



TOWN OF ESSEX  
**Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission**

**Executive Committee**  
*Fred Szufnarowski, Chairman*  
*Andre Roussel, Vice Chair*

---

29 West Avenue • Essex, Connecticut 06426  
Telephone (860) 767-4340 • FAX (860) 767-8509

**Regular Members**  
*Ernest Cook*  
*Michael Furgueson*  
**Alternate Members**  
*David Kirsh*  
*Noreen Brennan- Rowe*

**Minutes- January 11, 2022 Regular Meeting**

**1. Call to Order and Seating of Members**

The Essex IWWC conducted their regularly scheduled meeting on January 11, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held via Zoom. The meeting link was provided to the public on the Town of Essex website.

EIWWC Chairman F Szufnarowski was Chair for the meeting. F Szufnarowski welcomed members of the public to the January 11, 2022 Essex Inland Wetlands and Watercourse Commission meeting. The Inland Wetlands and Watercourse Commission members and attendees announced themselves. Attendees from the public were asked to please identify themselves for the record prior to making any comments.

**Attending Members:**

Fred Szufnarowski-Chairman  
Andre Roussel- Vice Chair  
Ernest Cook- Secretary  
Michael Furgueson  
David Kirsh- Alternate  
Noreen Brennan-Rowe- Alternate

**Absent Members:**

None

**Staff:**

Danielle Sanso- Recording Clerk  
Carey Duques-Land Use Official  
Robert Doane Jr., P.E.- Wetlands Enforcement Officer

**Audience:**

Gregg Fedus- Fedus Engineering (representing 3 Foster Lane applicant)  
Bevon Semple- Applicant 3 Foster Lane

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman F Szufnarowski. Commission members A Roussel, E Cook, M Furgueson, F Szufnarowski, and N Brennan-Rowe (for Dan Lapman, vacant position) were seated for the meeting.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

A. December 14, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

**MOTION** made by E Cook to approve the December 14, 2021 regular meeting minutes with the following amendments:



*The spelling of Furgueson needs to be corrected throughout the document*

*Page 2: strike R Doane and and C Duques from seated members*

*Page 3: None*

*Page 4: 7<sup>th</sup> F Szufnarowski stated that this is a planning and zoning matter and outside the scope of the IWCC*

*Page 5: 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from the bottom “will have equipment that is taxed as personal property”*

*Mike Ott commented not commended*

*Page 6: #6 Change from 10.10 to 11.8 in section 1 of the motion*

*Page 7: Middle paragraph “lack of soil testing in the area where they would be doing the ledge cut”*

*Change multi family to single family home*

*Page 8: Correct statement to say that Alder requires excavation down to the roots or herbicide treatment*

**SECONDED** by N Brennan-Rowe; **Voting In Favor:** A Roussel, M Furgueson, E Cook, N Brennan-Rowe, F Szufnarowski; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** None; **Approved:** 5/0/0.

**Discussion:** No Discussion

#### B. January 6, 2022 Site Walk Meeting Minutes

**MOTION** made by A Roussel to include the January 6, 2022 Site Walk Meeting Minutes for Application 21-21 on the agenda; **SECONDED** by E Cook; **Voting in Favor:** A Roussel, M Furgueson, E Cook, N Brennan-Rowe, F Szufnarowski; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** None; **Approved:** 5/0/0; **Discussion:** No discussion

**MOTION** made by A Roussel to approve the January 6, 2022 Site Walk Meeting Minutes for application 21-21; **SECONDED** by N Brennan-Rowe; **Voting in Favor:** A Roussel, E Cook, N Brennan-Rowe, F Szufnarowski; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** M Furgueson; **Approved:** 4/0/1; **Discussion:** No discussion

### 3. Public Comment

No public comment

### 4. Update from Attorney Regarding Pending Litigation

C Duques reported that there is a status conference scheduled for Wednesday 1/12/22 and read the following into the record from Attorney Sylvia Rutkowska:

*“The matter is scheduled for a status conference with the court on Wednesday 1/12/22. This will be the first time the matter is being reviewed with a judge and will be by a video conference with the judge and attorneys for each side. A status conference is intended to determine, the intentions of the parties, whether it can be resolved or whether it will be moving forward to trial. The property owner’s counsel has not provided any further communication to my office as to their intentions, despite attempts to determine the property owner’s intentions. We will report back after said status conference. Absent instruction otherwise, or proposal from the property owner, we will move forward with the litigation and trial of matter.”*



B Doane asked if the information had been shared with the association. C Duques replied that it had not and that she would share it with Fred who is the president tomorrow. C Duques also said she asked if the association will be in attendance and they had said no because they are not a party in this specific case.

