SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of Monday, September 14, 2026

Present: David Henkels, Chair; Ken Holtz, Vice Chair; Harry Hoffman; Kasey Rogers; Mark Sevier; Victor Sulkowski; and Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator

Absent: Jeremy Cook

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

Continued Wetland Applications:

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

- *Declaration of Restrictive Covenant*
- *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, July 27, and August 24, 2026.

Coordinator Capone stated that the discussion was a continuation of the previous meeting's review of the Declaration of Restrictive Covenant. She explained that a question had been raised at the previous meeting regarding the drainage easement located within the restricted area and whether the document accounted for future maintenance or replacement of the drainage easement. She reported that Town Counsel had reviewed the revised document, which included a paragraph addressing the drainage easement, and was comfortable with the language in the document. Coordinator Capone stated that the purpose of the discussion was to vote on acceptance of the Declaration of Restrictive Covenant so that the applicant could proceed with the development of Lot 4 Trevor Way.

Chair Henkels asked the Commissioners whether they had reviewed the details and had any questions or observations regarding the draft. He then asked whether anyone in the audience had a question or comment.

On motion by Comm. Rogers to accept the Deed Restriction, seconded by Comm. Hoffman, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Chair Henkels asked whether the Commission would entertain a motion to continue the Hearing to allow the parties to record the covenant, file a request for a Certificate of Compliance for the prior Order of Conditions, and submit the final plan for approval.

Mark Arnold identified himself as representing the applicant through Goddard Consulting and stated that Marcel Maillet was also present. He asked Coordinator Capone how soon the signatures could be obtained, provided that the applicant's attorney was ready to sign the document.

Coordinator Capone asked whether wet signatures were required. Mr. Arnold responded that he did not believe they were, noting that the Registry of Deeds had not generally required wet signatures since the COVID-19 pandemic and that digital signatures should be acceptable. Coordinator Capone estimated that the signatures could be completed by the end of the week.

Mr. Arnold stated that the Hearing could be continued to the 28th, as the documents had been drafted and the remaining step was confirmation that the deed restriction would be recorded.

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

Other Business:

Agricultural Commission

Comm. Sulkowski reported that the Agricultural Commission was being reestablished after having been inactive for several years. He explained that he operated a small farm in Sudbury and had spoken with Laura Abrams of Bartlett Greenhouses who had contacted him several times over the years about restarting the Agricultural Commission.

He stated that the Agricultural Commission had a full complement of five members and would hold its first meeting the following Thursday at 7:00 p.m. in a hybrid format at the Flynn Building. He invited members of the Conservation Commission and the public to attend. He explained that, unlike the Conservation Commission, the Agricultural Commission had no statutory or regulatory authority. This provided flexibility in determining its mission but also required the members to establish their purpose and activities at their first meeting, given the length of time since the Commission had last met.

He stated that the Commission's work would concern agriculture, but the members would need to determine how broadly to define agriculture in Sudbury and which activities to prioritize. He anticipated that the Commission might meet quarterly, although it could meet monthly at the beginning. The meeting frequency would also influence whether future meetings would be held in a hybrid or in-person format.

He explained that he was raising the matter because the Agricultural Commission's work could overlap with conservation, particularly regarding Agricultural Preservation Restrictions. He noted that Sudbury had substantial acreage subject to these restrictions and that the land provided both agricultural and conservation value through its open fields. He referenced an article by the Sudbury Valley Trustees (SVT) about the ecological importance of open fields in New England. He explained that the transition between forests and fields supported ecological activity and species that depended on open space, comparing this area to the ecological functions of riparian areas along ponds and streams.

He also stated that the Agricultural Commission hoped to provide input on the Open Space and Recreation Plan. He acknowledged that the Commission was beginning this work late but understood that Planning was still accepting feedback. He described his remarks as a notice that the Agricultural Commission was restarting and that opportunities for collaboration with conservation could arise. He invited questions from the Commission members.

Chair Henkels asked whether anyone had questions before the meeting proceeded.

He then acknowledged that this was the Agricultural Commission's first meeting in several years and asked how many members served on the committee. Comm. Sulkowski confirmed that the Agricultural Commission had five members. He stated that the Select Board had established the Commission in the early 2000s and that five members currently constituted its full membership. He added that the membership might be expandable but that he was uncertain about the process.

Comm. Holtz asked how the Agricultural Commission would define agriculture. He asked whether activities would need to involve a formally declared farm or land subject to an Agricultural Preservation Restriction. He also asked whether small-scale activities, such as backyard beekeeping and keeping backyard chickens, would fall within the Commission's scope.

Comm. Sulkowski agreed that the question would need to be addressed. He explained that recruiting members for commissions and committees could be difficult, based on past experience, and that the Agricultural Commission had sought members with different connections to agriculture and related industries.

Comm. Sulkowski described the composition of the five-member Commission. He explained that one member did not operate a farm but worked in the restaurant business and owned a cheese shop in Concord. He viewed this member's involvement in the food supply chain as relevant to the Commission's work. He noted that Concord had made progress in supporting agriculture by sourcing ingredients from local farmers and establishing relationships that benefited both local producers and businesses. He stated that he hoped Sudbury could develop similar relationships.

Comm. Sulkowski described another member as an equine therapist who owned horses used for therapy and identified another member as operating a horse-boarding business. He also identified Laura Abrams of Bartlett Greenhouses as a member and noted that Bartlett Greenhouses and Cavicchio's represented larger agricultural businesses in the area.

Comm. Sulkowski stated that he had attempted to recruit a backyard beekeeper but that the person had been unable to participate because of other commitments. He explained that he expected the Agricultural Commission's scope to encompass activities across the agricultural sector, from small-scale operations to larger businesses. He noted that many chicken-keeping operations in Sudbury were not formally declared, registered, or licensed. He also identified local beekeepers as part of the agricultural community. He reiterated that the Commission would consider the full range of agricultural activities.

