SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES
Meeting Minutes of Monday, July 27, 2026

Present: David Henkels, Chair; Ken Holtz, Vice Chair; Jeremy Cook; Harry Hoffman; Mark Sevier (7:02 PM); Victor Sulkowski; Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator; and Robert Bosso, Conservation Assistant

Absent: Kasey Rogers

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

Minutes

April 27, 2026

This vote was tabled due to a lack of a quorum.

Wetland Applications:

Request for Determination of Applicability: 416-420A Boston Post Road, RDA #26-13

- *RDA Application package, received July 13, 2026, including Proposed Tight Tank Plan, prepared by Connorstone Engineering Inc., dated June 11, 2026, revised July 7, 2026*

Chair Henkels began the meeting for the project to install a tight tank within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the local 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Sheily Colon was the applicant.

Jared Gillett of Connorstone Engineering represented the applicant for the project at 418 Boston Post Road. He stated that the site was developed with multiple buildings and that most of the lot was occupied by buildings or pavement. He identified a Bordering Vegetated Wetland to the rear of the lot and a local bylaw stream. One of the units would be occupied by a barbershop/salon, which required installation of a tight tank for potential chemicals associated with perms, hair dyes, and similar materials. He stated that the tight tank would prevent those chemicals from entering the septic system and leaching into the ground.

Mr. Gillett then explained that the proposed tight tank would be located within the existing paved parking area, more than 100 feet from the wetland. The pipe connections would extend to the rear of the building, with the only work within the Buffer consisting of the pipe connection shown behind the building. The tank would have a liner for secondary containment and a leak detection system.

Mr. Gillett stated that the work was expected to take less than one week and would be completed during the summer or early fall. He stated that groundwater levels were lowest during that period and that dewatering was not anticipated. During construction, silt sacks would be installed in the catch basins. He identified one catch basin at the front corner of the building where a silt sack would be placed. The work area would be repaved as soon as practical after installation for final stabilization.

Conservation Assistant, Robert Bosso, stated that the Board of Health had indicated that it had no concerns about the project. He asked about the pipes connecting the tight tank to the building and the location of the rear lot line. He asked whether the lot line shown on the plan had been professionally

surveyed. Mr. Gillett stated that the lot line was located just inside the retaining wall at the rear of the property and that Connorstone Engineering had conducted an on-site survey.

Mr. Bosso asked whether any monuments or other markers had been identified. Mr. Gillett stated that no monumentation was shown on the plan and that he was not certain what had been found, although roadway bounds along Boston Post Road may have been identified.

Mr. Bosso asked whether the visual markers should be confirmed to ensure that the pipes were located on the correct side of the property line. Coordinator Capone stated that the Commission needed confirmation that the lot lines had been surveyed as part of the design as the building and lot line were close together and that the Commission's GIS showed the lot line extending to the building. Mr. Bosso stated that the Determination could be conditioned to require confirmation of the lot line before work began.

Mr. Bosso stated that he had visited the site and observed a second catch basin in the lot behind the building, near the rear left corner. He stated that the catch basin appeared to discharge toward the naturalized area containing the resource area. He asked whether Connorstone Engineering had observed the catch basin and determined whether the project could send sediment in that direction.

Mr. Gillett stated that there was a high point in the pavement just beyond the proposed tank. He explained that runoff would flow back toward the catch basin at the front corner of the building, which was located on the abutting property.

Mr. Bosso then asked how far above the groundwater table the tight tank would be installed. Mr. Gillett stated that Connorstone Engineering could review the previous soil testing to determine the groundwater elevation.

Coordinator Capone stated that the groundwater elevation was a concern because the Commission had reviewed the previous septic design, which identified groundwater at approximately elevation 94.7. She noted that the tight tank detail indicated that at least six feet of excavation would be required, creating the potential to encounter groundwater. She acknowledged that conditions had been dry but asked how groundwater would be managed if it were encountered during installation.

