SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES
Meeting Minutes of Monday, August 24, 2026

Present: David Henkels, Chair; Ken Holtz (7:01 PM), Vice Chair; Jeremy Cook; Harry Hoffman; Kasey Rogers; Mark Sevier (7:09 PM); Victor Sulkowski; Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator; and Joseph Miller, Conservation Land Manager

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

Deer Management Program

Discussion and vote on 2026 Season

Joseph Miller, Land Manager, reported that the program in 2025 had opened a new property at Landham Brook Marsh and welcomed two new hunters for that parcel, along with three additional hunters filling openings created by new locations or departures from the program. Hunters had taken 12 deer from Conservation land during the previous season. He said the number was below the program's target and attributed this in part to new hunters learning deer movement patterns. He explained that the rail trails had also continued to affect those patterns.

He reported that hunters had contributed volunteer hours to Conservation Department projects. Their work included rebuilding the Raymond Road Turtle Fence and reestablishing and expanding the Davis Pollinator Garden. Hunters had helped install approximately 800 plugs in the garden, with three or four volunteers participating. Hunters had also continued to perform trail maintenance and other projects.

He identified the proposed addition of Raymond Reservation as the primary change under consideration for the upcoming season. He explained that the town had opened Landham Brook Marsh during the previous year and that Sudbury Valley Trustees had also opened the Lyons Cutler property, located between Raymond Reservation and Landham Brook Marsh. Adding Raymond Reservation would extend the contiguous area available for hunting across these properties.

He stated that the properties were not large individually but that opening them together would support deer population management across the area. He explained that the Town had opened Landham Brook Marsh because evidence indicated a substantial deer population there, although the area had not yet experienced serious over-browsing. The remaining native understory vegetation required protection before browsing reached a point where the vegetation could not recover. He said the same concern applied to Raymond Reservation because the properties formed part of one contiguous forest. He recommended adding Raymond Reservation to the program to continue managing the deer population in the area.

He also reported that the Department had found two illegal hunting stands during the previous season. He explained that expanding the areas where authorized hunters operated helped the Department identify unpermitted stands and verify that people hunting in Sudbury followed applicable rules and regulations and hunted safely. He stated that adding Raymond Reservation would continue to provide this benefit.

Chair Henkels asked how many hunters participated in the program and how many properties were available to them. Mr. Miller explained that several hunters had left the program for the upcoming

season and that the Department was interviewing prospective participants to determine whether all openings would be filled. He estimated that the program would include 24 hunters, increasing to 25 if Raymond Reservation were added. Because Raymond Reservation was not a large property, the Department proposed assigning one hunter to it during the first year.

Chair Henkels asked whether Mr. Miller was satisfied with the land stewardship work hunters performed as part of their program responsibilities. Mr. Miller explained that two seasonal land management assistants had joined the department that year, increasing the office's capacity. However, he said the volunteer hours contributed by hunters remained important to the Department's ability to complete projects. The program required each of its hunters to contribute two hours of volunteer work, and he estimated that about half contributed more than the required amount. Mr. Miller explained that hunters assisted with projects the Department could not otherwise complete or that ranked below other priorities but still benefited the town.

He also noted that some hunters owned equipment unavailable to the Conservation Department. For example, when the department installed kiosks, a hunter with an auger helped dig the holes, reducing the need for staff to dig them by hand. Other hunters provided landscaping equipment and mowed fields, whereas the department had only a walk-behind mower.

Chair Henkels asked how reports of illegal hunting stands had been handled, including how the department received and acted on the reports. Mr. Miller explained that participating hunters were required to provide GPS locations for their hunting stands. As hunters walked through properties to scout locations, they could identify stands that were not part of the authorized program. Both stands found during the previous season were located on separate properties. The hunters recorded their GPS locations and reported them to the Department. In one case a blind had been set up. The Police Department was contacted to assist with its removal.

Chair Henkels invited the Commissioners to offer comments or observations.

Comm. Holtz asked what happened to stands removed from properties when they were found to belong to unauthorized hunters. Mr. Miller explained that the Department handled removed stands differently depending on the circumstances. Some were discarded, some were given to authorized program hunters for reuse, and others remained in storage.

Chair Henkels then asked whether any other Commissioners had questions. He then invited audience members to ask questions or provide comments.

