

**Dennis Conservation Commission
June 15, 2023
Dennis Town Offices – Large Hearing Room**

PRESENT: Chairman MacDonald Members: Clark, Olwell, Norman, Hulst, Lombardi, Chamberlain
ABSENT: Staff: Director Johnson Members: None
STAFF: Agent Burnham, Pereira

As required by Open Meeting Law and Massachusetts General Law, we are informing you that Town will be video and audio taping, as well as broadcasting, this public meeting. In addition, if anyone intends to either video or audio tape this meeting, they are required to inform the Chair. This is to formally advise that, as required by G.L. Chapter 30A §§18-25, and pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, An Act Relative to Extending Certain Covid-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, signed into law on June 16, 2021, the Conservation Commission will hold a public meeting on June 15, 2023 in the Large "Stone" Hearing Room (Basement Level), 685 Route 134, South Dennis. The public is welcome to attend either in-person or via the alternative public access provided below.

<p>Zoom Meeting information for alternative public access: To call: 646-558-8656. When prompted enter meeting id # 766-003-6712 Zoom: Meeting ID 766 003 6712</p>
--

CONTINUED HEARINGS

Follow up from June 1, 2023

*****Approval of Tobey West Management Plan and Conservation Restriction*****

David Fryxell, Executive Director of Dennis Conservation Land Trust, was present to have the Commission sign two documents for Tobey West: Conservation Restriction and Land Management Plan.

Motion:

Commissioner Clark moved to sign the Conservation Restriction and Land Management Plan.

Commissioner Norman seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

A. 13 Port Way Realty Trust – Notice of Intent (SE16-2695)

13 PORT WAY, WEST DENNIS – Proposed relocation and reconstruction of existing pier, ramp and float with dredging and proposed new/additional pier, ramp, and floats.

Brian Wall, Attorney with Troy Wall Associates, was present representing the applicant; along with Mark Burgess, with Shorefront Consulting. This hearing is continued from May 18th, and is also the second Notice of Intent being proposed concerning the project to relocate and reconstruct existing float with dredging, and add additional pier, ramp, and floats.

For background, property includes 170 feet of overall frontage along the Fingers. Applicants own a Silverton 36, which has a length of 37 feet 8 inches; and is to be used mostly in Nantucket Sound. Applicants also have a pontoon boat, for use around Bass River.

In August 2022, applicants went before the Conservation Commission to propose the relocation of the existing 6x20 foot float, and proposed to add a second set of floats, proposing a total of 113 linear feet of floats, occupying 66% of the waterfront. Conservation Commission reviewed project but denied it due to the size as well as aesthetic concerns. Applicants decided to file a second (current) Notice of Intent after first denial.

On May 18th, Attorney Wall, Attorney Burgess, and applicants went before the Conservation Commission with the current Notice of Intent; which proposed 83 linear feet of floats, a reduction of 30 feet from the original 113 linear feet. With the floats occupying 48% of the 170 feet of waterfront. Several of the Commissioners seemed willing to approve project as presented, while some appeared willing to work with applicant if the project was modified and reduced. Applicants decided on a continuance and the further modifications and reductions were made.

Attorney Wall discussed the further reduced project that proposes two 8x16 feet floats, one 8x24 ft. float, and to permit the existing jet ski float. Resulting in a total of 69 linear feet of floats. Occupying 41% of available waterfront. A reduction of 43 feet from the original proposal; and also, a reduction of 14 feet from the proposal submitted on May 18th.

Attorney Wall discussed the change in location of proposed float. The last two proposals included two separate floats. Currently proposed is one continuous linear float, moved as far north and into the lagoon as possible. Attorney Wall stated the project meets design standards; and that the change in location and size, reduces the request for dredging 95 cubic yards down to 61 cubic yards. Attorney Wall indicated this float is also consistent with other floats in the area. Included in initial paperwork was an aerial photo showing the other floats existing in the same area. Attorney Wall mentioned the property directly across the lagoon from applicants, has Chapter 91 licensed floats, 71 linear feet in length. Attorney Wall stated this particular project is 2 feet less than what is directly across waterway.

