

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

September 11, 2007

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Patrick Walsh
Lillian Willis

Absent: James McChesney

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 8:26 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2007-059-PD:** Plenary Ruling application to dredge wetlands to create a pond on property located at **110 Armand Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: Michael G. and Dorothy L. Giersch. Appl./Auth. Agent: Nazzaro, Inc. *Received 6/5/2007. Raised to Plenary Ruling 6/19/2007. 35 days to close public hearing ends 8/21/2007. Permission to extent public hearing granted 7/18/2007. 35-day action period ends 10/16/2007. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was closed, and asked for discussion on the application.

Dr. Gelfman stated that he feels that this plan is a good compromise between what the homeowners wanted and what the environment demands, and one that will enhance the biodiversity of the land. He requested a more formal planting plan, as a condition.

Chairman Mucchetti asked him if he wanted to specify certain plantings, or simply request that they be appropriate to the site. He indicated the latter.

Mr. Katz said that, although he would also like to approve the application, the plan disregards the recommendations of the experts, especially those of Wetlands Inspector, Aimee Pardee.

Dr. Gelfman stated that those experts were not present that evening to hear the applicant's presentation. He reiterated his support for the plan, saying that it was well thought out.

Dr. Autuori agreed. Wetlands regulations are designed to be protective, not prohibitive, he said. He added that he had rarely seen a wetlands application which was as benevolent and protective of the environment as this one. He concluded that this could be considered a restoration, since the area most likely had some sort of pond which had filled in. He added that the shade will remain in great measure, as will areas of habitat for the amphibians. As a Board, the Inland Wetlands Board has to look at the technical data supplied by the experts, and balance that against what the applicant is trying to achieve, he said. He thinks that this will turn out to be, at the very least, environmentally neutral, and actually has the potential to enhance that pocket of wetland. His vote is for approval of the plan.

Chairman Mucchetti announced that Agent Brosius was distributing Wetlands Regulation 10.2 - Standards and Criteria for Decision. She recognized Dr. Gelfman, who offered to discuss these standards as they relate to this application.

Dr. Gelfman read each of the standards and criteria and gave his assessment and view on each, in relation to this application:

- a) this plan would enhance the biodiversity and activity of this location
- b) this represents a prudent and feasible alternative to the original plan
- c) there will be some short-term loss of vegetation, but the long-term impact will be positive
- d) the plan proposes to transform a small portion of a previously designated wetland area to a more open water, but not to a degree that it alters the wooded characteristic
- e) the plan has been positively supported by the immediate neighbors
- f) no comment
- g) measures that would mitigate are largely confined to the planting that will be done when the project is completed

Dr. Autuori was in total agreement. **Mrs. Willis** asked that it be stipulated that the machine at the site would be used only where indicated, and washed after use.

There was some discussion. The area of concern appeared to be the proposed location of vehicles and equipment in the mulch area.

The Chairman clarified that the concern is that invasives will be brought into the site. Dr. Gelfman said that the machinery would be cleaned, and the Chairman confirmed that this stipulation would be part of his motion.

Referring to some of the wetlands regulations, Mr. Katz said that there is nothing in the plan to indicate this project would cause irreversible or irretrievable losses to the

wetland, and there is no interference with health and safety, or reasonable use of property with this project. Hence, he reversed his prior objection to the plan.

Dr. Autuori said that he did not want to appear to be going against the experts. He simply feels that the Board has to take a broader view.

Mrs. Willis felt that the wood duck habitat would be supported with this plan, and suggested that the information gathered by Ms. Pardee relating to the wood duck be given to the applicant.

Mr. Fossi pointed out that it was because of Wetlands Inspector, Aimee Pardee, and the Conservation Commission's comments and initial concerns that this new and much improved plan was created.

Agent Brosius suggested some conditions. The excavator hired to do the job, who was not present at the meeting, should attend a pre-construction meeting in the zoning office before work begins. The applicant's consultant offered their experts for supervision of the erosion and sedimentation control and the project itself. She recommends this supervision, and periodic inspections.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to request that the Agent draft a resolution of approval for the application, referencing the modified, new plans submitted by the applicant and reviewed with the consultant. The motion passed, 8-0.

The applicant stressed his need to get moving with the project while the dry weather prevails, and there was some discussion, and ultimate agreement that it would be preferable to move the project along by eliminating the draft of the resolution, and making it a final approval.

In a separate motion, Mr. Katz moved to approve the application as a final approval, with staff to prepare the resolution according to the discussion and additional points raised by the Agent. The motion was seconded by Dr. Autuori and passed by a vote of 8-0.

