

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

November 4, 2009

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
James McChesney
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman

Absent: Peter Chipouras

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

Planning and Zoning Commission public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 8:15 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2009-047-PR:** Plenary Ruling application as required by Section 7.6 of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Regulations for the Town of Ridgefield for regulated activities within the wetlands and upland review areas for piping and reconstruction of watercourses in conjunction with the development of a single family residence on property located on **Second and Third Lanes** in the RA zone. Owner: Wayne E. Wood and The Estate of Charles F. Dean, Jr. Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy, VII, P.E. *Received 6/16/2009. Walked 6/28/2009 and 9/27/2009. Public hearing commenced 7/21/2009. Extension granted thru 10/13/2009. Continued public hearing 9/1/2009, 9/8/2009, 9/22/2009, 10/13/2009 and 10/20/2009. Extension granted thru 10/20/2009 (56 of 65 days of extension used thru 10/20/2009). Public hearing closed 10/20/2009. 35-day action period ends 11/24/2009. For action.*

Mr. McChesney asked Chairman Mucchetti if Commissioners who were absent for public hearing discussions had been able to listen to the tapes. Chairman Mucchetti, Mr. Mische and Dr. Autuori all confirmed that they had listened to the tapes for meetings where they had missed the public hearings.

Chairman Mucchetti announced that written comments from Town Engineer, Charles Fisher and the Board's consultant, Terri Hahn, of LADA had been received by staff post hearing, and were available at the table.

Agent Brosius said that legal counsel had confirmed that these comments would be admissible in the record (even after the close of the public hearing), because they were from staff and the Board's consultant, and had been received through staff.

Mr. Walsh was concerned as to the Board's ability to assess "this very challenging application," given the lack of information coming from the applicant and by the inability to hear the applicant's response to questions later raised by Mr. Fisher and Terri Hahn. Mr. Walsh noted that the applicant was made aware of the time constraints and the fact that he would not be able to participate in later discussions between the Agent, engineer and consultant. Mr. Walsh felt that these conditions present an obstacle in deliberating this application.

Mr. Katz was less concerned with these voids in information. He was prepared to address the application based on the information which had already been received, including the questions that were asked and answered during the public hearing, and the comments that were received from Mr. Fisher and Ms. Hahn after the close of the hearing. He said that a negative decision by the Board would not preclude the applicant from coming back with an application that addresses all the comments and concerns, including those which were introduced after the public hearing.

Dr. Autuori asked the Agent if the Board could require some of the points listed by the Town Engineer and the consultant as conditions of approval.

The Agent said the Town Engineer's comments could easily be turned into conditions, which the applicant would probably have no objection to, but, the consultant's comments would involve some decisions by the Board.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Gelfman, to request the Agent to draft a Resolution of Denial. Mr. Katz then went into a detailed explanation of his reasons for the denial, based on consideration of the individual paragraphs in Sec. 10.2 of the wetlands regulations.

Mr. Katz referred to Sec. 10.2 to analyze what he called an "exceptionally complicated application," point by point. He had high praise for the work and presentation by engineer, John McCoy. (The agent distributed copies of Sec. 10.2 for the Board.)

Mr. Katz addressed each point saying that the issues included, but, were not limited to the following [paragraphs in 10.2 of the IWWR]:

- a) The environmental impact of the proposed regulated activity...
The impact of the proposed activity is entirely within the wetlands, watercourses or upland review area. Every aspect of the construction from the driveway to the septic system is described as "serious," with "the potential to negatively impact both immediately and in the long term several areas surrounding the proposed project,

including Lake Mamanasco itself, which would be the recipient of most of the negative impact that the construction and its long term effects would have.

b) The alternatives to the proposed action...

Mr. Katz cited alternatives suggested by Dr. Autuori to the construction of the house, i.e., elevating approximately 20% of the house, which was proposed to be constructed in the wetlands. Testimony suggested that this could be done. The engineer did not recommend that, but it would certainly be a potential feasible alternative.

c) The relationship between short term and long term impacts...

The proposed regulated activity poses probable to certain short term and possible long term negative effects on Lake Mamanasco, Mr. Katz said, due to siltation and the deposits that could occur, according to testimony by the Mamanasco Lake Association. It was noted by the association that they had received estimates as high as \$50,000 for the remediation of such deposits, if remediation were possible, he added.

