

WEYMOUTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Town Hall Chambers
October 22nd, 2008 Meeting

PRESENT: John Thompson/Chairman, Cmmr. Scott Coven/Clerk, Cmmr. Jeff Kent and Cmmr. Adrienne Gowen

ALSO PRESENT: Conservation Administrator, Mary Ellen Schloss

Chairman Thompson called the October 22nd, 2008 meeting of the Conservation Commission to order at 7:35 PM.

Approval of Minutes - 9/24/08

The minutes were tabled until the next meeting when Cmmr. Murphy would be present.

Lot 29 Greenvale Avenue - Continued Public Hearing

DEP File #81-1047

Cmmr. Kent moved to open the hearing for Lot 29/Greenvale Avenue, File 81-1047.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Chairman Thompson announced that the applicant requested to continue the hearing until the next meeting and members were in agreement.

Cmmr. Kent moved to continue the public hearing for Lot 29, Greenvale Avenue to November 12th, 2008.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Alexan at Arbor Hill

Continued Public Hearing

Burkhall Street

DEP File #81-1046

Cmmr. Kent moved to open the continued public hearing for Alexan at Arbor Hill, File 81-1046.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Mr. William Seymour, Director, Civil Engineering Division of Gale Associates; Stuart Clark, Registered PE and Project Manager and Donald Schall, Senior Biologist/ENSR were among those present representing the client.

Also present was Richard Sweeney, Jr., Engineer from the firm of TetraTech Rizzo - serving as the Commission's peer consultant.

Chairman Thompson stated that this was a continued hearing from the September 10, 2008 meeting and explained to the many present that the applicant had submitted a proposal for a multi-family residential complex off Burkhall Street. He also took a moment to explain to the many interested residents that this was a 'conservation' hearing and any issues pertaining to zoning or planning would not be addressed this evening as it was not the appropriate forum for those questions. He further explained that the Commission had hired the services of Richard Sweeney, Jr., PE of the firm of TetraTech Rizzo to perform a peer review that focused on the drainage design and the applicant's compliance with the DEP Stormwater Management Standards (whose services were paid for by the applicant). Since the last hearing Mr. Rizzo has reviewed the applicant's proposal in detail and submitted 14-pages of comments regarding his findings to the Board/Administrator.

The Chairman acknowledged that reviewing Mr. Sweeney's report would require a lot of time, discussion and review by the Commission as well as by the proponents and based on that he felt that by continuing the public hearing to the December 8th meeting would give all parties adequate time to be prepared to discuss the project further in more detail. He was hoping that the applicant would be in agreement with continuing the hearing until that date.

At this point he requested Mr. Sweeney to come before the Board to give an overview of his findings/report, especially his comments on the drainage/water. He added that he felt it would be important to expand the review of the project to take into consideration the affects on the wildlife/study of the habitat.

Mr. Sweeney came before the Board. He initially addressed the applicant's need to comply with the new Stormwater Performance Standards. He felt the approach they took regarding the drainage was correct as it included provisions for water quality treatment. He noted that they were also proposing a detention basin and had included their drainage design. He commented that he still saw some issues that need to be addressed further regarding their plan/calculations. He also had comments regarding using the forebays to recharge, which he said were not allowed - pointing out they are now requiring other means for stormwater recharge. Additionally, he was recommending soil testing.

Mr. Don Schall, representing the applicant, spoke next. He stated that he just received Mr. Sweeney's report this afternoon and would need more time to review it and respond. He noted that Stuart Clark, Registered PE and Project Manager created the design and has also been working on responding to Mr. Sweeney's comments in detail. He felt they would be ready in time for the November 12th meeting, adding the applicant would prefer not to wait (60 days) until the suggested December 12th meeting.

Chairman Thompson responded that they could accommodate that request, but he fully expected the hearing would be continued once again to the December meeting.

Ms. Schloss wanted to point out to any interested parties that she had copies of Mr. Sweeney's comments for distribution (at this point copies were handed out to the public), adding that additional copies could be obtained by contacting her office.

