

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)
Corrected REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2019
(pages 6-8)**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), along with Mr. Tom Mocko, Environmental Planner, in attendance held a Regular Meeting in Town Council Chambers, second floor of Town Hall located at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members - Present

Mrs. Judy Harper, Chairperson
Mr. Dennis McInerney, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Brian Davis
Mr. Frank Kaputa
Mr. Mark Temple

Commission Members - Excused

Ms. Kim McClain, Secretary

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 7:29 P.M.

In order to proceed with formal action on the application from Glastonbury 2815, LLC as outlined below, Mr. Temple moved to approve the minutes from the meeting on April 11, to which Mr. Davis provided a second. There were no comments from the other Commission Members and the approval passed unanimously (5-0-0).

At this point, the meeting proceeded as usual.

I. FORMAL ACTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Application of Glastonbury 2815, LLC for: an inland wetlands and watercourses permit; and recommendations to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission for: a Section 4.11 Flood Zone Special Permit and a waiver to the specific requirements of Section 4.11.6.b.2 and 3; and a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning the proposed Redevelopment of 2815 Main Street (3,449 square feet restaurant building) – Flood Zone and Planned Business & Development Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC, counsel**

Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC was present to represent the applicant. In addition, Jonathan Sczurek, Civil Engineer; Karl Norton, Architect; and Scott Leonard, applicant and landowner, were also in attendance.

Ms. Hope indicated that, since the informal discussion, updates that address the comments made by the Commission, the Town Engineer, and Mr. Mocko were made, and revised plans have been submitted.

Ms. Hope went on to explain that the Salmon Brook flood carrying capacity will not be affected and, with grading, there will be 33 cubic yards of additional flood capacity.

Ms. Hope also stated that, since the last meeting, floodproofing has been revisited and a wet floodproofing plan has been put in place. A letter stating such from Karl Norton, architect for the project, was submitted into the record. She further explained that commercial buildings within the area in question must be raised out of 500-year flood zone *or* the owner can do certain things to flood-proof *or* a waiver can be requested. Since the applicant has now decided to wet flood-proof the building, he is going with the second choice. However, as a result of the plan to *wet* flood-proof, the building cannot be designed to be watertight. This is what the applicant is now seeking a waiver for. By nature, wet floodproofing means that the building will be constructed to allow water to pass through it in the case of flooding. The waiver is the same, but the exception needed now is from the watertight requirement.

Ms. Hope went on saying that, when the application for a waiver was presented to the TPZ they asked if these types of waivers have been done before. Ms. Hope looked backed 35 years to see if any precedent had been set and she stated that, ultimately, the answer is yes. In 1984 a waiver that was similar in nature was approved for the bank across the street from the proposed building site. That building's first floor is one foot over the 500-year flood line, and wet floodproofing was done. This is the most recent example.

Ms. Hope also presented the Boathouse as an example, stating that it is built one foot above the 100-year flood line. In that case, a special permit was granted, but obtaining a waiver was not discussed.

Mr. McInerney asked if Town Plan & Zoning Commission grants the waiver to which Ms. Hope replied that they do. Mr. McInerney then asked if the Conservation Commission has recommended the waiver in the past, and Ms. Hope stated that was unclear. She went on to say that, in the past, the focus seemed to have been on flood storage capacity.

Mr. Kaputa wondered why wet floodproofing was chosen and not watertight. He asked if the choice was made due to cost. Ms. Hope stated that yes, watertight floodproofing the building is a financial hardship; watertight floodproofing would be more expensive. Mr. Kaputa asked what the cost was for the shell of the building and Mr. Norton came to the podium to provide information regarding the building costs. Mr. Kaputa then asked Mr. Mocko about a garage that was constructed on Ferry Street in South Glastonbury with wet floodproofing and Mr. Mocko replied that, yes, wet floodproofing had been done in that case, but it was a garage. He stated that he did not feel that was the same as a restaurant building.

Mr. Temple then asked who defines wet floodproofing and Mr. Mocko replied that FEMA does. Ms. Hope confirmed that the applicant is following the FEMA guidelines in their wet floodproofing plans.

Mr. Mocko then stated that the probability of having an event that would flood this building are very low: a little below 1% per year, and slightly above 0.2%. He observed that the town has very conservative flood zone regulations; far stricter than many neighboring towns, though Avon does also have the same regulation that the first floor of a building *must* be built above the 500-year flood line. That being said, Mr. Mocko emphasized that, historically, there haven't been floods any time in the recent past that would impact the building in this way.

