

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY  
MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2020**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

By: Mathieu

Time: 7:03 p.m.

Place: Virtual

**2. ROLL CALL:**

		PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Martin Briggs	X	
	Patricia Laramee		X
	Lori Mathieu, Chairperson	X	
	Sam Norman, Treasurer	X	
	Thomas Woolf, Vice Chairman	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	Suzanne Choate	X	
	Mike Powers	X	
STAFF:	Todd Penney, Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent	X	

Staff read the procedures of this virtual meeting.

Choate was seated for Laramee.

**3. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS (2-minute time limit):**

No one wished to speak.

**4. OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. 20-07W – 1600 Boston Turnpike: Applicant: Garret Homes, LLC; Owner: Coventry Investments LLC; Agent: BL Companies – 7500 SF Retail Building with Associated Parking, Lighting, landscaping, storm water management, and utilities within the 75-Foot Upland Review Area.**

Staff mentioned we received this application on Tuesday, March 24, 2020, a day before the regular IWA meeting in March. That meeting was cancelled because of COVID-19. The application was automatically received per statute.

Matt Bruton, BL Companies, Eric Davidson, Soil Scientist, and Robin Pierson, attorney, were present.

Bruton began the presentation by orienting the Members to the 1.13-acre parcel. The proposed plan was then viewed. This site will have thirty paved parking spaces with handicapped spaces near the entrance and one driveway to Route 44 at the southeast corner. There will be concrete sidewalk along the front and back. Utilities are available on the site or at the road. A well will supply water and the site will require a septic system. There is a proposed storm water management plan to mitigate peak flows and treat the water from the site; the plan will match existing drainage patterns to the underground detention storage in front that will discharge to a DOT catch basin on Route 44. A rain garden at the back will capture and treat water from the roof and the surrounding impervious surface. The wetlands drain via a pipe at the front of the property. The wetlands will not be directly impacted. The upland review line is about halfway through the building and parking lot and continues toward the Walgreens site. The erosion and sediment control plan shows a variety of methods for construction. The control plan will remain in place protecting the wetland until the site is seeded and stabilized. On the landscape plan anything in green will remain lawn and a variety of trees and shrubs will be around the parking area and the rain garden. The plan presented to the IWA at the preliminary discussion called for a building of ~9,000 sq. feet. This plan calls for a smaller building. Sidewalk was removed from the side of the building to buffer the wetlands and the parking spaces have been decreased to the minimum required by zoning regulations. The grading has been tightened up to increase the distance of disturbance from the wetlands. The wetlands boundary is defined by the stone wall. At the closest point at the front corner of the parking area disturbance will be at 9' and that measurement increases as you go to the back of the property. There will be no direct wetlands impact. The plan was created with a minimum of disturbance in the upland review area.

Eric Davison, Soil Scientist, submitted a report with the application materials. The wetlands were delineated in September 2019. This is in the Coventry Brook watershed. There is a distance of 375' from the wetlands to Coventry Brook. This site is located in the center of the watershed. There is varied hydrology. Inflow is from the north and outflow to the south. There is a vernal pool where wood frog eggs were located. This is a low productivity vernal pool. The pool has limitation in its size and depth to preclude it from breeding of other vernal pool indicator species. The developed site, with no storm water controls currently, drains away from the wetlands. Davison understands the IWA members and Staff raised concern about so much activity so close to the wetlands during the preliminary discussion. The proposed plan will be adding building size and impervious surface to the property but it will also be adding storm water controls. The lawn goes up to the stone wall. The wetlands abuts the other side of the wall with no vegetative buffer at its boundary. When Davison found the vernal pool he had Bruton go through a plan revision to provide four additional protections to the pool (see below). These protections are about trying to avoid secondary impacts to the vernal pool. We don't know if there has been a change in the productivity of the vernal pool as we don't have this history of what it was like before Walgreens was constructed.

