

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

October 24, 2006

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

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

*A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.*

At 8:02 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

**PENDING ITEMS**

1. **#2006-048-SR:** Plenary Ruling application to conduct regulated activities in upland review area for construction of a single-family two-bedroom residence. Property located on west side of **Wilton Road East**, north of intersection with Split Level Road in the RA Zone. Owner: Earl A. Burchard. Auth. Agent/Appl.: Richard E. Kent, ASLA, Environmental Design Associates, PC. *Received 5/23/06, walked 6/4/06. Raised to Plenary Ruling June 6, 2006. Public hearing commenced 7/5/06, continued to 9/5/06 with granted extension, continued to 10/3/06 with granted extension. Public hearing closed and item tabled 10/3/06. Draft Resolution of Denial requested 10/10/06. Tabled 10/17/06. 35- day action period ends 11/7/06. For action.*

**Dr. Autuori** said he didn't see what he had introduced as a prudent and feasible alternative included in the draft denial, that being the construction of a bridge which he felt would mitigate the wetlands impact of the crossing. Although he admitted that this would not be helpful in the upland area, he said that if this reason is not included in the motion, he will not support it. He also mentioned a reduction in the size of the footprint of the house as a possible prudent and feasible alternative. If there is a potential property rights issue, he thought this would let the applicant know that there might be a way to accomplish their goal with a lesser impact to the wetland, not to say that a revised application would then necessarily be approved.

**The Chairman** asked if a prudent and feasible alternative could be proposed after the public hearing had closed.

**The Agent** said that it could, and referenced paragraph (b) in section 10.2.

**Ms. Willis** said that she felt the bridge would not be all that was necessary to mitigate the damage, and she was concerned that it might be necessary to name all prudent and feasible alternatives in order to prevent the applicant from thinking that just the addition of the bridge would be enough. She was also concerned that, absent a full list of alternatives, there could be a potential for a lawsuit if the applicant came back with some of the alternatives achieved and still was denied.

**Mr. Katz** said that, considering the elements of this application, the crossing of the water is only part of the discussion. The whole of the lot is the major part of the discussion, as the entire lot is part of the review area and, by the applicant's own estimation, at least half of the lot would be disturbed in order to create this project. After careful study of the mandated considerations in Sec. 10.2 of the regulations, Mr. Katz felt there was no way to accomplish the applicant's objective. The vast majority of the Board's concern around this project had not been around the crossing, but rather around the construction of the home, (which is the major part of the application). He felt that a prudent and feasible alternative did not "... attain the basic objectives of the activity proposed in the application," as stated in part (b) of 10.2, namely, the construction of the home. Therefore, he said he would not support the amendment to the motion and would retract his motion to approve this, as drafted, if it includes a potential prudent and feasible alternative. He felt as Ms. Willis did, that, if again denied, there was the potential for a lawsuit.

**Dr. Autuori** repeated his additional suggestion that the applicant could make the house smaller. He said that this was obviously a very difficult lot and he was not happy to support its being developed, but he is sympathetic to the fact that this is a pre-existing lot. He felt there was no harm in the Board's stating that there can be a prudent and feasible alternative that would be less detrimental to the entire lot. He did not feel that bringing a prudent and feasible alternative to this application would in any way then guarantee its approval. However, he stressed that he does see a prudent and feasible alternative, and feels that it would decrease the total impact on the lot, and, therefore, would support it if it was in the denial.

**Mr. Katz** once again cited part (b) of 10.2, and explained that a bridge would provide the "different environmental impacts," but it would only relate to the crossing. The building of the house itself is what creates the negative environmental impact. Mr. Katz stated that it is not incumbent on the Board to come up with a prudent and feasible alternative. He felt that if the applicant had wanted to present an alternative, they would have done so already. Consequently, he feels that the application which has been presented to the Board represents the prudent and feasible alternative, as seen by the applicant, to the application which was already denied. His motion stands.

