

THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2020, AT 7:00 P.M., VIA ZOOM: <https://zoom.us/j/99785227830>, meeting ID: 997 8522 7830; dial by your location, +1 301 715 8592 US, meeting ID: 997 8522 7830#.

Present were Chair Clifford Thier, and Vice-chair Michael Beauchamp; and Commissioners Bob Breckinridge, Jed Usich, and Martha Dean. Absent was Commissioner Michael Feldman (and Commission member vacancy). Also present were John McCahill, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent, and Town of Avon Attorney Kari Olson.

Chair Thier called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Chair Thier welcomed those who had joined the meeting and stated that the meeting was being coordinated and recorded by a meeting consultant, hired by the Town of Avon, to assist those participating in complying with the rules and protocol process regarding the virtual Zoom meeting. Chair Thier read aloud the protocol and processes related to the meeting for the map amendment application.

PUBLIC HEARING:

**APPL. #768** – Blue Fox Run Golf Course, LLC, Lisa Wilson Foley, applicant; Blue Fox Run Golf Course, LLC, owner; Nod Road Properties, LLC, owner; and Corner Properties, LLC, owner; Requesting to amend the Town of Avon Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map, per Section 15 of the Regulations, to update the map for the subject properties to depict accurate information based on detailed field mapping and soil evaluations. Locations: 65 Nod Road, Parcel 3290065; 117 Nod Road, Parcel 3290117; and 231 Nod Road, Parcel 3290231.

Present was Attorney Janet Brooks, who spoke on behalf of the petitioners Blue Fox Run Golf Course, LLC, Nod Road Properties, LLC, and Corner Properties, LLC, in this proceeding to officially amend the map of Inlands Wetlands and Watercourses Town of Avon, CT. She stated that the applicant's full party was present at this meeting and available to participate to answer any Commission questions. She stated that the party who filed an intervention petition, had filed a letter of testimonial from one of the party's witnesses at 5:00 p.m. on the day of this hearing. She stated that since the petitioner has the burden of proof, and if the Commissioner were to allow the letter, then she would ask the Commission for the opportunity of rebuttal, otherwise her party was fully present and prepared to any questions from the Commissioners at any point in the hearing. She inquired if the letter would be received into the record by the Commission.

John McCahill stated that Attorney Brooks was correct in the timing of the submission of the letter and that the letter had not been forwarded to the Commission via email. He stated that the letter was an untimely submittal and an untimely request by the attorney for the intervenor petitioners at 5:00 p.m. on the afternoon of this evening's hearing.

Chair Thier confirmed that the letter submission was untimely and that it would not be accepted into the record and he stated that there would be no need for a rebuttal by Attorney Brooks' party.

John McCahill requested that the applicant display Map 2.0, the map that would be used for approval, if it were so determined by the Commission, on the screen as a point of reference for any Commissioner questions.

Vice-chair Beauchamp stated that he did not have further questions for the applicant and that he had adequate information from the applicant.

Commissioner Breckinridge inquired if he could see simultaneously both the current Town wetlands map and the wetlands delineation map proposed by the applicant. He inquired about the waterbodies that the applicant's soil scientists delineated in the field that were not shown on the Town wetlands map.

A composite map was displayed on the screen.

Robert Russo, primary Certified Soil Scientist for the applicant, with CLA Engineers, Inc., confirmed that there were waterbodies and ponds mapped in the field that were not shown on the Town wetlands map, and that they were sizable areas. He described and pointed out those areas as seen on the virtual display.

Michael Klein, Certified Soil Scientist and peer reviewer with Davison Environmental, LLC, also confirmed Mr. Russo's statement, in describing the areas of the existing ponds.

Commissioner Dean had technical difficulties with her home personal audio system through the web link, as her voice was not able to be heard.

John McCahill stated that Commissioner Dean could use the written chat feature within the Zoom platform or dial in to the meeting from her cell phone to speak at this meeting.

Commissioner Dean indicated via written response on a note pad, seen visually on the Zoom screen, that she had no further questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Usich stated that he had no further questions and that he had received all of his answers from the applicant.

Chair Thier stated that he had no further questions for the applicant.

Attorney Brooks stated for the record that her party's presentation in its entirety stands, and that her party was available for any further questions that may arise from the Commissioners at this evening's hearing.

