

**NORWALK CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES**

**JANUARY 14, 2003**

**ATTENDANCE:** Matthew Caputo, Vice Chairman (6:10PM); Ed Holowinko;  
Andrew Kydes; Larry Losio (6:05PM); Karen  
DeStafanis (6:15PM).

**STAFF:** Alexis Cherichetti, Senior Environmental Officer; Erin Leonard.

The meeting was called to order at 6:15PM by Mr. Caputo.

**RECEIPT & DISCUSSION**

**A. 371 CHESTNUT HILL ROAD - VEY - #S02-125 - FIVE (5) LOT SUBDIVISION WITH ASSOCIATED SEPTIC SYSTEMS, ON-SITE WELLS, AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND WATERCOURSE.**

Ms. Cherichetti stated that the applicant had provided all the necessary information that was requested of them at the last meeting. A packet of information was supplied to the Commissioners for the record. She continued to say that the application was accepted at the last meeting, but the Commission had some concerns with the preliminary application and had held off making a decision until this meeting. Mr. Losio added that since the preliminary application still involved disruption to the wetlands, it was his opinion that the item go to a public hearing. Mr. Caputo then gave the applicant a chance to repond to the suggestion. Attorney Genuario, of Genuario & Conover, spoke on behalf of the applicant Mr. Vey. He responded that he had expectations of going to a public hearing.

**\*\* MS. DESTEFANIS MADE A MOTION TO HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING ON JANUARY 28TH, 2003, AT 7:30 PM ON ITEM #S02-125**

**\*\* MR. LOSIO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**B. 24 BELDEN AVENUE - AVALONBAY COMMUNITIES, INC. - #S02-129 - CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW MULTI-USE BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED PARKING, STORMWATER DRAINAGE AND LANDSCAPING ADJACENT TO THE NORWALK RIVER.**

Ms. Cherichetti stated that the application was accepted at the last meeting and that a public hearing was already scheduled for January 28th, 2003. She added that the applicant had requested, at the last meeting, a chance to give a brief introduction to their application at this meeting. Attorney Waters of Loposky, Loposky & Lang spoke on behalf of AvalonBay. He referred to a picture map of the current Norwalk Mall and gave a brief description of the current structure, citing that the impact of the proposed building would be fallacious. He said that they were proposing two separate buildings that would be interconnected by a parking garage. The garage would be expanded to include the current lot on Burnell Avenue, but would all be underground. They were also proposing a 3 tiered system around the building. The top level for occupant use, the 2nd level would be for emergency vehicles and unloading, and the bottom level would be a path for pedestrians. Mr. Waters also noted the proposal to raise the flood wall about 3ft to accommodate the proposed building of steps. He stated that the information the Commission had requested of them had been submitted and that the proposed look-out beyond the wall was no longer a part of the application. Mr. Caputo expressed his appreciation for the work that had been done to date by the applicant and repeated that the public hearing was set for January 28th, 2003.

**C. 10 NORDEN PLACE - UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION - #S02-131 - REMEDIATION, BY EXCAVATION, OF CONTAMINATED SOILS IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND.**

Ms. Cherichetti said that the application had not been received as yet. Ms. Cherichetti then stated that the applicant had submitted all the initial information needed in order to accept the application and recommended that the application be accepted tonight.

**\*\* MR. KYDES MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION**

**\*\* MR. LOSIO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Ms. Cherichetti then read a staff report dated January 6th, 2003 that gave a brief synopsis of the proposed application. Mr. Caputo then asked if a public hearing had been set for this application. Ms. Cherichetti said that the proposal was remedying an existing negative impact to a wetland and does not believe that it would cause any further negative impact. Mr. Bugden from Fuss & O'Neil spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the work that was going to be done was intended to remedy a contamination problem and would be fairly simple. Ms. DeStefanis asked for clarification as to the exact date the application was received and when did they want to commence the project. Ms. Cherichetti said the application was received today, January 14th. The applicant added

that they wanted to start work now while the ground was frozen so that the equipment needed would cause minimal disruption and while the water table was low.