Mr. Temple, referencing Mr. Norton's letter about the wet floodproofing, asked what was meant by the phrase "Kitchen Equipment" in item three ("Branch circuits and kitchen equipment will be installed above 28.7"). Mr. Norton stated that he meant outlets, counters, and other fixtures, not large kitchen equipment, like fryers, etc.

Ms. Harper then asked if this would set a precedent and Mr. Mocko said that yes, it does. He added, however, that he felt the precedent is limited in that the applicant it as least wet floodproofing, not asking for a waiver for floodproofing altogether.

Mr. McInerney then asked why Glastonbury is stricter about flood zone regulations and stated that, given changes in weather patterns and climate change overall all, it seems pertinent. Ms. Hope explained that her understanding is that the current regulations were put in place after the flood of 1984. Federal flood insurance is also provided as long as regulations are put in place for new building (which she believed came about in the 70s).

Mr. McInerney then asked who pays if the building is destroyed or damaged from a major flood and Tom replied that it may likely be the taxpayers. Mr. McInerney then wondered if it would be more prudent to either build the structure according to the flood mitigation requirements as written or, if that is cost preventative, build in a different location.

Ms. Hope then pointed out that there has been no request for a waiver from the flood storage capacity requirement and the plan, in fact, provides more than enough storage. She also said if there is damage to the building resulting from flooding, the owner will need to fix it.

Mr. Davis noted that his primary concern was more about the safety of the surrounding buildings. He felt wet floodproofing seemed like the best option in this case. He felt the proposed solution, as opposed the watertight floodproofing, in the case of a catastrophic floor would prevent the building from breaking free of its foundation and floating away.

Mr. Kaputa stated his concern was about flood storage capacity and water quality, not so much financial burden.

Ms. Hope stated that was what the changes to the plan had primarily addressed, and that, currently, there is only one curb cut at the traffic light in the plans.

Ms. Harper asked if there were any other unresolved issues and Ms. Hope added that additional shade trees have been added to the plan.

Ms. Harper then asked if an amount has been determined for the discussed landscaping bond and Mr. Mocko stated there is something to address that in the draft motions for this application. Mr. Sczurek stated that they do not have a number yet, but he has been working toward establishing one. He felt the most important changes include perimeter controls and seed mixes for the bottom and side of the flood storage basin, as recommended by NCCD.

Looking at the plans, Ms. Harper then asked if the impervious percentage is 68%. Mr. Sczurek replied that it is 58%.

Mr. McInerney then referenced the nearby wetlands and remarked that concentrated discharge off the property in question *will* impact the wetlands and wondered if it mattered whether the effects were adverse or not. Mr. Mocko commented that it is stated in the application that there will be no impact. Mr. McInerney then added that it is the Commission's job to look at overall impact, whether it is adverse or not. Mr. Davis then commented that someone should be at the build site during construction to ensure that impact is minimal. Mr. Sczurek assured the Commission members that best practices are being put in place and they will seek to mitigate any impacts to the wetland due to development.

Ms. Harper asked if the only impact on the wetlands would be during construction and Mr. Mocko said no. He went on to say that the current non-point discharge off the virtually unused parking lot and untreated vegetated areas, is very different (no automatic fluids/contaminants and no use of fertilizers and pesticides) than the single point discharge that is planned for the restaurant's parking lot, and the treated landscape areas. He emphasized that the applicant is doing what is required of them to remediate runoff, but the basin will not entirely remove the parking lot's contaminants and the residual fertilizers and pesticides before the water is discharged to the adjacent wetlands via the proposed single, point-source pipe. They are, however, meeting State requirements.

A consensus was reached that the only way not to impact the wetland at all is to not develop the land. Stating in the application that the wetland will not be impacted is misinformation.

Ms. Harper then asked if the adjacent wetlands are owned by the town and Ms. Hope replied that yes, they are at least partially on Town property. Mr. Mocko added that it goes onto other private properties as well.

To summarize, Mr. Kaputa confirmed with his fellow Commissioners that they agreed the design, as it is now, is fine but the application is erroneous.

