

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH MEETING

November 16, 2005 7:00 pm

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:15pm and announced that adequate notice of this meeting of the Readington Township Board of Health has been provided, by posting on the Township Bulletin Board, delivery to the Hunterdon County Democrat, the Courier News, filing with the Township Clerk and mailed to the members of the Board of Health.

Attendance Roll Call:

Christina Albrecht	present	Raymond Facinelli	absent	William C. Nugent	present
Daniel Allen	present	Stephanie Moore	absent	Wendy Sheay	present
Jane Butula	present	Beatrice Muir	present		

Also Present: Board of Health Engineer: Ferriero Engineering, representative Mr. Joe Kosinski
Board of Health Attorney: Ms. Marisa Taormina
Hunterdon County Health Department: Ms. Deb Vaccarella

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. Minutes of October 19, 2005.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Muir to **approve** the minutes of 10/19/05. This motion was seconded by Dr. Allen and passed with a vote of ayes all; nays none recorded.

Christina Albrecht and Jane Butula abstained.

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. NALBOH Newsletter.

- 1) A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula, seconded by Ms. Sheay to renew the BOH membership for 2006. This motion passed with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded.
- 2) Notice was sent regarding planning for potential flu pandemic.
- 3) Tobacco free USA. Rating for state of NJ was F in almost every category. Noted.
- 4) Environmental Health resource. Few people entering health care field. Noted.

2. American Lung Assoc. email dated 10/27,28/05 –

General Flu Information and Flu Clinic Locator.

Website www.findaflushot.com.

Ms. Butula stated people attending flu shot clinics should confirm credentials of persons giving shots and supplier prior to receiving shot. Noted.

3. HCHD LINC'S – dated 10/21/05 - Public Health Info: Drive-Thrus.
Information regarding drive thru locations was provided to HCHD by board secretary.
4. HCHD – Revised Septic Repair permit.
Ms. Vaccarella noted the revision on the back of the form.
5. HCHD – Memo dated 10/28/05 – November 22, 2005 Influenza Pandemic Planning.
Two members of the BOH will participate in the pandemic planning session on 11/22/05.
6. NJDEP application for Block 21.12/Lots 34, 34.01, 34.02, 38 & 39.
7. LOI – Map Revisions for Block 60/Lot 12.
8. Application for Gen. Permit #1 for PSE&G Natural Gas Distribution System.
9. NJDEP – Block 51/Lot 25 – LOI presence/absence determination.
10. NJDEP – Hess Station, Three Bridges – Remedial Investigation Progress Report.
Ms. Butula stated this involves a current leak.
Ms. Vaccarella will contact NJDEP regarding on going problem.
11. PSE&G – October 2005 Statewide Gen'l. Permit #1.
12. Block 72/Lot 31 - Twp. Engr. review dated 11/1/05.

13. **HCHD** – Memo dated 10/13/05 – Notice of Violation.
14. **Block 39/Lot 53.14** – Twp. Engr. review dated 9/23/05.
Chair to discuss further with secretary.
15. **Block 38/Lot 38.01** – Twp. Engr. review dated 10/25/05.
Noted. Application on file to be heard soon.
16. **Block 97/Lot 2** – Twp. Engr. review dated 10/24/05.
Lorraine to coordinate w/other secretaries, Twp. Engr. didn't receive delineation map or wetlands report.
17. **JCP & L** – Twp. Engr. review dated 10/25/05.
18. **Block 22/Lot 66** – Twp. Engr. review dated 10/31/05.
19. **Block 48/Lot 10** – Twp. Engr. review dated 10/25/05.
20. **PSE&G** – Twp. Engr. review dated 11/4/05.
21. **NJDEP** email dated 10/25/05 – DEP awards 3.4 million to support local recycling programs.
22. **Report on dog flu** dated 9/26/05.
23. **NJDEP** email dated 11/2/05 – DEP provides 5 million for Lincoln Park restoration.
24. **EPA management guidelines, fall 2005 “Pipeline”.**
25. **NJLM advisory dated 10/13/05** regarding Bill S-2636 NJSPCA support.
A MOTION was made by Ms. Muir to send a letter to the League of Municipalities and all the representatives of this area and call Senator Lance's office in support of the League of Municipalities concerns as stated in this letter from NJLM dated 10/13/05.. This motion was seconded by Ms. Sheay and passed with a vote of ayes all; nays none recorded.
26. **HCHD LINCS** – dated 11/9/05 – Upcoming Learning Programs.
27. **Bd. of Chosen Freeholders** – 10/25/05 letter regarding Windy Acres, Clinton Twp.
28. **Public Nursing Contract.**