Mr. Clark was the next speaker. Due to a problem with those in the audience being unable to hear the previous speaker, Mr. Clark went to the microphone and recapped Mr. Schall's comments. He further reminded members that he had received Mr. Sweeney's lengthy report last Wednesday, responded and is expecting to hear back by mid-week. He realized that they would be going back and forth for a brief period of time, but still was in favor of continuing their hearing until the next scheduled Conservation meeting on November 12th.

Chairman Thompson spoke to Mr. Sweeney, commenting that since all of the information is rather involved and relatively new, involved parties were not ready to speak on it this evening.

Mr. Sweeney recapped his findings for those present, which included the 8/26/08 Notice of Intent for Alexan at Arbor Hill Development package; the Notice of Intent/Alexan at Arbor Hill Plans dated 8/21/08; email comment by the Administrator dated 9/10/08 and the letter to Gale Associates from the Office of Dam Safety dated 1/4/2002. He noted that he had essentially broken down his assessment by topics, which included, Stormwater and Forebays; Sub catchments; Water Quality; Calculations and Soils Information. He then referred to the first category being 'Stormwater and Forebays'. He said that the applicant had provided calculations for recharge and water quality, but noted they couldn't use the forebays for recharge. He also had questions regarding the detention basins.

Mr. Sweeney went on to say that he did a site inspection on October 1st with Ms. Schloss and representatives from Gale Engineering (Stuart Clark, Peter Spanos). At that time he noted a large amount of ledge at the site. He found it difficult to find an area for recharge, which he commented was a big concern. Additionally he had concerns re. water quality/volume at Wisteria Point, adding if it's to be rerouted to the basin they would need to submit new calculations re. the impervious surface. He found some of the figures to be inconsistent with the calculations, although he commented the differences were not that big.

Mr. Sweeney stated that he also had concerns regarding the runoff from the roof and the size of the basin. He found the basins to be somewhat different, adding they would need an emergency overflow structure. Re. the extended detention basin, he felt it should be looked at further. He also questioned the applicant meeting other guidelines; i. e., Stormwater Standards. He noted that they had two design points - adding there was some confusion there and the applicant needed to clarify where all subcatchment areas are to be routed. Lastly he stated that there were some inconsistencies in reference to the accuracy of the plans and calculations.

Chairman Thompson emphasized that much of the information was very technical in nature and commented to Mr. Sweeney about his detailed report and the need to review it further. Based on this he said the Commission would be giving both parties extra time to work out any differences - at that point he would expect them to report back to the Board with their new comments/findings.

Cmmr. Kent said one of his main concerns was that the residents not experience any increase of water/runoff. He commented that the ledge outcrop didn't lend themselves to infiltration of the water.

Mr. Sweeney agreed, adding that he asked the applicant to look at the peak rate/peak volume of water.

Lastly Cmmr. Kent commented that whatever design the applicant comes up with, he wanted to make sure it was executed properly.

Cmmr. Coven referred to the animal habitat/vernal pool - stressing that he wanted to make sure they replicate that. He also wanted the public to know that the Conservation office would have the information regarding this application available to them.

Chairman Thompson opened the hearing to the public.

Town Councilor Mathews was the first speaker. He began his presentation by stating he was speaking in opposition to the Alexan at Arbor Hill proposal. He noted that he has seen a number of versions of the subject proposal beginning back in 2000, adding he thought this was their 36th public hearing since that date. He then presented a copy of the Weymouth Town Councils' October 2003 Resolution re. Alexan at Arbor Hill, which stated the following: "Be it resolved that the Weymouth Town Council on 10/20/2003 voted that it is in the best interest of the Town of Weymouth to oppose the latest proposed Trammel Crow residential project known as Alexan at Arbor Hill, consisting of 242 apartment units."

Town Councilor Mathews went on to say that he was in receipt of a copy of Mr. Sweeney's TetraTech Rizzo 15-page report and felt that his findings overall were very damaging to the applicant's proposal, pointing out that there were 88 critiques. He also wanted to emphasize that the report included so much incomplete information. He felt every one of the 88 points should be responded to by the applicant before the Commission considers acting on the application. Two major items that were a concern for him were the forebays and the Water Standard issues. He then reviewed a variety of items listed in the report including those cited on Page 6. #2b, 2c - commenting many times that the information was unclear or inconsistent. He went on to refer to Page 8; 3a. and b., re. Water Quality - commenting it would be difficult to enforce.