**Mr. Slavin** pointed out that he attended a wetlands seminar shortly after joining the wetlands Board, where there had been discussions pertinent to this very issue. A

lawyer who practiced in the area had warned that it is very “disadvantageous” for the Board to propose feasible and prudent alternatives, especially in writing, because, to do so, implies that the Board will support those alternatives when they are sent back by the applicant. Mr. Slavin felt that there were several reasons why the Board should not add that kind of material to the denial.

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Mr. Slavin, to adopt the resolution of denial drafted by the Agent. The motion passed by a vote of 7-2. Mr. Walsh and Dr. Autuori were opposed.

2. **#2006-103-SR:** Summary Ruling application for filling of wetlands and uplands for construction of single family residence and garage on property located at **20 Peaceable Street** in the RA zone. Owner/App.: AMD Homes, LLC. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara & Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 12/7/06. Received 10/3/06, walked 10/22/06. For action.*

(**Note:** Mr. Walsh recused himself from participation on this application and left the room.)

**The Chairman** said that the Wetlands Agent requested that there be a brief discussion on the application, and she introduced engineer Steven Trinkaus and attorney Robert Jewell.

**Mr. Jewell** said that the applicant was surprised to find that there was an area of wetlands on the property and the applicant is asking for permission to fill it in. He stated that he received a letter from the Conservation Commission which said that they have no problem with this, as the area in question has a very low functional value.

**The Agent** wanted some clarification. She agreed with the Conservation Commission that this is a relatively insignificant area of wetlands. However, she felt that it was worthy of discussion, because there is concern over the drainage on the lot because of the slope down to the house immediately behind this lot. She said that it was appropriate for the Board to understand that if the wetlands are not going to be absorbing the runoff on the land, there needed to be a plan to address runoff. She asked project engineer Steve Trinkaus how the lot is being designed to accommodate that runoff.

**Mr. Trinkaus** said that the old house on the property had its roof and footing drains going back to tie into the drainage system on the Egan property. He said that there was a catch basin in the yard there, and that the drains from the proposed buildings are going to continue to go there. He added that the lot was very shaded and there was a lot of moss, rather than grass. When this is opened up and there is a good lawn, there will be much better infiltration, and “you’re not going to see the runoff from the driveway area, which is basically going to occur as sheet flow,” he said. Also, there is to be a large landscaped area in the back to provide screening.

**The Agent** said she wanted the Board to hear that explanation, and said that her concern is with the downhill lot. As long as that would be accommodated, she would have no problem with the filling of this wetland.

**The Chairman** wanted clarification that all of the drains on the property are going down to the one catch basin on the Egan property. Mr. Trinkaus said that was true.

**Ms. Willis** asked if the proposed house is bigger than the former house.

**Mr. Trinkaus** said that it was. Ms. Willis stated that obviously the roof drains will then be carrying more water. Also she stated that it is well known that there are serious drainage problems between this area and Bryon Avenue. She would like to see some sort of infiltration on site. She also mentioned that the trees which were cut down probably would have absorbed more runoff than the grass will. Also she wanted to discuss the grading to the house below.

**Mr. Trinkaus** said the limit of the fill is between the Carriage House and the house, and that there's a retaining wall that slopes back down to grade. That's the only area of significant fill there is. The whole lower section of the lot, the whole northern end, is basically unchanged. The filling is all occurring up close to the house. Regarding the infiltration, he said that the soils really have no infiltrative capacity because they've been disturbed over the years. It's not topsoil, loam, and then hardpan, he said. It's a mix of soils, and there isn't the ability to infiltrate that water into the ground.

**Ms. Willis** suggested a rain garden.

**Mr. Trinkaus** explained that the rain gardens work if there is some infiltrative capacity in the natural soil profile. It wouldn't work here., he said, because these soils don't perk. The water doesn't go anywhere. He felt the best thing to do is to create a good grass cover and a landscaped area that's mulched.

**Ms Willis** said that the grassy area will take the surface runoff, but she still wondered about the runoff from the leaders.

**Mr. Trinkaus** repeated that the runoff was all going into the system that was already in place.

**Ms Willis** felt that that the existing drainage system to Bryon Avenue is faulty.

**Mr. Trinkaus** said that he had worked on other properties that tied into old systems, and added that the old system here works well, and it conveys all the water down to Bryon Avenue.

**The Agent** wanted the Board to be satisfied that, with the filling of the wetland on this lot, the runoff would be accommodated. She cited the Valentine subdivision at the bottom of the hill. There is a house there that has extreme water problems in the basement. There is also a house on High Ridge between Bryon Avenue and this lot with severe water problems coming down the hill and ponding. The Agent stressed that many water problems have been experienced by several of the homes between Bryon Ave. and Peaceable St. She is not concerned with this application per se, other than with the fact that she feels the engineer for the project has to address the water problems in a way that satisfies the Board. Connecting the pipes to the existing drainage system leaves her concerned with what will happen below the catch basin.

**Mr. Trinkaus** said, "To my knowledge, this has all functioned well." He said that, when he was out there, the ground was "squishy," but he saw no evidence of sheet flow pushing leaves either on the lawn or into the wooded area. If there was a water problem, you'd see the evidence in the field, he said. He mentioned one house on the Valentine property that needed a sump pump in the basement, stating that it was because the basement was so deep there was no way to daylight a basement drain from there to the ditch on the east side of Bryon Avenue's property.

**Dr. Autori** said he had not walked the site and, therefore, would not vote on it, but he wanted to know if this was an application specifically to fill in that small wetland. Mr. Trinkaus said that it was. Dr. Autori asked if there was anything about filling in that wetland that will increase runoff from the lot, and Mr. Trinkaus said, "No. Filling it in doesn't have any effect one way or the other."

**Dr. Autori** referenced the engineer's comment that he had not seen evidence of sheet flow pushing the leaves. He asked Mr. Trinkaus how much of a slope they were talking about, and Mr. Trinkaus said it was a 1% to 2% slope. Dr. Autori then asked if he would normally expect to see leaves pushed by sheet flow on a slope of this degree. Mr. Trinkaus said he would, explaining that you get ponding behind the leaf matter, and it builds up until you see movement.

**The Chairman** asked if there was anything further, and reminded the Board that Mr. Walsh had recused himself.

**Mr. Jewell** said they were only looking to for permission to fill in this area of wetland, and that the only buffer area that exists is the buffer of this wetland, so, once it's filled in, the property is really no longer in an upland review area.

**Mr. Katz** stated that not one of the seven mandated considerations is offended by this application. He stood by his motion to approve.

**The Agent** confirmed that this was not a draft. She said that in anticipation of the Board's approval of this application, she had prepared some proposed conditions, which were distributed to the Board. One condition requires a report from an

engineer, prior to the issuance of the final Certificate of Zoning Compliance, that the drainage from the lot will not impact downhill properties.

**Ms. Willis** repeated that she felt the runoff to the existing drainage system should not be increased, and that they should have come back with a plan to address that. Hence, she would not support the approval.

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the application with the conditions suggested by the Agent. The motion passed, 6-1-1. Mrs. Willis was opposed, Dr. Autuori abstained, and Mr. Walsh recused.

## NEW ITEMS

3. **#2006-112-A-IW:** Request for amendment to the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, 100-foot upland review area for lakes. Requested by: Mamasasco Lake Improvement Fund, Katherine Fisher, President. *For discussion c/o IWA.*

**The Agent** said that the MLIF has been interested in protecting their lake with an increased limit on their upland review areas for years. Knowing that the Board was looking at increasing the limits in proposed revisions to the IWWR in 2005, the MLIF waited to see what Upland Review Area would be established. However, they now are asking to increase the limit from 75' to 100' for any activity surrounding the lake. The Agent stated that if the Board had gone to a full 100' limit, the Mamasasco association would have probably been satisfied, but with the 75' limit, they are proposing this increase in the limit and have provided a set of guidelines for development around the lake.

**The Agent** continued by saying that state statutes for wetlands do not have provisions for someone from the outside to propose a revision to the regulations, so this is not an application for a revision, but a request for the Board to look at its own regulations. She asked that the Board look this over, recognizing that the guidelines are not proposed to be adopted as the regulation, just the 100' review area would be the regulation. She added that the guidelines could be referenced in the amendment as an Appendix to the Wetlands Regulations, allowing the Board to create conditions based on those guidelines, which the Agent felt were very useful.

**Dr. Gelfman** said there is no reason that the Board couldn't extend that review area around the lake, and would recommend the same around Great Pond. He said that the Board hadn't had a 100-foot buffer the review of the Toll Brothers application, but they had effectively saved the watershed. He stated that 100' isn't very far with a steep slope as exists around Lake Mamasasco.

**The Agent** reminded the Board that they can regulate anything that may affect the lake, no matter how far away it is. Something 150' or 200' from the lake which is affecting the lake falls under their scrutiny. The 100' limit is just a general guideline, she said. She referenced the Old Sib lots which have been brought to the Board's

attention over the years. They are well over 100' from the lake, but because of their runoff which is steep and right into the lake, the Board has regulated activities in those areas.

**The Agent** continued to say that these guidelines and this type of a regulation might be appropriate for all of the lakes in Ridgefield. However, she would like to make sure that, if the Board considers adopting this, it should be specific to Lake Mamasasco at first, so that the MLIF's request would not be caught up in delays which may surround issues related to the other lakes. She told the Board that, if they decided to go through with this, they would have to set a public hearing date, which would probably be in January because of the 35 day requirement to refer an amendment to the DEP.

**Mr. McChesney** echoed the Agent's thought that this might be the basis in the future for consideration by other lakes.

**The Chairman** asked about scheduling the public hearing on the 14<sup>th</sup> of November.

**The Agent** stated that the Board needed an amendment to look at before scheduling a public hearing, and offered to draw up a proposed amendment. In that way, after reviewing the amendment on the 14<sup>th</sup>, the Board could go ahead and schedule the hearing for January if they decided to go forward.

**The Chairman** asked the Board to read the information submitted by the MLIF and the item would be scheduled for further discussion on 11/14/06. If the Board decides to adopt an amendment to the regulations for the increased Upland Review Area around Mamasasco Lake, a public hearing could be scheduled for the first meeting in January 2007, to allow time for the state-mandated referral to the CTDEP.

## **BOARD WALKS**

There were no site walks scheduled.

## **REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION**

**Chairman Mucchetti** pointed out a letter dated 10/24/06 from Kate Throckmorton of Environmental Land Solutions about wetlands mitigation work on-going at **11 Old Stagecoach Road**, and asked the Agent to explain Ms. Throckmorton's suggestion for a \$6,500 bond amount. A \$25,000 bond had been approved by the Board as part of the approval of the mitigation plan.

**The Agent** explained that the contractor had failed to submit the bond, but work had progressed at a rapid pace and substantial improvements and mitigation were completed in the past three weeks, as reported by Ms. Throckmorton in her field notes on a weekly basis. The office had no "leverage" to obtain the bond without issuing a Cease and Desist order, and then work would have to stop. Mr. Walsh felt strongly that a Cease and Desist would be appropriate and should be issued until the bond was received. Mr. Fossi

pointed out that a stop work order would defeat the purpose of achieving the mitigation, and it was evident that substantial work had already been completed.

**Mr. McChesney** noted that he had visited the site and talked to the contractor who informed him that sod would be placed on the entire slope below the Derby field at the end of the week, to stabilize that area. Work was also progressing on the field itself, where hydro-seeding would be applied.

There was continued discussion about the bond amount proposed by Ms. Throckmorton versus the original bond amount of \$25,000, and methods that could be taken to assure receipt of the bond. Mr. Fossi suggested that a \$10,000 bond would be an appropriate compromise, and it should be posted within 5 working days of the receipt of the notice to the contractor, or a Cease and Desist would be issued.

