



MINUTES

May 26, 2011

PRESENT: Frank Wong, Chair, John Hall, Elisa Pollino, Jill Alibrandi, Richard Reiter

ALSO PRESENT: Patricia Sesto, Dir. Environmental Affairs; Liz Larkin, Recording Secretary; Clarissa Cannavino, Gregory & Adams; Erik Lindquist, Tighe & Bond; Kate Throckmorton, Environmental Landscape Solutions; Doug Reich, Land Engineering & Surveying; Tom Ryder, Land-Tech Consultants; Frank Jenkins; Homeowner; William Kenny, William Kenny & Associates; Michael Finkbeiner

ABSENT: Elizabeth Craig, Dennis Delaney (noticed of intended absence)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wong called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. WET#2008(S) – TEACHERS INSURANCE & ANNUITY ASSOCIATION OF SW CT – 10 Westport Road – construction of surface parking spaces within a regulated buffer (cont.)

Ms. Sesto read the new documents into the record. There was a discussion about the timing of this application as the public hearing time frame is expiring soon.

Ms. Cannavino handed out additional information for review addressing lingering questions and compensatory mitigation as requested from the commission.

Mr. Lindquist noted there are two plan sheets. They have added additional erosion control measures, including erosion control blankets. He also reported the addition of sediment traps based on the stormwater manual for sizing. He also noted that there is an additional limit of clearing on the plan and provided additional calculations.

Mr. Lindquist confirmed that the work on the State property is not required. He has removed this portion from the latest plan as this is not necessary for the stormwater system. He will complete additional perc tests around the site before excavation. They want to make sure that

they are putting the system in good location.

Mr. Lindquist reported that he tested the water quality and volume at the site. The storm water infiltrates to the bottom of the system and has enough surface area to handle the run-off. The reports he provided have been recalculated based on the revisions they have made. He also confirmed that he spoke with Wilton's Department of Public Works and has revised the slope and plantings per their request.

Mr. Wong questioned the timing of the project phases with the newest information. With this application, Ms. Cannavino confirmed that the applicant would build both lots simultaneously.

Mr. Hall asked Ms. Sesto for a recap of the last meeting as he was not in attendance. Ms. Sesto explained the restrictive layer and explained that the man-made systems do not equate to nature so compensatory mitigation was requested.

Ms. Throckmorton prepared an additional mitigation plan in reaction to VHB and staff. She clarified her comments from May 12, 2011 in that her plan calls for over one-hundred trees and two-hundred shrubs. She re-iterated that there is a substantial amount of drainage and infiltration, utilizing Best Management Practices. In her opinion they have addressed everything on the property and looked further by completing a site walk with the owner to consider the entire site.

Ms. Throckmorton verified that there is a fifteen foot lawn area around the building exterior for fire and maintenance access. This area is only seeded and cut, there are no additives of pesticides or fertilizers. Beyond that area they can re-plant and re-generate a healthier wetland and watercourse buffer.

The pond area has existing dense mature trees with forbs around it. This will remain a no-mow area. She described the areas where planting was considered and noted three areas where they propose under-story trees and deer-resistant plants. She described the areas that are not recommended for plantings and why.

Ms. Throckmorton noted that she was disappointed that VHB discounted the removal of Japanese Knotweed as valuable mitigation. She stated that this is an invasive species and has to be completely removed with no pieces left behind as it will re-grow. Ms. Sesto inquired if the building C plan would remain the same as previous plans to which Ms. Throckmorton responded no. There will not be extensive plantings there but she has incorporated the canopy.

Mr. Wong asked for clarification of the number of requested spaces. He disclosed for the record that he came across the real estate listing on the internet and noted a discrepancy between that information and information provided by the applicant. The listed parking ratio is 3 spaces per 1,000 ft. Ms. Cannavino was not sure why the internet states this. She noted that Louis Dreyfus is the property manager.

Ms. Pollino requested the square footage of the mitigation areas and Ms. Throckmorton did not have this calculation at the time.

Mr. Hall asked Ms. Sesto for her opinion. Ms. Sesto stated that the site looks big when on site, but much of the open area is on the neighboring property. Consequently, there are limits to the

amount of re-vegetation the applicant can offer. Mr. Hall stated that this was a well thought-out plan, with the parking closer to the building and the lot is angled much better than the first proposal.

Mr. Wong noted that this new parking plan is good but the issue he has is with the existing structure, the wetland and watercourse impacts that development brought. He expressed hesitation to approve activities with yet more impacts. Mr. Hall countered that they are maintaining status quo and making an effort to improve the conditions of the site. He added that they cannot move the buildings so they are trying to do the best they can with what exists on the site.

Mr. Lindquist confirmed that they looked at all possibilities and did the best they could. He added that it is very hard to retro-fit and improve existing storm drainage at this site.

Ms Sesto confirmed the consultants for the commission and she would be able to comment to the commission on the newly submitted information, even if the public hearing closes. Conversely, the applicant would not be able to subsequently respond to those comments. Ms. Cannavino stated she was content with this situation and ready to have the hearing closed. With that, Mr. Wong closed the public hearing.

B. WET#2009(S) – GUERON – 24-30 Cannon Road – construction of 25 new residential units and other site improvements within a regulated area

Ms. Sesto read a letter from Casey Healy requesting a continuation until the June 9th meeting.

Mr. Wong MOVED to extend the public hearing to June 9, 2011, SECONDED by Mr. Reiter and CARRIED 5-0-0.

C. WET#2023(S) – DRISCOLL – 149 Wolfpit Road – replacement of failing septic within a wetland buffer

Ms. Sesto read the documents into the record and noted that the fee was waived for this application and all documents from the previous application should be added to this record.

Chairman Wong, Mr. Hall, Ms. Alibrandi, and Ms. Pollino indicated they visited the site.

Mr. Reich passed out new renderings for the site, re-iterated the narrative for this application and noted that building additions should not be considered for this application. The previous application that was denied included building additions.

Mr. Reich explained that the septic is failing. The north-east corner of the property is the only feasible place per recent soil tests. He stressed that the leaching field will be outside the 100 ft. regulated area. The pump tank and the main tank will be within the regulated area. These tanks will be built off the existing asphalt driveway. There will be some staging with the old system while the new system is being installed.

Mr. Reich contemplated feasible and prudent alternatives such as fixing the existing which would entail removal of soils which he noted would be detrimental to the wetland area. A

second alternative would be to move the tanks closer to Wolfpit Road. A discussion ensued about the timing of the sanitary and sewer lines that are being installed along Wolfpit Road. Ms. Sesto conveyed Public Work's position that they could not put a definitive date on this installation.

Mr. Reich confirmed that erosion controls will be in place during construction. There is equal earthwork to remove and back-fill. He reported 75 cubic yards of cut and 71 cubic yards of fill. There will be a slight berm on both sides. Ms. Sesto noted that the alternate location near Wolfpit would be preferred for the tank and pump chamber. Ms. Sesto asked that the tank be tested for water tightness.

With no further questions or comments for the public, Mr. Wong closed this Public Hearing.

D. WET#2026(S) – JENKINS – 58 Musket Ridge Road – construction of pool and patio within a regulated area

Ms. Sesto read the list of documents into the record. Mr. Wong, Mr. Hall, Ms. Alibrandi, and Ms. Pollino indicated that they visited the site.

Mr. Ryder, of Land-Tech Consultants, explained the property as 2.21 acres on the north side of Musket Ridge Road, with Belden Hill Brook traversing the property.

The applicant is requesting a 32 x 22 ft. pool with a spa and patio tucked in along the western side of the house. He noted that there is a moderate slope near the pond so they are proposing a wall. There will be some grading in the southern portion of the property and the existing plantings are included on the plan. Mr. Ryder noted that this is a narrow wetland system that has existing dense vegetation. He added that the proposed buffer is down-gradient of the pool area and it will consist of long meadow grasses which are good for sediment retention. The house has drainage pipes and roof leaders so there is limited run-off from the footprint.

Mr. Ryder referred to the 2004 Summary of Buffer Widths and confirmed that there are references to grass filter strips. A 10 ft. strip had a good removal rate, so Mr. Ryder noted that this width is between 10 and 15 ft., which is acceptable in his opinion. Mr. Ryder added that the soils are well-drained per recent perc tests.

Mr. Ryder hand-drew the area which has a larger buffer than what was proposed. He explained his plan where he is impacting only 1,288 sq. ft. of regulated area. Since submission of the application he has learned of deficiencies with the previous B100a. Consequently, he will do more test holes and will re-evaluate the B100a. Mr. Hall inquired if a better location for the pool would be on the east side of the site. Mr. Ryder responded that there are setbacks from the septic to consider. He did add that they are open to other configurations of the pool per the staff report.

Mr. Reiter raised concern about pool chemicals and the maintenance required with a pool affecting the wetland. Mr. Ryder confirmed that the pool has a closed cartridge system so there is no back-washing. Mr. Reiter asked if there are any discharges from the pool on the property to which Mr. Ryder confirmed there is not. He stated that they can bring a tanker truck or use a hose and discharge the water to another location when winterizing. Ms. Sesto added that the chemicals are neutralized per State standards and will not be an issue for the wetland.

Mr. Hall stated that the proposed location of the pool is unnecessarily close to the watercourse. He suggested that they relocate the galleries for the B100, which would open up the area and would provide adequate space. Mr. Jenkins confirmed that they are having difficulty with the way the property is situated as they abut to the Silvermine Association and a wooded area. They would prefer to scale back the size of the pool rather than to move it somewhere else. Mr. Wong noted that unless it was a significant distance from the wetland, he would not view it favorably. Ms. Sesto added that this parcel sustained substantial impacts to the watercourse years ago with the original house development and said at some point, the construction needs to stop. Mr. Ryder countered that they are going to make the infiltration system better than existing with their proposal. Mr. Hall noted that engineering does not mimic nature. He added that the commission operates under regulations and while the system looks great, it is a more intense use and can have an adverse impact in the future. Mr. Reiter added that the applicant needs to quantify the extent of the impact and if there's mitigation it is the result of an impact. Mr. Reiter stated that the commission may want to get an expert to this application on their behalf. Ms. Sesto advised the owners that the specialist's fee would be their responsibility to pay.

Mr. Wong advised the applicants that this commission has not looked favorably on pools with lesser issues than this one. Ms. Alibrandi added that there is not a lot of room to work with and ten feet of buffer will not be enough. Mr. Hall added that the commission is not charged to consider aesthetics. Mr. Reiter recommended that they increase the buffer.

Mr. Jenkins asked if they should continue with the hearing. Mr. Reiter stated that he wanted to see plans. Mr. Jenkins stated that he did not understand why they would have to pay for the town's expert and stated that they would consider withdrawing the application at this time.

Chairman Wong continued the public hearing.

III. APPLICATIONS READY TO BE REVIEWED

A. WET#2027(I) – FOREST LANE ASSOCIATES – 84 Forest Road – “corrective action” installation of plantings to protect wetland from recent clearing

Mr. Wong, Ms. Alibrandi, Ms. Pollino, Mr. Reiter and Mr. Hall indicated they visited the site. Ms. Sesto passed around photos from the previous application and noted that eleven trees were removed in violation of WET#1992.

Mr. Kenny stated that they were at the meeting to correct the wrongful removal of the trees. He noted that the owner is regretful that this happened and that it was not done on purpose. He noted that the surveyor and neighbors are there in support of their corrective action.

Mr. Kenny explained the previous permit and the fire that destroyed the home. He noted that there was a wall along the wetland that will be enhanced and extended, and the demarcation features are installed including trees and meadow grasses. He explained that four trees in front of the house were removed and an additional 9 were removed that were not on the survey. As they were not on the survey, the applicant thought they could be removed as they were not told otherwise. Ms. Sesto countered that it was clear that only 2 trees were to be removed per the conditions of the last permit.

Mr. Kenny's proposal is to take action to prevent impacts to the wetlands. He confirmed that the

area to the north-east of the wetland has pollutants in the water and the removal of the trees has not had an effect on the penetration. The concern with water quality is with the first flush generated by a 1 in. storm. Mr. Kenny noted that lawn and woodland do not generate run-off until a 1 in. storm. He added that the water quality is important so they propose a rain garden. The rain garden is proposed to be 15 in. wide and 70 ft. long to include 500 native wildflowers. The plan also includes installation of 16 native trees. The applicant is requesting a reduction of the requirement of trees with the addition of the rain garden. Ms. Sesto quoted the meeting from April 14th when they discussed 2 to 1 replacement if using four inch trees and 1 to 1 replacement if using 6 in. caliper trees. Mr. Kenny re-iterated that the greatest benefit to the property would be the rain garden which was previously lawn and stated that the tree removal has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Hall noted that when the initial permit was issued, it was logical and specified implicitly what was permitted. He stated that they violated the first permit and clear-cut without a permit. He stated that he liked the plan and it all looks good but they have to fix their mistake rather than get another permit. Mr. Kenny countered that there is not a punitive component.

Mr. Pozzi, the owner of the property spoke to the remaining 50 – 60 trees on the property and added that 25-30 trees beyond the buffer were not removed. He stated that he did not willfully cut the trees. He thought he had permission as the trees were not addressed in the plan. He was concerned that clear-cutting has a negative connotation. Mr. Hall stated that there is a definition to clear-cutting and that's what he did. Mr. Wong interjected and stated that it was clear-cutting but maybe it was unintentional.

Ms. Alibrandi asked for a 2 to 1 replacement for 4 in. and 1 to 1 for 6 in.

Michael Finkbeiner, surveyor and Yale forestry graduate, class of 1971 prepared the base map and spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this was not a complete re-development, it's the re-use of the existing structure. As the structure burnt down they needed to replace the footings, drainage, and foundation. Mr. Finkbeiner stated that this work had a greater degree of disturbance at the time the approval was issued. He added that he has not been involved in tree cutting in 40 years but there was a state bill that was presented in January of this year to provide state authorization to make these decisions. He also noted that some of the trees were diseased and an arborist advised the owner that the trees needed to be removed for safety purposes. He recommended pricing out the replacement of trees. He thinks the cost will constitute a penalty and thinks this is a "Gestapo" measure. Ms. Sesto confirmed that there were only two trees discussed in the testimony and corrected Mr. Finkbeiner relating to the state statutes; the statutes he referenced do not supersede wetland regulations. The town has charge over the upland wetland buffer as per our wetland regulations. He rebutted by stating that the trees were not on the plan and should not have anything to do with this application. He questioned the validity of the photos and her statements of the areas the photos depict. Ms. Sesto noted that the photos were taken by his client before work began and the annotated map depicting where the photos were taken was also provided by his client. He countered that the trees are outside the 100 foot buffer and the diameter is not included in the regulations. Ms. Sesto confirmed that the tulip and the ash were specifically spoken to on the last application. She stated that there were "x's" through trees that were to be removed and these trees were not identified for removal.

Mr. Hall noted that the need to fix the mistake, not place the blame. He added that four of the trees taken down were proposed and approved and the commission is not asking them to spend

more money than necessary. He is looking for a reasonable solution to correct the violation. Mr. Finkbeiner's response was that 26 trees plus the rain garden is excessive and the arborist said that the additional trees should be removed as they were not healthy.

Mr. Pozzi stated that he had a meeting with Ms. Sesto who spoke to a 1 to 1 replacement ratio with a 4 in. caliper tree. Ms. Sesto noted that the commission had not weighed in when they met and it is ultimately the commission's decision. Mr. Hall added that the commission is trying to balance the need to undo the violation of the permit. He wants the applicant to reach where we were prior to cutting and the 1 to 1 small tree is not enough in his opinion. He also added that if the applicant had complied with the permit, this conversation would not need to take place.

Ms. Alibrandi would like to remain consistent with the 2 to 1 ratio for 4 in. trees and 1 to 1 ratio for 6 in trees. She stated her opinion that this is very straight forward.

Mr. Pozzi stated that this has been a heavy burden for him to bear. He has lost \$50,000 as he did not choose to put in an insurance claim for the fire. He thinks the current requests are unreasonable and stated that he has hardships. He said he has been a responsible property owner and cleaned up the debris from the fire within five days.

A discussion ensued about the tree plan. Ms. Alibrandi noted that the list has seven shade trees and asked if the commission should increase the caliper of these. Her recommendation was to enhance the canopy. Mr. Kenny responded that the trees take time to grow into a canopy. Mr. Pozzi interjected that there is a significant expense to plant just one tree. Mr. Wong countered that eleven shade trees were taken down and they need to replace seven. Mr. Kenny was not sure all the trees were the shade variety. Ms. Sesto confirmed that there were hemlocks, black birch and maple.

A discussion ensued about the rain garden. The applicant proposed that a rain garden and four trees are installed in connection with the original permit. After further discussion, the applicant disclosed that the plan before the commission is not one they were willing to go with. This thwarted the dialogue so Mr. Hall asked that they come back with a plan they can evaluate. Ms. Sesto stated that the rain garden is a good idea but the pachysandra conversion to lawn is against the permit to maintain lawn and added that a rain garden is not an acceptable substitution for the loss of the large trees. She added that sixteen trees are proposed but three trees are off the property in the town right-of-way.

David Bopit of 89 Forest Lane spoke on behalf of the applicant. He lives across the street and thinks there are misconceptions of what happened with the tree removal. In his opinion, the trees were an imminent danger and he would not let his kids walk on the road by themselves. He confirmed that his property would be the most impacted as it is down the hill from the subject property and he has no objection to the clearing that was done. He is an environmental scientist and a teacher for sixteen years at the Botanical Gardens. He disagrees with the concept of planting new understory foliage. He stated there was an extreme infestation of Japanese Stilt Grass and Japanese Bayberry which attracts deer ticks. His whole family, even his dog, has suffered from Lyme disease. He concluded by stating that the sixteen trees that were removed were junk and removing them has had no environmental impact.

Mr. and Mrs. Sam Johnson testified on the behalf of the applicant. They live across the street and are happy that the trees were removed as they have light coming into their home for the first

time in 57 years. They added that the previous owner did not take good care of the property and they feel that Mr. Pozzi does.

Mike Oliver lives across the street diagonally east. He noted that he had issues for ten years with the previous owner. He appreciates that he removed the trees that were dying and unhealthy. He stated that a rain garden cannot replace the trees that were removed but it improves the stewardship of the property.

After the applicant's team deliberated, they confirmed that the current plan in front of the commission is the current proposal to be considered by the commission.

Mr. Wong asked questions of Mr. Kenny about the capacities and functions of the rain garden. Mr. Kenny stated that the primary benefit is the reduction of lawn area and it will remain unmowed and unfertilized. Mr. Hall added that the rain garden is meant to catch, hold and infiltrate stormwater. Ms. Sesto confirmed that a rain garden must have a depression for this purpose. Mr. Kenny noted that it is ornamental and filters the water that goes through it. Ms. Sesto noted that if the commission approves the plan, the rain garden would need to be designed per state standards. Mr. Kenny confirmed it would be at least 6 in. deep.

A discussion ensued relating to the amount and size of the trees that will need to be planted. Mr. Hall raised concern about six 4 in. trees being replaced by a rain garden in the most sensitive area and does not think this will restore the property. Ms. Sesto confirmed that this is subjective. Mr. Hall recommended restoring the most sensitive area with a second set of plants. With the amount of plantings and trees the commission is requesting, they will not install the rain garden.

Mr. Wong directed staff to draft an approval with the condition that the applicant submit a revised plan to depict exactly what they are doing on the property so there are no more miscommunications.

B. WET#2028(I) – MERCK – 161 Cedar Road – “emergency” replacement of failing septic within a wetland buffer

Ms. Sesto noted that this was a failure so a temporary permit is being issued. She described the property as being adjacent to the Saugatuck River.

Mr. Wong MOVED to APPROVE this application, SECONDED by Mr. Hall and CARRIED 5-0-0.

IV. APPLICATIONS TO BE ACCEPTED

A. WET#2031(I) – DEIDAN – 268 Mountain Road – building addition and code complying septic system within a regulated area

B. WET#2033(I) – WALTER – 17 Sugarbush Court – “emergency” replacement of failing septic within wetland boundary

Mr. Wong MOVED to accept all new applications, SECONDED by Mr. Hall and CARRIED 5-0-0.

V. APPROVED MINOR ACTIVITIES

A. WET#2032(M) – ARNO/WALL – 487 Thayer Pond Road – “after-the-fact” 12 x 13’ addition to a deck

Ms. Sesto noted that this deck was already constructed and needed a Certificate of Occupancy to sell the home.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - None

VII. OTHER APPROPRIATE BUSINESS – None

A. Gas Main Extension Route – Wolfpit to Center Street

Ms. Sesto handed out an aerial photo with the proposed gas line highlighted. She explained that Department of Public Works is installing curbing and they want to lay a placeholder line so that a future gas line can be strung. The commission agreed that this can be considered a minor application that can be approved by staff.

B. Round House - 122 Olmstead Hill Road

Ms. Sesto reviewed the property that includes an oval pond that has meadowy lawn down to the pond’s edge and there is a thin wetland boundary around the pond. She described how the new owners would like to fix the current slopes. They would like to re-shape, relocate and expand the pond with substantial regrading of the old lawn. Ms. Sesto asked the commission if they want to conduct a pre-application review for this.

Ms. Sesto met with the owner and is looking at the gross assessment to see if this plan is prudent and feasible. If the commission raises substantial concerns that the project is approvable, she would let them know at the pre-meeting. Mr. Reiter raised concern that this will “open a can of worms”. Ms. Sesto confirmed that the commission would in no way be obligated by the pre-application meeting. He suggested that we run this by legal and Mr. Wong confirmed that this is not subject to the same rules as a public hearing. Given the unique character of the potential application, it was the consensus of the commission to accommodate the request for a pre-application meeting.

C. TEACHERS INSURANCE & ANNUITY ASSOC. OF SW CT – 10 Westport Road – construction of surface parking spaces within a regulated buffer (cont.)

Mr. Wong asked the commission if they would like to vote on this application now as the public hearing was closed. Ms. Alibrandi questioned why the town’s experts were not there to assist. Ms. Sesto noted that we can gather all questions and send them to VHB for their input. Ms. Alibrandi’s concern was relating to the engineering methods and was not sure if there was enough mitigation for this activity. Ms. Sesto was not sure if there is enough but asked what else they could do based on the site. She added that VHB did not contradict what was proposed by the engineers. Ms. Alibrandi asked if catch basin inserts were included on the application and Ms. Sesto confirmed that they are not because infiltration is being proposed instead.

Ms. Alibrandi stated her opinion that the lot is too large. Mr. Hall noted that when you look at

the whole forest, this is a small area. Mr. Wong thought the engineering could have been better as they ignored possible stacked or covered parking. In his opinion, these options should not be overlooked. Mr. Hall stated that the site work does not seem to make the watercourse any worse and Mr. Wong countered that they don't really know that for sure. He stated that the intensification at the site will create more traction and more vehicles. Ms. Alibrandi would like them to get a tenant prior to construction to see what they require.

Mr. Wong suggested that the commission monitor the site from the perspective of a formalized maintenance plan. Ms. Alibrandi suggested that the commission wait to vote as there is a lot of material to consider. The sense of some commissioners was that the applicant has done everything they can to ensure proper mitigation. Mr. Wong was hesitant about this and said the applicant has not taken enough measures to improve the watercourse. He added that there are inherent issues with the site and the level of mitigation the applicant has provided is not sufficient. He also noted that pre-existing does not mean the owner can do what they want and simply stating something is "state of the art" does not mean it is. He would like to see a maintenance plan. Ms. Sesto confirmed that this is something that can be included as a condition for the permit. Mr. Wong stated that there are treatment plants in large cities with less to work with so he is not sure they have looked at every option. Ms. Sesto stated that there will be tree removal no matter where they put the parking lot and urged the commissioners to review the data that has been presented. The commission has 65 days to make a decision and vote.

D. DRISCOLL – 149 Wolfpit Road – replacement of failing septic within a wetland buffer

Mr. Wong MOVED to APPROVE this application with the General Conditions, the normal Special Conditions and the additional Special Conditions that no building additions are included on this application, the septic tank will be installed under the driveway on the Wolfpit Road side and they have to produce water-tightness results to confirm there are no leaks, SECONDED by Mr. Hall and CARRIED 5-0-0.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 12, 2011

Mr. Wong MOVED to APPROVE the minutes of the May 12, 2011 meeting, Ms. Alibrandi SECONDED, and the Motion CARRIED, 2-0-3, with Mr. Hall, Ms. Alibrandi, and Mr. Reiter abstaining.

IX. ADJOURN

Mr. Wong MOVED to ADJOURN at 11:16 p.m., SECONDED by Mr. Hall, and CARRIED 5-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Liz Larkin
Recording Secretary