The Commission and applicant discussed the cash bond suggested for the purpose of ensuring compliance to the approved plans. Ms. Harper asked if the cash bond is something the Town will hold and Mr. Mocko replied yes. Further discussion regarding the amount of the bond ensued and how it will be determined. Mr. Temple suggested the amount of \$7500 and the bond would be held by the Town in full until the end of the 3-year period.

Mr. Kaputa asked if the applicant decided whether they would reword the application regarding the impact to the adjacent wetlands. Mr. Sczurek suggested rephrasing as “no *direct* impact” since no work is being done in the wetland itself. Ms. Hope indicated that the application would be amended to change this phrasing, according to Mr. Sczurek’s recommendation. Mr. Mocko and Mr. Kaputa were amenable to the revision. Mr. Kaputa thanked them.

Ms. Harper asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak to this matter and no one came forward, so the Commission moved on to formal action on the application.

Motion by: Frank Kaputa

Seconded by: Dennis McInerney

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency issues an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to Glastonbury 2815, LLC (Scott Leonard, member) for all site construction activities within the wetlands’ upland review area related to the proposed redevelopment of 2815 Main Street (involving a 3,449 square foot restaurant on 2807, 2813 and 2815 Main Street properties), in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. Comments numbered 2 and 3 within the Town Engineer’s May 9, 2019 memorandum shall be addressed prior to the filing requirements for any approvals granted by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission.
2. The “silt sack” specification sheet submitted by the project engineer for use in the existing catch basin on Main Street shall be duly placed on a detail sheet to be filed on the land records and said product shall be appropriately used during construction.
3. A professional engineer, at the expense of the Permittee, shall provide supervisory guidance to the site contractor with regard to: placement and maintenance of the approved soil erosion and sedimentation controls; installation of the pre-cast headwall and associated riprapped scour hole immediately at the edge of wetlands; and the critical components and their critical elevations of the proposed drainage system and the required flood-storage-related land regrading aspects of the project.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a professional engineer shall be required confirming that the stormwater management system was constructed in conformance with the approved design.

5. A cash performance bond in the amount of \$7,500.00, for at least a three-year time period after the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, shall be posted with the Office of Community Development prior to the issuance of any building permit for the project in order to assure: the water quality basin was constructed and functioning in accordance with its design; that the disturbed site was permanently stabilized with the prescribed vegetation; and that a three-year monitoring and management program for invasive plant species was undertaken upon completion for the project's construction.
6. Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.
7. Metal waste containers shall be provided at the site to facilitate the collection of refuse material generated from construction activities. Such material shall not be buried or burned at the site.
8. Underground fuel storage tanks shall be prohibited to reduce the potential of contamination to wetlands, watercourses, and groundwater resources.
9. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a landscape architect shall be required confirming that landscape plants were installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.
10. The Permittee shall be fully responsible for damages caused by all activities undertaken pursuant to this permit that may have a detrimental effect on wetlands and/or watercourses, and all such activities that cause erosion and sedimentation problems.

Result: Motion passes unanimously (5-0-0)

Motion by: Frank Kaputa

Second by: Brian Davis

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning Glastonbury 2815, LLC's proposed redevelopment project at 2815 Main Street, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. *Comments numbered 2 and 3 within the Town Engineer's May 9, 2019 memorandum shall be addressed prior to the filing requirements for any approvals granted by the Town Plan & Zoning Commission.*
2. *The "silt sack" specification sheet submitted by the project engineer for use in the existing catch basin on Main Street shall be duly placed on a detail sheet to be filed on the land records and said product shall be appropriately used during construction.*
3. *A professional engineer, at the expense of the Permittee, shall provide supervisory guidance to the site contractor with regard to: placement and maintenance of the approved soil erosion and sedimentation controls; installation of the pre-cast headwall and associated riprapped scour hole immediately at the edge of wetlands; and the critical components and their critical elevations of the proposed drainage system and the required flood-storage-related land regrading aspects of the project.*
4. *Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a professional engineer shall be required confirming that the stormwater management system was constructed in conformance with the approved design.*
5. *A cash performance bond in the amount of \$(to be determined), for at least a three-year time period after the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, shall be posted with the Office of Community Development prior to the issuance of any building permit for the project in order to assure: the water quality basin was constructed and functioning in accordance with its design; that the disturbed site was permanently stabilized with the prescribed vegetation; and that a three-year monitoring and management program for invasive plant species was undertaken upon completion for the project's construction.*
6. *Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.*
7. *Metal waste containers shall be provided at the site to facilitate the collection of refuse material generated from construction activities. Such material shall not be buried or burned at the site.*
8. *Underground fuel storage tanks shall be prohibited to reduce the potential of contamination to wetlands, watercourses, and groundwater resources.*

