

June 8, 2016

MINUTES: THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing & Regular Meeting on Wednesday, June 1, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Thornton Wilder Hall, Miller Memorial Library, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, CT, and the following items were reviewed:

Commissioners in attendance:

Joan Lakin, Chair
 Kirk Shadle, Vice Chair
 Michael Milazzo, Secretary, arrived 7:07 p.m.
 Daniel Liston
 Kirsten Jensen
 Jonathan Clapp
 Amanda Kallenbach
 Lauren Wholey
 Dan Smolnik
 Michael Stone, arrived 7:13 p.m.

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Acting Town Planner
 Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney, arrived 7:06 p.m.
 Tom Vocelli, Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer
 Holly Masi, Acting Commission Clerk
 Genevieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Ms. Lakin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.; Mr. Shadle called the roll and noted that there was a quorum. Ms. Lakin then introduced the Staff in attendance and reviewed the Public Hearing and Meeting procedures.

I. Public Hearing:

1) New Applications & Amendment Requests

- A. 14-1202 275 & 475 Mt. Carmel Avenue**, Amendment request-Condition #1
 referencing the 25 foot buffer
 Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Files available for review in the Planning Office

Public Hearing opened at 7:02 p.m.

Ms. Lakin noted that she is acquainted with members of the public in attendance, but that will not impact her ability to sit for the Application. She then referenced that there are a number of emails that were submitted regarding the application that are in the Commissioners' packets. She then reviewed the procedures for handling the Application to amend the Condition of Approval.

Attorney Bernard Pellegrino came forward to address the Commission regarding the Amendment Request. He submitted a copy of the approval (Marked Exhibit 1). Attorney Pellegrino reviewed and summarized the approval that had been received and noted that they have satisfied 7 of the 9 conditions of approval and he reviewed the changes

they made in order to do that. The Amendment Request is for 1,340 square feet of encroachment into the buffer. Attorney Pellegrino stated that the improvements proposed in the buffer area provide no detrimental impact to the wetlands.

Jon Lavy, the Architect from Centerbrook Architects, came forward to review the revised plans (on file), which include moving the fields further away from the wetlands to mitigate impact. He noted four things were revised and he addressed including an agreement from Fire and Building to reduce the fire access road to 16 feet, moving the fields further to the west to take as much of the field out of the buffer as they could while also maintaining NCAA approval.

Howard Pfrommer, the Engineer from Jacobson and Associates, came forward to review the revised plans (on file). He submitted an email reviewing the list of items to be installed within the 25-foot wetland buffer with regard to the application to amend Condition 1 (Marked Exhibit 2). He reviewed these items while showing them on the plans.

Mike Seegan, the Landscape Architect and vegetation specialist, came forward to review the wetlands enhancement plan that was submitted (on file). He stated that the most effective wetlands enhancement plan comprises an overall comprehensive approach not necessarily only related to the buffer. He noted it is related to a 3- prong approach, which includes 1. A substantial expanded plant palette with diverse native plantings/shrubs adding over 1,370 trees, shrubs and perennials in the wetland buffer and in the wetlands (all native), 2. A detailed plan for large areas of invasive species removal and replacement with native plantings (25,000 sq feet), and 3. Overall enhancement of the specific buffer, which is more substantial west of the north field. The average width is 50 feet in this area. He then reviewed that the regraded lawn between the fields will have large native plantings and that in the southeast corner of the field, they are preserving that area and the depth is over 70 feet. This is a comprehensive approach with a number of other plantings in support of native plantings. All wetlands and wetlands enhancements in the buffer provide a significantly cumulative benefit and make up for the areas of reduced buffer. He then submitted the color rendering of the Wetlands Enhancement Plan he was reviewing (Marked Exhibit 3).

Attorney Pellegrino concluded noting that with the exception of the 1,340 square feet of encroachment into the 25-foot buffer, the plans meet all aspects of the condition of approval. The average buffer will exceed 25 feet and some areas will be significantly larger. They are adding additional buffer benefits with their comprehensive enhancement plans.

Ms. Lakin asked for Public Comments in favor of the application. There were none. Ms. Lakin then stated that there was an Intervener Petition filed by Attorney Keith Ainsworth representing Gary De Simone.