Chair Thier stated that members of the public would have the opportunity to offer commentary. He asked that the public focus the nature of their commentary on information accuracy in the application and the burden of proof relevant to this application as presented by the applicant's party. The Commission would not consider issues outside of the wetlands purview.

John McCahill restated the virtual platform Zoom tips for the *raise hand* feature in order for participants to be called upon by the Chair.

Attorney Brian Smith, of Robinson & Cole, LLP, representing Nod Road Preservation, Inc. (NRP), inquired when the Commission would decide upon whether to grant or deny the petition to intervene, requested by his party. He stated that his party's correspondence submission at 5:00 p.m. that day was not late, however, the submission was an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), related to Dr. Klemens' stated vocal-chord disability; and due to Dr. Klemens' testimony inaccurately transcribed by the Zoom-recorded transcript. He stated that Dr. Klemens was attempting to correct those inaccuracies, and Attorney Smith requested that Dr. Klemens be given an opportunity to speak this evening and that those statements this evening be accepted into the record. Attorney Smith stated that his party was available this evening to answer any questions from the Commission. He questioned why the applicant's party had not submitted a disturbed soils map, which was mentioned at a previous meeting.

Chair Thier stated that the decision on the intervenor status would be made toward the end of the hearing.

Attorney Brooks inquired if one of the applicant party's soil scientists wanted to respond to the concern related to the disturbed soils mapping; however, she also stated that there had been no further outstanding concerns or requests for further applicant materials made by the Commission at the last meeting.

Mr. Russo stated that the soil scientists' charge was to delineate the wetland boundaries on the site, that the team had provided ample sufficient data on the wetland boundaries, and that disturbed soils encountered on the site were noted in the soil logs, which had been provided to the Commission. He stated that the guidance on mapping wetlands does not require the soil scientists to include mapping disturbed soils over the entirety of the site. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) guidance document does not require the mapping of the extent of disturbed soils.

Mr. Klein stated that the record of aerial photography is extensive and available online. He stated that the aerial photography shows that the site has been disturbed by agricultural activities, golf course construction, and sand and gravel extraction; all of which have been detailed in the soil scientists' reports. He stated that Attorney Smith's soil scientist witness, Mr. Timothy Welling, had the opportunity to construct a map related to his concerns based upon the information available to the public.

Mr. Welling stated his concerns over his confusion, related to complete and incomplete public information, and that he wanted to see the basis for the applicant soil scientists' information regarding disturbed soils on a map.

Town Attorney Kari Olson addressed Attorney Smith's and Dr. Klemens' concern over the Zoom transcript. She stated that the Zoom transcript was not a "verbatim" record that would be submitted in a court, should a case be brought before an appeals court; the Zoom full audio/visual video recording stands as the full record as well as the Commission minutes. The

technology of the virtual platform was not perfect with respect to any and everyone's testimony before the Commission. The Commission has no intention of relying on the Zoom transcript for its decision, or in relation to a possibly future appeal.

John McCahill stated that every report that had been presented to the Commission had been posted to the Town's Inland Wetlands Commission webpage. The Zoom video recordings have been posted to the webpage directly after each meeting for this application. The Town has provided a full capture of information in a multitude of ways.

Chair Thier asked if any members of the public wished to comment on the application.

Sally Reiger, Interim Chair of the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild Scenic Committee, spoke on behalf of the committee. She explained the nature of the committee and its charge in relation to Avon and to surrounding towns in Connecticut. She explained the meaning and significance of the wild and scenic designation. She spoke about the issues of flooding of the Farmington River and issues related to climate change.

Cheryl Jackson, of Nod Road in Avon, requested that the Commission deny the application. She spoke about frequent flooding in the area and climate change. She stated that any future development would make flooding worse and affect the drainage of the land. She did not feel that wetlands should be taken away from the map.

Aimee Petras, of the Farmington River Watershed Association, Inc., a private non for profit citizens' group with interests in protecting the Farmington River, read from the organization's letter submitted to the Commission, dated October 29, 2020. In the 2020 letter, she also stated excerpts from a letter, dated February 5, 2019, which had been submitted to the Commission for the record of a previous application. The request in the 2020 letter was for the denial of the application, and she discussed other issues including the 500-year flood plain elevation, which she stated should be an elevation considered by the Commission.

