

**INLAND WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
TOWN OF EAST HADDAM
LAND USE OFFICE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
October 20, 2015**

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Randy Dill called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Grange.

2. ATTENDANCE:

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Mary Augustiny, Randy Dill, Daniel Jahne, Laura Magaraci

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Jennifer Burton-Reeve, Bryan Goff, 1 vacancy

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Ventres and 8 townspeople were present.

3. MINUTES:

Motion by Ms. Augustiny, seconded by Mr. Jahne, and carried by unanimous vote to accept the minutes of the September 15, 2015 regular meeting with the following amendment: Last page, Item 9, Paragraph 2: Change “Mary” to “Laura”

4. BILLS:

Hartford Courant (legal notices)	\$184.36
NL Jacobson & Associates (site plan review)	32.09

Motion by Mr. Jahne, seconded by Ms. Augustiny to pay the bills as presented. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

5. FIELD INSPECTION REPORT

A field inspection was conducted on Sunday, October 18, 2015 to four locations: McClure, Hurlock, Braren, and Nuzzo. In attendance were Mr. Dill, Mr. Ventres, Ms. Augustiny, Mr. Jahne, Ms. Burton-Reeve, and Ms. Magaraci

6. WETLANDS PERMIT REVIEW

A) Continued: Annette Silverman, 5 Lakeside Drive, maintenance. Assessor's Map 49, Lot 52.
First date: July 21, 2015 **Last date: September 24, 2015**

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. Mr. Ventres stated the contractor called him this afternoon to indicate that he has not finished the diagram. Mr. Ventres recommended the commission deny this application without prejudice and waive the re-application fee once the plans are completed.

Motion by Mr. Dill, seconded by Mr. Jahne to deny the application of Annette Silverman, 5 Lakeside Drive without prejudice, and to apply the fee to the re-application when received. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

B) Continued: Gary Trombley, 74 Smith Road, Wildwood #18, reconstruct retaining wall, dock, and deck. Assessor's Map 49, Lot 40.

First date: July 21, 2015

Last date: September 24, 2015

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. Mr. Ventres stated that this is the site where the cottage was removed and the bank was sloped. The commission asked for a planting plan. Mr. Ventres assisted with the diagram, and showed the existing maple and oak trees. On the north side, he recommended the spicebush and other shrubs should remain in place. He suggested the addition of creeping junipers and flowering shrubs. There will be another review when the application comes back for the reconstruction of the cottage.

Mr. Dill asked when this work would be done. Mr. Ventres stated the planting would be done in the Spring of 2016. The re-build of the cottage would be approximately one year away.

Mr. Dill asked about one potential spot of erosion, to which Mr. Ventres responded there was silt fence installed.

Mr. Dill dated the sketch with today's date and added a North directional to the plan.

Mr. Ventres stated the deck has been removed from the application.

Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve to the application of Gary Trombley, 74 Smith Road, Wildwood #18, to reconstruct a retaining wall and dock, with plantings as described on the plan, dated October 20, 2015 by the commission. Motion seconded by Ms. Magaraci, and carried by unanimous vote.

C) Continued: Ronald, Robert, Ruth, and David Denya, 7 Lakeside Drive, maintenance of retaining wall and dock. Assessor's Map 49, Lot 53.

First date: July 21, 2015

Last date: September 24, 2015

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. Mr. Ventres stated the contractor called him this afternoon to indicate that he has not finished the diagram. Mr. Ventres recommended the commission deny this application without prejudice and waive the re-application fee once the plans are completed.

Motion by Mr. Dill, seconded by Mr. Jahne to deny the application of Ronald, Robeert, Ruth, and David Denya, 71 Lakeside Drive without prejudice, due to incomplete information, and to apply the fee to the re-application when received. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

D) Continued: James & Theresa Zukowski, 9 Lakeside Drive, maintenance of retaining wall. Assessor's Map 49, Lot 54.

First date: July 21, 2015

Last date: September 24, 2015

No one representing the applicant was present at this meeting. Mr. Ventres again stated the neighbor called him this afternoon to indicate that he has not finished the diagram. Mr. Ventres recommended the commission deny this application without prejudice and waive the re-application fee once the plans are completed.

Mr. Dill commented that the lake may be refilled before this gets done at this point. Mr. Ventres indicated that the State of Connecticut has claimed rights to the bottom of this lake.

Motion by Mr. Dill, seconded by Mr. Jahne to deny the application of Annette Silverman, 5 Lakeside Drive without prejudice, and to apply the fee to the re-application when received. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

E) New: Lori Young, 48 Fieldstones Drive, repair and increase size of dock and deck. Assessor's Map 58, Lot 107.

First date: September 15, 2015

Last date: November 19, 2015

Mr. Tim Young addressed the commission on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Dill stated there had been discussion at the last meeting. Mr. Young stated they have redrawn the plan to incorporate the items discussed at the last meeting. There is now a 6-ft. x 20-ft. floating section and then a 16x10 extension to the east. Mr. Dill commented that they had the most discussion about the dock because there were additions. Mr. Young stated they have reduced the overall length of it. They reduced it to only extend 20-feet, which is just slightly larger than their current boat. As discussed at the first meeting, they widened the dock to 6-feet, rather than the 4-feet originally proposed. This would be a removable section.

Ms. Augustiny recalled there would be existing rocks used to sure up the bank of the water. Mr. Young stated there is another drawing. He explained that the shore was undermining, which would be filled with natural rocks from the bank area. They will add some crushed rock or stone to fill in the voids, and to protect the area. He noted that the rocks are plentiful in this area.

Both Ms. Augustiny and Mr. Dill agreed that the applicant has addressed the commission's comments from last meeting. Mr. Dill added that there are some structures being removed, so this is a balance.

Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve the application of Lori Young, 48 Fieldstones Drive, repair and increase size of dock and deck as identified on the plans dated September, 2015 and August, 2015. Motion seconded by Ms. Magaraci, and carried by unanimous vote.

F) New: Chris & Joan Hurlock, 15 East Shore Drive, build 6' x 32' deck off rear of house. Assessor's Map 71, Lot 59.

First date: September 15, 2015

Last date: November 19, 2015

Mr. Chris Hurlock addressed the commission. He stated he shrunk the deck size per recommendations of the commission at last month's meeting. He added that his wife likes this idea.

Mr. Dill noted that the commission walked this site during their recent field walk. The earlier design had this deck very close to the shoreline. It was noted that there has been some reinforcement to the shoreline. Mr. Hurlock stated they would like to go all the way down, but have only done that small area. Mr. Dill commented that it did look good. He noted there has been some planting done. Mr. Hurlock stated they have added some of the grasses that the commission suggested. The commission discussed the existing roots, and Mr. Hurlock was encouraged to keep these intact.

Mr. Dill stated they looked at this again, and there was some discussion that it might be better since there is already a large existing deck, that the necessity of connecting the two decks might be more than is necessary. He stated having a deck off the sliders is reasonable, but to have a deck directly in line with the opening over to the edge of the house with steps going down is more than is necessary. Mr. Hurlock stated there is a wall before the water.

Ms. Augustiny suggested plantings be added in front of the deck to the edge of the house. Right now, the area is grass. Mr. Hurlock stated this area has wood chips. Ms. Augustiny suggested the plantings would help this area. Mr. Hurlock asked if he could use the same grasses. Mr. Ventres suggested taking some of the clippings from the edges of the grass and the woody structures and using those.

Mr. Dill noted there is a rain barrel on the corner with a hose. He stated the hose area is a potential site for erosion, although he did believe the rain barrel was a good thing to have. Mr. Hurlock stated they have a soaker hose that is used with this.

Mr. Hurlock asked if he could put a set of stairs on the other side of the deck as well. Mr. Dill saw no problem with that.

Motion by Ms. Augustiny to approve the application of Chris & Joan Hurlock for a 6 ft. x 20 ft. deck off the rear of the house to the lake side, with stairs going off the side, as shown on the plan, and to extend the plantings along the water to the existing dock as shown on the adjusted plan dated today. Motion seconded by Mr. Jahne, and carried by unanimous vote.

G) New: Lawrence McClure, 98 Bailey Road, raze two (2) seasonal cottages and construct one (1) single family residence with all supporting utilities. Assessor's Map 57, Lot 26.

