



BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453
FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG

Minutes of the Commission Meeting Held on May 18, 2006 In the Stone Building 33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners: (P = Present; A = Appointed; E = Elected)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| P James Athearn (E – Edgartown) | P Ned Orleans (A – Tisbury) |
| P John Best (E – Tisbury) | - Megan Ottens-Sargent (E – Aquinnah) |
| P John Breckenridge (A – Oak Bluffs) | P Deborah Pigeon (E – Oak Bluffs) |
| P Christina Brown (E - Edgartown) | P Jim Powell (A – West Tisbury) |
| P Carlene Condon (A – Edgartown) | P Doug Sederholm (E – Chilmark) |
| - Martin Crane (A – Governor Appointee) | P Linda Sibley (E – West Tisbury) |
| P Mimi Davisson (E – Oak Bluffs) | P Paul Strauss (County Comm. Rep.) |
| P Chris Murphy (A – Chilmark) | P Andrew Woodruff (E – West Tisbury) |
| - Katherine Newman (A – Aquinnah) | |

Staff: Mark London (Executive Director), Bill Veno (Senior Planner), Paul Foley (DRI Coordinator), Christine Flynn (Affordable Housing & Economic Planner), Bill Wilcox (Water Resources Planner)

1. WOODLAND BUSINESS CENTER I: DRI 39M - DELIBERATION AND DECISION

Commissioners present and eligible: J. Athearn, J. Best, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, N. Orleans, D. Pigeon, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley

Christina Brown reported that the specific project before the Commission is the replacement of the greenhouse with an office/retail building. LUPC recommended approving the project as proposed with conditions related to traffic and parking.

- Traffic will exit from two lanes and enter from one. The traffic plan will be submitted for LUPC approval.
- The landscaping plan will show the addition of a street tree and will include the condition that prohibits the use of pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides.
- A revised set of proposed lighting conditions was distributed that outlined the principles such as non-fluorescent, shielded downward, and turned off at night. The applicant agreed to work out the details and submit a final plan to LUPC.
- LUPC discussed the appropriateness of the project in view of the possible alternatives.

Christina Brown moved, and it was duly seconded, that the project be approved subject to conditions as recommended by LUPC.

Commissioners agreed that the impact on affordable housing should be designated *neutral*.

John Breckenridge suggested that the final lighting plan include an implementation timetable.

Linda Sibley asked when the traffic pattern would be adjusted. **Christina Brown** said the building occupancy permit couldn't be issued until the traffic pattern is changed.

Commissioners agreed that language be included in the written decision that requires that the submission of the final site plan, landscaping plan, and lighting plans be submitted for the approval of LUPC before construction begins.

Doug Sederholm asked for an explanation of the lighting conditions and asked what flexibility the applicant needs. **Mark London** explained that, the other buildings have already been renovated with wiring and finishing completed, and that it might be possible to achieve the principles of the lighting plan with fixtures installed somewhat differently than in the original draft conditions.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to approve the project with conditions. In favor: J. Athearn, J. Best, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, N. Orleans, D. Pigeon, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley. Opposed: None. Abstentions: None. The motion passed.

2. WOODLANDS BUSINESS CENTER: DRI 139M – WRITTEN DECISION

Commissioners present: J. Athearn, J. Best, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, N. Orleans, D. Pigeon, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley

Jim Athearn moved and it was duly seconded, that the draft written decision be approved.

Christina Brown moved, and it was duly seconded, to amend the motion, that the written decision be amended to read that the Commission finds that the project will have no impact on the stock of affordable housing. A voice vote was taken. In favor: 9. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to approve the draft written decision as amended. In favor: J. Athearn, J. Best, J. Breckenridge, C. Brown, N. Orleans, D. Pigeon, J. Powell, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley. Opposed: None. Abstentions: None. The motion passed.

3. OTHER

Linda Sibley reported that Eric Wodlinger would be on the Island on Thursday, May 25th and make one of his periodic visits with Commissioners. The meeting would include an Executive Session to bring Commissioners up to date on on-going litigation. The rest of the meeting would be held in open session for questions about procedure or general legal issues.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Island Plan Steering Committee has been meeting over the winter to outline the planning process. The kick-off is going to be a forum on June 24th. People are encouraged to fill out the survey at www.islandplan.org or at the local libraries. Islanders who are interested in being part of the process can request to be a member of a Network of Planning Advisors.

