

TOWN OF NEWINGTON  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, August 18, 2015

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Zelek called this meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 101 of the Newington Town Hall.

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present

Jeffrey Zelek (Chairman)  
Philip Block (Vice-Chairman)  
John Igielski (Secretary)  
Kathleen-Marie Clark  
John Casasanta  
Andreas Sadil  
Alan Paskewich  
Tim Manke (Alternate)  
Deborah Ann Krawiec (Alternate)

Also Present

Chris Greenlaw, Town Engineer  
Susan Gibbon, Recording Secretary

Commissioner Zelek: We have a vacancy and resignation of one our commissioners, so I am going to seat Alan [Paskewich] to fill that vacancy.

*(\*These minutes, with the exception of VI New Business B Application 2015-16, 89 Brookside Road, are a brief overview of the meeting held on August 18, 2015. Please refer to tapes for full transcript.)*

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS  
(EACH SPEAKER LIMITED TO 2 MINUTES)

None

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of May 19, 2015.

Commissioner Igielski: Page 24, middle of the page, my name is spelled incorrectly, it should be spelled as it is spelled elsewhere, also on page 24, where I state “at this time I make a motion based on the evidence before it”, in the second line the words “in

there” should be replaced with “make a”. So that it reads “before it, the Commission make a finding of fact”.

Commissioner Clark: Top of page 3, the first line, it states “the paragraph is going to be mute”, it should be “moot” [global replace throughout page].

Commissioner Casasanta: Page 28, third paragraph, end of first sentence, should be mission creep not creed, so change creed to creep, second to last paragraph on same page the last sentence should read “there are bright lines” not bright lights.

Motion to accept minutes as amended by Commissioner Casasanta, second by Commissioner Sadil. Unanimous vote. I [Chairman Zelek] abstain, I was not here for that meeting.

#### IV. PUBLIC HEARING

##### A. Inland Wetlands Regulation Changes – L.I.D. (Low Impact Development)

Chris Greenlaw: No updates at this time.

Commissioner Zelek: This is a public hearing, if any member of the public wishes to come forward to speak regarding this item, please do so now. See none, motion to table to next meeting.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Application 2015-12, 256 New Britain Avenue – New parking layout and drainage improvements in the upland review area.

Chairman Zelek: If the applicant is here, would they please come forward.

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Chairman, I do not see the applicant at this time, I believe he is conducting other business in this building. What I would recommend is for the Commission to consider adjusting the application such that perhaps I know we frequently discuss the wetland, it should be a short presentation, that individual is in the building, is in the room.

Chairman Zelek: I would like to get a motion to adjust the agenda to Item A to Item D. Commissioner Casasanta, I make a motion, second by Commissioner Sadil.

B. Application 2015-16, 89 Brookside Road – Shed, patio and walkway in wetland and upland review area.

Commissioner Zelek: Please state your name for the records.

Lawrence Lahickey, 89 Brookside Road. Thank you.

Commissioner Zelek: Please tell the Commission about your application.

Mr. Lahickey: Well, I currently have an application in order to add three improvements to my property, that will increase the value to my property and also to increase the quality of our life there.

The first item is a shed, and the second item is a sidewalk down along the side of the house and the third is a patio that is tucked in between the rear of the house and existing deck.

Commissioner Igielski: Mr. Chairman, excuse me. Can you ask the applicant to speak into the mic so that everyone can hear what he is saying.

Chairman Zelek: Please do so.

Lawrence: How is that? Is that better?

Chairman Zelek: I see you have some visuals.

Mr. Lahickey: Yes, I've got some photographs of the area. I can walk through them as you please.

*[Speaking difficult to hear due to folding and unfolding of maps, etc.]*

Mr. Lahickey: This is a view of the area that is out behind my house. That is my deck you can see there to the left side and if you look at the drawing that I provided there is a power line that runs down the rear of my property, you can see in the picture and then to the right side of the power line, not visible in the picture, is an MDC access road to a pump station that is located about four houses down the street from me.

Here is a panoramic view of the area again, standing in a similar vantage point as from the previous photograph, you can see a portion of the house now with the deck. There is the power line and you can see the access road that runs through. This I like a 180 degree picture so it is a little contorted. This is an area in the corner of the house near the hatchway on the deck next to the porch where I would like to locate the patio. It is on the drawing there, it shows it is crosshatched area that is approximately 20' x 20'. This is another view looking down at the deck toward the rear of the yard with the proposed patio area right to the left side by that little storage box. Here is another panorama, but it is taken from down at the bottom and you can see the access road running through on the left side and the pole for the utility. There is myself and the Chairman and Chris [Greenlaw] from the engineering department who came out to review the site with me a couple of weeks ago. There is a view looking straight up at the location where the bottom end of the shed would be, I will call it the south end of the shed, it will be near the corner of that tree and will go forward north to the upper end from that corner of the tree. Another view of the same area.

Chairman Zelek: So, if the Commission would note that the tree is marked with a ribbon. Could the applicant explain why the tree is marked.

Mr. Lahickey: Back in the end of June, a representative from Asplundh came through marking trees and branches for trimming to clear the power lines, so that tree has a band around it, the plan to take that down. That is the only one on my property, there are trees noted on both of the adjacent properties.

Commissioner Paskewich: Question, is that tree ...

Chairman Zelek; Commissioner Paskewich.

Commissioner Paskewich: Is that tree posted?

Mr. Lahickey: I don't ...

Commissioner Paskewich: Is there a sign on the tree?

Lehiccy: No. A sign indicating what?

Commissioner Paskewich: That it is going to be taken down.

Mr. Lahickey: There is an orange band on the tree.

Commissioner Paskewich: Right, but no signage.

Lehiccy: No.

Commissioner Paskewich: Ok.

Chairman Zelek: I would like to remind the commissioner to please use their microphones. Please continue.

Mr. Lahickey: How do I get back to the regular? ....

*[Technical discussion regarding photo presentation and computer]*

Mr. Lahickey: Here is another view that is looking at probably right around the area of the lower end of the shed. I think there is a brick in the grass in the center of that photo where I've got four corners of the shed marked for my own purpose and for any of your purposes too if anyone wanted to come out and view the area, and that is looking to the west. The hedge line the separates my property from the next is behind. Here is another view, probably from that same point the last photo was taken, now looking down at the brook and the holding pond out in the back across the MDC access road. Here is another panorama with us standing there. We are on the other side of the road now, and the brook is to our left and that shaded area on the tree. Here is a view from down below, looking across the road at the rear of my property.

