intercept water, and said the Commission must consider surface flow. Mr. Neff stated the proposed scope of development was as compact as possible. Ms. Purnell worried about the cumulative impacts of future activities. Mr. Neff stated additional activities would require separate permits. Mr. Klein spoke on behalf of the neighboring property owner, Ms. Weeks. He pointed out the very steep slope to the west of the leaching fields, said all the runoff would flow towards the proposed house, and noted the area to be developed is very muddy. Mr. Neff said this runoff would be deflected by the base of the existing stone wall, said the soil scientist did not find any watercourses in the area uphill from the house and leaching area, and noted there was no construction proposed in this area. Mr. Neff said a curtain drain was proposed and there was a specific erosion and sedimentation control plan and sequence that would be implemented. Mr. Picton asked if recontouring was proposed along the side of the house to deflect the runoff. Mr. Neff said the site would be graded and a 6" to 12" swale installed so the runoff would flow around the house. Mr. Picton was concerned that during construction, the runoff would pick up sediment. Mr. Neff said there would be a silt fence installed in the lower flat area to catch any silt. Mr. Picton did not think the proposed silt fence would be able to catch all the runoff, but Mr. Neff said it would be adequate because 1) the flow would not be funneled, 2) existing vegetation would be left in place on the side of the hill above the construction area, and 3) only modest disturbance was proposed. Ms. Purnell asked what percentage of the proposed 12.8 acre lot was upland soil or nonregulated area. Mr. Neff said at least 3 acres. Mr. Picton thought the applicants had given up possibilities for feasible and prudent alternates and had left themselves a marginal site when they created the four existing conservation

easements. He asked for calculations for how many square feet of the proposed lot were unregulated, the size of the watershed, and how much water will flow through the house site and down the access corridor. Mr. Picton suggested there might be so much runoff that a quarter acre detention pond would be required, but Mr. Neff stated this would not be necessary because the runoff would diffuse into the wetlands on both sides of the driveway. Ms. Purnell said her concern was about the long term impacts to the lake because of salt and sand from the driveway and the proposed tree cutting would generate more runoff flow. Mr. Picton thought that monitoring of the construction site would be critical and so Mr. Neff said he would review the construction sequence. It was noted the Commission would send the application to the NW Conservation District for review of the proposed erosion and sedimentation controls and Mr. Neff would submit a written request for an extension.

Holly Hill Farm, LLC./87 Whittlesey Road/#IW-04-65/Restoration and Reforestation: The report from the Commission's consultant had not yet been prepared and no one was present to represent the applicant. Mr. Picton asked Mr. Ajello to make sure all work on the property had stopped and to determine whether stabilization measures were required for the exposed dirt at the dump site. Ms. Purnell asked that Mr. Child's report be faxed or emailed to all Commissioners prior to the next meeting.

Dore-Jepson/144 East Shore Road/#IW-04-67/Renovate Cabin: The contractors were present. Ms. Purnell proposed a condition of approval that hay bales be staked around the existing catch basin, but Mr. Ajello said the bales would be too close to the traveled portion of the road. He thought possibly crushed stone could be placed around the catch basin. Mr. Picton asked that Mr. Ajello's recommendations be followed during construction.

MOTION: To approve as submitted application #IW-04-67 by Dore-Jepson per the map, "Property of John Smart," by Mr. Osborne, dated 12/21/62 to rebuild and increase the height of the cabin at 144 East Shore Road. By Ms. Purnell, seconded by Mrs. Hill, and passed 4-0.

Adams/57 West Shore Road/#IW-04-68ATF/Site Improvements: Mr. Churchill and Mr. Neff were present. Mr. Ajello's 12/8/04 report and the map, "Proposed Site Improvement Plan," by Mr. Neff, dated 11/1/04 were reviewed. It was noted driveway drainage, driveway repair work, and construction of a dock were not included in the current application. Driveway drainage was discussed, however, and Mr. Churchill said he would talk to a state DOT drainage engineer about what measures could be taken to improve the existing drainage conditions. Ms. Purnell stated she was concerned about the runoff flowing into the lake, but Mr. Picton pointed out that condition is existing; it was not caused by the proposed site work. Mr. Picton asked if additional erosion controls would be needed. Mr. Ajello noted the proposed stone wall with filter fabric behind would be built first and then backfilled. Mr. Picton asked Mr. Ajello to monitor the work in progress and to request additional erosion controls measures if necessary. Mr. Picton thanked Mr. Churchill for the detailed information provided.