9. *Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a landscape architect shall be required confirming that landscape plants were installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.*

Result: Motion passes unanimously (5-0-0)

Motion by: *Frank Kaputa*

Second by: *Mark Temple*

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of: a Section 4.11 (Flood Zone) Special Permit; and a waiver of Section 4.11.6.b.2.a concerning Glastonbury 2815, LLC's proposed redevelopment project at 2815 Main Street, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following condition:

A professional engineer, at the expense of the Permittee, shall provide supervisory guidance to the site contractor with regard to: placement and maintenance of the approved soil erosion and sedimentation controls; installation of the pre-cast headwall and associated riprapped scour hole immediately at the edge of wetlands; and the critical components and their critical elevations of the proposed drainage system and the required flood-storage-related land regrading aspects of the project.

Result: Motion passes unanimously (5-0-0)

A brief recess was taken at 8:29pm. The meeting reconvened at 8:33pm.

- 2. Application of Fritz Property Management, LLC for: an inland wetlands and watercourses permit; and a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning the proposed commercial building (1-story, 7,500 square feet for office and warehouse uses) at 108 (a.k.a. Lot S-4) Sequin Drive – Planned Commerce Zone and Groundwater Protection Zone 1 – Attorneys Peter Alter & Meghan Hope – Wes Wentworth, Wentworth Civil Engineers LLC – Kristen B. Muschett & Erica M. Backman, landowners**

Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC presented the application to the Commission. She opened by stating that Lot S-4 is 1.66 acres in area and reiterated that the planned building will be 7,500sf: 2,500sf of office and 5,000sf of warehouse. There will be no manufacturing, just storage. The property is located within the planned commerce zone, so the uses are approved. There are offsite wetlands with about .188 acre of upland review area.

Ms. Hope explained that the building is to be constructed close to setback and the accompanying parking lot will have 16 parking spaces for employees as well as a truck turnaround. When describing the types of vehicles expected at the site, she indicated that no "huge" trucks are anticipated, "just typical smaller-size box trucks." Two light poles, each 14ft tall with concrete

bases, will be erected in the parking lot. There will also be exterior fixtures on the building. The proposed landscaping was reviewed and approved by Beautification. The rear of the property is going to be left as meadow. This area will be seeded with a mix that will be beneficial to area wildlife, as recommended by the commission. Mr. Mocko added that the plant varieties in the mix should also be species that tolerate wetter conditions, given the location. Ornamental trees that were originally part of the landscaping plan have been switched for shade trees. 72% of the property will remain open space, 11% building coverage, and 17% impervious.

Wes Wentworth, Civil Engineer, then came to the podium to speak. He stated that the building proposed will be on public sewer and water. He explained that the property slopes down away from road toward the southwest and indicated that grading will be maintained. He said that, rather than allow sheet flow runoff from the parking lot, runoff will be diverted into a runoff remediation system. He pointed out that this is a large area for project of this size. He stated that the 2-100-year peak flow retention requirement was met without a problem and infiltration requirements were also met, no problem. He did say that some changes were needed after a more recent groundwater reading, but that has been accounted for. He stated that the plan for this site will provide a lot of relief to the downstream receiving wetland on Sequin Drive's north side and, once completed, will even improve current strain on that wetland somewhat.

Mr. Wentworth then reviewed several points that came up from the informal and whether they had been address. He stated the seeding mix for the meadow had been addressed; as requested, no mowing would occur in the meadow from April-October; they have done all they can to maximize snow shelf storage; and standpipes and additional groundwater readings were done. He explained that high May groundwater readings did go against previous stats, but it still was not enough to change the plan for this site.

Mr. Temple thanked Mr. Wentworth for "applying science to groundwater." He stated that the data Mr. Wentworth presented is consistent with what he has seen through monitoring at his office.

Ms. Harper then inquired about the parking and wondered whether the business had considered visitors to the business in their planning. Ms. Hope explained that no clients come to this business; only employees. All activity happens off-site and not even client meetings will be conducted at this location. There are three more parking spaces than required by zoning regulations, and the client is comfortable that this will meet his needs.