Mr. Gillett stated that dewatering of the tank excavation would be performed if groundwater were encountered. Depending on the depth of the groundwater, neoprene boots could be used on the tank if necessary. He stated that the tank inlets were expected to be well above the groundwater and that there should be sufficient fill above the tank beneath the pavement and grading. He stated that buoyancy should not be an issue.

Coordinator Capone then asked about storage of excavated material during the anticipated one-week project. She noted that the parking lot was active and asked whether the parking lot would remain open and where excavated material would be stockpiled. Mr. Gillett stated that the spaces in front of the parking spots where the piping would be installed, near the dumpster, would likely be used for storing fill and other excavated material.

Coordinator Capone asked whether that area was at the high point that was previously identified. Mr. Gillett stated that the high point was located somewhat north on the plan from the proposed tank.

Coordinator Capone stated that the contractor had probably not yet been selected and that these matters would be addressed with the contractor during the pre-construction meeting.

Chair Henkels then opened the discussion to the Commissioners for comments and questions.

Comm. Sevier asked about the operation of the proposed tight tank, specifically what would happen if hair dye or other materials from the barbershop went down the drain. Mr. Gillett explained that the tank would be separate from the septic system. The septic system was located at the front of the property, while the tight tank would be located beside the building. The tank would receive material from the wash tub used for hair dyes and other chemicals that could damage the septic system.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the tank would have a level alarm and whether it would be pumped when full. Mr. Gillett stated that it would have a leak detection system and would require pumping.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the tank had a capacity of 2,000 gallons. Mr. Gillett confirmed that it was a 2,000-gallon monolithic H20 septic tank. Comm. Sevier then questioned a detail shown on the drawing, noting that it appeared to show an inlet pipe and an outlet pipe and therefore did not appear to represent the proposed tank. Mr. Gillett explained that the detail was intended to show the detection system and was not the cross-section of the tank being installed. He identified the tank shown at the top of the drawing as the proposed tank.

Comm. Sevier asked why the other detail remained on the drawing. Gillett explained that it showed the floats for the detection system. Comm. Sevier questioned the apparent outlet pipe and asked whether there was an outlet pipe on the proposed tank. Mr. Gillett clarified that the pipes shown were the vent pipe and inlet pipe. Comm. Sevier asked whether the drawing identified the vent pipe. Mr. Gillett attempted to identify the notation on the drawing and explained that it described the type of vent.

Comm. Sevier asked about the column-like component inside the tank and whether it was used for pumping the tank. Mr. Gillett identified it as the protective pump-out sleeve and confirmed that it would be used to pump out the tank.

Comm. Sevier asked what would happen if the tank became full. Mr. Gillett stated that the alert floats would be triggered. Comm. Sevier asked what would happen if the alerts were not addressed and the tank continued to fill. Mr. Gillett stated that the tank would eventually back up into the pipe.

Comm. Sevier asked whether the vent height was above the highest or lowest sink in the facility. Mr. Gillett stated that the vent height was shown on the plan view. Comm. Sevier asked whether a specific vent elevation was provided. Mr. Gillett stated that he did not believe a specific height was called out and that the plan simply stated that the vent would extend to the roof. Comm. Sevier stated that the tank would therefore back up inside the facility before discharging through the roof.

Ms. Colon stated that the use would be strictly a barbershop and would not be a salon but understood the tight tank was required by the Board of Health.

Comm. Hoffman asked whether there were separate drainage systems for the different areas of the building and whether the distinction was identified within the building. He asked whether dyes and other materials used for washing hair would be directed to the particular drain connected to the tight tank. He noted that although Ms. Colon had stated that there would not be chemicals discharged, he understood the design to provide separate drainage systems.

Comm. Hoffman asked whether the enclosed system would connect to a separate set of drains rather than the leach field. Mr. Gillett explained that the new wash sinks would connect to the tight tank. The bathroom was currently plumbed to the existing septic field, and if the bathroom were remodeled, it would continue to discharge to the existing septic system. The wash sinks would be plumbed to the tight tank.

Comm. Hoffman stated that this meant there would be two separate drainage systems and asked whether that arrangement was identified somewhere in the plans. He explained that, although he was not an expert in the diagrams, he wanted to ensure that only the appropriate drains connected to the tight tank.

