

INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 13, 2024 – 6:30PM (VIA ZOOM)

- 1        1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.
- 2
- 3        2. Roll Call & Seating of Alternates. Present: Larry Burcroff, Sally Spillane, John Landon, Maria
- 4        Grace, Russ Conklin (Alternate), Tracy Brown (Alternate), John Harney (Alternate), Abby Conroy
- 5        (Land Use Director), Miles Todaro (Land Use Tech Specialist) and Georgia Petry (Recording
- 6        Secretary). Absent: Cary Ullman and Vivian Garfein. R. Conklin was seated as Voting Alternate
- 7        for C. Ullman. J. Harney was seated as Voting Alternate for V. Garfein.
- 8
- 9        3. **Approval of Agenda.** Item #11 was previously acted upon; no further action needed. A **Motion**
- 10       **to Approve the Agenda, as amended**, was made by R. Conklin, seconded by S. Spillane and
- 11       unanimously **Approved**.
- 12
- 13       4. **Minutes of October 28, 2024. A Motion to Approve the Minutes of October 28, 2024** was
- 14       made by R. Conklin, seconded by J. Landon and unanimously **Approved**.
- 15
- 16       5. Minutes of November 7, 2024. Tabled to the next meeting.
- 17
- 18       6. Public Comment – None
- 19
- 20       7. #2024-IW-045 / William J. Colaric (Matt’s Landscaping, LLC) / 67 Old CNE Road / Landscaping,
- 21       Hardscaping, and Other Work in the Upland Review Area / Map 40 / Lot 30 / DOR: 11/12/2024
- 22       Matt Schwaikert represented the applicant and described the entire plan in detail; they will
- 23       increase the living space and it will be eco-sustainable. They do not have TAHD approval yet. R.
- 24       Conklin asked where the patio is near the water; Mr. Schwaikert answered that it is in the
- 25       middle of the property and the front edge is about 8’ from the lake. R. Conklin asked about the
- 26       use of rip-rap; Mr. Schwaikert answered it would be the swale going down the side of the
- 27       driveway and capture the run-off from the front of the house. L. Burcroff asked if the driveway
- 28       was being re-done; Mr. Schwaikert answered that they are moving over the lower section
- 29       towards the house, about 72’ total from what was a circular driveway. J. Landon asked about
- 30       the topography from the road down to the lake; Mr. Schwaikert answered that it is an
- 31       aggressive slope and he will provide the contour map. R. Conklin asked about the buffer area
- 32       and what is there now, at the water’s edge; Mr. Schwaikert answered there are some boulders
- 33       now, but they would be adding rip-rap where needed and moving the dock. R. Conklin asked
- 34       about the rip-rap; Mr. Schwaikert answered that it is anything a foot and smaller in diameter,

35 usually 4" to 6" rock. A. Conroy asked if there would be 500 sq. ft. of disturbance within 75' of  
36 the lake; Mr. Schwaikert responded that it is up to the IWWC to determine. J. Landon and R.  
37 Conklin commented that a site visit is needed. A. Conroy indicated that this plan would also  
38 need approval from the PZC, which would trigger engineering plans, and that patios are  
39 considered structures. In the Lake Protection Overlay District there are setback requirements;  
40 A. Conroy will review the requirements for a special permit which involves a site plan designed  
41 for stormwater management and that needs to be done by an engineer. A. Conroy asked if the  
42 IWWC wants to do a site visit, regardless; R. Conklin has questions about the amount of  
43 stabilization required and J. Landon agreed they must actually see what it looks like. A. Conroy  
44 and M. Todaro will poll the members for a possible date and time. S. Spillane asked if there is  
45 any tree cutting going on; Mr. Schwaikert answered no. L. Burcroff asked how many boulders  
46 would be brought in; Mr. Schwaikert answered about 200 yards. J. Landon wants more  
47 information and all the details, including a narrative. A. Conroy suggested that the IWWC refer  
48 to the worksheet that was sent out and asked if there should be a Public Hearing; S. Spillane  
49 commented that nothing could be determined until there is a site walk. **A Motion to Accept this**  
50 **Application** was made by J. Landon, seconded by S. Spillane, **With All in Favor**.  
51 (At this time, the next 2 items on the agenda were skipped, in order to start the Public Hearing  
52 on time; they will be addressed after the Public Hearing)

53

#### 54 **Public Hearing – 7:00PM**

55 #2024-IW-027 / Salisbury Winter Sports Association, c/o Ken Barker / 80 Indian Cave Road /  
56 Construct a Pond for Water Supply and Snow Making / Map 15 / Lot 25 / DOR: 7/22/2024

57 The link to the Zoom recording of this meeting can be found at:

58 <https://www.salisburyct.us/inland-wetland-watercourses-commission/#minutes>

59 L. Burcroff opened the Public Hearing at 7:00PM. The Legal Notice was read by A. Conroy. Jay  
60 Fain, Jay Fain & Associates, Project Environmental Consultant, began with introductions of the  
61 team representing SWSA, including Pat Hackett, Engineer; Mark Capecelatro, Attorney; John  
62 Higgins and Ken Barker, SWSA Board of Directors. Mr. Fain described, at length, the materials  
63 he had prepared, including a summary of his letter to the IWWC dated November 11, 2024. R.  
64 Conklin asked if Attorney Capecelatro was joining the meeting; Mr. Higgins responded that  
65 Attorney Capecelatro was not representing or retained by them, but they had some discussions  
66 with him for guidance. When Mr. Fain concluded his presentation, A. Conroy noted for the  
67 record that the IWWC regulates use, not the user, so it is pertinent that the use is a snow-  
68 making pond. A. Conroy continued that a lot of the commentary just heard was about the user  
69 and that shouldn't play a role in the decision; the purpose may be to allow an activity which has  
70 public benefit, so it's a balancing act to determine which factors should be considered. A.  
71 Conroy asked to clarify and summarize, because there has been a lot of discussion about this  
72 application before the hearing, to make sure the message is clear. A. Conroy asked if, because  
73 of climate change, the operation is now largely dependent on snow-making; Mr. Fain answered  
74 yes. A. Conroy asked about the details of the current snow-making operation; Mr. Barker  
75 described it. A. Conroy noted that in Mr. Fain's November 11 report, he summarized that the

76 facility has adequate water, but what is inadequate is the instantaneous yield and supply  
77 capacity at the snow gun, it takes a long time and the operation is dependent on volunteers to  
78 make it up; Mr. Fain answered that it is important to do it in a compressed period of time. Mr.  
79 Fain commented that he had prepared a mitigation plan. A. Conroy expressed that everything is  
80 being covered again because this is the first night of the Public Hearing and it must be concise  
81 for the record. A. Conroy pointed out that a lot of this information was just received today and  
82 is new to the IWWC. Mr. Pat Hackett, Engineer, gave a lengthy detailed presentation on the  
83 engineering aspects, including a revised proposed snowmaking plan. He noted that after this  
84 process, they would be going to the State for a diversion permit because they would be  
85 pumping out over 50,000 gallons per day. Mr. Fain commented on addressing the removal of  
86 phragmites and Japanese Knotweed and on the proposed pond planting plan. A. Conroy noted  
87 that the IWWC did hire a third-party consultant to review Mr. Hackett's hydrogeology report.  
88 The consultant's review was that in his opinion, the hydrologic impacts will be limited,  
89 temporary and should not be significant; additionally, because the withdrawals will occur in the  
90 winter months, the significance of potential adverse impacts to wetlands and watercourse  
91 hydrology is reduced. The scope of the review did not consider any alternatives because  
92 alternatives were not provided until today; but he noted that does not mean that alternatives  
93 do not exist. The consultant's report should not be construed as certification the proposed  
94 pond will be viable; there is still a possibility that the pond will be no more productive than the  
95 wells. The consultant noted that a State diversion permit is triggered at withdrawals of 50,000  
96 gallons per day; therefore, additional recommendations would be to meter and report on usage  
97 to document that the user is not exceeding 50,000 gallons per day. A. Conroy asked Mr. Hackett  
98 about the demand for snow mentioned in his report, specifically about the current stated  
99 pumping of 58 gallons per minute, allowing for up to 14 hours of snow making before 50,000  
100 gallons is exceeded; Mr. Hackett indicated that was correct. Mr. Hackett commented that once  
101 a pond goes in, that rate can get significantly higher; he added that it's about the storage and  
102 that is what is driving the whole project. A. Conroy commented that it was on the record that  
103 the diversion permit is the ultimate goal; Mr. Hackett answered yes. A. Conroy noted the future  
104 use of the pond and asked if there was a specific reason they were here before this Commission  
105 before pursuing the diversion permit; Mr. Hackett responded that if they can't get through this  
106 process, going for a diversion permit would be a much more involved process. Mr. Fain pointed  
107 out that getting a diversion permit is time-consuming, expensive, and requires a lot. Mr.  
108 Hackett referred to the recommendations in the report from the Hydrogeologist at Weston &  
109 Sampson. A. Conroy mentioned there was a previous question from M. Grace and that the  
110 applicant had responded by providing this report; the IWWC then had a third party review of  
111 that report. A. Conroy pointed out that their Hydrogeologist found that because the  
112 withdrawals occur in the winter months, it's less likely to have a negative impact. Mr. Fain  
113 expressed that there aren't reasonable and prudent alternatives; the alternatives are too  
114 expensive; and the alternatives would be more impactful than what is being proposed. A.  
115 Conroy commented that the IWWC had previously conducted a site visit and noted where the  
116 phragmites are located in the existing wetland; Mr. Fain was asked to provide an estimate of the

117 percentage of the swamp to be converted contains phragmites and Mr. Fain estimated that to  
118 be about 60%. A. Conroy asked how he thought the phragmites got there; Mr. Fain answered  
119 that it is a disturbed site and maybe fill was brought in over the years. A. Conroy commented  
120 that the phragmites had been brought in by the user, spread and gone unmanaged. A. Conroy  
121 commented that additional disturbance is proposed in the wetland and asked how they would  
122 ensure that the new emergent wetlands shelf won't become established with phragmites; Mr.  
123 Fain answered that they would continue monitor and treat as necessary. L. Burcroff asked how  
124 they plan to get rid of the knotweed; Mr. Fain answered that it would be cut and treated, but  
125 not removed from the site. M. Grace asked specifically how it would be treated because it is in  
126 a wetland area, and would it trigger a permit for pesticide application; Mr. Fain described the  
127 knotweed as not being in the wetland area. M. Grace asked if there were more specifics in the  
128 application about the treatment, such as percentage of pesticides and how it would be cut; Mr.  
129 Fain answered that they typically work with a licensed applicator to do it and described a  
130 possible process. M. Grace asked if that was detailed in this application or if that was going to  
131 be a different permit; Mr. Fain answered that it is included in this application and that they  
132 would add additional details, as a condition of approval. M. Grace suggested that more details  
133 of the treatment should be provided because both the phragmites and knotweed are in the  
134 Upland Review Area (URA). Jon Higgins asked if there are specific recommendations for the best  
135 way of treatment or leave it to them to come back to the IWWC; M. Grace suggested they get a  
136 licensed pesticide applicator to give them a specific plan of action for that site and that it is a  
137 multi-year effort to control it. T. Brown asked for details about the emergent wetlands area and  
138 the pond and if expanding the emergent wetland to the entire perimeter of the wetland was a  
139 possibility; Mr. Fain answered that they don't plan on doing that initially, but his experience is  
140 that the zone along the edge will become dominated by emergent plants. T. Brown asked what  
141 kind of fence they would use; Mr. Barker answered it would be a simple floorboard post and rail  
142 fence. T. Brown asked how long the construction would take; Mr. Fain answered he hoped for  
143 about 6 weeks for the construction and de-watering. S. Spillane commented that the pond is  
144 0.27 acres and asked how big the entire wetlands are that it's sitting in; Mr. Fain answered  
145 about one half of an acre, maybe closer to 0.6 acres. S. Spillane asked if half of the wetlands  
146 would be converted to open water; Mr. Fain answered something like that. J. Harney  
147 commented that it is a significant impact because open water is less of a function, less integrity  
148 than the natural wetlands that have been removed. A. Conroy asked about Mr. Fain's initial  
149 report which did not characterize the wetlands as phragmites-dominated, but in the letter dated  
150 November 11, 2024, it was really emphasized. A. Conroy commented that she had not seen a  
151 functional assessment that included specific details to support the assertions that this habitat  
152 will be enhanced and asked for more detail about how the water quality and functions will be  
153 improved with this conversion of wetlands. Mr. Fain described the wildlife habitat as being  
154 improved; there wouldn't be excessive lows; there wouldn't be a polluting load from an outside  
155 source; he considers the recreation and aesthetic functions will be enhanced; people will enjoy  
156 looking at the water there. Mr. Fain commented that this is a conversion, but not an elimination  
157 of the area, and they have a real need for this pond. J. Harney asked A. Conroy if it was possible

158 to have another wetlands consultant review the letter and report from Mr. Fain. A. Conroy  
159 responded that the Hearing has been opened in the appropriate timeframe; they only have 35  
160 days for the Hearing; no more extensions are available on the application; when it comes to  
161 considering wetlands applications, it comes down to the expert testimony. A. Conroy  
162 commented that there was no discussion about water quality which is why she asked for more  
163 details in her question; it might be possible to find a qualified professional to do a third party  
164 review, if the IWWC thinks it is important. J. Harney expressed that it is important. S. Spillane  
165 commented that she is unclear about the State diversion permit and if they think they are going  
166 to be exceeding the amount of water, how this IWWC can move forward without that diversion  
167 permit. John Higgins commented that some members of IWWC are volunteers for the ski jumps  
168 and know the site well; if their limitation is 50,000 gallons per day without having to go for  
169 further permits, then that would be their limit or they would deal with it at that time. Mr.  
170 Higgins added that the issue is that they get into a crisis when they get to jump time because  
171 they need a lot of water in a very short timeframe. S. Spillane asked if that would be self-  
172 monitored and who would get the report; Mr. Higgins answered that they would probably  
173 meter the use and he would make the reports. A. Conroy commented that the IWWC could  
174 make a condition to ask for monitoring and reports; she does not want to be responsible for  
175 those reports. S. Spillane asked about the Wood Turtles. J. Harney asked to have a consensus  
176 on whether to have a third party review of Mr. Fain's letter and report. S. Spillane commented,  
177 if it could be done within the timeframe, it would be interesting to compare opinions. J. Harney  
178 expressed that it would be good to compare opinions on the impact and functionality of the  
179 current wetlands and the impact of the proposed development, by a third party. J. Landon  
180 asked what if they want that, but it's not feasible within the timeframe, what then. A. Conroy  
181 noted that it is a complex application, but one of the things is the exploration of alternatives and  
182 if the IWWC is satisfied with the explanation provided by the applicant; does the IWWC have  
183 enough information to render a decision. M. Grace asked if they had to make a decision  
184 tonight; A. Conroy answered no, they have 35 days to close the Hearing. M. Grace wants more  
185 information about the removal of invasives before acting on this; L. Burcroff asked if that could  
186 happen by the next meeting. A. Conroy asked if that would be an invasive management plan;  
187 M. Grace answered yes, unless they plan on submitting another application about it. A. Conroy  
188 asked if that management would also have to be a Condition of issuing a permit because it  
189 would have to be tied to this one and not a separate permit; as a Condition of a permit, they  
190 would have to do it. M. Grace expressed that it is important to review what is going to be done  
191 in the wetland and part of that work is going to be using pesticides in the wetland; it would be  
192 important for them to discuss that before a vote on this. A. Conroy asked if there was an  
193 updated DEEP reporting form submitted; Mr. Hackett answered no, he didn't do that as there  
194 was only a change on one number that should have been 0.4 not 4; otherwise it contained all  
195 the material Mr. Fain had submitted in 2023. J. Harney expressed again that it would be a good  
196 idea to have a third party wetlands review because his opinion is that this is a significant impact  
197 on wetlands and wildlife habitat and everything else is sent out to third parties for review; this is  
198 critical information to review to make sure it is not skewed on way or another. J. Landon asked

199 A. Conroy if she had someone to engage; A. Conroy answered yes, she has 2 ideas that she will  
200 contact by the next meeting. S. Spillane mentioned the Wood Turtles again; the Wood Turtle  
201 fencing; the timing of the work and how that corresponds to the Wood Turtles life. Mr. Fain  
202 commented that they have read Michael Klemens letter and their work will be outside of the  
203 critical areas of habitat for the Wood Turtles; they will take precautions during the construction  
204 period. A. Conroy commented that legally, they can't have Michael Klemens do the review. A.  
205 Conroy noted that this Hearing will be continued and the applicant is going to provide further  
206 information on the invasives management so the IWWC can fully understand all of the proposed  
207 impacts and activities that would be under their purview; she will work on securing someone for  
208 the third party review and suggested they should go on to Public Comment.

209

210 **Public Comment:**

211 -- Newton Tedder – No longer lives in Salisbury, but comes back every year for the ski jumps and  
212 his parents live here; his father is on the SWSA Board. He has looked at the documents  
213 produced for this project, regarding the ecological impacts, and expressed that wetlands do  
214 change over time; he noted potential changes in the short term, but not in the long term over  
215 geological time. He commented that this is a project that has real benefit for a community and  
216 urged the IWWC to allow a community to continue with an important function, as far as a ski  
217 jump, and approve this project.

218 -- Elyse Harney – Thanked the IWWC for their efforts and diligence. Her concern was if this sets  
219 a precedent for disrupting wetland areas. She totally appreciates the extensive volunteer effort  
220 that this has been over the course of many years and that SWSA is special. She hopes that in the  
221 future, people won't take this example and use it for another purpose, which would not be good  
222 for the community.

223 -- Mat Kiefer – Is a long-time volunteer at the ski jumps and this is an important part of the  
224 continuation of these jumps. He noted that J. Harney is no longer a volunteer. He commented  
225 that they never have plenty of water to make snow and they don't have the cold temperatures  
226 to make snow; this project would be an integral part of continuing this tradition in our town.  
227 They have fewer volunteers, so they want to make it easier for the volunteers to keep up with  
228 the snowmaking; they can meter it and not exceed 50,000 gallons per day, then go for a  
229 diversion permit.

230 -- Bruce Palmer – Asked the question, is it possible to have a tanker truck to keep up with the  
231 water supply needed for snowmaking? J. Landon responded that Mr. Hackett has looked at a  
232 number of different alternatives and that was one of them.

233

234 The discussion returned to Mr. Hackett, regarding alternatives; he indicated that basically there  
235 aren't any good ones. He referenced his letter, which is on the website. Mr. Fain offered  
236 additional comments. S. Spillane asked what temperature is required to make snow; Mr. Fain  
237 answered that it depends on the dew point and if the conditions aren't right, they can "farm"  
238 snow, making snow when they can and keep it to spread when they need it. T. Brown asked if  
239 the tanker idea was considered in the alternatives; Mr. Fain answered it is not feasible. A.

240 Conroy expressed that some of this analysis is basically static and looking at it as a static design  
241 is not a fair way to compare the options; saying they would need X number of tanks to have the  
242 same capacity as the pond is not a fair analysis.

243

244 Additional Public Comment:

245 Michael Klemens – Did not offer an opinion, but asked for a clarification from Mr. Hackett,  
246 regarding a 300’ line and a 1,000’ line, to show them again and explain what they are, for  
247 the record. (A. Conroy pointed out that the chat function cannot be used to introduce new  
248 material, but read the information contained to the IWWC) Mr. Hackett showed the 100  
249 scale of the existing and proposed site and the 1,000 scale and explained the lines he used,  
250 along with other details. Mr. Klemens commented that he did not get his question  
251 answered; he wants to know what the lines are. Mr. Klemens had another question about  
252 the fill area and the relation of it to the vernal pool at the top of the hill; Mr. Hackett did not  
253 know the location of the vernal pool, if he can get the location, he’ll put it on the map for  
254 the next meeting. Mr. Klemens asked Mr. Hackett to explain the significance of the 300’ and  
255 1,000’ lines; Mr. Hackett described them as arbitrary numbers measured from Moore Brook.  
256 Mr. Klemens commented that the pond is being built more than 300’ from Moore Brook,  
257 but less than 1,000’; Mr. Hackett responded that is correct. **A Motion to Continue the**  
258 **Public Hearing to Tuesday, November 26, 2024 at 6:30pm** was made by J. Landon,  
259 seconded by S. Spillane, **with All in Favor.**

260

261 8. #2024-IW-044 / Stephanie Field Martin and William Todd Spoor / 73 Rocky Lane / Dredge  
262 accumulated sediment on either side of an existing dock / Map 66 / Lot 34 / DOR: 10/28/2024  
263 (At this time, M. Grace left the meeting) Matt Vogt, representing the applicants, was present  
264 and noted that the homeowners had decided on a method for the dredging. Mr. Vogt indicated  
265 that Mr. Spoor had decided to go with the suction method for the dredging rather than continue  
266 with the method that had been done previously; that was the only addition to the narrative. S.  
267 Spillane asked who would be doing the work; Mr. Vogt assumed that his company would be  
268 doing the work and described the methodology. The IWWC was favorable to the methodology  
269 proposed. Mr. Spoor commented that it’s going to be a lot more money because the IWWC is  
270 pushing to have someone else do the work and it seems to him that the IWWC is being punitive  
271 to Jeff (the original contractor) because he started the work without a permit. He asked if the  
272 original contractor could use the same methodology because he has already paid him or if they  
273 are saying only Matt Vogt can do it with his company. A. Conroy pointed out that the IWWC  
274 permits the activity based on what has been proposed; it is not necessarily about who is doing  
275 it, it’s the method that’s being proposed. A. Conroy noted that the question becomes, if it’s  
276 someone else who’s doing the work, are they actually going to follow the protocol that was  
277 outlined in the application; the Motion on the Table is conditioned on the methodology. A.  
278 Conroy asked how to ensure that whoever does the work follows the methodology and how  
279 they are going to guarantee that. Mr. Spoor asked for guidance; if he goes forward with Mr.  
280 Vogt and has to pay him extra to do that, what is the next step? Mr. Spoor asked if Mr. Vogt

281 would have to meet with them and if there is a timeframe that's allowable, such as the spring.  
282 Mr. Spoor mentioned a pre-construction meeting that he had never heard of before. A. Conroy  
283 talked about the Standard Permit Conditions; protocols that would be in place to prevent debris  
284 materials from washing back into the lake, such as installing or using different methods to  
285 protect the wetland in case of extreme weather events. In this case, the method has been  
286 identified; the IWWC could also condition monitoring by a third party at the applicant's expense.  
287 Mr. Spoor asked again about a pre-construction meeting in the spring; A. Conroy responded yes,  
288 there would be a meeting with the contractor then. Mr. Spoor asked specifically about the  
289 timeframe; Mr. Vogt responded that the work should be done before the Hydrilla growing  
290 season, in March/April of next year. Mr. Vogt should get in touch with the Land Use office then.  
291 R. Conklin suggested that monitoring was not necessary; J. Harney and S. Spillane agreed. Mr.  
292 Spoor asked if this method was acceptable to recommend to other people; R. Conklin answered  
293 yes, generally, unless there is a question about what vegetation is being taken out.

294 **Motion: To Approve Application #2024-IW-044, Stephanie Field Martin and William Todd**  
295 **Spoor, 73 Rocky Lane, to dredge accumulated sediment on either side of an existing dock,**  
296 **Subject to the Standard Conditions, including a pre-construction meeting, with work occurring**  
297 **in the March or April timeframe and based on the preferred methodology of suction dredging**  
298 **as proposed in the Narrative provided by the applicant.** The **Motion** was made by R. Conklin,  
299 seconded by J. Harney and unanimously **Approved**.  
300

301 9. #2024-IW-028 / Wake Robin (SLR) / 104 & 106 Sharon Road / Redevelopment and Expansion of  
302 Wake Robin Inn Property / Map 47 / Lot 2 / DOR: 7/22/2024 Extension through November 13,  
303 2024.

304 Mark Arigoni, SLR, gave a progress update, including additional application information  
305 submitted; there were no questions from the IWWC.  
306

307 10. #2024-IW-027 / Salisbury Winter Sports Association, c/o Ken Barker / 80 Indian Cave Road /  
308 Construct a Pond for Water Supply and Snow Making / Map 15 / Lot 25 / DOR: 7/22/2024/  
309 Extension granted to November 29, 2024. Public Hearing Continued to November 25, 2024.  
310

311 11. #2024-IW-036 – No Further Action Required.  
312

313 12. #2024-IW-040 / 280 BTLR LLC (Great Falls Construction) / 280 Between the Lakes Road / To  
314 Relocate a Portion of Between the Lakes Road and Install Drainage Improvements / Map 67 / Lot  
315 07-2 / DOR: 9/23/2024 / Public Hearing Scheduled for November 25, 2024  
316

317 **Adjournment. So Moved** by S. Spillane, seconded by J. Landon and unanimously **Approved**.  
318 The meeting adjourned at 9:15pm.