The impervious surface of 2850 s.f. was adjusted to 2500 s.f. of impacted wetlands due to the substitution of pervious pavers. Approximately 10- 12% of the parcel would be filled or lost with the proposed activity. The proposed 2200 linear foot armored watercourse could also cause both short and long term negative impact on the lake, Mr. Katz felt. The two proposed septic pipe crossings of the longer stream also pose potential serious short term negative impacts on the lake and downstream properties, and possible long term negative effects, he said.

d) Irreversible and irretrievable loss of wetland or watercourses...

2500 s.f. or 2850 s.f. wetlands would be filled or lost, and 2200 linear feet of armored watercourse would be altered. The proposal eliminates wetlands and alters the course of the stream. It creates an encased waterway in one place, as opposed to the open watercourse which exists today. The natural stream bed, with the characteristics of such, is a phenomenon which will be destroyed by the piping, Mr. Katz said.

e) The character and degree of injury...

The downstream property which will be seriously affected is Lake Mamanasco itself, Mr. Katz said, a body of water already recognized by all State and local entities regulating or monitoring the health of lakes as extremely fragile. Testimony from the association states that remediation would be prohibitively expensive.

f) The impact of the proposed activity on wetlands or watercourses outside the area... [See all (a through e above) of the above].

Mr. Katz felt that these were sufficient reasons to deny this application, again stressing that there are no parts of the project which do not negatively impact the wetlands and watercourses on the property and the downstream properties, most notably Lake Mamanasco.

Dr. Gelfman complimented Mr. McCoy's presentation, as well, saying that it was "exceptionally frank and quite ingenious." However, the plan calls for piping the effluent horizontally across the entire parcel, he said, which contains many smaller rivulets and watercourses under the rocks. Dr. Gelfman questioned how it could be possible to traverse the rock for the required septic piping without altering the rocks completely and creating a compact barrier. That would change the character of the lot with respect to the water coming down the hillside, which is now dispersed by the rocks and absorbed to some degree by all the trees that would have to be removed, he said.

Mr. McChesney made mention of the additional fact that the driveway, which eventually will be paved, is within the upland review area of the watercourse which will contribute to the detrimental effect on Lake Mamasasco. He noted that the applicant intends to install a sizeable "grit chamber," in an attempt to minimize the debris reaching the lake. However, Mr. McChesney is concerned that the chamber will not be adequately maintained. It requires maintenance for hundreds of years, he said, and was not at all comfortable that proper maintenance would be done by the homeowners. There was no other agency assigned responsibility for ongoing maintenance, he noted.

Dr. Autuori defended some aspects of the application. He cited Sec. 10.3, saying that a feasible and prudent alternative had been suggested. Also, referring to Sec. 10.2, he said that some of the conditions observed on the site walk show scouring of the stream. He felt that the way the stream would be rip rapped, armored and check dammed, it may actually pose less of a threat to the lake, resulting in less siltation and sedimentation. Hence, the application is not all negative in Dr. Autuori's view. An agricultural use of the property would be a lot worse than the plan proposed, he said. He also addressed each individual parts of Sec. 10.2, and offered comment:

- a) The environmental impact of the proposed activity on wetlands or watercourses: He sees both positives, (the properly installed and implemented sedimentation and erosion controls), and negatives (which have been stated.)
- b) The alternatives to the proposed action: The basic objective is to build a house.
- c) The relationship between the short-term and long-term impacts of the proposed regulated activity: Short term impact from the construction is inevitable. Long term impact may be beneficial with regard to the clarity of the water flowing into the lake.
- d) Irreversible and irretrievable loss of wetland or watercourse resources: Where the house would go, there is loss. Where the septic fields would go, the grass may be more of a stabilizing factor than the leaf litter and sparse vegetation currently on site.
- e) The character and degree of injury to...: The ultimate effect of well maintained sedimentation and erosion controls on the property could be positive. He acknowledged the cause for concern expressed by Mr. McChesney with regard to

the ongoing maintenance required. He also addressed Dr. Gelfman's comments about soil compaction around the sewer lines, saying that the work could conceivably be done by hand.

This is "an amazing job of engineering" by Mr. McCoy, Dr. Autuori said. In retrospect, he was not sure that his suggestion for the house being on piers was prudent. He would not say that the lot is unbuildable. With all of the objections, he wondered if the applicant could try another approach. He was concerned that the applicant may feel that would be a lost cause.

Dr. Autuori said he would vote against the application because he feels there are some prudent and feasible alternatives.

Mr. Mische was persuaded that Sec. 10.2 clearly forbids the approval of this project. He said he feels that the water on the property is not fully understood. Its origin has not been clearly identified, he said. While he could see some merit to the points made by Dr. Autuori, he felt the risk of development could be "completely and utterly destructive to this piece of land and to the surrounding land and watercourses."

