MINUTES
GREENWICH INLAND WETLANDS AND WATERCOURSES AGENCY
February 22, 2016

Members present: Chairman Brian Harris, Vice Chairman Elliot Benton, Secretary Stephan Skoufalos, Joe Rogers, Jim Carr, Bill Galvin.

Alternates present: Jay Schondorf and Steven Fong

Staff present: Patricia Sesto, Director; Robert Clausi, Senior Wetlands Analyst; Doreen Carroll-Andrews, Wetlands Compliance Officer


1. **Call to Order**

Chairman Brian Harris called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Town Hall Meeting Room on the first floor of Greenwich Town Hall.

2. **Seating of Alternates**

Alternate Jay Schondorf was seated.

3. **Review and approval of draft minutes**

Stephan Skoufalos made a motion to approve the draft minutes of January 25, 2016, with no corrections, second by Jim Carr. The motion carried 7-0-0.

Joe Rogers made a motion to add the draft minutes of the Special Meeting of February 22, 2016 to the agenda, second by Bill Galvin. The motion carried 7-0-0.

Joe Rogers made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the Special Meeting of February 22, 2016, second by Bill Galvin. The motion carried 7-0-0.

4. **Director’s Report**

Mrs. Sesto provided an overview of her director’s report. Despite the vacancy of the assistant compliance officer, the number of compliance inspections is holding close to normal. This task has fallen primarily to Doreen Carroll-Andrews. As springtime approaches violations and planting deadlines will consume more of her time and fewer compliance inspections will be completed. Focused attention will be needed to prioritize sites.
The period to apply for the assistant compliance officer has closed and Mrs. Sesto is looking to have the first assessment of the 11 candidates from the Human Resources Department next week.

Mrs. Sesto has been speaking with Conservation Director Denise Savageau to encourage the Conservation Commission to weigh in on more substantial applications. The Commission’s views and suggestions should broaden the review perspective and help create a stronger record.

A symposium on nitrogen was recently held by The Nature Conservancy. The symposium spoke to the various sources of nitrogen and its deleterious effects on freshwater and marine environments. Of particular interest was the statistic that 40% of nitrogen discharged to a properly functioning septic system makes its way through groundwater, wetlands, and watercourses and ends up in Long Island Sound. There were no solutions or better alternatives presented.

5. Compliance Report

Doreen Carroll-Andrews referred to the Compliance Summary sheet that was distributed in the meeting packets, which included a breakdown of bond releases (5 requested, 2 initiated by Staff, 5 released), and deadlines set by the Agency that are upcoming or have passed. Fourteen Cutler Road and 105 Rockwood Road were issued Stop Work Orders. These were addressed and corrected at a staff level.

6. Other Business

a. Application # 2016-002 – 0 & 345 West Putnam Avenue, 37 Oak Street, and 26 Hemlock Drive - Significant impact determination and fee waiver request

Steve Studer, agent for the applicant addressed the Agency and recounted the reasons public hearings are held for applications. The first is public interest, which has already been determined to exist. The second is due to the potential for significant impacts to the wetlands from the proposed activity. This project has multiple wetlands associated with it, but except for very small portions of two of them, all the wetlands are off-site and degraded. The proposed development is well designed and will not significantly impact the wetlands.

Mr. Studer stated the Agency needs to determine there is a likelihood significant impacts will occur; it maybe will or might have impacts is not enough.

William Root of Milone and MacBroom concurred the wetlands associated with the project are substantially degraded. If this is the case, how can one significantly impact them?

Elliot Benton redirected by asking Mr. Root if degraded wetlands can be enhanced, to which Mr. Root responded affirmatively, however the subject wetlands are not on-site. Mr. Benton followed by asking if foreclosing the opportunity to enhance the wetlands in the future would be a significant impact. Mr. Root responded affirmatively.

Mr. Root encouraged the Agency to examine if the potential for significant impacts is probable not just possible. The project is already planned for a public hearing to facilitate public participation.
Mr. Studer recapped the applicant’s position. There is a clear intent to respect even the poor quality wetlands. Best Management Practices are incorporated and the stormwater will be better than the water that currently leaves the site.

Patricia Sesto contested the standard of determining the potential for significant impact as described by the applicant. The language of the regulations states the Agency has to determine if a significant impact may occur. The use of the word “may” is decidedly different than the criteria used when evaluating a proposal for approval or denial, when the standard is raised to having a likelihood to impact the resource. Mrs. Sesto stated she verified her interpretation with the CT DEEP.

