

December 10, 2013

MINUTES: THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing & Regular Meeting on Wednesday, December 4, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the Thornton Wilder Hall, Miller Memorial Library Complex, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, CT with the following results:

Commissioners in attendance:

Nancy Rosenbaum, Chairperson
 Mike Montgomery
 Joan Lakin
 Andy Brand
 Bob Gnida
 Kirk Shadle
 Kirsten Jensen
 Mike Milazzo, arrived at 7:11
 Bob Anastasio

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
 Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
 Tom Vocelli, IW Enforcement Officer
 Stacy Shellard, Commission Clerk
 Genevieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Ms. Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Mr. Brand called the roll and there was a quorum. Ms. Rosenbaum introduced the Commission and Staff and explained the Public Hearing procedure.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for a motion to hear Application 13-1199 prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Brand made the motion to hear Application 13-1199 prior to the public hearing. Ms. Lakin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

I. Public Hearing

- a. 13-1196** 275 & 475 Mt Carmel Avenue - reconstruction of athletic fields
 Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Mr. Bernard Pellegrino, addressed the Commission and stated that revised plans have been submitted with supporting reports. He said that the historical nature of the fields have been researched and will be addressed.

Mr. Howard Pfrommer, Civil Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the historic sites starting with the original approval in 1990. He reviewed comparisons of the original approvals of the fields starting in 1990 and an overlay of the current existing conditions for the northern field original municipal approval drawing vs. natural turf construction drawing(Exhibit A-Sheet WL1.0), the southern field original municipal approval drawing vs. natural turf construction drawing((Exhibit B-Sheet WL1.1), the northern field original municipal approval drawing vs. existing

conditions(Exhibit C-Sheet WL2.0) and the southern field original municipal drawing vs. natural turf conditions(Exhibit D-Sheet WL2.1).

Mr. Pfrommer reviewed the revised plans dated November 22, 2013 and a letter outlining the revisions made to the proposed plan after the November 6, 2013 meeting. He read the revised notes on the plans.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the existing notes and the added notes to the revised plans for during and after construction have been consolidated into one document(Exhibit E-Wetland Management Plan, dated November 26, 2013). The original plantings on Hogan Road that have died or were damaged have been replaced. Mr. Pellegrino submitted photos(Exhibit F) showing the new plantings and the wetland markers in place. He explained that during the site inspection it was noted that there was debris placed within the wetlands and that has been removed. Mr. Pellegrino stated that the grounds staff has been instructed that they are prohibited from placing debris within the wetlands.

Mr. Gnida asked if the borings for the monitoring wells with PVC pipes are for determining the depth to water. Mr. Pfrommer replied yes and noted that the geo-technical engineer had been monitoring them, but believes he had stopped. Mr. Gnida asked if a report was generated. Mr. Pfrommer thought that a report was submitted on August 15, 2013. Mr. Gnida could not locate boring B110 on any of the site plans. Mr. Pfrommer said he will investigate to determine where it is located. Mr. Gnida stated that the size for sub basin two has been reduced. It includes the western wetland area and is a mini watershed. He noticed the peak discharges are about one half of what it previously was and the sub basin area is a lot smaller than what it was. Mr. Gnida asked if a map will be submitted that shows the same amount of water going into the west wetland because there are no subterranean detention structures as there are in the south field and the eastern wetland. Mr. Pfrommer reviewed the preconstruction and the post construction watershed maps (Sheets WS1.0 and WS2.0 submitted November 22, 2013) vs. the 1990 approval.

Mr. Gnida is concerned that there will be less water going to the western wetland and it will not perform to its rightful function. Mr. Pfrommer noted that for sub area two, a 100- year storm is 1.8 csf and proposed is 1.15 csf. For a two year storm the existing is .44 and proposed is .23. Mr. Gnida referred to the hydro-logic report submitted November 22, 2013, page 2, 2nd paragraph, third sentence, an underground detention structure is proposed which will not be similar to a swale. He asked if water will be collected differently and discharged differently in the south field. Mr. Pfrommer stated that the water that runs through the southern field will be collected by the sub drainage and will have an underground detention system. Mr. Gnida asked if the water will infiltrate through three inch diameter pipes. Mr. Pfrommer explained that there will be 10-three inch perforated pipes with crushed stone. They did not account for water to go into the ground because it will go through the system. Mr. Gnida asked if there is a maintenance plan for the structure and Mr. Pfrommer replied yes.