Ms. Harper pointed out that the emergency spillway goes onto the neighbor's property and Mr. Wentworth replied that this is already happening. The plan for the property should, in fact, improve the situation. Mr. McInerney asked if this was because it would increase infiltration and Mr. Wentworth said yes.

With no further comments or questions, the Commission moved forward with formal action on the application.

Motion by: Frank Kaputa

Seconded by: Dennis McInerney

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency issues an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to Fritz Property Management, LLC for construction of the stormwater management basin and a small portion of the building within the wetlands' upland review area concerning the proposed commercial development of 108 Sequin Drive, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. Comments numbered 2 through 9 inclusive, within the Town Engineer's May 6, 2019 memorandum shall be addressed prior to filing the approved plans on the land records.
2. The proposed stormwater management basin shall be established and permanently stabilized with vegetation prior to directing the disturbed site's runoff into said basin.
3. The eastern portion of the stormwater basin between the proposed 98-foot contour and the stone filter berm shall also be seeded with a wildflower seed mix (appropriately selected with regard to the anticipated soil moisture and available sunlight) in order to enhance the constructed site's habitat value for nectar-dependent animal species and other ground-nesting species. Subsequently, this area shall not be mowed between April 15 and September 15 on an annual basis in order to provide the aforementioned wildlife habitat values and usage.
4. Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.
5. Metal waste containers shall be provided at the site to facilitate the collection of refuse material generated from construction activities. Such material shall not be buried or burned at the site.
6. Underground fuel storage tanks shall be prohibited to reduce the potential of contamination to wetlands, watercourses, and groundwater resources.
7. The Permittee shall be fully responsible for damages caused by all activities undertaken pursuant to this permit that may have a detrimental effect on wetlands and/or watercourses, and all such activities that cause erosion and sedimentation problems.

Result: Motion passes unanimously (5-0-0)

Motion by: Frank Kaputa

Seconded by: Brian Davis

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning Fritz Property Management, LLC's proposed commercial development at 108 Sequin Drive, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. Comments numbered 2 through 9 inclusive, within the Town Engineer's May 6, 2019 memorandum shall be addressed prior to filing the approved plans on the land records.
2. The proposed stormwater management basin shall be established and permanently stabilized with vegetation prior to directing the disturbed site's runoff into said basin.
3. The eastern portion of the stormwater basin between the proposed 98-foot contour and the stone filter berm shall also be seeded with a wildflower seed mix (appropriately selected with regard to the anticipated soil moisture and available sunlight) in order to enhance the constructed site's habitat value for nectar-dependent animal species and other ground-nesting species. Subsequently, this area shall not be mowed between April 15 and September 15 on an annual basis in order to provide the aforementioned wildlife habitat values and usage.
4. Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.
5. Metal waste containers shall be provided at the site to facilitate the collection of refuse material generated from construction activities. Such material shall not be buried or burned at the site.
6. Underground fuel storage tanks shall be prohibited to reduce the potential of contamination to wetlands, watercourses, and groundwater resources.
7. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a professional engineer shall be required confirming that the stormwater management system was constructed in conformance with the approved design.

8. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, certification from a landscape architect shall be required confirming that landscape plants were installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.

Result: Motion passes unanimously (5-0-0)

II. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (none)

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 28

Ms. Harper asked if there were any comments or questions regarding the minutes. As there were none, the minutes from the March 28 meeting were approved as submitted.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Chairman's Report

Ms. Harper asked Mr. Kaputa about "Helen's tree project" and he stated that he has not done the necessary work on it and inquired about a budget. The other Commission members indicated that, under these circumstances, the priority should be obtaining the best tree for the occasion rather than being overly concerned about cost and some discussion about varieties under consideration occurred.

2. Environmental Planner's Report

Mr. Mocko shared that two new hires were made recently: a part-time inspector and a part-time support person who will focus on aiding with writing reports. The inspector is Mark DeCapua and he is a Glastonbury resident. He is a former DOT employee with a great degree of property and easement management experience. Mr. Mocko feels he is a great addition to the department. The new part-time technical support person is Elizabeth Dolphin. She will mostly work remotely but will help alleviate some of Mr. Mocko's full workload.

With no other business to discuss, Chairperson Harper adjourned the meeting at 8:59pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Recording Clerk