Robert Clausi spoke of his initial review of the application. There are several areas of the development plan which lack detail and the potential for siltation, pollution, and turbidity to the wetlands exist with the plans as presented.

Brian Harris concurred with the elements identified by Mr. Clausi, adding there will be substantial rock removal and shading of the wetlands from the buildings.

Jim Carr stated the wetland east of the site is still valuable and his recollection of the past application on this property includes threats to this wetland and downstream. He acknowledged this is a new application, but the same types of risks persist.

Joe Rogers raised concerns regarding alteration of the watershed feeding each wetland.

Elliot Benton made a motion to conclude this application may have significant impacts to the wetlands, second by Jim Carr and carried, 7-0-0.

Mr. Studer again addressed the Agency to discuss the requested fee waiver. A $35,000 application fee has been submitted and the applicant has concluded a fee of $12,000 is more appropriate. There is disturbance to just 1/3 acre of wetland buffer. Further, this development is more similar to a commercial project than residential, thus the fee for a commercial project should be used.

Mrs. Sesto stated the department is self-sustaining; operating exclusively off of application fees to review and administer applications. There is no surplus, so the fees charged seem to accurately reflect the cost of their work.

Bill Galvin stated this is a complex application and will demand a lot of staff time.

Messrs. Benton, Carr, and Harris contributed similar statements.

Brian Harris made a motion to apply the fee schedule as written, seconded by Joe Rogers, and carried, 7-0-0.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. #2015-176 – 47 Valley Drive – 47 Valley Drive, LLC – Tax #07-2135 - construction of two multi-family buildings with parking underneath 60’ from wetlands, with walkways 25’ from wetlands and a rain garden 45’ from wetlands
Patricia Sesto read the additional information into the record.

Agent for the applicant, Atty. Thomas Heagney of Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Heagney spoke of a meeting with Mrs. Sesto to review the additional information required. Since then, the applicant’s consultants have been working on drainage, landscaping, and responses to DPW. There is no information ready for submission, but should be ready for the March 28th meeting.

Bruce Cohen of Fogarty, Cohen, Selby & Nemiroff, LLC appeared before the Agency on behalf of the intervenors, Georgetowne North Condominium Association. Mr. Cohen provided a site and project summary and explained the association hired Dr. Michael Klemens to review the project and environmental assessment from Michael Klein.

There are still issues pertaining to the legality of this applicant bringing forward an application. The applicant has yet to disclose their interest in the land. The estate is in probate and the probate judge has not approved the actions of the estate administrator regarding the purchase contract. Also, section 7.7 of the regulations requires the owner of the property’s name and this has not been provided.

Dr. Michael Klemens appeared before the Agency and spoke of the landscape position of the subject property and Georgetowne North, who will receive consequences of all the land use decisions at 47 Valley Drive. This proposal is an 8-30g project and Dr. Klemens compared this project to several others he worked on. In Wilton there was a 10.6 acre parcel developed by Avalon Bay. Milford had an Avalon Bay application for 370 units on 42 acres, which was denied. Milford also had the Wheelers Woods project that consisted of 180 units on 26 acres, 6.4 of which were wetlands. As compared to this two-acre site, these other parcels were larger and had adequate area to buffer the wetland from the construction. The density of Valley Glen is 46.6 units/acre in contrast to 19.18 units/acre and 11.42 units/acre for the two Milford proposals. Valley Glen is the poster child for all the ways to abuse section 8-30g.

The ecological assessment for the applicant was prepared by Michael Klein of Environmental Planning Services (EPS). Dr. Klemens identified Mr. Klein as the wetland scientist who also worked for the applicant of the Wheelers Woods proposal. Mr. Klein’s Wheelers Woods report was based in part on a 2 year study of the wetlands and he worked closely with the town to address concerns. This experience is a 180 degree shift from the work submitted for 47 Valley Drive. Mr. Klein was brought in on the project late and despite this and a lack of quality field work, Mr. Klein offered conclusions regarding the quality of the wetland and impacts. Such conclusions should have been withheld until further studies could be conducted.