1. Maintaining pre-construction hydrology to the vernal pool. Do not increase or reduce surface and groundwater flows in order to maintain the existing vernal pool hydroperiod (i.e., depth and duration of standing water).
2. Vernal pool wildlife can be susceptible to noise and visual disturbances during the breeding season. To minimize noise and visual disturbance to migrating and breeding amphibians, I would recommend installing a vegetated buffer of evergreen trees that will reduce the penetration of light and noise and create a visual barrier from the development. A staggered double row of tightly planted (ca. 15ft on center) of white pine (*Pinus strobus*) or arborvitae (Green Giant variety is deer resistant), or other dense needle evergreen would be suitable. These plantings should be placed up against the existing stone wall bordering wetland flags 4-9 which parallel the ponded area where the wood frogs are breeding.
3. If outdoor lighting is proposed along the west side of the building and parking lot, utilize directional lighting that prevents spillage of light from the development towards the vernal pool, as lighting at night can affect the nighttime breeding chorusing and disorient migrating amphibians.
4. If construction is proposed during the breeding and juvenile dispersal period (ca. March – June), I would recommend that barrier fencing, such as geotextile silt fencing (or comparable), be placed along the westerly limits of the proposed development (parallel to the stone wall, wrapping northeast and terminating north of the rain garden) in order to prevent migrating amphibians from entering the construction zone. If possible, avoid construction during the initial stages of the breeding period (roughly February 25-March 25, depending upon annual and seasonal variability).

If the recommendations outlined above are incorporated into the Site plans, it is my professional opinion that this vernal pool will not be adversely affected.

Staff has been waiting to do his review of the application until the septic system approval is received. If the IWA deems this application as not needing a public hearing it needs to be approved within 65 days of receiving it. That number brings us to the May meeting date. Staff will provide his review and comments of the plan to Bruton in the next week or two. Members will have his comments and the applicants answers for the next meeting.

Mathieu asked about the location of the septic system. Bruton explained it is not on these plans as testing was done last week. The proposed location will be on the right side of the building, under the parking lot, and adjacent to the neighbor. Davison stated the vernal pool is largely on the Walgreens property. There is likely another breeding pool to the north of this one. This would be the source pool. The biology of wood frogs is to have some of the population venture out and colonize new habitats. The eleven egg masses viewed is not a huge number. Mathieu recalls from the preliminary discussion the building being much closer to the wetlands. Bruton replied the front left corner of the building on the previous plan was 15.5' from the wetlands edge. This plan has increased that to 28'. A vegetative buffer was mentioned at the wetlands edge. What are the thoughts for landscaping on the rest of the property? Mr. Bruton stated the

plan shows a conservation seed mix around the rain garden and a wet seed mix in the garden. The plan is to leave the rest of the property as is. Mathieu thinks the site should be left as natural as possible, especially with Davison mentioning the importance of leaf litter to wood frogs. Turning the lawn area into a natural area can easily be added to the plan per Bruton.

Staff asked if the stone wall is acting as a physical barrier to the amphibians migrating to the developed site? Mr. Davison replied that does play into it. The primary driver is the lack of cover beyond the stone wall. The species want overhead cover and a cover that provides moisture. They physically cannot get over the wall and there is not enough cover form them to want to migrate through a break in the wall. Davison believes the frogs are moving north through the wetlands corridor and into the forest.

Norman asked if the addition of the plants being suggested would decrease groundwater? Davison does not think the vegetation would change that. Lawn have a high water use requirement. Evergreen roots are shallow and don't draw a lot of water. The primary source of the breeding pool is coming from the northwest. The area being planted would not draw from that. The rain garden water may drain to the vernal pool but increasing water to the pool will not harm it. Any water added to the pool will shed to the south as the water is already at peak level. The shade and increased moisture from the plantings will help as those will reduce sun exposure and increase the overall moisture content.

Woolf noted sheet EC1 looks like an entrance for traffic. Bruton stated the construction entrance is proposed as part of the erosion and sediment control plan. The entrance is so dirt is not tracked into Boston Turnpike by vehicles that would then be collected by the DOT system and end up in the brook. The surface will shake dirt from the tires before reaching the road. The permanent entrance will be a paved, curbed driveway. This is a DOT controlled road so permits will be needed for connection to the road. Woolf stated this seems lie a well thought out plan.

Choate asked about the processing of storm water in the underground chambers. Bruton reported the underground system is in the front parking lot that catches water from two catch basins. There is an impervious restrictive layer of soil here and the ground water is high. The detention chambers will mitigate peak flows that discharge into the DOT system. It was sized to be sure water is not sucked in from the wetlands. The elongated rain garden at the rear will capture roof water and upland water from Town property with the berm acting as a broad crested weir. The northwest corner of the parcel drains to the wetlands. There is a portion of the property that sheet flows into the wetlands and the plan calls for keeping that the same. There is a storm water management report that shows the operation plan for the property owner for maintaining the rain garden.