2. **#2007-094-SR:** Summary Ruling application for activity within the wetlands for filling and grading to create a dry lawn area on property located at **3 Stony Hill Terrace** in the RAA zone. Owner: Richard P. Donovan. Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, P.E. **Pursuant to Sec. 8-7d.(c) of the C.G.S., this application is considered received 8/28/2007. 65-day action period ends 11/1/2007. 9/4/2007 acknowledged received 8/28/2007, walked 9/9/2007. For action.**

The Chairman introduced the project engineer, John McCoy, of JFM Engineering.

Mr. McCoy, agent for the applicant, said the application is for corrective action; there was no Cease and Desist for disturbance to the wetland, he said, but explained that the applicant had started to do site work on his property, and was verbally asked

to stop, which he did. He was asked to retain professionals to prepare a plan, and also to quickly stabilize the site to prevent damage to downhill wetlands and watercourses from the drainage patterns through the site.

Mr. McCoy described the site as containing 6,923 sq. ft. of wetland, 2,300 sq. ft. of which is east of a wall that bisects the wetland. All of the cited disturbance and all of the proposed work involves the wetland east of the wall. The area west of the wall will remain undisturbed. After site walks and comments from IWB and the Conservation Commission, plus input from soil scientists, some changes to the original application resulted. It was determined that there should be more of a restoration of the wetland and less of a restoration of the lawn area. Mr. McCoy reported that the homeowner stated that portions of the wetland had been a lawn.

“What we are proposing at this stage,” he said, “is that 500’ of the existing wetlands be restored to lawn, and the remaining portion (east of the wall) would be restored wetlands.” The areas most disturbed, he reported, would receive new plantings recommended by the soil scientist, and the whole area would be seeded with a wetland mix. Along the delineation between the restored lawn and the restored wetland, they are proposing a series of boulders, approximately 10’ on center. The boulders would be large enough to require a machine to move them. They are open to suggestions as to what types of shrubs to plant between the boulders.

Mr. McCoy went on to say that the homeowner requests permission to pipe water away from the restoration line to an existing drainage structure near the end of his driveway, through an existing culvert and under the road, and into another wetland.

He added that the items noted on the field walk would be addressed, i.e., the creation of a tree well requiring removal of boulders, and the pulling back of the grading near the tree. Also, sediment and erosion controls, (check dams, silt fence, hay bales) will be used. Some are already in place, and will remain until the project is done, he said.

Mr. McCoy said that the homeowner recognizes that he infringed on the wetland and overstepped in his desire to create more usable space on his property, and to improve the wet condition that he had.

Mrs. Willis questioned the placement of the delineation line on the map. She also noted that, if the piping were approved, it could potentially create more useable land, and suggested that perhaps the homeowner would agree to restore the existing wetland as a trade off. She asked if Mr. McCoy could assure the Board that the downstream flow will not be increased dramatically. He said he thought there would be essentially no change. He felt that there would be additional ponding in the back, if anything.

Mr. Katz asked how there could be ponding if there is to be an area drain there.

Mr. McCoy said that they would be setting the drain at a level designed to protect the lawn downhill, but not drain the wetland.

There was much discussion about the demarcation on the map as opposed to the flagged area in the field.

Mr. Katz noted that the piping would eliminate overspill. He echoed Mrs. Willis' sentiment that a drained area would create more usable lawn, so the applicant should consider restoring the entire wetland, he felt. He stressed that, although it appears to be a small amount of wetland, all wetland applications seem to refer to a small amount of wetland. Collectively, they equal a very large portion of wetland. He noted that Connecticut is losing wetland at an alarming rate, because wetlands are being given up, parcel by parcel.

Mrs. Willis felt that this concession on the part of the homeowner was not too much to ask for.

Dr. Autuori felt that the zigzag outline of the wetlands might be hard to follow with the boulders, and he suggested that perhaps the Board and the homeowner "split the difference" and start the boulders at the stone wall where the arrow comes across and sweep the curve up to meet some of the applicant's desires and also significantly reduce, (from about 500 to 200-250 sq. ft.), the wetlands impact.

Mr. McCoy was sympathetic to the points made by the Board, but he understood the dilemma the homeowner was in, due to a mistake on his part, and a mistake in the Town records. He suggested that the homeowner, Richard Donovan, speak for himself.