**Mr. Katz** motioned to set the bond amount with posting to be required within the 5 working-day time restriction, seconded by Mr. Fossi. The motion passed, 8-1, with Mr. Walsh opposed.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- **#2006-048-SR: 6 Cedar Lane, Novik** – letter from Aimee Pardee, Inland Wetlands Inspector dated 10/20/06 re filling of wetlands and mitigation plan.

**Chairman Mucchetti** asked the Agent to comment on the letter and memo written by the Wetlands Inspector. The Agent met with the homeowner in the office on 10/23 when the letter was discussed. The Agent and the Wetlands Inspector will meet with the homeowner and the excavation contractor on the site to determine compliance with the approved plan. The Board concurred that the matter could be handled administratively as long as there were no substantial deviations from the approved plan.

#### **MINUTES**

**Mrs. Willis** motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the minutes of October 10, 2006. Some corrections were suggested by Mr. Katz and Chairman Mucchetti. The minutes were approved, as amended, by a vote of 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

October 24, 2006

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

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

*A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.*

At 8:55 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

**PENDING ITEMS**

1. **#2006-075-A:** proposed Amendment to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations Section 305.01.C(1) – **Exempt Signs**, to permit establishment of Community Sign Boards and posting of temporary event signs. Commission Initiated. *For discussion/action.*

**Mr Katz** said that he was in agreement that this sort of thing was needed and good for the community, but what he fears is a proliferation of these sign boards, and “information littering.”

**Dr. Gelfman** said why not address that if it becomes a problem.

**The Chairman** suggested that the Commission confirm the proposed language. She asked for any comments on the proposed text. She also said there were some details that needed to be worked out before creating the regulation, for example, how long a sign can be left up on the board.

**The Planner** said that the duration had to do with the event, not the posting of the sign. Putting up a sign two weeks prior to the event and taking it down 24 hours after the event is what had been suggested. Attorney Fran Collins, legal counsel for the Commission, referring to proposed point #1, asked what constitutes a short term event. There was much discussion of various definitions of short term vs. ongoing events.

**The Chairman** read the proposed wording and asked if the Commission if it was comfortable with it. After, continued discussion of point #1 relating to the one day/short term issue, it was decided to leave it as is. Point #3 was clarified as to what was to be done when a school play went on for 2 weekends. It was explained that the event would then be considered to extend over the two weeks and the sign would need to be removed within 24 hrs. after the last performance. Related to point #4(a) about the size of the sign, Mr. Walsh asked why the Board would want to limit the size. Discussion ensued and the decision was made to change the size to be 2' X 2'. The Planner explained that this was partially considered because, if typical sheets of plywood were used for these sign boards, 2' X 2' signs would fit within the 4' X 8" dimensions of the plywood. Part 4(b), (pedestrian oriented sign boards), was included as presented.

**Mr. McChesney** said that, based on the discussion at the public hearing, the danger of having drive-by signs placed parallel to the road was pointed out. As it appeared that signs needed to be placed perpendicular to the road, he suggested the need to have them permitted on both sides of the sign board, enabling traffic from both directions to read the message. The Planner said that this could be added to the proposed regulations.

**The Chairman** continued with the proposed regulations, noting small changes to points #5 & #6, and noting approval of points #7 & #8 as presented.

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to adopt the amendment with the revisions discussed at the public hearing and at the table. The motion passed, 9-0.

2. **#2006-110-REV:** revision to Special Permit to construct a 5 bay vehicle repair addition to the existing Ridgefield BMW building located at **746 Danbury Road** in the B-2 and RAA zones. Owner: Eric Erhardt. Appl./Auth. Planner: James M. Hancock. *65-day action period ends 12/21/06. Received 10/17/06, walked 10/22/06.**Fordiscussion/action.*

**Mr. Katz** noted that this is a prohibited use in the Aquifer Protection Zone. However, he felt that it seems to be an appropriate ongoing use for an extant, very important business in the Ridgefield community. He added that this installation disrupts nothing but tarmac, and said there is every reason to believe that the technology that would be employed for the cleanout and sumps that are going to be required will exceed that which is currently in use in the existing service area.