Ms. Kallenbagh made a motion to accept the Intervener Petition; Mr. Shadle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Attorney Ainsworth, the Intervener's Attorney, came forward stating his address of 51 Elm Street, New Haven and that he represents Gary De Simone. Attorney Ainsworth has filed the application for Intervener in compliance with the CT Environmental Protection Act and is an intervener on behalf of that. He then reviewed the wetlands buffer as the subject of this proceeding. He stated "What is the reason for a buffer?" It's a buffer from intrusion, latent noise, it's a filter, acts as a filtration system for stormwater and separation of activity, and all of this comes into play with regard to this. He noted that the current regulations ask for a 100-foot buffer and with the approval, it is already reduced significantly. He noted that the buffer is a non-disturbance buffer and that the Applicant is taking what has already been reduced significantly and is asking for more of a reduction. He referenced the average buffer discussion and stated that nothing in the law or the regulations references this. He said it is nonsensical using the example 1ft vs. 49ft and the average of the two. He also feels the Applicant did not make this variable related to the protection of the wetlands. Attorney Ainsworth stated they made the average buffer meet their infrastructure needs. They needed leeway for the fields and were not sensitive to what the wetlands needs. The decisions were based on what they needed and this is a Charlatan's trick. It is either a 25 foot buffer or it is not. Attorney Ainsworth raised concern about the risk in setting a precedent to allow it here. He then noted they are ensuring an NCAA compliant field clarifying that they were ordered to do it because of their violation of law. Their violation doesn't justify a violation of the wetlands. He noted that they can build the fields elsewhere. He prepared a supplemental brief submitted (Marked Exhibit 4). He then reviewed the impact that the stormwater management will have on the wetlands. He noted that

they underrepresented their numbers and there is no remediation of stormwater noted in the drainage reports. He then submitted a CV from his Engineer, Steven Trinkaus, PE (Marked Exhibit 5) and a Report from Steven Trinkaus PE (Marked Exhibit 6). This report is where he got the drainage information referenced in the discussion. Attorney Ainsworth stated this is unreasonable as a matter of law and noted that doing something in violation of the law by putting something in that violates the law, such as the proposed lighting, is a violation. He then referenced the 16 foot light poles and stated that the lights are presented in the plans yet they haven't put in a lighting plan and noted that the buffer is also for separation including light and their proposed reduction impacts this. The Applicant provided 4 intrusions they expect and Attorney Ainsworth's brief provides comments in response to each of these. The maintenance of items in the reduced buffer also impacts the wetlands since there would be an intrusion into the non-disturbance buffer each time. He then stated that they have not been great stewards of their own wetlands, which is why they need to do the remediation and removal of the invasive species. They have not indicated a history of being good stewards of their wetlands and have done what they want. Attorney Ainsworth then submitted petitions where a total of 545 people have signed in opposition to the application (Marked Exhibit 7). He stated Quinnipiac University had provided insufficient information, which is grounds for denial.

Mr. Smolnik referenced Mr. Trinkaus' report regarding the runoff for the artificial turf number and asked which surface it is for and it was clarified that the substance doesn't make a difference. Mr. Clapp asked for clarification about the existing fields being functional fields. Attorney Ainsworth responded they are adequate for current level of play, they can practice on them and use them, but they are not NCAA compliant, which is what they want and what they want doesn't mean that wetlands should compromise. Currently, kids are playing on them. Mr. Clapp asked if past behavior is indicative of future behavior. Attorney Ainsworth responded that is a fair estimation of human activity or nature.

Mr. Kops disagreed that the Commission had reduced the buffer to 25 feet noting that it was approved originally in the 90's with a 25-foot buffer. This Commission did not reduce it. Attorney Ainsworth then responded that these fields were approved in January 2015 and the Commission had a new standard. Attorney Lee clarified that this Commission maintained the 25 foot buffer that was originally approved. Attorney Ainsworth noted the current standards and the logical argument that the Commission now uses a greater standard and at the current moment, the Applicants are asking for a further reduction of the buffer.

Ms. Lakin then asked for Public Comments against the application and asked that the comments speak to issues concerning the wetlands and the 25 foot buffer issue and that the members of the public try not to be redundant and to be respectful. She then read the list of names of the people who had submitted emails with comments against the application (all emails on file as part of the record).