Town Councilor Mathews continued to cite different pages that included: Page 11 #E; Section H.

Chairman Thompson thanked Town Councilor Mathews for highlighting his points of concern regarding Mr. Sweeney's report. He explained to him that the Commission members, when reviewing the application need to work within the law, adding it doesn't matter if we like or do not like the project - they are ruled by the letter of the law. He was happy to point out that the Commission has the services of a wetland professional to help the members understand the technicalities of the Arbor Hill project.

Town Councilor Mathews requested additional time to cite a few more issues in the report that were a concern for him - including Page 14, Sect. 8. This item referred to dam safety.

The Chairman thanked him for taking the time to research the proposal and report his findings to the Board.

The next speaker was Mary McCarthy who told members that she has been a resident of Arbor Hill for over 20 years and then voiced the following concerns and comments:

- the development of pools
- amount of water runoff
- the affects of the runoff on the water table, adding that currently water runs between the fissures
- impact of pre and post construction
- the future of the wildlife/habitat
- water conservation and protection
- contaminants in the water
- possible increase of mosquitoes and insects (West Nile Virus)
- questions re. the Commission's responsibilities
- who is responsible if project backfires

In closing Ms. Murphy informed the Commission that her and her husband would be closely monitoring the project.

Chairman Thompson wanted to emphasize to all present that the Conservation Commission works for all the people of Weymouth and that their charge is to protect the Town's resources. The members receive no fee. Due to the complexity of this project, they have hired a consultant (paid for by the applicant) for their expertise to help the members understand the technicalities of the proposal and this information will assist them in making their decision on the project - on behalf of the residents/Town of Weymouth.

Nicole Sault/Wisteria Point was the next speaker. She referred to the wildlife sanctuary and the birds - as well as the abutting land. She spoke about seeing the wildlife constantly while living in this area. She also was concerned with the development's affect to the vernal pool and the disturbance of the ecological nature/habitat. Lastly she wanted to make sure the sanctuary was maintained/protected - as well as the vegetation/habitat and environmentally sensitive land.

Joanne Marques of South Weymouth spoke next. The following were the highlights of her concerns/comments:

- voiced her appreciation of contracting for peer review
- felt the application was lacking in several areas
- all of the property owners were listed as one (not individually)
- signature of property owners were missing
- Stuart Clark signed the Storm Water Report omitting the volume/calculations
- Payment of fees was paid by the Weymouth apartments
- A credibility problem with the applicant
- Plans were dated 2008, but it is the same one used in 2003
- Only the cover sheet was signed by the professional
- New/improved plan is actually part of the old plan
- Commented Mr. Seymour was not a 'licensed professional engineer'
- Applicant has the burden of proof which 'pretty pictures' cannot confirm
- Project should be denied for lack of required information
- Application does not comply with Performance Standards
- Plans and calculations continue to be inaccurate and incomplete as was the original submission
- Claimed applicant was incapable of designing a plan
- People should have confidence that their rights are protected
- Drainage is flowing onto abutting properties (hers) which is not permitted
- Future flooding of wetlands would be catastrophic
- Planning Board denied the project re. drainage flow onto the abutters property
- An easement is required
- All abutters were not notified
- MEPA and other permits have expired

Town Councilor Harrington/District 5 addressed the Commission. He stated that he read Mr. Sweeney's report and found the technical information daunting. He also noted that Mr. Sweeney spoke about 88 areas that need to be addressed, asking Mr. Sweeney 'is this typical?'

Mr. Sweeney responded to Mr. Harrington's comments by stating it was difficult to give a definitive answer because of the introduction of newly revised Stormwater Standards.

Town Councilor Harrington continued with his comments stating that in light of the inaccuracies he would give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant for the moment, but added he was still very concerned. He felt that the development efforts were sloppy, inconsistent and in general he questioned the intent.

Chris Ho, 116 Burkhall Street - He told members that he appreciated their hiring a professional engineer. He said that he could see the size of the project would affect the water flow. He commented that Massachusetts was lucky to have these resources, it was not the same in California when he came from. He was very concerned with the destruction of the wetlands. He noted that with the passing of time the eco system gets pushed back and eventually the wetlands are dying. He viewed this as a massive project. He told members that presently there are 460 units on Arbor Hill and this new proposal would add pollution. He urged the members to do what is best for the Town of Weymouth. He added that the EPA and WPA guidelines, in his opinion, are a last resort when people don't stand up for their resources.