Chairman Zelek: I just want to inform the commission that this particular area where this photograph is being taken from is part of a 100 year flood plain. That floor plain goes up to an elevation 49 feet which is approximately in the area where the applicant is

wishing to build his shed, so just to give you perspective when you are looking at the plot plans that applicant has provided the flood plain is running approximately through the middle of his back yard. Correct?

Mr. Lahickey: Yes.

Commissioner Paskewich: Question Chairman.

Chairman Zelek: Commissioner Paskewich.

Commissioner Paskewich: Do we have authority for flood plain? Intercedence? Is the Commission?

Chairman Zelek: Chris want to comment on that?

Chris Greenlaw: In conjunction with flood plains actually referenced, I believe is Section 6.3 of the zoning regulations and working with the applicant also has an application with the Zoning and enforcement office, one of the things I do in my capacity is I review those plans. If the plans you are referring to are the FERM or FEMA or FERM Rating Maps and those maps will determine, given the confluence of the two rivers or brooks in the case, Piper Brook and Mill Brook, long story short he is not proposing, yes he is in the flood plain, although he is not the flood way which is the channel where the velocity of waters are. It doesn't mean that he doesn't have to satisfy certain requirements of zoning that I checked as far as the map. When you review your plans you are going to see that he had to prepare necessary calculations such that is if he is filling in one area, he is going to be cutting material in another to balance the amount of material that is on site, therefore not exacerbating any flooding for any upstream or downstream parcels. In addition to that, he has got prove that he is not altering the conveyance of flow and that question is answered by the fact that he is not in the channel he is up on the flood plain. Yes, engineering is looking at that in cooperation with zoning and that is why you probably see some additional information on the map and calculations.

Chairman Zelek: I believe Alan's question was do we have jurisdiction regarding building within a flood plain?

Chris Greenlaw: You do as far as any activity that requires alteration of soil and that's what you do, you protect the interest of the poorly drained soils or wetland soils in the State of Connecticut. So, when Mr. Mr. Lahickey's came in and says well I would like to as part of my activity here I have to do something that is regulated under flood plain over here you are looking at that, because of what he is going to do. He is going to a cut and fill and balance so at the end the day he is not depositing any extra material that would cause flooding anymore. So you do have an overlapping authority with the flood zone. The Building Department is going to weigh in as far as the type of structure, how he anchors the structure, zoning has, I think it is 6.3, that speaks of flood plain and then now yourself with your Commission as far as what is he doing to mitigate those activities that are in the wetland area or upland review area as far as what is he going to control runoff, any TSS, pollutants, pesticides any of those.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you Chris.

Commissioner Block: Chris, I see the fill but I don't necessarily see something as to the cut. Is it shown on this diagram?

Mr. Lahickey: In each corner, the lower corners of the property you will see a little blue batch that is cut. That is a mound that is in the yard in each area and those can be shaved off, and so they are just designated as cut.

Commissioner Block: You are telling me that those are existing elevations.

Lechicky: They are humps, they are unevenness in the ground, they are there.

Chairman Zelek: Do you have any photos that demonstrate those humps?

Mr. Lahickey: No I don't. I don't think there is anything in here.

Commissioner Sadil: Chairman Zelek.

Chairman Zelek: Commissioner Sadil.

Commissioner Sadil: Just to be clear, the 50' buffer here holds, when were talking about relative to the wetlands. Is that 50' buffer within the existing house right now, just what the boundaries are relative to the wetland. It isn't clear on the map. I just want to be certain of that.

Chairman Zelek: So if you will notice on the site plan, the wetland line runs through the existing deck and through the area that he has proposed for the 20' x 20' patio and also the 12' x 16' shed is in the wetland area, not in the buffer, so it is not in the upland review, it is actually the wetlands.

Commissioner Sadil: Ok.

Chairman Zelek: I do want to share with the Commission an observation that I did make in the field. I believe that our wetland map is fairly accurate in that I did notice a change in the ecology where this demarcation is for the wetlands. The adjoining property on your map, immediately to the right, I believe actually to the west of the property his wooded in the wetland areas. Most of the property that's in that area are wooded within the wetlands areas. I did not observe any other structures with the wetland areas and I believe we have an aerial exhibit of the wetland map which will show us the wetland boundaries, I believe it is part of the slide show.

Mr. Lahickey: Yes, I think it is the last one. But first, to answer that question, there is an area right here, watch the screen and the cursor, there is a hump there in the ground that is right to the lower end of the shed and that can be shaved off as one of the cuts to be done. You can't see it very well in this photo, but this is the only photo that is of that area.

Chairman Zelek: If you could hold it there for just one second, if the Commission will notice up by the deck where that white line is a boundary supposedly exists according to our maps, you can see that the lawn actually looks a little different, so the soil types do seem to change in accordance with our map. Even though there is a thin layer of grass above the soil here, most likely different soils types will be found.

Mr. Lahickey: Well this whole area from the power line down across the access road was all part of the flood control project that they did in 1990 when they came in and straightened out both of the brooks, and they put the holding pond in the back of our house and that there is fill over the entire area, the fill comes up to the power lines and over to the left side of my house adjacent to the next property there was a low area, it was probably about 6, 7, 8 feet deep, it was a drop off and that was all filled in, if you look at my plot, there is a storm drain right away that goes down the west side of my property and there is a man hole that is not shown on this drawing, but there is a manhole that is out under the power line area that was raised when they filled in that entire area in, so it is all fill out in the back of me.

Chairman Zelek: How about your immediate properties, is there any fill on your property?

Mr. Lahickey: No, not as a result of that project, no.

Chairman Zelek: And the shed is going on your property.

Mr. Lahickey: Yes

Chairman Zelek: Commissioner Clark?

Commissioner Clark: Is there likely to be any change in the ability of this soil to hold water once the trees are removed?

Chairman Zelek: Well there is one tree that being proposed to be moved and that is not part of this application, that is actually something that the power company is requesting the property owners to do.

Commissioner Clark: I do understand that, I am just wondering if there might be any repercussions to the ability of the property owners soil to remain dry for the most part without the tree, trees effects which helps to...