Staff will follow up with his comments to the applicant. A litter plan will be in his comments.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS:**

### **A. 20-08W – 422 North River Road: Applicant and owner: Brian Grondin; - Addition (Garage & Living Space) to House in the 75-Foot Upland Review Area.**

Staff commented this plan will have 2,000 sq. feet of disturbance for excavation, backfill,

and the foundation for the addition.

Brian Grondin was present. Grondin wants to add onto his home as the family needs more space. Pictures that were part of the presentation show where the garage will be. The pond is 46' way by his measurement. The plan says it is 40.7'. That area will not be invaded by the construction. A silt fence will be used to protect the pond from any drainage. The back of the house will be graded to be more even at the addition. The footing location closest to the pond is 40'. The lower side of the lawn will be filled with extra material at the site of the abandoned well. This material will be backed up to the berm that is the dam for the pond. The pond is mad-made and Grondin owns it in entirety. He does not feel he will impact wetlands, wildlife, or drainage with the project. Mr. Grondin will be doing all of the construction. He is a contractor by trade who is currently not working because of the virus.

Staff added he has been working with the applicant. The driveway will remain at grade. The foundation are going to be up to follow grade. Foundations no longer qualify for minimal impact. Excess material will be used to fortify the pond embankment. The IWA is receiving the application this evening. The applicant has expressed desire to get started on this addition. Staff is comfortable with the application.

Mathieu is fine with remanding this application to the Wetlands Agent. She is looking keenly at the picture of the face of the dam and likes the idea of adding material to the face of the dam. The applicant is to work with the Wetlands Agent in deciding where best to put the material to reinforce the berm.

The other IWA members were also comfortable with the Wetlands Agent handling approval.

**Motion:** I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency give the Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent approval authority on application 20-08W for 422 North River Road.

By: Choate

Seconded: Norman

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

**B. 20-09W – 1657 Boston Turnpike – Applicant: Venkat Gogu; Owner: 1657 Boston Turnpike, LLC; - Replacement of the Fuel Tanks within the 75-Foot Upland Review Area.**

Staff relayed that Gogu owns the On The Go gas station/convenience store at the corner of Boston Turnpike and Main Street. Gogu is going to be replacing the three underground gas fuel tanks with two. Exactly where the two tanks will be placed in the hole is not yet known. The wetlands is 65' from the closest point of the tank storage area. The existing asphalt will be cut, the hole excavating, old tanks removed, and the new tanks put in. Staff has been talking to the contractor – metal shoring around the hole will be driven in. This area is already disturbed. All activity on commercial property needs a regulated area permit.

Mathieu stated if the tanks are shifted to outside of the 75' regulated area they wouldn't have

to come back to the agency. Staff thinks there will be activity 3' – 4' in the upland review area.

Norman asked why are they digging out and replacing the tanks? Is there leakage or is this a mandated replacement of tanks after a certain number of years? This is a fairly new business. Why are the tanks being replaced? Staff replied he does not know if this is a mandated replacement or if the tanks are leaking. The tanks were not replaced when the station was renovated. Norman agrees with Mathieu about shifting the tank placement to the north side.

Staff stated the excavation and backfilling is in a regulated area. He will relay to the contractor and owner the IWA's preference is to move the storage area as far as possible outside of the regulated area. Staff will obtain more information about this activity to be presented to the IWA at the May meeting.

**C. 20-10W – 51 Woodland Road – Applicant: Walter Borst; Owner: Walter & Ruth Borst; - Demo/Rebuild Single Family Residence in 150-Foot Upland Review Area.**

Walter Borst, 832 Nathan Hale, was present. The idea when he brought this property was to have a lake playground. However, the structure needs a lot of work so it is best to remove the existing structure and build a retirement home.

Kim Fletcher, Engineer, is representing her parents. The proposal is to tear down the current structure and build a new, larger home. The ZBA approved the plan. The plan calls for adding a deck, dwelling, and retaining wall behind the building. The dwelling was moved 2' farther back from the lake. The location of the well is in the right-hand side. Increasing the size of the house increases the amount of impervious surface. The mitigation plan calls for infiltration systems under the proposed deck. Mr. Borst mentioned the new deck is going over the existing deck. There will be no construction from the high-water line to the existing retaining wall. The entire construction zone will be within the 150' upland review area.

Staff commented the IWA is receiving the application this evening to be heard at the next meeting. He has not yet reviewed the plans. This property is located by the lake gate. There is a topography challenge here making it difficult to move the house farther back because of ledge. There is a fine line where the house can be located.

Mathieu thought increasing the size of a dwelling is not allowed by regulation but it was approved by ZBA? Borst stated the small triangle area was the actual variance that was permitted by ZBA. Everything else is within the existing non-conformity. Fletcher added the deck over the side yard is to be built on top of the existing deck so the non-conformity will not be worse. The existing lot coverage is 12%; the new plan brings that to 14%. Under the zoning regulations a property can go to 15% as long as there is storm water mitigation to 10%. The infiltration system is 22" deep with not much soil to place them in. Each can hold 43 gallons. These will supply more storage than is needed for the site.

Norman commented the current deck is smaller than the proposed 28' x 10'. The corner of the deck towards the lake was held to the same location; the larger deck extends toward Shonty Lane. Fletcher stated it is probably 30' or more to the water's edge. Staff concurs and instructed Fletcher to put that measurement on the plans.

The proposed connection to the sanitary sewer system is shown. This will require temporary disturbance in the wetlands. Staff added the connection will be at the stub, not all the way back to the main line. Choate asked how the owners can be sure the infiltration systems are functioning and not filling up with groundwater. Is there an overflow if they do fill up? Fletcher stated the systems will be oversized for a 1" rain event. Staff can speak to Ms. Fletcher about knock outs for any overflow.

**D. 20-11W – 35 Shore Drive – Applicant: James Blair Landscaping and Design; Owner: Norman & Peggy Myers; Agent: James Blair – Permeable Paver Driveway and Patio Installation in 150-Foot Upland Review Area.**

James Blair, 17 Columbia Landing, Columbia was present for the owners. The owners want to add outdoor living space under the deck on the lake side of the house. This is presently a graveled area coming out of the basement. The patio will extend 11' past the deck. The retaining wall will be 36" - 42" at its highest. Organic material will be removed to get an adequate base under the wall. A pipe will be installed through the wall for water to flow out onto decorative stone so there is no erosion. The driveway will be replaced with permeable pavers for less impact to the lake. From the property line to the road will be an asphalt apron as required by the Town. The owners wish to do the work on the lake side first. A silt fence will be installed at the beginning of the project and will remain in place until all of the work is done. Haybales will be used along the side of the house as check dams.

Work in the upland review area is ~600 sq. feet. The back patio is about 400 sq. feet. Staff has worked with Mr. Blair on multiple occasions around the lake. The run off from this property will be dramatically reduced with the permeable paver driveway. This is a win for this property and a win for the Coventry Lake watershed. This does not fit into the minimal impact categories as the IWA regulations have gotten very restrictive, with good reason.

The Members were comfortable with having the Inland Wetlands Agent handle this application.

how much stone you will end up with.

Powers left the meeting 9:43 p.m.

**Motion:** I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency give the Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent approval authority on application 20-11W for 35 Shore Drive.

By: Choate

Seconded: Woolf

Voting:

For: Briggs, Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

**E. 20-12W – 285 Woodland Road – Applicant & Owner: Thomas Archambault; Agent: Towne Engineering – Re-establishing Single-Family Dwelling with Detached Garage and activities associated with their construction in 150-Foot Upland Review Area.**

Thomas Archambault owns 285 Woodland Road. This property was purchased three years ago after it had been in blight for about twenty years. The roof was caving in and they were afraid squatters would move in so the structure was demolished. The property has 25' of frontage on Woodland Road and 45' of frontage on the lake. The ZBA granted a variance for this property. The garage will be moved down gradient toward the house rather than at the top near the road. The house is being shifted and increased in size. The shifts in locations are in attempt to meet all of the zoning and wetlands requirements. The existing driveway is at 18% grade. The zoning requirement requires it be no more than 15% grade. To meet that about 6' of fill will be needed to raise the garage up. Penney, Eric Trott, and Mark Landolina agreed that keeping the driveway at the existing grade to reduce the severity of it and protect the lake. There is an existing wall at the lake front that is in disrepair. Archambault wants to repair the wall lining it up with his property next door and install a ramp for accessibility to the waterfront. Infiltrators will be at the front for storm water runoff.

Staff added the location of the new garage is farther away from the wetlands and the proposed house is farther from the wetlands corridor watercourse off of Woodland Road. Staff must review this plan including the storm water mitigation.

Briggs left the meeting at 9:45.

Choate mentioned she will be recusing herself from this application. Therefore, she cannot make comments on it. Staff will ask the Town Attorney if a recused Member can make comments or express concerns on an application as a private citizen.

#### **F. Permit Extensions:**

##### **1. 10-32W Farr Subdivision, Pucker Street – 5-year extension request**

**Motion:** I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve the five-year extension request for application 10-32W Farr Subdivision, Pucker Street.

By: Woolf

Seconded: Norman

Voting:

For: Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

##### **2. 11-02W Olmer Site Development, 648 Brewster Street – 5-year extension request**

**Motion:** I move the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve the five-year extension request for application 11-02W Olmer Site Development, 648 Brewster Street..

By: Woolf

Seconded: Choate

Voting:

For: Norman, Mathieu, Choate, Woolf

Against: None

Abstain: None

## 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

### A. **10 Avery Shores – Concept addition project on Coventry Lake with additional lot coverage.**

Staff has met with Andrew Bushnell and the applicant. The applicant wants to do an expansion plan. This is an interesting plan from an IWA perspective as the lot coverage for the concept plan is north of 20%.

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates, presented the concept. This property is bounded by Avery Shore on the south, the lake on the north, and two residential properties on the sides. The garage and parking area will remain at the road. There is an existing asphalt driveway coming down the side of the property and ends at the house. The plan is proposing a permeable surface for service to the garage. The current coverage is at 19% and this plan would bring it to 24%. A large percentage of runoff from a 1” storm event will be gathered to the permeable portion of the driveway from the garage, driveway, and roof. The overflow will be infiltrators at the front. The concrete septic units will be removed to create a better grade. Side-by-side infiltrators will be located here. These would overflow to grade and flow towards the lake. A small permeable patio is proposed. The new house would be on the same plane as the existing one so it would not be any closer to the lake.

Staff commented this property is starting to get very developed with well over the allowable 15% of lot coverage. A variance from ZBA would need to be granted. Is 24% lot coverage too much? Mathieu replied the IWA is concerned when lot coverage goes above 12% so she would say yes, it is too much. This plan is very busy for a very small lot.

Joe Guardino, owner, commented the garage at ground level is part of the building with a bedroom above it and adjacent to the kitchen. He would like to move to this house permanently. Due to health conditions they need to be able to pull into a garage with direct access to the house. Flat surfaces are needed to move into and out of the house. An elevator is proposed so they don't have to navigate stairs. All of the hallways are 3.5' – 4' wide in the event they need to use wheelchairs in the future. The two-car garage is incorporated into the house for a particular reason. The upper garage is basically for storage and will remain so. We are exceeding lot coverage because we are not allowed to use pervious surfaces for the driveway because of the grade. If there is a pervious surface that can be found to work at this grade they would use that product. All of the solid surfaces will be mitigated into systems to make sure the water is properly handled.

Norman stated these lots were originally intended for summer cottages. It is concerning that people are trying to built full-time permanent residences on these lots. He is concerned we are trying to push the limit on what these lots should be doing.

Choate echoes Norman's comments. She asked if the infiltrators will work in relation to the proximity to groundwater.

Mathieu added when the lots were for summer cottages there was not a sewer system in place. Much has changed in twenty-five years and people want to redevelop in responsible ways. This can be challenging with how some of the lake lots are shaped or how narrow they can be. These were not intended for full-time residences. This was a concern and discussion

when the sewer project was proposed. That is why the zoning regulations and limitations were thoughtfully crafted. The ZBA has more limitations than the IWA. We have seen some very creative designs. People own the land and want to develop it. For the most part, people want to be responsible to the lake. Mathieu is concerned when lot coverage is around 12% - 15% because there is not a lot of land. This is her historical perspective. Zoning regulations were created so we don't get monster rebuilds. She feels the Town has done a great job with protecting the lake.

Staff stated this proposal is getting to the point of supersaturation. He is concerned about that. At over 15% lot coverage there needs to be a hardship for a ZBA variance to be granted. The IWA has concern about lot coverage as will the infrastructure work with the supersaturation.

**B. 55 Edgewater Drive – Concept teardown/rebuild on Coventry Lake with additional lot coverage.**

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates, presented another tear down and rebuild concept on a lake property. There are wetlands to the east and south of this property and the property next door has an intermittent watercourse that drains the neighborhood. The owner wants to remove the existing house and rebuild in the same footprint although squaring up the front corner and adding a deck on the lake side. There is a gravel parking area at the road with a stone accessway to the house and an impervious patio. Those would be removed and a garage added. There would be some impervious surface. The gradient is 15% so an impervious paved surface is required. The existing lot coverage is 11.2%; the proposed plan brings that to 18.5% because of the slope of the driveway needed the impervious surface. The plan calls for mitigation by means of groundwater infiltration or a rain garden. The plan would more than suffice for mitigating above 10% lot coverage as required by zoning.

Staff feels there are options with both of these plans. Activities could be shifted farther away from the lake, move things to not need a long driveway with the garage being higher than the finished floor of the house. The owner wishes the garage to be at the floor elevation of the house at the detriment to lot coverage. There needs to be a happy medium.

Gary Costello, 55 Edgewater Drive, does understand everyone's concerns. His grandfather has the last summer cottage on the lake three doors down. Costello has been looking for a lake property for thirty years. He is getting older and would like to get the garage attached to the house. Mr. Costello will accommodate anything the IWA wants in order to build their final house.

Woolf stated such plans are tough calls as we've denied plans in the past that go beyond 12% lot coverage. There has to be consistency in our decisions otherwise why do we have regulations. People have to try to fit plans within the lines that we have been working with for a long time. Mathieu agrees with Woolf. People have wanted bigger structures and garages that we have not permitted. Woolf continued that some people have been denied IWA permits because of not being in the acceptable range. If the IWA doesn't remain consistent erosion could show up here and there and then the Agency would be accused of not protecting the lake. Why have these guidelines if we give allowance to them all the time?

Staff stated he will research past applications within the LR Zone to see what sort of

coverage we have gone up to. This plan will have to show a hardship to ZBA to get a variance before coming to the IWA. The regulation is at 10% because over that you can harm the watershed; 15% with mitigation was the compromise to go beyond. Over 15% an owner has to show why that lot is creating a hardship.

Norman would feel more comfortable if this plan was not adding a second garage or the owner considers taking down the first garage to mitigate the lot coverage. How much is too much? Does the IWA have the right to say no? If the applicant has successfully mitigate the lot coverage do we have the authority to say no or is that a PZC prerogative? Do we have the regulatory ability to deny this? Staff replied answers to those questions will be part of his homework. Look at the long-term impacts. What are the long-term liabilities of the storm water infiltrators? How do we control how those are maintained and managed? From the 10% - 15% this proposal is near double the 10% coverage and the other plan is more than two times at 24%. The failure of the infrastructure is paramount. Dr. Kortmann would say we have to be careful or add a riparian zone near the lake to naturally resolve storm water. People would not want that because they want to be on waterfront. Staff will research what the IWA has permitted in the past – approved, denied, or had the plan modified? Mathieu stated it would be valuable to have this information. These are not applications. They are concepts and the owners can change the plans based on feedback. However, the owner wants a plan that meets their needs. Maybe their plans have to change to meet the regulations. These are lots with a lot of challenges that are well beyond what the IWA has approved in the past. The IWA is not saying no, but we are not saying yes.

Staff reported a new Wetlands Assistant, Mindy Gosling, is starting next week.

**7. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:**

None

**8. CORRESPONDENCE:**

None

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

Mathieu moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Yvonne B. Filip

Yvonne B. Filip, IWA Clerk

**PLEASE NOTE: The minutes are not official until approved by the Inland Wetland**

**Agency at the next Agency meeting. Please see the next Agency meeting minutes for approval or changes to these minutes.**