Dr. Klemens described the EPS report’s characterization of the site as broad. More emphasis is needed on how all water falling on-site will travel to the wetland, either overland or sub-surface over the bedrock. With this proposal, 90% of the site will be denuded, there will be significant bedrock disruption, and 42% of the site will be rendered impervious post-construction. The proposed green roof is inappropriate as it will starve the wetland of stormwater it previously received. This site forms the headwaters for the system that flows through the Georgetowne North property and beyond, and the proposed development represents a significant shift in the hydrologic regime.

Mr. Klein’s report describes the wetland as impaired, with which Dr. Klemens agrees, however this does not mean the wetland cannot be improved. Mr. Klein visited the site twice and those were at
the wrong time of year. It is the applicant’s responsibility to demonstrate the evidence to back up their conclusions, not just make statements. Dr. Klemens’ own experience has shown cursory observations can be wrong, in Greenwich in particular. Greenwich’s land use patterns do not show the typical concentric rings of growth. Greenwich’s land use is characterized by historic development of large estates and resulted in findings that defy conventional biological models. Wood frogs were found in a nearby vernal pool despite the suburban surroundings, and slimy salamanders were found on a parcel located between the Merritt Parkway and suburban development. Dr. Klemens urged the Agency to require the appropriate field work to substantiate wetland quality assessments.

Greenwich also maintains some unconventional urban areas. For this parcel, there are massive white oaks known as wolf trees. The nature of the bark of mature oaks provides critical habitat. Included in those animals that may use these trees is the long-eared bat, a species federally listed as threatened. In 2005 there was a rezoning application where it was recognized this site supports large and significant trees.

Dr. Klemens advocated for the Agency to see altered and impaired wetlands as opportunities to improve the wetland rather than an excuse to do more harm. Greenwich has considerable impervious cover and every application is the chance to compensate for this. This application does not do enough. There is an over reliance on a single path of stormwater treatment as opposed to treating the water in separate subwatersheds. This does not respect the receiving waters of the wetland system.

The proposal is not a sustainable development. All of the water which drains over the newly exposed bedrock will end up in the wetland system. Newly exposed bedrock is often a source of acid leachate. The applicant has not indicated what the acidity level of the water leaving the site is now and what the potential impacts of further acidic leachate would be.

The applicant has not pursued feasible and prudent alternatives. Among these would be the four lot subdivision plan previously approved for this site. This development scheme included only 23% impervious area and notably more land was preserved. Contrary to the statement of the applicant, this development and the current proposal are quite different in their ability to protect the forest and provide for better stormwater management.

Stephan Skoufalos made reference to section 8.1 of the EPS report, which states there are no direct wetland impacts and asked Dr. Klemens if he agrees. Dr. Klemens disagreed with the statement, reiterating the development will reduce the amount of water the wetland receives and increase the amount of pollution which will cause negative impacts. An activity does not have to occur within the boundary of a wetland to directly impact it.

Elliot Benton asked for Dr. Klemens to further describe this site as a headwater. This site is where the surfacewaters collect to form the watercourse system that begins in the corner of the property and flows under the access road to Georgetowne North, before working its way through the condominiums. The wetland is not fragmented as stated by Mr. Klein and what happens in the headwaters becomes amplified further into the system.

Brian Harris asked about the hydrologic budget and the tradeoffs between the greenroof and increased runoff from the rest of the development. If the greenroof starves the wetland, can’t other runoff generated by the development be directed to the wetland? Dr. Klemens rejected this theory
because the post development runoff patterns and amounts would be different and the runoff would introduce pollutants and thermal pollution. Stormwater cannot be viewed as a waste product. It is the food source for the wetland and when the food source is degraded, the wetland is subsequently degraded.

First Selectman Peter Tesei addressed the Agency, reaffirming the IWWA’s role as the gate keeper to protect the town’s water and environment. The 47 Valley Drive is a transformative project with negative consequences, an outcome not acceptable to this community. The goal of development needs to be one that leaves the property and town better off for having it and this project runs counter to this goal.

Hillary Gunn, a RTM district 7 member presented photographs of the flooding associated with a February 17, 2016 rain event, calling particular attention to the prolonged duration of the flooding.

Valerie Staufer identified herself also as an RTM member of district 7, but she was not speaking as an RTM representative. In her experience as a member, many residents have raised concerns regarding ongoing flooding problems in this area. It is common knowledge changes in imperviousness create flooding problems. If flooding gets any worse here, there is a daycare center whose business will be at risk and there will be no recourse to undo such a problem once this development is built.

