THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING ON TUESDAY, October 5, 2021, AT 7:00 P.M., VIA GOTOMEETING: by web, <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/932800893>; or by phone, United States: +1 (872) 240-3212, Access Code: 932800893#.

Present were Chair Clifford Thier and Vice-chair Michael Beauchamp; and Commissioners Bob Breckinridge, Martha Dean, Michael Feldman, Michael Sacks and Jed Usich. Also present was John McCahill, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent, and Emily Kyle, the newly hired Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent who will be taking over for J. McCahill.

Chair Thier called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. J. McCahill took attendance for the meeting. J. McCahill then introduced the new Clerk, Janet Stokesbury, and the new Community Development Specialist, Emily Kyle. There will be about a three week overlap with J. McCahill and E. Kyle and J. McCahill listed E. Kyle’s prior work experience.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Continued Enforcement Hearing: Mr. Thang Tran - 425 Waterville Road (Assessor’s Map #026, Lot #4500425); removal of mature trees/saplings along, and adjacent to, the banks of a watercourse and/or near wetlands associated with the property

J. McCahill started the meeting by showing the Agenda on the screen. This is a Continued Enforcement Hearing. David Whitney and Mr. Tran are on this meeting. We now have all 7 members of the Commission present.

D. Whitney began and is expecting Michael Klein to join us. D. Whitney welcomed E. Kyle. D. Whitney prepared a Remediation Plan for the property at 425 Waterville Road, shown on the screen. He stated that the Commission is familiar with this property and this situation has been going on for a while. The property owner cleared trees within the regulated area. There is an intermittent watercourse that flows from east to west from Waterville Road down to the river. It meets all the criteria for an intermittent watercourse and it is very obvious when you are at the site. The 100’ upland review area is shown on the map. On the northern side it extends onto the neighbor’s property and on the southern side it encompasses most of this property. The portion of the property shaded in green is the area that was cleared. The property that was cleared consists of about 16,000 square feet which is 0.37 acres, a little over 1/3 of an acre, and a small amount of the cleared area is outside of the upland review area. Within that upland review area are the stumps of the trees that were cleared and D. Whitney did his best to locate them on the plan. He put them in 3 categories: a few small trees shown with small black circles right near the watercourse (2-3” diameter trees), eighteen medium trees shown with medium circles highlighted in orange, and thirteen large trees (11-30” in diameter) and shown on the plan with pink circles. D. Whitney did his best to give a good representation of where the trees were. M. Klein from Davison Environmental has prepared a remediation plan that D. Whitney drafted onto his site plan which calls for a certain number of plantings: ten white hemlock and pine trees, ten red maple and gray birch trees, six flowering dogwood and crabapple trees, and twenty various shrubs, and some facenes which are bundled saplings that will be planted on the side of the watercourse in the areas that have eroded that will grow and provide vegetation in the eroded area. The remaining portion of the site is wooded and has not been disturbed. The limit of disturbance starts along the road and includes an area which is approximately 150’ back from Waterville Road. The location of the proposed plantings is taking into consideration the future development of the lot. The septic system will be in the front of the lot and the house will be a little bit further back and the driveway will be along the southern side of the property, actually outside the upland review area on the map. We have shown the plantings to replace the trees that were cut down and protect the watercourse but with an eye in mind to the future development of the site. It did not make sense to M. Klein and D. Whitney to propose plantings that in a few years the owner would have to cut down. Chair Thier stated that D. Whitney was making an assumption about the property and that there would need to be approval by the Commission of the activity in the upland review area. D. Whitney confirmed that he was making the reasonable assumption that this building lot will be developed in the only manner that it can be developed which is to locate the house, septic system, and driveway on the very front of this site. The back portion of the site is flood plains and wetlands so the only place to develop this site is the front portion. Chair Thier reiterated that the lot is subject to approval by the Commission and D. Whitney agreed. D. Whitney stated that this lot cannot be developed without a fair amount of activity in the upland review area. D. Whitney expects that M. Klein would say that the plantings should be done under the supervision of a botanist or a professional such as himself. There is a construction sequence on the plan. Part of the remediation is the removal of debris from the watercourse. T. Tran had cleared the lot and some vegetation had been placed in the watercourse and that was causing a problem backing up water and T. Tran has been working on removing the debris and has made significant progress. J. McCahill offered to bring up photos from the site. The first picture shows the front of the site and shows grass and no erosion occurring on the property. The area that was cleared does have decent vegetative cover. J. McCahill then showed a picture that shows the woody debris in the watercourse that was removed. T. Tran’s pictures also included a more recent picture that shows the view upstream and J. McCahill noted that there was a significant amount of debris that was removed. The debris is actually piled to the south of the intermittent watercourse. Another picture shows a pile of the debris that was removed from the north side of the existing watercourse. Other pictures show significant piles of the debris that were removed from the watercourse. This documents T. Tran’s activities and accomplishments to date. D. Whitney stated that he is happy to answer any questions.

Chair Thier then entertained questions from the Board members. J. Usish had no questions.

M. Sacks is concerned that we have addressed the wrong question. It is not how to protect the wetlands that have been exposed but how to restore what has been inappropriately taken down. How can we put trees back so the property is restored to the way it was? M. Sacks feels that we should not reward someone for taking down trees inappropriately to prepare it for a building site within a 100’ feet area. He feels that this is extremely poor precedent so his question to D. Whitney is what could be done to restore the trees not just in the border of the area but throughout the area so that we have an area relatively similar to what was there before. He feels that what D. Whitney has shown is important and should be done because we don’t want runoff and erosion into an area that it shouldn’t be but we also want to restore the area to what it was. What would D. Whitney recommend in terms of putting in trees and restoring this as best as possible. M. Sacks does not think putting grass in where trees were is what is appropriate.

D. Whitney stated that it is up to the discretion of this Commission what the owner should do. They could require replacing tree for tree throughout the site if you wish. This does not make sense to D. Whitney from a common sense viewpoint. He understands that the Commission does not want to reward anyone for violating the regulations but to plant trees exactly the way it was when the owner hopes to build on it in the next few years just doesn’t make sense to him. M. Sacks does not feel that the owner’s future plans are at all relevant. We are not allowing the owner to make a step toward what will fulfill future plans. We have a situation in which somebody engaged in activities that they should not have done. M. Sacks feels that we need to find the information that is necessary to restore the site in the same way that will promote the same kind of growth, animal life, and all that was there. It may not be the same trees – it may be different kinds of trees. D. Whitney replied that M. Klein believes this planting plan will accomplish the same goal – to protect the intermittent watercourse. M. Sacks believes that is not the objective. C. Thier asked whether this is supposed to be a remediation plan. D. Whitney confirmed that is what it’s called.

 M. Feldman asked D. Whitney about his past knowledge and experience in other remediation plans and whether those plans have been along the line of what D. Whitney and M. Klein have proposed or have they been more along the line of what M. Sacks is suggesting which is restoring it to the condition which previously existed. D. Whitney remembered the last situation like this that he worked on which was with Michael Flors at 232 Avon Mountain Road. That situation was where trees within the upland review were cleared and the remediation plan that D. Whitney and M. Klein prepared showed trees to be replaced within the upland review area where the trees were cut down but they were placed in a way so we did not have to put any new plantings where the house, septic system and driveway were proposed. Every piece of property is different. There was also a situation with Richard Gordon on the mountain. Those are the only 3 situations that D. Whitney could think of. J. McCahill mentioned Tony Galazan on Vermillion. D. Whitney stated that they planted trees along the property line. D. Whitney said he could check and come back with the information at the next meeting. M. Feldman asked J. McCahill if there was guidance in the regulations on remediation plans. J. McCahill replied that the regulations just talked about a violation that has occurred and then the Commission has to decide what’s appropriate to remediate the damage. J. McCahill feels it is important for M. Klein to talk about the resource itself, which is the intermittent watercourse, and what may or may not have occurred in the way of damage to that as a result of the work that was done and why he feels it is appropriate to do what he’s doing by the way of plantings along the watercourse. Then the Commission may want to get into the bigger picture of what to do with that remnant area that is beyond the fringe of the watercourse in the way of restoration. J. McCahill thinks M. Klein has got to give some indication of why he took the approach he did. M. Feldman reiterated that the regulations give no guidance and it is up to the Board to decide what the proper remediation is. J. McCahill stated that the Commission’s concern and priority is protecting the resource and making sure that the resource isn’t harmed or compromised based on the work that was done and if it was, how do we protect it again. How do we make sure that it stays healthy and viable? M. Feldman replied that the resource would not be limited to the watercourse, it would be the entire upland review and to the extent that it provides habitats for wildlife and scenic values, those should be taken into account as well. J. McCahill confirmed this.

M. Dean asked if this was an approved building lot. D. Whitney replied that it is an existing lot of record and it is being taxed as a building lot. M. Dean reviewed the materials submitted from D. Whitney and M. Klein and feels that we should work with that but also feels that M. Sacks is correct that we don’t want to encourage this action. M. Dean asked if T. Tran came in and asked to build on this lot, and the Commission gave him a permit to cut trees but with a plan to put up more new trees where they would be more appropriate to allow development of the site, if the cost is the same as doing it this way or doing it this way is even cheaper. She is concerned because it does create, it does encourage property owners to clear their property, and then come in and say, sorry, we didn’t know we couldn’t do that. M. Dean then asked what are our options? Can we impose a monetary penalty? Chair Thier stated that the Commission does not have the power to assess a fine but we can reject this plan as not a remediation plan. Chair Thier checked the dictionary definition of remediation and found the definition of a remediation plan in terms of environmental context is to return property to its condition that it was before the activity. M. Dean does share the concern of putting up trees that are going to be cut down. M. Dean also has another concern which is whether the property owner has made a legitimate mistake and it seems that he has, because it is out in the open and if you were trying to hide something, you wouldn’t do anything so flagrant.

B. Breckinridge can see the issues discussed and his concern is if the Commission agrees to this remediation plan and the property owner doesn’t do it or doesn’t actually build on this lot. Do we have the power to put money in escrow that would pay if the property owner decides not to build on the lot? Chair Thier stated that the Commission does not. B. Breckinridge asked what protects us if he does not build?

Chair Thier stated that he is dismayed because he expected a remediation plan and that was what the Commission was told they would receive and he feels that this is not a remediation plan. We would not be expecting that if a 12’ diameter tree was cut that there would be a 12’ tree put in the same place but it would be in a close enough place to make the property look as it did before the unauthorized activity within the upland review area. He would like the applicant to come back with a bona fide remediation plan. The current plan assumes that the owner or future owner is going to come back to us with a plan for a house on the lot in the place where the trees were cut down and we’re going to approve it. That presumes quite a bit. If the Commission or a future Commission does not approve that then we are left with a lot with no remediation – the lot doesn’t look like it did before. Chair Thier is also concerned about precedent. If the Commission does this, it is basically giving a green light to every property owner with an upland review area to conduct activity in this area and then come to us and say “I didn’t know and anyway at some future time I’m going to come back to you to ask permission to conduct activity in your area and so I shouldn’t have to return the land to the way it was before”. Chair Thier thinks the precedent is bad and also it is a bad precedent to accept something which is not a remediation plan and consider it as if it were a remediation plan. He is disappointed that the applicant did not come to the Commission with a remediation plan – this does not qualify.

D. Whitney stated the definition of remediation plan from the Oxford Dictionary which is “the action of remedying something in particular of reversing or stopping environmental damage.” If M. Klein believes that this plan will reverse or stop environmental damage, then it is a remediation plan. It may not be the plan that this Commission wants to see, but it is an honest remediation plan. Chair Thier asked D. Whitney if the Commission were to agree with this, what would prevent other property owners with upland review areas from doing the exact same thing as there would be a precedent. D. Whitney acknowledged the concern. Chair Thier pointed out the Rt. 44 property issue that we went to court over to protect our rules and our authority. We required that applicant to replace the trees that he cut down. Chair Thier said that the fact that the property owner would like to build a house there cannot enter into the calculus. We either require the property owner to return it to the same condition or he doesn’t. We either set a precedent that we won’t tolerate this or we shrug our shoulders or we tolerate it everytime a property owner comes to us and says he didn’t know any better. D. Whitney stated that he is not meaning to defend anyone breaking the rules or regulations.

M. Klein spoke next. He stated that he is a biologist and soil scientist in West Hartford. He stated that he would talk about the resource that is present here, then the goals of a remediation plan within the context of the Commission’s authority, and then we will be happy to answer questions. The resource that is involved here is an intermittent watercourse which carries little flow for most of the year but has substantial flows during and immediately after storm events. It drains off of Talcott Mountain or Avon Mountain. Those soils and the area that it drains is shallow, the bedrock is hardpan and is typically these intermittent watercourses that come off the mountain and there are many of them that are very flashy in nature. They flow quite aggressively from spring snow melt and after storm events. Otherwise the flow is very minor and most years watercourse like this dry up in the summertime. The only significant function and value that’s provided here is drainage conveyance and also to a certain extent, channel stabilization in terms of the vegetation on the immediate banks of the watercourse. M. Klein saw evidence of significant erosion, unstable banks along the steeply sloping banks of the watercourse in the area closest to Route 44. And based on more recent photographs, after some of the debris was removed, that situation continues downslope and it shows bare soil and very steep actively eroding banks. The functions and values are limited on the adjacent woodland to the south, and it doesn’t contribute a significant amount to those functions and value. M. Klein suggested that the Commission consult with their staff or attorney as the authority of Commissions over an upland review area has been looked at carefully by the courts. There is a case from Greenwich that he thinks went all the way to the Connecticut Supreme Court. The Court determined that the Commission’s authority in the upland review area is limited to activities which have the potential to have a significant impact on the watercourse or the wetlands in question. In this case, M. Klein suggests that the removal of vegetation on the immediate banks of the watercourse has that potential and that is within the Commission’s jurisdiction. As you get further to the south, those areas do not even drain to the watercourse. As a regulatory scientist, he is not even sure that area is within the jurisdiction of the Commission. This plan was designed to stabilize the banks. He has proposed bank stabilization measures, facene or brush bundles to be installed on both sides of the brook even outside the area that was cleared without approval. That’s the most significant environmental remediation activity that can occur here. Without that stabilization, the banks will continue to erode and deposit sediment downstream. The brush bundles are native shrubs and they will root and spread and they will provide wildlife habitat, and beyond that, he has proposed substantial, deciduous trees, evergreens and native shrubs to also provide additional soil stabilization habitat and shading of the watercourse. These measures are substantial, the trees that are to be provided are significant in size, and to scatter trees around the upland review area would not provide any additional benefit and in his mind, and they would provide less of a remediation activity than is shown here. With respect to precedent, M. Klein’s opinion is that every site or circumstance is unique and any remedial activity needs to be looked at based on the site conditions both prior to and currently, what’s feasible and reasonable, and what in fact will provide additional resource values and what will protect the resource values to the maximum extent possible. In his opinion, this plan does that.

J. Usich appreciates M. Klein’s input. J. Usich found it interesting that M. Klein believes this is a remediation plan, which J. Usich does think it is a remediation plan by definition, though it may not be the remediation plan which everyone wants to see. As to the issue of precedent setting. J. Usich also believes that every situation is unique and has its own set of circumstances and he does not think that using this version of the remediation plan precludes the Commission from ever asserting a right to approve something different than what’s presented in a similar situation.

M. Sacks asked what purpose the trees in the area do to protect the area from flooding. These are large and small trees throughout the area growing over many years with deep root systems and large number of leaves. He would like to know how that might have served the area. M. Klein stated that the flooding that occurs in the Farmington River is not directly affected by runoff from this site. The way this site contributes to the Farmington River flooding is through the flows in the intermittent watercourse that eventually, after a long circuitous path even though it’s not that far a distance and this channel is pretty diffuse or pretty indirect, get to the Farmington River. This property conveys the flows from a much larger area that comes off Avon Mountain. The flows from this site get to the river ahead of that larger flow and don’t contribute significantly to the flooding. There’s actually some literature that suggests that the conversion of woodlands to grasslands does not have a significant effect on the total discharge from the watershed and in this case, the watershed would just be the area on the site that has been cleared. It would not be the Farmington River and in respect to the Farmington River it is de minimus. D. Whitney added that the rear portion of this property,that is the far western portion of this property is in the floodplain of the Farmington River, which is elevation 169, 170, 171. The area that was cleared is 184-200 in elevation. We are significantly above the flood elevation and the portion that is cleared is not subject to flooding. M. Sacks also noticed the slant on the property and the water which would be running down towards the wetland area. He is concerned about the effect that the trees might have had in the immediate area whether it is from the nutrients of the trees in this area, or the slowing down of the water flowing into them, the kind of purification of the water that might be in the lower areas. If M. Sacks looked at a property like this in the future and saw a large area with grass and someone came in to put a house there, he would weigh it differently from a large area with trees to be cut down. The property has been transformed in a way that might change the way that you’d judge it in the future. We should avoid this. Someone that has gone in there and successfully cut down trees, put in grass, and says “I’m building a house where there is just grass so what’s the damage.” I think it’s a transformation of what has occurred. Any discussion about what is now the best way to now protect the wetlands is distracting us from the main issue. This is something that has been done to a piece of property and our question should be, we want to be able to find a solution to this which is not simply remediation, but a solution that says that homeowners should see this as a very unproductive activity. This should be seen as something that should not get you very far but anybody would look at this as an outcome that gets you real far. You can go in and take down all the trees and you can sell them. M. Sacks was looked at laws that pertain to damage from going onto property that is not your own, taking down trees, and selling them. There are penalties for this. You should not be able to do this. We should not simply concentrate on the notion of restoring this in a way that protects the wetlands. That should occur, those trees should be planted along the waterway. M. Sacks would not scatter them everywhere. That’s not the solution. That protection should occur but we also need to do something in the remainder of the area.

 M. Dean shares the thoughts of a number of Commissioners here. She does not have questions but her thinking is that she agrees with D. Whitney and M. Klein that every site is different and that every property owner and situation is different. She does not think that this is a green light to everyone to just go and cut down trees. She also does not think that this ties the Commission’s hands in terms of how you deal with future situations like this because no two situations are the same. She does think this is a remediation plan. She feels that Mr. Tran understands that this is wrong so she is not concerned that this is somebody that went out to do this intentionally. So M. Dean is comfortable with the remediation plan and is comfortable with the approach.

M. Feldman asked M. Klein if he had a cite for the case he referred to out of Greenwich. Chair Thier stated that he feels that we should not be discussing the case because we have counsel for the Town and we can turn to her if we have any questions on our authority. Chair Thier would like to keep this focused on this plan and not what our authority is. M. Feldman is not assuming that T. Tran did this intentionally or maliciously but sees this as a very convenient way for somebody to further their development plans and to bypass the regulatory process of this Commission. If I’m a landowner of a forested lot and I want to pursue development, how convenient it would be to clear cut it and hope that nobody noticed but avoid going to the Commission and jumping through the hoops of hiring an engineer, and the delays in hiring a soil scientist. I just clear cut it and create a fait accompli. And then if I’m caught, all I need to do is put up some buffer trees where it would accommodate my development plan. M. Feldman feels that this furthers the development plan and bypasses the Commission entirely so he has serious concerns about this being a really effective, meaningful plan.

B. Breckinridge agrees with M. Dean in that we have someone that made an honest mistake and to punish him to the extreme is not appropriate. This planting plan will not come cheap. B. Breckinridge feels that future violators trying to use this as a scam to get around our laws does not make sense to him because we can punish people who try to do this sort of thing in a different manner. Each case is looked at individually and he does not think we are setting a precedent and he is comfortable with this type of remediation. B. Breckinridge does not think it makes sense for T. Tran to be planting 12” trees towards the periphery of this property when there’s a good chance he’s just going to be cutting them down.

Vice Chair Beauchamp asked about the trees recommended to be planted. M. Klein replied that the trees are 1-1/2” caliper. In the past the Commission has not been happy with small containerized trees. M. Klein continued and stated that the survival of smaller stock over the 5-10 year period is better, and for the short term, the survival of the smaller stock is better. In the long term, the growth is equal to or greater than the larger trees because they suffer more transplant shock. So the size is based on the diameter of the tree, not the height. Vice Chair Beauchamp asked how big the trees were that were cut down along the watercourse. M. Klein answered that the trees varied in size from 6”, 12” or 18” in the vicinity of the watercourse. There is no way that you can replace those trees with something of similar size. Vice Chair Beauchamp is concerned about taking down much bigger trees and replacing them with much smaller trees. If there will be smaller trees planted, he would like to see more trees planted. Vice Chair Beauchamp asked if this property could be sold now. Chair Thier replied that it could be sold in minutes. Vice Chair Beauchamp asked if we could put a lien on the property until this remediation is done. Chair Thier stated that the Cease and Desist is filed on the land records so anyone buying this would know currently what the owner has to do. Vice Chair Beauchamp stated that this started during the spring and he feels that there has been some foot dragging on this. What we are doing now could have been accomplished about three months ago. In some ways, T. Tran is getting off easy. Vice Chair Beauchamp would like to see some more trees planted to feel comfortable with this remediation plan.