Mr. Montgomery prepared a report and referred to section 4.4 of Ms. Chase's report which indicated that the existing drainage patterns associated with the athletic fields will not be altered by the proposed activities. This conclusion seems to be different from the hydro-logic report. He noted that both reports were prepared on November 22, 2013, so maybe she did not consider the hydro-logic report. He feels there is a discrepancy because Ms. Chase indicated that the drainage patterns would not be altered. It was indicated that in 1991 there was more drainage to wetland number one than after the drainage was done in 1991. When the synthetic fields were built in 2004 the water went back to wetland one with an under drain. Mr. Montgomery said that he was unable to locate the drain.

Mr. Richard Snarski, Soil Scientist, addressed the Commission and stated that he could see the drainage pipe, but that there was no water coming out of it.

Mr. Montgomery referenced the subareas in the hydro-logic report. He noted several changes in the drainage that have potential to affect wetlands. For wetland #1, it is proposed to shift the drainage ditch outlet 40 feet south and 20 feet east and 75 percent of the surface area draining to it from the east and northeast will be diverted away from the wetland. He anticipates substantial changes in the quality and function of these wetlands.

Mr. Pfrommer referred to the 1990 approval and stated that it was approved to take water away from the wetland and flow it to the south. In 2004 it was approved to put the water back. This proposal is requesting to take it away again. Mr. Montgomery stated that the 2004 proposal was closer to the natural state of the wetland.

Mr. Montgomery referred back to his report and stated that wetland #2 would have substantial changes in the pattern of surface water draining to it. This area is presently fed by sheet flow along most of the 1000 foot length that is adjacent to the southern athletic fields. Mr. Pfrommer reviewed the sheet flow direction with Mr. Montgomery. Mr. Montgomery further stated that retaining walls will be placed along much of this length, blocking sheet flow. Mr. Pfrommer said there are two retaining walls. Mr. Montgomery asked if the water will flow over the walls. Mr. Pfrommer said that the water will go through the walls because of the type of materials used to construct them and through the artificial turf. Mr. Montgomery asked if the water will go across the artificial turf and Mr. Pfrommer stated yes.

Mr. Montgomery stated that presently there is a point of discharge from an underground drain (#5 on WS1.0) that feeds some of the best quality habitat of the wetland. This discharge will be diverted to a combined outlet. He anticipates that changes from sheet flow and discharge points to a single point source further south (downstream) will cause substantial localized changes in wetland #2.

Mr. Pfrommer reviewed sheet C6.1 dated November 22, 2013 which shows the existing storm drainage with Mr. Montgomery. Mr. Montgomery said that the coefficient number for artificial turf is the same as natural grass. He asked if the water goes through the artificial turf grass faster, because the coefficient number is the same. Mr. Pfrommer stated that he was being conservative. The general drainage patterns are for one field that is artificial and the other is natural and has the same pattern. If the outlet were to be moved, Mr. Pfrommer is not sure how the wetland will be affected. There is an established ditch in the area. Mr. Montgomery is trying to understand the pipes and drainage under the field. Mr. Pfrommer explained that the existing field is underlaid with a drainage system which consists of crushed stone and is wrapped in geo-textile for both fields in their entirety. The water goes through the topsoil and goes fast through the crushed stone. Mr. Montgomery asked how many pipes were under the field. Mr. Pfrommer said the entire fields are crushed stone. Mr. Montgomery asked if there were pipes under the fields. Mr. Pfrommer stated there are three pipes existing under the southern field. Mr. Montgomery asked if whether natural field or synthetic field the water is being intercepted or held in the stone layer. Also, how much water will enter into the ground water system by moving down or be brought to daylight by the pipe system. Mr. Pfrommer said that the assumption is that none will get into the ground. The coefficients used were conservative because all the fields have crushed stone and three inch pipes. Mr. Pfrommer and Mr. Montgomery further discussed the storm drainage system.