Attorney Wall discussed the relocation, addressing comments from the last meeting. Particularly the concern of setting a precedent that the floats were beyond the plane of the end of the lagoon. Attorney Wall addressed this issue, by stating the floats have been moved as far north as possible. Attorney Wall addressed the Boards denial to have the floats located on the southernly end. The aerial photo shows this particular finger and its uniqueness from the others. Being manmade, this is the only triangular finger. Attorney Wall indicated this means the applicants do not have as much linear feet in the lagoon as surrounding properties. By placing the float on the angle, it is not on the southernly end, addressing the issue of setting a precedent. Also, by relocating the float, this addresses the concerns from abutters. Such as the concern with the south-westerly wind blowing towards applicants' property, that sailboats needed sufficient area. This revised relocation has moved the float away from that particular area as much as possible. Attorney Wall specified that the applicant spoke with a board member at the West Dennis Yacht Club Board of Directors, that board member stated this project would be an improvement and that it addressed their concern of the tacking of sailboats.

Attorney Wall reiterated that this project was substantially reduced from what was originally proposed. These modifications present a change in location; and also, a change in configuration

of floats to keep them out of the channel, compressed, and as far north as possible. Thus, meeting design standards.

Attorney Wall finalized by discussing the issue with the Fingers and floats on the southerly end. Attorney Wall suggested to the Commission that this would not set any precedent, as this area is clearly distinguishable.

Mark Burgess stated the major change with the project is that everything has been consolidated into one access and one series of floats. The 6x20 foot float on the north, has been moved 14 feet to the south, opening up the end of the lagoon. The floats located on the angle, have been relocated 45 feet further north than previously proposed. Proposed to be the same distance away from bulkhead as previous, to reduce the need for dredging. Mr. Burgess indicated AutoCAD displayed there is only one cubic yard of material needed to be skimmed off, that is why dredging would go from over 90 yards down to 61 yards. With this new reduction, additional dredging is not needed further into the lagoon. Three feet of water is located on land side of all floats. Dredging is required bring one float closer to the bulkhead. This is only needed on the lagoon portion of the float.

Regarding mitigation, Mr. Burgess stated the applicants are willing to pay the fee for the shellfish mitigation fund. Mr. Burgess also stated on behalf of the applicants, they are also willing to provide own seeding on the property; providing on site mitigation as well. Mr. Burgess suggested a condition that relocates the shellfish to either side of dredge area, and in addition, to re-seed the area directly after dredging.

Lastly, Mr. Burgess read Division of Marine Fisheries comments with the time of year restriction.

Commissioner Chamberlain had no questions, but commented that the efforts to make changes and work with the Commission were appreciated.

Commissioner Lombardi had no questions.

Commissioner Hulst was also appreciative of efforts to balance dredging with the size of the dock, but disagreed with this project not setting a precedent with docks on the south side of Fingers. Commissioner Hulst's main concern was the extra addition of dock after the angle. Commissioner Hulst expressed understanding the angle of property, but felt the dock is still enough on the southerly end, that she still is not willing to approve. Commissioner Hulst stated if the section of the dock on the angular side were to be removed, she would be okay moving forward with project. Chairman MacDonald expressed Commissioner Hulst should not fear the setting of a precedent since the law does not recognize precedent. Chairman MacDonald addressed the issue of docks, referring back to a past hearing, where one applicant was approved while the neighbor was denied.

Commissioner Norman also expressed appreciation for the relocation of the dock out of the channel, away from the boats moored in Bass River and areas that might interfere with sailing vessels. Commissioner Norman stated his only concern was the proposed dredging and inquired if the intention was to seek a variance to do dredging. Commissioner Norman then backed this inquiry up by stating under Town of Dennis Wetlands Bylaw Section 3, paragraph 1 (d): all docking and loading facilities shall require a minimum of three (3) foot depth at mean low water

without benefit of dredging. Commissioner Norman asked if there was an option so that dredging is not necessary. Mr. Burgess responded that this would move the ramp more into the lagoon than the existing float, and then adding a boat, then creates a restriction. Mr. Burgess then discussed how this area is already pre-dredged and how this would be considered maintenance dredging, which is how the Fingers were created (by being dredged to -10 by the Army Corps, according to a past permit). Commissioner Norman had no further comments.

