

**Brooklyn Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission  
(IWWC)**

**Regular Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, January 9, 2024**

**Zoom and In-Person Meeting**

**Clifford B. Green Memorial Center**

**69 South Main Street**

**6:00 p.m.**

**Call to Order:** 6:02 p.m.

**Roll Call:** Adam Brindamour; Demian Sorrentino; Janet Booth; Jess Long; Adam Tucker; Sharon Loughlin (via Zoom).

Absent with Notice: Richard Oliverson; Jason Burgess.

**Staff Present:** First Selectman Austin Tanner, via Zoom; WEO, Margaret Washburn; Recording Secretary, Terry Mahanna

**Attendance:** Attending in person: David Held, Provost & Rovero; Paul Archer, Archer Surveying; David Smith, Archer Surveying; George Logan, REMA Ecological Services; Applicant Dale Lyon, LAC Properties; Applicant Mark Tetreault, Tetreault Building Company; Brooklyn Residents: Matthew J. Allen; Sharon Hawes; Dan Litke; Madyson Knox; Nicolas Goncalves; Mike Zmayefski. Pomfret Residents: Caroline Harris; Jillian Edwards. Woodstock Residents: Cameron Robida; Madison Brown; Emma Massey. Additional attendees: Sophie Hernandez; Sophie Parrella.

Attending via Zoom: First Selectman, Austin Tanner; Commission member Sharon Loughlin; Applicant Don Dubois, Dubois Forestry; Kris Crawford/Barbara Viens; Heather Allen; Austin George; Carrie Barna; Bill Green; Jenn Nemeth; Michaela George; Jean Fleming; Lou Brodeur; Maria Gandy-Winslow; Barbara Spence; Sandy (?); One additional anonymous attendee.

**Seating of Alternates:** Jess Long was seated for Jason Burgess.

**Election of Officers:** Prior to this meeting, Adam Brindamour spoke to Richard Oliverson regarding his re-election as IWWC Chair. Mr. Oliverson was agreeable to re-election.

A **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino and seconded by Adam Tucker to re-elect Mr. Oliverson as the IWWC Chair. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

As to the re-election of IWWC Vice Chair, Mr. Sorrentino made a **motion** to re-elect Adam Brindamour as the Vice Chair. Motion was seconded by Mr. Tucker and passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

**Motion** was made by Mr. Sorrentino and seconded by Mr. Tucker to accept the nominations as previously stated. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

**Public Commentary:** None.

**Approval of Minutes:**

IWWC Regular Meeting minutes from December 12, 2023, were accepted as written.

**Public Hearings:**

1. **SUBD 23-002 KA&G Investments LLC, owner/applicant; Map 32 Lot 15; Wauregan Road and Gorman Road; R-30 Zone;** 14-lot subdivision for development of single-family homes. The Public Hearing was opened at 6:08 p.m.

David Held of Provost & Rovero was present to represent the project. He provided the following:

- Mr. Held confirmed that public hearing notification signs had been placed on 12/22/23 on both Wauregan Road and Gorman Road. Photos, copies of written notices and copies of certified mailings had been provided to Margaret Washburn.
- Approval from NDDH and CT DOT was received.
- Mr. Held described the lots and indicated where wetlands are located. All lots will be served by onsite septic.
- For lots 1-4, access will be from one shared driveway on Wauregan Road/Rt. 205. The remainder will have access from Gorman Road.
- All development/disturbance will be ~50-feet from wetlands. For the most part, the soil is well-draining. The water from the wetlands percolates into the well-draining soils. A driveway culvert is proposed at the access to Lot 3 to handle any increased flow resulting from extreme storm events. There is an existing culvert under Rt. 205 that contains a DOT pipe. There is no perpetual flow thru this pipe and no offsite impacts are anticipated.
- Regional Town Engineer, Syl Pauley reviewed these plans and found them acceptable with no questions or further comments. Margaret Washburn did a site walk with Mr. Held and approved of the wetlands delineation.