Chair Henkels asked whether there were any additional Commissioner questions and then asked whether anyone in the audience had a question.

Mr. Bosso stated that the first two conditions were standard conditions included with many Determinations of Applicability. A third condition would require the rear lot-line markers or delineation to be identified before the pre-construction meeting. He stated that the lot line would need to be professionally surveyed, monumented, or otherwise marked.

Chair Henkels asked whether staging should also be included. Mr. Bosso agreed and proposed a fourth condition identifying and confirming the staging location. He referred to the one or two parking spaces near the dumpster and building that Mr. Gillett had identified as the likely location for stockpiling material. Mr. Gillett confirmed that this was the most likely location for the stockpiles.

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

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

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 and June 15, 2026.

Chair Henkels stated that the Commission was discussing a Declaration of Restrictive Covenant to permanently protect the remainder of the land that had been reviewed by Town Counsel. He stated that the document was ready for review and discussion to determine whether it was acceptable and whether the Commission would vote on it.

Jacob Crossan from Goddard Consulting stated that he was appearing on behalf of Mr. Berglund. He shared his screen and reported that, since the previous hearing, the conservation bounds along the limit of work had been installed and surveyed. He stated that this allowed the Deed Restriction to be established based on the surveyed bounds.

Mr. Crossan stated that Coordinator Capone had circulated the Declaration of Restrictive Covenant from Town Counsel on Friday morning. He reported that the applicant's counsel was still reviewing the document, but that the document appeared acceptable based on the preliminary review. He stated that, for the Certificate of Compliance request, the remaining materials would include a compliance letter, a Deed Restriction plan, and an as-built plan showing the balance, in addition to the Deed Restriction itself.

Mr. Crossan stated that the remaining matters were finalizing the Deed Restriction and obtaining final approval of the stormwater design from the Town Engineer. He stated that the applicant believed the limit of work was established and would not change. He reported that soil testing had been completed and supported the design, but that the applicant wanted final engineering approval before proceeding. He stated that these were the outstanding items and that the applicant hoped to complete the Certificate of Compliance materials and proceed with the issuance of the Order of Conditions.

Mr. Crossan stated that one of the applicant's primary questions concerned the sequence for issuing the new Order of Conditions and requesting the Certificate of Compliance. He asked Coordinator Capone and the Commission to discuss the appropriate sequence.

Coordinator Capone stated that the intended sequence was to record the Deed Restriction and complete the as-built plan. She explained that Town Counsel was requesting a separate plan clearly showing the deed-restricted area. She stated that all of those documents should be recorded before the applicant requested the Certificate of Compliance for the original Order of Conditions.

Coordinator Capone stated that the Certificate of Compliance for the original Order of Conditions could be issued at the same meeting as the new Order of Conditions, but that the deed restriction should be recorded before issuance. She asked Mr. Crossan whether that matched his understanding, and he agreed.

Coordinator Capone stated that the stormwater matter had been continued until approximately August 27 or 28. Mr. Crossan stated that he hoped the Covenant would be reviewed and finalized by the time the applicant received the Town Engineer's approval. He stated that the applicant was preparing the as-built plan with metes and bounds and would also prepare a separate deed restriction plan. He anticipated that the remaining matters could be completed once the final engineering approval was received.

Coordinator Capone asked whether the Commission had reviewed the Covenant. She explained that the Covenant was similar in language to a conservation restriction and would permanently protect the land from the bounds shown on the plan west to Horse Pond Road. She stated that the land would remain in its natural state in perpetuity.

She explained that the original Order of Conditions for the subdivision required a deed restriction on all land within 100 feet of the vernal pool. She stated that the proposed Covenant extended somewhat beyond the original requirement but remained close to the original design and would maintain the Buffer Zone around the vernal pool in a natural condition.

She stated that the area had been remediated under a prior Order of Conditions and was in compliance with that work. She explained that the boundary would be delineated using a combination of concrete bounds intermixed with existing boulders to clearly identify the boundary for future landowners.