Christina Brown said that adding one's name to the network doesn't mean being roped into a lot of meetings. **Jim Athearn** said people may participate in many different ways such as attending meetings or helping with questionnaires.

Commissioners took a brief recess. Carlene Condon and Andrew Woodruff arrived at 8:15. Christina Brown, Deborah Pigeon, and Jim Athearn left the meeting.

5. G.O.O.D. CO. INC.: DRI 551-M2 – PUBLIC HEARING (CONT.)

Commissioners present: J. Best, J. Breckenridge, C. Condon, M. Davisson, C. Murphy, N. Orleans, D. Sederholm, L. Sibley, P. Strauss, Andrew Woodruff

For the applicant: Dick Barbini, engineer; Sean Murphy, attorney

Carlene Condon, Hearing Officer, reopened the public hearing on the G.O.O.D. Company application.

Dick Barbini said he is prepared to answer some of the questions raised at the last public hearing. He also noted that G.O.O.D. Company has hired Kate Warner and she will remain on staff through the construction phase of the project. The applicants are submitting a list of energy efficiency suggestions that they will try to adhere to. Their goal is to be as energy efficient as possible.

5.1 Wastewater

Dick Barbini presented information on the wastewater plan.

- The exact flow for the development is 17,995 gallons a day. The Sewer Commission has approved 18,000 gallons a day and the applicants will not ask for any additional flow.
- 5900 gallons per day is for the recreation facility and staff housing. The remainder is for the 25 house lots.
- The applicants are proposing a limit of 110 bedrooms distributed to the 25 lots, each with no less than 3 bedrooms and no more than 5. The allocation would require a modification to the allocation of the original DRI.
- The calculation is based on state requirements for flows for tennis courts, pools, and bathrooms.
- The sewer department bills by number of fixtures.
- The three affordable housing lots will be allocated three bedrooms but would not be required to have that many. Any excess bedrooms could not be reallocated to other lots.
- The applicants will not consider a package sewage treatment plant on this site because it is his professional opinion that it would not work. There would be major seasonal fluctuation that would lead to difficulty getting the appropriate treatment level. They feel strongly about getting the sewage to people who are in the business of treating it.
- Two routes for the sewer line are possible: one is to go to Water Street to a pump station on Dunham Avenue and reroute the line to the West Tisbury forced main; the second is to go down Clevelandtown and Meshaket roads, and build a pump station at the old landfill site.
- Although the second option is more expensive, they are prepared to implement it, as it would help improve wastewater treatment in the Edgartown Great Pond. They have

designed the main line for the flow from the proposed development and will be building a pump station at the old dumpsite to also accommodate flow from houses in Island Grove. The pump station and the line from there to the treatment plant will be sized to handle the additional flow.

- The applicants believe that the pump station is a major benefit to the town as it is being designed for tie-ins of lots west of the landfill on Meshaket (about 12 from Llewellyn Way and all 149 lots of Island Grove). Capacity up to the dumpsite pump station is limited to the development's 18,000 gallons.
- After study of the remaining capacity of the treatment plant and its nitrogen contribution to Edgartown Great Pond, the major benefit of this proposal is that building the pump station jumpstarts adding houses to the treatment plant that would otherwise contribute nitrogen to Edgartown Great Pond.
- About additional 10 houses that might contribute to Katama Bay Watershed could be added to their 4" line.
- He explained the pump system.
- The cost of their wastewater proposal is about \$1.2 million. A package treatment plant would be about \$600,000, but because of the seasonal flow, it won't work. He believes they could get the discharge permits, but it would be difficult to keep them because he didn't think they would be able to consistently meet the permitted flow requirements. He won't consider a package treatment plant because, from an engineering point of view, it's not appropriate.

Joe Alosso, manager of the Edgartown Wastewater Treatment Plant, presented background information on the Edgartown Treatment Plant.

