

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

BOX 1447 • OAK BLUFFS
MASSACHUSETTS 02557
(508) 693-3453
FAX (508) 693-7894

Martha's Vineyard Commission Minutes of the Special Meeting of June 3, 1999

The Martha's Vineyard Commission held a Special Meeting on June 3, 1999, at 7:30 p.m. at the Tisbury Senior Center, Large Meeting Room, Pine Tree Road, Vineyard Haven, Mass.

At 7:41 p.m., a quorum being present, Richard J. Toole, Chairman of the Martha's Vineyard Commission and an Oak Bluffs representative, brought the Meeting to order. First on the Agenda was a meeting of the Martha's Vineyard Commission Joint Transportation Commission (MVC JTC).

Martha's Vineyard Commission Notice of Public Hearing

- Description:** *Meeting of the Martha's Vineyard Commission Joint Transportation Committee.*
- Purpose:** *To draft the Martha's Vineyard Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal Fiscal Years 2000 - 2005 (FY 2000-2005). The MVC JTC will be asked to recommend that the Draft TIP be sent to the State, with changes made on or before this Meeting.*
- Date and Time:** *Thursday, June 3, 1999, at 7:30 p.m.*
- Location:** *The Tisbury Senior Center
Large Meeting Room
Pine Tree Road
Vineyard Haven, Mass.*

[Because of the poor acoustics of the room, little could be heard clearly on the tapes recorded during the Meeting. Therefore, in writing these Minutes, MVC Secretary Pia Webster relied upon the shorthand notes she had taken during the Meeting. MVC Staff members were asked to ascertain accuracy where appropriate.]

Andrew Grant, MVC Transportation Planner, began by going over some of the figures for the proposed Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Island. He explained that the handout he had given to the Commission members contained lists of highway and transportation projects for the next six years, including Steamship Authority projects.

The Hearing itself, continued Mr. Grant, was a sort of "wake-up call" for the Towns and their Highway Departments to get their proposals together. In addition, because the plan covered a six-year period, it rolled over from year to year, with five years of projects remaining the same.

Mr. Grant then went over some of the Transportation Enhancement Program guidelines, for example, for bicycle paths, pedestrian facilities and the preservation of historic structures. He finished by asking if any of the Commission members had questions or comments.

Tristan Israel, a Commission member representing Tisbury, referred to the Tisbury Park and Ride facility, into which more transportation funds were being invested. The parking lot was being expanded, more buses would be running, and the cost of parking this summer would be \$3 a day, he reported. The Board of Selectmen had learned recently, he went on, that the Town would have to cap the corner of the Town landfill that abutted the Park and Ride parking lot. Mr. Israel wondered there would be an opportunity for the Town to receive funds from the current TIP.

At Mr. Grant's behest, Fred LaPiana, Director of the Tisbury Department of Public Works, responded to the question, noting that funds had been procured from the State Economic Development Program for the expansion Mr. Israel had referred to.

Benjamin Hall, Jr., a Commission member representing Edgartown, asked if the rural road standards work was part of the TIP. Mr. Grant and MVC Executive Director Charles W. Clifford both answered, No. Mr. LaPiana pointed out that there was a \$375,000 State project for the Cape and Islands that would be doing that work.

John Early, a Commission member representing West Tisbury, asked Mr. Grant to explain some of the notations at the heads of the category columns. Mr. Grant responded that they referred to "different pots of money"; for instance, CMQ referred to air quality programs.

Mr. Hall asked if the TIP included funding for State Highways. No, replied Mr. Grant, highways and bridges belonged to a separate budget. What about the bike paths of State roads? wondered Mr. Hall. The Towns help out on that, responded Mr. Grant, adding that he would have to check to find out to what degree, if any, the State contributed to the construction of bike paths on State roads.