**\*\* MR. LOSIO MADE A MOTION TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON JANUARY 28TH, 2003 AT 7:30PM**

**\*\* MR. HOLOWINKO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Caputo gave the applicant the choice to make a presentation tonight or wait until the public hearing. Mr. Bugden chose to wait until January 28th, 2003. He then asked for clarification about the timeframe in which to inform the abutting landowners of the public hearing. Ms. Cherichetti responded that 10 days was sufficient time and that she would draft a letter that could be sent to the neighbors for Mr. Bugden. He then asked for some direction on what the Commission would like to see in the presentation on January 28th. Mr. Caputo responded by stating that Ms. Cherichetti would be able to provide him with that information.

**D. 27 GLENWOOD AVENUE - MOISIADIS - #S02-132 - CONSTRUCTION OF A THREE-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED PARKING LOT, DRAINAGE SYSTEM AND LANDSCAPING IN A WATERCOURSE**

Ms. Cherichetti indicated that the applicant had provided all the information needed to accept the application.

**\*\* MS. DESTEFANIS MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION**

**\*\* MR. KYDES SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Strait, a Landscape Architect from Grumman Engineering, stated that the proposal was a revised version of a plan that was approved in 1997. The prior approved plan was for a 5 unit complex that had been reduced to a three unit complex with a parking lot in the back. Some of the amendments to the previous plans included a change in piping, (addition of a small brook course), 50 square feet of storm water renovation pool. He added that there would be catch basins in the driveway area and galleries for the catch basins. Also, a silt fence would be installed along the southern side with a mud-tracking pad off Glenwood Avenue and a separate stock-pile area. Mr. Kydes asked about the number of units at the abutting property.. Mr. Strait responded 11 units. Ms. Cherichetti added that the apartment buildings to the north were approved in 1995 and that the Commission at the time allowed for the watercourse to be piped. Mr. Holowinko questioned the proposed 15" pipe and indicated he would be more comfortable with a

24". Mr. Strait responded by stating that reports had shown that a 15-inch pipe was sufficient for the purpose. Ms. Cherichetti added that the Dean Martin Drainage Report would give all the details on that issue. Mr. Losio inquired about the surface above the pipe. Mr. Strait indicated that there would be a sidewalk and a 45ft lawn area for recreation. Mr. Kydes asked if a house once stood the area. Mr. Strait answered that a house once stood there and sat on top of the stream. Ms. Cherichetti wanted clarification on the required amount of parking spaces. Mr. Strait stated that 6 was required but that the additional spaces were to accommodate additional cars that a family might have. Mr. Losio asked Ms. Cherichetti for her opinion on whether the matter warranted a public hearing. Ms. Cherichetti indicated that though there were no wetlands, there was an intermittent watercourse and the work proposed was in the watercourse. Mr. Kydes added that the plan was better than before and that it was consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Losio disagreed. Mr. Kydes then added that there would be minimal impact based on his knowledge of the area. Mr. Caputo added that the work was in the watercourse and agreed with a public hearing. Mr. Kydes disagreed. Mr. Losio added that the issue was about consistency, rather than necessarily about the preservation of the wetlands.

**\*\* MR. LOSIO MADE A MOTION TO HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 11TH, AT 7:30PM**

**\*\* MR. HOLOWINKO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED WITH 3 IN FAVOR (MR. CAPUTO, MR. HOLOWINKO AND MR. LOSIO) AND 2 OPPOSED (MS. DESTEFANIS AND MR. KYDES)**

**E. 119 MAYWOOD ROAD - DAVIES - #S02-133 - EXCAVATION, FILLING, RE-GRADING, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A RETAINING WALL IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE.**

Ms. Cherichetti reported that upon review of the application, she found everything to be in order and recommended the application be accepted. She then added that there was no staff report.

**\*\* MR. LOSIO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION**

**\*\* MS. DESTEFANIS SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**



Ms. Cherichetti said that there was an existing low wall that the applicant wanted to rebuild with footings in order to solidify the wall. She then referred to a map of the property indicating to the Commission the proposed wall to be removed and rebuilt and its proximity to the wetland line. She said the applicant wanted to remove approximately 7.5 cubic yards and wanted to install a curtain drain from the eastern tip of the wetlands that would drain to the southern tip of the house. The applicant also proposed a small planting plan. She added that the work would require some excavation and would be in the wetlands. Mr. Caputo asked, for clarity, about the proximity of the wall to the wetlands and watercourse. Ms. Cherichetti said that the work would be approximately 10 feet into the wetlands and 2 feet from the watercourse. Ms. Davies, the applicant, said that the wall was sinking and that the footings would be under the existing wall. Mr. Losio asked about the proposed material for the wall. Ms. Davies responded that fieldstone was the proposed material for the wall and concrete for the footings. Mr. Losio then asked if there was a reason why the wall was currently sinking. Ms. Davies indicated that she did not have a definite answer but assumed it was due to the previous material used. Mr. Cherichetti then asked the applicant if she was aware of the location of the leaching fields. Ms. Davies indicated that no one knew because it predated record keeping. Mr. Losio then stated he was not clear on how the equipment would be able to enter and exit the area proposed, without interrupting the watercourse. Ms. Davies responded that she was a professional Landscape Designer and that she could assure that they would not go below the wall. Ms. Cherichetti inquired if there was any way to install the silt fence closer to wall. Ms. DeStefanis asked if the wall could feasibly be relocated elsewhere. Ms. Davies indicated that the area was mostly wooded and that she would do everything to maintain the natural state of the land. Mr. Losio then asked Ms. Cherichetti about the wording that would require a public hearing. Ms. Cherichetti stated for the record, that if the activity proposed significantly impacted the watercourse or wetland, then a public hearing was necessary. Mr. Losio asked about the location of the septic tank. Ms. Davies responded that the tank was behind the deck. Ms. Cherichetti recommended that there be a visit to the property to get a better idea.

Mr. Caputo then gave a brief recess at 7:25PM, before the public hearings began.

**PUBLIC HEARING (TO BEGIN AT 7:30 P.M.)**

The public hearing commenced at 7:30 pm and Mr. Caputo went over the rules of a public hearing for the record.

**A. 295 NEWTOWN AVENUE - KERSCHNER DEVELOPMENT - #S02-126 - FIVE UNIT CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED DRIVEWAY, STORMWATER DRAINAGE AND LANDSCAPING ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE.**

Mr. Genuario representing Kerschner Development, submitted proof of mailings for the record, to Ms. Cherichetti. He then began his presentation by giving a brief summary

about the purpose of the application. He referred to an aerial photograph of the property and stated that the area, which was 5.32 acres of land, allowed for single family lots approximately 12,500 square feet. He added that the conservation development was a condition of the zoning regulation that allowed units to be clustered together with the hope of keeping the land in tact. Prior applications on this property had been submitted and consequently been denied or withdrawn in the past due to the overwhelming amount of units that were proposed; 11 - units, and then 9 -units consecutively. He stated that of the 5.34 acres that was allowed for building use, 3.117 acres would be preserved in its natural state, of which less than 2 acres consisted of wetlands. The conservation development regulations only required 50% of land owned to be preserved but the applicant Kerschner Development planned to preserve 58%. The proposed units were only 5 in total and would be single family homes, which were consistent with the area. He then requested Ms. Throckmorton of Environmental Land Solutions give an outline of the site from her expert point of view.

Ms. Throckmorton briefly went through some of the resources that they found in the area. She began by saying that the central area of the wetlands consisted of a small grove of trees that was on the DEP list of concerns. She pointed out that the property had already been previously developed as a residential area and that there already had been a lot of disturbance to the site. She stated that one of the first things that would get done would be to remove the trash and debris in order to create a better buffer. Also, she suggested one use for the area would be to discharge storm drainage away from the wetlands, which in turn would limit disturbance to the buffer. Initially, all the areas would be directed to catch basins accompanied with sump pumps, that would take out some of the larger debris. The water would then be directed to underground galleries built underneath the property. She added that there was a planting plan proposed that included native plants and shade trees which would help to create some diversity in the area. Ms. Throckmorton then cited the different guidelines that had been set regarding disturbance of the population, distance from the wetlands and managing storm water, stating that they were in compliance with all the guidelines.

Mr. Genuario then requested Mr. Martin from Grumman Engineering to come to the podium and give information on the engineering portion of the proposal. Mr. Martin stated that the units would be accessed off Newtown Avenue and would be serviced by sanitary sewer and public water. DPW had done the design for the sewers. The storm drainage provided for the site consisted of each unit having its own underground gallery routed through and oil/water separator unit. The system, he added, was designed to accommodate the 25 year storm. Each unit had 20 feet of 4x4 galleries and there would be minor regrading. Also, a retaining wall would be installed which would be 2- 7 feet in height.

Mr. Genuario then asked Mr. Strait to speak briefly on the planting plan. Mr. Strait stated that there would be shade trees planted and that many of the existing Elk trees would be preserved along the edge of the property. Underneath that, a series of White Pine and Norway Spruce would be placed around the perimeter along with some flowering trees like Dogwood. The interior of the site, along the road, there would be native Red Maple

and Crabapple trees. There would also be a mitigation buffer planting proposed, that was proposed by Ms. Throckmorton which would add to the buffer. He added that there were a few trees that were able to be saved such as a large Oak and an Evergreen on the interior of the site. The entrance of the property, he concluded, would have a smattering of rhododendrons.

Mr. Genuario closed by stating that the applicant had done everything possible to preserve and respect the wetlands and that the proposal was very conservative.

Mr. Caputo then allowed the public to speak. There were no names on the list in favor of the proposal. There were 2 names in opposition. Ms. Lauricella was the first to speak. She stated that she was not completely opposed or in favor but rather in the middle. She expressed her appreciation for the applicant's efforts to mitigate dumping but stated that she felt the proposed building plan was too intense. She suggested that they considered reducing the number of units to 3. She added that a planting plan should be a condition of approval and suggested that septic tanks be considered instead of connecting to the sewer line. She stated that she felt the Commission should set conditions for approval such as requiring a maintenance plan for the oil & water separator and require the applicant to use pervious pavers and materials.

Mr. Jacobsen, a resident of Spinning Wheel Lane, stated that he also was neither opposed or in favor of the development. He then raised a specific question regarding deer and wondered if they would end up in his yard. He stated that a five unit lot was more preferably to an 11 unit and he appreciated the efforts to preserve the wetlands and the maintenance of a buffer.

Ms. Cherichetti then read a letter from Mr. Lauritoni, a resident of Grumman Avenue, dated, January 5th, 2003. In the letter Mr. Lauritoni stated that his property would directly abut the development and that he was strongly against the development for several reasons. He listed the possibility of excessive run-off, maintenance of storm water and the installation of a sanitary system as his primary reasons. He also voiced his concern with the density of the proposed 5 lot development and said that "...it did not conform to the character of housing in the Cranbury district".

Mr. Caputo gave Mr. Genuario the chance to give his rebuttal. Mr. Genuario stated that the conservation development scheme was not being abused in this instance as it had been in the past. He pointed out that public opinion was very much opposed when it was 11-units. However, the 5 unit complex has been more favorably received. He added that though the developer could legally build more units, a more conservative approach had been taken in order to preserve the conservation scheme. He stated that the use of septic versus sewer was a matter of opinion; however, DPW had specifically requested that they install sewer lines in case they had use for it down the road. Mr. Genuario went on to address the issue of the buffer zone by stating that all the houses would be 50 feet away from the wetlands. Ms. Throckmorton then added that though 25 trees of moderate diameter would have to be removed, 70 trees would be added, while preserving 40 existing trees. She continued to point out that mammals that currently frequented the area



to cross the roads would still do so and that amphibians would be accommodated with ponds. Mr. Martin then stated that the water/oil separator was designed to retain a certain amount of rainfall on site and added that a maintenance plan was designed per the requirements of the Zoning regulation. Mr. Losio expressed some concern about the use of pesticides for lawn care and inquired if anything beyond BMP was considered. Mr. Genuario said that the BMP was developed after the fact. Mr. Kydes inquired if the street would be a private road. Mr. Genuario responded that the road would be private and maintained by the homeowners. Mr. Caputo asked about the type of ownership would there be for the units. Mr. Genuario stated that they might be single family condos. He closed by stating that Kerschner Development had been in Norwalk for over 15 years and had been in business for over 35 years. All the buildings have been well received in the past and the developer was considered one of the most reputable builders.

Mr. Caputo closed the public hearing at 8:55 PM. A brief five minute break was taken.

**B. 39 LOIS STREET - ROUNDTREE DEVELOPMENT LLC - #S02-128 - CONSTRUCTION OF 29-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING AND PARKING LOT IN AND ADJACENT TO A WETLAND.**

The public hearing reconvened at 9:05PM

Mr. Caputo once again stated the rules of a public hearing for new arrivals. Mr. Genuario spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated for the record that his client had no affiliation the Roundtree Motel located on Westport Avenue. Mr. Genuario then submitted proof of mailing to Ms. Cherichetti for the record.

He began his presentation by stating that the area for the proposed development was in a number 2 business zone and was primarily a commercial area. A different type of building could have been considered but a multi-family facility seemed more appropriate. The site would serve as a transitional site between a heavy commercial area and residential area. He then gave a brief history of the property to clarify why there was or was not a wetland. He referred to a map from 1953 that showed a flowing brook. A brook, he added, that has since been closed off in order to build Fullin Road. He continued to point out that a map filed in 1961 showed Fullin Road as being fully developed with the existence of a drainage pipe that collected from four catch basins. He then requested Mr. Shuckup, a soil scientist, to give his opinion on the site.

Mr. Shuckup stated for the record that it was his opinion that the site was a leftover lot that never got developed. He added that the lot had been disturbed enough to meet the technical standards of a wetland but did not meet any of the attributes of an existing wetland.

Ms. Slayback, of Environmental Land Solutions, stated that she had recently visited the property and witnessed the water collection during a storm. She stated that the water



collected into catch basins and was transported onto an easement that went down a hillside. She pointed out that there was currently no diversity of wetland vegetation nor was there a 3 tiered vegetated community distinct to wetlands. The planting plan submitted, she added, was suitable to the environment and was more viable, more diverse and allowed for the open flow of water that would get into a storm drainage system. Mr. Shuckup was called again to give his opinion on the mitigation plan. Mr. Shuckup stated that the plan was to mitigate a man influenced wetland with another man influenced wetland and would be a benefit. Mr. Genuario then showed pictures to the Commission of the current condition of the site and the adjacent businesses in proximity to the property.

Mr. Martin from Grumman Engineering was then asked to give a brief statement about the drainage system and the materials used for pavement. Mr. Martin stated that the drainage system was designed to collect run-off of pervious and impervious material and had been approved by the DPW.

Mr. Strait gave a handout for the record about pervious pavements stating the manufacturer and the supplies. He reviewed the planting plan and showed copies to the audience. His overall plan, he stated, would be around 6-7 feet in height and would serve to improve wildlife value.

Mr. Caputo then opened the floor to the public. There were no names listed in favor. There were 3 names in opposition. Mr. Waters spoke on behalf of the homeowners present, which numbered approximately 40 individuals by a show of hands. Mr. Waters stated that his clients are aware that the property would be developed at some point in the future. He referred to a map stating that nothing on the site would be the same according the proposal. The assumptions that were made that the wetlands were marginal and that a better one could be created did not protect the neighbors. He added that the neighbors were upset about the density to and were concerned about the parking that would be needed to accommodate the building. He said that the impact of the drainage system on the neighbors created concern for potential flooding and would cut across the neighbors' properties as a result of re-channeling. In addition, the new wetland proposed would be in the backyards of the neighbors which would then subject them to regulated and restricted activity on their own property. An issue that did not exist before. The applicant, he pointed out, was moving the wetland for their own convenience and expense, with no thought to the impact it would have on others. He closed by asking the Commission to require the applicant to enhance the existing wetland instead of creating a new one.