- Ross Lanus – 4200 Ridge Road in North Haven submitted a packet (Marked Exhibit 8) and reviewed it. He is a retired Structural Engineer and he asks for denial. He referenced Drawing C5.1 and included part of it in his packet stating that the intrusion is hatched. He doesn't understand Note 2 regarding the percentage intrusion into the required buffer as 4%. The hatched area is 1,340 square feet in area. They drew a polygon and said to assume it to be a rectangle. The length of the wall is 240 feet approximate scale; he divided the 1,340 square foot area and came up with 5.5 feet for average width of intrusion. If the required buffer is 25 feet, the average intrusion is 22.3 %. He referenced a 25 % intrusion into the buffer. The next issue of concern is snow. The South Field is artificial new turf. He thinks they need to be creating a snow removal plan stating that the best defense is a good offense. He asked why the fields are always cleared. They need to do that for good maintenance. He asked what happened in early 2015. While wetlands hearings were going on and problems with Quinnipiac compliance with past approvals were part of that hearing, Quinnipiac plowed snow into the wetlands shown on the pictures in his packet. He then submitted his written notes (Marked Exhibit 9) and a corrected cross section copy (Marked Exhibit 10) for the record.

A 5 minute recess was taken at 7:55 p.m. due to the Clerk having a technical difficulty

- Gail Cameron 117 Squire Lane submitted a statement (Marked Exhibit 11) and read it into the record.
- Zacchary Heltke – 30 Washington Avenue North Haven. He is a Cub Scout and doesn't think the buffer should decrease. He showed pictures of some of the animals that live in the wetlands such as bullfrogs and turtles. He

is concerned they will not have a habitat or food. He stated the wetlands are a beautiful place. He goes there with his Dad and he saw the lifecycle of bullfrogs.

- Joshua Heltke – 30 Washington Avenue North Haven. He understands the preexisting approval under the old clause, but if there is a new clause, why not hold the new standard on new construction. He used a house rebuild as an example. He requests they deny the application.
- Julie Hulten – 42 Homewood Avenue, North Haven. She submitted a statement (Marked Exhibit 12) and read it into the record.
- Deb Smith – 87 East Gate Lane in Hamden – She read a statement into the record and then submitted it (Marked Exhibit 13).
- Dr. Rakic – Professor at Yale; also now a Hogan Road resident - He appreciates the opportunity to speak here even speaking inappropriately. He stated that to make a proper wetland, you need a million years. He thinks they are making a mistake for themselves, students and nature. This is a violation of nature. He believes this is not the last step. If you allow a first step, you open the possibility of the next step. He asked the Commission to deny the request.
- Mike Montgomery – Former Commissioner for 15 years – 140 Still Hill Road. He was a member when the application was first brought and testified during the first hearing; he didn't intend to speak here, but took a look again at historical photos. He asked if the Commission has taken a close look at these wetlands. Did they walk down into the wetlands or walk along the edge? He hopes at least one went in. Prior testimony indicated a vernal pool in the wetlands behind the South Field. The Applicant had questions about vegetation and species were missing. The soil in the center is very unusual. This puzzled Mr. Montgomery. If you look at the wetlands survey and plant list, what is along the South Field where there are narrow buffers proposed and noted the dogwoods and willow trees. One was an unidentified species. There are species there that are uncommon and unknown to their experts. He realizes they are degraded wetlands, but they are well worth protecting. One concern is not only that they come within 8-9 feet, but in trying to follow the testimony, now there is a pipe instead of a swale that will exit to another outlet. He thinks capacity to handle the water is probably already exceeded and there is probably silt. There is now a narrow buffer and a pipe in the buffer. It is hard to figure out the application by the materials on line. It's hard to figure out, but he figured it out by what he heard here tonight. He thinks the landscaping doesn't seem to correspond with what they are asking the Commission to approve. He referenced the slope and stated that some of the species are not suitable. The plant list is a smorgasbord with a range of conditions. Some will survive and some will die. There is a 25-foot buffer planting plan squeezed into 8 feet in some areas. What they are doing to enhance and the mitigation is being done for encroachments already done on wetlands. He thinks they should not count normal design as part of the remediation. The Cedar Grove is the only place with a full 100 foot buffer. He does not understand why they need light poles stating they are asking you to approve installation of lighting within 15 feet of wetlands although it may never be used. What is the benefit of that installation? What about the impact of the installation? They are going to disturb closer to wetlands. He referenced the scoreboard and asked if this is something that needs maintenance. He asked if the 4-foot chain-link fence along the wall is going to keep people and trash out of the wetlands. He doesn't think so. He noted the North Field's existing fence hasn't stopped trash and Quinnipiac University depositing maintenance junk into the buffer. He stated it needs to be 25 feet away. They need to present evidence that this will not impact the wetlands. He has not heard anything that will show it will not have adverse impact to the wetlands except testimony from Mr. Pellegrino. Is he an expert? Prior approvals asked the Applicant to adhere to prior buffers and approving this is contrary to those.
- Marilyn Calderon – 2190 Ridge Road North Haven. She is an Alumna of Quinnipiac University and her boys play soccer. She spends a great deal of time in Hamden and has utilized Sleeping Giant for quiet time. She asked that the Commission make decisions they won't regret in the long run. This violates the law. It is important that they maintain the beautification of where they live. She asked that they keep quiet moments and the environments; we don't need additional detrimental noise. She referenced the father and son who also spoke. Ms. Lakin asked that she keep comments based on the wetlands buffer issue. She responded that based on what was presented tonight, the Commission should deny the request.
- Joanne Mangi – 5061 Ridge Road North Haven – She is confused. She was told last year that if you don't like what the University does, if they meet the regulations, there is not much you can do. This year, however, they aren't complying so why are we here? She is confused about why they are discussing violating the regulations.