Mr. Crossan stated that several details highlighted by Coordinator Capone remained to be completed, including the final square footage of the deed-restricted area, the final date, and the name of the final plan. He stated that the applicant hoped to provide the information shortly and have the Covenant signed before the next hearing so that the documents could be recorded and the remaining matters could potentially be completed at the next hearing.

Mr. Crossan clarified that the applicant wanted the Commission to review the substantive provisions of the Covenant at the current meeting. He stated that the restrictions and the provisions defining the protected area were the portions of primary concern to the Commission. He explained that the outstanding items consisted primarily of administrative details, including the exact square footage, a plan depicting the deed-restricted area, and other information that would be incorporated after the plan was finalized.

He stated that if the Commission was comfortable with the substantive Covenant language, the remaining highlighted items could be addressed by Coordinator Capone and Town Counsel. He stated that Commission approval before the next meeting would allow the applicant to have the document

signed, record it, and arrive at the next meeting with the Covenant already recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Coordinator Capone asked whether Mr. Crossan was requesting that the Commission vote on the draft Covenant that evening. She explained that the Commission could not sign the Covenant without first voting on it. Mr. Crossan stated that if Commission procedure required a completed document before a vote, the applicant would wait until the Covenant was fully completed.

Chair Henkels asked whether members of the Commission had any comments.

Comm. Sulkowski stated that he would not be present at the next meeting but stated that he had no concerns with the Covenant and that the language appeared standard.

Comm. Holtz referred to Section 1F, which stated that the premises would remain in its existing natural state in perpetuity and prohibited clearing, grading, and other activities unless written permission was obtained from the Commission. He stated that he understood the provision to establish a baseline requiring the property owner to obtain Commission approval before conducting work and asked whether the Order of Conditions would establish what could be done in the future.

Coordinator Capone explained that the provision would allow the Commission to authorize work within the deed-restricted area if the Commission determined that the work would be beneficial. She stated that the new Order of Conditions would address construction of the house and work outside the restricted area, and that no work under the current Order of Conditions was proposed within the restricted area.

Coordinator Capone provided examples of circumstances in which future work could be beneficial, including the area becoming covered with invasive species or Phragmites returning to the pond. She stated that the provision would allow a future owner to seek Commission approval for habitat management or improvement within the restricted area. She explained that an absolute prohibition on all future activity could prevent improvements to the property.

Chair Henkels asked whether there were any additional comments from the Commissioners. He then asked Mr. Crossan for permission to continue the matter to August 10, 2026, which was granted.

On motion by Comm. Sulkowski to continue the Hearing to August 10, 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

- *Notice of Intent Site Plan – 182 Wayside Inn Road, revised June 23, 2026*
- *Invasive Species Management Plan, prepared by Dillis & Roy Civil Design Group, dated June 25, 2026*

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 8, 2025.

Ryan Vickers of Dillis & Roy Civil Design Group stated that the scope of work had been reduced from the scope presented in the original application. He explained that the last time some Commission

members had reviewed the project was in 2024 and that he wanted to review the application from the beginning and explain how the scope had changed.

He explained that the original application included an after-the-fact filing for an existing gravel drive. During installation of the gravel drive, the applicant had also replaced an existing culvert at the stream crossing. The original scope also included several other site improvements, which he identified on the plan, including a pool, walkways, an expansion of an existing garage, an outbuilding, additional hardscape, and a deck.

He stated that because the stream had been considered perennial, DEP had commented that the stream crossing needed to be upgraded to meet stream crossing standards. The original proposal therefore included replacing the newly installed culvert with a box culvert.

He stated that, since the original application, Mr. Leverone had met with the Commission and documented that the stream was intermittent. As a result, the Riverfront Area was removed from the site. He explained that he had shown the original plan to establish the context for the reduced scope of work and then displayed the current plan.

He stated that the current scope contained substantially less proposed work and was limited to the after-the-fact portions involving the existing gravel drive and the previously replaced culvert. He stated that the purpose of the current proposal was to maintain the existing conditions.