Ms. Reed, a resident of Fullin Avenue, gave a history of her childhood growing up in the woods. She expressed strong opposition to the development and requested that the Commission deny the applicant.

Ms. Lauricella, spoke as a representative of the Sierra Club. She stated that the members were concerned about the impact the creation of the wetlands would have on the Indian River. She agreed with Mr. Waters that the current wetland should be the primary concern, not the creating of a new one. She stated that the proposal was too intense and

that the applicant should consider building a parking lot underneath the building. She went on to say that man-made wetlands were not going to fulfill their purpose and suggested that a maintenance plan be written and submitted to the staff of the DPW.

She concluded by stating that the Commission require a phase 1 and site assessment to find out if there was any hazardous material.

Mr. Caputo then took a brief 5 minute break at 10:45pm.

The public hearing reconvened at 10:50PM and Mr. Genuario began his rebuttal. He argued that the existing wetlands were not viable and that no evidence had been presented to prove otherwise. He stated that their mitigation efforts were superior. He agreed that moving the buffer and creating a new wetlands was of course beneficial to his client but it made sense because of all the other commercial buildings on the other side. He thanked Mr. Lauricella for her suggestion to have a phase 1 report done but stated for the record that it would have been impossible to get to stage 2 without fulfilling the requirements of stage 1. He pointed out that the Conservation Commission was limited to dealing with issues concerning impact to the wetlands and that the hydrology that drove the wetlands no longer existed. Mr. Losio then inquired if other alternatives had been considered. Mr. Genuario said that other options had been considered but the applicant did not want to go that route. Mr. Caputo asked about the impact to property owners if the wetlands were shifted. Mr. Genuario stated that it was his opinion that no one would be impacted and the neighbors would still have the freedom to do as they pleased on their property.

Mr. Caputo closed the public hearing at 11:05PM.

## **DECISIONS**

### **A. 101 PERRY AVENUE - #S02-122 - VIGNEAULT - RELOCATION OF DRAINAGE PIPE AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN IN-GROUND POOL ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE.**

Ms. Cherichetti reported that the application was incomplete and that the applicant had not submitted any new information since the request for an extension was granted on November 4, 2002. Mr. Caputo asked for the exact date of the deadline. Ms. Cherichetti responded that the deadline was January 18th, 2003 but a decision had to be made in this meeting. She then recommended that the application be denied without prejudice.

**\*\* MR. LOSIO MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE APPLICATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

**\*\* MR. KYDES SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**BOND RELEASE**

**A. 4 NEWTOWN COURT - #639.S97 - KERSCHNER DEVELOPMENT -  
CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ASSOCIATED  
LANDSCAPING ADJACENT TO A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE**

Ms. Cherichetti recommended that the bond be released on 4 Newtown Court.

**\*\* MS. DESTEFANIS MADE A MOTION TO RELASE THE BOND**

**\*\* MR. LOSIO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* MOTION CARRIED WITH 4 IN FAVOR AND 1 OPPOSED (MR.  
HOLOWINKO)**

**ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

**A. DECEMBER 10, 2002 MINUTES**

Mr. Caputo recommended that in the interest of time, the approval of the minutes of December 10, 2002 be postponed until the next public meeting.

**B. DECEMBER 17, 2002 MINUTES**

Mr. Caputo recommended that in the interest of time, the approval of the minutes of December 17, 2002, be postponed until the next public meeting.

**COMMENTS OF STAFF**

Ms. Cherichetti informed the Commission that the next meeting would be held in room 225.

**COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

There were no comments to be noted.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MR. KYDES MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING**

**\*\* MR. LOSIO SECONDED THE MOTION**

**\*\* MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**



The meeting was adjourned at 11:30PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Montgomery

Telesco Secretarial Services