MOTION: To approve application #IW-04-68ATF submitted by Mr. Adams for site improvements at 57 West Shore Road per the map, "Proposed Site Improvement Plan," by Mr. Neff, dated 11/1/04; approved as submitted for items #1-#9 in the project description narrative dated 8/19/04 with the stipulation that items #10-#13 in the narrative and also described in Mr. Ajello's 12/0/04 report as #10, #11, #12, and #13 are excluded from the application being acted on at this time and with the stipulation that no work on the portion of the driveway below the existing retaining wall and the existing shed, no associated drainage improvements, and no docks are included in the approval. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Mr. LaMuniere, and passed 4-0.

Ross/10 Sunny Ridge Road/#IW-04-69/Driveway: It was noted the application was for the "passway" only and that its location was shown on the map, "Site Plan - Wetlands Restoration," by Bradford E. Smith and Sons, dated 5/2/03, revised to 5/28/03 drawn in blue ink by Mr. Ajello. This was consistent

with the 5/2/03 mylar submitted by the applicant with overlays showing the passway drawn by hand in black. Ms. Purnell thought there should be an as-built survey to document the completed location of the passway, but Mr. Ajello reported the stakes on site lined up exactly with the mylar location indicated. It was noted it would be difficult to reference the location of the passway in any motion due to the nature of the maps submitted. Mr. Picton asked for photo documentation of the location and condition of the passway for the file.

MOTION: To approve the location and present condition of the passway on the Ross property at 10 Sunny Ridge Road in the location shown in blue pen on the map submitted with application #IW-04-69, "Site Plan-Wetlands Restoration," by Bradford E. Smith and Son, dated 5/2/03 and revised to 5/28/03, which location was derived from a mylar overlay provided by Mr. Ross on another map, "Wetlands Restoration As-Built Survey," by Bradford E. Smith and Son, dated 4/26/04 also submitted for this application. The rock surface of this passway is not elevated above the adjacent ground, is no more than 12 feet wide, and is the existing rough rock surface. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Mr. LaMunier, and passed 4-0.

Matthews/142 Upper Church Hill Road/#IW-04-72/First Cut and Driveway: Mr. Neff, engineer, was present. The map, "Proposed Site Development Plan," by Mr. Neff, revised to 11/23/04 was reviewed. It was noted Ms. Coe had expressed her concern about the inevitable impacts when activities are approved in areas comprised of so much wetlands. Mr. Picton said the slopes were minimal here, however, and all construction activity and landscaping would be limited to an envelope at least 100 ft. from wetlands. It was also noted the application was for the driveway and feasibility for development only so future activities would require additional permits. The Commissioners requested that notes be placed on the map that 1) only the driveway crossing is approved, 2) the limit of disturbance is the line of silt fence as shown on the map, 3) clearing is allowed only for the driveway; no clearing is to be done beyond the point where the driveway leaves the regulated area and enters the building envelope, except for a small turning area, and 4) the right of way off Upper Church Hill Road is not approved for driveway access. Mr. Neff agreed to add these notes to the map and to revise the DEP reporting page in the application form.

New Applications

Kraft/53 Shearer Road/#IW-04-71/Extend Wall and Fence: Mrs. Kraft was present. Mr. Ajello said he had inspected the site and found the actual wetlands differ from those shown on the subdivision map. They are located within 30-40 ft. of the boundary line where the stone wall is proposed. It was noted the clearing had already been done, shallow scraping for the base of the wall would be required, and the wall would be dry laid. Mr. Ajello thought there would be no impact to the wetlands on the adjoining property. Ms. Purnell noted the large nearby wetland areas and asked that gaps be left in the proposed wall to enable wildlife to pass through. Mr. Ajello recommended tubes be installed every 20 ft. along the ground and Mrs. Kraft agreed to do so. Mr. Picton asked that the construction narrative be revised to include installation of the tubes and a note that the excavated material would not be spread on the wetland side of the wall. Action will be taken at the next meeting.

Ranieri/25 Nettleton Hollow Road/#IW-04-72/Dry Hydrant: Mr. Woodruff's 12/1/04 letter, which accompanied the application, was read. Mr. Ajello stated he had reviewed the application and it was complete. It was noted there was no fee submitted with the application, but that other dry hydrant applications submitted by the Fire Dept. had included the application fee.