- Pennywise Path Project, located at the edge of the watershed, has been approved for 129 bedrooms with 14,290 gallons of wastewater per day. Nitrogen contribution after treatment will be 135 lbs per year versus 1512 lbs. through septic treatment.
- High Road has the potential for 100 bedrooms with 11,000 gallons of wastewater per day. Nitrogen contribution after treatment will be 100 lbs. per year versus 1172 lbs. per year through septic systems treatment.
- Edgartown Meadows has been approved for 595 bedrooms, with 50% anticipated year round occupancy, contributing 59,500 gallons of wastewater per day. Nitrogen contribution after treatment will be 373 lbs. per year versus 4347 lbs. through septic system treatment.
- Island Grove subdivision has been approved for 745 bedrooms, 50% year round occupancy, contributing 74,500 gallons of wastewater per day. Nitrogen contribution will be 466 lbs. per year versus 5443 lbs. through septic system treatment.
- Vineyard Golf Club has been approved for 25,000 gallons of wastewater per day, contributing 75 lbs. of nitrogen per year versus 878 lbs. through septic treatment.
- Nitrogen reduction of wastewater through the treatment plant is 91%. Discharge of nitrogen will decrease from over 12,000 lbs. per year to 1139 lbs. per year.
- The treatment plant's capacity is 750,000 gallons per day. The permit for the wastewater treatment plant was originally for 615,000 gallons on a peak day; summer peak is currently 485,000 gallons per day.

- In 1999, as a result of the 604B grant done by the Commission, the plant's permit was reissued allowing the annual discharge of up to 2200 kilograms of nitrogen. Since 1999 the plant's output of nitrogen has ranged from 380 kgs per year to 625 kgs per year.
- He stated that the town has been very responsible and hasn't rubberstamped anything. Additions to the system have reduced costs to the town.

Joe Alosso responded to Commissioner questions.

- Designing a bigger pipe from the development in anticipation of future development is not a benefit to the town. This is the best design for the applicant and for the town. If another development were approved along the pipe route, the town's process is for the developer to upsize the pipe, which is installed by trenching or burrowing along the side of the road.
- Part of the town's plan is to sewer the denser parts of the Edgartown Great Pond watershed, but running sewers to some remote, seasonal locations is not unreasonable. Even after sewerage the reasonably accessible homes, there is still capacity remaining of 135,000 gallons per day.
- Sewering Island Grove is about a \$2 million project. The pump chamber that G.O.O.D. Company will install would save the town \$300,000 to \$400,000.
- Build-out numbers are based on the town regulation that houses on the sewer are limited to 5 bedrooms. The numbers anticipate that every house that is sewerage will have 5 bedrooms.
- He's not sure how many lots are available for development in the whole watershed. The Board of Health could ask for denitrifying plants for future major developments. If the treatment plant were to reach capacity, the town would be faced with expanding the treatment plant or finding alternative systems. The treatment plant was designed for expansion and could import more waste.
- There is a zoning by-law in the works that addresses bedroom counts; no house lot on the sewer system would be allowed more than 5 bedrooms.
- He believes that the Mass Estuaries Project will have recommendations and guidelines, but the project won't change 604B limits.
- The grant work defining the nitrogen limit for the treatment plant and watershed was done by the MVC.

Bill Wilcox responded to questions raised about wastewater.

- 604B nitrogen loading limit work for Edgartown Great Pond was done by Dr. Arthur Gaines through the Commission. At the time he prepared the limit, it was difficult to evaluate the pond because of its episodic tidal flow. The nitrogen load limit ballpark figure for the entire watershed is 2.5 kgs per acre per year. The Estuaries Project will come up with nitrogen guidelines for different sections of the watershed, for instance Meshaket Cove that receives effluent flow from the treatment plant as well as a large number of septic systems. The numbers will be more accurate than the current limits.
- In 1999 there were 625 houses in the Edgartown Great Pond Watershed, so 268 houses represent about 40% of the watershed. The 90% reduction is a reduction of the current septic load from 268 houses as a result of sewerage, not from the houses that are not going to be sewerage.

- Katama Bay is a nitrogen-sensitive coastal pond and there is less of an accurate number for its nitrogen loading limit. The ballpark loading limit is 19.5 kgs per acre per year versus 2.5 for Edgartown Great Pond because Katama Bay has tidal circulation.
- Some nitrogen from this project will remain in the Katama Bay watershed from landscaping and run-off, about 58 kgs from the club and the 25 lots. The total nitrogen contribution to the Katama Bay watershed will be 65 kgs total for the entire project, roughly 2.5 kgs per acre per year.
- Though the development is permitted for 18,000 gallons per day as a design flow, the actual flow will be considerably less. Design flow is 330 gallons per day for an average three-bedroom house; the average actual daily flow is closer to 167 gallons per day so the flow from the house lots will be less than the calculation.
- Once the water gets to the treatment plant, nitrogen will be reduced by over 90%. If the actual flow were 60% of the design flow, the nitrogen contribution would be about 44.7 lbs of nitrogen. Actual flow and nitrogen will probably be even lower because of the seasonal nature of the development.
- He handed out a pie chart showing various flows. The 18,000 gallons per day is about 2.4% of the design capacity of the treatment plant. The addition of the development's 18,000 gallons per day is about 4.2% of the treatment plant's excess capacity.
- He thinks tying in the development and additional houses is a great idea, about 268 houses at 45,000 gallons per day of actual flow. The design flow is about 88,000 per day. Septic treatment of wastewater would result in nitrogen at 26.5 parts per million. Treatment through the plant would bring nitrogen down to 3 parts per million.

5.3 Public Comment:

Jay Guest said that if there were ever a case for a package denitrification system this is it.

- A denitrification system would prevent nitrogen contribution to Meshaket Cove and Katama Bay. His favorite system is the SepticTech 2000 from Maine.
- He outlined his case against the Edgartown Wastewater plant regarding a water plume investigation and his objection to non-Edgartown-Great-Pond lots being added to the sewer system.
- He outlined background on the watershed approach, history on the treatment plant's restrictive permit, and DEP and EPA concerns about the plant.
- Nitrogen limits are based on 604B numbers. A biology study of the Great Pond has not been done and the pond has failed to get the protection it deserves.
- He objects to the revenues of over \$225,000 generated from the treatment plant's acceptance of sludge from outside the watershed.
- Existing functioning Title 5 systems were abandoned and tied-in to the facility.
- As a resident of High Road and Edgartown taxpayer, he never received notice that his property was eligible for tie-in, which could increase the value of his property.
- His group attempted to arbitrate the issue. However, town counsel was allowed to litigate the matter.
- He questioned Michael Donaroma and Martha Look's sewerage of their own commercial properties and all of upper Main Street, which was done without public notice or DEP permits.

- The treatment plant doesn't remove household or commercial contaminants. Sludge is the worst contributor.
- This wastewater facility shouldn't have been built on this site because of the sensitivity of the pond.

Carlene Condon asked whether there is a legal requirement of public notice of sewerage projects. **Dick Barbini** said that there is.

Doug Sederholm said that treatment plant does not remove heavy metals or other contaminants from sludge and asked if there are monitoring wells. **Jay Guest** replied there are monitoring wells and samples are tested for nitrogen. Core samples would show other contaminants. He said Jesse Shwarbaum took core samples from 90 feet, but the samples were lost. He confirmed that there are no test results showing heavy metals down gradient from the treatment plant.

Elaine Putnam said a package plant would be a good idea for the development.

- Sewering originally was a private concern but is now a public concern.
- Sewering shouldn't be charged to the whole town. Sewer charges should be based on a lot's use of water.
- The treatment plant is in a very fragile area and she asked why it was built there.

Bruce Rosinoff, who works for the Mass Estuaries Project, said he is pleased with the approach the town is taking relative to the Edgartown Great Pond and sewerage properties in the watershed.

- He noted that it's a shame the project can't be contained within the Katama Bay watershed where flushing is excellent.
- The amount of 18,000 gallons sent to the treatment plant is not a big concern. He is concerned that this project would set a precedent for other developments to be connected.
- He prefers to limit tie-ins to areas that have pollution problems or are within the watershed.

Tad Crawford, member of the board of the Vineyard Conservation Society, said he doesn't want to speak specifically in favor or against this project.

- The town spent a fair amount of money doing the Mass Estuaries Project. He asked whether those findings are important for putting this kind of proposal into context and suggested waiting for the MEP report.
- After build-out there would be 135,000 gallons per day excess capacity. This project represents 1/8th of the amount coming from outside the watershed. He asked how one goes about prioritizing projects.

Bob Woodruff speaking as an individual, not as deputy director of the Great Pond Foundation, said the foundation has been a very strong advocate of sewerage within the watershed.

- A package treatment plant would be an ideal thing.
- The big cost of sewerage is digging and laying down the lines. Once this is being done, perhaps a second pipe could be installed that would bring the treated effluent back to Katama Farm where the treated wastewater could be used to irrigate forage crops.

Bill Wilcox said the State has a re-use policy for treated wastewater for golf courses and toilet flushing. A crop that would be used for mulch could possibly be watered with reused water but food chain crops are not yet approved for re-use irrigation.

Dick Barbini stressed three points.

- Mr. Guest's presentation isn't about the project.
- The applicants will not build a package treatment plant; it is his professional opinion that a package plant won't work because of the seasonal and weekly fluctuations of flow.
- The applicant has worked out the flow with the Edgartown Sewer Commission; this 18,000 per day as part of the excess capacity will come from somewhere. The acceptance of their 18,000 gallons a day should be considered a benefit to the town because the applicants are building the pump station for future tie-ins by other landowners.
- The town has done an excellent job of sewerage the watershed.

Joe Alosso responded to various issues that had been raised and to Commissioners' questions.

- It is also his professional opinion that a package treatment plant wouldn't work because of the seasonal flow.
- Edgartown Great Pond is doing great. Shellfish have returned.
- Regarding Jay Guest's lawsuit, the judge dismissed all his arguments and ruled in favor of the town.
- Taking in other town's waste materials was a temporary measure. Tisbury and Oak Bluffs will have their own treatment plants.
- The sewerage of downtown was always part of the plan.
- All sewer expenses are paid by the users.
- In 1999 the plant won an EPA award.
- Re-use water is a big project but it is being looked into. There is a return line in place that could carry treated effluent to the Vineyard Golf Club.
- It is ironic that the Mass Estuaries Project will indicate that wastewater plants are the best things that ever happened because they reduce nitrogen so much.
- A package treatment plant can function with 5,000 gallons or more, but constant flow is necessary. What really messes up plants is fluctuation in flow because they are living systems.
- It's not likely that the town would seek a discharge area outside of Edgartown Great Pond, but the state is finally putting together reuse guidelines. The Island is a few years from water reuse because of the need for infrastructure and equipment.
- Tisbury never brought sludge to the treatment plant but Oak Bluffs will continue to do so until its plant is completed.
- The treatment plant receives about 1 million gallons of septage per year from private contractors. The amount they can accept is limited by the size of storage tanks. The amount coming from other towns will decrease when Oak Bluffs' treatment plant is built.
- They sample water for VOC and metal samples; results have occasionally shown acetone.
- There is little to no heavy metal in sludge because there is no industry on the Island. Sludge is grade A; it is treated, then transported and becomes Enviro, a soil additive.
- The plant is required to test sludge for VOC and heavy metal and the results are on-line.

- Downtown Edgartown was sewered because of the plant. In 1972, when the plant was built, the harbor was completely polluted. The harbor is 1000 % better. The Lilly Pond Well has improved too.

Bruce Rosinoff said the Mass Estuaries Project results for Edgartown Great Pond should be out later this year, but that he doesn't believe the results would have a great bearing on this project and the way Commissioners would view it. Everyone has the feeling that the Edgartown Great Pond is stressed to a certain extent and that nitrogen should be reduced, but he doubts that the specific numbers that will be produced by the MEP will be relevant to reviewing this project.

Andrew Woodruff thanked Joe Alosso for coming to the meeting. Originally he was shocked that the town would approve a project from so far away from the treatment plant and Edgartown Great Pond Watershed but he now understands the reasons. He noted that the 135,000 gallon excess capacity could be used within the watershed and asked what kind of criteria the Sewer Commission uses in approving a project. **Joe Alosso** said the town is currently developing criteria. This project was approved by the Sewer Commission partly because of the benefits to the town.

John Breckenridge noted that the B.A.D.D. written decision included a 4-bedroom limit. He asked whether the applicant needed to apply separately for an amendment to B.A.D.D. **Mark London** will consult with counsel as to whether this is a modification or a new application.

Commissioners recessed for 10 minutes.

5.4 Traffic

Dick Barbini outlined the traffic impact summary.

- 449 new trips would be generated by the recreation facility with 61 trips during summer peak hour. The total trips for the full development would be 897, 107 at peak hour.
- Parking is out of sight so visual impact isn't an issue.
- The intersection of South Road and the entrance into the subdivision works at all times; no second entrance is necessary.
- The intersection of Herring Creek and Katama shows worst-case scenario at 42 seconds average delay
- The 4-way intersection will operate with an average intersection delay of 32 seconds (LOS D).
- A series of mitigating measures are proposed, in addition to the fact that there will be staff housing on site which would cut down on the number of trips:
 - bus passes for employees;
 - employees won't be allowed to park on site;
 - the applicants will provide 100 student passes to be administered by the VTA for children in the area;
 - they will try to coordinate employee work schedules with transit schedules;
 - there will be bike racks, a parking lot management plan, a roadway association, stop signs at intersections within the subdivision, and 15 mph speed limit signs.

Srinivas Sattoor said the build-out rate for the B.A.D.D. Company study was 2008 using a 2% average growth per year. This proposal's build-out year is 2010 using 1% average growth per year. He would like to see numbers using the 2% growth rate. The delay on Katama Road

northbound is estimated at 49.9 seconds, LOS E, using the 1% growth rate and this would change to F if the 2% growth rate were used. The proposed mitigation measures seem to be reasonable.

Dick Barbini responded to Commissioners' questions.

- With respect to traffic mitigation for fundraising events gatherings would be during off-peak hours. They are offering that large events like an annual tennis tournament would use off-site parking.
- With respect to emergency vehicle access, there is one access to the development but two ways to get to the pool. Fire trucks can pull in and will have plenty of hose capacity. The Edgartown Planning Board and Police Department reviewed the original subdivision plan with 20-foot wide roads. At a big event an ambulance could park at the facility.
- There will be a landscaping plan. Exterior lighting will be limited to that required by lighting code, possibly with some down lighting on paths. Tennis courts will not be lit.
- With respect to the noise impacts on abutters, the tennis and pool are lower than surrounding houses, which will muffle sound. Landscape will also be designed to act as a sound buffer.

Elaine Putnam asked if there is enough space for people to get out of the development if fire trucks were stopped on the entrance road. **Sean Murphy** said if there were an emergency, there's plenty of room for people to get in and out. They aren't planning a second entrance because there is not a traffic issue out front, they would have to exit through a whole neighborhood, and there would be grade issues in building a second exit. Safety issues have been taken into account.

Elaine Putnam asked if rooms would be available for hire for functions. **Sean Murphy** said that the club is not for hire by the public. If a member wanted to have a party, we'd consider that, but that's not what we're looking for.

John Best asked about services at the snack area and food preparation. **Sean Murphy** said they still have to go through the application process for a club license to serve alcohol to only members and their guests. The snack bar is in the learning center. The intent is to serve quick breakfast and lunch; it is not a dining room and is for guests only. There is a small prep kitchen. Tennis courts close by 7:00 p.m., the fitness center by 9:00 p.m. and the learning center by 8:00 p.m.

John Breckenridge suggested that the applicants, as they plan the menu and kitchen, be aware of fryolator odors in a residential neighborhood.

Mark London suggested that the applicant work with staff on putting offers on paper, for instance those related to events.

Andrew Woodruff asked the applicants to speak to the cultural impacts of the proposal and the perceived widening gap between seasonal and year-round residents. He's wondering how the project can benefit the Island as a whole and the applicants' feeling about the need for the facility. **Sean Murphy** responded with:

- He's heard from people that there's a widening gulf, but there has been a long tradition of private clubs. There has always been a wealthier seasonal population.

- They truly believe this club will benefit the Island as a whole with its package of donations, all of which directly benefit year-round residents. They anticipate that this club will raise tens of millions of dollars for the Island.
- He doesn't believe that this club will take people out of the mix of existing clubs. The facility will be for people who want a place where they can socialize and do activities with their families.
- The market for this development's fitness facility is not members of existing Island clubs. They are not offering lower cost Island memberships because they don't want to take business away from other clubs.

Linda Sibley said she thinks the community benefit is great, but when Chapter 831 asks the Commission to weigh the benefits and detriments, it doesn't have in mind donations that are unrelated to the proposal. **Sean Murphy** said that the benefits are purposefully crafted to be directly related to the facility, for instance the swim lessons, fund-raising events, and other activities to take place on the premises.

Bill Veno asked if it would make sense to consider a sidewalk from the entrance to the facility so that people taking the bus can walk safely to the recreational facilities.

Chris Murphy suggested some dedicated parking for staff that lives on site. Dick Barbini proposed to modify the application in order to add four staff parking spaces. The finances of the facility are based on having 70 parking spaces for members. However, the traffic study was based on 70 parking spaces.

Carlene Condon continued the public hearing to Thursday, June 1st for the purpose of receiving any additional written testimony, particularly the clarification of the G.O.O.D. and B.A.D.D. Company applications and clarification of offers. Detailed offers will be submitted by May 25th and public comment by June 1st.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Linda B. Sibley
Chairman

Oct 19, 2006
Date

[Signature]
Clerk-Treasurer

Oct 19, 2006
Date