

Town of Lakeville
Conservation Commission
Tuesday March 23, 2021
7:00 pm – Remote meeting

Members present: Chairman Robert Bouchard, Joseph Chamberlain, John LeBlanc, Mark Knox, Josh Faherty, and Nancy Yeatts. This was a remote meeting and recorded by LakeCam.

4 Fieldstone Drive – NOI – Zenith Consulting Engineers. Jamie Bissonnette from Zenith was present for discussion. This is a proposal for a single-family dwelling with septic system and well. The septic system is out of the 100' buffer zone, the house, accessory grading, tree removal, proposed well, and a small portion of the paved driveway are within the 100' buffer zone. In the back of this property is an intermittent stream with a bordering vegetated wetland that runs along the stream. Member Yeatts said because of the slope, on the hay bale line she would like to see 5' spacing on the wooden stakes instead of 10. Mr. Bissonnette said that was reasonable. Chairman Bouchard said this site is very rocky with large boulders throughout and asked what difficulties were anticipated for construction. Mr. Bissonnette said he did not have an answer since he didn't do the perc tests on site. They were done by SFG Associates and the perc tests were good with nice sands down around 4 ½ feet. Member Knox asked if there was a proposed detention basin for any pump off. Mr. Bissonnette said they did not provide a dewatering basin because they didn't encounter any ground water on the test pits. Steve Gilbert from SFG was at the site in April of 2007 and didn't encounter any ground water until about 108", but they won't be near that elevation. Member Chamberlain asked if the perc test was still good after all these years. Mr. Bissonnette said in speaking with the Board of Health, he believes that any perc test done by Larry Perry is still valid. Member Faherty asked about the southwest corner of the house, since the hill seemed steep, he asked if they were going to step it out or if it would just be a slope. Mr. Bissonnette said he believed it was a 3:1 slope over on the side and wouldn't be surprised if the applicant wants to taper it a little bit but it would be pretty close to this grade. Chairman Bouchard said the stream is really close to the back of the house lot. Mr. Bissonnette said it's about 50' off the proposed structure. Ashley Evers-Bruninghaus (77 Pickens St.) said her property also abuts with the intermittent stream. She wanted to know if there would be any activity in the 25' buffer since the house is pretty close. Mr. Bissonnette said they show the 25' buffer to the wetland flags, which is off of the stream and they do have a little bit of grading in the back which is just catching the back yard. The house is about 44.6' off the wetland, so probably about 50' from the stream. In the back would be a grass back yard. Ms. Bruninghaus asked if in the 25' buffer there could be a tree removal. They have a lot of trees, a lot of different ecosystems going on there. Mr. Bissonnette said the tree removal will be back to the proposed silt sock, it will be approximately 10' off the stream and 5' off the wetland flags in one area and then the rest of it will be much further. Ms. Bruninghaus said pretty much all the trees. Chairman Bouchard asked if they could do some type of planting to delineate the edge of the wetland area. Some shrubbery, a few saplings. Mr. Bissonnette said he didn't see a problem putting a vegetated line when they are done and the ground is established. Ms. Bruninghaus said their concern overall as a neighbor is that they have the top of the stream and naturally keeps going down, should there be any sort of natural movement of scooping out or dealing with the rocks and boulders, long term what kind of effect that would have for the whole ecosystem in the area. Mr. Bissonnette said their intention is not to have any impact on the stream at all. If for some reason the stream over top of the banks and go

beyond it, what would happen is this walkout basement in the back and the grading pitches it down in the same direction it's going now. So, it would continue to flow down and head down in the same southerly direction. There would be no moves to create any type of damning effect or any significant grade changes. Ms. Bruninghaus envisioned that if the trees were cut that close to the stream and over time dirt gets pushed in and then it's dammed up, then they're trying to traverse that and it creates an effect upstream. Chairman Bouchard said any work such as that would still be subject to Commission review and approval. Anything within the 100' buffer zone is still within jurisdiction even after the Order of Conditions (OOC) is issued and the house is built. If there was to be any of that kind of activity, it would require a permit from the Commission and review and approve or not approve depending on the circumstances. Member Knox added that it could trigger a violation. Chairman Bouchard said if it was something that wasn't allowed under the OOC. Member Chamberlain asked Ms. Bruninghaus how long she has owned her property. She responded that they have been there not quite four years. Member Chamberlain asked if she was familiar with the flow characteristics and does it ever over top of banks. She replied that it has, in the first few years they were there a big rainstorm came through and it did over top. Member Chamberlain said she would be in a good position to tell if downstream from her there was something that was backing this up and she would contact the Commission and it would be in their jurisdiction to look it over. Member Yeatts asked if the roof run off was being infiltrated. Mr. Bissonnette said it was not. This is an 8 ½ acre parcel and they didn't include roof infiltration. Member Yeatts added that she was thinking about the run off from the roof going down the hill.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to close the hearing and issue an Order of Conditions with all the standard conditions for construction, a vegetated buffer will be planted along the line of the proposed silt sock, and a five-foot spacing on wooden stakes along the same silt sock barrier.
Unanimous approval.