Attorney Brooks objected to Attorney Smith's request that Dr. Klemens be allowed to read his letter into the record. It was her understanding that both the applicant's party and the NRP party were finished with their presentations. She stated that Dr. Klemens' letter submitted to Town staff this afternoon at 5:00 p.m., was more than corrections to the Zoom-recorded transcript; and that more information follows to comprise one continuous document. She objected to more testimony and more NRP party information being received by the Commission at this time.

Chair Thier stated he would consider Attorney Brooks' objection at the appropriate time during this meeting.

Andrew Rothstein, of 5 Acorn Glen in Avon, presented comments and a summary of his letter, which had been previously submitted to the Commission related to this application. Among other issues, he spoke about the danger of flooding, loss of habitats, and the protection of the environment as they relate to the wetlands of the State of Connecticut, and asked the Commission to deny the application.

Rinaldo Tedeschi, a member of the public, discussed issues regarding his own beliefs related to statements made by the applicant's soil scientists regarding the wetlands delineation and its accuracy. He spoke about the application's benefits for the property owner, which he stated did not include benefits for the Town of Avon, related to profits from developable land. He requested that the Commission deny the application.

Chair Thier requested of Attorney Smith if he could read the corrections to the Zoom-recorded transcript errors, and only the errors, as Dr. Klemens proposed in his letter to the Commission. The Chair stated that nothing new should be added to the record at this time, and no information should be repeated at this time, nor should the words that Dr. Klemens intended to say be included at this time.

Attorney Smith read aloud from Dr. Klemens' letter, dated December 1, 2020, the specific errors from the Zoom-recorded transcript. Dr. Klemens had pointed out the errors in his letter; however, he did not include in his letter the words that he did actually say at the previous meeting. Such errors included the word *weapon* that should have been recorded by the Zoom computer technology as *wetland*.

Dr. Klemens, an ecological scientist, spoke briefly to state his objection to the recording of his words in the Zoom-recorded, computer-generated transcript.

Chair Thier stated that there had been ample opportunity to submit to the Town and Commission the corrections to the Zoom-recorded transcript prior to the afternoon of the December 1, 2020, meeting this evening. He questioned why Dr. Klemens had not provided his comments regarding errors soon after the first or second meetings of the public hearing on this application.

John McCahill reiterated that the Zoom transcripts posted to the website were provided by Zoom-recorded computer technology. He stated that the best way to receive an account of what Dr. Klemens had said, and any other participant's commentary, would be to listen to the verbatim full audio recording/full visual as recorded in the Zoom video; and that it would be the appropriate correction to any Zoom-recorded transcript errors found. All reports that were prepared by any professional, and all application materials and correspondence have been posted clearly on the Inland Wetlands Commission page of the Town of Avon website.

Chair Thier stated that the members of the Commission heard Dr. Klemens' full account in his own words, as first-person evidence, at each meeting of the public hearing. Chair Thier stated, and restated, that the Commission would not be influenced by a computer-generated transcript and the Commission would not base any decisions upon it. The Chair stated that Dr. Klemens had already appeared as an expert witness for the NRP Inc., party, and not as a member of the public, and that Dr. Klemens had spoken at the previous meetings of the public hearing; and that the Commission had heard Dr. Klemens' full account at each previous meeting.

John McCahill stated that the original meeting of this public hearing began in October 2020. He stated that at the close of the last public hearing continuation meeting, the Chair made the deadline very clear, of within two weeks of the last meeting, for both the applicant's party and the opposing party if they needed to submit any further information.

Lynn Kenney, of 44 Country Club Road in Avon, spoke about open space in the Town of Avon, the issue of flood water in the area of Nod Road, and the protection of natural resources in town.

Christopher Jackson, resident of Nod Road, spoke about specific flooding events of the Farmington River in the years 1955, 2011, 2013, in the area of Nod Road, and some of the various river cresting levels, including 30 feet and approximately 17 feet. He spoke about the flood elevation line used in this application.

Chair Thier asked the Commission if there were any remaining questions or comments at this time.

Vice-chair Beauchamp stated he had no further questions related to the application at this point in the meeting and had ample information with which to make a decision on the application.