The Administrator then spoke of her comments on the project and added that she had received a letter from Jessica Buonagurio outlining her concerns regarding the wildlife habitat. This letter will be entered into the record. Ms. Schloss went on to say that she informed the applicant's engineer about the specific scope of services being provided by Richard Sweeney. They focused on the drainage design. She told members that she would like to better understand the impact of the proposal on the vernal pool. At this point, she felt she might need the services of an additional consultant; specifically a wetlands biologist that had a different set of skills from Mr. Sweeney. She also wanted more info on the detention basin, adding she realized Don Schall has worked on that. She was thinking of a potential biological survey in the future that she would like to have certified. She also wanted information on the area to be preserved as 'open space' (adjacent to the Bird Sanctuary). She would need that and the mechanism for it. She noted that in 1999 there was a Habitat Study done, but at this point she can't seem to find it in her files - she would like the applicant to supply it to her if possible so she could compare it with the present Wildlife Habitat Report. She recalled that Cmmr. Coven also mentioned his concern re. wildlife habitat report.

The impact of the design on the wetlands as well as the local jurisdiction was questioned.

Chairman Thompson referred to the applicant's proposal to fill 3,700 sq. ft., pointing out that the Town's bylaw requires 2:1 replication under those circumstances. Based on that he would like an assessment by TetraTech Rizzo (Mr. Sweeney's firm) verifying that the replication area would support the present level of wildlife or even a better level.

Ms. Schloss said that she would speak with the applicant about these findings in addition to Mr. Sweeney. She next referred to a date for the continued hearing, noting that 11/12/08 would not give Mr. Sweeney enough time to review all of the applicant's comments and to verify/respond to all other issues that have been addressed. She next referred to the requirement for soil testing, asking if the applicant felt that could also be done within the time constraints.

Chairman Thompson agreed there was a lot of work to be done. Based on that he was again requesting the applicant consider continuing the hearing date to December as opposed to November.

Mr. Clark told the Commission that they have been working on addressing Mr. Sweeney's comments for the past 4-5 days and felt that they would be prepared for the 11/12/08 hearing.

Chairman Thompson replied "okay", but wanted Mr. Clark to realize that most likely would have to continue the hearing again until the December 10th meeting.

Cmmr. Kent asked Town Councilor Mathews to explain the meaning of the Town Council Resolution he previously addressed.

Town Councilor Mathews replied that in the past the project was viewed as "two-headed" having with conservation issues too (as well as planning/zoning issues). He told members he had been very involved in the Arbor Hill proposal at that time and the resolution was a stand the Council chose to take regarding the 2003 proposed project.

Cmmr. Kent asked Town Councilor Mathews if it was 'non-binding' and he replied 'yes'.

Town Councilor Mathews noted that the Resolution referred to the 242 units, which he pointed out was the same number as presently being proposed.

Chairman Thompson stated that the present application must meet the muster of Conservation, adding that back at that time the Commission could not legally deny the project.

Town Councilor Mathews acknowledged this, but added now with the new regulations things are much more stringent - and with the applicant submitting the old proposal with the new date it certainly wouldn't pass.

The next speaker was Mr. Harvey Welch/Weymouth resident. He referred to the large amount of ledge and commented that its affect on the residents, water and wildlife was not mentioned.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that the Conservation Commission were looking into hiring an additional expert to evaluate any potential affects to the wildlife/habitat.

Mr. Welch asked about the blasting and Chairman Thompson told him that specific guidelines must be followed when blasting takes place -and if necessary the Commission will avail themselves of this expertise.

Mr. Clark explained that all blasting must be done in accordance with the State Fire Marshall's standards.

Cmmr. Kent moved to continue the hearing for Alexan at Arbor Hill, File #81-1046 to November 12th, 2008.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

41 Tayla Drive - Public Hearing

David Flanagan, Applicant

Map 50, Bl 561, Lot 25

DEP File # not Available

Notice of Intent

Cmmr. Kent moved to open the hearing for 41 Tayla Drive, David Flanagan/Applicant.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

It was noted that the application was for construction of a retaining wall and basketball court, as well as replacement of an above-the-ground pool with an in-ground pool.