C. SEPTIC REPAIRS (*HCHD status in italics*).

1. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 25/L 47. **Final Field 10/24/05**
2. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 73/L 3.16. **Final Field 10/14/05**
3. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 1.01/L 1.16. **Final Field 10/24/05**
4. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 38/L 17. *No work done as of 11/07/05.*
Carried from 7/20/05:
5. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 65/L 13.10. *No work done as of 11/07/05.*
6. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 70/L 17.23. *No work done as of 11/07/05*
7. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 66/L 27.08. **Final Field 10/28/05**
Carried from 2/16/05:
8. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 36/L 19. *Pending, the clog in sewer line not septic.*
9. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 47/L 7. *Pending, addition to home.*

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Cat Licensing.** *To be discussed at next month meeting.*
2. **Rabies Clinic** – 10/22/05 rabies clinic inoculated approximately 50 animals.
Ms. Petzinger reported a light turnout possibly due to the weather, the next clinic is 1/21/06 at Readington Recycling Garage on Mountain Road.
3. **Soil Testing Expiration.** *Chair will report at next meeting.*
4. **HCHD Emergency Mgmt. communication with local BOH.**
Ms. Muir stated our Emergency Management liason provides a report to Ms. Mekovetz, which is then forwarded to the mayor. If it is not of a sensitive nature,

the BOH may be copied on the report. There was some discussion of the responsibility of the local BOH in the event of a local emergency.

- 5. Governance Performance Document – Chair Nugent stated the subcommittee meeting will be scheduled shortly.**

E. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. 2006 Budget.** *Chair Nugent stated this is underway. Soil witness costs are being reviewed.*

- 2. Board of Health Administrative -**

A. Application Statistics as of 11/9/05 - Total Open Applications:

Single lots = 9

Subdivisions = 7

Chair Nugent stated these are the applications that are pending.

Ms. Taormina questioned whether these applications have fully complied and are awaiting review.

Chair Nugent stated most of the applications are not complete due to outstanding issues.

F. APPROVALS

Category A. – Single Lots

- 1. Block 36/Lot 44.01 – Ombalski, Fimbel Door, Coddington Road.**

Escrow fees paid 1/4/05. Check #1626. \$500.00.

Data mailed with 2/16/05 approval packet.

Mr. Steve Ombalski, licensed engineer in NJ appeared before the board. This application is for a small office section in the warehouse. Soils testing was done for 8 weeks. Testing resulted in conditions ranging from dry to 15” from the bottom. Generally, the most restrictive case was 54” below the surface. Revised forms were submitted in response to Ferriero Engr. letter dated 10/3/05. 7/21/05 wetlands letter was reviewed. Mr. Ombalski noted the fire retention pond, and man made ditch. This facility has well water. Mr. Ombalski testified that wells on lot 25 would not be impacted.

There was some discussion of fill usage.

Ms. Vaccarella confirmed that the well is existing, and the size of the system would accommodate future additions to the building.

Mr. Ombalski stated the well is existing, and the number of people has already been determined at 27 people, the system is designed for 30.