Chairman Zelek: So we have no expert here to give us a determination on that so we can't consider that, unless the applicant has some kind of expert with him.

Mr. Lahickey: No, I don't.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you. Any other commissioners?

Mr. Lahickey: This entire area out there all along the brook, even though you look up on the corner of my plan and the town map calls it swamp, that is the key, it says it is swamp and the pump station down the street is in the swamp, it is not wet land, it is very dry,

all year long the MDC come in there at least once a week to monitor their pump station, they plow the snow in the winter time and they never have any issues with their trucks coming in and out of there, it is not soggy wet land, it is solid. It solid on the other side of the road too down toward the brook. It is a \_\_\_\_\_ culture, it is all lawn, even though it is not my property down below if I didn't cut it, it would just be tall weeds. The town cuts on the other side of road and maintain that and if I didn't then it would just be all weeds right up to rear of my property, so I maintain that and there is no issues with it.

Commissioner Paskewich: This computation here I see calculations that are a little bit beyond me. How much actual depth of excavation is going to be done for his patio?

Mr. Lahickey: Well for the patio, it really is just going to be leveling off the area. It is going to start up where the corner is that is in the corner of the house.

Commissioner Paskewich: So let me just expand on that.

Lehciky: Up there, it will be level right with this, this little patio block area that is there and will come straight out this way, that is the way my drawing is shown. So there will be fill that will be added in this lower corner of the patio in order to level it out.

Commissioner Paskewich: What is the perimeter size of the patio again?

Mr. Lahickey: About 20' x 20'.

Commissioner Paskewich: Ok. So your really not filling a lot, not cutting a lot, it is mostly surficial.

Mr. Lahickey: Yes.

Commissioner Paskewich: And you are not in the flood way?

Mr. Lahickey: No, that is above.

Commissioner Paskewich: You are a little in the flood plain according to the engineer.

Mr. Lahickey: That area there is above the 49 foot line.

Commissioner Paskewich: Myself I don't see any real concern. That is just my opinion.

Chairman Zelek: With the patio, what about the shed?

Commissioner Paskewich: Well where are we with the shed? Show me a location on the picture.

Chairman Zelek: You have your drawing?

Commissioner Paskewich: I would rather see it on the screen.

Chairman Zelek: We need some reference to the map, so we need to see the plot plan Alan, you should have it in your packet.

Commissioner Paskewich: I do, but the picture will give me a better perspective of the distance between patio to be built and the shed away from the house.

Commissioner Block: And am I correct that is just about or adjacent to that tree that is going to be removed?

Mr. Lahickey: The lower corner of that shed is adjacent to that tree that going to be removed. So right there where the cursor is, that is approximately the south end of the shed and if you look at my drawing, the shed is going to run parallel to those hedges that you see and the upper end of it, the north end, stops about 9 ½ feet above the 49' flood line. So that is the 100 year flood, right, in '49, and my calculations that are shown in the center of the drawing show that there is just going to be fill that is added to the base just to level off the bottom of the shed and I have even calculated that to the bottom of the floor, once it is placed on this bed of stone and block I have approximately 12.36 inches to the bottom of the floor above the 49' flood line. So 12" and if you look at the ¾" of the floor then add another, so it almost 13". So the water actually goes over the top of the floor and that means that the shed is rated 500 year flooding.

Commissioner Paskewich: Does the shed fall under the exception for not needing foundation.

Mr. Lahickey: Yes, it is being delivered on a truck and being dropped on a gravel base. Here is a typical picture of a gravel base that will be constructed.

Commissioner Paskewich: So it's incidental excavation, it is not a foundation then.

Chairman Zelek: Commissioner Block

Commissioner Block: I am concerned with the greater picture for that neighborhood and as I read what is on here now, I see approximately 15 cubic yards of material to be added, unfortunately, I don't see any reference except for the drawing of the supposed two cuts. But your photographs don't seem to show any particular mounding and I am very concerned about creating a precedent where you have a fill calculation in quite detail but no real explanation of a proposed cut. It is, to me, unfortunately I think your application is incomplete in that regard.

Mr. Lahickey: Well I don't know how to calculate that there, other than to have an excavator and measure by the bucketful.

Commissioner Block: The surveyor can create a volume for you, the same way they did for the fill. But I'm just telling you that I am really hesitant to create precedent where a fill is undermined or not balanced if you will. By the equally detailed cut.

Commissioner Paskewich: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Zelek: Commissioner Paskewich.

Commissioner Paskewich: Have these calculations been looked at through the engineering department?

Chris Greenlaw: Staff has looked at the drawings, I have not looked at them myself at this time, but is certainly something we can take a closer look at. It is a good time to make a statement from the staff side. When Mr. Lahickey first came in and when I was informed by zoning that the intentions of this applicant or potential applicant to do this work within this area it kind of sits you back in your chair because you are thinking this is wetlands and you all have a vision in your mind of what wetlands are. Having a general idea and meeting DEEP out there, we are going to cover all the bases here, meeting DEEP out there every year. DEEP actually warrants that we meet with them and that within the flood way region, Mr. Lahickey comments as it refers to the cutting of the grass it actually also includes pervasive woodies, and anything that would impede flow, so that explains why you see town forces and DEEP with the flood control projects out there. I just want you to also know that it was after we looked at the mapping I called the Chairman to look at this and I said that this individual has an application for wetlands, I would suggest at minimum you also join me and go out to the site. Because, getting back to wetlands soils this is a good learning moment. Not being a soil expert, but when we think of soils we think about the definition of soils, we think about soils that are poorly drained, we think about soils are lowland, but we also think this is a good opportunity to think about the functional classification of wetland. What kind of wetland functionally do we have? What does it do as far as habitat? What is it doing? How does it function? We have a mono-culture, we have an area that is highly maintained, the activities you are going to look at. You are going to look at some of the features of the lot that are there. The lot is encompassed by storm water easement, it has a utility piece in it. Along that path when you look at the applications, when the applicant came in, I want to talk about the investment of time and where we are just with this one applicant. So I invited Mr. Lahickey in and I said you are going to have to put together a very comprehensive plan, this is before I even talked to the Chairman, I said it has to be a comprehensive plan, you have flood issues, you have soil issues, you have balancing the soil issues, building issues. In speaking to the wetlands he has a sight by which when we look at the plan from the field versus just looking at two dimensionally, when you go out into the field that is when you can...