Mr. Paul Tyrell, PE represented the applicant David Flanagan who was also present with Mrs. Flanagan. Mr. Tyrell explained that the proposed work would take place within 100 ft. of the buffer zone/bordering vegetated wetland. He described the parcel as being rectangular in shape, adding that the proposal, in part, calls for an in-ground pool, replacing the present above-ground pool. He told members that a large majority of the site has been cleared - 1,700 sq. ft., and that the plans also include the addition of a basketball court. The haybale line has been staked and no work was planned within the B V W or beyond the haybale line. Additionally, plans call for small retaining walls and there would be an increase of the impervious surface. To mitigate, plans are to install a drywell. adding there will be only foot traffic in this area. He further explained that the basketball court would be constructed close to the pool and building to limit any impact to the resource area.

(At this point Mr. Tyrell submitted the green cards confirming notification of the abutters).

Mr. Tyrell informed members that the wetland delineation was done by a wetland scientist and that he designed the court with the intent of minimizing the impact to the resource area.

Chairman Thompson asked if the leaching galley was expensive and Mr. Tyrell told him the cost was about \$4,500, fairly expensive.

Chairman Thompson applauded his efforts, but added there was a lot of flooding in that area which was a concern. He also questioned the size.

Mr. Tyrell said he found it on the small side, adding now he was proposing a 6 ft. diameter to maximize the recharge.

Ms. Schloss asked about the storm equivalent and Mr. Tyrell told her that the new drywell should accommodate about a 2- $\frac{1}{2}$ year storm.

It was noted that there was a big difference in cost between one that was 6' Diameter and 8' Diameter.

Mr. Tyrell stated that his primary concern was structural. He explained that depending on the size it could waffle. He wanted to point out that they were governed by new Stormwater Standards. He told members that they are grading the site to the drywell.

Chairman Thompson asked what would happen if there was 3" of flow and Mr. Tyrell replied it would immediately discharge.

Mr. Tyrell further explained that if the drywell fills up, it would overflow and go into the wetland or the buffer zone. Presently it has a 5%-6% slope and they are mitigating that. He noted that there would be no grade on the basketball court. At this point he described the runoff pattern.

Cmmr. Coven pointed out that there have been flooding concerns in the past - so for the applicant to propose such a large impervious surface presents a concern in that area. He asked Mr. Tyrell if any thought had been given to a half-court.

Mr. Tyrell explained that the site contains a clear lawn with a 6% slope. The applicant is slowing the flow of water into the wetland which should alleviate members concern. He added it could be a net equal. He said they were reducing the net affect by the introduction of the drywell.

Cmmr. Kent asked how high the wall was in the northwest corner and Mr. Tyrell replied 4' - which, he added, might be the same height. He said they could add a perimeter cap, noting they will make sure the water is facilitated in that direction. He felt that it was a good idea, noting it was in there by design.

Ms. Schloss stated that the Town rules on lot coverage apply to the 'house' only.

Cmmr. Kent asked if there would be a fence around the pool and the applicant's response was 'yes'.

Ms. Schloss said she would like to see where the fence would be noted on the plan.

Mr. Tyrell informed her that it was identified on the drawings, adding the pool is in the 100 ft. buffer zone and they planned on moving the new pool farther away from the buffer zone. Further, he explained that the wall protects the wetlands. He told members that he spoke with Ms. Schloss about this and Mr. Flanagan understands that there will be no work in the resource area.

Ms. Schloss said she would like a count on the trees.

Mr. Tyrell said there were about (20) with 6" caliber, half are double branched - and he counted them as a whole. He noted that they were marked today. He also pointed out that the 6% grade gives a good amount of runoff, adding they have 961 cu. ft. that runs off site as it exists today re. 2-year storm.

Ms. Schloss wanted to address 'pre' verses 'post' runoff in storm events.

Mr. Tyrell said he would provide that for Ms. Schloss, and then asked her 'do the regulations require that?'

Ms. Schloss replied 'no', clarifying that single family homes were exempted.

Chairman Thompson interjected they were just concerned about the drywell having the ability to do the job.