Mr. Held addressed questions, comments and concerns from the Commission and the audience:

- In response to Mr. Sorrentino, Mr. Held indicated the west side culvert under Rt. 205 is pitched away and drops off on the other side.
- Mike Zmayefski (176 Wauregan Rd.): Expressed concerns about the aquifer, stating that 14 houses is too many. He feels the Town does not have their best interest at heart. He stated the minimum lot size is 2 acres where he is. He indicated that after a storm event the property is all wet. Mr. Sorrentino added that groundwater is not a wetlands issue and that excess standing water is expected after a precipitation event. Mr. Zmayefski expressed concerns about his well running dry. Mr. Held addressed the Chairman and asked that they stick to issues only pertaining to wetlands.
- Austin George (225 Gorman Rd.): His house was recently built, but he previously lived SW of this area for 5 years and had seen the field under 8-inches of water. A stream runs parallel to his property. He asked how this project would affect the stream/drainage on his land. Mr. Held indicated he is on an upgradient location (referenced wetlands flags 1-65) and therefore there would be zero impact due to it being uphill. Mr. George mentioned he has a legal right to build on his property near the stream but does not want more wetlands upstream making it impossible for him to build. Mr. Sorrentino asked Mr. Held if he is creating an impediment to the flow. Mr. Held indicated that it is physically impossible as there is a 20-foot difference in elevation. Mr. Sorrentino mentioned that Lot 2 is not being developed, while Mr.

Held mentioned the development portion is not near Mr. George's property; the development will be downhill from his property. Mr. George also asked if there will be filling and/or removal of fill. Mr. Held responded only for the excavation of driveway areas, septic systems, and foundations.

- Janet Booth asked if there is conservation area, or the flexibility to create. Mr. Held responded no. The lots are not encumbered and there is flexibility for agricultural development. Mr. Sorrentino mentioned there is a hayfield now and Mr. Held confirmed.
- Mr. Sorrentino asked about a crossing near the Lot 3 driveway. Mr. Held confirmed that only standing water will flow through the culvert toward Rt. 205 and that culvert is the closest impact to a wetland. Also confirmed was that NDDH considers impacts on water resources/wells, although there is no well test data yet since there have been no wells dug yet.
- Matt Allen (115 Christian Hill): Asked regarding the swale on Rt. 205 - what would be considered an extreme water event, and would there be a possibility of runoff going to the other side/abutting property? Mr. Held explained that there is the potential although it would not be a regular occurrence and would not cause wetlands to form. Matt added that he has been mowing the field for 20 years and at times the upper corner is inaccessible; there seems to be a constant flow under Rt. 205; he believes the property cannot handle the flow now. Mr. Held indicated the culvert is sized to protect across the road, and the development area will be in well-drained soils and will not increase runoff. Ms. Washburn asked what percentage of the property will be impervious; Mr. Held responded 3%, with the development having a relatively low impact/no significant changes to drainage. Mr. Held believes it is a gross misrepresentation to say the culvert under Rt. 205 cannot handle the flow, and that there is no evidence that it cannot handle it.
- Mr. Held added that driveways will be gravel except for the aprons. Driveway slope will generally be 10-percent or under, with Lot 2 being around 8-percent.
- In response to Mr. Sorrentino, Ms. Washburn indicated that she does not see any threat to wetlands as it relates to this project. Mr. Sorrentino added that some issues mentioned here are more appropriate for the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting.
- Mike Zmayefski (176 Wauregan): Asked about setbacks and felt that a lot of houses were being stuffed into that area. He followed by asking what type of houses are to be built. Mr. Held indicated that he has shown the lands' ability to be developed and all lot development will be based on Brooklyn's regulations. Ms. Booth added that it would be different if they were trying to alter wetlands soils.
- Barbara Viens (79 Brenn): Concerned about construction destroying the soils and flooding under Rt. 205, feels the IWWC needs further assessments and asked who has surveyed. Mr. Brindamour responded with: David Held of Provost and Rovero, Syl Pauley – Regional Engineer, Margaret Washburn – Wetlands Officer. Mr. Sorrentino added that Joe Theroux, independent Soil Scientist, delineated the wetlands, with Ms. Washburn having concurred.
- Mr. Sorrentino added that although some may feel there are too many houses, the IWWC's charge is to examine direct impacts to wetlands and watercourses only.
- Mr. George asked about contamination. Mr. Held responded: Public Health Code addresses groundwater quality and designs are only approved if the treated effluent is of drinking water quality. Any unpermitted action will result in action by the Wetland's Agent. Ms. Booth adds that a conversation can also be had at the PZC public hearing on February 7, 2024. Mr. George also asked about any erosion and sediment controls.

Ms. Washburn responded that the Conservation Commission has scheduled a site walk for January 15, 2024 at 10:00 am; they are advisory to other Town commissions and they make recommendations on protected open space.

- Mr. Sorrentino asked about placarding around wetlands for future reference (i.e., placement of signs, etc.). Ms. Washburn responded that it is hard to maintain placards and signs and there is nothing in the regulations about this. Mr. Held added that it is obvious where the wetlands are.

- Barbara Spence (215 Gorman): Voiced concerns about drought conditions and potential effects on wells. Mr. Brindamour clarified that this issue is not under the purview of the IWWC and if required, may be part of the PZC analysis. Mr. Sorrentino added that this falls under the Northeast District Department of Health (NDDH), although he is not aware of the NDDH doing this on a larger scale. Ms. Washburn indicated the NDDH process is the same for all houses.
- Mark Tetreault (173 Wauregan): Owns the development across the road. He indicated that he respects Mr. Held. In reference to potential stormwater across Rt. 205 in the event of a 25-year event, he asked if it would be worthwhile to put in any detention prior to that happening. Mr. Held responded that the culvert under Rt. 205 is there to address this and there will be no change in flow rates or to flow patterns; if there are impacts now, they will continue. Mr. Sorrentino asked if the invert is at ground-level or raised; Mr. Held indicated it is in a depression/drops down.
- Jenn Nemeth asked if public commentary is allowed. Mr. Brindamour explained it is, as it relates to this public hearing.
- Mr. Tucker asked if the development will be in phases and what houses/lots will be started first. Mr. Held responded that it will be a multi-phase/multi-year project, with Lots 13 and 14 being first.
- Mr. George asked to confirm that there was no anticipated contamination and no impact to wetlands. Mr. Held stated that was correct, and that Ms. Washburn would visit/inspect.
- Mr. Sorrentino stated that individual site/lot development plans would be reviewed. Mr. Held confirmed and added that individual lot plans will be far more detailed as you would be viewing the reality of what was to be developed. Mr. Zmayefski asked if there were established plot plans for each house. Mr. Held responded that these will be done after the subdivision was approved. Mr. Sorrentino added that the plans currently are of the conceptual development; an individual lot development plan is a lot of record and will get reviewed by the NDDH, this Commission and the Town. Mr. Held added that if there are significant changes to an individual site plan from the subdevelopment plan, they would need to come back before this Commission for approval.
- Mr. Sorrentino asked if after individual plans are drafted, they would go back and stake. Mr. Held confirmed that was correct, and that Ms. Washburn would go out and inspect.
- Sharon Loughlin confirmed that all her questions had been asked and answered.
- Mr. Brindamour asked if there were any more questions. No additional questions were asked.

A **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino and seconded by Adam Tucker to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0. The public hearing was closed at 7:02 pm.

- 2. IWWC 23-015 LAC Properties, owner/applicant; Map 41 Lot 1; Providence Road, PC Zone;** Proposal to fill wetlands to level site for development of a commercial building, driveways and septic system. Proposed fill equals 8,900 sf; total regulated area altered equals 64,000 sf / 1.5 acres. The Public Hearing was opened at 7:03 p.m.

Paul Archer, David Smith, George Logan and Dale Lyon were in attendance representing this project. Mr. Archer provided pictures to the Commission and gave the following overview of the project:

- 2.3 acres on the corner of Providence/Rt. 6 and Brickyard Road.
- Property had been used by the State of CT as a staging area for the development of Rt. 6. The southeast corner is identified as having wetlands. The State put the driveway and swale in as well as a culvert under the driveway.

- Mr. Lyon is proposing a commercial landscape company with bins containing landscape materials. Also proposed is a septic system, for which soil testing has not yet been done. Mr. Lyon did not want to do testing until, and unless, this project is approved.

Mr. Logan provided the following additional detail:

- His credentials: has been a Certified, Registered Soil Scientist for about 35 years; M.S. in Wildlife; Senior Ecologist; Certified Wetlands Scientist; Wildlife Biologist.
- He first visited the site on 7/17/23. In his report he noted the unusual situation, and that he had seen the property had occasionally been mowed. He showed photos during this presentation.
  - Photo dating back to 1965 that showed the man-made pond.
  - In 1990, the pond was no longer there.
  - In 1995, vegetation growth was seen in the southeast corner where the pond used to be, likely then a wetland.
  - In 2004, there was a realignment and expansion of the highway, everything changed as the wetland area was disturbed.
  - In 2006, after the DOT work, the swale was green; not much restoration had occurred on the property and an increase in disturbance was noted.
  - In October 2023, the area was delineated which left a lot to interpretation of the wetland – marsh, wet meadow or swamp?
- There are less wetland species as the wetland was man-made, is low-functioning and isolated. The ecological integrity of the system is in question. There is some functioning as to wetland plants, but very little found as the area has been mowed for showcasing and is in a commercial zone. If not mowed, the wetland would shrink, shrubs, trees and evapotranspiration would increase. Invasive species will continue to come in.
- The proposal is to fill the area. He stated, the question becomes – is there a feasible and prudent alternative (he read this definition from the regulations)? This becomes a balancing act as to what is lost in wetlands benefits versus what is gained in socioeconomic benefit.
- He stated this is a valuable commercially zoned location.
- This project would not be economically feasible without filling the wetlands.
- Mr. Sorrentino asked about the hydrology. Mr. Logan indicated that it is seasonally saturated, temporarily flooded, and due to the water table, the flow is mostly flat.
- Mr. Sorrentino asked if this wetland would exist without it having been man-made. Mr. Logan responded that he doubts it.
- The upland review area is stated as 64,000 sf, with the proposed wetland alteration as 8,900 sf.

Discussion continued with the Commission to include Mr. Archer. The Commission questioned why the plans were only conceptual, with no landscaping, lighting etc. and missing information (as identified in Syl Pauley's comments). Mr. Archer explained that if the Commission does not approve, then it will not be feasible to move forward. Mr. Sorrentino stated it was not typical to come to the IWWC with a concept, but he understood their approach and asked the Commission if they understood that this is an incremental plan/approach.

Ms. Washburn asked Mr. Archer if he intends to bring in a revised plan before asking for the Commission's approval. Mr. Archer indicated that they can finalize the plan and come back.

Mr. Archer followed up by asking if they fill the wetlands, will the upland review area go away? He stated if approval is given to fill, they will come back, but if the Commission does not see that as feasible, they will stop the project altogether. Ms. Washburn stressed that this project is not different from any other project in that it is subject

to the same regulations and must meet all standards. Mr. Brindamour added that the plan is still incomplete, just as he believed it to be last month.

David Smith added that the Commission is being asked to consider if a wetland of lower value is sufficiently important to preserve or if the Commission will consider the development. If this wetland goes away and you are comfortable and allow the project to go forward, this plan probably has all the information needed to decide. Mr. Logan asked if additional information would be required on the plan for the Commission to ascertain a decision on the wetlands. Ms. Washburn added that whether man-made or natural, it is the same required review.

Mr. Smith added that many of Syl Pauley's comments are assuming a full forward project. At this point, they had wanted to check the temperature of the Commission (they are not ready to go to construction) and decide whether they go forward or not.

Ms. Booth asked how this project (at 8,900 sf to be filled) compares to others. Mr. Brindamour and Mr. Sorrentino responded that this is the largest they have seen. Ms. Booth added that the large amount is concerning, and she is also concerned about setting a precedent. Ms. Washburn added that she has been flagging wetlands since 1996 with the vast majority having been disturbed and many manmade. Mr. Archer added that all land that has frontage on Rt. 6 needs to be accessed from Rt. 6; therefore, they would need to go to CT DOT. Mr. Sorrentino asked what other entities would have jurisdiction; Mr. Logan stated, not the Army Corps of Engineers.

Ms. Washburn asked about the required alternatives analysis, which had been brought up by Ms. Booth at the last meeting. The application form requires this information. The application form left this required item blank. Mr. Brindamour asked why not consider alternate locations. Mr. Archer stated that access from Rt. 6 for commercial development is the point. Ms. Washburn asked why they were not taking a typical approach. Mr. Archer indicated that the CT DOT will not give approval until the Town gives approval. Mr. Sorrentino added this is not typical. Mr. Logan did not believe this to be precedent-setting because it is not typical.

Ms. Loughlin asked - this is identified as a wetland, but is it not high enough value to protect? Mr. Logan responded no; its functional value is relatively low. Mr. Sorrentino asked about their functioning value calculation. Mr. Logan responded: flood storage is minimal; nutrient transformation is low; sediment retention – nothing is really coming in; wildlife is minimal – it is a mowed meadow; there is some pollinator value; no shoreline stabilization; no unique heritage value; recharge is low; no principal function or value, or even a secondary function. Ms. Washburn asked if it temporarily flooded/some recharge. Mr. Logan responded – yes.

Mr. Sorrentino asked about bringing the grade up. Mr. Archer indicated it would be brought up ~4-feet. Ms. Washburn asked if there was any intention to pave the area. Dale Lyon indicated that they would have to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Lyon added that his business is landscaping. He wants to create an inviting place for his customers and give them ideas and options and supply them with material. He uses bins to separate his material. He does not sell live material (i.e., plants). Ms. Washburn asked about sediment controls. Mr. Smith indicated that will be addressed when developing the building and septic.

Mr. Lyon added that he does not (yet) own property. It is written into his purchase and sale agreement that he must be able to obtain PZC and IWWC approval prior to finalizing the purchase. Mr. Sorrentino added that if IWWC grants approval to fill 8,900 sf, approval could be conditioned such that no construction activity commences until such time that a fully engineered site plan is reviewed and approved by the IWWC. Ms. Washburn indicated that it is a big ask without enough information.

Ms. Booth adds that it matters to residents to preserve wetlands and sees them as having functions and values.

Mr. Smith stated that rather than having the IWWC approval now, they can re-submit the plan, follow the model and therefore approve once. Ms. Washburn stated that Mr. Pauley may want to see retention/detention for recharge of water. She also stated that she is concerned about sediment controls, and if there is no recharge on site, sediment will end up in the culvert and downstream wetlands. Mr. Logan stated there is room for detention. Mr. Smith added there is room to make accommodations and they can do the calculations (it is a tiny watershed), and beyond the property line it is already going somewhere else.

Dan Litke (30 Brickyard/24 Brickyard): He is a long-time resident of Brooklyn. He used to skate on the pond near NAPA until the State bought it. Mentioned his concern about the filling of the wetlands in this application causing flooding of the basement in his neighbors' house (the Burns' house). Brickyard sits lower than Rt. 6. The property under consideration cannot to tap into the sewer line, but could tap into city water.

Matt Allen (115 Christian Hill): In reference to Ms. Washburn's concerns, asked how this project is different. Ms. Washburn responded it is different because there are no details. She had also mentioned recharge. Mr. Allen asked how recharge on one is more important than another. Ms. Washburn stated that the whole site is pervious, rain percolates through the soil. Mr. Smith stated the project should stand on its own merits and not be compared to other projects. Mr. Brindamour stressed that they should stick to what is before the IWWC.

Carrie Barna (376 Stetson): Asked how the wetlands can be filled considering the species present. Mr. Brindamour stated that there is a report that covers that. Ms. Barna added that there are 4 similar businesses in the area.

Mr. Brindamour indicated that if the Commission continues and requires further information, the deadline (to receive) is the next meeting (35 days). Mr. Sorrentino added that he is not willing to say he would deny this application, but he is not sure how to proceed. Mr. Archer stated if the Commission wants them to modify the plans by adding silt fence, a recharge area, swale, they will do so and take it from there. Mr. Brindamour mentioned he did not want to get the same plan in 35 days ("kicking the can").

Mr. Lyon added that the size and shape of the lot makes it useless unless they can fill the wetlands. It can be turned into a usable lot. He will need to get trucks into the bays; create outdoor living areas; possibly add pavers. He mentioned the previous owner (who lives next door to him) stopped the State from filling the wetlands. Ms. Booth asked what makes it okay to fill the wetlands now. Mr. Lyon responded that no one has gotten to this step of having the wetlands flagged.

Ms. Barna mentioned this is prime property and the big issue is that there is no Town Planner.

The Commission and Ms. Washburn discussed their options for moving forward.

At 8:30 p.m. a **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino to continue the public hearing to the next IWWC meeting on January 13, 2024 at 6:00pm. Motion was seconded by Adam Tucker and passed by unanimous vote 6-0-0.

