

Wallingford Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission

**Special Meeting
Thursday, September 7, 2023, 7:00 p.m.
Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers
Second Floor, Town Hall
45 South Main Street, Wallingford, CT**

MINUTES

Chair James Vitali called this Special Meeting of the Wallingford Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission to order on Thursday, September 7, 2023, at 7:07 p.m. in the Robert F. Parisi Council Chambers, Second Floor of Town Hall, 45 South Main Street, Wallingford, CT. It had been rescheduled from the September 6 Regular Meeting, which was canceled.

PRESENT: Chair Vitali, Vice Chair Deborah Phillips, Secretary Nick Kern, Commissioner Jeffrey Necio, and Alternate Commissioner James Heilman, and Environmental Planner Erin O'Hare.

ABSENT: Commissioner Michael Caruso and Alternate Commissioners Aili McKeen and Mrs. Caroline Raynis.

There were about 60 persons in the audience.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - The Pledge was recited.

B. ROLL CALL - As above.

Chair Vitali said the five Members here will be seated tonight.

C. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Special Meeting, July 26, 2023

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF JULY 26, 2023 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.

MR. NECIO: SECOND.

VOTE: MR. KERN - YES; MS. PHILLIPS - YES; MR. NECIO - YES; MR. HEILMAN - YES; CHAIR VITALI - YES.

2. Special Meeting, August 2, 2023

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF AUGUST 2, 2023, BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED.

MR. HEILMAN: SECOND.

VOTE: MR. KERN - YES; MS. PHILLIPS - YES; MR. HEILMAN - YES; CHAIR VITALI - YES.

ABSTAINED: MR. NECIO.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. #A18-12.2 / 32 Barnes Road - Rowland Industries - Request for release of bond

Ms. O'Hare said this item is not ready.

2. #A23-5.5 / 10 Mansion Road - Joe Flamini (Lost & Found Ventures LLC) - (commercial development - restaurant)

Appearing were Attorney Dennis Ceneviva of Ceneviva Law Firm, Meriden, Mr. Christopher Juliano, L.L.S., P.E., Juliano Associates, 405 Main Street, Yalesville, and Mr. George Logan, Registered Land Surveyor, Certified Professional Wetlands and Soils Scientist, of REMA Ecological Services, Meriden, CT.

Attorney Ceneviva said, This matter was before you on July 26. It's approximately 2.15 acres in size. The purpose is to develop this site as a restaurant. We're before the Commission because the this does have substantial activity in your Extended Upland Review area, extended by nature of the steep slopes. We presented an updated design on July 26. Based on legitimate concerns raised by this Commission and neighbors, we have revised the site plan that is before you tonight. In it, I'd note that the activity is pulled away from that steep slope that is the northerly ravine. You commented in your August 31 memorandum that the Commission would allow an Intervenor to participate in a public hearing and provide specific facts and evidence as to how to resolve problems on the site over which you have jurisdiction. I'd give you the revised proposal so you all can see the changes before you and that we have a relatively simple application before you.

Mr. Juliano said, As Attorney Ceneviva said, we made some rather big changes to our site plan in response to the comments of the Environmental Planner, Commissioners, and to some of the comments that we heard at the August 2 Site Walk. On the west side of the property: First, you can see in this area where the original house is located. We were originally going to keep the house. The site contractor and the Owner believe that the structure is not able to be used, so the Owner proposes to remove that. That allowed us to bring the proposed building forward. It's kind of a T-shape rather than rectangular, and on an angle so that the proposed restaurant with large windows can look over the woods for aesthetics. Also, the shed there will be taken away, but we are leaving the base in place so we are not doing any earth removal by razing the structure. The original plan had the parking lot running perpendicular to Mansion Road, and it's now 90 degrees to that. We're not doing any dumpsters or parking in this area. It will all be grass, staying away from steep slopes. We'll pull that retaining wall and the corner structure in that area farther away from the wetlands.

Mr. Juliano continued, To give the Commission some clarification, I have plan copies for the Environmental Planner and others. (He put out plans for the public as well.) This is basically the original submittal, with the current plan overlay features in red. In black is what we were proposing, mostly on the west side to the east. We removed the existing house. We changed the building and cocked it. There's no three-season porch anymore. So we'll not have to do this clearing here--the seven trees. To respond to the Environmental Planner, parking is located 90 degrees differently, so what would have been the dumpster and a parking lot will no longer be there. We have a pre-formed scour hole, and we'll be cutting down less trees and less vegetation in the URA and moving the driveway over. Basically, we were directing more drainage through the manhole. So now the water from the building to Mansion Road and even in front of our lot will be infiltrated into our stormwater, going under our parking lot and the low area, going to infiltration. More infiltration is always a good thing. Do you have any questions about the overlay plan?

Chair Vitali asked, Questions?

There were none at this point.

Mr. Juliano said, The concept has remained the same, although we made changes to the parking and building. The pipe will now be laid directly in the ravine. And you can see the full design of the wall--how it's to be constructed, how the storage containers are going to interact with the wall. There will be a flat area for outdoor seating and for food trucks with three pads. They're the appearance of food trucks but outdoor kitchens--a shell with no engine, no rear end. As to utilities, water and electric run from the proposed restaurant to the three pads. So there's no overhead lines. If there was something else working, it would not be on the ground but would be on the pad as well, to protect the wetlands.

Mr. Juliano continued, My storm drainage system is designed to handle a 100-year storm, and it will connect to the pass-through pipe with this scour hole for dispersion. The pre-formed scour hole is designed for a 10' x 12' outflow, but I made it longer to insure that the outflow from this pipe stayed in the channel, so to get more treatment out of the pre-formed scour hole. Stormwater is collected in the front yard to keep it out of Mansion Road to infiltrate as much area as possible and not to have an issue with the Town storm drainage system.

Mr. Juliano continued, The Erosion Control Plan has stayed pretty much the same. On the downhill side, we made three additional sets of silt fence for any flows. We have a Construction Sequence to use with the Erosion Control and Demolition Plans. I'd get a storm pipe in there, and we have to put the wall in and pipe in and work our way back for storm drainage. Questions?

Commissioner Phillips asked, The house is coming out now. You'll fill the basement?