Mr. Lahickey: Want me to bring up the last?

Chris Greenlaw: We want to direct that you took photos so that you can demonstrate when looking at this site the Commissioners can start looking at the functional classification of that bottom land, it is very important to look at the area. Walking you through, Mr. Lahickey spent a lot of time, staff spent time with him, I spent, even before I called the Chairman, a good 2 ½ hours explaining to you [Mr. Lahickey] all the regulation, explaining to you what you would need as far as to do illustratably, I walked you through and said as part of the application when you talk about doing work in the wetland, even if it is perceived as a lower functioning class of wetland you still have to provide a feasible and

prudent alternative to the Commission, not only in narrative, but also on the plan and you have done that. All this coaching went into this one plan, even before we go to the meeting tonight. In addition to that, I sat with the Chair, the Chairman and I reviewed this along the other plans that we had and the Chairman absolutely said I want to visit this in the field. We spent a couple hours with you in the evening. In the field we started discussing that feasible and prudent alternative and I want to make sure that the Commission can appreciate the time that goes in with staff. We don't even know if he is going to get through wetlands, we haven't completed the review also with zoning. I want to reinforce the point of the time that we spent. What you see in front of you is not static, the lines that are dashed on the plan show the original plan with your desire to put the shed.

Mr. Lahickey: Correct.

Chris Greenlaw: Subsequently, we have asked you to go back to the table, look at the feasible improvement alternative, balance the loading, provide us with calculations so that is a long way of saying we have completed our review and certainly will make those calcs but there is a lot of things to consider, and as Commissioners this would be a good site for people to visit because it is not a typical wetland soil or site that we would think of. So I just wanted to walk you through and the Chairman can also attest to the amount of time which we have spent.

Chairman Zelek: Sure, we arrived at the site at 4:45 p.m. departed at 6:00 p.m. so it was about an hour and 15 minutes we spent on site. We did look at the original location that the applicant had wanted to put the shed and we asked for some feasible and prudent alternatives and he has attempted to move it somewhat out of the area. If the applicant could tell us how many feet he has moved it and why it can't be moved out of the wetlands.

Mr. Lahickey: I moved it 9½ feet north. Originally it was placed at the 5' town requirement from each of those property lines in the corner. So I moved it 9½ feet north and in a little bit to 6½, so it will be site right to the side wall of my garage. I can't take it any further north, because then it starts to encumber the house, it is very, aesthetically it is just too close to the house. As you can see right behind me there in the blue shirt there is some plantings at the base of the house that protrude out and so you have that, you have the deck and so that is where the best place, the best location is for the shed in relation to the house.

Chairman Zelek: In addition to the location, we also concerned, we did discuss the flood line, I made some suggestions, possibly to work around that flood line and I think you might have come up with something.

Mr. Lahickey: Well originally you can see on the plan that the north end of the shed was even with the flood line, and so now I have moved it 9½ feet where it is past the flood line to the north towards the 50. The dotted line represents the original location, the solid line represents the proposed new location.

Commissioner Block: Yeah, I hate to be saying things that seem like nitpicking but it really is important because of the fact that there is development and precedent. As I said, the diagram makes it very clear you are adding approximately 15-16 cubic yards, and as you

explained perhaps, it might be a little bit difficult, there really needs to be something as far as a number as to the calculations for the cut. I also would argue that instead of using fill under the shed, and elevated platform would allow you to have the flat floor you want and with some screening around it to keep out the vermin, you would have the restored flood capacity underneath, I believe that is perhaps a prudent alternative too. But I would really suggest that if you could complete the calculations for the cut to balance out what you have clearly defined as fill it would be a lot easier to go along with this proposal. Am I corrected in this Chris? It shows the fill clearly, it doesn't show any calculations for cut and I hate to have that as a precedent for future plans.

Chris Greenlaw: Some of the notes I was taking, one of the boxes I wanted to open as far as pursuing a more finite calculation for cuts, the balance of the cuts to our satisfaction, or looking at the scenario of an elevated platform for ideas of rodent protection, that could be something you can ask of the applicant to look at and provide us these things prior to the next meeting, if it is the consensus of the whole commission.

Commissioner Paskewich: Chairman Zelek I just don't think it is in our purview to propose a design for the shed.

Chairman Zelek: I would agree that we are not going to propose a design for the shed we will leave that up to the applicant. Commissioners? Any of the commissioners?

Commissioner Krawiec: I believe it is a proposal to ensure that the wetlands are maintained, so again I concur that this is a suggestion to the applicant so that we can maintain the property in better fashion.

Commissioner Clark: This is not about the shed, just a general question addressing Chris' explanation to us. Is this an appropriate time? Chris, my question is more of a general one, rather than this application, especially as to setting a precedent. So this property was designated wetlands during which designation time and then it was filled in after that fact? And when was it designated wetland and on what basis, based on soil type, so is the soil type affected by the filing?

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Lahickey has test quality that speaks to that, also the Chairman, just prior to the meeting, you do have a slide that shows our official wetlands map.

Mr. Lahickey: Yeah, how do I exit this to get back to the...

Chairman Zelek: For clarification Commissioner Clark, I did ask the applicant during our questioning session here whether there was any fill on his property and the response was no. So that filling took place off his property in the flood control area.

Commissioner Clark: Right, thanks for clarifying that.

Chairman Zelek: Again, I believe our wetland maps are correct.

Mr. Lahickey: 89 is right there, where the cursor is.

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Chairman, if I may, along with what the Chairman just said, that is why you know if we, it is a good learning moment because we look at those maps and chances are it probably is a poorly drained soil, it is just that the way it's been maintained and given the characteristic of the land and all of the moving parts around it, with the utility corridors and the maintenance of the those and the various agencies it really give you a different flavor of what you would originally think if you just looked at a two dimensional plan with a wetland lying on it and that is why I want to use this as a learning moment for commissioners to go out there and view. There is a broad spectrum of wetlands and that is why we should get engaged and view these unique as they are.

Chairman Zelek: Chris, I would like to have this slide, a copy of this sent to the commissioners so they review it. What I would like to point out again to the Commission, if you will notice the wetland demarcation, there are not structures within that area. Certainly there are power lines that come through here, there is an MCD gravel road, but there are not structures. Most of the back yards again are all naturalized throughout the wetland areas. There doesn't seem to be any improvements that have been made on any the other properties.