## 5. Public Hearings

No public hearings scheduled for this meeting

## 6. Old Business/Action Items

- A. **Application No. 21-14 – #3 Foster Lane (formerly labeled 2 Foster Lane) Map 37 Lot 2-1, Ivoryton.** Proposal for a single-family dwelling and associated site improvements (drainage improvements, driveway and other site improvements)  
*Applicant/Owner: Bevon Semple (Received October 12, 2021; Continued to November 9, 2021; Site walk on November 16; Discussion continued to December 14, 2021; Continued to January 11, 2022)*

D Kirsch read the details of the application (listed above) into the agenda.

F Szufnarowski asked C Duques and she confirmed that there have had 3 continuances so far for this application.

Presentation tonight is through an extension of 28 days according to C Duques. She said that another extension would need to be granted to continue past tonight, if the Commission was not yet ready to make a decision.

If an extension was not granted by the applicant, the Commission would either have to make a decision or the clock would run out.

F Szufnarowski asked if the clock ran out would the matter revert to the state and C Duques confirmed. F Szufnarowski then asked how many more days of extensions and C Duques said that 25 days had already been granted so if another 28 days was granted that would leave 9 days. A decision would have to be made at the February meeting unless a special meeting was held.

F Szufnarowski explained that the Commission's authority is delegated through the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environment Protection and that this is the amount of time they allow the towns to handle these applications. If we don't act in this time frame then it reverts back to them.

Connecticut Licensed Professional Engineer Gregg Fedus from Fedus Engineering introduced himself as representing applicant Bevon Semple. He said that they would absolutely grant the extension or balance of the extension if necessary.

He commented that there are a couple of items that B Doane brought up that need to be addressed and that there is a fairly extensive watershed that is off of the property that comes down and carries surface water onto the property.

G Fedus shared the latest revised site plan that was sent to the Town last week.



They have been working on the system of rain gardens and how they are dealing with the ledge cut. He thinks that they are closer but not at the finish line yet with B Doane. There is a series of stacked rain gardens on the east side of the house. The gardens on the west side of the property are relatively smaller than those on the east side. They are capturing water that is coming off of the rock ledge cut and piping it to enter the rain garden systems as well as capturing some overland flow. He explained that they are trying to capture the first inch of rainfall. As of today they adding areas off of the property and trying to figure out the best way to deal with that by expanding rain garden size and/or adding another rain garden behind the garage. This area is relatively flat and we could put a larger rain garden there. As for the other items on R Doane's review, he said that they had submitted a response letter that stated that they had addressed all of the items dated January 4<sup>th</sup> (in response to B Doane's January 3<sup>rd</sup> review comments)

G Fedus showed the E&S Plan (Erosion Control Plan) and went on to review the response to each of B Doane's items:

1. The silt fence on the south side (should be backed by hay bales for support. Hay bales have been added to the right side/down gradient side of the silt fence.
2. Hay bales should be on downhill side of silt fence
3. For items 3 and 5 the short answer is yes. The original idea was that they would stack the rain gardens so that water would flow into garden 5. Garden 1 (2<sup>nd</sup> one) would take some of the piping from the crushed stone at bottom of ledge cut. Then 5 would overflow into 1. 5 and 1 would then overflow into 6. Ultimately, they capture the first inch of rainfall but they had left off some of the watershed areas above. Adding in additional rain garden behind the garage. G Fedus said that he would need to talk to B Doane at another time about if they could divert some of the overland flow into a level spreader or something similar to get it back to a sheet flow condition. He says he does not think that they are 100% there with the rain garden designs and that the Commission could make a condition that as long as the Town Engineer is happy.
4. Has to do with additional testing in the area. G Fedus said that they haven't been able to get out there given the time of year and the weather. He said that in order to really figure this all out they would have to dig several holes up there and we need to make it work with some sort of tiered system within our constraint, whether with a ledge cut or a reinforced concrete retaining wall. If they don't hit ledge in the area then they would have some sort of retaining wall system very similar to what you see on the sheet.

He said that they will do test pits if R Doane and the Commission are adamant that it be done but he is not sure how much without dotting the area with test pits. He said they would need to make field modifications when they get out there and start excavating. This would be within the constraints and if it was outside of the approved work they would have to come back to Commission

5. G Fedus said that R Doane and him have a difference of opinions on what ratio for crushed stone and sand/soil mixes. They went with 30% per R Doane across the board



and that he thinks it is conservative. He would like to hear what R Doane has to say. R Doane commented that 30% is ok.

G Fedus says that this is where we stand and that he appreciates that this is not a straight-forward application given what they are trying to do. They are trying to work with the Commission, Town, and Town Engineer to come up with a design to protect the wetlands. He said he feels confident and that they are not fully there with the rain garden design but he thinks that they headed in the right direction with the guidance of R Doane and the Commission. He said that yes we are running out of time but yes they will grant an extension if it is necessary. They will work diligently to get B Doane's sign off on the rain gardens if that is where they are headed.

F Szufnarowski asked if there was anything that R Doane would like to say.

R Doane shared the watershed plan provided by Fedus Engineering with the Commission. He said that he had been working today with Nathaniel one of G Fedus's employees. He said that he was having trouble with calculations that were on sheet 3-4 of 6 with the areas contributing to the rain gardens.

He said that he is concerned about the 4 rain gardens with the watercourse close by. He said that he had been going through the areas and checking the storage in the rain gardens and the area that continues beyond the property (contributing area). The sizing is correct for their mitigation and design of a rain garden.

He said that he is concerned about the actual watershed going into the rain gardens and that they will be overwhelmed and that this is what they had been working on. As he realized that this boundary and that the watershed only went to the boundary what he asked for was the crossing design. He said the watershed was stopped at the property line when it actually includes the pond and the contributing area. The drainage area for the stream crossing needs to be extended off of the property.

G Fedus commented that he did include more area when he did the calculations.

R Doane said that he and C Duques went up and looked at the outlet and expected to see an outlet that was controlled with boards, but there was no controlling structure present. He said that it was just a stream coming out of the pond.

M Furgueson asked if R Doane was concerned about the crossing and the size of the watershed and he said yes. R Doane said that it is designed for about 100,000 square feet and that we have about 300,000 or 400,000 square feet.

M Furgueson asked what one would do typically to address that, if you would make a culvert or make the pipe bigger (changes to the physical structure).

R Doane said that location would not change and that the watercourse is very well defined and handles the flow. He said that G Fedus needs to look at the structure and make sure it can handle the flow. It may need a larger pipe but would not change location. There are currently two 12 inch pipes.



F Szufnarowski asked if it would be the function of the diameter squared.

R Doane commented that it isn't just a simple calculation. Soil types have an influence and will change the coefficient.

F Szufnarowski asked if this is a fatal flaw and B Doane said no. He said that they are taking a look at the areas to the rain gardens and the area to the crossing.

G Fedus says that the original analysis was short a couple hundred thousand square feet of watershed. They had come up with 3 CFS (Cubic Feet Per Second) in the pipe analysis with a capacity of 20 CFS. He thinks that it is just a matter of getting the right watershed on there and that they will still be below 20 CFS.

A Roussel commented that from a non-engineering standpoint what they need to do is to size the culvert appropriately and the rain gardens appropriately to handle the runoff from the larger watershed (problem/project 1). Project 2 is digging test pits to find if there is ledge behind structure versus soil that would need to be reinforced or slope changed. B Doane confirmed that this was correct.

R Doane says this will also be going to the Planning and Zoning Commission due to the amount of soil proposed to be excavated.

A Roussel asked if test pits could be dug between now and next meeting.

G Fedus said if the Commission and R Doane requires them to do that that they will do that.

R Doane says that he does not think it is a fatal flaw to the application if they are not dug because the response from G Fedus is that the shape of the bank will either be made by ledge or retaining walls. If test pits don't get done from a wetlands point of view it is not a flaw in the application. From an excavation permit as far as zoning is concerned, they need to know if they are blasting 10,000 cubic yard of ledge or excavating that much material.

Roussel asked if the design flows in the mitigation plan are appropriate and accurate.

R Doane said that G Fedus mentioned collecting the surface water from above and bypassing the rain gardens so that the rain gardens are not overwhelmed. He would encourage investigating that so that the rain gardens are not overwhelmed.

C Duques asked R Doane to explain what the 30% means; it would be helpful for the Commission to understand.

R Doane stated that the 30% is the voids in the soil. The material that is being used for the rain garden is mulch, on top of a sand top soil mix, on top of clean crushed stone. For the capacity of recharge, they were using a calculation of a 30% void ratio in each of the mixes. R Doane said that he would use a lower void mixture. G Fedus's response to him was that he did some



research and R Doane also did some research and pulled out his soils textbook. He says that he thinks they are ok with 30%.

F Szufnarowski said that from a wetlands perspective, not planning and zoning, the soil testing is not an issue because they have a solution. If the ledge isn't there will be a manmade retaining wall. The existing wetland crossing has a hydraulic capacity of 30 CFS which is 10X the existing calculated 3 CFS from the smaller watershed. R Doane corrected that it was 20 CFS.

A Roussel asked if everything was related with the size of the rain garden and the amount of flow coming down. If the sheet flow was intercepted somehow and that there were multiple solutions to the problem. The culverts need to be made larger to capture it.

M Furgueson says what A Roussel is saying is that there are technical engineering issues but we have an applicant that has been responsive and engaged in the process and that they have indicated they will work with the Town to figure out what the right solution is. Our response here is probably not to get involved in the details around the technical matters and leave it to the experts to come up with the technical solutions. He says that we look at the overall application and that he thinks they can make a decision about whether it fits the bill or not for discharging our responsibility.

F Szufnarowski said in simple terms we could approve this application subject to resolution of these matters to the satisfaction of the Wetlands Enforcement Officer. He said that they have a very responsive cooperative applicant.

F Szufnarowski asked the Commissioners if there was anything else and if it seemed reasonable to them. D Kirsch and N Brennan-Rowe said it sounds good.

A Roussel asked if B Doane is willing to take the burden of giving the final ok. B Doane said that he is ok with that and that he doesn't think that they are that far from having final plans.

F Szufnarowski asked if they had a motion to approve application number 21-14 subject to resolution of the rain garden issue and determining what the inflow is and the wetland crossing. He asked B Doane if they need to say something about the retaining wall and if they don't hit ledge we go to a retaining wall.

B Doane said yes that he thinks the embankment behind the house and the excavation will have the same shape that is represented either by ledge or by retaining wall.

F Szufnarowski said that the 3<sup>rd</sup> special condition is the embankment behind the house will have the same profile with the terraces as shown on the plans, whether with ledge or retaining wall (shown on plans revised on January 4, 2022). They are going to confirm the design for the wetland crossing and additional watershed area and resolve the rain garden concerns to the satisfaction of the Wetlands Enforcement Officer.

4<sup>th</sup> condition is that permit includes potential additional work in the upland review area



**MOTION** made by A Roussel to approve application 21-14 for 3 Foster Lane and issue a 5-year permit. Based on the information presented in this application, the accompanying documents in the record, and on the testimony given at this meeting, the Commission finds that the proposed activity is a regulated activity not involving significant or major effect upon the inland wetlands or watercourse which occur on the property as defined in Section 2.2. and that no reasonable or prudent alternative exists to the proposed plans.

The commission makes a Summary Ruling and grants a permit and gives permission for the applicant to proceed with the proposed activity as stated on said application and as shown on the plans accompanying the application. Subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with the Commission's Regulations section 11.8, the activity pursuant to said permit shall be for a period of 5 years from the permit's effective date with allowed activity occurring between March 15<sup>th</sup> and October 15<sup>th</sup> of the year of initiation.
2. Should the applicant determine that the permitted activity will not be completed between March 15<sup>th</sup> and October 15<sup>th</sup> of the year of initiation, the applicant agrees to appear before the Commission prior to October 15<sup>th</sup> and present a plan for the stabilization of the site during the months of no activity.
3. The applicant agrees to follow the advice and direction of the Town of Essex Enforcement Officer with regard to any field changes she/he deems necessary or may require for the protection of the inland wetlands and water course during the process.
4. The Commission, through its Enforcement Officer, shall be notified in writing upon the initiation of the authorized activity and again upon completion of these activities
5. Approval is subject to engineering and design of the rain garden being revisited to ensure calculations are correct. Designs must be to the satisfaction of the Wetlands Enforcement Officer;
6. The culvert under the driveway will be looked at to ensure it is sized appropriately to handle inflow from the watercourse, rain gardens and flow from watershed;
7. The embankment behind the house will have the same profile with the terraces, whether with ledge or with a retaining wall (as shown on drawing revised on January 4, 2022);
8. The permit includes additional work in the upland review area to divert additional water;

**SECONDED** by E Cook; **Voting in Favor:** A Roussel, E Cook, N Brennan-Rowe, F Szufnarowski, M Fergusson; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** None; **Approved:** 5/0/0;  
**Discussion:** No Discussion

**B. Application No. 21-21- 95 Plains Road, Essex.** Proposal for wetlands remediation of invasive species and improvement plantings in uplands and wetlands. *Applicant: Dan Needleman Owner: Plains Road Essex, LLC (Received December 14, 2021; Site walk scheduled for January 6, 2022; Discussion continued to January 11, 2022)*

Alternate D Kirsch read the details of the application (listed above) to the commission.

F Szufnarowski asked who they had representing the applicant and C Duques said that she did not see the applicant and said she didn't know if they wanted to just review the site walk. She said it looked like R Snarski (Wetlands Scientist) was not able to join the meeting either.





F Szufnarowski asked if it would be more productive to review the site walk with him too as many couldn't make the site walk on short notice. He asked if they could continue and C Duques responded that they could and that they have enough time without the applicant requesting an extension. He asked the Commission what they thought.

A Roussel said that he would like to have R Snarski and one of the applicants, whether it is N Needleman or D Needleman. He said they we are going to propose some conditions that are a little unusual based given what they saw on the site walk.

R Doane said that he did talk to R Snarski today and he was going to try to make it but he was involved with some personal matters.

A Roussel said that what he recommends since D Kirsch, N Brennan-Rowe and him were there that they give first impressions and observations on what they saw. He did not want to go too far regarding concerns until the applicant was there.

N Brennan-Rowe says that her initial thought was that a monitoring plan would need to be implemented, especially for the invasive species. It sounds like they have a herbicide to make sure the roots don't grow back. She said that she thought that was a good suggestion. She also liked the suggestion about sedimentation and erosion control during the project because it is right by one piece of wetland so close to the highway (route 153 Plains Road). If a plan could be followed and they could keep the trees that were necessary in the wetlands and plant some other wetland plants that it would be fine. She had no other major concerns.

D Kirsch said that he did not have any major concerns. He said there was a lot of ambiguity about the trees coming up, especially the ones along Plains Road. Says he heard 2 different pieces of information; one was that no trees would be removed from the wetlands and another that anything that was close to the wires would be removed.

F Szufnarowski said that if the applicant were there if he would ask for clarification on what trees go and what trees remain.

N Brennan-Rowe said that is an excellent question and in an ideal world they would mark the trees that they were going to keep with orange ribbon or something similar.

D Kirsch said that it sounded like they were not 100% sure yet and they may not know until they start clearing out.

A Roussel said that it was a bit of an eye opener and when he first saw the management plan that R Snarski put together he was ready to dig in his heels and call for a quick no vote. It appeared that they were going to be stripping out a wetland and existing established speckled alder which is regarded by the federal government as a perfect plan for tough places and replacing it with plants. When they got there and saw the site, 30-40% of the vegetation is invasive. The alders that are there are not covering the entire property so the remark in the management plan about doing this to increase diversity was kind of lost.



He said that N Needleman was there and made the remark that he really needed to clean it up because it was a gateway to Town and visually it is a mess. He thinks that everyone would look at it and agree with that with the invasives pulling down the native growth.

He was surprised that wetlands is as small as it is, that the whole unmanaged area is more upland review area than wetlands. The wetland is just a little pocket down at the corner of Plains Road/Rt 153. The area that we would be trying to protect or minimize disturbance in is relatively small. A lot that they want to take out is actually into the upland review area. He said the reason he wanted to do this was so that C Duques and R Doane could bring these back to both applicants and R Snarski to see if we can get some clarification before the next meeting. A Roussel said that the larger trees don't appear on the bank just up from the wetland and that they are probably upland review area trees.

He said another remark he picked up from D Needleman was that their plan for the upland area would be to clear all the existing vegetation and rototill roots out, put in a meadow mix, and mow twice a year. If you are going to put a meadow mix in as an alternative to wetland plants or upland plants and mow it twice a year within a year he would guess it would turn into lawn and weeds. He would like to hear from R Snarski appropriate management plan for meadow mix adjacent to wetland area. In terms of habitat, if it is being cut twice a year it is not going to offer much for habitat and will not have the ability to seed or reseed the flowering plants he wants to put in.

The plan is to cut the existing growth and treat the stalks with herbicide. According to literature about speckled alder you have to either rip it out or treat with herbicide. There is also Japanese Knotweed that will have to be treated. He said that there are more invasives than there are native plants. He is going to propose that this will be a 5 year and not 2 year permit because it is going to take that long to prove out and make sure it was done properly.

C Duques shared several photos from the site walk on January 6, 2022.

A Roussel said that it is a very visible area and if the property owner is going to rip out a wetland and reproduce we don't want other property owners to see it as a model approach to a wetland. We need to make sure the right perspectives are being drawn by people driving by and looking at it.

D Kirsch asked if someone could explain the difference if you could clear out a wetland and why we can and why we can this time and not other times.

A Roussel said that this one has a heavy concentration of invasive species so just going in and removing the invasives would be an appropriate action. He said that if the value of the wetland is primarily aesthetic and the work that is going to be done is going to improve the wetland both from an aesthetic as well as marginally improving habitat and some of the other function seen in the highway method that it is reasonable to go forward on it.

If not for improvement of one of the values we hold important for a wetland (flood retention, pollution control or minimization, wildlife habitat) if it is purely for the property owners whom we would be hard pressed not to deny it.



C Duques commented that one thing to add is that there are qualified professionals taking care of this and not just the property owner who is doing the work. They have hired a wetland scientist to come up with a very specific and customized planting mix for the site.

F Szufnarowski said that the other function is water conveyance. He said we look at function and values and if that is a positive for the site.

**MOTION** made by M Furgueson to continue application 21-21 for 95 Plains Road at the February 8, 2022 meeting **SECONDED** by E Cook; **Voting In Favor:** A Roussel, M Furgueson, E Cook, N Brennan-Rowe, F Szufnarowski; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** None; **Approved:** 5/0/0. **Discussion:** No Discussion

**7. Receipt of Applications/New Business**

C Duques reported that she received a draft application for 25 Heron Pond Road in regard to a violation that was pointed out by someone from the land trust. They met with the property owner over a month ago and he has slowly been working on the application and it is not complete. She said that he has been responsive, and she expects a completed application for the next meeting.

**8. Section 12 Action by Duly Authorized Agent**

None

**9. Other Business**

None at this time

**10. Correspondence and Invoices**

None

**11. Reports:**

**A. Wetlands Official**

R Doane reported that it has been a slow month. The only application is the one C Duques spoke about.

F Szufnarowski wants to commend him on a thorough review of the Foster Lane application on short notice.

**B. Chairperson**

The chairman reported that in December D Lapman formally resigned from the Commission. He has been a force on the Commission for about 36 years. He was appointed as an alternate in March 1986 not before R Doane was Town Engineer. He has worked with us as an alternate and very active member of the Commission. He was always on site walks. He was Vice Chair for a number of years and then Chairman. He was a mentor to many of us. He touched all of us and made a difference on the Commission.

He asked if any of the other Commission members had anything to say



R Doane said that Dan was a good steward of the wetlands, if he saw a violation, he was on top of it. He was always a pleasure when we met and talked about wetlands issues.

A Roussel said that when F Szufnarowski was out and he had to step up that he often looked to Dan to help with direction and process. He always available to say if you should do it this way or that way.

F Szufnarowski said that up to the end he always turned to him if he wasn't sure about something. He said the Town is very fortunate and that we are all the better off for having Dan Lapman serve on the Commission.

E Cook asked if there would be an official thank you from the Town. F Szufnarowski said he wasn't sure and if it wasn't COVID we could all go out to dinner and a drink or something. E Cook said some sort of a letter of appreciation.

F Szufnarowski said he would make a note to talk to N Needleman.

## 12. Adjournment

**MOTION** made by E Cook to adjourn at 8:33 PM p.m. until the next regularly scheduled IWWC meeting to be held on Tuesday, February 8, 2022 at the Essex Town Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room A, 29 West Avenue (alternate location by teleconference); **SECONDED** by N Brenna-Rowe; **Voting In Favor:** A Roussel, M Furgueson, N Brennan-Rowe, E Cook, F Szufnarowski; **Opposed:** None; **Abstaining:** None; **Approved:** 5/0/0. **Discussion:** No further discussion.

Respectfully Submitted,



Danielle Sanso  
Recording Clerk

