Minutes of Derby Inland Wetlands Agency meeting of Wednesday, April 9, 2008
at Aldermanic Chambers, New City Hall, 1 Elizabeth Street, Derby. This meeting was called to
order at 7:10 p.m. by Chairman Fred Columbo.

By roll call members present were Chairman Fred Columbo, Paul Padilla, David Rogers, Paul
Dinice, David Barboza and Roger Birtwell. Michael Joyce from Milone & MacBroom was
also present.

Additions, Deletions, Corrections to the Agenda:

There were no additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda.

Public Portion:

There was no one from the public wishing to speak.

Acceptance of Minutes

Mr. Padilla moved that the minutes of the March 12, 2008 meeting be accepted. The motion
was seconded by Mr. Rogers and carried unanimously, with Mr. Rogers abstaining.

9b. Fran Finnucan, 45 Belleview Drive: Drainage problems on property.

Fran Finnucan, 45 Belelview Drive asked if any progress has been done with the problem at his
property. He stated that whenever we have a serious rainfall there is runoff from the city landfill
onto his property and flooding his basement. Mr. Columbo stated that he had a meeting with
various department heads and the mayor and it is being addressesd. Mr. also stated that Paul
Padilla did an on-site visit on 4/5/08 and Mr. Columbo visited the property on 4/9/08. Mr.
Finnucan submitted a series of pictures regarding the ongoing problem. Mr. Columbo read a
letter dated 3/7/08 from Ron Columbo, Director of Public Works which stated that the City
worked on the property in early March to divert water from going onto the yards of individuals
on Belleview Drive. Mr. Columbo stated that if there is an emergency situation, the City will
work to try and correct that.
Mr. Joyce stated that they went back to the site to try and track some of the drainage systems. He stated that some of the system is full of sediment and sand and they are looking to clean those out and restore volume of the system. He also stated that a cease and desist was issued to the property owner on Marshal Lane who is building the retaining wall. He also stated that there is a significant trench cut away from the properties on Belleview Drive and some of those may have allowed water to back up. They are planning on cleaning that out and that should provide different direction for the overflows. Mr. Padilla stated that if you look at the road everything pitches to the left toward Mr. Finnucan’s property and he asked if a curb would help. Mr. Joyce stated that either a curb or a berm may help. Mr. Joyce stated that they will try to investigate the topographic mapping but it is limited and he did not know what Public Works si going to be doing. Mr. Columbo stated that he will contact Public Works and see what they are planning on doing and will get an update for Mr. Finnucan.

9c. Detention Basin, LLC, Lanzieri Court, Attorney Michael Bologna - Agent: Submission of supplemental data for on-going detention basin.

Atty. Michael Bologna, 1150 Post Road, Fairfield was present along with Kathy Norwood and Frank Lipke. Atty. Bologna stated that significant work has been done in maintaining the basin. They need to get a chipper into the property but the slopes are too steep. An on-site meeting was held and they discussed the best way to address this. Mr. Lipke suggested that as you go down the easement he will put in 2 to 3 inch traprock in to stabilize the bank. This will also act as an anti-tracking pad. He would then build a path with woodchips. This is only going to be used once or twice a year to bring a machine in to get to the slope and around. He stated that in order to support the path they will have to go below the 85’ contour line but not into the basin. The path itself is not below the 85’ contour line.

Frank Lipke, 20 John Street stated that he will be bringing in traprock to establish the bank and the path will be constructed of mostly woodchips. Mr. Birtwell asked about the problems that they had in the past with the neighbors and the removal of trees. Atty. Bologna stated that some of the tree trunks have been moved further away but they are still in controversy with the neighbors. Mr. Columbo stated that they have the responsibility of maintaining the basin and are doing that. Mr. Dinice stated that he could not tell from the sketch where the riprap is going and would like to see it on the plan. He felt that there should be a concrete record that delineates the slope. Atty. Bologna stated that they can begin the work and then provide the plan and adhere to the plan.

Mr. Joyce stated that the base map drafted and that should be updated. The City will need something that shows where the limits are. It was also asked whether he will stay within the area of the haybales and Mr. Lipke indicated that he will stay upslope of the haybales. Mr. Columbo stated that an on site visit was done on 4/1/08. Atty. Bologna asked if they get the plan to Mr. Joyce and he states that it complies with what is being requested can they proceed. Mr. Columbo stated that is fine and it will be on the agenda next month. Mr. Joyce stated that
the cross section from the slope down to the basin should be shown.