He stated that invasive species had been identified on the property and were shown with cross-hatching on the plan. He explained that the invasive species management and mitigation planting plans had been developed to address the previous disturbances. He stated that Dillis & Roy had worked with a landscape architect to develop a planting list using native species.

He explained that the proposed mitigation area was calculated by reviewing the amount of gravel within each Buffer Zone. He stated that the proposed planting and seeded areas provided at least a two-to-one restoration ratio and that the total proposed restoration exceeded two-to-one. He identified the proposed planting and seeded areas with green hatching and stated that all of the areas were within the Buffer Zones.

He stated that the mitigation planting and invasive species removal were intended to address the previous disturbances and support permitting of the existing gravel drive and previously replaced culvert. He then asked whether there were questions or whether Leverone wanted to add information.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone for comments. Coordinator Capone stated that she had been surprised when she received the revised plan because all of the built elements had been removed from the scope of work, which reduced the scope under review.

Coordinator Capone stated that the invasive species identified in the plan included bittersweet, burning bush, and Norway Maple. She asked whether those were the only invasive species within the areas proposed for treatment or whether other invasive species could take the opportunity to occupy the areas being cleared. She also asked whether the Norway Maples proposed for removal were mature trees or young saplings.

She stated that the proposed treatment areas corresponded to areas previously discussed with the Commission in the field and with Mr. Leverone on other occasions. She stated that the plant list appeared consistent with the proposal. She noted that the areas also contained native plants, making it difficult to quantify what vegetation would be removed, what would be planted, and whether the proposed square footage and planting density were appropriate.

She stated that she had included in the draft Order of Conditions an expectation of 90 percent native coverage as a condition for receiving a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Leverone responded that there was no problem and addressed the question about the Norway Maples. He stated that five mature trees would be removed in the area between the gravel road and Prides Crossing.

Coordinator Capone added that she wanted to bring to the Commission's attention that herbicide treatment was included in the invasive species management plan. She stated that she believed the proposed treatment was a spot treatment consisting of cut-stump treatment.

Chair Henkels thanked Coordinator Capone and asked the Commissioners whether they had questions.

Comm. Sulkowski stated that the proposal appeared consistent with the mitigation approach and that he did not often see a mitigation plan with that level of detail. He asked whether the applicant expected to submit another application for the other site work in the future or whether that work had been abandoned.

Mr. Leverone explained that the largest structure in the prior plan had been the proposed garage expansion, which would have extended the garage toward the area where the outbuilding was located. He stated that there would no longer be an outbuilding and that he planned to rebuild the garage on its existing foundation. He stated that engineers had evaluated the existing foundation and confirmed that it could be reused. Based on the plan, he believed the garage reconstruction would not be within the Commission's jurisdiction. He stated that the pool and other proposed work remained on hold.

Comm. Holtz asked the applicants to confirm that invasive species treatment would be limited to spot treatment, such as cut-and-dab or a similar method, and asked whether any foliar application was proposed.

Mr. Vickers stated that buckthorn had also been identified on the property and that Dillis & Roy had no objection to updating and resubmitting the plan to include buckthorn and treatment options. He noted that the plan specified selective removal by hand and no machine removal. He stated that Dillis & Roy could incorporate any additional specifications concerning invasive species removal into the plan.

Comm. Holtz referred to the herbicide options listed in the plan, including Roundup and Bush-B-Gone, and asked how those products would be applied. He referred to the section stating that cut-stump treatment should be used to avoid damage to non-target species and asked whether that method would apply to all treatment or whether foliar spraying of Roundup or Bush-B-Gone could occur.

Mr. Vickers stated that treatment would be performed by hand on a specific basis and that he did not expect the area to be sprayed, particularly because the applicants were attempting to retain the existing native vegetation. He stated that cut-and-dab treatment was preferred and that the management plan could be revised to state that requirement.

Comm. Holtz stated that he thought the restriction should be stated clearly and that cut-and-dab treatment should be the only acceptable method, subject to the Commission's approval of that method. He stated that the Commission did not favor herbicide treatment and sought to limit its use where possible. Mr. Vickers acknowledged the comment.