Chair Nugent confirmed there were no issues or concerns regarding the soils test.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula to **approve Block 36/Lot 44.01**, map named Septic Design for Fimbel Arch Door dated 12/22/04, revision 7/22/05, prepared by Stephen Ombalski, licensed engineer and surveyor in NJ. This is new construction, primary is soil log 5x and soil log 8 done on 4/19/04, soil log 5x no mottling and seepage at 90”; soil log 8 no mottling and seepage at 100”. Pit bail 1 in soil log 5x was done on 4/19/05, passing. In season ground water monitoring dates were 3/6/05 – 4/29/05. In 5x it was 71.5 establishing the regional level for ground water in the primary, in 8 the highest was 89. For the reserve, soil log 6 done on 4/19/04, no mottling, seepage at 92”, soil log 7 done 4/19/04, no mottling, seepage at 94”. Permeability test was pit bail 1 in soil log 6 done on 4/19/04 with passing results. Soil log 6 level was 79”, in 7 it was 54” which sets the level for in season ground water monitoring which was 54” on 4/8/05. Wetlands letter from Agovino Associates dated 7/21/05 states there were no regulated freshwater wetlands and transition areas with 150’ of the proposed disturbance. This is a pump system, including the maintenance and deed restriction requirements. A note to the HCHD for design, that the bed is to be upgraded to 1.61 sq. ft./gallon/day. Property line setback is 15’. The applicant has stated the facility use is 30 people. The 25% fines for select fill must be complied with.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Sheay. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

The following application is carried to the next meeting:

2. Block 48/Lot 6 – Parker Engr., Boraski, 42nd Street.

Escrow fees paid 7/22/05. Check #1686. \$500.00.

The following application is carried to the next meeting:

3. Block 70.01/Lot 10 – Fine Engr., Guerriero, 22 Hillcrest Rd.

Escrow fees paid 8/00/05, Check #0000. \$500.00.

Previously heard 8/17/05, 9/21/05.

Category B. – Subdivisions

1. Block 40/Lot 1 – Van Cleef Engr. , Solberg, County Line Road.

Escrow fees paid 6/2/05. Check #133. \$1,250.00

Mr. Ed Herrman, Van Cleef Engineering, licensed engineer, appeared before the board. This is a proposed 6 lot subdivision on County Line Road, south of Route 22 and NJ Transit RR Line. Frontage is on County Line Road and abutting Branchburg Twp., Somerset County. Soil testing was conducted in wet season 2004, Fall 2004 and wet season 2005. The full 8 week ground water monitoring was completed. This is a 3 acre zone in the RR zone. Primary and reserve testing, layouts of driveways, houses, proposed wells and septic are shown on the drawings.

Chair Nugent stated 5/27/05 map with revision date 8/9/05 is being used; additional information sent with this packet were an LOI which was revised and published by NJDEP on 1/5/05 which upgraded the buffer zone to exceptional value at 150' buffer requirement which is reflected on the maps, minutes from the Twp. Committee meeting reflecting the mayor from Branchburg addressing the committee, the LOI application and witness data and 8/1/05 and 10/5/05 letters from Ferriero Engineering. We will start with Lot A.

Mr. Herrman stated for Lot A, primary is soil logs 19 & 20 and basin flood 1. 19 showed regional zone at 64" massive rock at 106". Soil log 20, regional zone at 69", massive rock 98". Basin flood 1 was done at 6'. Soil logs 17 and 18 represent the reserve areas. 17 no ground water, massive rock at 97", 18 had regional zone at 2" based on ground water monitoring, and had 6" total depth to machine refusal. Basin flood 2 was done at 6.5'. Monitoring wells were installed between the two bed areas, designated as monitoring well- A P and A R for the in season ground water monitoring, piezometers. Soil log 19, highest ground water was 98", reserve was 121" in the three day monitoring, done by open pit in April 2004, piezometers were done for 8 weeks in March/April 2005. This would be a gravity fed system.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula to **approve** for Block 40/Lot 1, Lot A, on map "Soil Test & Permeability Plan for Block 40/Lot 1 dated 5/27/05, revisions on 8/9/05, map prepared by Robert J. Clerico, signed by surveyor Carl M. Herrman, new construction, 6 lot subdivision.

Primary for Lot A is soil log 19 and 20 done on 4/22/04, soil log 19 reveals no mottling and seepage a 102.5". Soil log 20 revealed no mottling and no seepage. Basin Flood 1 was a permeability test done 10/4/04. This is designated as a fill enclosed soil replacement select fill 25% fine system. Two in season ground water monitoring tests were used. A stand pipe in/near soil log 20 was in place from 4/23/04 – 4/28/04 revealing the highest level at 64" on 4/27/04. A piezometer in from 3/9/05 – 4/27/05, highest reading 98". Regional ground water for the primary is based on the open pit and is 64".

The reserve, soil log 17 and 18 done on 4/22/04, 17 revealed no mottling and seepage, 18 reveals no mottling and has seepage at 106". Permeability test was basin flood 2 at 78" done on 10/4/04, results

passing. LOI dated 1/5/05 issued by NJDEP #1022-04-00011.1 issued to Solberg Aviation Co., pertaining to all lots stated the wetland identified by points W2-1 to W2-13 is an isolated swale of ordinary resource value. There is no standard transition area required adjacent to ordinary resource value wetlands. The remaining wetlands are of exceptional resource value due to threatened and endangered species and require a standard transition of 150'. This will be a gravity fed system.

In the reserve, in season ground water monitoring was done with a stand pipe for 3 days, highest reading on 4/27/04 at 82". Piezometer in soil log 18 from 3/9/05 – 4/27/05, highest reading 121" on 3/30/05. Regional ground water for the reserve is based on the open pit on 4/27/04 at 82".

This motion was seconded by Ms. Sheay, on roll call vote the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye
Ms. Butula	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

Mr. Herrman stated for Lot B, primary area designated by soil logs 23 and 24, basin flood 4, reserve area 21 and 22, basin flood 3. Soil log 23 regional zone of saturation 84" open pit 3 day monitoring, *inaudible* 99". Soil log 24 reported dry in the open pit 105" depth, the regional zone 129.5" for the 8 week ground water monitoring. Basin flood 4 was done at a depth of 6'. For the reserve, soil log 21, regional zone of saturation 88" for the 3 day monitoring. Soil log 22, 100" total depth results of 3 day monitoring all dry. Basin flood 3 was conducted at a depth of 6'. The ground water monitoring was done utilizing B-R and B-P and the report primary 129.5" was the regional zone of saturation for the primary, highest depth was 110" in the reserve piezometer. This will be a gravity fed system.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula to *approve* for Block 40/Lot 1, Lot B, on map "Soil Test & Permeability Plan for Block 40/Lot 1, Lot B, map dated 5/27/05, revisions on 8/9/05, map prepared by Robert J. Clerico, signed by surveyor Carl M. Herrman, new construction, 6 lot subdivision. In the primary, soil log 23 no mottling or seepage, soil log 24 no mottling or seepage, both done 4/22/04, the permeability test was basin flood #4 at 72" done 10/4/04 passing. In season ground water monitoring was done in an open pit from 4/23/04 to 4/27/04, highest level 84" on 4/27/04. Piezometer was done from 3/9/05 – 4/27/05, highest reading 4/6/05 at 129.5". Regional ground water level for the primary will be 84" in the open pit on 4/27/04. For the reserve, soil log 21 and soil log 22, no mottling or seepage, both done on 4/22/04. Permeability test was basin flood 3 done at 72" on 10/4/04 passing, but it was fast, will be a fill enclosed soil replacement select fill system. LOI is the same as Lot A.

In the reserve area, monitoring was done in an open pit, highest reading was 88" on 4/27/04, done in soil log 21, with a piezometer from 3/9/05 – 4/27/05, highest reading on 3/30/05 at 110". This is a gravity fed system.

This motion was seconded by Dr. Allen, on roll call vote the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye
Dr. Allen	Aye	Ms. Sheay	Aye
Ms. Butula	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

Chair Nugent stated Lot C would be considered next.

Mr. Herrman stated for Lot C, the primary designated using soil log 33 and soil log 34, basin flood 5. Reserve area soil log 35 and 36 and basin flood 6. Soil log 33, regional zone at 96" in the open pit, 108 massive rock. Soil log 34, 75" regional zone, water level in the pit in the 3 day monitoring 108" total depth. Basin flood 5 done at 5.58'. Soil log 35, mottling at 27", reported as the regional zone. Soil log 36 reported mottling at 30", basin flood 6 done at 7.5' in depth.

Piezometers identified as C-P and C-R, C-P indicated a highest depth below grade of 107" and C-R highest level 102". Long term monitoring was deeper than the mottling indicated, no hydraulically restrictive horizons reported, regional zone is as indicated. Soil log 34-primary and 35-reserve are located 25' apart, may not be far enough apart to warrant consideration, a conservative approach may be valid in

this instance. The eight week monitoring did not indicate that the ground water was coming up close to those readings.

Chair Nugent asked referring to the reserve area soil log 35, with the regional zone set at 27", does that not imply that the depth of the basin flood is beyond code requirements as far as the requirement that the basin flood be performed 6 to 8' below the level of infiltration?

Mr. Kosinski stated it may be necessary to give an interpretation with regard to compliance with the ordinance, since the monitoring requirements have been met and permeability has been established for the location, although it doesn't meet the design requirements with regard to the separation distance between the level of infiltration and the permeability testing.

Chair Nugent stated it is not compliant with NJ State Code 7:9A 6.7 b1 aside of the ordinance requirements. It is 18" off.

Mr. Herrman stated they would contend that that is what was classified as the reserve area, given the basin floods were done slightly off elevation. He felt confident that a test done higher in elevation would function properly.

There was some discussion of compliance with state/local code.

Chair Nugent stated unless there is an alternate opinion, the suggestion is made that further testing is required for the reserve area. Further, he liked the idea of recognizing the proximity of 34 – 35 and adjusting the regional zone in the primary.

Mr. Herrman confirmed that a decision on Lot C would be deferred.

There was some discussion of a pump/gravity system.

Mr. Herrman stated it would be a gravity system.

Ms. Sheay stated a minor correction on form 2b for soil log 34, it should be 10" for fractured rock, instead of 40.

Chair Nugent stated the board would move on to Lot D.

Mr. Herrman stated Lot D consists of soil log 6, soil log 8 and pit bail 6 for the primary area. Soil log 5, 7 and pit bail 7 for the reserve area. Monitoring wells are DR and DP. For the primary soil log 6 indicated a regional zone at 51.5" on the 3 day monitoring 102" total depth, open pit. Soil log 8 had a 49" regional zone, ground water in the open pit, 3 day monitoring, 90"; the pit bail was done at 8.5'.

For the reserve, soil log 5 had a regional zone of 70" based on seepage observed. Soil log 7 had a 51" seepage in the soil log, pit bail 7 was done at 8.5'. Piezometer monitoring consisted of 68½" highest reading in the primary piezometer and 71½" in the reserve piezometer.

Chair Nugent asked what the distance is between the proposed bed locations and the 25' slope and drainage easements.

Mr. Herrman stated the primary is close to 20', the reserve is about 10'. The offset requirement does not apply to easements of this type, but does to property lines and right of ways.

There was some discussion as to whether or not this is a water course.

Ms. Taormina stated a water course is a defined term in the code.

Mr. Herrman read "a water course means any stream or surface water body or any ditch or subsurface drain that would permit drainage into a surface water body this term does not include swales or roadside ditches which convey only direct runoff from storms or snow melting in storm sewers designed or constructed in a manner that would prevent infiltration of ground water into the pipe with lateral movement of ground water through the excavation of which the pipe has been laid."

Ms. Vaccarella and Mr. Kosinski agreed that by definition, this would not be considered a water course.

There was further discussion by the board of this being a water course.

Mr. Herrman stated to interpret at this time is anticipatory at best, this road has been constructed for at least 10 years, he would offer that the ability exists to gasket the storm drain which would take this entirely out of the picture, this discussion about a water course.

Mr. Kosinski asked Mr. Herrman in his opinion if the existing topography depicted on the plan would meet the definition of a roadside swale.

Mr. Herrman stated there is no defined swale. The intent there is not to have any collection system of any sort. There is a somewhat defined ditch if you would call it that off the intersection that resulted in the cut of the roadway coming in to meet the existing ground.

Ms. Butula stated we need definition that this is not a water course.

Ms. Muir asked Mr. Herrman to point out where the bridge is for the stream that flows under County Line Rd.

Mr. Herrman pointed out the location.

Chair Nugent stated the map should come back with the details on it that represent this not being a watercourse requiring setback.

Mr. Herrman asked what should be indicated.

Chair Nugent stated Mr. Herrman should confer with Mr. Hansen and himself to determine what would designate this as a watercourse or not.

Chair Nugent stated the soil logs would not be reviewed at this time, the 100' setback requirement issue has to be decided prior.

Mr. Kosinski stated that he confirmed Chair Nugent's suspicion that the setback issue with regard to the permeability testing in the basin flood test, is going to become an issue for each of the remainder of these lots, it looks like the 8 foot requirement in the code has been exceeded for the suitability testing in each of these reserve and primary areas for the remainder of the lots.

Chair Nugent stated Lot D would be deferred, they would move on to Lot E.

Mr. Herrman stated Lot E primary consists of soil logs 29 and 30, basin flood 11. Soil log 29 had a regional zone of saturation at 30" based upon mottling, and an 8" total depth, soil log 30 had a regional zone of saturation of 25" based on mottling, basin flood depth for 11 was 7'. Reserve soil log 31 had 24" mottling recorded as the regional zone of saturation, soil log 32 had a 36" regional zone of saturation based on mottling. Basin flood 10 was done at a depth of 7'. The ground water monitoring piezometers, primary highest was 71", reserve was 140.5".

There was some discussion of ground water monitoring.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Herrman to address the reason for the soil logs and pit bails that were in the lower left hand quadrant of Lot E and what the results of that were.

Mr. Herrman stated for the initial conceptual layout, they were defining the lots. Soil log 1 had a regional zone at 75 based on seepage, there was a restrictive horizon 7 – 44. Soil log 2, restrictive 30 – 64, regional zone at 100 based on seepage. Soil log 3, 58" regional zone based on ground water open pit, restrictive horizon 9 – 71. Soil log 4, restrictive 8 – 31, no ground water classified. Soil log 13 regional zone at 79" based on open pit, no restrictive horizon, total depth of 120'. Pit bail 1, depth of 6.7', K rating 0.6, pit bail 3 done at 11.1' resulted in 0.3" per hour permeability.

Chair Nugent noted they all exceed 150' from the proposed primary and reserve areas, are closer to Lot D proposed beds than Lot E. Regarding Lot E, the issue is the depth of the basin floods relative to the regional zone exceeding state code of 6 – 8', so Lot E is deferred.

Mr. Herrman asked if the board wanted to review soil logs for Lot E.

Ms. Butula stated no, as long as Mr. Herrman agreed that the regional water for the primary was 25" because of the mottling in soil log 30, and on the reserve area, the regional is 24" because of the mottling in soil log 31.

Mr. Herrman stated that is correct.

Chair Nugent stated Lot E is deferred for more testing, they would move to Lot F, the basin flood depth is incorrect relative to the code, the regional is set at 27" for the primary, and for the reserve at 25". Basin flood is performed at 80", depth should have been 49 – 73" for the reserve and 51 – 75" for the primary in contrast to the 82" basin flood depth on 14.

Mr. Herrman clarified Lots C, E and F have the basin flood minimum depth. For Lot F, primary, soil log 25 and 26. 25 had a regional zone at 27" based on mottling, 123" total depth. Soil log 26 had a 30" zone based on mottling, 160" total depth corresponding basin flood 14 done at 6.83'. For the reserve soil log 27, regional zone of saturation 25" based on mottling. Soil log 28, 25" zone based on mottling. Basin flood inaudible done at 6.66' in depth. Ground water monitoring for F primary resulted in 98.5"; reserve was 73.5" maximum below grade. This will be a gravity fed system.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any further concerns for this application, to recap, Lots A and B have been approved, Lots C, D and F were deferred because of basin flood depth and Lot D because of the possible water course and its proximity to the primary and reserve areas.

Mr. Herrman asked in regard to the review of the soils, for the record, soils on Lot D were not reviewed at all because of the potential interpretation of the water course. Lots C, E and F soils will be reviewed at a later date. Mr. Herrman asked what would be the appropriate procedure if they went back out there in a reasonably quick manner to do the testing as asked.

Chair Nugent stated resubmit the data, the BOH engineer has to review it, get a letter to us and you, and assuming all details are addressed, depending on the waiting list, will be placed on an agenda, the faster the data is in, the sooner it is on the agenda.

Mr. Kosinski stated fortunately, the applicant does not have to wait for the wet season.

G. ADJOURNMENT

A *MOTION* was made by Ms. Sheay, to adjourn at 9:50 pm, seconded by Ms. Butula with a vote of Ayes all, Nays, none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger

Board of Health Secretary