**The Chairman** mentioned a letter from James Hancock Associates, which states that the site is flat, no additional site work is planned, no new site lighting is planned, and no new utilities are planned.

**The Planner** told the Commission that the applicant, Mr. Hancock, was present if they had any questions. She confirmed with the applicant that he had gone to the Architectural Advisory Committee prior to coming to the Commission. She stated

that the AAC recommended design approval with the following comments: bring the existing lighting on the building and the site flood lighting up to the current lighting regulation, and plant low shrubs along Route 7 similar to those at the Union Savings Bank on Danbury Road.

**The Planner** continued, saying that she had been approached by the zoning enforcement officer about two lights at the front of the property that shine in motorist's faces as they are traveling down Route 7. The company had been asked to tip the lights down, which they did, but the lights are back up. Dr. Autuori wanted a commitment that the lights would be brought into conformity.

**Mr. McChesney** wanted to comment on the suggestion by the AAC that shrubbery be planted along the grass strip along Route 7. He didn't feel that the suggestion was realistic, considering that road salts would be impacting any plantings in the narrow grass strip as a result of the widening of Route 7.

**Ms. Willis** asked what would happen to the runoff from the roof leaders. Mr. Hancock replied that the plan was to "spill on grade". The Planner confirmed that this was the plan for the new addition, and Mr. Hancock said that it was.

**The Planner** said that, if the Commission was going to approve this, there needed to be conditions as suggested by the AAC, and also the condition that it must be reviewed by the Fire Marshall, who is currently out of town. If, after his review, there are substantial changes, the Commission would have to review it again, she said. However, she did not anticipate that there was going to be a problem. The Commission agreed that the planting of shrubbery on the grass strip would be a futile effort.

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve the request for Revision to the Special Permit, with the conditions suggested by the Planner and the AAC pertaining to exterior lighting, compliance with requirements of the Fire Marshal, including implementation of oil separators as may be needed to protect the aquifer. The motion passed, 9-0. The Chairman confirmed that this was not a draft, but a final.

3. Request for determination of suitability of a proposed use for the MCDD zone, c/o Planning Director. Re: Health & Wellness Center for **901 Ethan Allen Highway**. For continued discussion/action.

The applicant did not appear for continued discussion, and the item will be placed on the agenda at a future date.

## **NEW ITEMS**

4. **#2006-111-REF:** Referral for drainage easement to enable drainage improvements under Section 8-24 of the Connecticut State Statutes. Property located on Cross Hill

Road and Shady Lane in the RA zone. Owners: Anrico/Hung. Referred by Town of Ridgefield. *For action.*

**The Planner** referred to a map that had been passed out and explained that there is a very substantial wetland at the western side of the Bennett's Pond property, contiguous to many of the small lots around Fox Hill Lake. This is a drainage easement that would come from Cross Hill down the hill toward that wetland under Shady Lane. She was not sure why the Commission received the 8-24 referral, but did not have a problem with the request.

**Ms. Willis** asked that there be some sort of plunge pool if it's appropriate, so that there could be easy clean out. The Planner said they could work with the Highway Department on this. She added that the Highway Department has been especially cooperative about installing measures to protect wetlands.

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to issue a favorable report regarding the proposed drainage easement, with a statement that the Highway Department should consult with the wetlands staff concerning any drainage systems that empty into wetlands, to insure proper design to protect the wetlands. The motion passed, 9-0.

#### **COMMISSION WALKS**

There were no walks scheduled.

#### **REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION**

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

**Chairman Mucchetti** noted the Planner's hand-out on "Sign Pollution."

#### **MINUTES**

**Mr. Katz** motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of October 10, 2006. Mrs. Willis offered a few corrections. The minutes were approved by a vote of 9-0. Chairman Mucchetti complimented the new recording secretary, Linda Caponetti, on her ability to accurately and clearly report the Commission's discussion in the minutes.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti  
Recording Secretary