Commissioner Paskewich: Chairman Zelek, can you point out on this particular map where the shed would be placed so that we can get a visual of it.

Chairman Zelek: I believe it would be here.

Mr. Lahickey: No, it would be right below the wetlands line.

Chairman Zelek: This is the wetlands line.

Lehickey: What about the MDC pump station, that is down the street?

Commissioner Paskewich: Let me just finish. We are not in the flood way, we are in the flood plain for building the shed, but you are saying there is no..

Chairman Zelek: We are in the wetlands.

Commissioner Paskewich: Ok.

Chairman Zelek: The proposal is to build in the wetlands. Not the upland review area, this is directly in the wetlands according to our maps and also the flood plain.

Commissioner Paskewich: So where do you think we would go from here?

Chairman Zelek: So Commission what is your pleasure, we can table this to the next meeting, because we certainly are not going to approve the application this evening.

Commissioner Block: I would move that we table this to the next meeting and allow the applicant to complete his calculations and reevaluate his plans.

Chairman Zelek: I agree, any other commissioners before we adjourn with this application. Ok, we will table this to the next meeting.

Mr. Lahickey: In the meantime, can I go ahead with the sidewalk? That is just in the upland review area, that's not.

Chairman Zelek: You cannot proceed with any activities until you have an approved application.

Mr. Lahickey: Ok.

Commissioner Sadil: I vote to motion to table this to the next meeting. Do we need a motion for that?

Mr. Lahickey: Can I say one last thing. You were talking about no structures being present being down there. I think if you walk along there, you will see that there are sheds and outbuildings that people have put in all along the brook area. And the MDC pump station is there, that is a structure that they built completely within the wetlands according to the map that you can see to put on the top corner of my drawing. I wish that everyone would go out there, I invite you to go out there and see this area, because it is not wet land, it is solid all year long. Trucks drive in and out of there, people walk there in the snow, they walk there all year long.

Commissioner Paskewich: Chairman Zelek, one last thing.

Chairman Zelek: I don't entertain any more because we have already tabled this.

Commissioner Paskewich: Ok, he spoke I wanted to speak.

Chairman Zelek: You can save it to the next meeting.

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Chair, if I may, it has been a few meetings since we have been together, all new business items we are unable to by statute vote on, so they automatically get carried over into the next meeting either as old business or unless they are warranted to have a public hearing either by your discretion or directly i.e., a map amendment. Just a helpful reminder.

B. Application 2015-17, 39 Clifford Street – In-ground pool in the upland review area.

Chairman Zelek: Moving on to the next item under new business Application 2015-17, 39 Clifford Street – In-ground pool in the upland review area. If the applicant is available please come forward and state your name and address.

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name is Tom Lavoie, 39 Clifford Street. I am John Sajak, I am the pool installer.

Chairman Zelek: You are the pool installer and you sir are the property owner?

Lavoie: Yes, that is correct.

Sajak: Presented plan as shown on drawing. 500 year flood plain. Put as close to property line and house as possible. Not in wetland, in wetland review area. Wetland review boundary is in front of house.

Chairman Zelek: Any concerns about the water going into a pool during a 500 year flood? I don't know if there is anything in an in ground pool that would pose a hazard dangerous to the water system. Any serious loss of threat to existing to wetland? Any commissioner have concerns?

Commissioner Clark: Can a flood undermine a pool?

Sajak: Pool is going to be vermiculite.

Chairman Zelek: Any things that could be adverse to the wetlands?

Commissioner Clark: Just a concern about chlorine going into the wetlands.

Chairman Zelek: This activity is taking place within the upland review and I did have a discussion with Chris as far as where the waters go if they do drain.

Chris Greenlaw: Verbally in the past have asked health department about this. Chlorine vaporizes, it is volatile, by the time it gets to receding waters it is not an issue.

Sajak: Applicant is running a saltwater pool system.

Chairman Zelek: Any other questions. We will table to next meeting.

#### C. Application 2015-18A, 690 Cedar Street – Wetland Map Amendment

Andrew Grecker, on behalf of the Town of Newington, 131 Cedar Street. National Welding building site. Town is seeking to dispose of property in a manner that will benefit the Town in terms of future development that will occur there. In addition the Hayes property, 4 acres to the west of the National Welding property is a prime development site. In approximately 2007 Mr. Hayes obtained conversation commission permission to fill wetlands and re-grade and at that time no map amendment was done, subsequently CT Fastrack system was constructed and other changes were made to the wetlands and again no map amendment was requested. Trying to be proactive and address map amendment now. C Webb and Associates has been hired to do three things: 1-Complete a soil survey; 2-deliniate new wetland boundaries for the area and 3-prepare a report. Here tonight to request a public hearing to be scheduled on this matter at next scheduled meeting on September 15, 2015 at which time all of these documents can be entered into the record and the public can provide comment. A Webb representative will be available on that date and will be prepared to entertain and respond to all questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Commissioner Block: There was drainage pollutants on the site, has something been presented regarding investigation and remediation?

Grecker: Regarding the application for wetlands map amendment?

Commission Block: No, for anything? Was the site contaminated?

Grecker: Yes. The property was contaminated, it is less contaminated now.

Commissioner Block: Can I suggest that that clearance be made part of the record.

Chairman Zelek: Again what we are doing is a wetlands map amendment so we are just changing wetland demarcation, we are not really going to talking about any improvement to the site, so I don't think is germane to a map amendment.

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I want to remind all the commissioners of our process. We have one formal application vehicle. We are going to get two bites of the apple. One is a finding of fact to delineate and possibly re-delineate a map based on field investigation of the soil analysis, just for the determination of a field analysis with a report and an illustrative map to proactively correct this map before we move forward. After that first application goes through, at some time in the future somebody will come in with a development plan, whatever there plan is, if it entails any soil alteration they will be required at that time to apply for an application to inland wetlands for you to review those activities.

Chairman Zelek: A public hearing is warranted since this is a map amendment

Commissioner Igielski: In the correspondence from Webb & Associates, they reference a photo 4, not included in packet, error in submission.

Grecker: Will be sure to include or exclude as necessary.

Commissioner Igielski: Who is the property owner of the CT Fastrack Cedar Station location?