Mr. Donovan admitted that he had "shot himself in the foot." He had had a large lawn prior to the work, he said, but it was "mushy" at certain times. When he went to the Town to consult the maps on file, he was incorrectly advised of the wetlands limit, because the map was out of date. Now that he is being asked to restore the wetland and demarcate it with boulders, he feels he is not only losing the additional 500 sq. ft., but now it is being separated off by the boulders. He feels he is now being asked to restore something that he didn't damage in the first place. His original intention was to stop the water, but, now, he is losing that area to the wetland boulders.

Mr. Walsh asked Mr. McCoy what he considered to be the functionality of the 500 sq. ft. of wetlands in question. If it were lawn, he asked, what would the functionality be?

Mr. McCoy said it had previously been an area that was discharging, as opposed to retaining. It would still do that if it were a lawn, he said, but, obviously, it would provide better cleansing if it were not a lawn.

Dr. Autuori asked if the plantings proposed to be installed north of the boulders would enhance the filtration and cleansing effect. Mr. McCoy said they would. Dr. Autuori asked if it would help enough to negate the negative effect of the loss of filtration below the boulders.

Mr. McCoy thought about the question, and then summed up, as follows: The back area is going to function better than it does today. It will provide a different value than it did when there were trees there. In the area that was a lawn, there will be less groundwater effect. In some respect, the wetlands will lose their function.

Mr. Katz asked the homeowner if the 100 or so linear feet of a drier lawn wouldn't be a fair trade off for the small amount of wetland that could be left intact.

Mr. Donovan said his backyard is very small, and the whole side of the yard is wetlands. He said the 500 sq. ft. may seem unimportant, but that area is directly outside his back door, where his children will play. He added that he realizes that if he hadn't disturbed that area, he would still have those 500 sq. ft.

The Chairman asked for the letters from the Conservation Commission and from Aimee Pardee to be read into the record.

Mr. George Orlan read the Conservation Commission's letter, which notes that there are at least 12 tree stumps in the wetland area, which Mr. Donovan claims was a lawn, and there are indentations in the ground that are not characteristic of a lawn. The Commission asserts that there is ample lawn in front of the house, and the entire wetland should remain, as it performs the important function of absorbing and cleansing water.

The Agent read both Ms. Pardee's letter and the soils report prepared by soil scientist, Mary Jaehnig. The Board noted that Ms. Pardee's letter did state that the restoration would offset the effects of the area proposed to be filled.

Dr. Autuori noted that Ms. Pardee also states that the piping will mitigate the adverse thermal effect if there is too much sun. He felt that there is no real need to split the difference.

Mr. McCoy said that he had taken the applicant's feeling and the comments that he heard in the field into consideration, and that this plan represents his attempt to create a plan that is as close as possible to meeting both sides.

Dr. Autuori said this was a particularly difficult application, with differing opinions from the Conservation Commission and the Wetlands Inspector. It is complicated further, he said, by the fact that the applicant, "in all good faith," proceeded on the basis of incorrect information, which was on file in the Town. He didn't think he was dealing with a wetland, because the large scale map provided by the Town did not show one.

Dr. Autuori also felt that Mr. McCoy had done “a wizard’s job” of creating a plan that would satisfy both sides. He sees no adverse affects to the environment with this plan.

Mr. Walsh said that there is no reason to believe that the area in question was not a lawn prior to the work. He thinks the piping and the plantings to the north of the disturbed area where the grass is going to be will further enhance the wetland.

Mrs. Willis reiterated her previously stated position. Mr. Katz agreed.

The Agent advised the Board that, if there failed to be an agreement on this, they could consider a second, modified approval.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve the application as a final approval (no draft) according to the plans submitted. There was some discussion and disagreement about filling of a small portion of the wetlands, as shown on the plans. The vote was taken, and the motion passed 4-3, with Chairman Mucchetti, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Fossi and Dr. Autuori in favor, and Mrs. Willis, Mr. Slavin, and Mr. Katz voting against. Dr. Gelfman abstained because he had not walked the site.

3. **#2007-102-SR:** Summary Ruling application for activities in the upland review area in conjunction with the construction of a single family residence on property located at **188A Main Street** in the RA zone. Owners: Bob and Jan Hebert. Appl./Auth. Agent: David Adams. *65-day action period ends 11/8/2007. Received 9/4/2007, walked 9/9/2007. For action.*

The Chairman introduced Mr. David Adams, of Design Builders, the builders of the home.

Mr. Adams displayed a map of the site and described the proposed project. He said that the plan is to clear the back of the property up to the wetlands line. He mentioned the presence of an invasive plant known as “knot weed.” The property involves cut and fill, he said, so there would not be a lot of trucking of fill in or out. They may create a small retaining wall in the back of the property, but, other than that, it will be basically lawn.