Inland Wetlands Agency 3 April 9, 2008

7. Gilbert Debrum - Applicant. APPLICATION #08021301 - Seeking permission to conduct a “Regulated Activity” proposing to construct one single family house on Stelmack Drive, Lot #81, Tax Map #5-4.

Gilbert Debrum were present and stated that at last month’s meeting there were some issues regarding the underground drainage pipe and Mr. Joyce suggested that they make the changes that they have done. And also, as far as the right of way and existing and new dwelling. Mr. Columbo stated that there is a letter from Milone & MacBroom dated 4/9/08. Mr. Joyce stated that at last month’s meeting it was suggested that there be some dialog between the ZEO, town engineer and applicant because of some zoning issues that may impact or relate to how this plan is laid out. The applicant has proceeded joining that right of way to his parcel as part of a larger plan which allowed him different setback requirements. This further indicated that the underground drainage pipe needs to be re-located. This plan shows the relocation of that existing pipe. Mr. Joyce stated that the only activities proposed in the upland review area are the installation of the relocated drain pipe. He suggested putting in a catchbasin in the driveway.

Mr. Joyce noted that in his review letter dated 4/9/08 comment No. 1 should read “does not reflect”. He also wanted to add comment No. 8 which suggests that the house be built on slab that any addition also be on slab.

Mr. Birtwell moved that the City of Derby Inland Wetlands Agency (DIWA), based upon the information provided by the applicant and finds the following:

1. The proposed project does not involve a significant impact or major effect on an inland wetland or watercourse as defined in the regulations and will require a summary ruling.

2. Sedimentation and erosion control measures have been incorporated into the design including sediment filter fence, stabilized construction entrances, etc.

Therefore, the Agency moves to approve Application No. 08021301 as presented and shown on the following documents submitted in support of the application:

1. “Site Development Plan - Gil DeBrum - Stelmack Drive”, prepared by D’Amico Associates, dated 1/7/08 and revised through 4/1/08, drawn at a scale of 1”=20’.


In addition to the requirements listed in Sections 11.9, 11.12 and 11.13 of the Regulations Protecting the Wetlands and Watercourses of the City of Derby the following stipulations also apply:
1. The plans shall be revised in accordance with the comments offered in correspondence from City Engineer Milone & MacBroom, Inc. dated April 9, 2008.

2. Lack of compliance with any stipulation of this permit approval shall constitute a violation of the Regulations Protecting the Wetlands and Watercourses of the City of Derby, and a cease and desist order shall be issued by the Wetlands Enforcement Officer.

3. Any significant changes or modifications to the application presented shall be submitted to the Derby Inland Wetlands Agency to determine if additional review and approval is necessary.

4. Prior to any construction activities covered by this permit, the applicant shall have the following items both completed by a qualified party and verified as complete by the City Engineer, Corporation Counsel and/or Wetland Enforcement Officer:
   
a. Arrange for the filing of this approval on the Derby Land Records.

   b. Installation of all sediment and erosion control measures indicated on the plans.

   c. Pursuant to Section 12 of the Regulations Protecting the Wetlands and Watercourses of the City of Derby, a $5000 cash bond covering the costs of the sedimentation and erosion control measures and drainage work proposed shall be filed with the City Clerk. The form of the bond shall be approved by the City Engineer and Corporation Counsel.

   d. Written confirmation that the deed of the property references the regulated areas on site and the stipulated conditions of this approval.

5. Prior to issuance of a building permit, an A-2 survey depicting the revised property boundary shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer and Zoning Enforcement Officer which, upon approval, shall be filed on the Derby Land Records.

6. All disturbed areas on the site not directly required for construction activities shall be temporarily hayed and seeded until permanent vegetation is established.

7. Pavement repair and restoration within any and all City streets shall include the full width mill and overlay of the existing pavement within the limits of the
area of disturbance. Contractors working within any city right of way shall be insured and bonded appropriately and all work shall be coordinated with the
Inland Wetlands Agency 5 April 9, 2008

Derby Department of Public Works.