Enforcement

Gatto/155 Woodbury Road/#IW-04-01/Unauthorized Deck: Mr. Picton noted the Commission must decide whether the enforcement order issued on 11/30/04 should remain in effect. Mrs. D. Hill read the order. Ms. Purnell stated the deck was inconsistent with the permit issued because the application and

plans did not include a deck and that it was not known whether a deck would have been approved because it had not been applied for and so had not been discussed by the Commission. Mr. LaMunier said that Mr. Gatto had told the Commission the deck would be removed. Ms. Purnell noted the cumulative impact of chromium copper arsenic to invertebrates and to the wetlands. She said the Commission's job is to protect the resources of the state and town and so it should take every opportunity to improve their quality. Mrs. Hill did not think there was a strong enough reason to make the Gattos remove the deck. Mr. Picton noted the Commission must be able to conduct its business in an orderly, consistent, and effective manner and could not be expected to "double back" to permit a deck when clearly the application did not include it. Mr. LaMunier agreed the Commission must abide by its standards and treat applicants consistently.

MOTION: That the 11/30/04 Enforcement Order issued to Mr. and Mrs. Gatto concerning the deck at 155 Woodbury Road remain in effect. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Ms. Purnell, and passed 3-1. Mrs. Hill voted No because she did not think there was a strong enough reason to order the deck to be removed.

Other Business

Pullaro/23 Calhoun Street/#IW-04-35/Request to Amend Application to Include Gravel Parking Area, Gravel Path, and Fence: Mrs. Pullaro read her letter dated 12/3/04. She explained the proposed fence would have non pressure treated cedar posts and the holes would be hand dug. The map, "Site Improvement Plan," by Mr. Neff, dated 8/10/04 with hand drawn notations by Mrs. Pullaro was reviewed. Mr. LaMunier reminded Mrs. Pullaro that fill is still needed along the edge of the driveway so the runoff will sheet flow down the drive instead of washing over the lawn. Mrs. Pullaro said she had already contacted her contractor to request this area be filled. It was noted on the map the area with native plantings would be extended the length of the area between the new proposed fence and the stream, the fence would be non pressure treated pickets and posts, and crushed or clean stone would be used instead of gravel for the parking area and path.

MOTION: To approve the revisions to permit #IW-04-35 requested by Mrs. Pullaro for a fence, parking area, and walkway at 23 Calhoun Street per the 12/3/04 narrative and the revisions noted in black pen on the map, "Site Improvement Plan," by Mr. Neff, dated 8/10/04, which was submitted with the request. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Mr. LaMunier, and passed 4-0.

Enforcement Report

Armstrong/72 Mygatt Road: Mr. Ajello reported there were unstable stockpiles of material, surface runoff, and an overflowing well on this property. He will reinspect and said he would not sign off until either the site is stabilized or a bond has been posted.

Brody/Bee Brook Road/IW-02-06: Several Commissioners were disappointed that so much of the rock outcropping had been excavated. Mr. Ajello explained the rock had been too porous for footings and so had to be chipped out.

Fowler/138 Nichols Hill Road/#IW-04-V5: Mr. Ajello reported Mr. Fowler will comply with his specific directives, will hire a professional to draw a planting plan, and will propose to reduce the slope going down to the wetland area by removing material.

Holly Hill Farm, LLC./87 Whittlesey Road/#IW-04-65: Mrs. J. Hill noted the \$2500 consultants fee had been submitted.

Gatto/155 Woodbury Road/#IW-04-01/Unauthorized Deck: It was noted the 11/30/04 enforcement order had been upheld.

Gentile/38 Winston Drive: Mr. Ajello reported the erosion control measures requested last month had

not been installed. Mr. Picton advised Mr. Ajello to notify Mr. Gentile that if the erosion controls are not installed as soon as possible, a notice of violation will be issued.

Greenfield/12 Ives Road: The Commission is still waiting for an application for clearing in or near the wetlands.

Guliano and Robbins/Winston Drive: The driveways on these two properties had been paved without permits. It was noted that although this is a regulated activity, permits are frequently overlooked by property owners. Ms. Purnell suggested that the Selectmen put an advisory note on the Town website that paving a driveway within 100 feet of a wetlands or watercourse requires a permit. Mr. Picton asked Mr. Ajello to write to both property owners to ask if the recent driveway work resulted in any change to the surface runoff. This matter will be discussed again in January.