Marge Peppercorn stated that she had lived on Sawmill Lane in Sudbury for more than 50 years and objected to the deer hunting program on several grounds. She said she had heard the reasons presented in support of the program and had read articles that contradicted those explanations.

She stated that the Town had not conducted annual deer counts to determine whether hunting was necessary. She expressed concern that the program was being continued to accommodate hunters, including the admission of junior hunters during the previous season. She noted that the previous winter had been severe and that severe winters in other years had reduced the deer population. She questioned the need to continue the culls without determining the effects of those winters on deer numbers. She stated that the program had killed six deer in 2024 and questioned whether removing that number of deer had affected the objectives of the program.

She addressed Lyme disease, stating that she had worked as a physician in Sudbury for more than 30 years. She argued that studies had not shown that reducing deer populations reduced the risk of Lyme disease. She explained that deer did not develop Lyme disease and that people contracted it from

infected ticks. She said mice and other woodland animals infected ticks, which then attached themselves to deer. She argued that unless the deer population was eliminated, ticks could attach to other deer or mammals. She also stated that the American Lyme Association did not advocate eliminating deer as a means of controlling Lyme disease. She questioned the rationale for using deer culls to address the disease.

She also objected to bow hunting. She stated that studies had found bow hunting to cause suffering even when practiced by experienced hunters. She expressed concern that the program allowed supervised junior hunters to participate. She said deer struck by arrows sometimes died at the time they were shot, while others survived for hours or days before dying from their injuries. She characterized this as an inhumane method of population control and argued that, if the Town intended to reduce the deer population, it should use a method that killed deer humanely rather than one that accommodated bow hunters.

She stated that Conservation land should protect wildlife and vegetation. She recalled a presentation from several years earlier that included an image of a meadow and presented deer removal as necessary to preserve the meadow. She argued that the meadow was beautiful with deer present. She also recalled a second image of a forest area described as an example of what could happen to a meadow, but she considered the two images unrelated.

She argued that the annual culls had become routine without the town reassessing each year whether they were necessary. She stated that the program expanded hunting opportunities for bow hunters without resolving the issues it was intended to address. She cited studies that, in her view, showed that Lyme disease incidence and deer-vehicle collisions had increased over the years in which culls had been conducted in Massachusetts. She also stated that research had shown that the remaining deer produced more offspring after deer were killed. She questioned whether the culls achieved their intended results.

She thanked the Commission for holding hearings but expressed concern that the scientific evidence was not receiving sufficient consideration. She objected to what she described as the annual approval of hunting on Conservation land without a reassessment of the program. She said residents moved to the suburbs in part because they valued wildlife and wanted to protect the animals and plants on Conservation land. She added that people she had spoken with also objected to the culls, although some had not known that the program existed.

She requested that the Conservation Commission consider suspending the program for one year following the severe winter to determine what effect a pause might have. She reiterated that she did not believe killing six or 12 deer would make a meaningful difference to the program's stated objectives. She said she had references supporting her arguments but did not wish to take more time to present them.

Chair Henkels thanked Ms. Peppercorn for her comments and observations. He then asked whether anyone else in the audience had a question or comment. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to continue the deer hunting program for the upcoming season through December 31, as well as to extend the program to Raymond Reservation.

On motion by Comm. Sulkowski to continue the program, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Comm. Sevier did not vote as he was late to joining the meeting.

Minutes

On motion by Comm. Cook to accept the minutes of the May 11, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Comms. Sevier, Holtz, Hoffman, and Sulkowski did not vote as they were not present at the May 11 meeting.

On motion by Comm. Cook to accept the minutes of the June 1, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Hoffman, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Comm. Sulkowski did not vote as he was not present at the June 1 meeting.

On motion by Comm. Sevier to accept the minutes of the June 15, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Comm. Sulkowski did not vote as he was not present at the June 15 meeting.

Wetland Applications:

Request for Determination of Applicability: 24 Birchwood Avenue: RDA #26-14

- *RDA Application package, received August 3, 2026, including: Proposed Plan, prepared by Chongris Engineering, dated July 30, 2026*

Chair Henkels began the meeting for the project to excavate soil test pits within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Jane Haley was the applicant.

Alek Chongris of Chongris Engineer represented the homeowner at 24 Birchwood Avenue. He explained that the wetlands have been surveyed by Goddard Consulting but the survey plan was still being developed. He explained that nearly the entire low-lying property was within the Buffer Zone. He stated that the applicant would return to the Commission when the septic system design was ready for review and approval by the Board of Health.