First date: September 15, 2015

Last date: November 19, 2015

Attorney Scott Jezek addressed the commission on behalf of the applicant. He introduced Mr. Roger Nemergut, the project engineer, and Ms. Brooke Gurdey, the architect. They will go through the designs for the commission. Attorney Jezek, Mr. Nemergut, and both clients attended the fieldwalk. Ms. McClure's family has owned this property since 1939. This is the first significant renovation since the wetlands commission came into existence.

Mr. Nemergut submitted revised plans to the commission. Mr. Nemergut stated that Ms. Nancy Mackinnon did the planting plan, but was unable to be here this evening.

Mr. Nemergut distributed a plan of the trees that will need to be removed. The first plan is the septic area, and the second is the house location. The trees marked with an "X" will need to be removed.

Mr. Nemergut stated there are currently three seasonal cottages, a single well, and each has its own septic system. If you total the bedrooms, it currently adds up to seven. They plan to remove two cottages and replace it with a year-round residence with four bedrooms. The other cottage will be renovated, and with the removal of one bedroom, it will be a one-bedroom cottage.

Mr. Nemergut stated there are trees marked on the plans that would have to be removed for the septic system.

Mr. Nemergut explained that they will replace three existing septic systems of unknown size, and well beyond their useful lives, one of which is 45-feet from the lake. One code compliant septic will serve both new cottages. The effluent will be removed quite far from the lake as opposed to what is there now. One problem with a seasonal septic is that during the winter dormancy, no nutrients are being added, and the material dies off. In the spring, there is a window of concern when you are not really getting the treatment that you need because of the loss of the bio-mat. This is one benefit of the new system.

Mr. Nemergut stated that one change made to the plan is that the house system will gravity feed into a septic tank, and be pumped to a leaching field at the west end of the property. The system for the small cottage will gravity feed down to the leaching field. The trench will be one bucket-width wide. Mr. Nemergut stated where they cross the stone wall, there is a note to restore the stone wall where it is penetrated for the line, and they will stay 10-feet off the property line and off the well radius. They may be able to make an adjustment in order to save trees. Responsive to inquiry by Mr. Jahne, Mr. Nemergut stated this would be a call made in the field.

Ms. Augustiny asked about an alternative leaching area. Mr. Nemergut stated for the small cottage, they are just dropping in a 4-inch pipe. There will be a note that the three existing systems will be removed and taken off site.

Ms. Augustiny asked if all of the effluent comes to the pump chamber and if the pump is electric. She asked what would happen if and when the power goes out. Mr. Nemergut explained that first, if there is no electricity, there will be no water. There is a lake, and they can obtain water from there. The systems are made with 24-hour emergency storage, and they are designed for a 5-bedroom house, with 2 people in each bedroom. He explained that these systems are designed with very conservative features. These systems are run with a pump, but that is exactly what enables them to pump the septic 300-feet away from the lake. He added that this is one of the best things that could happen to the lake, at least in terms of the septic issue.

Mr. Nemergut stated in terms of the water quality, there is a bigger house with a larger roof area. They will try to improve the impervious area of the site. There are currently three roofs with no infiltration system. The new system will capture the first inch of rainfall with the new system and put it into the ground. The existing bluestone patio is impervious, and that will be replaced with a pervious patio area. There is about a 3% increase in impervious area with the new plan.

In terms of the erosion question, Mr. Nemergut explained that they had a silt fence, but they have changed to composite fencing now to combine silt fence and hay bales. This gives better protection. This site has been pretty much undisturbed for a long time. They have done no maintenance on the driveway for 25 years. Typically, driveways such as this eventually become rutted.

Mr. Nemergut informed the commission that they added a couple of surface swales on the plan, even though there is no evidence that there is erosion on any part of this site. The only place where there is any question is the southeast corner at the edge of the water where the boats go in and out. This is a very steep slope area. This is not a lot that is prone to erosion.

Mr. Dill saw no erosion control for the septic or leach field area. Mr. Nemergut stated they will extend this on the side. Mr. Nemergut stated it doesn't take much to put them in, but there is really not much exposure here. The system will be in and backfilled within two days. Mr. Dill agreed that he saw no washed out areas, but the slopes indicate there is potential. Mr. Dill suggested staked hay bales could be used.

Mr. Nemergut stated they added proposed grading for the site. This house was designed for this specific site. He commented that Ms. Gurdy went to great pains to design this house for this site. That is why this house is stepped to conform to this property. They have added a note where the proposed grading will exceed two high to one vertical. These areas will be reinforced with turf-reinforcement matting. They will use this on a portion of the south side of the house.

The infiltrator system has been shifted downhill a bit. The main reason was because of the trees that exist there. By doing this, they can save some of the trees. They will also take this steep cut and fill over it, which will allow them to somewhat flatten that slope and to add plantings to help stabilize that

area. They plan two rows of sumac low grow, which were suggested by Ballek's Garden Center. Mr. Dill asked if there is a detail for this, to which Mr. Nemergut responded it was on page 3 of the plan. They will fill to elevation 160. Ms. Magaraci asked how much fill would be required. Mr. Nemergut stated it would be approximately 20 yards of fill.

Ms. Augustiny asked why Mr. Curtis had looked at this. Mr. Ventres stated the top of the location was 164 to 158. On one corner it will be 6-feet down, and the other will be approximately 1 foot. Mr. Ventres stated there would be more roof surface, and new soil. He believes that Mr. Curtis may have a question about this. Mr. Nemergut stated the system will take the first inch of rainfall. He stated that these systems will overflow in a larger storm, but that is the nature of the beast. He believed that Mr. Curtis may want some 2-inch stone to protect the downhill side.

Mr. Jahne asked about large storms with these plantings. Mr. Nemergut replied that a 1 or 2 day rain event should not have an adverse effect on the plantings that Ballek's had planned. Responsive to inquiry by Ms. Magaraci, Mr. Nemergut stated this is Canton/Charlton soil which is well drained.

Mr. Nemergut stated that if the house were forced back to a new location, you would essentially be disturbing two areas, because the houses would have to be removed, plus the area with the new house. This would essentially create a larger area of disturbance. It would also require additional trees to be removed. He talked to the owners, and they would agree to commit to a construction schedule after June 1, which would limit disturbance during the most vulnerable spring time.

Mr. Nemergut stated there is a fairly extensive planting plan. They will improve infiltration wherever they can. They will get rid of three existing antiquated systems, and reduce the effluent load on the lake from 7 bedrooms to 5 bedrooms.

Ms. Augustiny asked why there were wide steps proposed to the south end of the property. Ms. McClure stated they are quite narrow now, and showed with her hands the approximate width of the steps, to which Mr. Ventres stated that was approximately 18-inches wide.

Ms. Augustiny asked about the docks. Mr. Nemergut stated they were not changing the size of the docks. These two docks pre-date the establishment of the wetlands commission.

Mr. Ventres distributed plans showing existing versus proposed activity. Ms. Augustiny reviewed the existing patio area. Mr. Nemergut stated the new house is being placed 10-feet farther from the water, they will add patio area. The existing patio area will remain as a patio, but will be replaced with pervious pavers. They will save and stack the patio material. When they replace it, it will have aggregate underneath, and the paver joints will be spread enough to qualify as pervious.

Ms. Augustiny asked about the terrace. Ms. Gurdy explained that this would be an at-grade terrace. It was noted that this will be a pervious area.

Mr. Dill stated he would like to talk about an alternative placement of the house. The changes are very significant. There is a 93% increase in coverage, just for the house. He asked Mr. Nemergut to help him understand why it cannot be moved 85-feet. Mr. Nemergut stated they are not increasing the percentage. He asked Mr. Ventres to talk with Mr. Curtis about the lot coverage. He stated the reason for the placement proposed is because the owners use and enjoy the lake. In Mr. Curtis' report, he noted that an 85-foot move would make the house 24-feet above the lake, necessitating a steep access way to the lake. Mr. Dill voiced concern about the outside terrace area, which is pushing very close to the lake.

Mr. Ventres asked if it would be possible to slide the house 20-feet back to put some of the infiltrator into native soil. Mr. Nemergut likened this to the tail walking the dog. He asked Mr. Ventres to talk to Mr. Curtis, but an alternate solution would be more expensive and more intrusive.

Ms. Gurdy addressed the commission and stated for these property owners to decide to tear down the cottages was not easy. However, there are issues with the foundations, roofs, etc. In designing the house, she explained that she normally has to go to the site and look at many things, but the McClure's were able to give her a great deal of detailed information. This house will have three levels – a lower, middle, and upper. The middle area has the bedrooms, while the lower level will have all of the living space, which is how this lower area has been used since 1939. They tried to recreate the good things about the house, but in a newer house. There is another bedroom area at the top. Ms. Gurdy explained that she tried to take the slope and emulate it with the roof forms. The materials would be wood siding, a darker paint color, and natural stone to blend in with the environment and to tuck it into the hill.

On the north side, Ms. Gurdy showed the terrace area. There will be steps on the side of the house to enter the middle area entrance. It is a complicated house, but it had to be to accommodate the grades.

Ms. Magaraci asked if the good ground cover area would remain. Ms. McClure stated they would either keep or try to replicate what is there now for plantings.

Mr. Dill showed photographs he took on his phone during the site walk. Mr. Nemergut showed various areas on the plan that depicted the areas in the photographs.

Ms. Magaraci asked what parts of the house would go into the infiltration system. Mr. Nemergut stated that all roof area would go into the infiltration system. She asked if they had considered using a gutterless system on part of the house to a rain garden. Mr. Nemergut stated they could look at this. Ms. Gurdy agreed.

Mr. Nemergut explained that after construction, the lot coverage would go to 7.4%, which reflects an increase of 2.7% of impervious area on the lot. He noted that 10% is allowed. This is a 1.1 acre lot. For a 100-year storm, the lake level change from what they are doing there is less than the thickness of a paper. It would actually be one-third of the thickness of a sheet of paper.

Mr. Dill asked if the cottage and the house be year-round. Attorney Jezek stated the intent of the cottage will be seasonal. Mr. Ventres noted to protect the client, the cottage is outside the upland review area and not this commission's purview.

Mr. Dill referred to the NL Jacobson review letter regarding the comments about the 50-foot setback from the lake. Mr. Ventres believed that Mr. Curtis may have thought he was writing a dual purpose letter for P&Z as well. However, Mr. Ventres stated the applicant has already received approval from the ZBA for a variance.

Ms. Augustiny asked if the sliver of land has been purchased yet. Attorney Jezek stated it has not yet, but there is a new contract for 35-feet which would take care of the piping issue.

Ms. Augustiny believed that Mr. Curtis should review this again. Ms. Augustiny personally felt that part of the patio could be removed, rather than being made pervious.

Ms. Magaraci asked if removal of the larger trees was taken into account for the drainage calculation. Mr. Nemergut stated he is unaware of any mechanism to account for that. They used the curve for the grass versus wooded area.

Ms. Augustiny stated they have to be concerned about all of the lake and all of the houses on the lake.

Mr. Ventres reviewed the NL Jacobson & Associates report, dated October 12, 2015 by Brian Curtis.

Motion by Mr. Dill, seconded by Ms. Augustiny to continue the application of Lawrence McClure, 98 Bailey Road, raze two (2) seasonal cottages and construct one (1) single family residence with all supporting utilities until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

H) New: Carl & Irene Braren, 146 Lake Shore Drive, shoreline rehabilitation. Assessor's Map 8, Lot 297.

First date: October 20, 2015

Last date: December 23, 2015

Mr. Pete Doyle, contractor addressed the commission on behalf of the applicants. They plan to use existing stone, as well as bring in some new stone to rehabilitate the shoreline. They would like to try to reclaim some of what was lost. They feel like they have lost at least 3-feet of property there. They have photographs there from 1993. When the water is higher, it is right at the rock line.

Responsive to inquiry by Mr. Dill, Mr. Doyle responded that the applicant says they have sloped area. It was noted that this would not account for three feet of lost property. Mr. Dill stated if they replace the stone around the curve will help. They will need a bit of space between the stone and the filter fabric. Mr. Doyle stated he would use the erosion control filter fabric. He noted that the homeowner does not have a problem with plantings on the south side of the property. However, there is one spot where they actually access the lake. Mr. Dill stated many times they suggest plantings because people have problems with geese. In this location, they probably will not have a problem with geese. Ms. Augustiny suggested pachysandra, periwinkle, low bush blueberry, something other than grass that would hold the root structure better.