Commissioner Breckinridge stated had no further questions related to the application at this point in the meeting.

Commissioner Dean had no further questions related to the application at this point in the meeting.

Commissioner Usich had no further questions related to the application at this point in the meeting.

Chair Thier inquired of the attorneys for the applicant's party and NRP Inc., if they wished to provide any additional statements at this time.

Attorney Brooks stated that Dr. Klemens had accomplished his mission in subverting the will of the Chair due to resident Christopher Jackson's reading of Dr. Klemens' letter into the record as part of Mr. Jackson's commentary, since the Chair had said Dr. Klemens' letter would not be part of the record due to its untimeliness. She asked for her party's soil scientist to respond to residents' comments.

Mr. Russo again stated the definition of wetland soils based upon the State of Connecticut's regulations and the Town of Avon's regulations, as defined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). He restated the agreement of the four soil scientists, including those experts from the Natural Central Conservation District (NCCD), in meeting the requirements for soil delineation.

Mr. Klein, in response to commentary from the public, reiterated the charge of the soil scientists in following their professional protocol; and that in any application before the Commission, an accurate delineation of wetlands would be required according to the regulations of the Town of Avon. He stated some of the specific inaccuracies in the statements made by the public this evening. In response to Mr. Jackson's statements, which included Dr. Klemens' statements from his letter, as purported by the applicant's attorney, Mr. Klein pointed out inaccuracies as stated by those parties.

Attorney Brooks, on behalf of her party, presented a closing statement. She stated that the intervention petition did not fit her party's application, since there was no conduct or activity within a regulated wetland or upland review area, as part of this application. She stated that her party met its burden in establishing a precise wetlands delineation map of the subject site.

Attorney Smith, on behalf of NRP, presented a closing statement. He spoke about the nature of the dam operation and control of the Farmington River, north of the subject site, in relation to alluvial soils at the subject site. He stated that the application was highly unusual being without the inclusion of a development plan. He stated that it was appropriate for his party to contest an incorrect map by the applicant's party. He stated that if the map were inaccurate at this time, the wetlands would be impacted, and it was important for the Commission to consider the petition to intervene in this application, in order to consider prudent and feasible alternatives. He stated that even though the applicant's map included more data than the last application submitted to the Commission for this site, the data was still not enough and the work was incomplete. He questioned why the applicant's team did not request that the NCCD present the findings of its letter so that the NCCD could answer any questions by the Commission. He requested that the Commission grant NRP's petition to intervene, to consider feasible and prudent alternatives, and also deny the application at this time.

Chair Thier asked the Commission is there were any remaining questions or comments at this time.

Vice-chair Beauchamp inquired regarding a motion on this application at this meeting.

Commissioner Breckinridge stated he had nothing further to add at this time.

Commissioner Dean indicated by written note, visible on the screen of this virtual meeting, she had nothing further to add at this time.

Commissioner Usich stated he had nothing further to add at this time.

Attorney Olson stated that she appreciated the practices of this Commission and others to make a formal motion regarding acceptance or non-acceptance of a petition to intervene, however, the Connecticut's General Statutes did not require such a motion. The State of Connecticut allows an intervenor to participate based upon the submission of a verified complaint alleging conduct involving the potential for unreasonable pollution, impairment, or destruction of the natural resources of the State. She stated that this Commission had recognized the petition from the first day of the petition submission. Unless the Commission decided to deny the petition to intervene upon some basis, or that the petition was not within the Commission's jurisdiction, she did not believe the Commission had to make a formal motion to grant the petition.

Chair Thier inquired with the Commission members whether or not anyone wished to make a motion on the petition.

There was no motion from a Commission member regarding the petition for intervention from NRP.

Attorney Olson stated that the first motion the Commission should consider was whether or not to close the public hearing.

Vice-chair Beauchamp motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Breckinridge seconded the motion. All Members who voted in favor were the following: Chair Thier, Vice-chair Beauchamp; and Commissioners Breckinridge, Usich, and Dean. The motion carried and the hearing was closed.

Attorney Olson stated that the Commission had the option to commence deliberations and vote that evening. The Commission has up to 35 days to render a decision, absent an extension, following the close of the public hearing. She stated that the Chair had asked her and Town staff to draft a motion to approve this application, following the guidelines of Robert's Rules of Law, in order to assist the Commission. That motion could be considered, discussed, and amended, by the Commission this evening. If the Commission decided that another Inland Wetlands Commission meeting should be scheduled, in order to render a decision, it would have to meet within the 35-day deadline.

Chair Thier inquired with the Commission whether or not any member wished to have more time, within the 35-day, in order to deliberate a decision prior to voting on the application.

Vice-chair Beauchamp and Commissioners Breckinridge, Usich, and Dean, stated that they ready to vote on Appl. 768, this evening. Chair Thier stated that he was the only member not ready to vote, however, he announced that the Commission would vote this evening.

John McCahill shared his computer screen, which showed the document for the motion drafted to approve Appl. 768, to be viewed by all Zoom meeting participants. He read the draft motion aloud, as presented on the screen; the following:

**"Draft Motion of Approval For Application #768**

A. Avon Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission ("Commission")

Findings:

1. The application is a request to amend the inland wetlands and watercourses map of the Town of Avon by Blue Fox Run Golf Course, LLC, Lisa Wilson Foley, applicant; Blue Fox Run Golf Course, LLC, owner; Nod Road Properties, LLC, owner; and Corner Properties, LLC, owner, per Section 15 of the Regulations, to update the map for the subject properties to depict accurate information based on detailed field mapping and soil evaluations. Locations: 65 Nod Road, Parcel 3290065; 117 Nod Road, Parcel 3290117; and 231 Nod Road, Parcel 3290231 (the "Map Amendment").
2. The applicant provided information to the Commission from qualified environmental consultants and wetlands soil scientists indicating that the proposed Map Amendment would not remove any wetlands or watercourses from the area of the Commission's regulatory authority.



3. The Commission sought and received an independent third-party review which was conducted by the North Central Conservation District (NCCD), providing substantial evidence confirming that the proposed Map Amendment would not remove any wetlands or watercourses from the area of the Commission's regulatory authority (in correspondence dated September 22, 2020).
4. Whereas, on October 1, 2020, Nod Road Preservation, Inc. ("Nod Road"), submitted a "Verified Petition pursuant to General Statutes 22a-19" (the "Petition"); and
5. Whereas, in the Petition the proposed intervenor alleges that the Map Amendment involves conduct which has, or is reasonably likely to have, the effect of unreasonably polluting, impairing or destroying the public trust in the natural resources of the state; and
6. Whereas, the Commission having considered all of the information submitted into the record, finds that the Map Amendment will have no adverse impact to the wetlands or watercourses; and
7. Whereas, the Commission having considered all of the information submitted into the record, finds that the Map Amendment does not involve conduct that is likely to cause unreasonable pollution, impairment or destruction of the natural resources of the state that are within the Commission's jurisdiction; namely, inland wetlands and watercourses.
8. Because the applicant's experts have sufficiently demonstrated that the Map Amendment involves no regulated activities and involves no conduct that will adversely impact wetlands or watercourses, it is not necessary for the Commission to consider whether there are feasible and prudent alternatives to the proposed Map Amendment. In fact, the Map Amendment is a correction of the existing Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Map; and
9. Whereas, the Commission finds, based upon the substantial evidence presented to it, that the Map Amendment more accurately circumscribes the existing wetlands and watercourses on the property in question within the jurisdiction of the Commission and in accordance with the Avon Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations Section 15."

Now Therefore,

Based upon the foregoing findings and all the evidence provided, the Commission approves Application #768 submitted by the applicant per the plans,

1. Sheets 1.0, 1.0A, 1.0B, 1.0C and 1.0D prepared by F.A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc. dated 12-14-2018, revised 04/09/2020 & 08/07/2020.
2. Sheets 2.0, 2.0A, 2.0B, 2.0C and 3.0 prepared by Richter & Cegan Inc. dated 08/07/2020.

The effective date of the Map Amendment shall be: December 15, 2020."

Chair Thier stated that the draft motion could be amended. John McCahill stated that it was past practice for staff to draft motions of approval, however, the draft motion of approval was not intended to guide the Commission to vote one way or another, as has been stated at Commission

meetings for other applications. Chair Thier gave the Commission members some time to read through the draft motion at this point in the meeting.