He proposed excavating three test pits. The applicant intended to prioritize Locations 1 and 2. If those locations did not provide suitable soil or sufficient space for testing, the applicant would also excavate Location 3. He estimated that the test pits would remain open for three to four hours before being backfilled on the same day.

Coordinator Capone stated that the site was flat and since the test pits would be backfilled the same day, she did not consider erosion controls necessary for the proposed work. She confirmed that she had requested that Locations 1 and 2 be excavated first, with the goal of avoiding excavation at Location 3.

She explained that the entire backyard was within approximately 50 feet of the wetlands, which would make it difficult to locate a septic system that met the applicable regulations. She noted that the existing septic system was located near Locations 1 and 2 and expressed hope that the proposed testing in those areas would identify suitable conditions for the new system.

Chair Henkels invited the Commissioners to ask questions. He then asked whether any audience members had questions or comments.

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

Notice of Intent: 9 Trevor Way, DEP #301-1461

- *Declaration of Restrictive Covenants*
- *Deed Restriction Plan, prepared by Connorstone Engineering Inc., dated August 14, 2026*

Chair Henkels resumed 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. This Hearing was continued from March 23, June 15, and July 27, 2026.

Jacob Crosson of Goddard Consulting presented the deed restriction plan prepared by Connorstone. He explained that the area extending downhill from the concrete bounds was included in the deed restriction and was shaded on the plan. He stated that the restriction would protect the wetland and potential Vernal Pool and covered approximately 42,500 square feet. The title, date, and square footage had been incorporated into the deed restriction language, which had been revised and submitted to the Commission. He requested a vote on the final deed restriction so that the applicant could return with the remaining items for the Certificate of Compliance (COC) request. He offered to answer questions.

Coordinator Capone stated that Town Counsel had reviewed the deed restriction, also referred to as the restrictive covenant, and agreed with the language. She raised a question about a drainage easement located within the restricted area. She asked what the easement consisted of and whether maintenance would be required, noting that she did not believe the restrictive covenant addressed those matters.

Mr. Crosson stated that he did not know the details and suggested that Mark Arnold of Goddard Consulting might have more information. Mr. Arnold explained that the drainage easement served an underground infiltration system for the Trevor Way roadway. He stated that the covenant referenced existing easements that might be present. Regarding maintenance, he explained that the system would be inspected and cleaned only if sediment buildup was identified. Based on Connorstone's most recent review, the street's drainage infrastructure had met maintenance requirements, the catch basins were clean, and the inspection had not identified issues.

Mr. Arnold stated that the subdivision's Certificate of Compliance request would include a letter addressing the system inspection and confirming compliance with the original Order of Conditions. If cleaning were required, workers would open the inspection port, use water to suspend sediment, and remove it with a pump truck. He reiterated that the easement served the roadway infiltration system.

Coordinator Capone asked whether the system might need to be replaced at some point in the future, given that the deed restriction would be permanent, and stated that any such rights needed to be addressed in the Covenant. Mr. Arnold said he did not believe replacement would be necessary but would need to consult counsel to determine how the easement related to the covenant's wording. He recalled that the restriction included language concerning easements.

Mr. Crosson read the provision stating that the declarant and its successors and assigns, including subsequent owners of the premises or portions thereof, were required to incorporate the Declaration of Restrictive Covenant, in full or by reference, into deeds, easements, mortgages, leases, licenses, and other documents.

Mr. Arnold acknowledged the provision but stated that he could not confirm whether it adequately addressed the drainage easement. Coordinator Capone stated that the language did not appear to

capture the issue. She explained that such documents generally included a paragraph identifying the easement and specifying the rights reserved for its future maintenance.

Marcel Maillet, of Maillet & Son, asked whether the matter had arisen previously. Chair Henkels summarized that the parties needed to consult additional experts to determine whether rights concerning the easement needed to be reserved. Mr. Arnold agreed that Town Counsel and the applicant's counsel should discuss the question to ensure that Town's concerns were addressed.

Coordinator Capone stated that she wanted to avoid imposing a restriction on the property that might require amendment in the future. Mr. Arnold explained that an existing easement generally could not be superseded unless the document specifically provided for its modification or replacement. He stated that this interpretation required input from a land-use attorney and that he lacked sufficient background on the matter to provide further guidance.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the dimensions of the drainage easement shown on the plan were correct and how they had been determined. Mr. Arnold explained that the easement hatch matched the original Trevor Way subdivision plan. He stated that two drainage easements existed, one on each side of the road, serving two infiltration systems. The dimensions were based on the subdivision plan, and an as-built plan confirmed that the system was located within the designated easement.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone whether the Commission should continue the matter rather than vote. Coordinator Capone stated that, given the time already devoted to the document, she considered it preferable to obtain an answer before the Commission voted.

Chair Henkels stated that the next meeting would be September 14 and asked Mr. Arnold whether he agreed to continue the matter until that date. Mr. Arnold agreed.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to September 14, 2026, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 1011 Boston Post Road (Lot 11), DEP #301-1462

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct a house with associated common driveway, utilities, grading and clearing within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the local 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Reinaldo Faria of Faria Home Improvement was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from April 6 and May 11, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to September 28, 2026, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Notice of Intent: 1011 Boston Post Road (Lot 10a), DEP #301-1463

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to grade, clear, install utilities, and construct a common driveway within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the local 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Reinaldo Faria of Faria Home Improvement was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from April 6 and May 11, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Rogers to continue the Hearing to September 28, 2026, seconded by Comm. Hoffman, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

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

- *Site Plan, prepared by M. A. Engineering, dated October 28, 2026, revised June 18, 2026*
- *Stormwater Report, prepared by M.A. Engineering, dated October 28, 2026, revised June 18, 2026*

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, January 26, and April 6, 2026.

Doug Dillon, Wetland Scientist from Goddard Consulting, introduced himself and stated that the owner-applicant was present. He explained that the Planning Department had issued its final decision and approval of the stormwater plan for 94 Pride's Crossing Road earlier that afternoon. The revised plan included changes to the rain gardens, removal of the driveway area, additional plantings, and placement of the septic system and associated work outside the Buffer Zones of the resource areas.

Mr. Dillon stated that the stormwater approval would allow the applicants to address the outstanding questions concerning the properties under discussion. For 94 Pride's Crossing Road and the neighboring 100 Pride's Crossing Road, the applicants intended to finalize amendments to the Agricultural Preservation Restrictions (APRs). He reviewed the proposed changes, including loaming and reseeding the trailer storage area and relocating the gravel path outside most of the APR area and the Buffer Zones associated with the lower wetland. The relocated path would run east to west from the large barn area, outside the Buffer Zone.

He also described a proposed fence for the agricultural area, which would use a split-rail or stockade design suitable for containing livestock. He recalled that the Commission had previously discussed the fire road and the appropriate surface material. The parties had settled on stone rather than asphalt millings, addressing questions raised by Comm. Holtz about the suitability of asphalt millings. Mark Elbag had incorporated stone into the design shown on the site plan

Coordinator Capone stated that she anticipated the applicants would submit a revised Notice of Intent incorporating both properties because work was proposed on each. She indicated that the driveway realignment appeared consistent with previous discussions. She identified the connecting path leading to the Mary Martha Chapel as the remaining issue requiring clarification from the Commission. The plan appeared to show that the path would remain in place and retain its recycled asphalt surface. She asked whether the Commission would permit the path to remain and what surface material would be appropriate.

Mr. Dillon stated that the path appeared to consist of a mixture of materials and asked Jon Delli Priscolli, representing First Colony Development Co., to comment on the final surface material.

Mr. Delli Priscoli stated that the path leading to the Martha Mary Chapel had existed for centuries and had served as a horse path over the decades. He explained that it consisted of stone and other materials, along with accumulated silt and leaf matter. He wanted to retain the existing path because he occasionally used it to transport landscaping materials to and from the inn. People also walked along the path and rode horses through the area. He stated that the path formed part of an existing trail system that he believed the Commission and the inn had approved years earlier.

He distinguished between the section on the inn's property and the section on his property. The latter consisted of mixed gravel with some asphalt millings. He described it as a pervious path rather than an impervious surface and explained that it was structurally capable of supporting farm equipment and horse-drawn carts. He stated that it was not intended to function as a roadway.

Coordinator Capone agreed with his description but stated that she did not believe the path had been included among the paths shown on the original APR. She explained that the path would therefore need to be included in the revised APR. She also noted that the surface material had changed over time, based on aerial photographs, and asked whether the Commission had preferences regarding the material that should be used.

Mr. Delli Priscoli explained that the original APR allowed agricultural activities on the property, which required paths to support farming and livestock. He acknowledged that the path's status had not been made clear when the APR was established but maintained that a path had always existed in that location. He stated that historical Google Maps imagery showed the path before he acquired the property in 1980 and that it had been present for approximately 40 to 50 years. He indicated that he would try to accommodate the Commission's preferences but wanted to preserve a connection to the Wayside Inn's path.

Chair Henkels observed that the Commission had not discussed the project for some time and that there had been approximately five previous discussions. He stated that he needed to review the information because some of the materials had only recently become available. He recalled that stormwater details had been available earlier and asked whether those materials would be submitted to Planning.

Mr. Dillon explained that the Planning Department had received the stormwater materials that afternoon. He stated that the submission followed the broader stormwater discussions underlying the Conservation filing and clarified that the information had not been available in time for the Commission's current review. He reported that the Planning Department had resolved the stormwater issue that afternoon.

Chair Henkels welcomed the news but reiterated that he had not yet reviewed the documents presented that evening. He asked whether the plot plan was a revision of previously submitted documents. Mr. Dillon confirmed that the materials represented the final stormwater plan set that Mr. Elbag had used for the stormwater filing and stated that the set reflected the Planning Department's approval. Chair Henkels confirmed that the information was new to him and stated that he would need to review it as the process continued.

Chair Henkels then returned to Coordinator Capone's comments about submitting a combined Notice of Intent and raised the APRs as another outstanding matter. He recalled that previous discussions had addressed specific paragraphs in the APRs but stated that he was not familiar enough with those discussions to proceed without reviewing them. He asked Coordinator Capone how the Commission should proceed.

Coordinator Capone stated that the Commission's comments on the connecting path and its surface material would help the applicants determine how to proceed. Otherwise, she did not anticipate the applicants returning until they had assembled a complete submission. That submission would include a Notice of Intent covering both properties and revised APRs for both properties, documenting the existing conditions and accounting for future uses of the land.

Chair Henkels summarized the immediate objective as reviewing the proposed surface material for the existing path. He asked the Commissioners whether they had questions, comments, or observations on that issue. He specifically invited Comm. Holtz to share any further thoughts, recalling that Comm. Holtz had raised points during the earlier stages of the review.

Comm. Holtz commented on the exchange between Coordinator Capone and the applicant. He stated that Coordinator Capone's concern was not whether the path existed or whether it could be maintained, but rather the surface material. He explained that an Agricultural Preservation Restriction allowing maintenance of existing paths did not authorize the use of any surface material. He stated that the path could be maintained if evidence established that it existed when the Agricultural Preservation Restriction was filed or earlier, but the replacement material should be consistent with the existing material and should not create a more impervious surface.

Comm. Sevier stated that he understood the applicant to be seeking clarification about which surface materials would be permitted and whether the path could remain in approximately its existing condition. He observed that the path appeared to be pervious and stated that, based on his understanding of the request, it could remain.

Referring to a photograph, Coordinator Capone explained that the trailers in the storage area were at the far side, the path extended toward the viewer, and Mary Martha Chapel was behind the photographer.

Comm. Sevier asked which building appeared in the photograph. Coordinator Capone identified it as the existing barn to which the road would be redirected. Comm. Sevier clarified that he had understood the discussion to concern the path leading to the chapel. Coordinator Capone confirmed that the photograph showed that path. Comm. Sevier stated that he had understood the site plan to depict the path in a different location. Comm. Holtz explained that the path continued beyond the area shown in the photograph and extended through the woods from the barn to the chapel.

Mr. Dillon began clarifying the photograph's orientation and location. Comm. Sevier then asked whether the revised plan proposed loaming and seeding the area shown in the photograph, with no path remaining there. Mr. Dillon clarified that the trailer storage area was a separate, approximately 10,000-square-foot area containing trailers and other stored materials.

Comm. Sevier referred to another drawing and stated that he had understood the proposed 20-foot-wide gravel driveway between the two fences to replace the existing route. Mr. Dillon confirmed that the lower turning area was included in the more recent plans as a proposed relocation. Comm. Sevier then identified the notation stating that the existing path to the Wayside Inn property would remain.

Mr. Dillon explained that the notation referred to the historical trail. He offered to review his records and stated that older United States Geological Survey maps showed the path as a dashed gray line in that location. He said the mapping supported the representative's account that the path had existed for an extended period as a horse path or cart path.

Comm. Holtz asked the participants to stop debating whether the path could remain, stating that he understood that the Commission had established that the path existed and could be maintained. He redirected the discussion to the surface material that would be used to construct or maintain the path and asked what material the path should consist of.

Mr. Dillon stated that the applicant could provide a material that would allow the path to remain in a form acceptable to the Commission. He added that the selected material could be documented in the APR revisions.

Mr. Delli Priscoli asked Chair Henkels for permission to address the Commission. He explained that he wanted the path to be narrower than the area shown in the photograph and stated that the surrounding areas could be loamed and seeded. He wanted to retain a path through the area but emphasized that it needed a solid surface rather than loam. He stated that he was flexible about the material and wanted to identify a surface that would satisfy the Commission's requirements while accommodating the property's use.

Comm. Sevier stated that Coordinator Capone's concern appeared to be that the existing material should be replaced with gravel, crushed stone, or another material known to be permeable. Coordinator Capone agreed. She then displayed an aerial photograph showing the area when the APR was established. She identified the barn and the path and noted that the area appeared different at that time.

Comm. Sevier observed that the photograph appeared to show grass in the area when the APR was established. Coordinator Capone agreed that the photograph appeared to show that condition. Mr. Delli Priscoli maintained that the area had always functioned as a hard-packed path, although grass might have grown in the middle between the travel lanes.

Comm. Sevier stated that, based on the photographs, he believed the appropriate approach was to replace the existing surface with materials known to be permeable, such as gravel or crushed stone. Mr. Delli Priscoli agreed to that approach.

Mr. Holtz stated that the mixture should not contain asphalt. Mr. Delli Priscoli agreed to remove all asphalt millings and proposed using native gravel mixed with three-quarter-inch stone in a 50/50 mixture. He explained that the native gravel consisted of sand mixed with stone and stated that the resulting surface would remain permeable while providing sufficient structural support. He also confirmed that the path would be narrower than its existing width. Mr. Dillon would establish the path's dimensions, which the representative expected to be approximately half its current width.

Comm. Sevier asked whether Mr. Dillon would add dimensions to the dotted line on the drawing and provide a section detail identifying the agreed-upon path. He noted that another section detail referred to a width of approximately 22 feet. Coordinator Capone explained that the 22-foot width was intended to accommodate emergency vehicles accessing a particular location. Mr. Delli Priscoli clarified that the emergency access route was a different path. Coordinator Capone agreed that the path under discussion should be narrower.

Mr. Delli Priscoli proposed a width of 12 feet as adequate. He also stated that he had worked with the Fire Chief on the separate emergency access path, although that matter had not been discussed during the meeting. He stated that he supported the proposed changes and wanted to improve the path's appearance.

Coordinator Capone raised a concern about the proposed fence location, stating that the plan appeared to show portions of the fence within the wetland. She asked that the fence be located with a setback from the wetland. Mr. Dillon agreed to verify the fence location.

Comm. Sevier asked whether a surveyor would locate the fence given the circumstances. Mr. Dillon confirmed that the final design would be surveyed and verified. He stated that the topography shown on the plan was an estimate and that there would be no direct impact to Bordering Vegetated Wetland. He explained that wetland flags were already present in the upper area but had not yet been incorporated into the survey. He stated that the wetland boundaries could be depicted accurately

because of the slope, particularly in the upper area, and that the wetland boundary was distinguishable from the surrounding land.

Comm. Sevier stated that fence installers might not pay sufficient attention to the wetland boundary and recommended that a surveyor install pins identifying the precise starting point, ending point, and each change in the fence's direction. He wanted the fence location clearly marked so that the installer would follow the approved alignment.

Mr. Delli Priscoli clarified that he would install the fence himself. He explained that used a small auger mounted on a skid steer, and that each post location was measured and marked before drilling and that the posts were placed into the resulting holes without using a backhoe or undertaking extensive excavation.

Comm. Sevier acknowledged the explanation and stated that, knowing the representative would install the fence, the Commission would expect it to be placed in the appropriate location. The representative agreed.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone whether any other matters needed to be addressed that evening. She stated that there were none.

Chair Henkels stated that the Commission's next Hearing dates in September were the 14th and 28th. Mr. Delli Priscoli expressed a preference for September 14

On motion by Comm. Cook to continue the Hearing to September 14, 2026, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Adjourn Meeting

On motion by Comm. Hoffman to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 PM, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.