Christina Brown, a Commission member representing Edgartown, asked about the status of the bike paths in Tisbury and West Tisbury. Mr. Grant said that he was not aware of any activity. Mr. Clifford noted that the next area to be completed would be the path around the upper northeast corner of the State Forest, that is, behind the Regional High School, Dodgers Hole and Bold Meadow. Mr. Grant added that upon the completion of this work, the bicycle path loop around the State Forest would be complete. The time was 7:50 p.m.

Item #3: Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Next on the Agenda was the Approval of the Meeting Minutes of May 6, 1999. Jane Greene, a Commission member representing Chilmark, made a Motion to Approve the Minutes of May 6, 1999, duly seconded. The Commission members took a few minutes to review the Minutes since it had been some time since they had read them. Michael Colaneri, a Commission member representing West Tisbury, made a Motion to Approve as Written, duly seconded. The vote went as follows:

AYES: J. Best; C. Brown; M. Colaneri; M. Donaroma; J. Early; T. Israel; J. Jason, Jr.; M. Lazerow; M. Ottens-Sargent; L. Sibley; R. Toole; J. Vercurysse; R. Zeltzer; M. Allen; and A. Gallagher.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAINING: B. Hall, Jr.; and J. Greene.

ABSENT: M. Cini; T. Henson; and M. Bolling.

Next, Ms. Greene made a Motion to Approve the Minutes of May 20, 1999, duly seconded. Megan Ottens-Sargent, a Commission member representing Aquinnah, pointed out that on page 5, paragraph 1, sentence 4, the word "interrupt" should have been "interpret." So the sentence should have read: "Attorney Wodlinger had observed that the Commission was a land use board and was not called on to interpret the fine points of any zoning ordinance."

Mr. Early noted that his name should have been listed on page 2, paragraph 6, as having voted "Aye" on the Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes of April 29, 1999.

Marcia Cini, a Commission member representing Tisbury, had left a marked copy of the Minutes of May 20, 1999 with Ms. Webster earlier. On page 5, paragraph 5, sentence 1, she wanted the phrase "its maintenance" replaced with "enforcement of the restriction." Thus, the sentence should read: "Mr. Donaroma went on that it was suggested that a preservation restriction be placed on the Beriah Weeks House and that monies be provided for enforcement of the restriction."

Ms. Greene made a Motion to Approve the Minutes of May 20, 1999, as Amended, duly seconded. The vote went as follows:

AYES: J. Best; C. Brown; M. Colaneri; M. Donaroma; J. Early; J. Greene; T. Israel; J. Jason, Jr.; M. Ottens-Sargent; L. Sibley; R. Toole; J. Vercruysse; R. Zeltzer; M. Allen; and A. Gallagher.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAINING: B. Hall, Jr.; and M. Lazerow.

ABSENT: M. Cini; T. Henson; and M. Bolling.

Postponement of Continued Public Hearings.

Mr. Toole then announced that the Carroll Realty Trust and the Timothy Gomes Continued Public Hearings (DRIs 472 and 472a) had been postponed at the request of the Applicants on the preceding afternoon. Mr. Colaneri asked if the Tisbury Zoning Inspector had been heard from on this matter. John Best, a Commission member representing Tisbury, said that the Inspector had acceded to the request for postponement. A brief discussion of this subject ensued. Lenny Jason, Jr., the Commission member from the County Commission, asked if there were, in fact, zoning violations. Yes, replied Mr. Israel, a representative from Tisbury.

Item #4: Reports.

Michael Donaroma, a Commission member representing Edgartown and the Chair of the Land Use Planning Commission (LUPC), explained that there had been no LUPC meeting on the preceding Monday because of the Memorial Day holiday.

Ms. Greene reported on the **Aquinnah DCPC Exemption Committee**. The committee had met the week before, she said, and had granted two exemptions. She went into some detail about the alternatives to the plans that the committee had required of the Applicants, which in one case included lowering the height of the house from 26.5 feet to 25.5 feet.