Chair Henkels asked whether there were additional Commission questions and then asked Coordinator Capone whether a provision concerning herbicide treatment was included in the Order of Conditions. Coordinator Capone stated that the Order of Conditions did not specifically identify how the herbicide would be applied.

Chair Henkels asked Comm. Holtz whether he had a preference. Comm. Holtz stated that if herbicide were used, the cut-and-dab method should be required exclusively unless there were a reason to use a broader treatment. He stated that no one appeared to be identifying such a reason.

Chair Henkels asked whether anyone had comments on Comm. Holtz's position. Comm. Sevier stated that he agreed in general and suggested changing the language from "should be used" to "will be used."

Chair Henkels then asked Coordinator Capone about the planting plan, the required survival rate, and the period over which the Commission would determine whether the plantings had survived. Coordinator Capone stated that the requirement would be 100 percent survival of the plantings for a minimum of two years. She stated that any plant that died during that period would have to be replaced. She explained that the two-year period would restart for any plants that had to be replaced and that the Certificate of Compliance could not be issued until the requirement was satisfied.

Chair Henkels asked Mr. Vickers or Mr. Leverone whether they knew when the planting would occur, potentially in the following spring. He stated that controlling the invasive species would take time, particularly if cut-and-dab treatment were used. Mr. Leverone stated that the following spring was a realistic timeline.

Comm. Holtz stated that, based on the invasive species management plan displayed on the screen, he saw a treatment schedule for May through June that explicitly addressed foliar application. He noted that the plan stated that foliar spray was not appropriate for the site and was not to be used. He nevertheless stated that, as Comm. Sevier had suggested, the word "should" in the preceding section should be changed to more definitive language because the restriction required reading further into the document to locate it.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone whether the cut-and-dab requirement should be included in the Order of Conditions even though it was defined in the invasive species management plan. Coordinator Capone stated that it could be included because a contractor might not review the invasive species management report.

Chair Henkels asked whether the Commissioners or anyone in the audience had any further questions.

On motion by Comm. Cook to close the Hearing, seconded by Comm. Sulkowski, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Coordinator Capone identified the timeline as an item for the Commission's consideration. She stated that, because the matter had been before the Commission for several years, the Order of Conditions required mitigation to begin in the fall with invasive species removal. She stated that the applicants could then begin planting within the mitigation area in the spring. She asked the applicants to notify the Commission if the schedule fell behind so that the schedule could be addressed with them. She stated that the Commission wanted the restoration completed because the violation had been in place for a period of time.

Chair Henkels thanked Coordinator Capone and asked for a motion to issue the Order of Conditions as outlined, including the cut-and-dab provision.

On motion by Comm. Hoffman to issue the Order of Conditions, seconded by Comm. Sulkowski, 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, January 26, and April 6, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Holtz to continue the Hearing to August 10, 2026, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Certificate of Compliance:

Herb Chambers: 105 Boston Post Road, DEP #301-1336

Coordinator Capone stated that the site on Boston Post Road had been highly degraded and had been used as a staging, laydown, and bus storage area for Wayland. She stated that the project had been completed for a period of time, but the plantings had continued to die. An irrigation system had been installed within jurisdictional areas and needed to be decommissioned. Coordinator Capone stated that the failed plantings had been replaced and that the required two-year monitoring period had elapsed for the replacement plantings and that the irrigation has been decommissioned. She stated that the site was ready for a Certificate of Compliance.

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

Jungalwala: 87 Cudworth Lane, DEP #301-1411

Coordinator Capone stated that the project involved construction of a three-car garage. She stated that the garage had been constructed in accordance with the approved plan. All of the required plantings had been installed and had survived for two years.

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

Other

Coordinator Capone encouraged the Commissioners to respond individually to an Open Space and Recreation Plan questionnaire that had been sent by email that day. She stated that the questionnaire was intended to help establish goals for the next 10 years and that Commission members' input would help identify current field needs and other matters they wanted considered in the plan.

Adjourn Meeting

On motion by Comm. Sevier to adjourn the meeting at 8:09 PM, seconded by Comm. Cook, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.