Commissioner Usich inquired regarding the wording of paragraph three. John McCahill responded to the issue of wording in the third paragraph of the draft motion.

Attorney Olson reiterated the nature of the draft motion for approval, and the points of consideration for the Commission as to the construction of the draft motion and its purpose, as there was no presumption in the draft motion.

Attorney Olson confirmed that Commissioner Dean did not wish to call in to the virtual meeting at that point, since Commissioner Dean had experienced technical difficulties with joining the audio via the computer link to the meeting. Commissioner Dean signaled visually on the screen in the negative, in answer to Chair Thier's question that she had no further comment at that time in the meeting. John McCahill stated that the opportunity to call in to the meeting was provided to Commissioner Dean at various points during that meeting.

Commissioner Breckinridge referenced page two of the draft motion, which stated revisions to three maps, and he inquired if the Commission should approve only one map in order to provide clarity within the application, if the motion were to be approved.

John McCahill stated that the map is comprised of one complete plan set of five maps stapled together. The set captures the survey data, the record of soils at the site, and also the supporting test pits and data as part of the set, along with colored renderings.

In response to Commissioner Breckinridge's request to specify one particular map as part of an approval motion, which would show a new wetlands delineation, Attorney Olson stated it was a valid point to specify clearly which map the Commission's decision might be based upon, however, the motion should also include the complete plan set of the application. She stated that a bullet point notation added to the draft motion could satisfy the clarification of a specific map. John McCahill stated that the specific map for clarification would be Sheet 2.0. Attorney Olson stated that a Commissioner could move to approve the motion as it presently exists and then a motion could be made to amend afterward; or a motion could be made with the amendment at the time of stating the motion.

John McCahill typed the added the revision to the draft motion on display, in the section of "*Findings*," and stated the following:

"10. The Commission finds that Sheet 2.0 'Field Delineated Wetlands and Watercourses' accurately depicts the boundaries of the wetlands and watercourses and therefore the Town of Avon Inland Wetland and Watercourses shall be updated based on this mapping."

John McCahill stated that Commissioners would need to state the reasons for their votes.

Vice-chair Beauchamp motioned to approve the draft motion, as amended by John McCahill, for Appl. 768. Commissioner Usich seconded the motion.

Commissioners who voted in favor of the motion were the following: Vice-chair Michael Beauchamp, Commissioner Robert Breckinridge, and Commissioner Jed Usich. Commissioners who did not vote in favor were the following: Chair Clifford Thier and Commissioner Martha Dean. It was confirmed that due to a six-member Commission (one present vacancy) the agency did not meet the minimum majority of members who voted in favor. The motion to approve failed/application denied.

Attorney Olson checked and confirmed in the Connecticut General Statutes that a majority of the Commission, and not simply a majority of those members present at the meeting, must vote in favor of the motion in order for the motion to be approved.

PENDING APPLICATION:

**APPL. #767** – Michelle and Anthony Angeloni, applicants; Jason L. Addison, owner: Request: 1) partial elimination and redirecting of existing intermittent watercourse (eroded drainage swale); 2) construction activities within 100' regulated area; proposed activities include construction of single family residential house, driveway, septic system, detached garage, pool, retaining wall, and related site grading. Location: 4 Vermillion Drive, Parcel 4420004. **(Public hearing date to be determined; no discussion at this meeting.)**

John McCahill stated that the applicant had previously advised the Commission, in writing, that the applicant was not yet ready to schedule the public hearing. John McCahill recommended holding the public hearing on Appl. 767, at the next regularly scheduled meeting on January 5, 2021, at 7:00 p.m., via remote platform.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There was no communication from the public at that time in the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS:

There was no other business.

STAFF COMMENTS:

There were no further staff comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- Minutes - November 5, 2020 – Special Meeting and Public Hearing Continuation: Commissioner Usich motioned to approve the minutes as submitted, and Commissioner Breckinridge seconded the motion. The following members voted in favor: Chair Thier, Vice-chair Beauchamp, and Commissioners Breckinridge, Usich, and Dean, with none opposed. The motion carried.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING:

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on Tuesday, January 5, 2021, at 7:00 p.m., via virtual GoToMeeting platform.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Susan Guimaraes, Clerk  
Inland Wetlands Commission  
Town of Avon Planning and Community Development