Christine Flynn, MVC Staff member, reported on the meeting of the **Affordable Housing Subcommittee** on the previous day. They had met with members of the Dukes County Regional Housing Authority, she explained, and had come to the conclusion that the Commission's current affordable housing policy had to be revised and updated to meet the needs of the Island. It had been agreed that the standard 10 percent exaction was inadequate in the case of subdivisions. Moreover, commercial developments should be expected to replace any housing, be it year-round or seasonal, that any new construction would eliminate. Ms. Flynn finished by saying that MVC Staff would be studying all options and that the subcommittee would be meeting again in mid-June.

Mr. Jason, who was a member of the subcommittee, added that all members of the subcommittee believed that the 10 percent exaction was inadequate. They had also talked about policy for commercial projects, as discussed by Ms. Flynn. Also, he announced that the next meeting of the subcommittee would be at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, June 15.

Mr. Best noted that he had not been told about the previous meeting of the subcommittee. Mr. Colaneri reminded the Commission members that Attorney Eric Wodlinger had encouraged them the week before to get an affordable housing policy in place as soon as possible. Ms. Flynn responded to that by saying that during the next meeting they would be coming up with a time frame for the development of such a policy.

Commission member Michele Lazerow, representing Oak Bluffs, noted that the policy would need to address the affordable housing exaction for projects that did not primarily entail buildings. Ms. Flynn said that this subject had been discussed at the previous meeting and would be addressed in the formulation of the revised policy. Mr. Jason added that the group had talked about the issue of unusual projects and that this would definitely be on their minds as they continued to meet. Mr. Colaneri mentioned that he had not been told about the meeting, so Ms. Webster offered to include all future committee meetings on the extended Commission schedule.

On a related subject, Linda Sibley, a Commission member from West Tisbury, reported that the airport commission had met the day before and had voted to encourage the development of dormitory housing on the Edgartown side of the airport business park. Their major concern was the possibility of "wild parties," but the commission believed that with proper management such a proposal could work. Ms. Sibley explained how a non-profit corporation would be created and that business owners would "buy" beds for their employees, who, in turn, would pay rent to the owners.

Mr. Colaneri wondered if there was any particular section of the airport which the airport commission thought would be appropriate for such an undertaking. Ms. Sibley replied that they were looking at the standard lots in the business park. Since there were limitations on the amount of septage that could be handled at the airport, the groundwater

discharge permit would have to be worked out with the airport commission. Further discussion of the possible dormitory housing followed.

Marie Allen, a Governor's appointee, asked how many beds there would be. Two hundred, replied Ms. Sibley, with one bed per room. Ms. Brown explained that there would be four buildings with 50 rooms each, plus a common room and a unit for the resident manager. There would be no kitchen facilities, and the buildings would not be heated. A brief discussion of the details of the plan ensued.

Regarding on the **PED/ETF/Ag Task Force Committee**, Mr. Early asked if the MVC Staff had been working on developing guidelines for the Island building caps. Mr. Clifford replied that he had met with local MVC Counsel Ronald Rappaport about this and would be meeting with the All-Island Selectmen's Association on Tuesday, June 8, about getting political support for the building caps.

Ms. Lazerow reported on the **Cell Tower Study Group**, which had met on May 22. The group had discussed inviting representatives of the six companies doing or proposing to do business with the Island to meet with them with the aim of learning what the companies needed for coverage and possibly coordinating cooperation among them. They were also working on getting mapping of the taller buildings on the Island, as well as looking over the wording of the Cape Cod Commission's published guidelines on the subject. Ms. Lazerow noted that said commission did not limit the regulations to cell towers, but applied them to other types of tall structures as well.

Governor's appointee Anne Harney Gallagher asked if anyone had considered putting the antennas on the 75-foot poles at the Windfarm Golf Practice Facility. Ms. Greene replied that she had already suggested that. "I was serious," Ms. Greene added. Mr. Colaneri asked if they had gathered any data from the company representatives yet. No, responded Ms. Lazerow, the group was still trying to contact them. Answering Mr. Toole's question about when the next meeting of the group would be, Ms. Lazerow said that it had not been set yet.