Dr. Autuori was concerned about several “beautiful” trees on the property, and he asked Mr. Adams if they were within the wetlands, or slated for removal to create the lawn area. He confirmed that, if they were found to be in the wetland, they would not be cut. He also asked if herbicide would be used to get rid of the knot weed. Mr. Adams said that it would not.

Mrs. Willis asked Mr. Adams how he intended to eliminate the invasive. He said that he was not sure how to proceed with it, but thought small machinery would be needed.

Dr. Autuori again stressed the need to protect the trees

Mr. Adams said that the owner wants the property opened up and he is not sure what that will involve. They are not sure what trees are actually on the property, as yet. He assured Dr. Autuori that they will proceed carefully

The Chairman and Mrs. Willis explained that the removal of the Japanese Knot Weed from the upland review area is of concern, because of the difficulty in removing it. Mrs. Willis said that it can spread over the entire site if not handled properly. She cautioned against having machinery going back and forth over the invasive.

Mr. Adams said that it is his understanding that, once you remove the knot weed and plant lawn, it won't be a problem as long as you keep the lawn mowed.

Mrs. Willis asked if he would be using herbicides to control the knot weed seedlings that would grow up through the lawn. He said that he couldn't attest to what the property owner would choose to do.

The Agent summed up by saying that there is a request to clear the land up to the wetlands buffer. Damage to the wetlands can be minimized or eliminated by creating a silt fence along the wetlands boundary. She recommended that, if there is going to be clearing of the lot, the wetland boundary be clearly delineated, (by orange construction fencing, for example), before any machinery goes in.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to request that the Agent prepare a resolution of approval for the application, according to the plans submitted, with the condition that construction fencing be installed to delineate the wetlands clearly. The motion passed, 7-0-1. Dr. Gelfman abstained.

4. **#2007-104-SR:** Summary Ruling application to conduct regulated activities in the upland review area in conjunction with the renovation and expansion of existing residence on property located at **46 Blackman Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: Valory Munroe. Appl.: Flore Munroe. Auth. Agent: MacMillan Architects. *65-day action period ends 11/8/2007. Received 9/4/2007, walked 9/9/2007. For action.*

[Note: Mr. Fossi recused himself from discussion on the application and left the room.]

The Chairman introduced Mr. Doug MacMillan, architect/agent for the project.

Mr. MacMillan described the project, explaining the intent to have a construction trap rock access for the addition. The house will be a slab on grade construction. All the excavated material will be removed from the site at the time of excavation. Once the framing is in place, the trap rock access will be removed, and all the excavated

areas will be back-filled, raked, hayed and seeded. The area will then be stabilized. He explained how he would handle the sheetrock and lumber deliveries after that.

He said he talked with the Conservation Commission, and plans to run a split rail fence along the overgrown area next to the pond and up to the tree. Beyond that, the area would be left in a natural state. He referred to a letter he had received from Wetlands Inspector, Aimee Pardee. Relating to her comments about water from roof leaders, he will install a drywell to contain the water from the gutters and leaders. He will be able to handle the water that comes off of the additions and part of the original house, but he will not be able to correct any runoff from the house that exists now.

He had not received any planting suggestions from the Conservation Commission, and would welcome any suggestions from the Board.

The letters from both the Conservation Commission and Ms. Pardee were read. All concerns had been addressed by Mr. MacMillan.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to request the Agent to draft a resolution of approval for the application, according to the plans submitted and the modifications described by the authorized agent during discussion. The motion passed, 6-0-2. Mr. Fossi had recused himself from participation, and Dr. Gelfman abstained because he had not walked the site.

NEW ITEMS

5. Suggested Walk dates for 2008 (distributed 9/4/2007). For discussion/approval.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve the walk schedule as presented. The motion passed, 6-0-2. Mr. Slavin abstained, and Dr. Gelfman was briefly out of the room.

BOARD WALKS

There were no walks to be scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASE / REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Memo from Aimee Pardee to the owners of **10 Kendra Court**, requesting status report on resolution of a violation. **Agent Brosius** noted that the applicant's counsel, Rex Gustafson, has been in touch with the office upon receipt of the letter, and the original wetland line has been staked by the surveyor. A landscape architect is being retained to develop a mitigation plan.
- Copy of notice from the UCONN Center for Continuing Studies regarding a CTDEP wetlands training program on 10/13/07. Agent Brosius will attend.

