



MINUTES

October 28, 2010

PRESENT: Franklin Wong, Chair; Jill Alibrandi, John Hall, Elisa Pollino, Rich Reiter, Syd Gordon.

ALSO PRESENT: Patricia Sesto, Director of Environmental Affairs; Liz Larkin, Recording Secretary; Kate Throckmorton, Environmental Landscape Solutions; Jay Fain, Jay Fain & Associates; Casey Healey, Gregory & Adams, Eric Lindquist, Tighe & Bond, Michael Farrell, Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association of S.W. CT; Dave Adams, Design Builders; Thomas Abbotts, Thomas Abbotts General Contractor, LLC

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wong called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. WET#1977(S) – TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION OF S.W. CT– 10 Westport Road – add surface parking spaces, some of which are in regulated buffer (cont.).

Elisa Pollino and Rich Reiter recused themselves.

Ms. Sesto read the recently submitted documents into the record.

Attorney Casey Healy provided additional new documents to the Commission. He summarized that Phase 1 of the project consists of 101 parking spaces, which appear in a V-shaped lot on the map. Phase 2 of the project consists of 96 spaces, which is on the northeast area of the property. He further described the parcel as areas A, B, and C. These areas have 497 spaces combined, and current zoning regulations require 718 spaces.

Mr. Healy confirmed the easements that were granted including access, utilities, drainage, maintenance, and parking. When 20 Westport Road was developed, 159 surface spaces were removed from the 10 Westport location. 20 Westport needed 1,139 spaces which left 15 spaces for the private easement.

Mr. Healy pointed out that there was an agreement between the original builder, Richardson Merrill, and P&Z to keep a 100 ft. buffer around the perimeter of the property in its natural state. He offered and discounted two alternatives: 1. To build a lot off Dudley Road, but this is not an option per this builder agreement or 2. To build a lot offsite on 20 Westport Road and in excess of 500 feet from the building to be served, which cannot be done per Zoning Regulations.

Kate Throckmorton presented a reduced sketch highlighting the alternatives. One of the options shows a lot 500 ft. from the front door of the building. The other option shows the Tighe & Bond alternatives outside the 500 ft. requirement and with additional grading. This option eliminates trees and also reduces the peak volume of storm water.

Erik Lindquist noted changes from the previous plans, including correcting where the building entrance is located, added a new review area, and confirmed the drainage has no impact on the watercourse due to good infiltration.

Ms. Sesto inquired about the use of the Hansen House. It was confirmed that the building is open and empty, but a future use may be meetings and conferences. Phase II parking is intended to support this future use. Ms. Sesto also sought confirmation that the 1971 agreement to keep the 100-foot natural buffer is not a deed restriction. Mr. Healy confirmed the statement.

Mr. Hall noted that he has a problem with the “V-shaped” lot and asked if they could switch the phases and complete the upper lot first as the upper lot has no environmental effect. He noted that the upland review area for the lower lot is a drastic slope. Notwithstanding the mitigation, the woodland is still being taken away for this proposal. The builders chose to build on the watercourse and they should have understood that future building or remodeling would be difficult.

Mr. Healy pointed out that the only 2 parking spots of the V-shaped lot that were within 100 ft. of the watercourse have been removed from the plans. Ms. Sesto noted that this lot would still affect the upland review as the topography causes the upland review area to extend past the 100 ft. buffer. Attorney Healy countered that the 1971 builder created wetlands and that they have shown that they are not negatively impacting the wetlands, therefore they deserve the permit. Ms. Sesto disagreed that there were no impacts and countered that mitigation diminishes impact but doesn’t match natural conditions: The slope the applicant is proposing to impact is the healthiest section of buffer left on-site.

Mr. Lindquist reviewed the storm drainage and confirmed that they plan on maintaining the 100 ft. buffer, keeping vegetation, and implementing numerous measures to reduce the impact including reducing post development runoff volumes below the existing volumes.

Ms. Throckmorton confirmed anywhere they place the parking area on 10 Westport Road would require removing mature trees, but that they would prefer to work with the contours as proposed with the V-shaped lot to reduce the cuts and fills. She also noted that there would be thermal pollution concerns with a double-loaded parking configuration. Every option has impacts.

Mr. Hall inquired about the requirement for parking. As the building is vacant, there is no way to know how much parking is needed. Mr. Healy countered that Zoning would want to change this from non-conforming to a situation that meets present zoning. Mr. Hall confirmed that this

proposal to meet current zoning regulations is an option for the applicant; P&Z is not requiring this.

Mr. Farrell added that he is trying to lease the property and he cannot find any interest due to the lack of parking. When Deloitte & Touche wanted to extend the lease, they wanted 5 spaces/1,000 sq. ft. to suit modern needs. When they signed the lease, they had 159 more spaces, until 10 Westport Road was fully leased.

Mr. Hall noted that Deloitte took a risk in signing the lease and it worked for 5 years. Mr. Farrell added that they would not spend 1.7 million dollars to add parking if they did not feel it was necessary. Mr. Wong voiced concern about removing 2 acres of forest buffer; even with mitigation, this is not good enough to protect the watercourse.

Mr. Lindquist noted that the proposed filters will intercept runoff and improve water quality given that even on naturally vegetated slopes sedimentation occurs. Mr. Hall voiced concerns about the filtration being better for the wetland environment than natural conditions. Mr. Lindquist suggested that the commission look at the existing topography, as the runoff currently goes to the building, not towards the watercourse. Mr. Hall added that the lower watercourse is not affected by the proposed Phase II upper lot and that we should strive to have no impact to the natural watercourse. Mr. Hall advocated building just Phase II.

Mr. Wong asked Mr. Lindquist to summarize the pollutants. Mr. Lindquist responded that there will be catch basins, curbs, inserts to remove biological wastes, and an infiltration system and is directed to a channel. He tried to move the V-shaped lot to another location with less impact, but they were limited in all directions.

Mr. Wong asked why a multi-level lot was not considered and Mr. Lindquist confirmed that they would only be saving minimal impervious coverage. Ms. Sesto added that if the Hansen House change of use did not go forward, the proposed activity would be different since less parking would be needed.

Mr. Wong asked for questions from the public.

Mrs. Sesto noted that this is the last meeting available for the public hearing; there is no more time. Hearing no further questions from the commission or public, the public hearing was closed.

B. WET#1985(S) – VOLLMER – 137 Olmstead Hill Road – proposed 4-lot subdivision with regulated activities within 100 ft. of a watercourse (cont.)

Ms. Sesto asked the record reflect Ms. Pollino and Mr. Reiter are recused.

Mr. Healy provided a new plan with expanded protected areas as was encouraged at the last meeting.

Mr. McChord described the changes made pursuant to Town Engineer concerns per the recent memos and those expressed by this commission. They propose to pull back the limit of lawn on Lots 2 & 3 to limit of the 100 ft. buffer and up to the upper stone wall on Lot 3. Lot 2 has 100 ft. of buffer on all sides and the rain garden was relocated to the west side of the home so the discharge will stay on lot 2 until the watercourse. Mr. McChord reported on changes to the catch

basin configuration on lot 1 per Mr. Ahern's concerns on the catch basins.

Mr. Healy provided a new plan and the Open Space Restrictions to all Commissioners. He noted that items 1 and 2 are important for this application. Item 1 states, "the open space shall not constitute acreage of building lots for subdivision purposes and said Open Space shall not be subdivided." Item 2 states, "The use of the Open Space shall be limited to flood control, conservation, park and recreational purposes for use by the Owners and their tenants, guests and invitees." He suggested that we add language in the agreement that adding another driveway will not be permitted.

Ms. Sesto inquired about a maintenance agreement for the driveway and would it prohibit the driveway from being curbed in order to sustain the stormwater management plan. Mr. Healy suggested that this can be covered by this agreement declaration. Mr. Hall suggested that there be a pedestrian easement between the properties to allow access to the open space. Mr. Healy noted liability and maintenance of this easement discouraged the applicant from pursuing this. Mr. Hall feels that everyone should have ownership and access to the open space; multiple owners are more likely to steward wetland in conformance with the regulations than a single owner. Lots 2 and 3 are oversized so it is possible to create an access way to the open space.

A discussion ensued about open space under private ownership. Mr. Healy noted there is no municipal exemption for liability. Ms. Sesto confirmed that there is indemnification provided by state statute with respect private owners, not municipal owners.

Mr. Wong asked if they can create lawn up to the demarcation. Mr. McChord noted that the homeowner has flexibility on one side, but not the other. The maintenance of the rain garden is the only disturbance in the buffer area other than mowing a few times per year.

Mr. Wong called for questions from the public. With no questions from the public or commissioners, the public hearing was closed.

C. WET#1986(S) – DRISCOLL – 149 Wolfpit Road– additions and replacement of septic system within 100 ft. of a pond

Commissioners Reiter and Pollino were reseated.

All of the present Commissioners confirmed they visited the site and Ms. Sesto read the list of documents into the record.

Jay Keillor provided a new plan and described the project. The current septic system is 25 ft. away from the wetlands. The proposed system is in high quality soil. The existing garage and access of Wolfpit Road is not conducive to practical use; accordingly they propose to eliminate access to Wolfpit Road and reconstruct the garage off Wolfpit Lane. They will need a waiver from the Zoning Board of Appeals to do so based on the front setback.

Mr. Keillor pointed out that they proposed to move the septic and existing driveway further away from the pond and noted safety concerns associated with the failing septic system. The drainage of this proposal shows a slight decrease as they will eliminate the current driveway and will remove ledge for the new driveway.

Mr. Keillor showed the protected trees on the property and explained which trees would be removed. They only plan to remove 5 trees, 3 of which are under 12 in.

Mr. Keillor further described the history of the property whereas there was a septic repair, done in 1993 by another engineer, and included restrictions. It was a 3-bedroom house in 1993 and now it is considered 5-bedrooms. In 1998 the Connecticut Public Health Code changed the definition of a bedroom, which may account for the change in the number of bedrooms attributed to the house.

Mr. Keillor reported on the water usage, which indicates that the home does not use an exorbitant amount of water for the size. He noted that the old septic system is in poor soil and that the proposed location has excellent conditions. He handed around a sample of soil to explain the different sizes of sediment found in the area. The proposal is for Green Leach system for a 6-bedroom home. This additional bedroom is for potential future use if they decide to create an in-law apartment. Mr. Keillor explained that Green Leach is a living system with a soil and stone interface. The “knock-off” system he proposes has a filter fabric and a rectangular shape for more soil surface. He reported that only one failure of this type of system has been reported.

A discussion ensued regarding the property conditions being conducive to supporting the leaching field as the Commissioners understood the area has ledge in the area of the proposed leaching system. Mr. Keillor confirmed that there is no ledge under the leaching system and that it is an area of very well-drained soils. He further explained that they have corrected the grading with the garage addition, as they will have 6 ft. of fill on the inside of the concrete wall. He went further to state that the owners have a topographic hardship per the coverage calculations. The owners are allowed 15% coverage and right now they have 26% but this plan will translate to 18% so they still need a waiver from zoning. The applicants have decided that they do not need a paved driveway so this has been removed from the plan.

Mr. Hall agrees that a new septic is needed, but questioned the need to extend the home within an already tight lot. He also noted that the footprint is larger than the percentage and it seems like there is additional impervious coverage and perhaps an increase in runoff. Mr. Keillor added that there was a slight decrease of runoff due to the loss of ledge and also noted that during the summer months, drainage from the house could discharge to the abandoned leaching area.

Ms. Sesto voiced a concern about “piece-mealing” additions on this parcel, noting that if all of these small changes were on the same application, it would most likely be denied.

A discussion ensued relating to a back-up leaching field in case of failure. Mr. Keillor confirmed that there is a reserve area and that they could further concentrate on this item. Mr. Wong added that there is a 43 ft. reserve area and 10 feet of credit on the other end, yet this has not been approved by the Health Department.

The alternate plan has asphalt pavement to the new garage. Ms. Sesto compared other approvals by this commission that have had similar regulated activities farther from the wetland and they created a better buffer. Conversely, this application would include the permanent consumption of the buffer with less mitigation.

Ms. Throckmorton submitted a new planting plan, which includes replanting ½ of the driveway with woody vegetation. She also confirmed that the drain in the driveway that is discharging into the pond will be removed.

Mr. Hall noted that just because they need a septic does not mean they should extend the home. He would like to see the proposal scaled back to include just the septic improvements.

Mr. Wong asked for the driveway details and Mr. Keillor reported that the north side is 50 ft. away from the pond and 30 ft. in setbacks on the south side. Mr. Hall added that if the net increase of the footprint is zero, he maybe more favorable towards the additional changes. In requesting additional information, commissioners cautioned that they have notable reservations regarding the further expansion of the house.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Mr. Wong continued the hearing until November 11, 2010.

III. APPLICATIONS READY TO BE REVIEWED

A. WET#1992(I) – FAHEY & BRAUN – 84 Forest Lane – property improvements including addition to existing home, detached garage, subsurface sanitary disposal system and gravel driveway near a wetland buffer.

William Kenny, agent for the applicants, went over the plan noting wetlands in the southwest corner of the property. The applicants wish to upgrade the property adding a 2nd story to the house and enclosing some existing porches. The septic will be upgraded in a location more than 100 ft. from the wetlands. The addition of a raingarden coincident with a new low stonewall creates a demarcation and filter system from the upland area east of the wetland.

Mr. Kenny reported that there are invasive species around the wetlands. There is a manmade pond that was created for ornamental purposes. They will eliminate this and keep the area as a vegetative wetland, adding vegetation, including six shade trees. They do not want to remove any of the existing large trees that are healthy. There are some dead and declining trees immediately adjacent to driveway and these should be removed. Six of these trees fall within the 100 ft. buffer.

Ms. Sesto inquired about where the roof leaders would drain. Mr. Kenny could not confirm this detail. Footing drains were discussed and would not discharge directly to the wetlands. Mr. Wong added that the houses in the area have water treatment systems and asked if this house would have one and where it would drain. A discussion ensued about the health of the wetland. Ms. Sesto confirmed that the wetland is functionally healthy but could understand if the owners desired aesthetic improvements as there is no ornamental landscape to the west of the pond. No changes to this end are proposed.

Ms. Alibrandi MOVED to approve WET1992 with the General and normal Special Conditions and the additional Special Conditions that roof leaders will discharge above the new stonewall, the site plan will be revised to show the pond will be filled to an average level equal to that of the surrounding grade, and the rain garden will have plantings spaced 18 in. on center, Mr. Gordon

SECONDED and it CARRIED 6-0-0.

B. WET#1983 (I) – BROWN – 544 Nod Hill Road – “corrective action” to extend lawn and additional plantings (cont.)

Ms. Sesto is meeting with the Brown’s at their property next week so this application should be continued by default.

Mr. Wong MOVED to extend this application, Mr. Hall SECONDED and it CARRIED 6-0-0.

C. WET#1993(I) – SMITH – 26 Lovers Lane – addition to existing home to include a deck 77 ft. from a watercourse.

Mr. Smith reviewed the history of the property he has owned it for 48 years and made many improvements to keep the Comstock River within its boundaries. He proposed an addition, which will require excavation of footings and the construction of a temporary driveway, which will be seeded after the project is completed. Mr. Smith noted that the structure is 35 ft. above the river and that he will install a silt fence. He has 64 years experience in excavation.

Ms. Sesto confirmed that the foundation will not be graded out and he should back-fill with the material he has. Mr. Smith confirmed that the fill will not be higher than the existing grade. He also noted that he wants to connect to the town sewer. Ms. Sesto noted that he would need to get approval from the WPCA and the Health Department and questioned the prudence of the commission acting on the application prior to knowing the WPCA decision. She encouraged the applicant to wait until the full scope of the project can be confirmed.

The commission asked Mr. Smith to provide further information for the next meeting regarding the sewer. The application is continued until November 11, 2010.

D. WET#1994(I) – LEE – 228 Branch Brook Road – proposed B-100a system within 100 ft. of wetlands.

Mr. Adams reported that there is only one location suitable for the new system, which is essentially in the same location as the current system, and 33 ft. from the wetland. The homeowners would like to make an addition as well.

The new septic will be in an existing lawn area and there will be a silt fence in place. The wooded area has boulders so no additional delineation is warranted. The additions would be largely over existing decks and not much different from the existing footprint.

Ms. Alibrandi MOVED to approve with General Conditions and normal Special conditions, Mr. Gordon SECONDED and it CARRIED 6-0-0.

E. WET#1996(I) – BRUNO – 12 Ivy Lane – demolish flat-roofed 2-car garage and replace with 3-car gable-roofed garage within 20 ft. of wetlands.

Mr. Bruno spoke on his own behalf and all present Commissioners indicated they had visited the site. The proposal is to take down an existing 2-car garage that is not sound. There are shallow footings and concrete was poured directly over earth, which allows water to come through.

Other locations for the garage will block windows of the house so he is asking to extend the garage to a point 9 ft. from the wetland/watercourse.

The alternatives were discussed. Ms. Alibrandi inquired about the garage being moved up towards the house and Mr. Bruno confirmed that this would still encroach on the wetland setback. The alternative provided would need a zoning variance as the 2-car garage would be 20 ft. from the property line.

Mr. Wong suggested that Mr. Bruno consider rotating the proposed garage to place it over the driveway. This will reduce the impervious coverage and maintain a greater separating distance to the wetland. Mr. Hall asked about the functionality of this wetland. Mr. Sesto reported that the configuration of the wetland suggests it has been historically filled and we are seeing just a portion of the original system. Mr. Bruno added that he was putting in a raingarden per the plan to improve the runoff.

Ms. Alibrandi noted that if the garage were contained to the existing pavement, it would be big enough for a 2-car garage. Mr. Hall agreed that this would be a good idea. Mr. Wong added that Alternative B is acceptable as is with a 3-car garage but there may be a zoning issue for the applicant to address.

Mr. Hall stated that if the applicant incorporated the gravel driveway and rain garden into alternative B, he would be comfortable approving the application. Mr. Bruno expressed that plan B was acceptable to him; he will install a 20 ft. raingarden, raise the old garage, and add a gravel driveway and new deck.

Mr. Wong made a MOION to approve WET#1996 with the General Conditions, normal Special Conditions, and the following additional Special Conditions, the approved plan is alternate B, the site plan shall be revised to show the garage as shown in alternate B, demolitions of the old garage, the expanded deck, and rain garden, and a detail of the proposed gravel driveway needs to be provided, Mr. Hall SECONDED and the motion CARRIED 6-0-0.

F. WET#1997(I) – ZABEL – 453 Newtown Turnpike – new septic within 100 ft. of wetlands.

Mr. Abbotts, agent for the applicants, described the history of the property. Additions to the main house were previously approved, however code complying systems were not demonstrated for the out buildings. With the current plan to alter the house, the health department is correcting the past mistake by requiring B100a's for all the qualifying structures.

Mr. Abbotts confirmed that there will be no change to the footprint of the main house. They plan to alter the existing patio to re-lay stone and add an outdoor kitchen. This pit area was the old barn entrance and was approved for a pool previously. The watercourse is 8 ft. below the bank.

Mr. Hall made a MOTION to APPROVE WET#1997 with the Normal Conditions and any applicable normal Special Conditions, Ms. Alibrandi SECONDED, and it CARRIED 6-0-0.

G. WET#1998(I) – GABRIELE – 469 Danbury Road – new septic in reserve area bordering wetlands.

Ms. Sesto reported that the 2002 original approved site plan had a primary and reserve leaching

field. As the property changed hands and the new owners built a driveway the soils of the primary system were compacted and rendered unsuitable. Since the original permit has now expired, a new permit is needed to install the reserve system.

Holt McChord noted that they can reduce the footprint of the previously approved system to one row which would be 60 ft. to the wetlands. The septic tank and pump chamber are included in the proposal. They have plotted a location in the best soils as it is very steep in other locations.

Mr. Wong confirmed that they should have a restoration plan in place for the disturbed areas. Ms. Sesto confirmed that the 1st application had mitigation associated with it. No new plantings would be needed to compensate for this septic area.

Ms. Alibrandi MOVED to Approve WET#1998, Mr. Hall SECONDED and it CARRIED 6-0-0.

H. WET#1973(S) – SOUND MANAGEMENT GROUP – 21 Trails End – rectify landscaping and construction in and adjacent to wetlands.

Commissioners Pollino and Reiter are recused from this application.

Ms. Sesto went over the permit and the conditions. Mr. Wong voiced concern on what was there before. He wants to be very clear to the applicant about their mitigation plan and wants before and after pictures. Ms. Sesto noted that we should include a special condition to provide photo documentation upon completion.

Ms. Alibrandi MOVED to approve WET#1973 as drafted with the additional condition that the applicant provides photo documentation of the finished project, Mr. Wong SECONDED, and it CARRIED 4-0-0.

I. WET#1974(S) – SOUND MANAGEMENT GROUP – 3 Trails End – rectify landscaping and construction in and adjacent to wetlands.

Commissioners Pollino and Reiter are recused from this application.

Ms. Sesto went over the draft permit and conditions. Mr. Wong has asked that a condition be added the agent provide photo documentation upon completion of the project.

Mr. Hall MOVED to approve the application with special conditions as drafted and the additional condition that the applicant provides photo documentation of the finished project, Ms. Alibrandi SECONDED, and it CARRIED 4-0-0.

J. WET#1977(S) – TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION OF S.W. CT– 10 Westport Road – add surface parking spaces, some of which are in regulated buffer

Commissioners Pollino and Reiter are recused from this application.

The commission initiated deliberations on the application, noting their negative opinion regarding the loss of the healthy wooded watercourse buffer for additional parking associated with Phase I. Commissioners tendered procedural questions, among other things asking if it was possible to approve certain aspects of the proposal while denying others. Phase II did not present

impacts to the wetland in contrast to Phase I. There was consensus that Phase II should be approved.

Commissioners commented that the reasons to dismiss the presented alternatives were not wholly compelling; there were likely other alternatives that would be less intrusive to the protective watercourse buffer; the justifications offered for the parking were based on market demands, which was not a factor this commission is bound by.

Given the complexity of the application and the new submission of data, the discussion of the application was carried over to the next meeting.

K. WET#1985(S) – VOLLMER – 137 Olmstead Hill Road – proposed 4-lot subdivision with regulated activities within 100 ft. of a watercourse

Commissioners Pollino and Reiter were reseated.

Commissioners reviewed the elements of the application. Positive comments were offered regarding the revision to maintain the 100 foot buffer along the southern most wetland and pond system. They agreed the two front wetlands were of lower value and the proposal provided an opportunity to increase their functionality. Ms. Sesto stated that the maintenance agreement for the common driveway needs to include language to prohibit the use of curbs in order to protect the integrity of the stormwater management plan. Ms. Sesto also stated that difficulties are probable with regards to consistently maintaining the meadow buffers; most of the areas are split between properties and she is pessimistic that the areas can be managed well in a piecemeal fashion. She suggested a legal document similar to that of the driveway be required so the areas can be managed as one unit.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposal to have the open space solely owned by Lot 3. This was effectively an extension of that lot, and didn't meet the commissioners' vision of what the open space should be. It is beneficial to the wetland and pond to have multiple owners stewarding it and it enjoying its passive recreation opportunities. After further debate it was the consensus of the commission that the open space requirement and the intentions of that were a Planning and Zoning issue. Staff was directed to correspond with P&Z and convey the IWC's preference for joint ownership and access to the resources within the open space.

Mr. Wong made a MOTION to draft an approval of WET#1985 with the General Conditions, normal Special Conditions and the additional Special Conditions regarding a prohibition on curbing, joint meadow maintenance, and other items as discussed, **SECONDED** by Mr. Hall and **CARRIED 6-0-0**.

IV. APPLICATIONS TO BE ACCEPTED

A. WET#2001(I) – DELATTRE – 5 Powder Horn Hill Road – “corrective action” to delineate the limits of the lawn and enlarge the wetland buffer planting.

Mr. Hall made a MOTION to **ACCEPT** the application, **SECONDED** by Ms. Alibrandi, and **CARRIED 6-0-0**.

V. APPROVED MINOR ACTIVITIES

- A. WET#2000(M) – FRASER – 353 Mountain Road** – “after the fact” deck approximately 70 ft. from wetlands.

Ms. Sesto described the application.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - None

VII. OTHER APPROPRIATE BUSINESS

Ms. Sesto notified the Commission of the New DEP Training Video if anyone would like to borrow it.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 8, 2010, October 14, 2010, October 24, 2010

Mr. Wong MOVED to approve the minutes for all above dates, Ms. Alibrandi SECONDED and the motion CARRIED 6-0-0.

IX. ADJOURN

Mr. Wong MOVED to ADJOURN at 11:44 p.m., SECONDED by Mr. Gordon, and CARRIED 6-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Liz Larkin
Recording Secretary