8. The Wetland Enforcement Officer, City Engineer or any other duly authorized representative of the City of Derby shall have the authority to direct the applicant, developer and/or contractor to install additional sediment and erosion control measures as conditions may warrant.

9. A contact individual together with a 24-hour phone number shall be designated with responsibility and authority to receive notices of any breaches or deficiencies of sedimentation and erosion controls on-site, and to coordinate repair on any such breach or deficiencies within 8 hours of the notice from the sediment and erosion control inspector, Wetland Enforcement Officer, City Engineer or any other duly authorized representative of the City of Derby.

10. Approval from the Water Pollution Authority is required for the proposed sanitary sewer connection.

11. The Agency’s decision to grant this approval makes no warranties or representations, either express or implied, that future regulated activities will be permitted on this site.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Padilla and carried unanimously. Mr. Columbo noted that the fee for the application is $100.00.

8. Conduct a public hearing for Marcucio Gardens, Philip Marcucio Applicant, APPLICATION #08021302 - Seeking permission to conduct a “Regulated Activity” Proposing to re-establish existing detention basin volume, relocate and expand existing greenhouse and relocate existing storage bins on property at 480 New Haven Avenue, Route #34, Lot #37A, Tax Map #4-3.

A motion was made by Mr. Birtwell to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dinice and carried unanimously.

Atty. James E. Cohen, 315 Main Street, Derby stated that the Marcucio family has had an agricultural identity in the City of Derby for many years. He stated that the application that is before the Agency is with respect to an application before the P&Z Commission seeking a special use to ratify the operation of a nursery in the R-3 zone. He stated that in conjunction with that application they have filed the application here concerning the detention basin and the request to locate the new greenhouse on the property. Atty. Cohen stated that they have removed from this application the relocation of the existing greenhouse, which has already been removed. It will not be relocated but will be a new greenhouse which is shown on the plan. There will be no relocation of the storage bins, these will be removed from the property. Atty.
Cohen submitted the certified mailing receipts and list of adjacent property owners.
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Atty. Cohen stated that as part of the Cornfield Subdivision Mark Nuzzolo was required to construct a detention basin. In February, 1998 the Marcucio family purchased the detention basin parcel because it was contiguous to the commercial property on which they have their business. He stated that no as-built was filed showing the dimensions of the basin so the City does not have a record of exactly what the finished product consisted of at that time. Their engineers have determined that the pond as it now exists does not conform to that which this board approved going back to the Cornfield approval. The Marcucios have applied for permission to restore the pond to the dimensions that this board and the Planning & Zoning Commission had approved. Atty. Cohen stated that since the design, size, configuration and the construction of this basin was approved by this board, that there is no significant impact with their activities to restore it. He stated that the evidence that they will present will demonstrate that there is no significant impact to the wetlands.

He stated that since the P&Z Commission hearing in March the applicant has done the following things on this property. They have removed the existing greenhouse; they have removed the mulch and discontinued any commercial activity with respect to the storage bins on the residential piece of property. They have locked access to those storage bins all of which is prior to their being removed. The propane facility will be relocated to the commercial property and during this interim they have discontinued any sale of propane. They have demolished the barn on the commercial in order to make room for items to be placed in the commercial area which could not be stored there prior to this. They have removed and relocated any outside storage which had been on the residential piece. They are adding catchbasins for storm water collection and disposal and they have added a formal non-encroachment line to be permanently marked on the site.

He stated that they received the comments from the city engineer and their engineer has responded to those. Atty. Cohen stated that they are submitting revised plans, copy of the site engineering report, the purpose and description of activities and the engineer’s reply to Mr. Joyce’s comments.

Mr. Columbo stated that they also submitted a report from ConnSoil dated 3/31/08. He also stated that letters were received from Frank Voccia and John Saccu which were read into the record.