- Letter from Milone & MacBroom engineers regarding the conditions at the outfall opposite **638 Danbury Road (“Regency at Ridgefield”)**. *The Agent noted that this item should be placed on the 9/25/07 agenda for discussion.*

MINUTES

The minutes of September 4, 2007 were distributed.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

September 11, 2007

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Patrick Walsh
Lillian Willis

Absent: James McChesney

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 9:42 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2007-084-SP:** Special Permit under Section 9.2 as required by Section 7.5.D.5 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to permit on site crushing of material on property located at **40 Ned's Lane** in the RAAA zone. Owner: Hunter Harrison. Appl./Auth. Agent: Don Longo, Longo & Associates, LLC. *Received 7/17/2007. Walked 9/9/2007. Public hearing commenced 9/11/2007. 65- day action period ends 11/15/2007. For action.*

The Planner said that the conditions should include the comments made at the table by the applicant and the Commission, and those from her memo. She stressed the need for adherence to the noise ordinance rules.

The question of what happens if this project exceeds the 30 day time limit was addressed. The Agent said that the time period is merely an estimate.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the application as submitted, with the conditions suggested by the Planner, including reference to requirements in the regulations and the Town's Noise Ordinance. The motion passed, 8-0.

2. **#2007-103-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e as required by Section 3.2.C of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to reconfigure the back parking lot at **21 King Lane** and add additional spaces to existing main Church lots at

207 Main Street in the RA Zone. Owner/Apl.: Rev. William B. Pfohl, Jesse Lee Memorial United Methodist Church. Auth Agent: Peter Seirup. *65-day action period ends 11/8/2007. Received 9/4/2007, walked 9/9/2007. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the formal, detailed A-2 survey had not been received, and the applicant has also not completed review with the Historic District Commission. The matter was tabled and will return to the agenda when these issues are addressed.

NEW ITEMS

3. **#2007-042-REZ-A: 616 Bennett's Farm Road, Eureka V, LLC (under Sec. 8-30g of the C.G.S.)** *Discussion c/o P.D.* Notice of Intervention and Request for Notice of Meetings from Charles J. Rothenberger, Connecticut Fund for the Environment, Inc. Commission review, statutory requirement to determine (find) that specific claims in verified pleading are within the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.

Prior to action on the item, Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner to review her memo and to outline the responsibilities of the Commission.

The Planner said that 22A-19 requires that the Commission determine whether or not the intervener is an appropriate party to intervene in the matter, and to determine if they have filed a verified pleading, and if the pleading alleges claims that are within Commission's scope and jurisdiction. She consulted with legal counsel and reviewed the matter, applying guidelines laid out by Christopher Smith, of the Connecticut Bar Association, in his handout that deals with 22A-19. It is her opinion that the intervention does qualify under all three of these categories.

The Chairman summed up, saying that it must be determined that the intervener is an appropriate party, the intervention is properly filed, and the matter is within the Commission's jurisdiction to consider.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to determine (1) that Intervener, the CT Fund for the Environment, is an appropriate party to intervene; (2) that the intervener has filed a proper verified pleading in conformance with 22a-19 of the CGS; and (3) the pleading alleges claims that are within the Commission's scope of jurisdiction. The motion passed, 8-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

There were no walks to be scheduled.

Dr. Gelfman asked if the Commission had permission to walk the Eureka site at 616 Bennetts Farm Road, and the Planner confirmed that the application included permission to inspect the property. By consensus, the Commission determined that a formal walk was not necessary, but those who wished to walk the site could do so

without a Special Meeting, provided there was no quorum walking the site at the same time. The Planner will inform the applicant that there is an interest, and confirm permission for the inspection.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Letter from the WPCA to Matthew Ranelli, Esq., re **76 Governor Street**
- Article about the Saugatuck Watershed planning group from the Ridgefield Press
- NY Times article about watershed protection for a property in the Catskills
- Letter from Michael Klemens, announcing the termination of the Metropolitan Conservation Alliance
- Memo to the Chairman from the Board of Selectmen, requesting that the Commission re-visit the discussion on requiring first floor retail on Main Street.
The item will appear on the 9/25/07 meeting schedule, for discussion.

MINUTES

The minutes of September 4, 2007 were distributed.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

UNAPPROVED / UNREVISED
MINUTES
AQUIFER PROTECTION AGENCY

September 11, 2007

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Patrick Walsh
Lillian Willis

Absent: James McChesney

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 9:52 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

There were no pending items.

NEW ITEMS

There were no new items.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the minutes of June 12, 2007.
The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary