



SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of Monday, March 23, 2026

Present: David Henkels, Chair; Ken Holtz, Vice Chair; Jeremy Cook; Luke Faust; Kasey Rogers; Mark Sevier; Harry Hoffman and Victor Sulkowski, Associate Members; and Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator

Absent: Bruce Porter

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

Minutes

On motion by Comm. Sevier to accept the minutes of the March 9, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Faust, with Comms. Cook and Holtz abstaining, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Wetland Applications:

Notice of Intent: 200 Raymond Road (Feeley Field), DEP #301-1460

Chair Henkels opened the Hearing for the project to reconstruct softball fields and install an irrigation system and subsurface stormwater infrastructure, ADA walkway, dugout, and bleachers within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Victor Garofalo was the applicant.

Kyle Rowan stated that he was a project manager with Gale Associates representing the Town of Sudbury for the Feeley Fields Phase 2 Improvements Project. He stated that the Notice of Intent was submitted on March 9 and that a site plan review and stormwater management permit application was submitted on March 4. He stated that a pre-application meeting was held with Conservation, Planning, Fire, and Police on the 16th.

Mr. Rowan described the site as an 18-acre parcel in a residential zoning district within a water resources protection overlay district. He stated that the work was limited to two existing softball fields within a larger athletic complex. He stated that the site was bordered by parking areas to the north and west and by Bordering Vegetated Wetlands to the south and east, with a Riverfront Area associated with a nearby brook. He stated that the project was located within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and partially within the 200-foot Riverfront Area. He stated that the site currently had slopes ranging from 2.5% to 4.5% and that mowing extended into the Buffer Zone and Riverfront Area. He stated that the existing topsoil was deep, compacted, and high in silt, resulting in drainage issues.

Mr. Rowan stated that the first goal of the project was to extend ADA access from Field 1 to Field 2. This will be a bituminous walkway meeting the slope requirement. He stated that this required minor grading, a retaining wall, and stabilization measures near the slope.

He stated that the second goal was to address drainage issues. He stated that the site would be regraded to a uniform 1.75% slope. He stated that topsoil would be stripped, amended with sand, and reinstalled to improve drainage, with minimal import or export of material. He stated that clay infield material would be reused and supplemented as needed. He described a drainage system consisting of an infiltration trench at the base of the slope, supplemented by flat panel drains, a collector pipe, and an overflow structure. He stated that only the infiltration trench was relied upon for stormwater management standards.

He stated that the third goal was to add a backstop, dugouts, bleachers, and connecting walkways at Field 2, consistent with existing structures at Field 1. He stated that fencing would be added between fields and at the outfield. He stated that mowing south of the new outfield fence would be discontinued and the area would be allowed to revert to fallow conditions.

He stated that the fourth goal was to install a limited irrigation system connected to an existing water main, intended for drought conditions and limited use.

Mr. Rowan stated that deduct alternates included removal of the north walkway, dugout roofs, flat panel drains, and irrigation system depending on project cost, while still permitting the full project.

He stated that the project would result in approximately 37,000 square feet of impact within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and approximately 1,700 square feet within the 200-foot Riverfront Area. He stated that impacts included regrading, walkways, drainage, irrigation, fencing, and associated structures.

He stated that the alternatives analysis was constrained by field size and orientation requirements. He stated that the fields were shifted as far as feasible to minimize impacts while meeting dimensional standards. He stated that grading was designed to balance cut and fill while allowing for soil amendment. He stated that discontinuation of mowing in portions of the Buffer Zone would reduce ongoing disturbance.

He stated that the application included plans, reports, and supporting documentation, including stormwater, geotechnical, and erosion control materials. He stated that the anticipated schedule was to bid the project in spring, begin construction in July, complete work by October, and allow for field establishment with use the following spring.

Chair Henkels asked Mr. Rowan to explain the function of the drainage panels in simple terms. Mr. Rowan stated that the flat panel drains were installed vertically within sand trenches approximately 8 inches below the amended topsoil. He stated that the panels consisted of perforated pipes wrapped in geotextile fabric and surrounded by sand. He stated that the system allowed water held in the topsoil to move into the panels, where it could infiltrate into the surrounding material or be conveyed toward a collector pipe. Chair Henkels stated that the system would allow recharge through the drainage process. Mr. Rowan confirmed that the panels provided an additional opportunity for infiltration and could also convey water to the collector pipe.

Coordinator Capone stated that the field predated the Wetlands Protection Act and that wetland flags were located near the edge of the mowed area. She stated that the delineation might not reflect actual conditions without further study. She stated that the southeast portion of the area proposed to be left un-mowed contained standing water and could revert to wetland conditions if allowed to remain fallow.

She stated that leaving the area unmanaged could result in the spread of invasive species from adjacent wooded areas. She stated that coordination with DPW resulted in a plan to apply a wetland seed mix in the southeast area, transitioning to an upland mix closer to the developed portions of the site. She stated that this approach would support biodiversity and provide restoration.

She stated that excess fill should not be placed in the southeast corner to avoid filling potential wetland areas. She requested that the applicant minimize alterations in that portion of the site.

She requested revisions to the irrigation plan to relocate infrastructure outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone while maintaining spray coverage within the jurisdiction. She stated that the irrigation system would be used only as needed and not on a regular schedule.

She stated that DPW did not fertilize the field and did not plan to do so. She stated that a prohibition on fertilization should be included in the Order of Conditions due to the potential for nutrient transport toward the wetland through the subsurface drainage and irrigation system.

She stated that stormwater design review was ongoing and recommended continuing the Hearing until that review was complete. She stated that the Commission should consider allowing for additional soil replacement if soil amendment alone proved insufficient to resolve drainage issues, in order to ensure long-term functionality of the project.

Chair Henkels thanked Coordinator Capone and requested questions from the Commission.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the addition of sand involved surface application or full mixing and redistribution. Mr. Rowan stated that the process involved stripping and stockpiling the existing topsoil, blending it with sand, and then reinstalling it over the regraded subgrade. He stated that the panel drains would likely be installed while the topsoil was removed and the subgrade exposed.

Comm. Sevier asked how water collected by the panel drain system would be managed and expressed concern about the volume of water. Mr. Rowan stated that the system was designed primarily for infiltration. He stated that amending the topsoil and installing sand trenches would improve infiltration across the site. He stated that the panel drains would provide an additional pathway for water to infiltrate and would convey excess water to a collector pipe leading to an overflow structure. He stated that the overflow was not expected to handle significant volumes and that similar systems were commonly used in athletic fields.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the system followed a slope or remained level. Mr. Rowan stated that the panel drains followed the subgrade, which would be uniformly graded at 1.75 percent across the field.

Comm. Holtz asked about the depth of the groundwater table and whether it had been considered in the design. Chair Henkels asked whether test pits had been conducted. Mr. Rowan stated that test pits were performed and referenced the geotechnical report. He stated that groundwater was observed at approximately 5 feet in one location and 3 feet in another closer to the resource area. He stated that the panel drains would remain above the groundwater table and that the infiltration trench design also accounted for groundwater conditions. He stated that grading changes were minor, with limited cut and fill across the site.

Comm. Holtz asked for clarification on the location of the proposed fence and the conditions beyond it. Mr. Rowan described the fence alignment relative to the field layout and existing features, stating that it would extend behind the field and along the outfield perimeter. He stated that the area beyond the fence consisted of existing tree line and vegetated areas.

Comm. Holtz asked about retrieval of balls beyond the fence. Mr. Rowan stated that the fence would be approximately 6 feet high with a safety cap and that balls traveling beyond the fence could be difficult to retrieve, similar to existing conditions, particularly in areas with standing water.

Comm. Rogers asked whether the adjacent upper fields had irrigation systems. Mr. Rowan stated that the upper field had an existing irrigation system, including a meter pit and irrigation manhole identified during the survey.

Comm. Rogers asked whether the proposed 6-foot fence would allow space for animals to pass underneath. Mr. Rowan stated that the fence would not extend continuously across the entire tree line and would typically include an approximately 4-inch gap at the bottom. He stated that the gap could be adjusted if required by the Commission.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone to clarify a prior comment regarding potential soil removal. Coordinator Capone stated that additional unsuitable soil could be encountered during construction and that, if necessary, more material than currently proposed could be removed and replaced with suitable material to ensure proper drainage.

Chair Henkels asked about the sequencing of drainage installation. Mr. Rowan stated that construction would begin with stripping and stockpiling topsoil, followed by re-grading the subgrade. He stated that drainage infrastructure, including the infiltration trench, collector pipe, and flat panel drains, would be installed next, followed by replacement of amended topsoil. He stated that paving, structures, and fencing would be installed after grading and drainage work. He stated that drainage infrastructure would likely be installed by mid to late August within a July to October construction schedule.

Chair Henkels invited Tina Rivard to speak. She identified herself as DPW Director for the Town of Sudbury. She stated that the project was funded through a CPC-approved program and had been delayed for several years. She stated that the primary goal was to improve field usability by addressing drainage issues. She stated that project planning included contingencies, with drainage identified as the highest priority. She stated that potential reductions in scope could include removal of irrigation and the access ramp if necessary to meet budget constraints. She stated that the intent was to complete the project within current funding and avoid future funding requests.

Chair Henkels asked about reseeding and field readiness. Director Rivard stated that seeding would occur in early fall, with establishment expected before winter. She stated that the contractor would be responsible for ensuring acceptable growth. She confirmed that the fields would not be in use during construction and would be ready for play in spring 2027 following establishment. Chair Henkels confirmed that no field use would occur until 2027.

Comm. Rogers stated that the lower fields were used throughout the summer and clarified that use extended beyond July. Chair Henkels asked Mr. Rowan to quantify the area proposed to be mowed. Mr. Rowan stated that

the maintained field area was approximately 95,000 square feet, which was less than the area currently mowed. He stated that approximately 1,700 square feet of that area was within the Riverfront Area.

Chair Henkels asked about the location of mitigation planting. Mr. Rowan stated that the mitigation area was the portion of the site extending from the outfield fence to the tree line, which was currently mowed. He stated that this area would be left un-mowed and seeded with a wetland seed mix.

Chair Henkels asked whether that area would remain un-mowed under the Order of Conditions. Mr. Rowan stated that the intent was for the area to remain un-mowed, with seeding implemented during construction, and deferred to Coordinator Capone for final conditions.

Coordinator Capone stated that the area was proposed to be left fallow but that she wanted to retain the option for periodic mowing to control woody invasive species. She stated that the area would otherwise remain un-mowed.

Comm. Sevier asked whether eliminating mowing in that area was practical given potential loss of balls. Mr. Rowan stated that the outfield fence would reduce the number of balls entering that area but acknowledged that balls traveling beyond the fence could be more difficult to retrieve. He stated that this was a tradeoff associated with reducing disturbance in the Buffer Zone.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the fence would include gates. Mr. Rowan stated that the fence would be chain link, open at both ends, and would likely include one or more gates. He stated that the fence fabric could be set at different heights depending on Commission direction.

Comm. Sevier noted that balls could pass under a gap at the bottom of the fence. Mr. Rowan stated that the typical gap was approximately 3 to 4 inches, but that vegetation growth at the base of the fence could reduce openings over time. He stated that the installation height could be adjusted if needed.

Chair Henkels noted that the project review was still ongoing and asked Coordinator Capone when the applicant should return to the Commission. Coordinator Capone recommended that the applicant return after meeting with the Planning Board for site plan review and stormwater management and addressing any resulting concerns. She asked Mr. Rowan to clarify whether the irrigation plan would be revised at this stage or later.

Mr. Rowan explained that the irrigation design was completed at the 50% design level by a subcontractor and could be revised after the Planning Board meeting. He stated that this would allow the project to proceed with finalized irrigation plans prior to bidding. He asked for Commission guidance on whether irrigation heads should remain outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone. Chair Henkels confirmed that the irrigation heads should be designed outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone.

Chair Henkels invited audience comments. Gail Kessler-Walsh, 236 Raymond Road, and Tim Walsh spoke. They noted that the plans did not preserve the area known as Feeley Sledding Hill, which is used recreationally in winter. They suggested considering alternative pathways to maintain access without impacting organized sports.

Chair Henkels thanked them and noted their comments.

Chair Henkels then confirmed with Mr. Rowan that the Hearing could be continued. Rowan stated that the applicant preferred to wait until after the Planning Board meeting and initial peer review were complete.

Comm. Sevier clarified that the sledding hill issue was not a conservation matter and would be addressed at the Planning Board or other appropriate meeting.

Chair Henkels requested a motion to continue the Hearing to a date to be determined. Mr. Rowan confirmed agreement to the continuation.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to date to be determined, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 9 Trevor Way, DEP #301-TBD

Chair Henkels opened the Hearing for the project to construct a house and associated septic system, driveway, utilities, and appurtenances within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. John Berglund was the applicant.

Mark Arnold, representing Goddard Consulting, introduced the Notice of Intent for 9 Trevor Way in Sudbury, Massachusetts, with Jacob Crosson and the property owner also present. He provided a history of the property, noting prior wetland permitting, subdivision construction, and restoration efforts dating back to the early 2000s. Mr. Arnold described the site's previous conditions, including a dilapidated house, degraded wetlands, and dumping, and recounted the efforts to restore the vernal pool and surrounding wetlands, emphasizing successful establishment of native species and habitat improvement. Three lots had been developed, while Lot 4 remained undeveloped due to past construction challenges and regulatory compliance issues.

Mr. Arnold explained that long-term monitoring and management of invasive species and plantings had been ongoing. An interim as-built plan was prepared showing existing conditions, including the expanded wetland areas, installed trees, and functioning stormwater system, with the exception of the bounds for Lot 4, which were pending. A letter from Connorstone confirmed substantial compliance with the subdivision requirements. The team proposed establishing conservation restrictions to permanently protect the area in front of the vernal pool while still allowing a smaller single-family home on Lot 4.

Mr. Crosson, wetland scientist with Goddard Consulting, presented the proposed plan. He outlined a new permanent limit of work for Lot 4, to be formalized via a deed restriction, which would create perpetual conservation of land west of the work area while allowing limited development. He described the construction impact within resource areas: grading within the 50-foot Buffer Zone to Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW), and approximately 2,000 square feet of the proposed house and nearly 1,950 square feet of driveway within the 100-foot Buffer Zone. Mr. Crosson emphasized that this represents a significant scale reduction compared to prior designs, minimizing impact on wetlands and the vernal pool. The work within the vernal pool Buffer is limited to the outermost 100-foot buffer, affecting approximately 212 square feet.

Mr. Crosson also noted that stormwater management would be addressed via a proposed CULTEC drywell system. He concluded by opening the floor to the Commission for questions or comments.

Coordinator Capone noted that Lot 4 presents some challenges, but given its prior approval as part of the original subdivision and the applicant's efforts to minimize impacts, the proposal largely respects the resource areas and prior restoration work. She asked whether more than 5,000 square feet of alteration is proposed, confirming with Mr. Arnold that it is, and reminded that stormwater management under the local bylaw would therefore be required, including potential considerations for the driveway.

Coordinator Capone inquired about the proposed bounds for the restricted area. Mr. Arnold explained they sought a balance between clear demarcation and aesthetic integration, suggesting concrete 4x4 posts with a two-foot reveal and medallions, or potentially boulders with medallions. Capone emphasized the importance of visibility and future recognition of the bounds and encouraged consideration of additional natural features.

Regarding plantings on the hillside between the house and bounds, Mr. Arnold indicated none were currently proposed but acknowledged potential for plantings on the lower slopes while maintaining walkable space. On mitigation, Mr. Arnold noted that the development respects the original 50-foot Buffer from the vernal pool, keeping the footprint tight, with no additional mitigation proposed. Coordinator Capone suggested reviewing opportunities for invasive species removal within the resource area, noting that some bittersweet, honeysuckle, and buckthorn remain, and requested a walk of the property with the wetland scientist to confirm flags and limits of work. Mr. Arnold agreed to stake out the limit of work.

Coordinator Capone asked about two pipes entering or exiting the site. Mr. Arnold explained that one pipe daylighted on a neighboring property but has remained dry, and the other drains a small watershed; both were investigated by Connorstone and will remain in place, with a swale installed to manage water. Capone confirmed that DEP issued a number for the project with no comments.

Chair Henkels asked about debris in the southern pipe, and Mr. Arnold responded that leaves were present but no significant sediment.

Chair Henkels then asked about the size of a proposed retaining wall; Mr. Arnold described it as approximately two feet tall, providing a flat area for a walkout basement patio.

Chair Henkels inquired whether the patio would affect drainage near the pipe; Mr. Crosson indicated the permeable design and existing swale should prevent significant adverse impacts, but deferred detailed assessment to Mr. Arnold.

Comm. Sevier asked for clarification on the two pipes at the bottom of the plan, noting that the retaining wall appears to be at elevation 168–170, and confirmed that any discharge from the pipes would likely flow toward the wetland rather than affect the patio. Chair Henkels agreed with this interpretation. Coordinator Capone confirmed that any flow from the pipes would be picked up by the swale and discharged toward the wetland, preventing impacts to the house or patio.

Comm. Sevier suggested possibly capping the pipes, but Capone advised against altering them without knowing their purpose. Comm. Sevier noted the pipes might appear to be from a neighboring property dumping onto the site. Coordinator Capone referenced a 2010 letter from an abutter regarding flooding in the area for the Commission’s consideration.

Mr. Arnold then provided details from a 2018 Connorstone Engineering letter, noting that one 12-inch drain connects to a catch basin on an adjacent property and does not carry significant flow. Camera inspection could not progress past 50 feet, but no obstructions were found, and the pipes do not receive water from Route 20. He emphasized that the proposed work would maintain existing flow paths and not disrupt natural drainage.

Chair Henkels asked if the restoration or previous work had altered the flow from the pipes; Mr. Arnold confirmed the area remains flat, with sheet flow directed toward the wetland and the swale preserving that path.

Comm. Rogers asked why the pipes couldn’t be removed. Mr. Arnold explained that blocking the pipes could cause flooding on the neighboring property, so they will remain in place to avoid impacting abutting parcels. Comm. Rogers then asked whether the driveway could be moved further from the vernal pool and conservation bounds. Mr. Arnold explained that they are constrained by the existing curb cut and the location of the septic system, but there may be minor flexibility to adjust the driveway slightly once wetland bounds are staked.

Comm. Rogers also asked about relocating the septic system closer to the roof drain. Mr. Arnold explained that the approved Board of Health plan and required setbacks restrict movement, so the septic system remains in its existing location, and the house footprint was designed to work around it with minimal disturbance.

Chair Henkels asked for a description of the CULTEC drainage system. Mr. Arnold explained it is a 330XL chamber system with six inches of stone at the base, approximately 30 inches tall, buried with inspection ports, and connected to roof gutters so that only clean runoff enters the system. The soils at the site are sandy and conducive to infiltration, and the system is expected to function well long-term.

Chair Henkels confirmed that Mr. Arnold would provide an update on proposed driveway drainage. Comm. Holtz asked about overflow scenarios. Mr. Arnold explained that overflow would exit at downspouts around the house and spread across the grass, ultimately flowing toward the wetland, with no direct overflow to neighboring properties.

Chair Henkels inquired about residential operations and maintenance (O&M) for the system. Mr. Arnold confirmed that standard manufacturer O&M procedures exist and would be included with the Stormwater Bylaw submission and recorded with the Order of Conditions to be attached to the deed.

Chair Henkels asked about the difference between a conservation restriction and a deed restriction. Coordinator Capone explained that a CR is signed by the state and protected under Article 97, whereas a deed restriction lacks that added protection.

Chair Henkels then opened the floor to questions from commissioners and the audience; none were raised. He summarized that further work includes addressing stormwater under the local bylaw, confirming wetland flags, and completing minor outstanding items.

Mr. Arnold requested a continuation to the April 27th meeting to allow time to stake the limits of work and review the site with Coordinator Capone.

On motion by Comm. Holtz to continue the Hearing to April 27, 2026, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Continued Wetland Applications:

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

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing from the project to construct a roadway and associated drainage system and utilities in the 100-foot 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, July 24, 2023, August 26, and December 16, 2024, and February 9, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to April 6, 2026, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 32 Emerson Way, DEP #301-1458

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct a detached garage within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Frank Vincentelli was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from December 12, 2025.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to April 6, 2026, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 182 Wayside Inn Road, DEP #301-1434

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to install a gravel driveway and stream crossing after-the-fact, renovate and expand an existing garage, construct an accessory outbuilding, exterior pool, and replace an existing culvert within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Andrew Leverone was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from November 18, 2024, June 23, August 4, and December 12, 2025.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to May 11, 2026, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 94 Pride's Crossing Road, DEP #301-1455

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to demolish an existing carriage house and construct a single-family house within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. First Colony Development Co. was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from September 29, November 17, December 29, 2025 and January 26, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to April 6, 2026, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Certificate of Compliance:

Perry, 23 Moore Road, DEP #301-1436

Coordinator Capone explained that the project involved a small addition to the front of the house over existing driveway or landscaped areas, which had been completed as approved. The applicants were requesting a Certificate of Compliance. She noted four trees of concern: one overhanging the house, one leaning toward the house and backyard, a large front-yard pine leaning slightly toward the house, and a fourth tree located between the first two. None exhibited significant health issues, though branches had fallen from the trees nearest the house. The applicants proposed leaving the stumps in place and planting native shrubs to mitigate the removal. The closest tree was approximately 20 feet from the wetland edge. Coordinator Capone indicated that these requests would likely have been permitted originally with appropriate mitigation.

Chair Henkels invited Joel Perry to speak. Mr. Perry explained that over their 12 years on the property, trees had fallen, including one that struck the house. They expressed concern for family and property safety and supported planting native species to compensate for any removals.

Chair Henkels asked how this would be handled administratively. Coordinator Capone stated it would constitute a minor modification to the existing Order of Conditions and recommended withholding the COC until tree removal and plantings were completed and inspected. Mr. Perry confirmed understanding and agreed to keep the order open until completion.

On motion by Comm. Sevier to approve a minor modification, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Cavicchios, 110 Codjer Lane, DEP #301-1394

Coordinator Capone explained that the Order of Conditions addressed impacts to the adjacent wetland from a 2022 fire at a storage building. The Order required restoration of the altered wetlands and reconstruction of the burned building. She reported that all restoration work had been completed and was in good condition. She noted that phragmites surround the restored area and may gradually encroach, though efforts would be made to control it. The applicant will not rebuild the storage building, instead locating it elsewhere on the property, and is seeking to close out the Order of Conditions.

On motion by Comm. Sevier to issue the Certificate of Compliance, seconded by Comm. Faust, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Enforcement Order Update:

73 Wayside Inn Road: Parking Lot Restoration

Coordinator Capone reported that work on the site had begun that morning. She met with the contractor, who exposed a section to confirm the thickness of the material previously installed and to clarify expectations for its removal. She stated that the removal process would take approximately a week. Following removal, she will re-inspect the site to ensure satisfactory completion before clean material is brought in to restore the site to pre-existing grades.

Other Business:

Sudbury 250 Day

Coordinator Capone noted that the event is scheduled for Saturday, May 16th, from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and that committees were invited to host informational tables. Comm. Rogers volunteered to staff a portion of the time, citing prior positive experience at a similar event. Assoc. Comm. Hoffman indicated he would be unable to participate due to volleyball travel commitments. Chair Henkels proposed splitting the day with Comm. Rogers, and inquired if any other commissioners could cover additional time, but Comms. Sevier, Holtz, and Faust indicated scheduling conflicts. It was agreed that Chair Henkels would cover the morning session, with Comm. Rogers tentatively covering the afternoon, pending confirmation of her personal schedule. The discussion concluded with an understanding to finalize the schedule closer to the event.

Adjourn Meeting

On motion by Comm. Sevier to adjourn the meeting at 8:54 PM, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.