Peter Buda, Rotondo Engineering and Cynthia Rubinowitz were present. Mr. Rotondo stated that the site is approximately 7.6 acres and was originally part of the Cornfield Subdivision. There is one acre of open space just south of the residential lots. Mr. Joyce had asked that they go out and get a delineation on the wetlands as they currently exist today. Cynthia Rubinowitz, soil scientist flagged the wetlands. The plans show the wetlands boundaries recently flagged. He showed a plan showing the new wetland boundary and the original approved wetland boundary. Mr. Buda stated that several activities have been removed from the site. The existing greenhouse has been taken down; the mulch storage bins have been dismantled and are
in the process of being removed on the site. The proposal for this project call for the construction of a proposed greenhouse, delineation of a shrub/tree cultivation area. The existing gravel surface will be removed and restored back to a natural condition. All millings will be removed from the site except for a small portion which will be designated as a delivery truck area and turnaround. They have added a temporary nursery recycling area. They are proposing a detention basin maintenance accessway around the basin. They have to maintain the basin and this enables them to perform that maintenance and get into that basin on a regular basin and do the necessary work. They have identified an area on the plan within the 50' regulated area for any material that they remove from the detention basin to be stockpiled on the site. He stated that sedimentation controls will be around that. That materials will be stored there and either used on the site or removed. He stated that one other structure that they are proposing within the regulated area, outside of the wetlands is a nursery equipment shed to store the necessary equipment to maintain the detention basin.

Mr. Buda stated that they are asking for approval for several activities located within the regulated areas and those items are excavation and placing of the fill within 50' of the wetlands to enlarge the existing detention basin. Installation of a proposed greenhouse and nursery equipment shed within 50' of the wetlands. The land grading and stabilization within 50' of the wetlands to enlarge the existing detention and installation of proposed shrub/tree cultivation area, nursery recycling area and basin accessway and material stockpile. Installation of a gravel surface for delivery truck unloading turnaround within 50' of the wetlands. Installation of the erosion and sedimentation controls in and within the wetlands in conformance with the 2002 Connecticut guidelines for soil erosion sediment control.

He stated that they received comments from Mr. Joyce and reviewed those comments and submitted a written response to them. He stated that the Purpose and Description of Activity and Alternative Plans statement has been revised to reflect the current proposal. A reference to the Consol report has been added to the plans and they submitted a summary table which essentially breaks down all of the activities within the wetlands and within the 50' buffer. He stated that the original approved detention basin had a total encroachment within the wetlands and the 50' buffer area of .67 acre. The total proposed improvements with the current wetland boundary amount to approximately 1.56 acres.

Mr. Buda stated that all disturbance or encroachment beyond that delineated non-encroachment line will be restored back to its original vegetated state. He stated as far as the surface treatment for the shrub/tree cultivation area; the trees are just going to be planted right on grade and covered with mulch. There will be no changes to the grading in those areas. Any areas where the existing pavement millings is within those will be removed then the shrubs will be put in with the mulch on top. The material for the delivery truck unloading and turnaround area has been identified on the plans.

He stated that the dimensions have been added to the non-encroachment line in the southwesterly and northerly property lines. The basin access has been revised to connect to the turnaround area in the vicinity of the nursery equipment shed.
Catchbasins have been added to the plans to collect runoff in the lower areas of the site. A landscaped berm will be constructed along the back of Mr. Hughes’ property and some additional grading has been to the plans to show that with the installation of this berm there will be a catchbasin in that area and grades are such that it will drain away from Mr. Hughes’ property and back toward the catchbasin. This is an improvement for any water making its way down toward Mr. Jupin’s property. He stated that additional spot elevations have been added to the plan to direct runoff into the proposed catch basins. Bituminous concrete aprons are also shown around the proposed basins along with connection piping to the existing stone infiltration trench.

Mr. Buda stated that the detail of the proposed catch basins has been revised to specify a 4’ deep sump. There will be ultra-urban catch basins inserts in each of them. He stated that they will have to go out and dig a test pit to confirm the condition of the pipe where they want to make the connection. This way they will be able to make a better design and detail on how the connection will be made.

Mr. Joyce’s review indicated that based on their review of the original wetland delineation and topographic information associated with the Cornfield Subdivision it does not appear that activities on the property are contributing to the drainage conditions experienced by the abutting property to the southwest. Mr. Buda stated that they concur with Mr. Joyce and they are adding the berm and catchbasin which should alleviate some of the problem that exists with runoff making its way to Mr. Jupin’s property. He stated that a final as-built will be prepared and submitted once the work has been completed.

Mr. Columbo asked how wide the berm on the basin will be and Mr. Buda stated that it is for small machinery to do the maintenance on the basin. The width will be 12’.