Matthews/89 Lower Church Hill Road: Mrs. Corrigan's 12/6/04 letter was read. She found numerous groundwater seeps on this property, which she thought could be impacted by the blasting required for the proposed dwelling and pool. Ms. Purnell stated these were ephemeral wetlands. Mr. Picton asked how close the seeps were to the construction site. Mr. Ajello said they were in the cleared area and immediately below and in the blasting area. The groundwater hydrology and surface runoff of the site were discussed. Mr. Picton noted that seeps within 100 feet of the construction area and any regrading and redirection of surface runoff that could change the flow towards a wetlands and/or watercourse would be under the Commission's jurisdiction. He said, too, the Commission must consider erodable soil in the event that surface water is redirected. Mr. LaMunier stated blasting could compress the stone, which would compact the seeps, affecting the hydrology. It was the consensus that Mr. and Mrs. Matthews should submit an application with a complete site plan by a qualified professional. Mr. Ajello will send a letter to notify the property owners.

Howard/99 West Shore Road/Tree Cutting: Mr. Ajello circulated photos of recent cutting of damaged trees. Ms. Purnell asked if this would impact the steep slopes above the lake. Mr. Picton advised Mr. Ajello to stipulate to the property owner that the roots may not be dug out so there would be no soil disturbance. Ms. Purnell recommended installation of a jute mat, seeding, and mulching to stabilize the slopes over the winter if they have been disturbed by the tree work.

Meeker/269 New Milford Turnpike: An application was submitted on 12/8. It will be received at the next meeting.

Rheinhardt/10 Perkins Lane: Mr. Ajello reported Ms. Rheinhardt wants to cut trees in a possible wetlands area. He will inspect the site, check the soils map, and possibly request an application.

Sasson/4 June Road: Mr. Ajello showed photos taken in June 2004 and the summer of 2002, which Mr. Sasson claims show the configuration of the previous stone deck. Mr. Picton and Mr. LaMunier remained skeptical that the photos were taken before the new work was done. Mr. Sasson's 11/29/04 letter was read. Mr. Picton asked for a photo of the current deck so the stonework could be compared with these photos. Mr. Ajello will provide one.

Young/113 Litchfield Turnpike/Drainage Ditch: Mr. Ajello noted there was no permit for the drainage work done on this property. He will discuss the matter with Mr. H. Underwood, contractor, and will require either restoration or an after the fact application.

Ross/10 Sunny Ridge Road/#IW-02-V2/Wetlands Restoration: Mr. Ajello reported Mr. Ross had filled in the gullies and had dug the silt out of the wetlands as the Commission required. Mr. Picton noted there was no as-built showing the successfully completed restoration, but upon review of the approval of the permit, it was noted this had not been stipulated. Mr. Ajello said he had been on site, had checked the staked locations, and had found the restoration was complete. It was the consensus to approve the restoration as substantially complete based on Mr. Ajello's inspection, noting the approval

would be for 10 Sunny Ridge Road only and not for the adjoining property where material had been deposited without a permit. Mr. Ajello will send a letter to Mr. Ross to inform him he is required to remove the material deposited within 100 feet of wetlands or to apply for a permit.

MOTION: To approve the restoration on the Ross property at 10 Sunny Ridge Road as substantially in conformance with the approved restoration plan based on Mr. Ajello's inspection, and therefore the Commission files a release of the 9/3/02 enforcement order for 10 Sunny Ridge Road. By Mr. Picton, seconded by Ms. Purnell, and passed 3-1. Mrs. Hill voted No because she thought Mr. Ross should be required to submit an as-built map prior to taking the order off the Land Records.

A copy of the above motion approving the restoration will be filed on the Town Land Records.

Carter/292 Walker Brook Road/#IW-04-V8/Repair of Retaining Wall: Mr. Picton noted a notice of violation had been sent. If no citation check has been received by the next meeting, the Commission will take appropriate action.

Discretion of the Chair

It was noted the New Milford Zoning Commission had approved the zone change for Walker Brook Road and the number of lots applied for, and had since requested an environmental review by Kings Mark.

The procedure for writing/filing site inspection minutes detailed in Mr. LaMunier's 11/24/04 memo was briefly discussed again.

Mr. Picton said he had discussed with Mr. Jontos of Land Tech previous problems the Commission has had with consultant reviews. Mr. Jontos said the problems could possibly have resulted from unclear instructions. Therefore, Mr. Picton noted that in the future the Commission would have to be careful when describing what work it wants done and should ask for environmental as well as engineering reviews. He circulated brochures about the services offered by Land Tech Consultants.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Picton.

Mr. Picton adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,
Janet M. Hill
Land Use Coordinator