Mr. Tyrell stated that the hydrology software doesn't accommodate such a small area. He maxed what he thought they should do, noting that actually this information wasn't required.

Cmmr. Coven told Mr. Tyrell that he wasn't convinced the Commission has enough information to determine if there would or would not be a flood.

Mr. Tyrell wanted clarification on what storm event Mr. Coven was referring to. He noted that there was a design standard, adding that the DEP has requested Water Quality info, which he has provided. He said that he could give the members the 2 year figure and pointed out that they are only required to mitigate a 2-year event.

Ms. Schloss replied that it was outside of the 100 year flood zone, but she knew that downstream there was a 100-year flood zone. She told Mr. Tyrell that she would like the figures re. a 2 year and 10 year storm event, adding she realized it was a tricky issue because the storm water standards are not applicable here. She then asked about possible downsizing.

Cmmr. Kent commented that he could see what was proposed would generate considerably less than what's there now with the addition of the drywell.

Mr. Tyrell interjected that they were not taking into consideration the infiltration. He pointed out that they would contain 700 cu. yds. with no runoff.

Chairman Thompson asked if they would be reducing runoff with the drywell and Mr. Tyrell replied 'yes', adding that 2-years and under would be going directly into the ground.

Chairman Thompson referred to the 100-year event, commenting that no drywell in the world would make a difference. He asked for something in writing for the files and Mr. Tyrell agreed.

Cmmr. Kent moved to continue the hearing to November 12, 2008 for 41 Tayla Drive, David Flanagan/Applicant.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Other Business

Healy Road

Ms. Schloss reminded members that this application is for a single family home, and she found it to be a tight site. She told members we had asked for a line of plantings for a permanent barrier to help prevent encroachment that would go 10 ft. from the house. The owner is now requesting to amend their wetland line with the goal to move back the buffer 25 ft., which she said was not a valid request. Based on this she spoke to the applicant and he said he might request for an amendment to their Order of Conditions.

Chairman Thompson asked about if a Variance was an option and Ms. Schloss replied 'essentially, yes, but as an amendment to their Order of Conditions.

Ms. Schloss went on to explain that the need to hold a hearing and to notify the abutters, including reviewing the wetland line. She informed members that the neighbors have expressed an interest to be present.

Chairman Thompson responded 'fine'.

Other Business

Ms. Schloss referred back to the Healy Road project, noting that since they can't change the wetland line, the owner might let the Order of Conditions expire, then come back before the Board.

Clancy Hearing - 431 Union Street

Ms. Schloss told members that she sent the letter to Mr. Clancy as requested by the Commission at the last meeting.

Ms. Schloss said a Plan of Action has been requested by October 1st, and it was strongly suggested to the owner to hire a professional consultant (mailed 10/22/08). At this point she was recommending that members visit the site, but to call the owner first to advise they would be visiting the property (and she gave members the telephone number).

The Propriety of Recording Enforcement Orders

Ms. Schloss informed members it was her understanding that Enforcement Orders are not supposed to be recorded, adding it could put the Commission in a precarious position if it is not substantiated. Additionally, it was recommended that the bank not be contacted for this purpose.

Conservation Report (Cont'd)

Ms. Schloss reported that she has received a letters of interest from those who do peer reviews. One that came to the office was from a wetland professional/wildlife biologist. The person as offering their services for the anticipated upcoming Algonquin Gas project, noting his experience in this area.

Margo Clerkin/DEP

Ms. Schloss informed members that the /Mass. Dept. of Environmental Protection is starting electronic Notice of Intent filing.

Community Preservation Committee Update

Cmmr. Coven, the Commission's representative on the CPC told members he had nothing to report regarding this Committee at this time. He sent a note to Mr. Clark asking for the status of the Town's Open Space Plan.

Ms. Schloss commented that it is really needed, referring to the Weymouth Open Space/Recreation Plan.

Adjournment

Commr. Kent moved to adjourn at 9:45 PM and to meet again on November 12th, 2008 at 7:30 P. M. at the Weymouth Town Hall/Town Council Chambers.

Cmmr. Coven seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED

Respectfully submitted,

Susan DeChristoforo
Recording Secretary

APPROVED: _____
Scott Coven, Clerk

DATE: _____