- Michael Martucci – 720 Mount Carmel Avenue. He asked if his email was included in the list of emails of opposition that was read. He said he submitted a statement for both the Inland Wetlands Commission Application and the Planning and Zoning Commission – Mr. Kops and Mr. Vocelli will research this. He then noted the snow in the buffer issue and noted he has witnessed green flecks in the snow that was removed and deposited in the buffer.
- Elizabeth Knope – 5200 Ridge Hill Road – She supports the opposition and hopes the Commission denies the application.
- Gary De Simone – 5200 Ridge Road – He supports the opposition. Please deny.
- Barry Gold – 171 Sleeping Giant Drive – He supports the opposition and denial. He also feels the University is aggressive.
- Deane Hetrick – 33 Westview Street. He urges the Commission to say no.
- Cheryl Garrett – 2600 Ridge Road North Haven – She opposes the application
- Ann Trawinski – 746 Mount Carmel Avenue, She stated “please say no.”

Attorney Pellegrino came forward for rebuttal. He explained that when the fields were approved on the two occasions, the 25-foot buffer was the standard used and the approvals were based on that and not a 75% reduction. He stated that the point that it is a violation to include the lighting is not accurate and that the lights are not illegal and neither is the inclusion of the lighting pole foundations. Attorney Pellegrino reviewed that you can have a light pole on a foundation provided it does not exceed 35 feet in height. He also noted that the Photometric Study provided (on file) showed 0 foot candles at the buffer and that they have not proposed lighting at this time, but perhaps in the future, maybe they would. Any lighting attached to those foundations will need to meet the conditions of that approval. He reiterated that these are not illegal and that lighting is permitted. He then also noted that the Photometric Study that was submitted is compliant with the other lighting proposed and it complies with the condition of approval as well as the Planning and Zoning requirements. Attorney Pellegrino stated that their Amendment Request is a calculation of 4% of the entire buffer on this project. He referenced there were a number of comments about encroaching into wetlands and disturbing wetlands in the future. The applicant has no intent to do that and would provide the Commission a Conservation Easement over the entire wetlands area like they did on the Delaney property after the Athletic Center was approved as an added assurance. He stated that a Deed Restriction as such would be proposed and he would be willing to provide this as a condition of approval. Attorney Pellegrino then countered the argument about the snow and disputed the snow photos. Howard Pfrommer, the Engineer then came forward to address the technical issues raised. Mr. Pfrommer refuted the average intrusion calculation on Mr. Lanius’ Exhibit. He then reviewed the information provided in the Steven Trinkaus letter and addressed the runoff curve numbers. Mr. Pfrommer rebutted by also explaining the methodology used and stated that he stands by his numbers.