Grecker: The State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation.

Commissioner Igielski: The map amendment would change property not owned by the Town of Newington.

Grecker: We are proposing a map amendment that would cover the area of the National Welding site and the two adjacent areas.

Chairman Zelek: Did you have permission to flag off the National Welding properties, the town's properties and adjacent properties.

Grecker: We got permission to enter and to survey and to perform what ever testing was required.

Chris Greenlaw: Commissioner, excellent question. Staff had to solidify first an agreement with the State of CT to have people to out and represent us. We have sign off from the State giving permission.

Commissioner Igielski: All this information will be included with the packet?

Grecker: Correct.

Commissioner Block and Commissioner Clark expressed concern about the contamination on the site and the map amendment.

Commissioner Paskewich questioned the application.

Chris Greenlaw: Mr. Chair, to the benefit of the commission, we have one piece of paper that is a vehicle by which all applications come in. Map amendments are different and I will say that the commissioners comments, you know point of order, the commissioners comments as they pertain to a chemical existence, as compared to a delineation is not germane. You will be arguing with their experts whether or not the soils as delineated are wetland soils. If you wanted to contest that, you could. That argument would be a field delineation and determination of is this soil wetland as it is delineated. The chemical composition would be a question that would be a question that would come up on a future application or a general question outside this commission. Not germane to wetland soil determination or delineation.

Grecker: At some point the soil test will be available, just not available at next meeting.

Secretary Igielski: At this time I make a motion that per Section 15.7 of the Inland Wetlands and Water Process Regulations of the Town of Newington, the Commission hold a public hearing on Application 2015-18A, 690 Cedar Street – Wetland Map Amendment to for the proposed map amendment to establish wetland boundary limits determined by soil scientists in the field on September 15, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room L101, Town Hall.

Chairman Zelek: May I have a second please.

Commissioner Block: Second.

Chairman Zelek: Second by Commissioner Block. All in favor. Unanimous vote.

D. Application 2015-12, 256 New Britain Avenue – New parking layout and drainage improvements in the upland review area.

Alan Bongiovanni, Bel Air Manor. Application comprised of three separate parcels which will be merged together through this application process and through Planning and Zoning. Looking to expand number of beds from 71 to 116. There are approximately 7.2 acres in the r20 zone. Dark blues lines are inland wetland per Town of Newington official map, had soil scientist out to property, light blue line on map. All work will be within the regulated area, not requesting map amendment, acquiesce to Town's line. Area in grey is existing pavement currently on site, all proposed building is outside regulated area, area shown in light green is additional pavement within regulated area. Total 5,500 sf of impervious area within the regulated area, will be removing 1,750 sf of impervious area, net increase of 3,750 sf of impervious area within the regulated area. Some is very minor in nature, straighten out parking, allow for greater ADA access to front drive, some necessity from code perspective, and some is necessity to provide additional parking. Nice feature of design is that the vast

majorities of improvements is to areas already on site, problem is not taking into the environment, no low impact development design standards applied to this, no real best management practices. By allowing this applicant to increase the building and reconstruct the parking with minor additions, you will have a new comprehensive drainage design that will take all of the storm water, slow down its rate of increase with the additional impervious area so it's better than what there is now for runoff. Runoff will pretreated and filtered prior to leaving site it will be renovated before it reaching the wetland area. The other areas of disturbance are within the line areas to create four bays and sediment chambers and detention facilities in the south area, and then a small area in the north which requires a couple thousand sf of tree clearing. All work is outside the inland wetland areas, but within the regulated area. Minimized to the greatest extent possible. Believe plan respects the environment, will increase the quality of water that goes to the wetland area.

Chairman Zelek: Can you show us the retention or detention areas and the inland to the wetlands.

Bongiovanni: This is the larger of the two facilities. You have a long linear fore bay and the larger detention area. The inland comes in through this area here and it exits here. There is currently at this point where the storm water exists there is currently an outfall from the existing storm drain. We have kept that same area as a stabilized outlet that by allowing new improvement should create no areas of scour or problems in that area. The second area is a long linear treatment facility, the detention itself is actually under the parking lot in this area and it comes out and you have dual level spreader to dissipate the storm water. We analyzed the soil, we did borings to determine where the water table was and whether it would accept drainage, although somewhat well drained in areas, there is seasonal high ground waters, drainage engineers have looked at the benefits of that pervious soil, didn't take credit for it, at times of year soil will accept a lot of storm water, in other time in heavy wet spring it may not accept it but we are not taking credit for that drainage computation. Very conservative in all the structures designed will take that increase in volume.

Chris Greenlaw: Just quickly, you mentioned LID and perhaps you can point out or I can point out to the commissioner too, when you refer to you have a water quality soil, and a detention area, you have a filter media, so you made a statement as you are holding a 100 year storm, you are decreasing the runoff, you are decreasing the runoff, you are entenuating volume, but I think most important to this commission is before that water, perhaps you can highlight in the detail sheets, look for the LID method and techniques for the water quality. I think that it is important for this commission to hear so that water is released to the wetland area. It is currently released to the wetland area, it all runs down there, but perhaps you could highlight.

Bongiovanni: One of the things I tried to portray in this plan is that we really have a minimal, relative, amount of increase in impervious area. Having said that the entire site currently drains to the wetland. It currently drains some sheet flow, a good portion of the paved area to a drain, but outlet directly to the wetlands with not best management practices, no methods of trapping sediments, no hydrocarbons, pollutants that may from the pavement and vehicles and such work their way into the wetlands. Weston & Sampson is civil engineer,

have been before commission previously. They worked with staff very closely to apply Town of Newington's best management practices in some of the construction details, the sediment forebay, the pretreatment of storm water and the larger structure we have retention soil mixture in the media. Very detailed proposal to address low impact development standards because we are close to a large wetland. Piece to east of us is part of a larger wetland corridor and anything we can do to prevent degradation of that wetland and ecosystem in construction of this proposed expansion will help mitigate any negative effects. Do not believe will be anything but a positive improvement to the wetland because of what is being proposed. We have spared no effort to incorporate the best management practices and the expertise from the Town in their low impact development standards to come up with a drainage system that will do the best it can for the wetland.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you. Chris your opinion on the design for the low impact.