Commissioner Olwell remained opposed to the project, largely due to the high activity of sailboats in the area. Commissioner Olwell was not in favor of the shellfish mitigation proposal either.

Commissioner Clark agreed with Commissioner Norman's statement. Commissioner Clark discussed the past permit for the construction of the Fingers back in 1950's, briefly mentioned by Mr. Burgess. Commissioner Clark inquired if that permit's conditions would still be applicable today. Chairman MacDonald responded the permit was only issued for whatever was needed at the time to dredge and fill. Chairman MacDonald said after that is completed, the permit is done. Commissioner Clark stated that is why he felt it was a stretch to consider this maintenance dredging. Mr. Burgess said improvement dredging is improving an area that had never been touched before. By designation there is improvement dredging and maintenance dredging. Maintenance dredging is re-dredging an area, and that it should still apply to an area that was previously approved to be dredged. Mr. Burgess conveyed Commissioner Norman was right regarding how, in any new proposal, 3 ft. is desired because for brand new docks, no dredging is allowed. Mr. Burgess referred back to a similar project on Grand Cove in Bass River, where an existing dock in a silted in area was approved by this Board for a one-time dredge in order to return the area back to how it was. Commissioner Norman inquired what year this project was that Mr. Burgess was referring to. Mr. Burgess responded a couple years ago. Commissioner Clark mentioned still being concerned moving forward with current proposal. Commissioner Clark also alluded to Commissioner Hulst's concern about the precedent of the floats in the channel.

Attorney Wall responded to Commissioner Hulst and Commissioner Clark's concerns. Attorney Wall suggested the applicant made a good argument that this area is different and would not set precedent. Attorney Wall asked the Board what is the exact concern and to assume with there being no well-defined map stating where exactly docks are allowed in this area by regulations and where docks are not allowed in certain areas. Attorney Wall stated how each dock is a case by case concern to be reviewed by Commission. Attorney Wall suggested the concern is that docks placed on the southerly end of the Fingers, might interfere with navigation. A concern that the Commission under the bylaw regulates. Attorney Wall stated he understood why docks are not placed there and why there is a concern to continue to prohibit docks. But Attorney Wall asked the Board to view this on a case by case basis, as this configuration differs in regard to navigation. Attorney Wall indicated by relocating the floats north and condensing them, that navigational interests are protected with this particular project.

Regarding the dredging, Attorney Wall reiterated the regulations from the state make a clear distinction between improvement and maintenance dredging. Attorney Wall discussed how maintenance dredging requires best available measures to reduce impacts to the maximum extent possible. Stating the standard for improvement is much higher. Attorney Wall suggested

once an area has been dredged and licensed, subsequent dredging is considered maintenance dredging. Attorney Wall conveyed that Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Norman made a good point that regulations state no new docks, but that it is interpreted to say docks cannot be put in by dredging. Attorney Wall suggested if there is an existing dock in a pre-dredged area, that maintenance dredging should be allowed.

Lastly, Attorney Wall addressed comments on the size and the reductions made. Attorney Wall states the project in its reduced design now, is less in size than others in the same area, as well as the one directly across the Finger.

Chairman MacDonald stated the applicants have been responsive to Board's concerns and also inquired if there were any commercial fishing interests. Attorney Wall responded there would be no commercial fishing. Chairman MacDonald stated he would vote in favor of the project; and that the shellfish issue has been addressed. In regards to dredging, Chairman MacDonald stated it would be better to dredge out the area, than to allow props to stir up sediment.

Agent Burnham clarified and confirmed with Mr. Burgess that the areas of new docks already have 3 feet of water depth but the areas of existing floats do not and require the dredging. Agent Burnham stated it already appears to have 3 ft. at the outside edge of the float before the dredging. Agent Burnham indicated the regulation states all docking and loading facilities require a minimum of 3-ft. depth at mean low water without the benefit of dredging. Agent Burnham stated with this project, the 3-ft. depth requirement is being met. Agent Burnham agreed this is maintenance dredging and that it is beneficial. Agent Burnham also expressed if shellfish are moved appropriately, there should not be any impact on them.

In regards to Agent Burnham's comment, Commissioner Hulst agreed about the maintenance dredging being beneficial. Regarding the location of the dock on the angle, Commissioner Hulst indicated concerns with navigation and aesthetics still.