Chair Thier feels that it is a fundamental mistake to try to punish T. Tran. Chair Thier takes T. Tran at his word that he made a mistake and if there was any other way to do this, Chair Thier would vote in favor of it. He then asked D. Whitney how many trees will be planted. D. Whitney replied 26. So the cost of planting 26 trees will be the same no matter where he locates them. Chair Thier is happy that T. Tran will plant 26 trees but he just does not like where T. Tran is proposing to put them because it doesn’t restore the property to where it was before. Chair Thier says there is no issue of punishment here, as he believes that T. Tran made an innocent mistake. We have to be guided by what we think is the best precedent going forward. If we approve this plan, we are opening ourselves up to a whole box full of problems in the future. Again, it will not cost T. Tran a penny more to move the proposed location of the trees to where they were before. Also, we cannot even consider what T. Tran’s future plans may be. He may never come back to us so if he doesn’t or if he does and the Commission turns him down, then the land certainly wasn’t returned to the state is was.

Chair Thier asked T. Tran if he had anything to say. T. Tran stated that he hopes the Commission understands the situation and approves the plan. Chair Thier stated that he thought, on behalf of the entire Commission, they do understand the situation. T. Tran hopes that Chair Thier understands that it was a mistake. Chair Thier stated that he did not think anyone doubted that. Chair Thier then asked the Commission if they wanted to vote this evening or think this over. He asked if anyone wanted to make a motion.

M. Dean made a motion to approve the proposed remediation plan as presented for the enforcement matter for 425 Waterville Road. J. Usich seconded the motion. Chair Thier asked if anyone wanted to address the motion before it was voted on. Chair Thier then asked for a vote on the motion. M. Dean, J. Usich and B. Breckinridge voted in favor. Chair Their, Vice Chair Beauchamp, M. Feldman, and M. Sacks are against. J. McCahill confirmed the votes and stated that the current restoration plan is denied. J. McCahill asked if the Commission wanted to give the applicant direction. Chair Thier answered that the applicant needs to bring back something else. T. Tran has heard the objections from the four Commissioners that voted against it. He and his consultants should discuss how they satisfy the objections. J. McCahill confirmed that the Cease and Desist Order will remain on the land records and the Commission is expecting follow up at its next meeting on November 9. Chair Thier confirmed this. J. McCahill stated that the cut off date for materials for the November 9 meeting is October 22. Chair Thier asked D. Whitney and M. Klein if they could have something to J. McCahill by that date. D. Whitney confirmed that they could.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Chair Thier asked if there was any member of the public that wished to speak. There was no one.

STAFF COMMENTS:

J. McCahill had no comments other than reiterate his introduction of Emily and the role that she will inherit, and Janet as well. Chair Thier welcomed both.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

M. Feldman had one correction to the July 20 minutes. A date was wrong in the first paragraph. J. Stokesbury stated that she knew about it and it was corrected. Chair Their, Vice Chair Beauchamp, B. Breckinridge, J. Usich, and M. Sacks voted in favor of approving the 7/20/21minutes. M. Feldman and M. Dean abstained. The 7/20/21 minutes were approved.

Chair Thier then asked about the minutes from the 7/6/21 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF 2022 MEETING CALENDAR:

J. McCahill stated that the only adjustment to the normal meeting dates of the first Tuesday of the month was in October. Due to the Jewish holiday, Yom Kippur, we moved the meeting date to 10/11/22. Chair Thier asked if anyone had any objections to the calendar. The calendar passed unanimously.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING:

November 9, 2021

B. Breckinridge then made a motion to adjourn. M. Dean voted to second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Janet Stokesbury, Clerk
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