Chris Greenlaw: It is very promising. But to be honest with you we have a multitude of work, we having gone through every calculation, but everything you see right now, is in line with our best methods and techniques. There is a filter media, both in the water quality soil and the retention pond itself. We haven't completed all the calculations, that is currently what we are doing as we generate comments from the consultant and we are going to recommend, I will give you details, we have communication with consultant and we will recommend certain filter media composition. Overall plan is very promising to see cutting edge technology for LID water quality.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you Chris. Commissioner Block.

Commissioner Block: Two questions. I want to make sure I am reading this, you are demolishing 268 New Britain Avenue?

Bongiovanni: The house will come down, yes.

Commissioner Block: Ok and second, over on the adjacent property of 238, it shows and intermittent water course, you are taking a 12 inch pvc directly into that?

Bongiovanni: If you look at the exiting drainage there is currently a 12 inch pipe that goes there, replacing with a different pipe.

Chairman Zelek: Can you describe, what is the current intermittent water course?

Bongiovanni: It is the outfall from the drainage.

Chairman Zelek: A little bit of a stream

Bongiovanni: It is a ditch that when it rains and the water comes in the parking lots or from the roof leaders into the structured drain system on site now it goes into the pipe and creates and intermittent water course.

Chairman Zelek: The intermittent water course, it is inside or outside the wetland boundaries.

Bongiovanni: Outside wetland boundaries.

Commissioner Block: Do you have an agreement with Mr. Cibriglio?

Bongiovanni: All owned by two others, Bel Air Manor as well as individual properties. Merged into one common name.

Commissioner Block: Can you please provide letter permission for the file.

Bongiovanni: Will be happy to provide that.

Chairman Zelek: Any further questions? Ok, we will carry this over to the next meeting. Thank you very much.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

### A. Inland Wetlands Regulations Changes – L.I.D. (Low Impact Development)

Chris Greenlaw: No update at this time.

### B. Community Litter Pick-Up

Commissioner Krawiec: Spoke with Commissioner Fox from the Environmental Quality Commission, another litter clean up in the fall, will provide details when received, want to make commission aware of it. He will also be making a presentation in regards to altering the ordinance in this Town to help support an anti-litter ordinance, he will be approaching Town Council on this in September.

Chairman Zelek: Ok, do you wish us to keep this on the agenda?

Commissioner Krawiec: If it is the desire of everyone around the table, then yes, please.

Chairman Zelek: Seems to be.

### B. New Initiative – Vernal Pools

Commissioner Paskewich: Attended an phd study research a couple of months ago regarding residential building development, sizes of building development, property sizes and its potential influence on our water surrounding the development, including vernal pools. Will get back to student who gave lecture and follow future studies on housing development and water.

### C. Invasive Plants

Commissioner Clark: Two things. One is there was recently an informational meeting about plans to do work on Churchill Park and I spoke, as a private citizen, at that and stated that I would like to see them when they come up with a budget for that to put some money aside to address the specifically the fragmities that are pretty much the sole plan visible from the nature trail.

Chairman Zelek: Chris, have you heard anything that might be coming to us regarding improvement to Churchill Park that might need an upland review?

Chris Greenlaw: Yes and no. The short answer, right now they are in the preliminary stages. With a transition of department heads, there was a handoff of the project, we kept it moving along as far as all the preliminary work that needed to be done as far as mapping, existing mapping. Probably many of the folks here around this table and in the audience probably know more than I do where they are right now. I haven't been included, I haven't received anything as far as a preliminary design. Next public works meeting, they do keep me in the loop if there is anything to review. I will certainly inquire as to where they are now.

Commissioner Clark: One more comment. This weekend I was in Ogunquit, Maine and I happened to come upon an invasive plant working group, working on a trail along the rocky cliffs and they were targeting a specific invasive plant, using specific techniques for that invasive plant call dog chocking vine. Quite a few volunteers, informational tables, working very visibly to deal with invasive plants.

VII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS  
(EACH SPEAKER LIMITED TO 2 MINUTES)

Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive. I just happened to look at your agenda as I was looking for other things I was looking at, but it seems to be that there is more information under the application and I have been asking for that for a while, so it has been there and I missed it and I am sorry that I didn't thank you before this, I appreciate it. I don't know whether it would be appropriate to put the applicants name as well like TPZ, I may be pushing my luck. I don't know whether anybody has an answer for this but I had the occasion to go up and down Cedar Mountain yesterday and today. I noticed that there was activity along the rock ledge. I was just wondering if you knew what was going on and whether the project. I see that there is a lot of growth at the end of Dowd and Main Street and I was just curious if anybody had any information and I hope someday that we have better recording equipment.

John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill. I came up here to say hello, I haven't seen you in so long. It is nice to see you. I just give you a little update on, Commissioner Paskewich mentioned something about vernal pools. I have been up to Cedar Mountain and they are still alive and thriving well. The swamp cottonwoods are actually growing quite nicely and may actually be reproducing and from what I heard other groves or patches in the state we not producing young, ours appear to be growing robustly. That is not Town property yet, but there is another vernal pool that is on the former Marcap property that is approximately a few hundred feet southeast from the water tower and it is a very viable vernal pool as well. If you

go there are the right times in the spring you can hear the wood frog, it is quite symphony of sound. Really surprised how much activity is in there. Quiet most of the year. Put video You Tube. We have our own litter eco-classroom up there if you will, it is interesting. About 2 minute rule, I asked the Mayor about that because I keep having a problem at TPZ and the chairwoman asked me if I had a problem with it to bring it up with the Mayor. No, certainly you have your own authority here to set your own rules, however many minutes you want to allow people to talk, I complimented him on a couple of occasions because he has lets people, he doesn't shut off anybody, unless there is a whole room full of people that want to speak and it would really extend the meeting, so I think that is something to consider when you have members of the audience that do want to offer legitimate information, I see no benefit to shutting them off. Thank you very much.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you Mr. Bachand, anyone else? Seeing none, we will move on to Communications and Reports. Before we get into those, I want to respond to a couple of comments from the public. Rose Lyons did acknowledge that we are including more information on our agenda at the request of the public and Mr. Bachand has pointed out that we are a little more flexible in allowing more time to speak. It just reflects that we are more favorable and accommodating to the public, perhaps other commissions aren't, but we tend to be. With that said we will go on to communication and reports.

## VIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

### A. Internal Rules and Procedures

Chairman Zelek: No updates for that, just haven't had any time.

Chairman Zelek: Administrative Approvals, so Chris we have a number of these that we went through. As Mr. Bachand said, he hasn't seen us in a while, with the summer months we were fortunate enough to have applications that did not require the full commission to do a review. Many of these were minor activities within an upland review area and with that said I will turn it over to Chris and he can run us through list.

- B. Administrative Approval - Application 2015-10AA, 172 Kelsey Street, for soil remediation in the upland review area.
- C. Administrative Approval - Application 2015-11AA, 100 Milk Lane, for fire line installation in the upland review area.
- D. Administrative Approval - Application 2015-13AA, 62 Welles Dr. North, for a new deck in the upland review area.
- E. Administrative Approval - Application 2015-14AA, 3333 Berlin Turnpike, for soil testing in regulated areas.
- F. Administrative Approval - Application 2015-15AA, 1936 Main Street, for shed in the upland review area.

G. Administrative Approval – Application 2015-19AA, 113 Cambridge Drive, for deck in the upland review area.

H. Southfield Apartment correspondence.

Chris Greenlaw: I can't stress enough to the Commission and I think the Chair can attest to the fact that we have been quite engaged with the amount of time we spend with these agent approvals, both with staff and the Chairman himself. As you can see he has authorized my department to administer not only the administrative approvals you see before it, which staff gets involved in as far as assisting people with their applications. Many people as you heard this evening, don't know to calculate, don't know how to draw or fill or understand the form. A number of applications is tasking to the department, behind the scenes applications take administratively a large amount of time. Would you appreciate that, haven't cut you out of the loop by any means and invite any of you in to sit down with staff and review these. Do have six agent approvals for various minimal impact perceived by the Chairman, myself and staff and have executed and processed these applications in accordance with the law. In addition to that, I want to share with you that we have been engaged in notices of violation, could be a formal letter, phone call or meeting on site. Would like to present to you letter regarding with area that had maintenance issues with a swale, pipe. Chairman became aware of issues and phone calls, letters and site visits ensued.

Would also like to mention that every year we get one free voucher for commissioners to be certified as municipal inland agents, the DEEP apologized in stating that this came out very late. I believe the chairman has reached out to you and we have put together a list, I actually got together with DEEP, we got a listing of individuals on staff who have been certified and the Chairman has a voucher that is free, online to be trained.

Chairman Zelek: In order to fairly dispense of this voucher to a commissioner, I asked Chris to get our records from DEEP as far as which commissioners have completed the courses which DEEP offers for training. There were a few individuals on the Commission who have not yet completed the training, so based on the number of years they have served on the commission I asked the one with the most years if they would be interested and they declined, I have offered to another individual and am awaiting their response. We do now have record of training that has been completed by all commissioners, would like to turn over spreadsheet to Secretary Igielski to keep with records.

Commissioner Krawiec: I completed this training last year and I can't say enough on how well done the training is. Not being a person who enjoys eLearning, online training, I have to say it was well done, I learned a lot and to those commissioners that have not participated, I encourage you to think about it, I wish I could take it again, it was so good.

Chairman Zelek: Because our tasks are both technical and of a legal nature, some of these applications can be quite complex. So to those commissioners who have not completed the training to please do so.

Chris Greenlaw: I have copy of The Habitat, I will pass around for all of you to have your own copy. Lastly I have a copy of CT Wildlife and correspondence for the Chairman to review.

Chairman Zelek: I do have one last item communicate. As you know the Hunter property, also known as Amara, a few months ago the TPZ approved a site improvement application. There was a question as to whether or not they had a valid inland wetland permit. Several commissioners have approached me questioning whether or not this whole process was legal. My suggestion is, and I can do this if the consensus of the commission wishes it, I can create a time line of events as far as when this commission approved permits for the property, when we were approached by the applicant, December of last year into the beginning of this year, the events that occurred during TPZ meetings and the observations that were made regarding whether or not they have a permit for that property that is valid and some of the comments that were made by the TPZ commissioners. Several of them expressed their desire to have input from inland wetlands agency prior to making a decision on the site plan. If you would, I can put together that time line and turn it over to the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Energy and Protection and possibly the State's attorney's office for review. I volunteer that to you and would like to know if that is something the commission would like us to pursue.

Commissioner Clark: I would like you to pursue that. I attended several of the TPZ meetings in question in which members of the TPZ seemed to question why inland wetland wasn't consulted and though it was too late and approved application. Expected to be involved at some point but it went right by us. Would like to find out what happened and pursuing to the extent so we are not left out of the loop in the future in inter-Town applications.

Commissioner Casasanta: I will keep this short and to the point. Yes on everything.

Chairman Zelek: I see there is 2, other commissioners?

Commissioners Krawiec, Block and Manke expressed desire to Chairman to pursue it.

Commissioner Paskewich: I have a question. What authority in the town oversees the commissions and how they should work together in a sequential manner.

Chairman Zelek: No one that I am aware of.

Commissioner Block: If I may, that would be the manager. He is the administrator of the whole entity.

Commissioner Paskewich; I would like to expand on that form Vice Chairman Block's statement. I am going to make a comment and recommendation, is that the Town Manager receive a letter regarding that pursuit.

Chairman Zelek: Thank you, we will consider that.

Commissioner Clark: I would like to make once more statement that is another recent series of events that I feel went in the wrong order. The referendum last year about building in Mill Pond Park, in my opinion an application should have been brought both before the TPZ and Conservation Commission prior to ever having any kind of referendum which cost the town over \$30,000 and if we had denied it or at least brought things up it never would have gone in that direction and I believe that series of events is very similar to what happened with the Amara property.

Chairman Zelek: With that, I think we are done with comments. Can I get a motion to adjourn?

Commissioner Clark: I have one more comment. Could you please, the CACIWC conference is coming is up, might be appropriate to state date. [Date listed in The Habit - Saturday, November 14, 2015.] Please note keynote speaker is Dr. Michael Klemens.

Chairman Zelek: Dr. Clark is vernal pool expert that we have cited in this meeting.

#### IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Zelek moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m., motion by Commissioner Casasanta, seconded by Commissioner Clark; it was unanimously voted to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mrs. Susan Gibbon

Recording Secretary – Conservation Commission