Motion:

Commissioner Chamberlain moved to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Hulst seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

Motion:

Commissioner Chamberlain moved to approve the project as presented with its modifications.

Chairman MacDonald seconded the motion.

Vote: 3-4 (Chairman MacDonald, Commissioner Norman, Commissioner Chamberlain approved – Commissioners Clark, Olwell, Hulst, and Lombardi opposed)

Motion fails.

Mr. Burgess argued that the project met all the performance standards in the bylaw. Attorney Wall also noted comparisons to the property across the way were in reference to size similarity. He also discussed the standard of aesthetics.

Commissioner Hulst indicated still having aesthetic concerns about the portion of the dock on the southerly side. Commissioner Hulst believes it would significantly affect the public's ability to view this area and aesthetically enjoy the area.

Motion:

Commissioner Lombardi moved to deny the project based on dredging, shellfish, and aesthetics and other issues noted during the hearing under both the Wetlands Protection Act and Town of Dennis Wetlands Bylaw

Commissioner Olwell seconded the motion.

Vote: 4-3 (Commissioners Clark, Olwell, Hulst, Lombardi approved – Chairman Macdonald, Commissioner Norman, Commissioner Chamberlain denied)

B. Pelham Farms LLC – Notice of Intent (SE16-2699)

***** CONTINUED TO 7/6/2023 *****

607 & 621 MAIN STREET, WEST DENNIS – Proposed farm-to-table restaurant, event, and retail building with beer garden.

NEW HEARINGS

C. Pisciotta – Request for Determination of Applicability

106 CENTER STREET, SOUTH DENNIS – Proposed garage building.

No one was present for the hearing. Agent Burnham explained how minimal information was provided. Agent Burnham indicated the project proposed is a 24x36 ft. metal garage building with poured foundation.

Commissioner Clark was concerned by there not being enough information.

Commissioners Hulst and Norman wanted to see a clear site plan with existing versus proposed, flood zone, BVW location.

Commissioner Clark inquired if the purpose of the garage was for residential or commercial use. Commissioner Hulst wanted clarification on what garage will be used for and if any hazardous materials will be stored.

Agent Burnham responded that it is a residential lot and was unsure if anything commercial would be allowed.

Motion:

Commissioner Lombardi moved to continue until next regular scheduled Conservation Commission hearing.

Commissioner Norman seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

D. Drive-O-Rama, Inc. – Request for Determination of Applicability

342 ROUTE 28, DENNISPORT – Proposed septic system upgrade.

Commissioner Chamberlain recused herself.

Mike Pimentel, Engineer with JC Engineering, was present representing the applicant for the upgrade of the existing septic system of a two-bedroom home. Currently, there is a failed

cesspool located in the groundwater, approximately 105 ft. from wetland. Failed cesspool is also located within land subject to coastal storm flowage.

Proposed is to replace cesspool with a new Title 5 1500-gallon tank with a 500-gallon pump chamber compartment. New leaching system will have at least 4 ft. of separation from groundwater. Mr. Pimentel stated applicants will also be going in front of the Board of Health for this design as several variances are requested.

Commissioner Lombardi had no questions.

Commissioner Hulst commented on the items stored next to the area but within the floodplain and asked if they were secured or if anything hazardous was stored. Mr. Pimentel stated he was unaware of the use of those buildings. Commissioner Hulst was okay with this and had no further questions.

Commissioner Norman mentioned the private well on the site and inquired if the well is used for drinking water. Mr. Pimentel stated this well does currently service the existing two-bedroom home for their drinking water purposes. Commissioner Norman also mentioned there only being 4 ft. of separation between the bottom of the leach field and the estimated high groundwater level. Mr. Pimentel stated this is one of the reasons the project will be going before the Board of Health to ask for this particular variance to avoid having a raised septic system in this location as it is too close to the existing home. Commissioner Norman inquired if this was a standard conventional pump system or an enhanced nitrate removal system. Mr. Pimentel stated this is a standard conventional pump system. Commissioner Norman wanted to clarify groundwater was 3 ft. below ground surface. Mr. Pimentel confirmed, it is shallow and 4 ft. of separation would be provided. Commissioner Norman referenced a 5 ft. of separation requirement and mentioned this requirement being met in order for approval. There was a discussion of nitrogen loading calculations.