### **Old Business:**

- 1. SUBD 23-002 KA&G Investments LLC, owner/applicant; Map 32 Lot 15; Wauregan Road and Gorman Road; R-30 Zone;** 14-lot subdivision for development of single-family homes.

Mr. Sorrentino stated there are no direct impacts to wetlands with this project. Mr. Brindamour added that Syl Pauley had no comments on the plans. Ms. Loughlin added that the plans are clear and she had no comments or questions.

A **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino and seconded by Sharon Loughlin to approve this application, due to no significant impact on wetlands or watercourses, with standard conditions. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

- 2. IWWC 23-015 LAC Properties, owner/applicant; Map 41 Lot 1; Providence Road, PC Zone;** Proposal to fill wetlands to level site for development of a commercial building, driveways and septic system. Proposed fill equals 8,900 sf; total regulated area altered equals 64,000 sf / 1.5 acres.

A **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino to table the decision on this application. Motion was seconded by Adam Tucker and passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

- 3. SUBD 23-003 Tetreault Building Company, owner/applicant; Map 23 Lot 38; Wauregan Road, RA Zone;** Proposed 7-lot subdivision. Private road, residential houses, septic systems, minor grading.

Paul Archer, Mark Tetreault and David Smith were present representing this project:

- This is a conservation subdivision (only allowed in RA Zone) in which 40% of the land must go into permanent protection.
- Joe Theroux (Soil Scientist) had gone back out a second time to delineate more wetlands after Margaret Washburn noticed two 36-inch culverts where water flows onto the property from under Wauregan Road.
- Mr. Archer submitted a letter from CT DOT.
- Ms. Washburn mentioned that Syl Pauley's review called for digging test pits and performing perc tests at the proposed catch basin and recharge area. Mr. Archer stated that they felt that "they had already done enough digging out there".
- Mr. Tetreault indicated he is not concerned about water coming across Rt. 205 from the proposed 14-lot on the corner of Wauregan/Gorman. His question during that public hearing was simply to put it on record.
- Lot sizes will be under 2 acres. The last lot, Lot 7, will own the deed restriction for the permanently protected open space and private road.
- Mr. Smith indicated that he is just now seeing the comments from Syl Pauley on this project, most of which fall under the PZC review. Options were discussed (i.e., slab on grade vs. basements) along with Syl Pauley's comments. Mr. Smith felt Mr. Pauley's comments were over the top.
- Mr. Archer provided updated plans (2 changes) to the Commission. It is noted that these are conceptual plans that will change.
- Ms. Washburn asked about an Operations & Maintenance Plan for the recharge unit and basin. Mr. Sorrentino indicated that someone needs to clean it out occasionally.
- Mr. Brindamour asked if any members wanted a site walk or a public hearing. No response provided.
- Ms. Washburn mentioned a complaint received regarding logging. Mr. Tetreault agreed to stop logging until the necessary permits have been issued.



A **motion** is made by Demian Sorrentino to approve the application, due to no significant impact to wetlands and watercourses, with standard conditions. Motion seconded by Adam Tucker and passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

**New Business:**

1. **DR 23-004 Chris and Pam Cadro, owners, Dubois Forestry, applicant; 232 Canterbury Road; Map 23 Lot 21; RA Zone;** Timber harvest: Improve forest health by removing trees with defect, deformity, die-back and disease. This is a silvicultural thinning treatment for salvage and regeneration.

Don Dubois was present via Zoom to represent this project. He gave an overview of the project and indicated that he and Ms. Washburn walked the site. There is one stream crossing in which he will lay a bridge across during the harvest.

Mr. Sorrentino indicated that forestry is an agricultural use permitted as-of-right, not non-regulated.

A **motion** was made by Demian Sorrentino to issue a Declaratory Ruling for an agricultural use permitted as-of-right and seconded by Sharon Loughlin. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

**Communications:**

1. Wetlands Agent Monthly Report was provided to the Commission. Included was a Site Plan Review Checklist for the Commission's reference.
2. Budget Update: Was provided to Commission, with no further discussion.

**Adjourn:** Motion to adjourn was made at 9:25 p.m. by Jess Long and seconded by Janet Booth. Motion passed unanimously by vote 6-0-0.

Submitted By:  
Terry Mahanna  
Recording Secretary