Ms. Wholey asked about the speculations for the geo fill, which reference a pre-winter treatment with salt solution of 2.2 pounds so she noted that pollutants may be on the field. Mr. Pfrommer then clarified that this is for the North Field, which is not part of this discussion. Mr. Shadle asked him to discuss points concerning the language of average buffer. Attorney Pellegrino came forward stating that he is not suggesting measuring a buffer by an average clarifying that the buffer is 25 feet in all areas except for the 1,340 feet of encroachment so the average area of the buffer is 32 feet, which exceeds the required 25 feet. He is not saying that for this or any other application, they should take an average. Attorney Pellegrino then stated they attempted to do everything they could to meet the condition. He then noted that the buffer is protecting the wetlands from 25 young women hitting a field hockey ball and that there will not be cars parking or trash stored. He then spoke to the argument about the custodianship of the wetlands over 25 years and stated that since he has been involved, it has been good. Attorney Pellegrino reviewed that there are extensive wetlands on the site and they take care of them. The timing in this particular area revealed an isolated issue where maintenance staff deposited grass clippings in the wetlands. He stated that the University sent maintenance supervisors to a special course on the sensitive maintenance of properties like this in order to protect the wetlands. He noted that in this as well as the previous application, the effectiveness of the buffer in its totality provides adequate protection and no one has shown that there will be an adverse impact. The relief requested is minimal and they have provided over 8,000 feet in excess of what was asked for. There is no evidence that the relief requested will have a detrimental impact.

Mr. Shadle raised the foundations for possible future lights issue and asked about phasing and maintenance. He also noted that they are putting the foundations in the non-disturbance buffer. He asked what the plan is in terms of when the light poles would be put in. Attorney Pellegrino responded that if some day, the lighting was put in, the existing condition of 0 foot-candles at the 25 foot buffer area would remain. Mr. Shadle then asked if in the playing field, it would be dark in a portion. Attorney Pellegrino responded that area is actually a runoff area. He also noted that anything that would happen in the future with regard to light installation would have to come back to the Commission. Mr. Shadle then asked how big the poles are. Mr. Pfrommer explained the installation of the footings and Mr. Shadle asked if the poles would be put in post construction of the fields. Mr. Pfrommer responded yes. Mr. Shadle again asked how big the poles would be. Mr. Pfrommer was not sure. Mr. Shadle asked how the poles are handled and what level of the non disturbance buffer area would be disturbed yet again for installation of lighting poles. Mr. Lavy, the Architect came forward and responded that the height depends on the technology at the time of installation. He then noted that the fields can be driven on and any light pole installation would not require anyone to be in the buffer with equipment. The photometric plan is based on the existing 25 foot buffer and not an amendment. They are not seeking to change the photometric condition according to Attorney Pellegrino. Mr. Shadle stated that the retaining wall is a structural necessity, but the location of the lighting footings is not a structural necessity and asked what the necessity of the foundations in that area is. Attorney Pellegrino reviewed the prior proposed lighting plan and then noted that in order to get the lighting as tight as they could get it, moving to this alignment of poles was needed. This was the best plan to concentrate the lighting and keep it out of the wetlands area. There was further discussion about “why to do these foundations now?” Attorney Pellegrino noted that with the proposed activity, why not do the work now and that it is better to do the foundational work now rather than create any additional disturbance later.

Mr. Liston asked if the Commission has heard an expert on wetlands give testimony on the impact to the wetlands of the buffer reduction. Attorney Pellegrino stated that in the initial application, they had a Soil Scientist speak to the buffer noting no adverse impacts and that Mr. Seegan spoke to the buffer and stated that the proposed buffer will provide a greater protection than what was previously approved. Mr. Liston asked if Mr. Seegan is a wetlands expert. Attorney Pellegrino responded that he is a Landscape Architect, not a Soil Scientist. However, this amendment request is talking about the buffer, not soil science, and that is Mr. Seegan’s expertise and his evidence as to the adequacy of the buffer is sufficient to support the burden. Mr. Liston then stated “so, the answer is no?” Attorney Pellegrino then responded “no, no Soil Scientist has spoken to the reduction in buffer.” He then noted that, previously, the Soil Scientist spoke to there being no impact for the prior encroachment area, which was actually bigger.

Mr. Kops then explained the Commission’s 2 options: Option 1 – close the Public Hearing; Option 2 – if Commissioners need more information, keep the Public Hearing Open. If the Public Hearing is closed, the next decision for the Commission is whether or not to vote on the application tonight or table the decision to next month’s meeting.

Mr. Milazzo made a motion to close the Public Hearing; Mr. Clapp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Public Hearing closed at 9:22 p.m.

II. Regular Meeting:

1) Pending Applications:

- A. 14-1202 275 & 475 Mt. Carmel Avenue, Amendment request-Condition #1**
referencing the 25 foot buffer
Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Mr. Milazzo made a motion to table the decision to next month’s meeting in order to give Commissioners the opportunity to review record; Mr. Shadle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Other Business

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

- a. **N.O.V.** 64 Rocky Top Road – clearing of trees & removal of vegetation

Attorney Lee did not have anything to report on this matter. The N.O.V. remains tabled.