Mr. Juliano said, Yes, the house basement is here in front of the building setback. We will fill in that basement. Utilities will go in through there, and it will be backfilled, compacted and grassed.

Commissioner Necio had no questions.

Commissioner Heilman asked, What method of infiltration are you referring to on this pipe area?

Mr. Juliano said, Infiltration focuses on the Cultec 902 units and gravel with backfill using granular material. It's for infiltration and taking all our impervious area, putting infiltration into the ground and sending it to the system or to groundwater.

Commissioner Heilman said, No wetland that it is shedding directly to--O.K., that's fine.

Chair Vitali said, Your dark squiggly line?

Mr. Juliano said, That's the proposed tree line.

Chair Vitali said, The stormwater on Mansion Road is going directly to the wall and not to the drainage system?

Mr. Juliano said, Right. It will drop just beyond the wall with a pre-formed scour hole.

Chair Vitali said, Do you have Ms. O'Hare's comments?

Mr. George Logan said, I have a report to pass along (he handed out to the Commissioners and Ms.

O'Hare). It addresses the cumulative comments and questions Ms. O'Hare had over the past weeks. This information is in the letter dated today that substantiates wetlands in the record back to September 2022. I believe it shows the soil type that we encountered and verified at the site. One of the questions is the definition or status of the minor ravine that comes down and receives discharge from Mansion Road. The question is, Is that an intermittent watercourse or just a drainage swale, which I characterized it as. In your regulations, "Intermittent Watercourse" shall be defined by "a defined permanent channel and bank and the occurrence of two or more characteristics: evidence of scour and presence of detritus; presence of standing water longer in a particular storm; the presence of hydrophytic vegetation." So I believe we have a channel and bank here--criteria of 48 to 72 hours for standing water as issued to us by DEEP to affirm there was or was not a base flow. The feature has an estimated watershed of 5.31 acres, which in my 35 years of experience is way too small a watershed to give an intermittent watercourse. It showed only a bit of moisture. Finally, regarding the hydrophyte criteria, I found some hydrophytes in the far upper section of the feature. There are no hydrophytes in the rest of the channel. Lower down, there were found species of jewelweed and clear weed and intermixed with upland non-hydrophyte species. So it's my opinion that the feature is a drainage swale and not an intermittent watercourse.

Mr. Logan continued, Erin O'Hare asked whether in the larger ravine it was a perennial stream or not. It has 141 acres of watershed. It's semi-perennial. Sometimes it flows; in some years it doesn't. That's not an official designation. If you look at it at USGS maps, perennial watercourses have a continuous blue line. When I was there July 25th, I looked and there was nothing to identify a watercourse as I saw no aquatic organisms.

Mr. Logan continued: Something mentioned by Erin O'Hare in her 9/5 report: A question of whether the redirection of flows could go over the hill. In my opinion, no effects on the upper slope vegetation will be realized, as they have deep root systems, get only runoff from storms. Water will be brought to the proposed stormwater management system. I've had no indication of it going over the steeper slopes and no erosion. Another question from Ms. O'Hare was whether or not we were moving the drainage from the road farther down this pad. Ms. O'Hare asked me to put it in writing.

Chair Vitali said, To hand us a report that the Commission could look at--if she says, it's O.K., but you handed it to the Commission the night of the meeting, and we're supposed to review the information?

Mr. Logan said, Comment 4.a. is about whether the status of the drainage ditch would change to become a wetland or an intermittent watercourse. It's possible, but we won't really know until it is actually done.

Ms. O'Hare said, I think what you're saying is it will have more sediment, and then we'll see whether the plants establish, and so it may become an intermittent watercourse by definition.

Mr. Logan said, The hydrology will change; it will become wetter, so it's possible it will become regulated. You have in the report #5 about the soils, with concern about soils and erodibility. Based on the map from the federal government, there were two types of soils associated with the big ravine and above: the Manchester and (mostly associated with the big ravine) the Penwoods. Penwoods soils are well drained and ready for invertebrates in the corridor--only the lower stream. But I agree with Ms. O'Hare on the Penwoods erosional ratings for the slopes as the slopes are not "B" but "E", more steep. These soils have poor structures. If you send flow to them, then you have a problem; but if you spread flows out, you don't have a problem. So we will have to look at that.

Mr. Logan said, I looked at the revised plan. As to the potential for physical adverse impacts, I feel that the Application is not affecting the hydrology. We're infiltrating water. The other thing is what will happen during storms. If we maintain what's been proposed and maintained, then the risk in the construction phase is minimal.

Commissioner Kern asked, What's going to happen to the well?

Mr. Juliano said, It will be capped and removed, according to EPA standards. We'll tie into city water.

Commissioners Phillips and Necio had no questions.

Commissioner Heilman said, Piping across the road on the south side in that ravine area--is anything being picked up south of that, going across the road, surface flow?

Mr. Juliano said, My office in 2006 did a survey of the bank across the road. It came back that it does not pick up water or snow coming off. I have not seen any.

Commissioner Heilman said, Looking at Google Earth, you can approximate elevations and see changes. What was formerly referred to as an "intermittent stream" has no source. When you look toward the north, you follow it to a small pool, and it continues and goes up to Fresh Meadows up at Schoolhouse Road. Your map agrees with the water as in 2008 aerial photographs. I don't see the source. Do you know of any flows coming in from the south side of the road to the north?

Mr. Juliano said, I used Manning's equation to do a sewer flow analysis of the pipe. So I was able to calculate the maximum limits of flow over time, and a maximum velocity coming out 24" that pipe to make sure, if we were infiltrating, that we had enough capacity. So that pipe stayed 24 inches, but that pipe is primarily flat--it's 0.7%. Once we get through the sewer, we address the increase at 5%, which is higher. So we have the capacity to deal with that. If more water goes to it, it's a priority to develop the section on our property. So I think the 5% pipe has enough capacity.

Commissioner Heilman said, The mound you see to the east of the property, underneath that, and existing under it all the way to the power lines, is a basalt intrusion and it's close to surface. That's the cause of these ravines. In this area, the stress put fractures in the sandstone and put joints in the bedrock and created the deep ravines after soil eroded away down to intrusive bedrock. The ravine is eroded down to bedrock. That's why I'm concerned about infiltration and the possibility for liquefaction, which would happen in minor flooding. Yes, more water is coming today from erosion and through there.

Chair Vitali asked Ms. O'Hare, Are you all set?

Ms. O'Hare said, A lot has happened in the last few weeks. Today I got a response from Juliano Associates to my recent comments. Chris, could you talk about the peak flow rate that you have to meet under Stormwater Regulations? You're increasing the velocity in this pipe extension about 130 feet long, and changing the pitch?

Mr. Juliano said, Because the pipe slope is increasing, the capacity of the pipe is greater than the existing drainage now. The water that gets into the channel, or the stormwater into our system, will be metered out. Flows in the summertime report delays; but, for my post-construction, peak flows must be equal to or less than that of a 150-year storm.

Ms. O'Hare said, I believe you just said that because of the pipe you're going to increase the rate. You're contributing additional flow from the detention units. When there's a large storm, some overflow will find its way into this.

Mr. Juliano said, I said a 5% increase over the whole pipe. This pipe now has no erosion control at the end of the pipe. So I determined what the maximum possible could be, based on geometry and in the drainage calculations. So the existing handles that 23 cfs; and with the extension of 500 feet, the pipe can handle it. With that watershed the flows aren't going to be that high. So I'm increasing velocity and peak flows. I'm just showing how the pipe has capacity. The pipe can handle a 50 c.f.s. additional flow.

Ms. O'Hare said, We're talking concrete pipe or?

Mr. Juliano said, ADS N-12 corrugated plastic pipe.

Ms. O'Hare said, I imagine that water will go through the pipe faster than water flowing through the natural channel with rocks in the bottom of it.

Mr. Juliano said, Possibly. I'd point back to our pre-formed scour hole—its role is to take those velocities and slow them down so erosion is basically nil.

Commissioner Heilman said, A corrugated pipe slows flow due to turbulence versus smooth, which increases the velocity.

Mr. Juliano said, The pipe comes corrugated or smooth bore, and we haven't specified. Let's say it's a corrugated bore. I have not specified corrugated, but will.

Ms. O'Hare said, This Commission has always been concerned, and actually enabled to be concerned, about water quality. It's under your authority. In 1996 when the definition of "intermittent watercourse" was inserted in the Wetlands Act to deal with the issue of farmers digging ditches to drain fields and suddenly they were slapped with a regulated stream, and that was not the intent. So the focus here is on water with the potential to cause erosion and transport sediments and the effect on water quality. I'm interested in the waterway--and this Commission is--water moving, if it's in a concrete channel, an open ditch, a pristine waterway. It's moving and it has the ability to transport sediments. We deal with development applications, so we have to look to make sure you get soil loosened up. You have rains, sediment, the potential for erosion. You have erosion control measures that we then apply to minimize the potential for erosion. I'm concerned, both George and Chris, to talk about when you're putting in this pipe and you're channelizing this open stream, open waterway--moving water that moves after storms and it has the ability to transport sediments. After storms, you're channelizing it in a pipe for 130 feet or so. In my comments I wanted George to comment on the impact of that waterway, in terms of now it's in a pipe and before it was open to the rocks and air? Now it's in a pipe--and, more importantly, water quality, what does going through this length of pipe do to this water quality? But the other thing is the potential for erosion when you're constructing this wall and you're channellizing 130 feet. And I asked for a phasing plan, where it could be drawn out, and that was not turned in. What, Chris, you turned in was a written phasing plan, which I also asked for; but I wanted it visually--not engineered, just sketches. First you do this, then you do this--the steps, because there are about, I don't know, 15 steps. It's a complicated thing. Because, as you're building this, you've got the water rushing through. So it's complicated, and I'd like you to walk the Commission through those steps because we are concerned about sedimentation downstream to the wetland

that exists north of this retaining wall that's going to be built.

Attorney Ceneviva said, If I might, Mr. Chairman. I'm getting confused as to the level of concern when your Environmental Planner's Report indicates that this Commission has the task of determining whether or not this northerly section--easterly section, rather, of this drainage ditch is or is not an intermittent watercourse. And if it's not an intermittent watercourse, then she suggests that you declare the application Not a Significant Impact Activity and turn your deliberations about a permit decision. Again, the Intervenor can certainly speak to the scientific information they have to provide to you. But on the issue of intermittent watercourse versus drainage ditch, the only evidence that's been presented on this record--back from July, and certainly comments from Commissioner Heilman, certainly Mr. Logan's presentation. It seems as if there is no other evidence than a 2003 report that Erin dug up that suggested it's anything but a drainage ditch. Everything else suggests--and why go on to talk about this drainage ditch when it's really something typically you're not concerned about? You're concerned about watercourses, that's the level of the distinction. That's why I'm lost about the level of questioning on what she's unwilling to acknowledge as a drainage ditch.

Ms. O'Hare said, I could enlighten you, if you'd like.

Chair Vitali said, No, not now. This goes back, again, to things that should have been done long before tonight.

Attorney Ceneviva said, Well, there isn't a resolution with your Environmental Planner. The decisions are made here. This is a drainage ditch. There's no evidence--I'm happy to listen to the Intervenors. But I'd like to have someone present evidence that it is anything other than the drainage ditch that Mr. Logan has qualified it as.

Ms. O'Hare said, I'm not saying it's an intermittent watercourse. That wasn't the nature of my concern. My concern is in the Upland Review Area--what's being one Regulated Activity in the Upland Review Area is the construction of this 80-foot-long retaining wall and the pipe going through it, and then the pipe discharges. I'm concerned about the water quality for that discharge, which is also a Regulated Activity, the discharge of stormwater; but also, construction of that whole entire retaining wall is within the purview. Also within the purview of this Commission is general water quality--that's all I'm saying. I don't really care if it's an intermittent watercourse. It can be--it's a ditch. It's a ditch because it has, as I explained in my Environmental Planner's Report; and I also concurred with Commissioner Heilman--maybe things change. Maybe 20 years ago, when Tom Petrus wrote his report, it did support hydrophytic vegetation.

Chair Vitali said, Chris, you got a short display or presentation on water quality during construction of this wall--short?

Mr. Juliano said, All right. Let me, I'll just take one step further back but I will keep it short. The water quality flowing through this drainage ditch now is storm runoff from developed areas and roadway. Water quality is poor to start with, O.K.? Water quality coming off of our site that we're collecting is high because we are going to put it through--treat it with--isolate our runoff and infiltrate it.

Chair Vitali said, That isn't what she's referring to.

Mr. Juliano said, I know--and infiltrate it.

Chair Vitali said, The wall--I want to get to the wall and the pipe. She's worried about during construction. That's what I want to hear.

Mr. Juliano said, O.K. The narrative goes through and explains how we're going to take care of this, how we're going to cut trees but not stump them at first; put in our silt fence. Then we are going to stump in the vicinity of the wall. We are going to build the wall up a few bricks at a time, get the first 40 feet of pipe or so in, get our free-form scour hole in; use our wall, the back of our wall, as another deterrent for any water flowing down this channel while we are putting in pipe and backfilling. And, as we get higher up, we'll put more layers of the wall in. So we are going to use the wall--silt fence behind that wall--and it's all explained here. And do this, working our way from that discharge point all the way up, control it.

Chair Vitali asked, How are you--how long is it going to take? You're starting at the wall and you're working back to the road.

Mr. Juliano said, I don't think that'll take more than a week.

Chair Vitali said, That much, seriously?

Mr. Juliano said, If that much, if that much. I mean, we are talking 130 feet of pipe, but we're also talking about building a wall and putting in storage containers. Now, site contractor, if he's really good, has a decent team, might be able to do it in a couple days. But I generally will overestimate construction like that.

Chair Vitali asked, How much material is underneath the pipe to bring it in?

Mr. Juliano said, Underneath the pipe it's only what we're going need for the bed--the bed of the gravel, because we're going to put it right on that channel. So we're going to bed the pipe with gravel.

Chair Vitali asked, So you're going to be connecting to the existing drainage almost instantly then?

Mr. Juliano said, We can pretty much almost come up instantly, yes.

Chair Vitali said, So the pipe coming from the street to the primary watercourse shouldn't be affected?

Mr. Juliano said, No, we can get that in. I was just starting with back at the wall and working my way back--at most a week. But, if you want us to put it in and connect it right away--we could do that, too.

Chair Vitali said, Well, that's the only way--you're going to have to use the wall as a retention pond, then. There should be no poor water quality.

Mr. Juliano said, No.

Chair Vitali said, You'll have the same water quality you have today but within two or three days of heading the pipe to the brook.

Mr. Juliano said, Right. The reason why I mentioned using the wall is because we will have cut trees in here; we will have exposed soil as we are trying to build this up to rough grade. And that's why I'd be using the wall--so, if anything came, we have basically a line here with our wall and a silt fence behind it as we're building it up. And then, obviously, behind it we'll have our triple row and our perimeter silt fence. So I was trying to do buttons on belt and suspenders to make it almost foolproof so we didn't have a problem.

Chair Vitali said, If you're taking the trees off the bank of the ravine, that shouldn't be that big a job. You're not clear-cutting the whole, where your new line goes?

Mr. Juliano said, No, no we're not.

Chair Vitali said, So you--you should have that relatively quickly. Okay?

Ms. O'Hare asked, Are you diverting the stream around so you can make your scour hole pad?

Mr. Juliano said, There's no stream, first of all; and no, the scour hole is built right on the grade. It's built right there, in there. It's grade, it's stone--a foot thick--the water's coming down the slope. It won't really divert anything. It'll flow through this area.

Ms. O'Hare said, O.K.

Chair Vitali said, O.K., what's the next question?

Audience Person: (Inaudible.)

Chair Vitali said, Not just yet.

Ms. O'Hare said, Okay, going back to--I see there's footing drains around the proposed restaurant and the sump pump in the back of the--in the back corner of the restaurant. O.K., so I looked at your July plan, and in your July plan the water on the west side was going to continue the way it did--that-away (she pointed). It was just the parking lot in the July plan that was going to go to the east, right?

Mr. Juliano said, No. As I--as for my response to your question, the water from the west side--specifically the building--was always going to be heading east. When I redid these plans, I put in a lot of additional detail: footing drains, which are required by Building Code, which I normally wouldn't deal with. Yes, we have a sump pump, but that's because we put in and we're depicting delivery access on the west side of the building. And it's going down to the basement, so I have a low spot: There's a door to the basement, and it's below grade. Water will get there. I needed a way to get water out of there so it didn't flow into the building. So I have a small drain and a sump pump which pumps it up, and that's then directed to our system. It's just additional details that we took the time to flesh out now versus for construction drawings.

Mr. Juliano continued, I believe George answered your question with respect to water flowing to the west and the vegetation. We are not going to have any detrimental effect on it because we're actually taking the higher peak flows and the higher volumes away. So that vegetation will be fine, there won't be any erosion from--for it--to it, I should say.

Chair Vitali said, O.K., Nick. Do you have something, Nick?

Commissioner Kern asked, What happened to we used to have a pre-presentation--presentation before the application was received? And what happened to--we get one set of prints with your stamp on it with all the questions and answers on the print, so that we can review it and make a decision and move on to the next month? This, we're not here like a Sunday school where every week we come and we learn a little more or a little more. This has to stop. We need to get back to the system we had where you argue it out with the Environmental Planner, or you work it out with the Environmental Planner, give us a set of stamped prints for us to review, and then we go from there. We either Yes or No it. This is ridiculous, what we're doing. We're just wasting time.

Mr. Juliano said, Well--

Audience applause heard.

Mr. Juliano said, Well, I'll let them finish for a minute. Some of the issue is the process, okay? We submitted plans in June. June 2nd we submitted these plans. We got comments from them, because I kind of forced the issue, I think two weeks before the meeting. Okay, we did have a kind of pre-meeting. My associate came here, sat, gave you a brief overview of this project back in June. Obviously in the summer months, obviously you have your Special Meeting because you combine July and August. A big problem, at least from my position is, we get comments very last minute. We do not have time to react and get things to you in a proper time. One of the comments you made, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Logan was about handing in a report tonight. But what he didn't say is that we got Erin's comments September 5th. Today is September 7th. So we've addressed comments and gotten you plans as we can based upon the information that comes out of the Environmental Planner's office. And I understand your frustration because we feel it, too, because we don't have proper time to do it. I just--I just think the system is broken. So something in the system has to be reworked out. So the only thing I can do is react to her comments, answer them, and provide updated drawings as required.

Commissioner Kern said, If that is the case, then if you're not ready or you don't have a significant amount of time to answer these questions, then it should be withdrawn or it should be postponed. There's no reason for you to be here tonight, or last month, if we're going back and forth like it's some kind of school where we're learning as we sit here. That's not the case. We're Commissioners; we know the regulations. We need to review the prints and then either Yea or Nay it. I don't want you to change 16 times in front of us while we're sitting here. It should have been done with Erin. And if you have a problem with Erin, then you need to see somebody higher up about that--expedite a quicker or faster decision or comments. That's got nothing to do with this Commission. We have no power over her. The power becomes upstairs. We've got enough stuff here to go through.

Mr. Juliano said, I understand your frustration, Mr. Kern.

Commissioner Kern said, This is uncalled for, to have five or six memos in this--George has got this that came in tonight. She's got that that came in last night. Two packets. I know it was a holiday weekend, but there's too much junk sitting in a pile here, and none of it's stamped saying "This is what Chris Juliano wants to present to us." You know, here's another thing tonight you just gave us. It's a revise or update or whatever. There's no stamp on it, so is this--?

Mr. Juliano said, So that is a display. I shouldn't argue. I apologize.

Commissioner Kern said, Come back next month with an engineered print, with all her decisions answered; and we can look at something and review it and we can either Yea or Nay it. Or come back with a pre-application meeting that we can give you opinion on what we want to do with it, and then you can go back and revive it and bring it in and it's approved. Because this system isn't working. We're wasting too much time, because not only this one tonight but we have another one later on in the evening that's going to be the same way.

Mr. Juliano said, I disagree on that comment about the next project, if you're talking about mine. I disagree with that statement. I don't have an answer for you. We get many of the same comments. You'll see in any of my memos, some things where we say, "This has already been addressed." How are we, a design firm, supposed to deal with that, when we get the same comments again and again, even though we know we've answered them? I've been doing this 31 years, and working with Erin here.

Chair Vitali said, What else you got, Erin?

Ms. O'Hare said, I do want to point out the questions for George Logan were my comments were on July 6th. No one's heard from George Logan since July, since my comments on July 6th. Oh, we have to address the Environmental Intervenor.

Chair Vitali said, What do we have to do?

Ms. O'Hare said, Well, here's what we have to do tonight on this project: We have to determine--I want the Commission to determine Significant Impact, up or down.

Chair Vitali said, We're not ready for that yet. We're not ready for that yet.

Ms. O'Hare said, And then we have to--I just want to read into the record the receipt of the verified pleading for the Environmental Intervenor, and it's--if it would be--

Chair Vitali said, All right, so you're done at the moment.

Ms. O'Hare said, I don't think you want to hear all the details I have. I think we've covered, big picture, my concern for water quality during construction, not post construction--during the construction of this significant wall and significant filling.

Chair Vitali said, All right, you've gone over that with them. Okay.

Attorney Ceneviva said, If I might, Mr. Chairman. I'd just want to point out that Mr. Logan appeared at the July 26th meeting. So, if she says she hasn't heard from him since July 6th--

Chair Vitali said, You can argue that back and forth: She didn't do this; he didn't do that. We already just did that.

Attorney Ceneviva said, I know. The party that suffers, though, is the Applicant. That's the problem--that's the process.

Indistinguishable audience voices at this time. (Applause.) Additional indistinguishable audience voice.

Chair Vitali said, Are you people done now? Can we get back to this meeting?

Indistinguishable single audience voice.

Chair Vitali said, Not necessarily. O.K. At this time we've had an Intervenor-status Person or Complaint, I don't know what the person would be called. If they would like to get up and enter in their Complaint, fine. If not, we'll just enter it into the record. So that's up to the group, the SMC Group. O.K., I don't see anybody.

Audience Person said, We're all SMC.

Chair Vitali said, I just asked if anybody would like to read this into the record, and I have nobody interested. This is your Verified Complaint.

Indistinguishable single audience voice.

Chair Vitali said, All right. O.K., listen. Listen. Listen. If you're going to speak, you got to go to the mic, and I need your name--

Indistinguishable single audience voice.

Chair Vitali said, Excuse me, Ma'am. Please go to the mic, use your name and your address if you'd like to speak. That's for everybody involved and, of course, this is Wetlands issues. (Chair Vitali waited a few moments.) O.K., let it be known that there's no speakers going on. O.K., Erin--

Indistinguishable audience voices.

Chair Vitali said, Erin, the Complaint has been entered into the record, O.K.? And let it be that.

Ms. O'Hare said, Um--.

Chair Vitali said, The next thing is the Commission. Do they feel comfortable in voting on Significant Activity?

There were no answers from the Commissioners here.

Chair Vitali said, Yes, Ma'am?

Mrs. Sheryl Petrillo, 164 Mansion Road, said, My name is Sheryl Petrillo. I live at 164 Mansion Road, and this is part of the Save Mansion Creek Group. I filed a Verified Complaint prior to the changes in the plans so some of this is not applicable. I'll just read off the various parts of my Complaint. It's going to be lengthy.

Mrs. Petrillo read from the Complaint: "To the best of SMC's knowledge, there was no notice posted at the subject property indicating the intention of the previous owner to change the zoning from

Residential to Commercial. The individual owners of Brentwood Village and Heritage Woods were never individually put on written notice and had no voice in the town's decision to grant the previous owner this change from Residential to Commercial. The 2.14-acre parcel contains wetlands, waterways and streams that have been deemed Intermittent Watercourses, and historically all past requests from various applicants were denied and rejected for this reason."

Mrs. Petrillo continued: "The Applicant, the current property Owner, has submitted plans for creating a restaurant complex including a restaurant building, concrete pads for stationary food trucks, a paved parking lot, another feature, and intends to bring in a substantial quantity of filling material. The property's wetlands and intermittent watercourses are part of Mansion Creek and feed the Quinnipiac River a short distance away. There is the likelihood that toxic and other materials associated with the restaurant complex may leach into these waterways, eventually reaching Long Island Sound. The construction of any subsurface sewage disposal system may directly impact these wetlands and watercourses."

Mrs. Petrillo said, I go on to quote some of the statutes: "Section 2.1.z, 2.1.z.1, 2.1.z.2., 2.1.z.3, etc."-- I won't bore you with that. "The Applicant also plans to remove trees and vegetation from the steeply sloping ravine and creek, intermittent watercourses, traversing the northern portion of the site with its significant wetlands. This action may affect and/or impact erosion on these slopes. The trees and vegetation along the deeply sloping ravine at the rear of the subject property act as a direct border and privacy screen for the residents of Brentwood Village. Residents of these units located directly beyond this tree-bordered line will more than likely be the most impacted by the removal of said trees and vegetation. The trees and vegetation also provide a natural sound barrier to the heavy traffic on Mansion Road and South Turnpike Road, which is also Old Hartford Turnpike. Any grading or fill changes to the property may have a direct impact on the residents of 12 Mansion Road immediately abutting the proposed restaurant complex, and may cause flooding and erosion at that property."

Mrs. Petrillo continued: "The Applicant plans to install a grassy area and food truck array and other attractions for restaurant patrons. This area is currently graded to discharge directly onto the on-site watercourses. Food waste, refuse from patrons, any fluid discharge from food trucks (which was discussed, so I'll leave that out), the grading, construction, and paving of the restaurant's parking lot will more than likely impact the absorption of any rainwater into the ground and may cause flooding and runoff onto Mansion Road and neighboring properties as well as additional erosion to the existing waterways and intermittent stream."

Mrs. Petrillo continued, "Drainage issues and water runoff stemming from the various proposed changes and grading at the subject property as well as the possible redirecting of the existing waterways by the Applicant are also of great concern to the residents." We would like a public hearing.

Audience applause.

Chair Vitali said, One at a time. You go ahead.

Mrs. Mary Cimino, 145 Brentwood Village said, This is my back yard. When you said that Hartford Turnpike doesn't get flooded, I don't know where you've been the last 20 years. But it gets flooded at least once, if not twice, a year--where you can't drive through; where cars are stranded in parking lots. This is my back yard, where I won't be able to open up my window. We need a public hearing.

Outdoor theater, are you kidding me? Music at night? No more crickets, no more owls.

Chair Vitali said, Wetlands.

Mrs. Cimino said, Yea, I'm just telling you, we've--never posted, never posted that it became commercial, never posted that it was going to become a restaurant.

Chair Vitali said, Stop. That's a Planning--that's a Planning and Zoning issue.

Mrs. Cimino said, I'm telling you, we need a hearing.

Chair Vitali said, It's got to be addressed for Wetlands. Yes, Ma'am?

Mrs. Karen Foster, 40 Jones Road, said, Good evening. On behalf of Save Mansion Creek, a properly signed and notarized Affidavit was submitted to Ms. O'Hare requesting a public hearing, given the tremendously high degree of interest in this matter. As you see, over 60 residents of Wallingford are before you with little blue signs. So we respectfully request that the Commission establish the date of a public hearing. Thank you very much.

Audience applause.

Chair Vitali said, O.K., just a comment or two on your Complaint: The first paragraph doesn't pertain to us. It's more of a Planning and Zoning issue, so that is not an issue. The statute--the way the statute reads: From the Town Attorney, it has to have specific items in your Complaint. These are very general. In fact, these items are the same thing that the Commission deals with, every Application. We strive for every Application to protect everything that you're asking us to protect in this item. Nick, do you have a comment?

Commissioner Kern said, Well, I wanted to make a Motion, but I want you to finish what you were saying.

Chair Vitali said, Well, I think the next step is regarding Significant Activity?

Commissioner Kern said, I'd make a Motion.

Chair Vitali said, Regarding Significant Activity?

Commissioner Kern said, Yes.

Chair Vitali said, A comment or two: On your Complaint, the first paragraph is more of a Planning and Zoning issue, so that is not an issue. The statute, the way the statute reads from the Town Attorney, it needs to have specific items in your Complaint. These are very general. In fact, these items are the very same items that the Commission deals with, every application. We strive for every Application to protect the things in this--this item. Nick, you've got a comment?

Commissioner Kern said, Well, I wanted to make a Motion, but I want you to finish what you were saying.

Chair Vitali said, Well, I think the next step is regarding Significant Activity?

Commissioner Kern said, Yes, Sir.

Chair Vitali said, I think that, as one of the ladies mentioned, that the Complaint is tailored closer to the previous Application, not the present Application. But go ahead, Nick.

MR. KERN: MOTION THAT APPLICATION #A23-5.5 / 10 MANSION ROAD – JOE FLAMINI (LOST & FOUND VENTURES LLC) – COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT – (RESTAURANT) BE DEEMED A NONSIGNIFICANT ACTIVITY.

MS. PHILLIPS: SECOND.

In discussion, Commissioner Heilman said, Mr. Chairman, it has been historically established that the public's interest in wetlands is a driving cause for a public hearing.

Chair Vitali said there isn't that much wetlands involved here.

Commissioner Heilman said it is the Number One focus for the enacting of a public hearing.

Attorney Ceneviva said, The Intervenor already has the same right/status as the Applicant, the right to present evidence, make presentations which would not normally accrue to them. So to them it is a public hearing.

Commissioner Phillips said, We have something from the Law Department that no petition was filed within the 14-day deadline.

An unidentified man approached the mic and said, Mr. Chairman, You said you were just presented with new material that you haven't had time to review. So how could you possibly make an accurate decision? There's a lot of new material in diagrams, so how could you rule tonight and not extend it?

Commissioner Kern said, We're not deciding tonight. We're just deciding on the Significant Impact of the activity. I don't see how you have any added input for Wetlands that can help this Application-- maybe at Planning and Zoning. We're not deciding on the Application--what we're deciding is whether this Intervenor can offer us new input to this. I believe we're not going tonight to be making this decision.

Mr. Benjamin Foster, 40 Jones Road, said, We'd like to request a public hearing for our people and our own experts to present more information for this body. This was not announced as a public meeting, so with everyone seated in this room, we would like to return with more documentation.

Chair Vitali said, The Intervenor should have had all that information tonight. We're back to the Motion regarding Significant Activity. I'd call for a vote.

VOTE: MR. KERN – YES; MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. NECIO – YES; MR. HEILMAN – NO; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

The Motion passed 4 YES to 1 NO. The result of the vote was to deem this Application to be Not a Significant Activity.

Chair Vitali said, Asking Members, I'm not sure we're ready to vote on this tonight. O.K. We'll get all the details worked out in the next weeks.

Mr. Juliano said, I will work with Ms. O'Hare, but there may be a few sticking points.

Commissioner Kern said, We need to get these plans approved by Erin and stamped in front of us. She's our staff person. Work with her and smooth things out so we can make a decision.

Mr. Juliano said, I'll do my best.

Chair Vitali said, I don't remember asking for a cross-section of a wall you referenced. There's two different paths regarding the continuance of this Application: granting an extension retroactively and granting an extension going forward. Erin, did Dennis Ceneviva bring in a letter regarding an extension?

Attorney Ceneviva said, Tonight I offered that my client had agreed to a 65-day extension of this Application through tonight's meeting. I will provide this Commission a further letter that my client consents to extend to October 4. That is 119 days, and the total permitted is 134.

Chair Vitali said, I'm not so sure--there is a limit of 134. O.K., we'll see you October 4th.

Ms. O'Hare said, So it's a Regular Meeting, not a public hearing, on October 4th. So we are tabling it. And the extension has been agreed for the second time to October 4th.

Note: Most of the audience members left at this time, 8:48 p.m.

3. #A23-5.6 - 898 Church Street - Vincent Perretta - (apartment complex)

Appearing were Mr. Christopher Juliano, P.E. and L.L.S., of Juliano Associates in Yalesville and Mr. George Logan, Registered Land Surveyor, Certified Professional Wetlands and Soils Scientist, of REMA Ecological Services, Meriden, CT.

Mr. Juliano said, At last month's meeting I went through the application for the affordable housing as apartment buildings. I was concerned about what would happen if we encountered groundwater. I talked about raising the site, but that would have more impact. So we went out and did six soil tests. one in each building, two in the parking lot, and two in the detention area. We submitted photos, rainfall data, and a plan that showed where those tests were located. Results indicated that the upland soils there do not have high groundwater. The Environmental Planner put into her comments that those Ludlow soils generally have a high water table. But we also submitted to you from USDA/NCRS, specifically for Connecticut and Massachusetts, that talks about Ludlow soils. They're basically well-drained soils, which basically means that they do not have a high groundwater table. Test pits confirm that. We went down 5, 6, 7 feet. We gave pictures, at least four for every test pit. I hope that addresses constructibility of this and groundwater. We've had more rain this year, about 5 inches above average, a wet season in July. So we're not changing the plan at all other than providing you with location/results of the test pits. And at the request of the Environmental Planner, the proposed sidewalk going to Shire Drive is now designated as Upland Review impact area, Area E.

Chair Vitali said, It's interesting that your soil type has good drainage to it, but it's like standing water

on that site all the time. How come?

Mr. Juliano said, Those are perched wetlands, meaning a layer of non-permeable material there. So if we would punch a hole through it, it would drain. But the uplands do drain.

Commissioner Heilman said, Isn't a lot of the gravelly stuff glacial till? It's on top of a layer of regolith, which, when the glacier receded it became a layer of coarse, broken-up sandstone, which is very porous. They are suspending water. You see these flat-tops over Wallingford. Looking at it, there's one area in the middle where there's gravelly soil. It's well drained, but underneath that is bedrock. It has no elevation to drain with, and it's suspended water. So what would you do with excess water in your area? Would you pipe it to the north? But the natural grading is to the south. Very little goes in, and there's a tremendous source for groundwater. It sits there. So dissipate your site water.

Mr. Logan said, That borrow pit I delineated is a wetland. You can see at the back, there's an area at one time where there was water at the surface. The surface is higher than the bottom at those pits, so it's a perched situation and it's flat.

Ms. O'Hare said, George, in your report on May 31, you said that the south area was Udorthent. Could you elaborate? The NRCS information says Ludlow.

Mr. Logan said, There's a section at the southeast of the site where there's been some disturbance of filling and gradation. When soils are disturbed, they lose their characteristics: Udorthent soils are in there. I did see an NRCS map.

Ms. O'Hare said, Chris, on September 5 you submitted soil information from NRCS and another one from the internet which say depth to water table is about 18" to 30" for Ludlow (p.15). So Ludlow has a high seasonal water table. But in your test pits it looks dry down to about 60".

Mr. Logan said, So the NRCS may be somewhat off--they just look at large units. So they have a delineation that Ludlow is a silt loam. That's not a silt loam. It's fine sandy soil. It's probably a Wethersfield.

Ms. O'Hare said, So that's a Wethersfield? That's why it doesn't have a high water table?

Mr. Logan said, It's probably closer to Wethersfield, but I am just looking at pictures.

Ms. O'Hare said, So does it have a higher infiltration?

Mr. Juliano said, Some areas are well drained. This land has always been wet. People have tried to develop it, my client included. It's been 20 years. I am not a geology expert. But here we have a nice upland area that's very well drained. We do have areas that are wetter. We've had more rain this year, but I don't think this area looks any wetter than other times. But we have test pits that showed these results, luckily.

Ms. O'Hare said, My other question was about the proposed detention basin. On your Wetland Impact Map you calculated it will become a wetland of 2,000 square feet. Today you answered that the basin bottom is at the same elevation as the outlet. So how can it support a wetland community if the water is going to leave instantly?

Mr. Juliano said, Stormwater. I looked at the area at the bottom of the basin and said, "Does it turn into some kind of a maintained wetland?" To the Commission: While we may be getting rid of this small manmade wetland, we might be making something long and narrow that has a function over time. It's a pit that allows water to trickle through perforations in the standpipe that allow water to drain out over time. That will keep some water in the basin for the wetland seed mix that we'll plant in there. Or I'd remove it--it's such a minor element. All the water can't leave at once. With 1/8" holes, it will take some time. Water will stay in this for 24 to 72 hours after a storm event.

Chair Vitali asked about the small wetland spot again.

Mr. Logan said, When I was ready to leave, I saw it and dug down with the auger and found fine sandy gleyed soils. Either they put it in, or there's some Wethersfield in there.

Chair Vitali said, If somebody dug a test pit there, would that be breaking through and allowing water to get in?

Mr. Logan said, No.

Ms. O'Hare said, I keep on asking for a detailed drawing of this outlet control structure. I don't know why you haven't done it. And the temporary sediment basin?

Mr. Juliano said, I'll get those done for you.

Chair Vitali said, The majority of these issues are going to be on the contractor who comes in. Commissioners?

Commissioner Kern asked, Did you calculate the swale water retention/recharging system? That whole area is impervious, and the control can't go into the ground.

Mr. Juliano said, For the test pits, I kept the figures. I didn't take any benefit for infiltration going on. Based on the test pits we did, there's to be infiltration that will only improve the capacity of the basin.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION ON APPLICATION #A23-5.6 – 898 CHURCH STREET – VINCENT PERRETTA (APARTMENT COMPLEX) BE DEEMED NOT A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ACTIVITY.

MR. NECIO: SECOND.

VOTE: MR. KERN – YES; MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. NECIO – YES; MR. HEILMAN – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT APPLICATION #A23-5.6 – 898 CHURCH STREET – VINCENT PERRETTA – (APARTMENT COMPLEX) BE APPROVED WITH THE CONDITIONS OF:

1. A REVISED PLAN OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE TO INCLUDE THE MAINTENANCE OF THE OUTLET PIPE AND CATCH BASIN IN THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY NEAR HIGHLAND AVENUE AND "RESPONSIBLE PARTY INFORMATION" FOR THAT PLAN.

2. A RETENTION BASIN IS CALLED OUT AS A SEDIMENT BASIN DURING

THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE.

3. A DETAILED PLAN OF THE OUTLET STRUCTURE.

4. AN UPDATED SURVEY WITH SITE-SPECIFIC SOIL INFORMATION.

5. A BOND OF \$20,000.

6. THAT WETLANDS PLACARDS BE PLACED AT 50-FOOT INTERVALS.

MR. NECIO: SECOND.

In early discussion, Chair Vitali had requested the bond of \$20,000. Commissioner Kern specified that this bond above is for Inland Wetlands for erosion control.

VOTE: MR. HEILMAN – YES; MR. NECIO – YES; MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. KERN – NO; CHAIR VITALI – NO.

Commissioner Kern said he has followed this property since 1999. In 2000 a catch basin on Highland Avenue was clogged and water came across the road. Water goes down through Hanover Street and enters the Quinnipiac River. I don't believe that this is a site that should be developed.

Chair Vitali said, I have felt this site is a sensitive area with all the area around it. I am not excited about 22 units here.

The Motion passed by a vote of 3 Yes to 2 No.

E. NEW BUSINESS - None.

F. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- 1. #A23-8.1 / 34 Cooke Road - Anthony Lemme - (fencing, accessway, stockpile of excavated material & silt fencing in URA associated with construction of in-ground pool out of URA) - Request for Administrative Approval - *Granted 8/24/23***
- 2. #A23-8.2 / 50 Hanover Street / Hanover Brook - Christopher McLean - (removal of trees and shrubs near stream bank & installation of plantings) - Request for Administrative Approval - *Granted 8/24/23***
- 3. #A23-8.3 / 531 North Branford Road, "Ferguson Woods" - Kenny Michaels, Director, Parks & Recreation Dept. - (bog-bridge installation in wetlands)**

Chair Vitali said this Application is received and will be on the October agenda.

G. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. Discussion of proposal to adopt fines for violations - Not discussed.**
- 2. Farm Hill Road Detention Basin - Not discussed.**
- 3. Notification from City of Meriden (within 500') re: "Site Plan Modification of Mark Development, LLC - 850 Murdoch Avenue (aka 1107 Northrup Road) - "to expand the**

north parking area to 180 spaces"; dated 8/30/23 - Not discussed.

- 4. #A22-5.3 / 1107 Northrup Road - Mark Development** - (bi-municipal industrial development) [permit approved 6/15/22; permit approval modified 12/14/22 administratively] - new project modification, staff

Ms. O'Hare pointed out Items 3 and 4 above. She had received a letter from Project Engineer Jim Cassidy. The expansion of 90 or so parking spaces is located on the Meriden side of this bi-municipal development. Nothing is changed in Wallingford, but she said that the Engineering Department is reviewing the number of trucks and cars going out into Wallingford.

- 5. #A22-12.3 / 1 North Main Street Extension - In Memoriam Cemetery Association, Inc.** - (construction of interior drives) - report, staff

Chair Vitali asked for an update.

Ms. O'Hare reported there were off-site sedimentation issues. The swale was constructed wrong and will need to be rebuilt.

H. VIOLATIONS

- 1. Notice of Violation Remains - 1245 Old Colony Road & Quinnipiac River - Jerzy Pytel** - (unpermitted clearing & filling near river) – *Remains*

Ms. O'Hare reported to Chair Vitali that she had corresponded with the Owner this summer. This Violation is recorded on the Land Records. Chair Vitali said this Violation remains.

- 2. 340 & 46 Quinnipiac Street - Southern CT Pallets** - (possible violation) - *Remains*
- 3. CEASE & DESIST - 67 Schoolhouse Road - Michelle Millican & Michael Gerace** - (new filling) - issued 4/25/23; decision 5/3/23; revised decision 7/26/23 - *Remains*
- 4. CEASE & DESIST - 67 Schoolhouse Road - Karl Kieslich** - (new filling) - issued 4/25/23; tabled – *Remains*
- 5. Notice of Violation - 24 Mapleview Road - Patricia Clarke c/o James W. & Patricia Clarke, Trustee of The Clarke 2022 Living Trust** - (alteration and filling within wetlands and within Upland Review Area on 24 Mapleview Road & on 13 Rolling Meadow Drive) - issued 4/21/23; Special Meeting at site 5/16/23 - *Remains*

Ms. O'Hare stated that Mrs. Clarke has a new plan involving a swale. Chair Vitali requested that Mrs. Clarke should put her plan in writing and submit it. *Ms. O'Hare will inform Mrs. Clarke.*

- 6. Notice of Violation - 19 Tamarac Swamp Road - William Schubert** - (clearing, grading & filling in wetlands and within Upland Area); issued 4/24/23 - *Remains*

I. ADJOURNMENT

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MR. NECIO: SECOND.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS TO ADJOURN.

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

J. NEXT SCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING: October 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen L. Burns, Recording Secretary