Mr. Montgomery stated that the existing artificial turf field is irrigated in the south and north field. Mr. Pfrommer stated that the existing north field is irrigated. Mr. Montgomery stated that the plans do not show irrigation. There will be 7,000 gallons a day of water put onto the soccer field which is artificial turf. He anticipates that there will be 10,000 gallons of water put on both fields each day. Mr. Pfrommer explained that it would be approximately 5,000 gallons a day when the field is being used for a game. Mr. Montgomery observed the sprinklers working on a Sunday when there was no activity. He feels it was being done to keep the field cool, and also noted an over spray. He would like clarification as to the effects the over spray has on the wetlands. Mr. Pfrommer said the southern field is irrigated and reviewed sheet C6.1. He explained that they are looking at ways to limit the spray angle and the intent is not to over spray. Mr. Pfrommer and Mr. Montgomery further discussed the irrigation system and amount of over spray that comes from it.

Mr. Shadle referred to sheet 6.1 and asked if the detention system for the irrigation system is also servicing the water runoff for the buildings to the north. Mr. Pfrommer explained that the detention pond is also for natural events. The piping feeding to the detention pond is coming from a trench along the edge of the driveway. Mr. Shadle asked what the role is for the detention system. Mr. Pfrommer said the detention system limits water and peak discharge. Mr. Shadle asked if the final output from the system would go to the 40 feet linear level spreader into the wetland and Mr. Pfrommer replied yes.

Ms. Jodie Chase, Wetland Ecologist addressed the Commission. Mr. Shadle referred to Ms. Chase's report, Section 4.4, Field Drainage and Water Quality. He noted that Ms. Chase referred to the effects of the runoff and infiltrating the ground water as it does today, as well as referring to the report from Milone and MacBroom about the surface water quality. He asked if she had referred to it and read the report. Ms. Chase replied yes. Mr. Shadle asked Ms. Chase what her professional response was to the report. Ms. Chase stated that she concurred with Milone and MacBroom because they were the experts and she was reiterating what was in the report. Mr. Shadle asked if Ms. Chase had reviewed Milone and MacBroom's reference material and she replied no. Mr. Shadle stated that the 2010 DEEP report referenced the same material. He was surprised that the DEEP finding on page 19, Section 3, Aquatic Toxicity, found high levels of aquatic toxicity and particularly zinc. The study states that there is a high risk with high level of toxicity and zinc. He asked Ms. Chase if she could speak to this and Ms. Chase replied she could not. Ms. Chase stated that she referenced Section 4.4 from Milone & MacBroom's report and did not check their work or references. Mr. Shadle said that the DEEP report is contradicting what is being reported by Ms. Chase and Milone & MacBroom. Ms. Chase said her report was based on what was reported by Milone and MacBroom and Mr. Shadle should address them if there are questions about their report. Mr. Shadle stated that Ms. Chase did state that there would not be a significant impact to the wetlands. Ms. Chase stated that she restated in her report what was in Milone and MacBroom's report. Mr. Shadle reviewed the DEEP conclusion and asked if based on their statement if Ms. Chase thought there would be an impact to the wetlands. Ms. Chase replied that she had not read the DEEP report.

Mr. Vince McDermott, Milone & MacBroom, addressed the Commission. Mr. Shadle asked if based on the report the DEEP was referenced and he asked if Mr. McDermott had read their report. Mr. McDermott replied that he had read the report. Mr. Shadle submitted the final DEEP report, Artificial Turf Study, Dated July 2010, pages 1-24(Exhibit G). Mr. McDermott stated that the report he read was more expansive and the final report appears to be a summary. He said he reviewed the report(Exhibit G) and said that the zinc test done on four fields had not identified the nature of the fields and how they were constructed. He noted that the critical point is the higher the acidity of the water the greater the potential for the release of zinc. The key component is the nature of the stone as found as it relates to the zinc. The release of zinc from the dynamic stone is affected by the salt and when the PH changed and is no longer as acidic the zinc binds and no longer releases. Mr. McDermott further reviewed his findings with the nature of zinc. The DEEP did not identify which four fields were tested. The field test done by Milone & MacBroom showed there was no die off from the zinc and the point of discharge in one instance was ten feet from the adjacent wetland.