Lin Lavery, referencing a promotional brochure for the proposed development, listed a series of rooftop uses proposed as amenities to the future residents and expressed concern about the extensive use and how all of this could possibly fit.

With no further questions from the Agency or public, Tom Heagney responded to some of the points made. The authorization provided by the estate administrator is valid. He knows of no other offers on the property which would prevent the probate judge from approving the purchase contract. If there was, his client would have the opportunity to match a higher offer.

Members requested a copy of the promotional brochure and a mineral analysis.

Bruce Cohen contradicted Mr. Heagney, stating there is another offer on the property and the judge has the discretion to choose between them.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Harris continued the hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Agency on March 28, 2016.

2. #2015-181 – 25 Flagler Drive – Sophia Hartch – Tax #11-1221 – construction of a motor court and rain garden 10’ from wetlands and residential additions 80’ from wetlands

Bob Clausi read the additional information into the record.

Mr. Clausi described the revisions to the plan made since the last meeting. The motorcourt has been repositioned northeast of the cottage, retaining walls have been added to the driveway redesign, a landscaping plan has been submitted for the wetland adjacent to the cottage and for the rain garden, the E&S plan has been improved significantly, and more details of the proposed structures were provided. Additionally, DPW has reviewed the pertinent revisions and finds them acceptable.
The ongoing erosion problem associated with the previously installed drain line along the southern property boundary still needs to be addressed.

Jim McTigue of Risoli Planning & Engineering appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant and stated he is in agreement with the staff report. He added the erosion problem associated with the drain line is a function of the construction underway across the street. The catch basin protection is diverting flows around the catch basin at the head of the drain line and down the slope. The situation should be temporary and correctable.

Chairman Harris asked for public comment and none was offered.

The issue of the eroded drain line will be handled as a function of enforcement of the permit across the street.

Elliot Benton made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Jim Carr and carried, 7-0-0.

Elliot Benton made a motion to approve IWWA #2015-181 with the standard conditions and special conditions as proposed by staff, seconded by Joe Rogers and carried, 7-0-0.

II. Pending Application

1. #2015-179 – 0 Indian Spring Road – INCT, LLC – Tax #10-1319

Patricia Sesto reviewed the contents of her supplemental staff report.

Bill Kenny of William Kenny Associates appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant. He stated the site plan has been revised pursuant to the recommendations of Josh Ryan, Timber and Stone, the professional trail builder consulting for the town. The boardwalk design has been designed and signed off by a structural engineer. Examples of the type of machinery to be used in the forestry management were distributed as well as pictures of the wetland crossings. The decking is proposed as 2X6 boards with 1/8” – ¼” gaps. This could be expanded to one inch gaps if the Agency deemed it appropriate.

There were no comments from the public.

A motion to approve the application with general and special conditions as proposed by staff and the additional special condition the boardwalk decking be spaced leaving ½” gaps at a, minimum was made by Brian Harris, seconded by Jim Carr and carried 7-0-0.

III. New Applications for Review

1. #2015-185 – 61 Woodside Drive – The Milbrook Corporation – Tax #01-1245/s - construction of an addition 45’ from wetlands, and a patio 30’ from wetlands

Bob Clausi described the proposal and site conditions. He noted the catch basins are to be protected, which will keep sediment from more distant activities from reaching the regulated resources. There is a piece of ledge which separates the addition and patio from the watercourse and this outcrop in itself will provide protection to the regulated resource. DPW has reviewed the existing storm water
management system and deemed it capable of processing the additional flow generated by the addition.

Tony D’Andrea of Rocco V. D’Andrea, Inc. appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant and offered no objection to staff comments.

There were no comments from the public.

A motion to approve the application with the conditions proposed by staff was made by Jim Carr, second by Jay Schondorf. The motion carried 7-0-0.

2. #2016-003 – 8 Burning Tree Road – Kristopher and Erica Spraker – Tax # 11-2483 - Demolition and reconstruction of single-family residence 80’ from wetlands, with driveway re-grading 10’ from wetlands

Bob Clausi introduced the application. The redevelopment of the residence will be within the existing limit of residential land use and the wooded buffer to the wetland will be unchanged. The development will result in a net decrease of impervious coverage and as such, a stormwater exemption is applicable. The roof leaders will reportedly discharge to splash pads and this intent needs to be shown on the plan. Mr. Clausi also recommended plantings to enhance the woodland edge at the lawn/woods boundary west of the wetland.

Bryan Nesteriak of B&B Engineering appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant and offered no objection to staff comments with the exception of the requirement to exclude disturbance of the southwest corner of the site. This area is more than 100 feet from the wetland and the property owners are contemplating modifications in the future.

Mr. Clausi clarified his recommendation was to fence this area off during construction to protect the trees. He was not suggesting a long term ban on use of this area.

No public comment was received.

A motion to approve the application with the conditions proposed by staff was made by Elliot Benton, second by Bill Galvin. The motion carried 7-0-0.

3. #2016-011 – 12 Byfield Lane – Gerald and Edwina Musano – Tax #11-1750 - construction of walls, patio, and grading immediately adjacent to wetlands

Bob Clausi introduced the application, describing the plans to make improvements to compliment the residential redevelopment previously approved. The patio and associated retaining walls are in lawned areas and another retaining wall runs parallel to the south side of the driveway in previously approved residential areas. The area south of the driveway has been disturbed beyond what was allowed by permit and will need E&S controls a soon as possible, and then stabilized in the spring.

The stone wall parallel with the front property line passes over a small, intermittent stream. The wall will incorporate a four foot opening to span the stream and provide ample room to pass storm flows and debris. The precise dirtbag location will be finalized in the field to be sure there is no water back flowing to the work area.
Larry Liebman of S.E. Minor & Co., Inc. appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant and offered no objection to staff comments. He agreed to have the additional silt fence by the driveway installed no later than 2/23/16.

No public comment was received.

A motion to approve the application with the conditions proposed by staff was made by Bill Galvin, second by Joe Rogers, and carried 7-0-0.

4. #2016-012 – 25 Fairview Terrace – 25 Fairview Terrace, LLC – Tax #09-3745/s - construction of a new single-family residence, driveway, pool, and drainage system 20’ from wetlands

Joe Rogers, Bill Galvin, Jim Carr, Steven Fong, and Jay Schondorf indicated they visited the site.

Bob Clausi introduced the application. A permit was previously issued in 2004 when this rear lot was created as part of a two-lot subdivision. An open space parcel containing the wetland and stream was also created.

There are many elements of the application which are problematic. The silt fence is proposed perpendicular to grades with no check dams, wings, etc. The infiltrator and its grading come to within seven feet of the wetland. The buffer in the 2004 approval was larger than currently proposed. Plantings are proposed in an area parallel to the wetland, although no details are provided. The project narrative lacks substance and needs to be augmented.

Agent for the applicant, Atty. Thomas Heagney of Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP appeared before the Agency on behalf of the applicant. He stated a meeting with DPW is scheduled for this week and a response to the engineering report submitted on behalf of the neighbor to the east will be provided.

Maria Carasella of Hunt Terrace appeared before the Agency. She is concerned the proposed development will add to the stream volume and eventually undermine the trees, causing them to fall and damage the brook. The loss of trees will also eliminate habitat for the numerous bird species she has observed and amphibians.

Ann Pisetzner of 38 Hunt Terrace appeared before the Agency. Her home is down gradient immediately to the east. Her concerns with the project lead her to retain Lou DiMarzo, P.E. of Redniss and Mead.

Mr. DiMarzo presented his report to the Agency, focusing on three major points. The calculation for impervious coverage failed to include the retaining walls. Given the extent of walls being proposed, their impact has to be taken into account. Secondly, the Cultec unit is proposed on a slope and the proposed grades will yield an extremely steep slope of 1.5:1 and no high flow overflow is shown. Lastly, the designed outlet protection of the rain garden is inadequate and does not meet the minimum setback off of a property line. These and the other issues in his report have to be addressed before he can determine if the proposed development will harm his client’s property.

Bill Galvin sought clarification on the depths of cut and fill. At the garage, the depth of fill will be 7-8 feet. He expressed his views on how this is a difficult site to develop and with the extent of cutting, filling, and work close to the stream, the potential to significantly impact the wetland and
watercourse exists. Cross sections of the existing and proposed conditions were requested, as were additional details on the Cultec system. Given the steep slope, these details are critical. Mr. Galvin went on to request the specifics of the rain garden operation and retaining walls.

Mrs. Sesto asked for the reason behind the pool fence location and requested it be pulled tighter to the limit of residential landscaping to prevent lawn being established close to the wetland and watercourse.

A motion to delay action on the application was made by Stephan Skoufalos, second by Elliot Benton, and carried 7-0-0.

IV. **Agent Approvals**

The Agency was provided eight legal notices for projects approved by Authorized Agents. The projects are as follows.

1. #2016-005 – Pamela Stonehouse for construction of a front porch and deck, and designation of a septic reserve area 70’ from wetlands at 43 Hettiefred Road, is approved with conditions.
2. #2016-006 – Jorge Beristain/Huxley LLC for construction of new single-family residence, driveway, terrace, and drainage system 80’ from wetlands at 22 Wescott Street, is approved with conditions.
3. #2016-007 – Stuart and Suzanne Katz for construction of an in-ground pool, patio, and stormwater management system, and designation of a septic reserve area 60’ from wetlands at 61 Baldwin Farms South, is approved with conditions.
4. #2016-008 – Jason and Leah Butler for construction of an in-ground pool, patio, and drainage system 55’ from wetlands at 530 North Street, is approved with conditions.
5. #2016-009 – Nicholas and Tammy Kiratsous for construction of a residential addition, modification of a driveway, relocation of septic tanks, and designation of a septic reserve area 45’ from wetlands at 9 Sawmill Lane, is approved with conditions.
6. #2016-010 – Alex Samoilescu for construction of residential additions and deck, and modification of a driveway 35’ from wetlands at 19 Carriage Road, is approved with conditions.
7. #2016-013 – Palko Group, LLC for construction of a new single-family residence, pool, patio, retaining walls, and septic system 90’ from wetlands at 19 North Porchuck Road is approved with conditions.
8. #2016-014 – Alex and Dale Troy for installation of a septic system 100’ from wetlands at 32 Lower Cross Road, is approved with conditions.

No questions were presented and no public comments were received. No action by the Agency was required.

V. **Applications To Be Received**

Elliot Benton made a motion to receive the thirteen applications listed on the agenda and schedule them for discussion or public hearings as appropriate, at the next meeting of the Agency, second by Jim Carr and carried 7-0-0.
VI. **Violations**

1. **Cease & Correct Order #2015-27 – Jonathan and Meghan Olsson – 25 Ferncliff Road – Tax #08-3605**

   Jonathan Olsson, property owner, appeared before the Agency. He explained he was on track to submit a corrective action application in time for this meeting as required, but the amount of the application fee is an issue. When the violation was first issued in early December, the fee to correct the problem would have been $1,500. The fees were increased as of December 21st and the new fee is $4,500. The increased fee is a hardship and will impact his ability to propose as robust a restoration plan. Mr. Olsson is requesting the fee schedule in effect at the time the order was issued be used.

   A motion to use the fee schedule in effect as of the date the cease and correct order was made by Elliot Benton, second by Stephan Skoufalos, and carried 7-0-0.

VII. **Bonds Releases**

1. **Application #2010-094 – Permit #2010-096 / Order #2012-021 for Michael and Virginia Parker – 1110 Lake Avenue.** The $5,000 bond is to be returned to Michael Parker.

2. **Application #2010-095 – Permit #2010-107 for 51 Mooreland Road, LLC – 51 Mooreland Road.** The $8,000 bond is to be returned to Barrie Thrasher.

3. **Application #2014-087 – Permit #2014-074 for W2W Entertainment, Inc. – 150 Pemberwick Road.** The $4,000 bond is to be returned to W2W Entertainment, Inc.

4. **Application #2014-109 – Agent Approval #2014-014 for Michael and Monica Tai – 9 Paddock Drive.** The $2,000 bond is to be returned to Jackson and Kay Yee Tai.

5. **Application #2015-129 – Agent Approval #2015-108 for Kirstin Bolstorff and Khaled Elmarsafy – 10 Meadowbank Road.** The $1,000 bond is to be returned to Redwood Construction, LLC.

   A motion to release the bonds was made by Brian Harris, second by Bill Galvin, and carried 7-0-0.

VIII. **Other Business**

   a. **General Procedural Discussion**

      No discussion was offered.

IX. **Adjourn**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Patricia Sesto  
Wetlands Director