Mr. Katz amplified his previous comments with reference to Sec. 10.2 a. He cited sections from the Conservation Commission's letter of 7/29 and also quoted the wetland Agent's memo of 7/20/09 (specifically p.3, item 8) in answering the questions of environmental impact. He also questioned the suggestion that this parcel could be used for agricultural use.

Mr. McChesney asked about the outcome of a prior application requesting the use of Third Lane as the access, (which was brought before the Board during his absence). The Agent and Chairman said the item had been withdrawn due to an outstanding legal issued regarding disputed ownership of Third Lane and the fact that the timeline had been exhausted.

Agent Brosius referenced her staff report of 7/20/09, noting that the proposed driveway from Third Lane was in excess of 14% grade. During the review, the applicant presented an alternate design using Second Lane for access. The driveway on Second Lane does not exceed 14% and no Special Permit is required, she said. The proposed driveway off Third Lane was adjacent to a watercourse "in far worse shape than the one next to Second Lane," she added, noting a lot of scouring and very deep cuts. The current application is the alternative proposed during the previous application review.

Mr. McChesney said he had looked over the....Mamasasco Lake Association's Guidelines for development (which were adopted by the Board as an Appendix to the IWWR) and felt that the guidelines apply to this lot and indicate that development of it would be detrimental to the lake.

Mr. Katz said that the record should reflect the fact that the engineer substituted pervious paving blocks for the asphalt paving, reducing the impervious coverage from 10% to 8%, in line with the Lake Association's document.

Chairman Mucchetti called for a vote on Mr. Katz's motion. The motion to draft a denial passed by a vote of 8-0 in favor. The resolution will come back to the table in about 2 weeks.

2. **#2009-084-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Section 7.5 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations for the Town of Ridgefield for drainage and discharge into wetlands on property located at **161 Spectacle Lane** in the RAA zone. Owner/App.: Tom Sturges. *Walked 9/27/2009. 10/6/2009 Agent authorized to retain soils scientist (fees paid by applicant) to re-flag wetlands boundary. Walked 10/18/2009. 65-day action period ends 11/26/2009. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Attorney Robert Jewell, representing the applicant. The Chairman read a memorandum written by Wetlands Inspector/Agent Aimee Pardee, with recommendations for conditions of approval of the application.

Mr. Jewell said that, after walking the property, he feels that the stone scour holes appear to be a sufficient remedy for the pipe outlets. He said that Mr. Sturges has made improvements over the conditions previous on the site, such as removing the septic system which had been in the wetland. He restored the area to the natural grasses. "Despite the work that's done there," Mr. Jewell said, "the wetlands are probably in much better shape than they were before Mr. Sturges got there." With regard to the possible expansion of the lawn by a future property owner, Mr. Sturges would be agreeable to placing boulders to delineate the edge of the lawn.

The Chairman said Agent Pardee has suggested a remedy. Agent Brosius agreed that Ms. Pardee's suggestion for a bio-filtration planting area is preferable to just placing stones at the pipe outlet, because the filtration afforded by the plantings is greater.

The Chairman asked Agent Brosius if Wetlands Agent Inspector, Aimee Pardee would be working with any design that would be a condition of approval.

Agent Brosius said Ms. Pardee suggested that the Board could approve the application with a condition requiring submission of a landscape architect's plan for a bio-filtration system to her for implementation.

Mr. Jewell asked for clarification of what the location and limitation of the system would be.

Mr. Fossi wanted to leave to Ms. Pardee and the applicant the decision as to whether or not it would be prudent to pipe both drain outlets (a footing drain and a driveway drain) together, so that there would be only one detention basin.

The Agent thought Ms. Pardee was suggesting the addition of a system, but, not that the pipes be dug up and re-directed. She said the most important pipe, which takes the driveway runoff, is the one that flows into the woods.

Mr. Jewell said that the drain on the left hand side that comes off the leaders already goes into a channel that runs into what looks like a natural berm. It appears to be almost self-regulating, although it may require some stone, Mr. Jewell said.

Dr. Autuori said he visited the site and was impressed by the fact that there was very little pitch from the driveway out toward and into the wetlands. It's difficult to get a sense of where the upland merges into the wetland, he said. How would a bio-filtration system be appropriate where there is already standing water, Dr. Autuori wondered. How would it work? He asked for clarification of what Ms. Pardee was proposing. There doesn't seem to be much velocity to the water coming out of the drain, he added.