Mr. Shadle noted that when the data sets were being compared from Milone and Broom vs. the DEEP report both were looking at the crumb rubber. There was a significant level of discharge that exceeded the aquatic threshold for aquatic toxicity. Mr. McDermott asked if the report said it was above the drinking water standards and Mr. Shadle replied no. Mr. Shadle said that the concern is the wetland impact that discharge will have. He stated that all data sets must be looked at. Mr. McDermott said that the release of zinc is less likely when using salt. From his understanding none of the fields are using cryogenic rubber. The data indicates that there seems to be a fracturing of the rubber product particles over time that does not occur to the same extent as ambio produced rubber. The exposure of zinc diminishes if cryogenic rubber is used. Mr. Shadle asked whether the source of rubber data is from the manufacturer or an outside finding. Mr. McDermott believed the analysis of the rubber products was an outside finding. The overall DEEP conclusion is that the fields are acceptable and safe.

Mr. Montgomery questioned the specifications of the use of rubber and asked what is being used. Mr. Pfrommer stated that the type of rubber being used is not in the plans. Mr. McDermott discussed the different types of rubber used for fields with Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. Montgomery reviewed the DEEP's conclusion study (page 22). Mr. McDermott stated that in his experience with the use of salt as stone changes the PH is closer to neutral. He reviewed his findings.

Mr. Montgomery reviewed page 19 of the DEEP Conclusion. He discussed Milone and MacBroom's study with Mr. McDermott.

Mr. Montgomery submitted & discussed the Evaluation of the Environmental Effects of the Synthetic Turf Athletic Fields completed in 2008 by Milone & MacBroom(Exhibit H). He reviewed the DEEP statement with Mr. Pfrommer

and the use of bio treatment. Mr. Montgomery is concerned with the groundwater in the area and discussed treating the water with bio infiltration with Mr. Pfrommer.

Ms. Marjorie Shansky, Attorney, representing Johanne Mangi, Intervener, addressed the Commission and noted her concerns about the impact to the wetlands associated with the application. She referred to the minutes of the site walk of the original approval granted in 1991 which referred to the fields being shoe-horned. Ms. Shansky reviewed a letter to William Minor, Hamden Town Planner, dated June 7, 1991(Exhibit I). Ms. Shansky stated that the application should be denied because the material submitted for the application is incomplete under section 7 of the IWC regulations. The applicant is subject to enforcement procedures under Section 14 of the regulations and required to submit a restoration plan. The wetlands need to be restored as required by the CGS under Section 10, Section 10.2. Ms. Shansky stated that this application should be denied.

Mr. Jeffrey Loureiro, Professional Engineer, addressed the Commission and reviewed the retaining walls (sheets C.5 and C.51) for the north and south fields. He also reviewed the eastern wall on sheet C.92 which includes the construction notes. The equipment used to build the retaining wall will be placed perpendicular to the wall and material will be pulled back. This will be a difficult and time consuming operation. Mr. Loureiro said that he is a contractor and the proposed operation is not normally done. He feels that there should be daily oversight of the activity to make sure that it is being done as proposed.

Mr. Loureiro reviewed an aerial photo dated March 13, 1990(exhibit J) prior to the material being placed in the wetlands and Northern field (exhibit K) with the Commission.

Mr. James Cowen, Soil Scientist, addressed the Commission and submitted his report dated December 4, 2013(Exhibit L). The initial review was completed but he said that there may be supplemental findings. The applicant received the revised plans on November 26, 2013, but Mr. Cowen had anticipated having 20 days to review them so there may be supplemental findings. Mr. Cowen stated his findings noted in the report.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked Mr. Cowen why the report is signed by Mr. Michael Klein. Mr. Cowen replied that the report was written by him in conjunction with Mr. Klein. He noted that Mr. Klein is the principal of the company and signs all letters.

Ms. Shansky stated that Mr. Cowen's credentials and resume are appended to the report(Exhibit L). Ms. Shansky submitted and reviewed her summary letter(Exhibit M).

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for comments in favor of the application. There were none.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked for comments against the application:

Mr. Brendan Sharkey, 600 Mount Carmel Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that he is in opposition to the application because feasible and prudent alternative plans to this application have not been submitted. This is a standard that must be applied to any application before the IWC and there is case law on the subject. However, it is clear that the courts do not require the applicant to come up with every possible alternative that could potentially be applied to the application. The courts have held applicants to a standard that says that they have considered alternatives such that the impacts to the wetlands that will likely occur can be mitigated, and were considered and eliminated as an option for reasons of using the feasible and prudent alternative. Mr. Sharkey feels there is a feasible and prudent alternative because this applicant is not limited to using a certain parcel of land to develop and is not constrained by the area in which they have control. The University has hundreds of acres of land in and around the main campus area on Mount Carmel Avenue. In particular, the playing fields that exist just to the west of Hogan Road. There is probably a football field and a half that extends from Mount Carmel Avenue along and adjacent to Hogan Road. Mr. Sharkey passes this field everyday on his way to work and sees that it is currently used for intramural sports, practices, and other athletic activities. This field is not proximate to any wetlands as far as Mr. Sharkey is aware. There is an existing playing field that runs perpendicular to Hogan Road between the asphalt parking lot and baseball field and is directly adjacent to the athletic facility. This field is currently used for NCAA

playing activities with scoreboards and bleachers. It is located in the center of the green space located on the main campus and not proximate to the wetlands. Mr. Sharkey feels that to expand the other two playing fields would be shoe-horning a major facility with impervious surfaces into an area that is vulnerable to any wetland impact. As an alternative, there are other playing fields on the campus that would have less impact on the wetlands. This meeting is not to talk about the aesthetics or lighting on the field, but to talk about the wetland. Mr. Sharkey feels that there are feasible and prudent alternatives that have not been presented and for this reason opposes the application.

Mr. John Acampora, 5036 Ridge Road, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that he supports Mr. Sharkey's assessment of the application. He said that the Commission is a steward of the land and of the environment. Due to the sensitivity of this application he feels to approve it would be an atrocity. Mr. Acampora is opposed to the application.

Mr. Calvin DeMarsalis, 311 Hogan Road, addressed the Commission and stated that from what has been presented and the questions asked with regard to what is in the water, he is concerned about the well that serves his family. He feels that the questions asked were not answered by the applicant. He asked how a permit can be issued to the University when it has flagrantly disregarded the rules of the wetlands. Mr. DeMarsalis asked why the fields that degraded the wetlands and destroyed the small wetland across the street are not being shutdown. He is against the application.

Mr. Richard Fennelly, 3711 Whitney Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that he is opposed to the application.

Ms. Elizabeth DeSimone, 5200 Ridge Road, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that she opposes the application.

Ms. Susan Dannenhoffer, 1277 Mount Carmel Avenue, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that she is strongly opposed to the application and agrees with the opinions and statements made on behalf of the intervener.

Mr. Gary DeSimone, 5200 Ridge Road, addressed the Commission and stated that he opposes the applicant and agrees with the arguments raised by the intervener and her supporters.

Ms. Carla Roussel, 590 Mount Carmel Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that she is against the application.

Mr. Michael Martucci, 720 Mount Carmel Avenue, addressed the Commission and thanked the Commission for their thoroughness in examining the application.

Ms. Johanne Mangi, 5061 Ridge Road, North Haven addressed the Commission and stated that she agrees with what has been heard and she appreciates the Commission's questions and concerns.

Mr. Jim Reilly, 4500 Ridge Road, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that he opposes the application.

Ms. Patricia Martucci, 720 Mount Carmel Avenue, addressed the Commission and stated that she agrees with everything that has been brought forth by the opposition and opposes the application.

Mr. Ross Lanius, 4200 Ridge Road, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that he agrees with what his neighbors have said and what Ms. Shansky has said. He opposes the application.

Ms. Maria Acampora, 5060 Ridge Road, North Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that she opposes the application.

Ms. Rosenbaum closed the public comment portion of this hearing.

Ms. Rosenbaum asked that the Public Hearing be continued until the January 8, 2014 meeting. She asked Mr. Pellegrino if he would grant an extension of time. Mr. Pellegrino agreed to continue the application and granted a 35 day extension.

Mr. Milazzo made the motion to continue the public hearing until the January 8, 2014 meeting. Ms. Lakin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Regular Meeting

1. New Applications

- a. 13-1199** 1950 Dixwell Avenue – construction of a self-storage facility
BRB Development, LLC, Applicant

Mr. Robert Baltramaitis, Professional Engineer, addressed the Commission and submitted certified receipts for the abutter's mailing. He reviewed the application and the existing site. Mr. Baltramaitis said that the existing structure will be demolished in its entirety. There will be no alteration to the watercourse. The impervious surface adjacent to the wetlands will be pulled back and will be reduced to 51,000 square feet. Mr. Baltramaitis described the stormwater management system that will be located on the site and he noted that the CT DOT will review the plan because the system will tie into their system. Mr. Baltramaitis reviewed the planting plan.

Mr. Gnida is concerned with the stream bends to the west and the head wall that goes under the parkway. He noted that the stream flows from the west to the east and there is a sharp bend in the upland review area that is not depicted on the plan. Mr. Baltramaitis stated he will add this area of the stream to the plan.

Mr. Gnida made the motion to table this item for site inspection. Mr. Anastasio seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Pending Applications

- a. 13-1196** 275 & 475 Mt Carmel Avenue - reconstruction of athletic fields
Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Tabled until the January 8, 2014 meeting.

3. Notices-of-Violation, Cease & Desist & Restore Orders, Notices-to-Appear

- a. N.O.V.** 64 Rocky Top Road – clearing of trees & removal of vegetation
- b. N.O.V.** 251 Welton Street – oil spill or discharge
- c. N.O.V.** Lot 10-Benham Hill Estates (aka 0 Benham Hill Place)
Failure to repair & maintain stormwater detention basin

Mr. Lee reported that owner Trofa has agreed to give the Town an easement to access lot 10.

All N.O.V.'s remain in effect.

4. Review Site Inspection Schedule

Mr. Vocelli will issue the inspection notice for 1950 Dixwell Avenue.

5. Review of November 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Montgomery stated that on page 7, 2nd to last paragraph, 1st sentence, change “2003 approval” to 2004 approval”. Also, page 7, last paragraph, 2nd sentence, should read: “the University should keep a further distance away”. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that Mr. Pfrommer had sent an email requesting changes to the minutes. After a discussion it was determined that on page 8, 2nd paragraph, the 3rd sentence should read: Lines were hand drawn on the 2004 IWC approved drawings to represent an area to remain in its naturally vegetated state. Also, on page 8, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence should read: Mr. Pfrommer read the hand written note on the 2004 IWC approved drawings regarding the area to remain in its naturally vegetated state: “No activities, actions, or uses of the land shall be permitted and it shall remain in its naturally vegetated state. J. Howard Pfrommer, 11-3-2004”. Mr. Montgomery asked to amend on page 8, 2nd paragraph, 6th sentence should read: Mr. Montgomery said that there is now a mow area between the fence, and the medallions that were shown on the fence are clearly not placed there. Ms. Rosenbaum had given to the clerk the following changes: page 6, 1st paragraph, “Pfoemmer” spelled incorrectly two times, should be “Pfrommer”. Also, in paragraph 7, 1st sentence, “seet” should be “feet”.

Mr. Anastasio made the motion to approve the November 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes as amended. Mr. Milazzo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Other Business

2014 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Shadle made the motion to approve the 2014 Meeting Schedule. Mr. Brand seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Rosenbaum thanked Mr. Gnida for the de minimis reports.

7. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Milazzo and seconded by Mr. Shadle. It passed with no dissenting votes. The meeting ended at 10:07 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard-Clerk of the Commission