Responsive to inquiry by Mr. Dill about equipment, Mr. Doyle stated he has a small excavator. He also may use a small crane with a 100-foot boom. It works well to be able to place the stones. The boom itself extends 60-feet. They may even be able to come in on the driveway side. This will be a challenge to get these stones in place.

Mr. Dill asked if there would have to be any excavation. Mr. Doyle stated there would be some. Mr. Doyle stated he would put any excavated material on the side. They will be using quarry stone, roughly 2-feet wide, 2-4 feet long, and 1-foot thick. He will hand pick the stones. Ms. Augustiny noted this is a very limited property in which to work.

Mr. Dill asked about a fire pit. He noted that the property owner talked about a fire pit. Ms. Augustiny believed the property owner wanted a flat stone, with the fire pit placed on top. Mr. Dill stated if there is no excavation, and this is all this is, there is no need to add it to this application.

Mr. Ventres gave Mr. Doyle materials on plantings.

Mr. Dill stated the commission cannot act on this application this evening. But Mr. Doyle does not need to come back unless he has any changes.

Motion by Ms. Augustiny, seconded by Mr. Jahne, and carried by unanimous vote to continue the application of Carl & Irene Braren, 146 Lake Shore Drive, shoreline rehabilitation until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

I) New: Phil and Linda Nuzzo, 192 Lake Shore Drive, shoreline rehabilitation. Assessor's Map 80, Lot 281.

First date: October 20, 2015

Last date: December 23, 2015

Mr. Doyle, contractor, addressed the commission on behalf of the applicants. He submitted a narrative to Mr. Ventres, which included removal of the concrete slab, wooden deck ramp, stump grinding of a fairly large ash stump, relocated aluminum dock on north end moving 40-feet to southern portion of the lot. This would leave approximately 10-feet to the neighbor's property line.

Responsive to inquiry by Ms. Augustiny, Mr. Ventres stated there was an approval on this property from 2007. At that time, there was a planting plan from Ballek's Garden Center. Some of the plantings had not succeeded. Mr. Doyle noted that he would remove the invasive plants.

Ms. Augustiny stated they should have a diagram showing the dock and the lake's edge. Mr. Ventres suggested Mr. Doyle talk to the owner about how the shoreline is now, and then what it will look like after the work is done. This should also show the full concrete patio and ramp, the dock, etc.

Mr. Dill commented that the work being done on this property is a vast improvement.

Ms. Magaraci asked how the stump removal would be done. Mr. Ventres stated it is a large grinder. Mr. Doyle stated that topsoil would go on top, but the root structure would remain.

Mr. Dill stated the commission could take no action on this application this evening. He suggested Mr. Doyle get the diagram to Mr. Ventres, but there was no need to be here next meeting.

Motion by Ms. Augustiny, seconded by Mr. Jahne to continue the application of Phil and Linda Nuzzo, 192 Lake Shore Drive, shoreline rehabilitation until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

7. IWWC ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S REPORT

A) Urban

Mr. Ventres reported that Mr. Urban has not been in town for over a month. His mother came down, and hopefully will have Mr. Urban get in touch with him.

Other

Mr. Ventres got a call from the State of Connecticut to inform him that they own the bottom of the lake. Mr. Dill asked if this was an eminent domain issue. Mr. Ventres stated he believed it stemmed from the spraying of herbicides at the lake.

Mr. Dill asked how the photo documenting is coming. Mr. Ventres needs to get back out there to finish this.

Motion by Mr. Dill to go into executive session at 9:45 for the purposes of discussing potential purchases of open space. Motion seconded by Mr. Jahne, and carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Mr. Dill, seconded by Ms. Magaraci to exit executive session at 9:53 p.m. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NO VOTES WERE TAKEN, AND NO MOTIONS WERE MADE.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Ms. Augustiny, seconded by Mr. Jahne, and carried by unanimous vote to adjourn at 9:54 p.m. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Holly Pattavina