Cynthia Rabinowitz, ConnSoil stated that she compared the wetlands delineation from the old plan and current delineation and there has been considerable change because of construction of the detention basin. She presented a drawing showing the old wetlands delineation and the new. Mr. Birtwell asked why the error in the sizing of the basin was not discovered when Mr. Marcucio purchased the property. Atty. Cohen stated that there was no way for anyone searching the title to the property to determine that the basin was not constructed properly. He stated that they are proposing to put the pond in the condition that the board approved when the Cornfield Subdivision was approved. Mr. Joyce stated that the basin was identified as not being of the correct size and the focus of the activity is to correct that. Mr. Birtwell asked is anything being done will contaminate the soil. Mr. Buda stated that .6 acre is based solely on encroachments that were originally proposed for the construction of the basin. Mr. Birtwell asked if .6 acre was the original detention basin. Mr. Buda stated that .67 acre in total includes area within the wetlands and area within 50’ of the wetlands. The total encroachment associated with the construction of this detention basin as shown on the plan with the original delineated wetland line. They made an approximation based on that plan utilizing the proposed silt fence and that came out to the .67 acre. The 1.5 acres that was mentioned is what is being proposed
now which includes all of the regulated activities on the property not just associated with re-establishing the detention volume associated with this plan.
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Ms. Rabinowitz stated that she felt that very little of the activity from the nursery will affect the wetlands. Mr. Joyce stated that he wanted to clarify a comment that whether or not activities on this property will solve the drainage on the adjoining property. He stated that he does not believe that they will solve them, but will alleviate some of the problems. Mr. Buda stated that it is their opinion that after analyzing the drainage areas based on the original approved plan and what exists today, that none of the proposed activities from the Marcucio is creating any greater of a runoff problem for any of the adjoining properties. He stated that because of the uphill area above Mr. Jupin’s property there is just natural runoff that occurs on that land which eventually makes its way to his property. He stated that to try to alleviate some of the problem with the installation of the proposed landscaped berm along the back of Mr. Hughes’ property and the installation of the catchbasin, they can grade it so that it collects any water in that area not might have made its way to Mr. Jupin’s property. He stated that in their opinion their activity does not contribute to the drainage problems that Mr. Jupin is experiencing.

Mr. Joyce stated that from review of the documentation he does not see any source of storm water coming from the Marcucio property going to the lower lawn area. Any additional drainage issues may be from areas above. He stated that he has looked at it closely and does not see that the property is causing the problems. The improvements that are being proposed will help but will not solve the problems in that corner of the property. Mr. Joyce asked about the quality of the wetlands at the bottom of the basin. Ms. Rabinowitz stated that there is very little noticeable vegetation at the bottom of the basin when she observed it.

Mr. Columbo asked for any public comment and stated that four people had signed up to speak on the application. He indicated that each individual would have five minutes to comment.

Delores Cremonie, 15 Homestead Avenue asked if all the proposals are in the commercial area or the residential portion. Atty. Cohen stated all these activities are within the residential zone. Ms. Cremonie stated that P&Z did not give them permission to do anything. Mr. Columbo stated that this is a wetlands agency and do not deal with zoning issues. Mr. Joyce stated that P&Z cannot act on an application until Wetlands has acted on the application first. Ms. Cremonie stated that the new proposal for the detention basin appears to encompass a good portion of wetlands and asked if they were comfortable with that. Atty. Cohen stated that the detention basin was approved by this board and P&Z at the time the Cornfield Subdivision was submitted. All this is doing is creating that which should have been done when the Cornfield Subdivision was done. It appears that what exists now is not in conformity with what was originally planned.

George Jupin, 464 ½ New Haven Avenue, abutting property owner stated that when the trees were there a lot of water was absorbed in the wetlands. The whole pond was wetlands and what happened was the detention pond went in and the trees were taken down, wetlands bulldozed over and hard surface millings were placed on there. He stated
that pictures were submitted to P&Z showing the amount of water running off from that surface. He stated that he thought what they are proposing may solve the problem a little bit. He asked if they are proposing sump pumps and how noisy they may be and are they capable of handling a 100 year storm. He stated that he is concerned with noisiness from the sump pumps. Mr. Jupin stated that the way the berms are being proposed it should catch the runoff and it is going to be made soft which should also help. He stated that he never had water in one area of his property and did not know if the sumps will help this. He did not know if shrubs are going to be put behind Mr. Hughes’ property with sprinklers and if so those will be noisy for a residential property. He asked how much encroachment there will be in the 50’ buffer of the wetlands on what is being proposed. He also asked about the sediment in the detention pond and if it has been tested for contamination. He felt it should be tested to make sure it can be used on wetlands. He also mentioned the wildlife and if a study has been done regarding that.