- b. **N.O.V.** Lot 10-Benham Hill Estates (aka 0 Benham Hill Place)
Failure to repair & maintain stormwater detention basin

Mr. Vocelli did not have anything to report on this matter. The N.O.V. remains tabled.

2. Review Site Inspection Schedule

There are no applications currently that require a Site Inspection.

3. Old/New Business

1. Quinnipiac University athletic fields-compliance review of Condition #2

Mr. Liston raised this issue. Ms. Jensen asked about decompaction and Attorney Pellegrino responded that fibers compact so they need to be rebluffed. The machine used is a rake with a tractor. Mr. Milazzo referenced a field in a different Town that his son plays on. Mr. Liston asked if this process kicks up dust and Mr. Milazzo responded no. They asked if the field has to get cleared of snow. Attorney Pellegrino responded that yes, it is plowed and then snow is removed. Sal Filardi, Vice President of Facilities came forward and noted that the clearing of snow is to promote playing noting that if you don't plow, there ends up being ice buildup when the season starts. Commissioners then discussed the chain-link fence noting that it can't hold back the snow. Mr. Filardi noted there are gates in the corner which is the route to remove the snow off field. They then reviewed the plans noting the gates were designed and put in the fence for the snow removal process. Mr. Smolnik asked which version of the coconut is being used. Attorney Pellegrino responded that it is the brown coir from the husk that surrounds the coconut. Mr. Liston asked if there was review of any studies done on the impact of this. Attorney Pellegrino stated that no studies come up on this one regarding impact. Mr. Filardi referenced that the manufacturer does saturation tests on runoff. These were submitted and show no trace elements of the types of things they search for. Attorney Pellegrino referenced the Geo-fill system report (on file), which shows a list on the last page. Attorney Pellegrino submitted a copy of this list for reference because the Commissioners did not see it in their packets. Mr. Kops also noted that in his review for the Planning and Zoning Commission Application, he didn't find any research on this material either. Attorney Pellegrino then noted that there have been many studies done on crumb rubber and this product has been touted as the better alternative and has no impacts. He hasn't found anything negative. Mr. Liston then noted that there has been no expert evidence showing the impact to wetlands

Mr. Liston made a motion to table the vote on compliance with Condition #2 to next month's meeting; Ms. Kallenbach seconded the motion.

Mr. Clapp asked what the outstanding issue is. Attorney Lee clarified that the condition states that the Commission approve the alternative material to be used for the fields. Mr. Clapp feels they should decide it now. Mr. Smolnik asked if the Chair could appoint a subcommittee to research the issue. Attorney Lee said the Chair could appoint a Committee or if Commissioners research the issue on their own, they should be sure to bring their information to the next meeting for discussion. Mr. Liston noted he motioned to table the decision so Commissioners could look at the list Attorney Pellegrino submitted. The Chair called for a vote.

The motion passed unanimously except for Mr. Clapp who voted against it.

2. Election of Officers

Ms. Lakin appointed Mr. Shadle as temporary Chair. Mr. Shadle asked for nominations for Chair.

Mr. Milazzo nominated Ms. Lakin to continue as Chair; Mr. Liston seconded the nomination. Mr. Shadle asked if there were any other nominations. There were no additional nominations. The nomination passed unanimously in favor of Ms. Lakin.

Ms. Lakin reassumed the position of Chair and asked for nominations for Vice Chair. Mr. Milazzo nominated Mr. Shadle to continue as Vice Chair; Mr. Stone seconded the nomination. Ms. Lakin asked if there were any other nominations. There were no additional nominations. The nomination passed unanimously in favor of Mr. Shadle.

Ms. Lakin asked for nominations for Secretary. Mr. Stone nominated Mr. Milazzo to continue as Secretary; Ms. Kallenbach seconded the nomination. Ms. Lakin asked if there were any other nominations. There were no additional nominations. The nomination passed unanimously in favor of Mr. Milazzo.

4. Review of May 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Vocelli made a correction to the Minutes as follows: On page 3 revise Condition #8 to read “*Condition #8 – submission of a revised set of plans incorporating all required changes and listing all conditions-of-approval can await the results of the application to amend Condition #1 and the results of the compliance review of Condition #2.*”

Mr. Stone made a motion to approve the Minutes of May 4, 2016 as amended; Mr. Milazzo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Adjournment

Mr. Milazzo made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Liston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Holly Masi, Acting Clerk of the Commission