The Agent said it would be a shallow swale, acting like a small detention area. All through the swale would be plantings. At the end of the swale, there would be a stone filter where the water exits into the wetland. This system would act as a buffer between the pipe's outlet and the wetland.

So this would be a shallow, broad swale (not a dry swale) with plantings, Dr. Autuori confirmed, adding that it would probably be under water much of the time.

Mr. Walsh asked why the runoff could not be allowed as sheet flow off the back side of the driveway, across the lawn area into the wetlands. That would take care of the thermal spiking, Mr. Walsh felt.

Mr. McChesney was not in favor of the idea because the land is so wet. If it sheet flows, it will never dry out, he said. He would prefer to pipe the water.

Mr. Katz said that Ms. Pardee used the term "the pipes," and appears to be referring to both pipes. He would prefer to have her recommendations followed per se.

Mr. Fossi agreed, saying he felt the decision should be left to Ms. Pardee and Mr. Sturges.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to request a draft resolution of approval, incorporating Ms. Pardee's recommendations.

Mr. Mische said that the use of boulders to delineate the lawn area was not sufficient to prevent mowing. He asked that a stipulation be added to require that the wetland grasses be left unmown, or mown only at prescribed intervals.

The Agent said that the area had been lawn for a very long time. It has now been disturbed, and looks like brand new lawn, but, the area covered appears to be similar to what was previously covered by lawn.

Mr. Jewell said the homeowner has the right to maintain the limits of the existing lawn because the lawn pre-dated the wetlands regulations.

Dr. Autuori said the delineation boulders should be at the edge of the lawn, not where the wetland flags are.

As the maker of the motion, **Mr. Fossi** stipulated that the boulders delineating the lawn area be large enough to preclude their being moved by a person.

The motion passed, 8-0. The draft resolution will be prepared in time for final vote at the meeting to be held on November 10th.

NEW ITEMS

There were no new items.

BOARD WALKS

There were no site walks to be scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

Chairman Mucchetti noted that there were two requests for release of bonds, and asked for a motion to add the items to the agenda. Mr. Walsh motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to add the items to the agenda for discussion and action. The motion passed, 8-0.

- **#95125-SR:** Request for release of \$1,000 bond posted for installation of a septic line crossing wetlands, for a project at **15 Cedar Lane** that was completed in 1998.

Mr. Walsh motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to release the bond in full as recommended by the Agent. The motion passed, 8-0.

- **#20048-SR:** Request for release of \$1,000 bond posted for home construction within the upland review area of wetlands at **23 Pond Road**, construction completed in 2001.

Mr. Walsh motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to release the bond in full, as recommended by the Agent. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Katz pointed out a court case about a decision made by the wetlands agency of the Town of Torrington, sent by e-mail from the Agent to Boardmembers.

MINUTES

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve the minutes of October 20, 2009. The motion passed, 5-0-3, with Dr. Autuori, Mr. Mische and Chairman Mucchetti abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REIVSED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

November 4, 2009

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
James McChesney
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman

Absent: Peter Chipouras

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

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 9:15 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2009-071-A:** Proposed Amendment to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, **Section 3.5.F and 3.5.G.**, Maximum Lot Coverage and Floor Area in the Residential Zones and **Section 3.6.C**-Lot Coverage Exceptions. Commission initiated.

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing had been closed and asked for discussion on the item.

Mr. McChesney said he had requested a printout of lots larger than two acres from Town Assessor Al Garzi. He listed statistics detailing the numbers of lots affected and their acreage.

Mr. Mische said he needed more time to digest the numbers in the proposed amendment, and asked that a final decision not be made at this meeting.

Mr. Katz felt it was important to remember what the Commission is trying to do, which is to essentially unburden itself from the 140% rule in favor of a “numerically nuanced formula” for how much building can be done on how much land. Looked at in that context, it seems simpler to decide, he said.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Dr. Gelfman, to table discussion on the item until the meeting to be held on November 17th. The motion passed, 8-0.

2. **#2009-083-A:** Proposed Amendment to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, **Section 3.2.C.2** Special Permit Uses on Town-owned or Town-Leased Land. Commission initiated.

Mr. Walsh noted that he had a professional affiliation with the Community Center and recused himself from all discussion and deliberation on this item. He also had not participated in the public hearing.

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing had been closed and asked for discussion on the item.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to adopt the proposed amendment. Mr. Katz noted that the language of the amendment made sense, and offered clarity for the special permit process for public uses on town-owned or town-leased land.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-1, with Mr. Walsh recused. [Note: The amendment will become effective upon publication of the legal notice of approval.]