Commissioner Olwell had no comments.

Commissioner Clark inquired about there being two acres of land and why the septic has to be so close to the house. Mr. Pimentel responded that this is the only area to place the system to maximize the distance from the wetland, and this also maximizes the distance to the well. Mr. Pimentel stated there was no other area on the property to place the septic. Commissioner Clark mentioned not having the wetland defined on the plan and inquired on the actual distance from the wetland. Mr. Pimentel answered the septic tank and pump chamber are 102 ft. away from the wetland. Mr. Pimentel described how the wetland land extends all the way to the west, considering the well is on the west side, leaching system would be within 100 ft. of this. Commissioner Clark had no further comments.

Chairman MacDonald had no comments.

Motion:

Commissioner Lombardi moved to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Hulst seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0 (Commissioner Chamberlain recused)

Motion:

Commissioner Lombardi moved to issue a Positive 5 Determination as the area/or work shown on the plan is subject to review and approval by the Town of Dennis Wetlands Bylaws. Chairman MacDonald seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0 (Commissioner Chamberlain recused)

Motion:

Commissioner Lombardi moved to issue a Negative 2 Determination as the work described in the Request is within an area subject to protection but will not alter an area subject to protection.

Commissioner Hulst seconded the motion.

Vote: 6-0 (Commissioner Chamberlain recused)

E. Wolff Rev Living Trust – Notice of Intent (SE16-2702)

188 SESUIT NECK ROAD, DENNIS – Proposed raze and replace of existing single-family dwelling.

Dan Ojala, with Down Cape Engineering, was present representing the applicant. Proposed is to raise and replace the existing single-family dwelling.

Salt marsh is located across street and project is within this buffer zone. A culvert runs under the street in front of dwelling, which drains some of the run off side of lot. Mr. Ojala stated these drainage patterns will generally remain the same through the project.

Property is within land subject to coastal storm flowage and is located in a FEMA flood zone. Raising the house will adhere to FEMA regulations.

Entrance will be minimally altered so not much work will be done within the 50 ft. buffer. Off the entrance driveway, is a proposed pervious paved parking area located off the side. There is a proposed storage area off the proposed parking area at elevation 14½. This proposed storage area will be elevated above flood elevation so it will not require flood vents. In other areas, it may be required to go onto a helical pile foundation. Mr. Ojala reiterated it will be a fully flood zone compliant foundation. A couple feet of fill is proposed to go around house to return it back to existing grades. High groundwater was found; so, to mitigate against that a retaining wall is proposed to elevate the leaching field. Leaching field is to be located far back on site, far away as it can be from buffer. An innovative alternative septic system is proposed. Mr. Ojala stated this septic system will be 4 ft. from groundwater and leaching will be pressure dosed. UV light will aid in filtering any pathogens that may enter the system or go into salt marsh.

Mr. Ojala mentioned the dwelling is on Town water. Dwelling will be more than 100 feet away from salt marsh. Old existing cesspools in buffer on property will be removed. Light grading will be done to handle surface runoff, but drainage patterns will remain the same. Drip edges are proposed for roof run off.

Paul Jacobs and wife Janine, owners of 182 Sesuit Neck Road, were present. Mr. Jacobs property borders 188 Sesuit Neck Road by two boundaries. Mr. Jacobs took the podium, and wanted to clarify if there would be any affect to his driveway bordering the property. Mr. Ojala stated Mr.

Jacobs driveway is 20 ft. away from the work limit line. Mr. Ojala said natural drainage will be undisturbed and Mr. Jacobs driveway will stay dry throughout the whole project, not being affected.

Chairman MacDonald stated he was satisfied. But inquired to Commissioner Hulst if she was not satisfied of the project, that he would recommend a condition for the work necessary so that water is not displaced. Chairman MacDonald asked Commissioner Hulst if this was relevant. Commissioner Hulst indicated that the flooding has been more of a storm water issue. If heavy rain and storm surge occurred at once, Commissioner Hulst's concern was an increase in flooding on the road, surrounding properties, and salt marsh across the street.

Commissioners Chamberlain and Lombardi had no questions.

Commissioner Hulst confirmed with Mr. Ojala that the property, surrounding properties, and the road are not to be affected by displaced water from the fill needed to increase parking area. Commissioner Hulst wondered how this would be handled. Mr. Ojala answered that the road runoff goes into a pipe and will continue to. As for water that falls on this particular lot, more will be infiltrated after this project takes place, due to the pervious pavers and runoff going into drip edges. Mr. Ojala indicated there is some sheet flow runoff off of the site, due to the amount of soil clays in the area, but it won't be more than it currently is. Commissioner Hulst inquired with the water pipe, that it will not increase the amount of water beyond what the culvert can handle. Mr. Ojala clarified the water would not increase. Commissioner Hulst had no further comments.

Commissioner Norman inquired about sediments and the placement of the septic.

Commissioner Olwell had no questions.

Commissioner Clark mentioned a potential perennial stream. Mr. Ojala responded that the aerial topography does not show any intermittent streams impacting this property and drainage patterns will remain the same. Commissioner Clark stated he liked the septic design and had no further questions.

Chairman MacDonald was satisfied with the project.

Motion:

Commissioner Norman moved to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Clark seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

Motion:

Commissioner Norman moved to approve the project under the Wetlands Protection Act and the Town of Dennis Wetlands Bylaws as shown in the plan of record and instruct staff to prepare an Order of Conditions for the next regularly scheduled Conservation Commission hearing.

Commissioner Olwell seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

ADMINISTRATIVE

- F. Nolan – Order of Conditions (SE16-2700)
53 DR. BOTTERO ROAD, DENNIS – Proposed raising of dwelling with new foundation, reconstruction of decks, addition of access stairs.

Motion:

Commissioner Olwell moved to sign the Order of Conditions for SE16-2700.

Commissioner Lombardi seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

- G. Crowell –Determination of Applicability
254 & 270 SESUIT NECK ROAD, DENNIS – Proposed open space with subdivision.

Motion:

Commissioner Clark moved to sign the Determination of Applicability.

Commissioner Olwell seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

- H. Riechmann – Order of Conditions (SE16-2698)
7 MURPHY ROAD, WEST DENNIS – Proposed deck replacement.

Motion:

Commissioner Hulst moved to approve the Order of Conditions as prepared for SE16-2698.

Commissioner Lombardi seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

- I. Michael Graziosi Living Trust – Order of Conditions (TOD23-01)
52 CENTER STREET, EAST DENNIS – Proposed raze and replace of existing dwelling.

Motion:

Commissioner Clark moved to approve the Order of Conditions as prepared for TOD23-01.

Commissioner Lombardi seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

- J. Mulroy – Order of Conditions (SE16-2701)
146 SHORE DRIVE, DENNIS – Proposed raze of two-family home and replacement with single-family dwelling, new sewage disposal system, and associated site improvements.

Motion:

Commissioner Clark moved to approve the Order of Conditions as prepared for SE16-2701.

Commissioner Olwell seconded the motion.

Vote: 7-0-0

- K. Pelham Farms, LLC – Enforcement Order Discussion
39 INDIAN POND ROAD, WEST DENNIS

Agent Burnham explained how Conservation received a letter from the applicants and she advised them that there was no need to show for tonight's hearing as there were no updates. Agent Burnham stated the applicants have been in discussion with Kelly Powers from NRCS, applicants spoke with her on Tuesday, June 6th. Kelly Powers stated they are on a five to eight-month lead time for farm conservation plans from the time of initially calling, which was in February.

Agent Burnham stated Dylan Leary had sent over an email June 15th to provide an update on the removal of the chicken coop from the field and the repurposing of that area. The chicken coop is deconstructed and all materials have been removed from the area. The former chicken run is now a rounded bed containing mostly perennial culinary herbs surrounding corn, beans, and squash. Agent Burnham stated she asked Mr. Leary to clarify which chicken coop was mentioned. Agent Burnham stated she believed it was the chicken coop to the north near the wetland, not the one near the house.

L. Conservation Agent's Report

No report.

M. Director's Report

No report.

Motion:

Commissioner Hulst moved to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Olwell seconded the motion.

The Committee voted 7-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10pm.