



## SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of Monday, August 26, 2024

**Present:** David Henkels, Chair; Ken Holtz, Vice Chair; Jeremy Cook; Luke Faust; Bruce Porter (7:12 PM); Kasey Rogers (7:32 PM); Mark Sevier (7:44 PM); and Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator

The meeting was called to Order by Chair Henkels at 7:00 PM via roll call.

### Minutes:

#### August 12, 2024

On motion by Comm. Cook to accept the minutes of the August 12, 2024 meeting, seconded by Comm. Holtz, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### Wetland Applications:

#### Notice of Intent: 74 and 80 Maynard Road: Bonnie Brook Realty Corp., DEP #301-1341

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct a roadway and associated drainage system and utilities in 100-ft Buffer zone and Adjacent Upland Resource Area for a 6-lot residential subdivision, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. John Derderian was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from June 7, August 9, September 27, 2021, August 22, 2022 and July 24, 2023.

Mr. Derderian apologized for the late submission of information and acknowledged that he did not have all the details that Coordinator Capone had requested. He indicated his intention to discuss Lots 4 and 5 and the possibility of moving the backyard closer to the wetlands, as shown in the plans he had sent earlier. He acknowledged that the process would involve reestablishing some of the wetland areas, as Coordinator Capone had mentioned, to ensure that the boundary had not shifted.

Coordinator Capone confirmed that there was an existing Order of Resource Area Delineation approved for the site. She noted that due to recent beaver activity, she, Chair Henkels, Mr. Derderian, and his wetland scientist had walked the area to confirm that the boundary was still reasonable under the original Order of Resource Area Delineation. The area under consideration for the yard expansion was currently set about 50 feet from the wetlands, but the new proposal was to reduce that distance to about 25 feet.

Chair Henkels clarified that the only significant change in the proposal was the request to reduce the distance to 25 feet from the wetland, which Mr. Derderian confirmed.

Mr. Derderian then sought the Commission's opinion on the proposal and mentioned that, depending on their feedback, he would approach the Planning Board. He outlined a sequence of steps involving digging more test holes, consulting with the Board of Health, the Commission, and the Planning Board to finalize the necessary approvals.

Chair Henkels inquired about the expiration of the current Order of Resource Area Delineation, and Coordinator Capone informed him that it would expire in about a year.

Chair Henkels noted that during a site visit, they did not observe any substantive changes in the wetland flagging on the development side of the property. Coordinator Capone confirmed this observation.

Coordinator Capone provided additional context, explaining that the project previously involved nine lots but was now reduced to six lots with seven units total, including a duplex closest to Maynard Road. The common driveway originally planned for two lots on the northern section was now eliminated, and where there were originally three houses on a steep slope, the plan now included a duplex by the road and one house in the back, with the cul-de-sac layout remaining mostly unchanged.

Mr. Derderian agreed with Coordinator Capone's description and added that the reduction in the number of lots and houses led to less overall disturbance, including less driveway area.

Chair Henkels inquired if this change would impact the mitigation discussed earlier. Mr. Derderian acknowledged that he had misspoken previously regarding the mitigation details and had not yet provided the correct information to Coordinator Capone. He explained that they were now proposing 4.95 acres of upland and about 8 acres in total for mitigation. He mentioned that he was unable to obtain this information from his engineer in time.

Mr. Derderian clarified that while he initially thought the amount of upland was doubled, it was actually similar to before. He noted that there would be less overall wetland area to be given as part of the mitigation. He reiterated that the proposed plan involved moving the backyards of two houses closer to the wetland.

Chair Henkels brought up the issue of the land donation to the town as part of the mitigation. Mr. Derderian confirmed the donation details, noting that it included 8 acres of total area with 4.9 acres of upland.

Chair Henkels questioned whether the topography and hydrology of the area, particularly north of the flagged wetlands, had changed significantly since the original delineation, considering the ongoing beaver activity. He suggested that the wetland area might now include more water and associated wetland habitat, potentially affecting the viability of any trail system in the area.

Mr. Derderian agreed, acknowledging that the area proposed for the easement, near the cul-de-sac, was likely impacted by the water, which could make any proposed trail system less feasible.

Chair Henkels opened the floor for comments from the other Commissioners.

Chair Henkels invited Comm. Porter, who had just joined the meeting, to speak. Comm. Porter introduced himself but indicated he had no comments at the moment.

Comm. Holtz then expressed interest in understanding how the proposed mitigation compared to the additional lawn space being requested. He acknowledged that there was less disturbance overall but noted that the request involved nearly 15,000 more square feet of lawn area. He also inquired about what would be done at the back of the yards being expanded, specifically asking if there would be retaining walls, fences, or any other features to delineate the wetland from the lawn.

Mr. Derderian responded that they had previously discussed installing some type of boundary, possibly bounds, though this had not been discussed recently. Coordinator Capone explained that the development would involve two different mitigation strategies: a donation of open space to the Conservation Commission and Conservation Restrictions on each lot to prevent future encroachments. These restrictions would typically include markers or bounds along the edge of the agreed-upon disturbance area for future monitoring.

Mr. Derderian clarified that the intention behind requesting additional land was to create a reasonable yard area, not something large. He mentioned that the only planned addition would be grass, possibly with some trees planted. No fence was planned.

Comm. Holtz then asked about the subsurface detention area shown on the plan, assuming it was designed to capture runoff from the roads. Mr. Derderian confirmed this, explaining that earlier designs had included multiple areas to retain water, but they had consolidated it into one area for the entire subdivision, as there were now fewer houses. The detention system would handle surface water for the street but not for individual house gutters.

Comm. Holtz inquired further about how water from the driveway leading up to Lot 6 would be captured, noting that it was some distance from the subsurface detention area. Mr. Derderian acknowledged the concern, noting that the road generally pitched towards the detention area, but he was not certain about the specifics and offered to find out more details.

Comm. Holtz raised a question about the need for another small subsurface detention area near the driveway to Lot 6, considering the distance involved. Mr. Derderian explained that there was originally one planned at the start of the driveway, but it was deemed unnecessary after reducing the number of houses from two to one in that area.

Coordinator Capone clarified that the current discussion was to gauge the Commission's comfort level with the general plan, which was still in a conceptual stage. Coordinator Capone highlighted that the key issue for discussion that evening was whether the Commission was comfortable with the proposed yards being so close to the wetland. She emphasized that full design, including the drainage system, had yet to be finalized. She mentioned that each lot had previously been designed with dry wells for roof runoff, while the driveways directed water to the road.

Comm. Holtz then revisited the concern about the donated land or easement potentially being underwater due to beaver activity. He asked Coordinator Capone whether it made sense to accept such land as a donation or place it under a Conservation Restriction, considering the situation.

Coordinator Capone explained that the final decision on how to handle the land would depend on its evaluation. It could be accepted as Town open space or protected under a Conservation Restriction. The Commission would ultimately decide the best course of action once the land's condition was assessed. Mr. Derderian reminded the Commission that the back parcel in question abutted two significant conservation parcels. When combined, they would create a continuous conservation area of about 118 acres.

Chair Henkels sought clarification on the requirements for a baseline report if the land in question were to be donated or placed under a Conservation Restriction. Coordinator Capone explained that a baseline report would be necessary only if the land were placed under a Conservation Restriction, not if it were simply donated to the town.

Chair Henkels then asked Mr. Derderian about the number and location of test pits planned for the project. Mr. Derderian responded that they had already conducted approximately 60 test pits due to the extensive movement of house locations. However, because of the recent changes, particularly with Lot 1, he anticipated needing to perform additional test pits there. He mentioned that this would depend on discussions with the engineer and the Board of Health.

Chair Henkels then requested Coordinator Capone to display the cul-de-sac area to review the elevations of the two homes in question. He observed the elevation differences and inquired whether additional test pits in the expanded yards would be relevant or beneficial to the Commission, particularly concerning groundwater tables. Coordinator Capone responded that the test pits were primarily for the septic systems and wouldn't be necessary for the lawn areas. She explained that the lawn areas, despite being elevated from the wetland, might become soggy but wouldn't be considered wetlands, so further soil testing wasn't required.

Comm. Porter raised a general question about the history of the project, specifically recalling an earlier proposal from two or three years ago. He asked whether the original plan involved one or two owners sharing a driveway. John Derderian confirmed this, explaining that the initial design, which included eight or nine lots, had a shared driveway for two houses. The Planning Board had concerns about the number of houses and the design, which led to the removal of one house and changes to the driveway configuration. Mr. Derderian noted that the driveway had originally been wider and longer to accommodate the additional house.

Comm. Porter then inquired about the original motivation behind having extra houses, to which Mr. Derderian responded that the goal was to create more lots. He also mentioned that the initial eight-lot subdivision was not approved by the Planning Board, leading to the current revised proposal.

Comm. Faust inquired about the size of the yards for the two houses, noting that the yard expansion for the house on the right seemed larger. Coordinator Capone explained that originally both lots had a 50-foot setback, with the yard on the left being 51 feet deep and the yard on the right being 74 feet deep. The new proposal requested 81 feet and 104 feet respectively.

Comm. Holtz expressed that although the new encroachment was closer than preferred, he was okay with continuing the conversation due to the overall reduction in scope. Comm. Faust stated that while a smaller yard would be preferable, he believed they could work out a suitable mitigation given the large lot size. Comm. Porter felt confident that the reduced scope allowed for compliance with necessary decisions. Comm. Cook agreed with

the group, noting the effort towards mitigation and that it was closer than ideal, but he supported continuing the process. Comm. Rogers, having just joined the meeting, acknowledged she didn't like the idea but found it reasonable to continue exploring it. Chair Henkels agreed to continue discussions based on the logic presented by the Commissioners and the potential mitigation discussed.

On motion by Comm. Porter to continue the Hearing to December 16, 2024, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Request for Determination of Applicability: 24 Goodnow Road, RDA #24-16**

Chair Henkels resumed the meeting for the project to alter grade within the 100-foot Buffer Zone within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Goodnow Partners, LLC was the applicant. This meeting was continued from July 1, 2024.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to September 9, 2024, seconded by Comm. Porter, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Notice of Intent: 143 Union Avenue, DEP #301-1402**

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct an addition to a single-family home within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the local 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Faye Zou was the applicant.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to September 23, 2024, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Request for Determination of Applicability: 316 Boston Post Road, RDA #24-22**

Chair Henkels began the meeting for the project to replace an existing septic system with the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Mark Alexander was the applicant.

Mike DiModica addressed the Commission regarding the project that was originally presented in 2018, which involved the replacement of an existing leaching field and septic tank at the rear of a building. At that time, the Commission had approved the project with a Negative Determination. However, due to complications in redeveloping the parcel, the permit expired, and the project was delayed. He explained that they are now proposing the exact same project as in 2018: installing a new 2,000-gallon H-20 monolithic septic tank with minimal disturbance. He noted that the building is currently used by three employees, with restrooms not open to customers. Due to the small and challenging nature of the site, a tight tank was deemed the best and most cost-effective solution, and this approach was also approved by the Health Department.

Chair Henkels then asked Coordinator Capone for her comments. She expressed concern about the high groundwater levels, noting that the modeling indicated groundwater was only about one foot below grade, while the tank would be installed about seven feet down. She asked Mr. DiModica to prepare a contingency plan for managing potential groundwater issues during construction, although she acknowledged that the wetland itself is dry and groundwater may not be encountered.

Mr. DiModica responded, clarifying that the groundwater modeling showed levels at 30 inches, with the proposed work area being almost two feet lower. He emphasized that the soil in the area drains very well, with tests conducted in August 2018 showing no water present. However, if groundwater is encountered, he stated they could create a pit with stone and filter fabric, encased with straw wattles, to manage the water. He reassured the Commission that groundwater issues were not anticipated at this time of year, which is why they chose to proceed now.

Chair Henkels then invited comments from the Commissioners.

Comm. Holtz asked if there had been any consideration of placing the tank in front of the business rather than behind it, noting that the area in front is currently asphalted. Mr. DiModica responded that the structure is a slab

on grade, with plumbing that exits at the back of the building. Moving the tank to the front would require cutting the floors and might place the tank closer to the wetland across the street. He emphasized that the current proposed location is approximately 80 feet uphill from the resource area, making it a better option.

Comm. Porter asked about the distance between the building and the property line at the rear. Mr. DiModica explained that the back corner of the L-shaped building is approximately 12 feet from the property line, with the distance increasing to about 30 feet as the property line runs diagonally across.

Comm. Porter expressed concern about how close the tank would be to both the boundary line and the adjacent property. Mr. DiModica clarified that the adjacent property to the rear is a single-family dwelling, while the property on the westerly side is the Barely Read Bookstore, a commercial property. He added that the proposed tight tank meets all Health Department regulations for setbacks from dwellings and property lines.

Comm. Sevier notified Chair Henkels that he had joined the meeting, and Chair Henkels acknowledged his presence. Chair Henkels then opened the floor to the audience for questions but received no response.

Coordinator Capone mentioned that while erosion controls might not be necessary unless there is significant rainfall during construction, some protection could be needed for catch basins in the road near the site. She suggested meeting with Mr. DiModica on-site before construction begins to assess the need for erosion controls and discuss dewatering plans. Additionally, she requested photo documentation after construction to confirm that the project was completed according to the determination.

Chair Henkels asked Mr. DiModica if he had any questions regarding these conditions, to which DiModica responded that he had spoken with Coordinator Capone and noted that there is only one catch basin near the westerly property line by the Barely Read Bookstore. He stated they could install a silt sack if necessary.

Comm. Holtz inquired whether a detailed drawing of the dewatering system would be required or if discussing it during the pre-construction meeting would suffice. Coordinator Capone replied that a pre-construction discussion would be adequate, as Mr. DiModica's description aligned with her expectations.

Comm. Porter raised a concern about the possibility of buried tanks on the property, noting that it had once been a gas station. Mr. Alexander, the property owner, assured the Commission that the tanks had been removed in the 1980s or 1990s.

On motion by Comm. Holtz to issue a Negative Determination of Applicability #3, seconded by Comm. Porter, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Notice of Intent: 87 Moore Road, DEP #301-1424**

Chair Henkels opened the Hearing for the project to construct a garage with associated driveway and drainage, relocate an existing fence, and remove trees within the 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Dwight D. Henderson was the applicant.

Stephen Poole from Lakeview Engineering described the proposal, which involves constructing a 20 by 40-foot garage barn at the rear of the property, accessible via a gravel driveway. The garage is intended for boat storage during the winter. He explained that the structure's location within the Riverfront Area was necessary to provide sufficient space for vehicle and boat trailer maneuvering. He acknowledged that during the initial site development, they were unaware of the Riverfront Area's existence until it was pointed out by the Commission's staff. He also mentioned that a fence had been built in the Riverfront Area without a permit and addressed concerns about tree removal and potential adjustments to reduce the project's impact on the Riverfront Area.

Chair Henkels invited Coordinator Capone to provide her comments. Coordinator Capone expressed concern that the project, which was initially designed to avoid the Riverfront Area, now included non-essential development within this jurisdiction. She was particularly worried about the unauthorized fence, the possibility of future expansion that could exceed the allowable alteration limits, and the presence of invasive species such as buckthorn that was invading the riverfront area from the development. She noted that there were alternatives to reduce the impact and suggested that these be explored before the Commission made any decisions.

Coordinator Capone recommended that the Commission conduct a site visit to assess the situation and consider the project's implications more thoroughly.

Chair Henkels asked Mr. Poole if the boat intended for storage in the proposed garage had already been purchased. Mr. Henderson confirmed that the boat was already owned by them. Chair Henkels then requested Mr. Poole to explain how the Riverfront Area and its boundary were defined for this project.

Mr. Poole explained that they had located the edge of Stearns Mill Pond at the bottom of the site and identified the wetlands in the area. From this, they established the 200-foot buffer zone. He noted that they only became aware that the site was within the Riverfront Area after a site visit from the Commission's staff.

Chair Henkels sought clarification on whether the area in question was considered a perennial stream. Coordinator Capone explained that Stearns Mill Pond, being a man-made pond with a dam at the downstream side, required an evaluation to determine where Hop Brook ended and the pond began. She noted that without a dam at the upstream end, the area might exhibit riverine characteristics, and since no wetland scientist evaluation had been provided to dispute this, the Commission should assume it was riverine.

Mr. Henderson then asked if there had been other applications related to Hop Brook River and Stearns Mill Pond that could help them understand how the river had been defined in past cases. Coordinator Capone confirmed that there had been other applications, specifically on Barton Drive, where the area was determined to be riverine.

Chair Henkels then opened the floor for further questions from the Commissioners.

Comm. Sevier raised the question of whether it would be possible to back the boat into a garage structure closer to the road instead of constructing the proposed building at the rear of the property. Ben Maiden, who identified himself as residing at 37 Fairfield Street in Maynard and contractor for the project, responded that the front of the lot contained the septic system and leaching field, leaving limited space for the garage footprint other than the rear section of the property.

Comm. Sevier suggested adding another bay to the existing garage to accommodate the boat. Mr. Maiden responded that doing so would block any rear access and also violate the setback requirements. Chair Henkels then noted that addressing setback violations would require going to the Zoning Board of Appeals, which was an option.

Mr. Poole asked Mr. Henderson to address concerns raised by Coordinator Capone about the potential for future development in the area between the existing fence and the limit of the Riverfront Area. Mr. Henderson assured that they had no intentions of further development in that area and were open to planting additional vegetation if required. He emphasized that the only planned structure was the garage, and the rest of the area would remain undisturbed.

Comm. Sevier then questioned whether the proposed turnaround space would be sufficient for maneuvering the boat, trailer, and vehicle, noting the challenges of backing the boat into the garage given the space constraints. Mr. Henderson, with input from Mr. Poole, acknowledged the tight squeeze but believed the area was viable based on his experience with trailers. However, Comm. Sevier expressed skepticism, suggesting that the turnaround might need to be extended significantly to be functional.

Chair Henkels then asked if there were any further questions from the Commissioners.

Comm. Holtz inquired whether the proposed structure would be used solely for boat storage or also for storing the truck. Mr. Henderson explained that the structure was intended for multiple purposes: storing the boat, tools, fishing equipment, and serving as a general storage area. He clarified that the boat itself was about 20 feet long and that the truck would be stored in the garage.

Comm. Holtz expressed an interest in understanding the alternatives analysis better and confirmed with Coordinator Capone that abutter notifications were part of the Notice of Intent (NOI). Coordinator Capone affirmed this, and Chair Henkels invited further questions from the Commissioners.

Comm. Rogers suggested a site visit might be necessary to explore other possible configurations that would minimize the impact on resource areas. Comm. Faust proposed rotating the barn 90 degrees and bringing it closer to the house, placing it at the end of the current turnoff. Comm. Rogers supported this idea.

Mr. Poole noted that rotating the barn would require repositioning the turnaround where the existing garage is, making it necessary to drive down and then back into the barn. Mr. Maiden added that rotating the barn could potentially block sunlight to the existing pool and patio space, which were located just on the other side of a 2-foot retaining wall.

Comm. Rogers asked about the materials proposed for the driveway and turnaround area. Mr. Poole responded that a stone gravel mix would be used, which is a pervious material. The underlying soil is well-drained sandy gravel.

Comm. Sevier inquired about the slope by the house, specifically asking if the contours were two-foot increments. Mr. Poole clarified that they were one-foot contours and noted that the gravel would likely have a stone cover to prevent exposure of loose dirt.

Chair Henkels then asked about the staging area for the project and the placement of erosion controls. Mr. Poole indicated that the staging would occur in the turnaround area and described the excavation as minor, primarily for the frost wall, with minimal grading. He confirmed there would be no need for additional soil other than the stone topping.

Chair Henkels also asked about the high groundwater level. Mr. Poole explained that the leach pits, which are six feet deep, are well above the groundwater level, and the site drops off significantly.

Chair Henkels inquired about the pool's discharge system. Mr. Poole and Mr. Henderson discussed that the pool uses a filter system and does not have a backwash system, as it is a closed system.

Finally, Chair Henkels asked if gutters were planned for the barn structure. Mr. Poole confirmed that there would be a collection system to direct water from the downspouts into the leach pit.

With no further comments from the Commission or the public, Chair Henkels announced that the Hearing would be continued to allow time for a site visit and that a site walk would be arranged within the next 10 days. He asked for Mr. and Mrs. Henderson's permission to continue the hearing to September 9th, which they granted.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to September 9, 2024, seconded by Comm. Faust, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### Other Business:

#### **Bursik: 41 Lincoln Lane**

Chair Henkels began the discussion regarding tree removal within the Riverfront Area and a Conservation Restriction at 41 Lincoln Lane.

Coordinator Capone provided an overview of the property, noting that it is a small lot located on the Sudbury River and that the edge of the wetland extends into the area. The property was constructed around 2012, and a portion of it is under a Conservation Restriction, which is being well managed by the current owners.

Coordinator Capone stated that the owners had consulted an arborist and were seeking permission to remove four trees within the Conservation Restriction. She mentioned that she had no concerns with the proposed removals but wanted to bring the matter to the Commission due to the location within the Conservation Restriction, which permits tree removal if the trees pose a hazard to the house.

She described the trees in question: The first tree was part of a clump near the house and was hollow inside, making it a potential hazard, especially to the owners' grandchildren who use the yard. The second tree was a large pine on a slope near the river, with significant damage and a hollow base, posing a threat to the house if it fell. The last two trees were smaller, with two of the three leaders on one tree completely dead. The owners planned to remove the dead leaders and leave the healthy part of the tree.

Coordinator Capone mentioned that the homeowners agreed to remove three large Japanese barberry plants around the pine tree and replant native species as mitigation.

Chair Henkels asked the Commissioners for their input. Comm. Holtz suggested that the hollow tree could be left as a snag for wildlife, which Coordinator Capone said she would discuss with the homeowner.

Chair Henkels confirmed that no vote was necessary for this matter, as it could proceed with administrative approval unless the Commission had concerns. No concerns were raised.

### **Herb Chambers**

Chair Henkels began the discussion regarding the decommissioning of the irrigation system at Herb Chambers. Coordinator Capone explained that during the previous year's Certificate of Compliance review, it was noted that an underground irrigation system had been installed in the mitigation area, despite it being in violation of the Order of Conditions. Although the system had been deactivated, it could easily be reconnected. Coordinator Capone presented two options to ensure the system could not be reactivated: fully removing the system from the ground, which would be disruptive, or removing the sprinkler heads and filling the pipes with foam to prevent reactivation.

Chair Henkels asked about how the original Order addressed the installation of irrigation systems. Coordinator Capone confirmed that irrigation was not permitted within resource areas and that the two-year period for seasonal success had passed. Once this issue was resolved, the property owners would seek a full Certificate of Compliance.

Comm. Holtz inquired about the materials used for the irrigation system, and Coordinator Capone confirmed it was made of plastic piping. Comm. Sevier added that it was likely black polyethylene. Comm. Holtz expressed reluctance about leaving plastic underground but also did not want to disrupt the newly established vegetation. Comm. Porter commented that the issue originated when the plastic was installed.

Comm. Porter suggested filling removable joints with a material like concrete to prevent reactivation, with Comm. Sevier agreeing that filling the joints where the sprinkler heads are located made the most sense.

Coordinator Capone mentioned that the system was already disconnected from the main box, but the wiring could be easily reconnected if desired. She noted that the property owners had learned from this experience and used above-ground drip hoses for subsequent projects.

Chair Henkels inquired about the consequences if the system was reactivated, to which Coordinator Capone responded that it would not be visible from the road and could only be detected by physically visiting the site. The Commissioners discussed the options further, with most agreeing that filling the pipes would be the best approach.

Chair Henkels asked if a vote was required, but Coordinator Capone clarified that she was only seeking direction to ensure the appropriate action was taken.

### **Adjourn Meeting**

On motion by Comm. Porter to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 PM, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.