63B Bedford St – Warren Trask – Extension of Order of Conditions. Steve Comb from Prime Engineering was present to represent Warren Trask. They are requesting a three-year extension on an Order of Conditions. Member Knox said he remembered this filing, there was a proposed addition to the property. He asked if anything was done. The representative from Warren Trask, Dan Mayer said they started some of the tree removal but it's been put on hold indefinitely and that was more towards where the wetlands, where the tracks are, in the back of the property. They are looking to put up one of the three-sided sheds that was approved as part of this filing. They are not asking to change anything on the filing, just extend the Order of Conditions. Member Yeatts said they had granted great leeway on the back portion of the property and there's so much wetland on the front portion, the applicant had considered agreeing to not developing that front portion because the wetlands are pretty extensive on the front portion along Bedford Street. The representative said they are not looking to do anything along the front of Bedford Street. Member Chamberlain asked if there was some question about paving and degree or percentage of coverage of that lot. Mr. Mayer said it was approved, they were over 50%, but they are not looking to extend any pavement beyond what's already been approved. Chairman Bouchard said it has been a while since he walked that property, but he recalled that the rear is made up of very steep slopes. Mr. Mayer said it was more of a swale that once you get beyond it, it would flatten out so they were kind of leveling the ground. Along the border on the left-hand side there is a steep slope there that they are not looking to get anywhere near, anywhere closer to than they already are.

Member Faherty asked if the three-sided shed is on the western side of the property. Mr. Mayer said it was parallel to the back of building three.

Upon a motion made by Member LeBlanc, seconded by Member Chamberlain, it was:

Voted: to approve the extension for 63B Bedford St., extension of the Order of Conditions for three years with a start date of November of 2020.

Unanimous approval.

12 Juniper St – NOI – Foresight Engineering. Darren Michaelis from Foresight was present for discussion. This property has a failed septic system on a dead-end road in Clark Shores with the end of the road collecting the main drainage for most of the neighborhood and therefore creating a wetland. This is a tributary to the surface water supply. They will be within 100' so they will be installing a pre-treatment system, a MicroFAST. The new leach field will be going exactly where the old leach field was but it will be raised above ground. The new tank will go exactly where the old tank was with the blower unit in that area along with the pre-treatment system. The property is limited on area due to the location of the well and abutting wells. Chairman Bouchard asked about the rocky area adjacent to the leach field and what looks like standing water, but this is actually part of the stream. Mr. Michaelis said the wetland, definitely when there's heavy flow, you can see all the rocks are exposed at the beginning of the wetland, there's a steep slope down at the end of Juniper Road. There's no steady flow, it's just kind of a ponding area, everything ponds there and gets collected by the paper road that's on the back lots that's not shown here, there was paper road that was actually built that kind of cuts off the wetland. There is a house on Evergreen that's right behind this property that is new construction that blocks out all the flow off, there's no wetlands on that property at all. So, this is really just a trapped area in vacant land and collects a lot of the runoff drainage and it is probably true groundwater at that point. Member Yeatts asked if they were just putting silt fence. Mr. Michaelis said it's already a lawn area that the entire lot is pretty well disturbed right up to the stone wall, and then there's a brush line where you can see there's a road that is used to access the shed, so the tree line is bumped up. The ground is kind of raised, so putting a silt fence right in front of the brush, in front of the rock wall, that's a foot tall should be more than sufficient, and that's only for construction.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member LeBlanc, it was:

Voted: to close the hearing and issue an Order of Conditions with all our standard conditions.

Unanimous approval.

2 Bedford St. – continued – NOI – Cape & Islands Engineering. Raul Lizardi was present from Cape & Islands Engineering. The abutters from Middleboro have been notified and a copy of the notifications and plans have been sent to the Middleboro Conservation Department. At the last meeting the Board asked if an environmental assessment had been done on this property. The property owner said there was a phase one assessment done which concluded that there was no need for any further evaluation on the site. The Fire Department said there have been no reports of hazardous waste or materials on this site. At the last meeting another item mentioned was providing the Planning Board with copies of this application. Mr. Lizardi said there is another consultant that is putting together the application for the Planning Board. There have been no changes to the site plan since the last meeting. Overall the plan will improve the existing conditions. The existing septic tanks are less than 50' to the wetland and the leaching field is about 70' from the wetland. They are moving the entire system outside of the Conservation jurisdiction and also higher elevations to provide greater separation to groundwater.

Member Yeatts said she liked the look of this project, she liked the rain gardens. She did a site visit and said the wetlands need to be cleaned up, there was a pile of brush that was right on the wetland line that's been cleared and thrown there. Some conditions will need to be added about how to go about cleaning up some of that wetland area that has trash in it. She had a hard time with the flags because there were old flags, older flags, and new flags that look just like the boundary flags. There are some flags she doesn't necessarily agree with. She would like to walk the wetland line with whoever did it, but she didn't think it would affect their project overall, but she would just like to get it right. There is a 52-page stormwater report and she would like to run it by a consultant to make sure that it's all correct. Mr. Lizardi said he understood about the cleaning of the wetland, but one thing to keep in mind, it was brought up that the wetland except for maybe five square feet of that wetland is located on somebody else's property so the condition of cleaning up the wetland cannot be put on this applicant because it will be trespassing over someone else's property. They understand there are some existing tanks that are near the property line, when those tanks are removed, some of that material can be removed from the site, but going onto abutting properties to clean up the wetland, he didn't know if they could have this applicant take on that task. Chairman Bouchard said they wouldn't ask them to go on private property, to go over the town line or property line just to do whatever clean-up was necessary on the Lakeville side. The site plan has some notes for the site to be cleaned daily and any blown debris that does crossover the property lines onto abutting properties will be subject to this applicant and contractor to clean and rectify. Chairman Bouchard asked Member Yeatts if she would like to have the flags verified and they could have them re-surveyed and included on the plan of record. She responded that she didn't know if it has to do with surveying or they need to be moved. The problem is some of them that are in a "v", if you go from one flag to the next flag and look back they're not at the top of the bank. There aren't that many to be moved but it's an area that seems closest to what's going on. She also wanted to know what kind of siltation barrier they would use. Mr. Lizardi said at the prior hearing it was discussed that the erosion control was preferred to be the compost rolls and they have no problem using that. There was a brief discussion about the wetland line. Mr. Lizardi said near wetland flags 16 and 17, there is a concrete structure in the wetland. They don't know what it is, but it isn't on the applicant's property. It's not part of the septic system for the old restaurant. Member LeBlanc said he concurred with Member Yeatts that they need a peer review of this. He also asked if the Commission could get a copy of the 21E, the initial one that was done. The applicant did not get a copy so Mr. Lizardi did not know if one was completely finished if phase one determined that no further action was needed. Member LeBlanc asked if the Commission could get a copy of the phase one. Mr. Lizardi said he would ask the applicant to submit whatever he's got. He didn't have one when contacted. Member LeBlanc asked when the assessment had been done. Mr. Lizardi did not know. Member LeBlanc said he would just like to know when the 21E was done and if the Commission could get a copy of it. He was concerned about the area of the property where the garage was. Member Knox also concurred with the peer review to look at storm water and lot coverage. He said the representative for the project should go in front of the Planning Board and get that going at the same time so this Board or that Board aren't conditioning on separate approvals as there is an overlap. One of the biggest things he sees is with all the pavement. They have gone through this with another project where peer review engineers recommend planting of large deciduous trees to shade the pavement to avoid the heat island effect. Chairman Bouchard asked if he was recommending a dual peer review. Member Knox replied that Conservation should recommend a stormwater review and he would want the peer review engineer to look at the amount of pavement and the heat island effect to see if there is mitigation with trees. That information should be shared with the Planning Board because they would look at that as well. Member Knox said he thought more trees should be included in the plan, they will need to by the time this gets

to the Planning Board. Member Faherty said he would like to see something from the phase one saying that there was nothing to be concerned about. With this having to go in front of the Planning Board, he thought getting those wetland flags in the correct place, just if the Planning Board ends up with a design change, it could come into play. He continued, if we don't think that is where the wetland line is, we should change it to get it right. Member Chamberlain asked if there were any abutters from Middleboro on the meeting. Steve McCarthy from 19 Tinkham Lane had a couple of questions. He was concerned with the back of the building because that's his property line. He wanted to know if any of the existing trees would be torn out, if there was going to be any added and will there be any fencing put up. Prior to the A-Frame building being torn down, the vacant parking lot became a source of people that really shouldn't be there. He does have video cameras in the back of his house as does his neighbor. They had people coming through the parking lots into their backyards trying to get into the house and into the sheds. When the A-Frame was there, there were people living inside and they had to call the Lakeville Police to come down and remove them. There was also an auto shop or garage of some sort and at some point, there was someone living in that as well. He wanted to know if there'd be any fencing put up as a minor deterrent. From the plan, it looks as though there is going to be a drive through in the back of the building. With no one there at night, obviously a shielded spot for somebody to walk through those woods. Mr. Lizard said they had not been instructed to install or propose fencing anywhere on the property yet. He said he wouldn't be surprised if when the application package is put together for the Planning Board with a landscape plan, some fencing is installed. There was a brief discussion regarding landscaping. Member Knox told Mr. McCarthy that would be a question to address at the Planning Board.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member LeBlanc, it was:

Voted: to continue to April 13th at 7pm, while arranging for a peer review and a copy of the phase one environmental.

Discussion: Mr. Lizardi commented first, that they have to inform the client how much the peer review will cost and if they will have enough time to get feed back before April 13th. His other comment was on the environmental assessment. He had not seen a copy. If they can't get a copy, what would be required if this is being conditioned. Chairman Bouchard asked Mr. Lizardi if he could look into it first and if it can't be obtained to give him a call at the office and they can discuss what alternatives there are. Member Knox suggested there is a motion and a second to continue, but everyone is in agreement that a peer review is in order and the applicant is questioning the cost. He thought the motion should include the request for a peer review to give pricing based on certain disciplines. They need to call that out in the motion of what they are requesting. Chairman Bouchard asked Member Yeatts if it is out of line to ask for a ballpark figure. Member Yeatts said they have been successful in using Environmental Partners. It is completely up to the Board who they want to use, so she would say we would ask them for a price. To be fair we could look for three prices, and they don't necessarily have to take the lowest one, that's 53G, which we approved at the Conservation Commission, is the law. She thought the quickest results they could get would be to ask Environmental Partners to give a cost of the peer review of the storm water. Member Knox said the only other thing he would recommend is the amount of pavement with the lot coverage and if a heat island effect is an issue and planting deciduous trees around the parking lot would be beneficial to the storm water discharge being more temperature conducive to that recharge. Member Yeatts made a revised motion.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member LeBlanc, it was:

Voted: to continue the 2 Bedford Street hearing to April 13th at 7pm. In the meantime, we would like a peer review of storm water also reviewing the amount of pavement and the heat island effect and if more vegetation would help that, and also a copy of the phase one environmental, if they can get it.

Unanimous approval.

81 Southworth St. – continued – RDA. Property owner and applicant Chris Poirier was present for discussion. Chairman Bouchard said they had a few questions, one was the silt fence and its location and makeup. Mr. Poirier said he had spoken to the pool company and they will install a silt fence along the line that had an existing silt fence when the house was built. He did not know what the materials were. Chairman Bouchard said when he finds out the materials he could call the office and let him know what it's going to be and once you do the installation of the silt fence, give the office a call so they can review it. Member Yeatts asked if there was a question of depth to ground water so it doesn't pop out of the ground. Chairman Bouchard said they discussed it but didn't come to any resolution on it. The plan was prepared by the previous engineer and Chairman Bouchard asked if it showed any test pits that indicated groundwater levels. Member Chamberlain asked if the Commission had a question about what filter material was going to be used. Member LeBlanc said it was going to be a cartridge filter. Member Knox said if you look at the plan provided, and look at the grading lines coming off the sides of the house, the back corner has a grading line of elevation 100. If you go all the way back, behind the pool into the wetlands, well into the bordering vegetated wetlands, you have 98. There's only 2', from the back of the house in elevation change to the water level in the wetland. If you dig down 5-6' to put a pool in, it seems the water table is right there. The top of foundation is almost 108, which means the footing is only about 1' deep. Member Yeatts said it was her understanding that the applicant was sent to answer those questions. These are the same questions asked last time and it doesn't feel like they've been answered. Mr. Poirier said he remembered it being advised at the last meeting, but didn't realize it would be part of this review. Chairman Bouchard said he didn't recall it being a requirement. Member Knox said it was a concern. Member Faherty said he remembered the conversation and it was definitely a concern, but he thought that the Board landed on that the pool company installing the pool wouldn't do it if they felt that it wouldn't work. He thought they had concluded that the weight of the water in the pool was going to assist that. He didn't recall sending the applicant back to find out the depth of groundwater. Member Knox inquired if fiberglass pools get drained in the off season or if they remain full. The applicant responded that they remain full. He said he had conversations with the pool company about this and they have advised him that once the pool is set and full of water that it will not move. Member LeBlanc said he thought the risk is on the installer and the owner. Member Knox said there were four test pits shown on the plan and asked if that was a record at the Board of Health. There was a brief discussion about the test pits. Member Knox said he thought the Board would feel comfortable if they knew where the water table was and the depth of the pool that they could say that in a motion that the top of pool be set at a certain height so that it wouldn't be below the water table.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to continue to April 13th at 7pm in order for the applicant to contact the Board of Health to determine the groundwater level or any other means he wants to use.

Unanimous approval.

1, 2, & 3 Bella's Way – NOI – Zenith Consulting Engineers. Jamie Bissonnette from Zenith was present for discussion. Member LeBlanc abstained from the vote. The three filings will be done simultaneously. Member Chamberlain said isn't that what DEP wants us to do if you have a small subdivision, handle them joint impact. Chairman Bouchard said yes, and they have done this in the past. Member Yeatts said when it comes to Orders of Conditions, there might be three different kinds of Orders of Conditions. Chairman Bouchard said they could do that. Mr. Bissonnette started with lot 1 and said that DEP has not issued file numbers yet. A subdivision plan was submitted at a previous meeting and the Commission requested individual filings for each of the houses. For lot 1, a single-family home with a garage is proposed. This lot has bordering vegetated wetlands (BVW) that run along Cross St. at the front and behind the site that connect by a gravel roadway to a larger BVW. There is a small isolated non-jurisdictional BVW that was discussed at the subdivision filing. The proposed house is between the 50 and 100' buffer and the septic system proposed just outside the 50' buffer. The proposed well is approximately 40' outside the BVW in the back. There is an existing silt fence on the property. The silt fence does not run behind the well location currently, but will be installed prior to construction. Mr. Bissonnette explained that there is a conservation restriction on the property so there will be signage requested by Natural Heritage along the restricted area and a steward from Wildlands Trust will oversee the conservation restriction.

Lot 2 - The drainage and wetlands area have all been discussed and approved at prior meetings. The septic system is outside the 100' buffer while the house is between 25-100' with a small portion of the patio outside of the buffer zone. This lot will also have signage along the conservation restriction area. The erosion control is in place and the drainage is roughed in. They will come back with loam and seed in April. On either side of the silt fence they have place hay bales to increase erosion protection. There is a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) on this property so the erosion control will be checked weekly. Member Yeatts asked if the Commission had a copy of the SWPPP. Mr. Bissonnette said he would send a Dropbox link so members could review the plan. There was a brief discussion regarding boundaries for conservation restriction.

Lot 3 - The proposed plan shows a well outside the buffer zone. A small portion of the septic system, some grading, and proposed pool are within the buffer. There is a wetland on the adjacent site that has a certified vernal pool. Due to the size of the proposed house, they are being aggressive with the sloping to minimize disturbance of the buffer zone. Chairman Bouchard asked if the three lots will be developed simultaneously. Mr. Bissonnette said on lots 2 and 3, the applicants would like to start right away, but without DEP file numbers, they will need to come back to the next hearing. Member Yeatts said they would be able to approve pending the DEP file number but would not be able to write the Order of Conditions until then. Member Knox commented that the septic system design on lot 1 was large and was it because the soils were so poor or was there a different use. Mr. Bissonnette said they had a 3 minute per inch perc rate and a 55 minute per inch perc rate. Therefore, they designed at the 55 minute per inch rate. The back lots had better soils with less than 2 minutes per inch perc rates. David Morrissey, an abutter at 37 Cross St., asked about grading and run-off. He asked if the grading was going to the south. Mr. Bissonnette replied that the water would pitch in two directions, toward the drainage system on one side and toward the wetland on the other. There was a discussion regarding the swales and water. Mallory Reis (35 Cross St) also asked about grading and run-off. Mr. Bissonnette said right now, the pitch goes into the wetlands and they have no intention to change that and should be shedding no water onto her property. Ms. Reis asked if they were done cutting trees. Mr. Bissonnette replied there was a small area of additional tree removal. They also may need to remove a few trees to drill the well on lot 1. Member LeBlanc asked how many acres were going to be deeded over to Wildlands Trust. Member Yeatts responded it was over 20. Mr. Bissonnette said there is a

conservation restriction on this property. The property owner will need to pay an outside entity money to set up an annuity to last an infinite amount of time to steward the land. There are a few companies that do this such as Wildland's Trust and Audubon or the State or local Conservation Commissions. Mr. Bissonnette said he would like to see the Commission issue three different notices, one for each property pending DEP file numbers. Member Chamberlain asked if the Commission issues an Order of Conditions assuming they will get a number from DEP. But could they start work on the site, or do they start work at their own risk. Chairman Bouchard said DEP recommends against that, but it would be at their own risk. Member Chamberlain said, so the Commission is saying they will issue an Order of Conditions, but won't issue one yet. Chairman Bouchard said it won't take effect until there is a file number. Member Knox said Town Counsel made a clarification because of the 43 Main St. project. They could vote to approve and still have 21 days to submit your Order of Conditions. Member Yeatts said it's 21 days from when they get the file number. They could approve pending the file number and issue the Order of Conditions at the next meeting. Member Yeatts said Chairman Bouchard could issue the Order of Conditions and the members could come in and sign. Even with an Order of Conditions, starting work is at your own risk since there is a 10-day appeal period.

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to close the hearing on Lot 1 Bella's Way and issue an Order of Conditions with all the regular conditions pending receipt of a file number from DEP and any additional conditions they might want to add.

Four in favor, 1 abstention (LeBlanc)

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to close the hearing on Lot 2 Bella's Way and pending a file number from DEP, issue an Order of Conditions with any additional conditions from DEP and all their regular conditions for construction.

Four in favor, 1 abstention (LeBlanc)

Upon a motion made by Member Yeatts, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to close the hearing on Lot 3 Bella's Way and pending a file number from DEP, issue an Order of Conditions with any additional conditions from DEP and all their regular conditions.

Four in favor, 1 abstention (LeBlanc)

Recommend appointment of Nancy Yeatts to CPA - Member Yeatts said she would like the Commission to recommend her appointment to the Community Preservation Act Committee (CPA).

Upon a motion made by Member LeBlanc, seconded by Member Knox, it was:

Voted: to appoint Nancy to the CPA.

Unanimous approval.

Heaven Heights- (old business)- Chairman Bouchard said he received a call that someone had positioned their dock on the beach without permission. Chairman Bouchard sent a letter to DEP. The homeowner's association was contacted by DEP and his recommendation was to contact Conservation. Since then, there has been a new dock put in to replace the old one, and a complaint about discharge of graywater from an illegal pipe into the pond. Chairman Bouchard recommends they send a violation notice since the boat dock was put in without a Chapter 91 license. Member Yeatts suggested they do

this at the next meeting and post it since there were a lot of upset neighbors. Member Knox thought maybe they should start the process and put it on the agenda to ratify. There was another recommendation from DEP to contact the Environmental Police to see if they could assist in any way.

Adjournment- (9:00pm)

Upon a motion made by Member Knox, seconded by Member Yeatts, it was:

Voted: to adjourn

Unanimous approval.