Mr. Columbo stated that when the original development was done studies were done on wildlife and it was found to be negligible. Mr. Buda stated that as far as the encroachment within the buffer, the proposed improvements are approximately .76 acres of disturbance within 50' of the wetlands (buffer). Mr. Columbo stated that some of the work proposed is the removal of the stone, which is an improvement as far as they are concerned. Mr. Buda stated that what currently exists today, the greenhouse, paved millings, driveway, storage bins, all of the disturbance on the site with those items still in place within the wetlands and regulated area totals 2.07 acres. The proposal for all the disturbance within the wetlands and regulated area is 1.56 acres so they are reducing it by approximately one-half acre from what exists today. Mr. Buda stated that there are no sump pumps being proposed. The sump is being installed in the catchbasin. The catchbasin will have an outlet pipe and there will be a 4' sump below the invert of the pipe. The sump will be maintained by the applicant.

Ted Baltes, 23 General Wooster Road stated that they stated a number of times that the mulch storage bins have been removed and they have not been. Atty. Cohen stated that they did not say that they have been removed. He stated that at the suggestion of the building official they were blocked so that nothing could be put into them. They will be removed, they are there now, but they will not remain and they did not say they were removed. Mr. Baltes stated that they are there and only blocked. He also stated that they are an eyesore and must be removed. Mr. Columbo stated that part of the proposal is to remove those. Mr. Columbo read a letter from David Kopjanski dated 4/9/08 which noted that activities observed on the lot included the concrete blocks forming mulch bins in the northeast corner of the property have been unstacked and stored on the lot. The mulch within them has been removed and no longer offered for sale. Several trees with potted or burlap roots are stored in the southeast and southwest corners of the property; these are currently in process of being relocated to the garden center lot. The greenhouse along the eastern property line has been dismantled. The lp gas tank and security fence are in the process of being relocated to the garden center lot. Customer gas sales have ceased and will not be offered until the tank relocation has been completed.
George F. Jupin, 464 New Haven Avenue stated that he did not want to speak but would give his time to George Jupin.

George Jupin, 464 1/2 New Haven Avenue stated that some extensive survey work has been done and if any work was done directly behind his house and up toward the hills and if any swales have been put in to divert water more toward the center of his property.

Atty. Cohen stated that an A-2 survey was done which has been certified by the proper official.

Mr. Columbo stated that the public hearing was opened this evening and four members of the public spoke. He stated that a lot of information was presented this evening with major changes to the proposal. He asked to have the hearing continued to the May meeting. He stated that the new information presented will be available to the public at the Town Clerk’s Office. Atty. Cohen stated that they allowed two matters to be heard before those and now you are saying that we have run out of time to finish this evening. He stated that if he refused that request then they could have finished this and answered everyone’s questions.

Mr. Columbo apologized but felt it was not right to close the public hearing this evening and whether we had more time or not there is new information which has to be reviewed and should be made available for the public to review. He stated that the normal procedure is that once the public has time to review the data submitted then they can comment and the public hearing can be closed.

Mr. Birtwell moved to continue the public hearing to the May meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dinice. Atty. Cohen asked to hear how each member votes. Mr. Dinice voted yes and stated that he would like to finish but understands the need to look at new evidence. Mr. Padilla voted no and stated that he would like to stay and get this done. Mr. Birtwell moved yes and stated that new information needs to be reviewed and Mr. Columbo voted yes. The motion carried 3 to 1.


A motion to pay the bill from Milone & MacBroom was made by Mr. Birtwell, seconded by Mr. Padilla and carried unanimously.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Birtwell and carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

ATTEST:

Maryanne DeTullio

These minutes are subject to the Agency’s approval at their next scheduled meeting.