3. **#2009-086-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.3.D.2 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to operate a major home occupation from the residence located at **155 Tanton Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owner/Appl.: Felicia Jamieson. *Received 9/29/2009. Walked 10/18/2009. Public hearing commenced 11/4/2009. 65-day action period ends 1/8/2010. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing had been closed and asked for discussion on the application.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the application as presented. Mr. Katz pointed out that the home occupation is a “benign internal use” of the property, and there would be no measurable increase in traffic for the neighborhood with normal residential UPS deliveries being the extent of impact.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a vote of 8-0. [This is a final decision.]

4. **#2009-091-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.6.C.(Lot Coverage Exceptions) of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for a detached pole barn on property located at **35 South Olmstead Lane** in the RAA and RA zones. Owners/Appls.: Charles and Karen Belardinelli. *Received 10/13/2009. Walked 10/18/2009. Public hearing commenced 11/4/2009. 65-day action period ends 1/8/2010. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing had been closed and asked for discussion on the application.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the application as presented. The motion passed, 8-0. [This is a final decision.]

NEW ITEMS

5. **#2009-097-VDC:** Village District application under Section 8.3 as required by Section 5.1 of the zoning regulations, to permit the installation of windows and building signage for a “The Perennial Chef” coffee shop at **449 Main Street** (former Cortina Shop) in the CBD zone. Owner: Addressi Center II, LLC, Applicant/Auth.Agent: Michael Tierney, Paul Krause Architects. *35 days to received VDC report ends 12/9/2009. For receipt/schedule walk if needed.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site visit for 11/8/09, to observe the location and appearance of the wall where exterior changes are proposed.

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site visit as suggested. The motion passed, 8-0.

6. **#2009-099-SP:** Special Permit under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.4.D.3 to permit a horse barn in the front yard on property located at **259 Spring Valley Road** in the RAAA zone. Owner/Apl.: Nora Suppers. *65 days to commence public hearing ends 1/8/2010. For receipt, schedule walk and public hearing.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site walk for 11/8/09 and a public hearing for 11/24/09.

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk and public hearing as suggested. The motion passed, 8-0.

7. **#2009-100-MISC:** Six wood boxes for campsites at Sturges Park, **217 Rippowam Road**, Eagle Scout project. *Discussion c/o P.D.*

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out a memo from the Planner, and asked her to explain the item.

Planner Brosius stated that the park is a Special Permit use and any change would be of concern to adjacent neighbors. She referenced information submitted by Parks and Recreation Commission Chairman Phil Kearns, describing an Eagle Scout project to construct six small wood boxes at the existing established campsites at Sturges Park. The Planner’s memo states that the boxes do not require building or zoning permits, and it is her opinion that the installation of these boxes will not change the current use of the park nor will it increase the intensity of use. The boxes are a minor amenity to keep the wood dry at the campsites, and no formal Revision to the Special Permit is

required. She asked for the Commission's endorsement and agreement with the statements in the memorandum.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to acknowledge and agree with the Planner's statements in the Planner's memorandum. The motion passed, 8-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

The Commission scheduled the following items for site visits on **November 8, 2009**:

- **#2009-097-VDC**: Village District application, **The Perennial Chef, 449 Main Street**, Michael Tierney, Architect (if necessary)
- **#2009-099-SP**: Special Permit **259 Spring Valley Road**, Suppers

The following item had been previously scheduled for site walk on **November 8, 2009**:

- **#2009-096-SP**: Special Permit **48 Peaceable Hill Road**, Harford

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

Chairman Mucchetti noted that there was one request for release of bond, and asked for a motion to add the item to the agenda. Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to add the item to the agenda for discussion and action. The motion passed, 8-0.

- **#94137-ACC**: Request for release of bond posted in conjunction with accessway construction at **15 Cedar Lane**, a project completed in 1998.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to release the bond in full as recommended by the Planner. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Letter from the Planner to Commission Counsel, seeking legal advice on a property at Eleven Levels Road and West Mountain Road, subject to a Stipulation for Judgment.
- Appeal of the Commission's denial of the Major Home Occupation application for **23 McKeon Place**, submitted to Danbury Superior Court.
- Decision by the Court in favor of the Commission's decision on a Major Home Occupation at **225 South Salem Road**, dismissing the appeal filed by neighbors.

MINUTES

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve the minutes of October 20, 2009. The motion passed, 5-0-3, with Dr. Autuori, Mr. Mische and Chairman Mucchetti abstained.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary