

January 11, 1005

PRESENT: Dan Hooper, Eric Alexander, Matt Hayes, Karyl Spiller-Walsh

ALSO PRESENT: Susy Affleck-Childs, Mark Louro, Gino Carlucci

Meeting called to order at 7:36 pm

#### CITIZENS COMMENTS

Dan – any citizen comments?

Karyl – I have noted that there are still chevrons at CVS looking worse and worse – shredded

Dan – I went to BOS mtg last night – for 2-4 Main St site plan approval – it was the easiest thing I have ever been involved – john willisam chaired – minimal comments – malcom porter and henry marcel reprsetned bob potheau who was elsewhere e- at the moment of truth when selectman rozanski asked the applicant if they had anyobjectins to the waivers and conditions – the comment was NO we do not. That was a huge step forward – they got approved last night. To your question – one of hteother item s- was sign violation form that Susy had drafted and mimicked another form that Bob uses – raphella recommended it go to town counsel before it is used – the form is to be used by pb, drc and anyone else and submitted to the BOS who would send a communcatio of some sort to the alleged offender – need to cite an actual infraction to the sign bylaw – then they can go ahead with a letter – the ultimate responsibility is the zoning enforcement officer – this is an effort to relieve him of some burden.

Karyl – what was upshot of discussion re: who would be the delivery officer - then who after

Dan – the BOS will send a note/letter - say at the end this is yournotification to make the change – please do so – if not it will go to the ZEO for further action to follow up face to face – this should probably focus on non-size things

Dan – we are waiting for Alan DeToma to arrive –

#### CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION

ICE – poured concrete behind the curb – perfect

West Haven 40B project  
Fox Run 40B project

Karyl – both are very dense developments; asking for many waivers right away from the ZBA's 40B regs – I thought Mark should be present at some of the initial presentations – I was shooting from the hip looking at the detention pond – it was enormous – again, there was a suggestion that was a unit 12 feet

Mark – I haven't seen anything on these yet.

Karyl – there are already water issues – it has been built to a 25 year storm level only –

Mark – that doesn't conform to the stormwater management policy

Karyl – somebody from vhb should have been there early on to give input on those matters – have to get the numbers down

Alan arrive at 7:45 pm –

## PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION – Wingate Farm Subdivision Modification

Karyl – I will recuse myself

]

Gene Walsh

Rachel Walsh

Steve Poole

Dan – For those of you who might not have had a chance to read your packet – we are in receipt of the last revisions for engineering a week ago Monday – there was not sufficient time to construct a written review at this time. But there are a number of other issues we can take up at this time.

Mark – the plans were received on Jan 3 – we wouldn't have been able to get a letter done by Friday – the engineer doing the drainage review had a family emergency and was not able to complete

DRAFT Waiver Requests – At the top of this is a list of the waivers approved with the original subdivision plan – this matters because we are now comparing the new waiver requests to the existing approved plan.

Attach and make a part of these minutes –

Dan – this is what will ultimately be included in the certificate of action – let's take some time to review –

Gino – they may not need a waiver from 4.1.1 or 4.1.2 – cause to waive it may imply that it could meet the standards at some point in time - standard cross section only applies to things that are to be accepted

Dan – we have tended to go section by section when we have these discussions –

Matt read aloud

4.1.1 and 4.1.2 –

waiver not needed for 4.1.1

4.2.6.8 – pavement material

photos provided from Emerald Farm in Bellingham – Granite Street

steve – we are trying to track down somebody who can give us some information

dan – we are looking for some historical reference elsewhere that the material over some length of time has performed as promised because neither we nor VHB had much experience with this – in a private way application, something that we are willing to consider – I thought it was understood that we would see a letter – verification from a third party

mark – minimize maintenance and provide stability

Rachel – the person that owns emerald farm is Mike DiNapoli – he is in construction –

Dan – that is a driveway that you showed us

Rachel – it access the house and a riding facility

Mark – what is the slope on that site?

Steve – steeper than our site

Motion by matt and seconded by alan – extend deadline to February 11, 2005 - all yes

Continue to February 8 at 7:35 pm – matt, alan – all yes

-----  
8:45 pm – brief break

\*\*\*\*\*

8:50 p.m. - Informal Subdivision Discussion – Daniel L'Etoile for 22 Milford Street

Daniel – my property is at 22 Milford Street – 1.47 acres. The next property to the west is a horse farm – I want to divide the land to get another lot –

Alan – are you proposing that the house would stay

Daniel – no – the barn would have to go as well.

Dan – real problem is with the lot shape factor – those are ZBA issues –

Daniel – can we eliminate the cul de sac? Sue talked about a hammerhead alternative

Dan – in the context of a private way subdivision – under the regs that we are soon to be approving we are adding two categories of road – private way (2 & 3 lot) and neighborhood (for up to 5 lots)

Mark – you will need some of that layout to create a T –

Dan – but the T ends can serve as the driveway ends to the property

Alan – but moving forward, I would like to see the driveway on route 109 to come off the new road

Mark – the right of way for the road is too narrow - needs to be 45 feet for a private way – paved width needs to be 18 –

Karyl – is there any uplands issues here?

Daniel – it would still need to be 45 foot right of way?

Dan – yes –we shouldn't spend any more time designing this – it is a good size lot but if it has constraints with wetlands in the back and access width – and domino effect of adequate LSF, frontage and area –

---

#### Pine Meadow Public Hearing Continuation

Paul Desimone  
Matt Barnett –

Dan – a couple of documents to give to you – one is a draft certificate of action and the other is a review of the prosoinal study

Paul – we have something else we want to show you – we did a septic design for lot # 3

Dan – any concern with the location of the leeching field to the detention pond and leeching field to catch basin?

Mark – stormwater management policy may be more stringent than this – have Barbara take a look at that to make sure –

Paul – bill fisher will need to do a review of this

Paul – getting back to the subdivision itself – what we didn't put in the report was that if we shorten the road 107 feet to get to 600 feet deadend – but if you add up all the area, you have six to seven lots – now those are duplex lots in this zone – so what we could offer for further mitigation – if we get 8 single family homes with the longer dead end vs. 6 2-family buildnigs

And 2 1 family lots.

Matt – if we have to move the roadway back, we would do

Paul – besides a sidewalk on both sides, we would restrict two of the

8 lot proposed with approval of 107 foot dead end waiver – all single family lots no matter what size vs. the alternative is to meet the rules and regs of the planning board relative to the dead end length but the applicant is saying that they would seek duplex status for 6 of the 8 lots.

Dan – can the PB dictate what happens on those lots

Gino – they can offer to do

Karyl – 8 single family vs. 6 -7 duplex lots (12-14 units)

Matt – I originally came in for 3 lots -

Dan – interesting that it took us a long time to get to this option –

Dan – since we are on the professional study – you have a review from PGC Associates – I would ask gino to give us an overview

Gino – interestingly, the main theme that I wrote about, he never mentioned in the report anything about impacts of a complying layout – nothing about the benefits or detriments of that to their proposal – he outlined 6 points

Topography saying that it precludes a loop road – but it doesn't preclude a complying layout

Zoning – he mentions zoning that based on area and frontage there are 8 lots – he said the rules and regs should be waived to allow maximum compliance under zoning

Dan - Gino – can you elaborate on your point #2

Gino – the bylaw deals with lots and sub regs deal with roadway and drainage –

Paul – in the case of the zoning, my statement is that the layout meets frontage, area and shape factor and maximizing the use of the land

Dan – but that is not the only requirement of a subdivision proposal

Paul – after that fact is what you end up with the length of the road,

Dan – that is determined by the PB – you need to fulfill them currently

Paul – zoning, to maximize the land – either you go to waivers thru subdivision rules and regs or you seek a variance to the zba – the mechanism for the waiving

Dan – the PB rules and regs are not related to zoning – they are related to subdivision control law that allow us to come up with standards that are in the towns best interest and not outside spirit of law – dead end length standards – we feel it is good planning practice to adhere to them – the fact that somebody is trying to max out their parcel has zero relevance to us – just like the zba does not look at our rules and regs for their decisions

Paul – I don't find zoning to be contracticotry – but your rules and regs are

Paul – in order to maximize his piece of land and he is entitled to do that – the only way for him to do that is to get waivers from the PB

Alan – Gino, please explain more your #2

Gino – that is Paul's claim – waivers are supposed to be in the best interest of the town not necessarily for the land owner

Dan – there is a bigger and broader concern for the town's benefit.

Gino – soils are appropriate and perked well for 8 lots and both did not object – I don't know why they would object – same would be true on road location for concom – length issue is not important to them

Paul – the only points I was making is that both and concom are town boards and they don't have a problem with it

Dan – but that is not in their purview in their roles as board members

Paul – you ask for comments from the other boards

Matt – we don't question where the wetland lines are determined

Paul – but you asked if a house could fit on that lot

Paul – how many times have you been out to the site?

Alan – I don't think it is germane

Dan – I have been there

Paul – I think you should go out to every other site

Dan – gino, any other comments

Gino – not really – the drainage is mentioned

Paul – 1966 anr plan – back then the road length requirement was for 400 – the PB approved an ANR plan leaving a 50 roadway opening

Mark – town cant dictate how many road openings ther should have been

Dan – wehave nothing to report as far as responses to VHB's last letter

Paul – we are still waiting for Barbara thissel

Mark – so the NOV 19 letter addresses –

Dan – we are at the last feasible date

Paul – not a problem to do an extension –

Dan – what is your pleasure? Based on what has been proposed

Eric –

Dan – can we assume that stormwater drainage design would work with the alternative design

Paul – if we kept it the same, it would be overdesinged

Alan – if this is a plan that complies with the town's rules and regs – then lets make it this plan that complies, so we can evaluate it

Dan – verbally it was conveyed tonight – In my opinion, that verbal conveyance satisfies my need to see a compliant plan – I think I have enough info from what Mark has seen – clarify 6 or 7 lots – one of the coniserations is at what point to extend further –

Paul – I honestly feel comfortable with 6 lots at 30,000 sq. ft but if I was to sit down and recalculate it oculd be 7

Mark – if you went with duplexes would the footprints change? Larger structgures, larger septics?

Paul – septics wouldn't have any impact on the drainage?

Matt – I think we figured 60 by 40 footprints for the single family house; - alan has asked him to redraw it

Alan – I am not asking for that, the rules and regs

Dan – we are talking about a comparison – that is what was asked for at the beginning – I would have liked to have been afforded 135 days plus extensions to contemplate the comparison what you are saying you will do in a threatening tone – now we are getting it today – if anybody has a right to be hot and heavy, it is us.

Paul – I can calc it – it is not a big deal – I didn't have time to do it for tonight.

Duplex size would be 30 by 40 –

Paul – I am pretty sure she took 25% impervious surface area for the calcs

Mark – I feel pretty good about that – what about garages on each plus two driveways –

Mark – just come up with some calcs to verify it. –

Paul – 25% if based on 8 lots

Karyl – what is the buffer for duplexes?

Alan – I just have to say – you do this and figure out that is what you wanted to do all along, - I got no problem –

Paul – he wants to live on lot #3 – this is to show the best interest of the town thing –

Alan – not to mention that he couldn't have 6 single family lots too –

Susy – how many single family lots could you do with a compliant roadway

Paul – 7

Karyl – so what is wrong with 7?

Paul – he wants 8

Dan – the regulations that we are proposing –

Paul – we would do sidewalks all around; and we

Dan – dual sidewalk subdiviosn serving Fisiher Street with no sidewalks?? That serves no public purpose

Paul – I forgot to mention – we got rid of the retaining wall – cause he got a grading easement – and we gave a bit of land to be deeded to abutter –

Dan – originally we intended to vote on findings – we need to hold off on that



Dan – you are presenting new information – with a more finite description of what hteoption would be under this scenario

Paul -0 will give you some numbers for the drainage

Dan – this is absolutely critical to our findings discussion

Extension – Motion to extend to 2-28-05 – matt, seconded by alan – all yes

Dan – it is clear that things in excess of 600 feet matters –

Paul – everybody is trying to cram stuff into tight boxes –

Motion to continue thepublic hearing for pine meadow to January 25 at 8:15 pm – alan – eric  
All yes

---

The Haven Public Hearing Contnuation –

Rick Merrikin – we didn't meet last time even tho we submitted revisied plans – we only had the original comments

Rick – what we have done – we have changed the layout to do a conentional cul de sac layout and 3 lots which still have required area and one might be suitable for a two family – afer layout we went and put a similar reduced construction roadway – you guys presented me with your future standards for aprivte way – we have shown it as a 20 foot private way with a T – we had a water quality swale and there was conern it was in the layout – we replced the open basin with an underground infiltratins syste – so there are two catch basins at end of road and a water quality tank and then an infiltratoinssystem – so the chambers are close to the property line to get them out of the right of way – we presented this sceanior to the concom and we are grading right up to the wetlands line and they are OK with it – they will accept this – so that is what we have – we submitted our waiver list and we got commjents back from VHB and then I got most recent comments back yesterday on the newest plan s- most of the items left on the list are minor but there are a couple of things I want to discuss with you

First thing – mark asked that we put the designation Private Way on the cover sheet –

Susy = private way subdivision

Rick – mark has brought up a couple times a requirement for a vertical curb – I am just not sure it is appropait – what we did here is – inorder to prevent the water coing down fisher into the property, we left accomodation for a gutter – mark's comment is that we should have a vertical curb at this point – I can do it, but it seems kind of silly to me –

Matt – couldn't you put a vertical curve in and k eep the gutter

Rick – what we have for a rise in slope is not much – It just seems a bit of a waste

Mark – what are the grades? What are the angle? If it is less than 1%, then you don't need a curve – if it is 15 feet

Karyl – he did say that there is a possibility that one of these units could be a duplex

Rick – I am not sure if there is a room for a duplex – that is up to them if they want to approach it

Mark – a 2% break merits a curve

Rick – you state in the ar2 zoning that the parking area needs to be 10 foot away. I believe that only applies to a 2 family or a conversion – I hope Mark will take it off the list – I don't think it really applies – I think it really only pertains to two family

Rick – the other issue – is the infiltratin system – concom would love it if we could slide it up – 2 possibilities –

If you are concerned about it being under the right of way – you could waive the layout to half a circle and let us put it in – we have proved it can be done

#2 – why not allow us to put the drainage structures in the right of way in that part that is not being used for anything – if it extends beyond the right of way it would need a drainage easemtn – that would relieve you of needed to waive the steep slope in the back – I think overall it is a good idea

mark – would you have to

rick – usually the process in a road is to grant easement rights over the entire road for all utilites – it is already an easement anyway – if any of it extends beyond – I don't see any problem –

mark – the genesis of the comment was when you had the pond in the right of way –

gino – I also believe it was proposed as a public way before.

Dan – two thoughts – one is – have we heard back from Dave D'Amico related to the detneiton basins being in the right of way – I thought that was something that was a concern to DPS if it had been a public way.

Dan – the other concern – was the potential for cointnuation of this road someday to what we know is an expansive area that this could connect. – I am not sure that a cul de sac designed this way is in the best interst of medway –

Rick – if you want that to continue through, we can draw it that way.

Dan – it is a matter of likelihoods, do we think that this way would ever serve as a continuation of a massive development beyond –

Karyl – there is no way you can tell without seeing a better locus

Rick – boston Edison back here – ffff

Rick – you can contemplate that

Dan – if it is proposed as a private way, the ownership falls to the midline how does that work with a hammerhead

Rick – usually it would be common ownership of the roadway –

Dan – so if it were ever to be extended, all three parties would have to agree to do so

Rick – I really don't think it is an issue here

Dan – we run into problems if things

Rick – you have to make a determination whether you want to ensure road extension provision – we can do it either way – it is really up to you guys

Dan – I think when we have a request from the conglom on something like this

Dan – private way puts the question to bed

Rick – we use h-20 loading for the infiltration system – same thing we do with houses with septic tanks – that is really all the big issues we have – I have a couple of questions I don't understand –

Susy

Rick – what width do you want?

Alan – how is it drawn now?

Mark – would 18 feet get you down to the problem on the 2 year storm

Dan- board I saying 20 feet

Rick – how do you want to put in the infiltration basin

Dan – gino, any comments on this issue – likelihood for continuation with wetlands, etc.

Gino – I don't think there is any problem as long as it is in the private way

Mark – OK

Dan – what is the preference> - one is that it goes under the right of way with a little drainage easement or the other option is to modify the cul de sac layout to a half circle

OK to move it into the right of way – hammerhead OK

Rick – cape cod berm for everything

Dan – so that will need a waiver

Rick – it is on the plans

Rick – the only other item is the two year storm – the 2 year storm calcs are so small

Dan – you are adjusting the system now,

Rick – the numbers are so small – because it is going off the grass –

Dan – cul tech units on the houses?

Dan – we are pretty hard and fast on the stormwater

Rick – I may just do it on one house – just fractions of cfs –

Alan – make it go away – deal with it –

Dan – if it can be achieved, then do it.

Susy – need to provide sample homeowners association;

Rick – I think it is all the issue s-

Rick – there are some items here that I forgot and there are some items that are on the plan that VHB didn't pickup –

Mark – they are proposing deciduous trees –

Rick – we did it the way

Matt – let's stick with our standard and get them back –

Rick – do we have to chase further comments?

Dan – it helps to have them in hand for you – we do ask for them initially?

Susy – we really want to see something from fire, police and water/sewer

Rick – I am sure that the next go around we will have it worked out with Mark –

\motion to extend to February 28 – matt, alan =-

continue to feb 8 at 8:30 pm – eric, alan –

rick – maybe we should meet directly to go over –

mark – conference call

Bill masterson

Rick – bill wanted me to mention the fact that louis checksi has agreed to do some fencing along his side of the land

Mark – there is a strip of land – that will be donated

Karyl – what kind of fencing

Rick – wood stockade – it is not your issue – it is not any requirement of yours – it is a private deal – mr. mateson just wanted you to be aware of this –

---

127 Main Street

Karyl – recuse

Chan Rogers joined the meeting

Mark – this was delivered to us last week on January 3,

Dan – we discussed a revised draft – before I open it up to the applicant – do you board members have any comments –

Eric – is this the time to begin a discussion about what uses will ultimately be allowed

Dan – yes, this is – the issue, as you may recall, was whether or not the board interpreted the AUOD bylaw to be restrictive or less restrictive – in the restrictive approach, the board would be quite specific as to what was proposed at the time of application as opposed to the less restrictive that would give the applicant the pleasure to have any of the allowable uses in the bylaw – I would say that initially, my thoughts were to – that the intent was to have enough oversight so that we would be in the more restrictive category – should the use change, we should review a modification to the permit – after thinking about it some more – I am moving a bit away from

that – I think we should consider the more restrictive approach – I would rather err on the side of caution because we have heard from some neighbors express concern about density – if the proposal is for an insurance usage today and 6 years down the road and a proposal came in for a coffee shop/café, that presents to me a whole different scenario of considerations potentially in terms of traffic, parking, access, in terms of what kinds of things – outdoor umbrellas – that then begs the question whether we wrote our AUOD bylaw well enough – I just don't know if we are there

Matt – I think it should be somewhat restrictive – I agree with you about the café and I had an issue with hair dressers that might generate

Dan – so food service

Matt – and personal care services

Alan – a nail place vs. a haircut place – you could have a dozen in an area

Matt – so I was thinking that somewhere in between the two options would be a good option

Alan – I think the board has to be careful of those very issues you raised – if we proceed down the path on having it on a more restrictive side – I wouldn't want it to be so burdensome on the applicant that it wipes out the benefit

Eric – I would come at the compromise from the opposite direction – I want to be sensitive to the neighbors concern – I believe the appropriate time for the neighbors to have expressed their concerns was at town meeting when the AUOD was discussed and adopted – the whole purpose is to revitalize the properties along route 109 and to ensure that the incentive does not go away, we may start a precedent that it becomes unattractive if we are too restrictive – I just want to make sure there are two sides to that precedent issues

Chan – I feel there are so many variations up and down the street from single family homes to businesses – I don't feel we should open it up to the applicant to choose whatever he wants – how much of a problem is it to come back to the board for a specific use change – it is fairly simple.

Dan – that is kind of how I was feeling too – I kind of like the compromise approach that Matt is presenting here – early on here we want to make sure that we are doing this to serve the intent of the bylaw – based on this – we are not restricting the uses that are outlined we are just saying that we would want to revisit it on some of the uses – if there are no impacts

Alan – the allowed uses under the AUOD – do we have the right to extract

Matt – yes,

Dan – I definitely want to open this up to your comments – Ted, I know where

John fernandes – I think we can repeat some of the things we talked about last time – from an owners perspective, there are a lot of things that determine whether this is an attractive bylaw – one is flexibility – you can sit there and say it is a slam dunk to come back – I know that this just isn't so – from teds perspective, he is making a financial investment – he is going to have a partner who is a lender – they get more sketchy the more restrictive – if you make this specific to the reardon insurance agency only – he just wont continue – if his tenant leaves and he has to come back here, his lender will not like that – a different board – what I look to these kinds of processes to do is to develop a site – and that is certainly what you have done – certain architecture, design for the site for landscaping and parking – the most critical aspect of that is parking – in teds case, it is probably going to be OK to exclude food and personal care – but ultimately what drives use at this site is parking – dominos pizza just wont work – it is not the kind of thing the board has to analyze – the site itself restricts – so if somebody wanted to put an outdoor café, there is no permission for a patio – if you want to say he can do just certain uses that is probably OK – the market is going to control.

Dan – you are wrong – look at cumberland farms and dominos – that is a disaster – from a practical end use – so all I am saying is that the board's consideration of restricting one or two uses and all others being fine that is where I think we are settling out to.

John – I have worked with many business clients who say simply that they cant go there because there is not enough parking –

Ted – the one thing I will say – dan's pizza, you want to rent space from me – are you going to pay rent knowing that you will have only a few spaces

Dan – that is when people start parking in the driveway – people will try to do things that they shouldn't do – I don't know what the answer is – from an early on standpoint with this I get a little unnerved with the idea of a food or personal care services – maybe we should make some special considerations for food service operations

Dan – the other item was for the board to consider was the issue – will the permit carry with ownership – I don't care about that at all – it should just continue on.

Chan – whatever decision is made applies to the property no matter who owns it

Dan – I think we want it to run with the land and not the owner

Eric – my rule is making this as flexible and as attractive as possible to investors -

Karyl – just a concern that hypothetically, the ownership changes, you want to make sure that there is a consistency of the quality of the building – we are trying to keep these properties pristine and prestigious – one thing about renewing the permit is that then you have an opportunity to review the condition of the property when it changes.

Dan – it is true, but I personally don't see that as a business friendly approach – as an attraction to somebody coming in to buy that property to have to go thru a process to keep the [permit -= that is one of the

John – have we come to resolution on the allowed uses?

Alan – I think we may want to consider excluding the food services

Alan – if he had 3 more acres of land at the back, he would have ample capacity for additional parking – I think extracting the restaurant use is appropriate

John – you have a list of uses in the AUOD - #5 is food services and #7 are personal care services

Dan – let's consider those two – Personally, I think #5 only should be restricted

Karyl – you wouldn't want to restrict a catering business -

Steve poole – could you make it a restriction that they would come back for that purpose

John – Ted is saying it is OK to remove food services

Alan – I think that is the way to go as long as he can come back in for reconsideration

Chan – I think 5 and 7 be eliminated .

Dan – I think we have the

Alan – I want them to come back for 5 and 7 –

Dan – so 5 and 7 should come back –

John – so write it in such a way that it is clear to future boards that those are not permanent exclusions –

# 9

continue to January 25

11:50 pm – karyl returns

-----

confirm our submittals for fall town meeting – for consideration

\*\*\*\*\*



2005 Annual Town Meeting – second Monday in May

OSRD – Westborough and Hopkinton – meet at medway high school at 9 am – aim to be back by noon

Site Plan Review and Approval mendments – susy and dan are going to work very aggressively to have a draft for you - small projects, major products – development review council – pre application hootenanny

AUOD bylaw –

List – see assignments

---

Avellino Medway Gardens – asking for sponsorship of rezoning this property –

10 minutes –

---

response letter to paul desimone –

edits to be made

board signed

\*\*\*\*\*

Invoices

Refund to Eugene Walsh refund on site plan application –matt, alan – all yes – Karyl recuse

Refund - Wicket Way Definitive – matt, alan- all yes

Refund to Dan Hoopper 77.25 – travel expenses in relation to lawsuit – alan , karyl – all yes – dan recuse

Plan review – PGC Associates – 962.50 – motion by matt, alan – karyl recuse

Plan review – VHB 1760.51 – motion by eric, alan – all yes – matt recuxse

Plan review VHB/12/1 - – total – alan, eric – matt recuxe; karyl recuse

Contracted services VHB – 409.74 – motion by alan, karyl – all yes – matt recuse

Consulting servicdes – PGC – 1312.50 – motion by matt, alan – all yes

Construction observation VHB – 6921.19 – moiton by eric, alan – all yes – matt recuxse

---

Distribute budget submittal and Forest Edge letter

Motion to adjourn – matt – karyl –

12:35 am –