Mr. Clifford provided the **Legislative Update**, relating to the Commission that rumor had it there would be a "big fight" in the State House over the budget, with the House pushing for bridges and roads. In the meantime, the Governor was paying people "triple time and a half" to finish the Big Dig, and the final budget might not see the light of day until October. "It could be a dry summer, folks," observed Mr. Clifford. The time was 8:20 p.m.

Discussion: Allen Moore Division of Land Concurrence Vote.

The discussion began with a presentation by Doug Hoehn, an engineer with the firm Schofield, Barbini & Hoehn, who was there to represent the Applicant, Allen Moore. Mr.

Hoehn explained that the project involved a simple division of land that had been referred to the Commission because the lot had been part of a larger property which had been the subject of an earlier Development of Regional Impact (DRI). In 1976 that larger property, which lay in a Coastal District, had been divided in two. The Applicant, continued Mr. Hoehn, had offered owner/tenant restrictions to be associated with the land and was hoping to negotiate an agreement with the Town of West Tisbury.

Next to speak was Simone DeSorcy, Assistant to the West Tisbury Planning Board, which had referred the project to the Commission. She read into the record a letter dated June 3, 1999, signed by Virginia C. Jones, Chair of the Planning Board. It read in part: "The Board has met on several occasions with Mr. Moore and/or his agent, Doug Hoehn ... We found Mr. Moore to be responsive to our concerns and believe the resulting plan, which was ultimately referred to you, minimizes any adverse impacts that development could have on the subject site, surrounding wetlands and Tisbury Great Pond."

The letter went on to explain that the proposed plan would allow only two residence, one on each buildable lot, and would prohibit guest houses. Self-imposed building footprint size and height restriction had also been proposed by the Applicant, along with other owner/tenant restrictions. The letter concluded: "In sum, although development at the Moores' property has the potential to adversely impact Martha's Vineyard, we believe that the mitigation measures designed into the proposal preserve the natural and ecological value of the site."

Mr. Toole asked for discussion. Mr. Colaneri asked Mr. Hoehn how the self-imposed restrictions would be enforced. "By written covenant," replied Mr. Hoehn. Mr. Colaneri then commented that it appeared that the Planning Board's concerns had been met. He wondered, though, what would happen if in a few years the next owner wanted to change the lot lines. "What are the mechanisms in place to prevent that?" he asked. Mr. Hoehn explained the mechanism of the written covenant with the Planning Board: the restrictions imposed thereby would remain with the land forever, he said.

Mr. Colaneri noted that in the past the Town had been able to enforce the Town's bylaws. However, if the project went through the Commission, then perhaps the restrictions would carry more weight, he said. Mr. Hoehn said that they were talking about a possible homeowners' association, which would also facilitate enforcement.

Mr. Colaneri wondered who owned the unbuildable lots that abutted the Applicant's land. "These are held by the Trustees of Reservations," replied Mr. Hoehn. He added, "We will do whatever the Planning Board wants to do."

Ms. Ottens-Sargent wanted to know if the covenant would be registered at the Registry of Deeds. "That doesn't mean anything," interjected Mr. Colaneri. Mr. Hoehn assured Ms.

Ottens-Sargent that the covenant would be a notarized, fully legal, and enforceable document.

Mr. Jason wanted to know why the project had been referred to the Commission. Mr. Hoehn replied that the property lay in a Coast Wetlands District of Critical Planning Concern (DCPC). And this was in 1976, before the current rules and regulations were in place? asked Mr. Jason. Yes, responded Mr. Hoehn.

There followed some discussion of whether or not the project should be accepted as a DRI. Ms. Sibley pointed out that the Commission had, in fact, heard the earlier property division. Ms. Brown wondered if the Commission had put any Conditions into its earlier Decision. No, replied Mr. Hoehn. Would these be spec houses? asked Ms. Gallagher. "I don't think so," said Mr. Hoehn.

Ms. Sibley stated that she would vote to hear the project. "The change is significantly substantial to allow a Public Hearing," she said, "and we should tie the pieces together from the earlier Decision." Then Ms. Sibley made a Motion to Accept the Allen Moore Division of Land as a DRI, duly seconded by Mr. Jason. The time was 8:36 p.m.

Mr. Israel wondered what would happen if the Commission did not concur. Would it just go back to the Planning Board? he asked. "We have enough on our plate," he went on, "so I'm against accepting this as a DRI." Mr. Hall pointed out that the Town was powerless to offer Conditions; this was something the Commission could do. He wanted to know if there was a copy of the proposed covenant in the file; there was not.

Ms. Sibley observed that accepting DRI status would also protect the Applicant. For instance, a neighbor could argue later that the Planning Board decision was not valid; this was harder to argue with a Commission Decision in force.

Mr. Colaneri said, "Our plate can be as full as can be. But based on my experience, it needs our review. It'll just take one night." "One hour, even," said Ms. Sibley. "And our Decision has more teeth," added Mr. Toole. "I surrender," said Mr. Israel. The vote to concur went as follows:

AYES: J. Best; C. Brown; M. Colaneri; M. Donaroma; J. Early; J. Greene; B. Hall, Jr.; T. Israel; J. Jason, Jr.; M. Lazerow; M. Ottens-Sargent; L. Sibley; R. Toole; J. Vercruysse; R. Zeltzer; M. Allen; and A. Gallagher.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAINING: None.

ABSENT: M. Cini; T. Henson; and M. Bolling.

The time was 8:39 p.m. Mr. Toole called for a short break.

Staff Update: Martha's Vineyard Golf Partners (aka Vineyard Acres II) (DRI #484).

At 8:49 p.m. Mr. Toole readjoined the Meeting and announced that the next item on the Agenda was a staff update on the Martha's Vineyard Partners' golf course. The update began with a presentation by MVC Staff member William Wilcox.

Mr. Wilcox pointed to the different areas on a site map, indicating the frost bottom, the irrigation well, the cone of influence during the three-day pump test, the private wells, and the golf course housing lots and neighboring housing lots. He also explained in which directions the groundwater flowed and where the Kanomika and Wintucket wells were located.

In response to a question from Mr. Colaneri, David Wessling, MVC Staff member in charge of DRIs, explained that 15 member houses were proposed, along with two senior staff member houses and two lots for affordable housing. These last would entail a total of four houses on two acres, with two houses on each acre and one acre going to the Duke County Regional Housing Authority and the other to the Edgartown Resident Homesite Committee. Mr. Jason noted that it sounded as though a Special Permit would be required. Yes, replied Mr. Wessling, the current zoning is for an acre and a half.

Mr. Wilcox then reported on the drainage on the site, explaining that the soil was mostly of the Carver type with rapid drainage, along with some of the klej type, which allowed for moderate drainage. Asked how far down the groundwater was, Mr. Wilcox replied that it ranged from 68 to 75 feet down to just 17 feet down in the frost bottom. Mr. Wilcox added that the Kanomika and Wintucket wells provided 75 to 80 percent of the Town's water; in 1997 that amounted to 204 million gallons. The golf course would be pumping two-thirds of their assigned limit, perhaps a little less, he said.

Mr. Toole asked if the golf course would cause a drawdown from the Town well. "I don't think so," replied Mr. Wilcox. He then discussed the caps that would be set on water withdrawal by the golf course. He added that there "could be some lowering of private wells on the southeast boundary," but not to any significant degree.

Robert Zeltzer, a Commission member representing Chilmark, had some questions about the pumping test conducted in February. Shouldn't it have been done during the summer? he asked. Actually, replied Mr. Wilcox, during the three-month period from January through March the groundwater was not receiving any recharge; so this was a conservative test.

Mr. Colaneri revisited the questions that Fred Domont, the Edgartown Water Resource Management Officer, had raised during the final session of the Public Hearing. What were Mr. Wilcox's conclusions about those issues? he asked. Mr. Wilcox replied that the golf course would not be pumping any more than 150,000 gallons a day, even during the peak season. This had been offered by the Applicant and could be written into any Decision as a Condition.

Mr. Zeltzer asked how the groundwater would be monitored. Mr. Wilcox said that someone could be assigned to do that. Again, it could be Conditioned into any Decision made by the Commission. Mr. Best asked about the effect of the irrigation well on the surrounding wells. Mr. Wilcox referred him to the data in his report of May 27, 1999, which described in detail the pumping test that had been conducted with virtually no drawdown after three days.

Mr. Israel asked if a drought would affect the amount the golf course would pump. Mr. Wilcox explained that during a drought the recharge ceases, but the aquifer itself basically remained the same as far as the delivery of water to the pump intake was concerned.

Ms. Sibley wanted to know if "the critters" near the vernal pond would be affected by the golf course. Mr. Wessling corrected her and noted that the area to which she was referring was a wetland. Ms. Greene said that they had not found any "critters" there, and Mr. Wilcox pointed out that the 200-foot buffer around the artificial reservoir would increase the potential habitat for such creatures. In addition, that area was a perched water table which was not part of the aquifer.

Mr. Israel asked about the artificial pond that would hold the runoff from the greens, about which Mr. Wilcox then spoke in some detail. [Refer to Mr. Wilcox's report of April 22, 1999, and the report of Scott Harrison of Centre Analytical Laboratories, Inc., dated December 3, 1998, both of which are in the DRI file.]

And would frogs that jumped into that pond glow in the dark? asked Mr. Israel. Mr. Wilcox explained that much of the leachate would degrade and that this would hardly be a "toxic waste dump." What about sediment? wondered Mr. Israel. There would of course be some leaf litter, said Mr. Wilcox. And would the sediment be toxic? Mr. Israel wanted to know. Mr. Wilcox explained the concept of half-lives and how the pesticides would start to break down almost immediately. "If there are no 'cides," interjected Mr. Colaneri, "then it's a non-issue. We should be heading in another direction," he suggested.

Ms. Sibley wanted to know the degree to which it was possible to "go organic" in maintaining the golf course. Mr. Wilcox replied that the only area where 'cides had to be used would be the greens, where fungicides would probably be required. Ms. Lazerow asked where the pesticides went when they evaporated off the leachate pond or as they drifted while being sprayed onto the turf. Mr. Wilcox talked about the volatility of the

chemicals in general and noted that he could look up the exact figures if she wished him to. If applied properly, he added, the "drift" should be minimal.

So in all likelihood the greens would need to be treated with fungicides? asked Mr. Best. Yes, replied Mr. Wilcox. And wouldn't organic fertilizers also have an effect on the groundwater? wondered Mr. Best. Those release more slowly, explained Mr. Wilcox; still, care had to be taken with application rates. Mr. Best then asked about other 'cide substitutes. Mr. Wilcox replied that there were many natural products, although the products for organic turf pest and disease control were limited.

Mr. Vercruyse wondered if the Commission members should be concerned about the placement of two of the holes near the frost bottom. He hoped that the MVC Staff would review that part of the design. Mr. Wilcox said that this was another aspect of the plan that could be Conditioned in the Decision.

Mr. Colaneri referred to the Cape Cod golf course Widow's Walk, which was built right on top of the town aquifer in a Zone 2 area of contribution. With 10 to 15 years' experience at that facility, there didn't seem to be any problem with the groundwater, he said. He then asked about the number of 'cides that the Applicant was proposing. Mr. Wilcox replied: four fungicides, two insecticides and no herbicides, although what was used would change from year to year.

Ms. Ottens-Sargent asked if any of the listed products were prohibited in Zone 2. No, replied Mr. Wilcox. Ms. Ottens-Sargent then referred to the Sagamore Hampton golf course in New Hampshire, which was 98 percent organic. Could you come up with a percentage for the Vineyard Acres II site? she asked. Mr. Wilcox said that he couldn't say exactly, although he offered that 95 percent of the fungicides would be used on the greens, which were 10 to 12 acres of a total of 71 acres of managed turf. There would also be spot treatment with insecticides on the fairways.

And it would be unrealistic to ask the Applicant to go totally organic? Ms. Ottens-Sargent asked. Mr. Wilcox suggested that the greens could actually be replaced instead of being treated with fungicides. With the constant dew on the greens, there would always be problems, he added.

Had there been any study of any possible interactions of the materials on the list? asked Mr. Zeltzer. No, replied Mr. Wilcox. How would they know whether it would be safe to use these together if they hadn't been tested? asked Mr. Zeltzer. Why would you use something like that to kill something? asked Mr. Jason. Were there standards for organic farming that were also available for golf courses? he wondered. No, not for turf management, said Mr. Wilcox, "but we're not talking about eating the turf." He added that the Decision could be Conditioned in such a way that the Applicant would have to manage the turf totally organically.

Would the drift of the chemicals affect the rare moths in the frost bottom? asked Mr. Israel. Also, what would be the impact on wildlife of the chemicals used on the greens? "There's no real good answer for that," replied Mr. Wilcox. "Drift occurs. It doesn't take much wind to move it. It depends on the buffer of vegetation, the height of the vegetation and the distance to a sensitive receptor." Naturally, the groundskeepers would try to apply the chemicals when there was little or no wind, Mr. Wilcox added.

Ms. Ottens-Sargent wanted to know if the lighting from the houses would affect the moths in the frost bottom. Mr. Wilcox replied that, again, these things could be Conditioned. Also, bug zappers could be prohibited in the area. What about mosquito control? asked Ms. Sibley. There was a bacterium that could be used to kill mosquito larvae, suggested Mr. Wilcox. "Tell them to use mosquito repellent," said Ms. Greene. Actually, the Applicant had offered to use only organic mosquito repellent, interjected Mr. Wessling. Are you sure that wouldn't kill the rare moths? asked Ms. Sibley. "Condition it that they don't use it and be done with it," suggested Ms. Greene.

Mr. Wilcox went on to describe the three sewage disposal areas: the clubhouse and member housing area, which would have two Bio-Clear systems and would produce 12,320 gallons per day at the peak of the season; the turf maintenance center with 300 gallons a day (conventional Title 5 sewage); and the senior staff housing area, which was also within the Zone 2 area of contribution and would have two Bio-Clear systems. Would they need a groundwater discharge permit for that? asked Mr. Best. Yes, replied Mr. Wilcox. Then he offered the nitrogen loading numbers from each of these operations.

Michael Donaroma, a Commission member representing Edgartown, wanted to know how much nitrogen would be applied per square foot. There would be 8,400 pounds of nitrogen applied to the fairways and tees. This would amount to 129 pounds per acre or 0.003 pounds per square foot. And how much does the average household produce? asked Mr. Jason. Mr. Wilcox explained that the average three-bedroom house with year-round occupation produced about 12 to 13 pounds of nitrogen per year.

Mr. Israel wondered if the subdivision proposed for the site in the 1980s would have exceeded the nitrogen loading limit. Yes, slightly, responded Mr. Wilcox. Mr. Jason wanted to know if the golf course sewage loading numbers were based on the entire year. The sewage figures were for 12 months, said Mr. Wilcox, and they were generous by about a factor of two.

There followed a discussion of the pumping test results and the nitrogen loading figures. Mr. Wilcox reviewed the pesticide program and went over the memorandum from Scott Harrison referred to earlier. He also described the collection devices for the leachate and the lining of the greens, and observed that monitoring program appeared to be a good one.

Also, he advised the Commission members to Condition intervention measures into the Decision.

There was a brief discussion about the greens mix that would be brought to the Island. Mr. Wilcox emphasized again that such aspects of the project had to be addressed in the Written Decision. A discussion of the grading plan followed.

Mr. Ottens-Sargent asked about the nature of the review committee. Mr. Wilcox believed it would consist of members of different Town Boards who would review the pesticide and groundwater monitoring data. If the course were to be pesticide-free, then only the nitrogen loading would have to be looked at. After Mr. Wilcox finished up, Mr. Zeltzer complimented him on his work and his contributions to the discussion.

Mr. Wessling asked if any of the Commission members had more questions. Mr. Jason wanted to know where the original housing had been located. Mr. Wessling pointed to those sites on the map. And what ever happened with the neighbors who were complaining about the housing's being too close to their homes? asked Mr. Jason. Those houses had been for seasonal workers, and they had been eliminated from the plan, replied Mr. Wessling. Mr. Best said that the maps that the Commission members had been given did not show this. A discussion of the maps ensued. Mr. Best then asked where the driving range was. Mr. Wessling showed him on the large map.

Ms. Sibley pointed out that the Commission members should be going through the project systematically and not just asking random questions. Ms. Greene said that the members had agreed to read the Staff Notes and to bring their questions to the Meeting. Mr. Jason thought that it was not unreasonable to expect to have an accurate map in front of them, that was the issue, not how they were going through the project. In the absence of such a map, some Commission members thought the Meeting should be adjourned.

Mr. Colaneri made a Motion to Adjourn, duly seconded. Any discussion? asked Mr. Toole. Ms. Greene suggested that Staff bring an appropriate map to the next meeting.

There was a brief discussion of whether or not the Staff had enough information about the proposal. Mr. Toole asked for those in favor of adjourning the Meeting. All present answered, Aye. The Meeting was adjourned at 10:11 p.m.

Richard J Toole 7/19/99
Chair Date

Ann A. Hesse 7/19/99
Clerk/Treasurer Date

PRESENT: J. Best; C. Brown; M. Colaneri; M. Donaroma; J. Early; J. Greene; B. Hall, Jr.; T. Israel; J. Jason, Jr.; M. Lazerow; M. Ottens-Sargent; L. Sibley; R. Toole; J. Vercruysse; R. Zeltzer; M. Allen; and A. Gallagher.

ABSENT: M. Cini; T. Henson; and M. Bolling.

*Summary of Revisions to the
Meeting Minutes of June 3, 1999
Proposed by Commission Members
in the Meeting of June 24, 1999*

[An excerpt follows immediately from the Meeting Minutes of the Special Meeting of June 3, 1999, describing the changes as they were proposed by the Commission members in the Meeting.]

Page	Paragraph	Sentence	Revision
4	9	2	Strike this sentence and substitute: "She went into some detail about the alternatives to the plans that the committee had required of the applicants, which in one case had included the option of either lowering the height of the roof from 26.5 to 25.5 feet or moving the house to a different place on the site."
5	3	2	Add the word "new" before the term "affordable housing policy" so that the sentence reads: "Mr. Colaneri reminded the Commission members that Attorney Eric Wodlinger had encouraged them the week before to get a new affordable housing policy in place as soon as possible."
6	7	1	Add the following sentence before the present first sentence in said paragraph: "Ms. Greene left the room during the Allen Moore Division of Land Concurrence Discussion and Vote."
8			Amend the roll call vote by eliminating Ms. Greene's name from the list of those voting Aye. It should read: "AYES J. Best; C. Brown; M. Colaneri; M. Donaroma; J. Early; B. Hall, Jr.; T. Israel; L. Jason, Jr.; M. Lazerow; M. Ottens-Sargent; L. Sibley; R. Toole; J. Vercruysse; R. Zeltzer; M. Allen; and A. Gallagher."