Chair Henkels asked whether anyone else had questions or comments. He then invited members of the audience for the same.

Land Management

Comm. Sulkowski stated that he had contacted Chair Henkels before the meeting after learning that Joe, the current Land Manager, was leaving his position. Comm. Sulkowski explained that he had worked with Joe on a trail restoration project in Memorial Forest. He referred to comments from members of the public at the previous meeting that criticized the Deer Management Program. Sulkowski stated that he respected the public's views but felt that Joe Miller's last appearance at a meeting before leaving his position might have ended on a negative note.

He stated that he supported the Deer Management Program and believed that other members of the Commission also supported it. He wanted to recognize Mr. Miller's work on the program, as well as his trail maintenance work and the work of the entire office. He explained that he did not want Mr. Miller to leave without acknowledgment of these contributions or for the previous meeting's comments to be the final impression of his work. He added that he should have spoken up at the previous meeting but had not done so.

Chair Henkels stated that the Commission agreed with his comments. He recognized the work performed by Mr. Miller and his team, and cited their contributions to signage and stewardship.

Comm. Sulkowski commented on the work completed in Memorial Forest, stating that the amount of work undertaken there was substantial and that new improvements appeared frequently.

Minutes

June 29, 2026

On motion by Comm. Rogers to accept the minutes of the June 29, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Hoffman, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

July 13, 2026

On motion by Comm. Sevier to accept the minutes of the July 13 meeting, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

New Wetland Applications:

Request for Determination of Applicability: 3 Washington Drive, RDA #26-15

- *RDA Application package, received August 21, 2026,*

Chair Henkels began the meeting for the project to install a second floor addition within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands *Protection Act and* Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Richard Kaye was the applicant.

Nilesh Chohan stated that he worked for Chohan Contracting and was representing Mr. Kaye. He explained that the project involved a second-floor addition over the existing garage, using the same footprint. The work would not require excavation, soil removal, or other ground disturbance. The existing roof structure would be replicated and raised to accommodate the second floor.

Coordinator Capone explained that the project was unusual because it involved no ground disturbance. She presented the site plan and explained that wetlands surrounded the project area. The mapped wetlands did not accurately reflect the conditions on the site, and additional wetland areas were present near the edge of the driveway. The existing garage was located approximately 30 feet from the resource area.

She explained that she had required the applicant to file a Request for Determination of Applicability to establish a record of the project and ensure that materials and equipment would not be stored in the area near the wetlands. She also wanted to prevent tree pruning, tree removal, or other activities within that area as part of the project. She stated that she had no concerns with the proposed work and expected the construction to be completed without impacts to the resource area.

Chair Henkels invited questions and comments from the Commissioners.

Comm. Sulkowski asked about the anticipated construction timeline and whether the work could be completed by the end of the year if the necessary approvals and permits were obtained. Mr. Chohan stated that the exterior work would be completed by the end of the year, while interior work would likely continue into the following year.

Comm. Sulkowski asked Coordinator Capone whether completing the exterior work by the end of the year would reduce concerns about snow, runoff, and outdoor stockpiling. He noted that materials would likely not need to be stored outside once the exterior work was completed. Mr. Chohan confirmed this and explained that the existing garage would be used to store most of the construction materials indoors, protecting them from the weather.

Comm. Rogers asked where construction personnel would park. Mr. Chohan stated that there was sufficient off-street parking in the cul-de-sac. Some vehicles would park in the driveway, while the remaining vehicles would park in the cul-de-sac.

Chair Henkels invited further comments and invited anyone in the audience with ask a question or make a comment. Chair Henkels then asked Coordinator Capone whether she recommended any specific conditions for the project. Coordinator Capone requested a pre-construction meeting with the contractor. She also recommended a condition prohibiting vegetation removal or pruning and any alteration of the wetland resource area. Following completion of the work and stabilization of any areas disturbed during construction, the applicant would be required to submit photographic documentation confirming compliance with the Determination.

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

Notice of Intent: 381 Willis Road, DEP #301-TBD

- *NOI Application package, received August 20, 2026, including Subsurface Sewage Disposal System Plan, prepared by Grady Consulting LLC, dated August 13, 2026*

Chair Henkels began the Hearing for the project to install a septic system within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the local Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Rodenhiser Excavating Inc. was the applicant.

Felicia McCarey of Grady Consulting stated that she was representing the project on behalf of the client, Rodenheiser Excavating, and the property owner, Kathleen Atwood. She explained that the applicant proposed to construct a septic system within the 100-foot Buffer of a wetland and the local Riverfront Area. Construction would be accessed through the existing driveway and would involve grading within an existing lawn area where a septic system and leaching field were already located. She stated that the applicant wanted to replace the septic system in anticipation of selling the home in the future and offered to answer questions.

Coordinator Capone stated that the plan showed erosion controls along the driveway and around the septic replacement area. She asked how construction equipment would enter and exit the work area if access was through the existing driveway.

Ms. McCarey explained that the equipment could be placed on the left-hand side of the lawn, after which the silt sock would be staked in place. The equipment could then be used to perform the grading and other construction work. Once the work was completed, the silt sock could be removed and the equipment driven off the property.

Coordinator Capone clarified whether Ms. McCarey intended to bring the equipment onto the site before installing the erosion controls. Ms. McCarey confirmed that sequence.

Coordinator Capone asked whether the equipment would remain on the site throughout the project. Ms. McCarey stated that she could confirm the construction sequence with the contractor. Based on her experience with septic system installations and inspections for as-built plans, equipment typically remained on site so that the contractor could complete the construction and backfilling after the inspection.

Coordinator Capone asked whether the house would be vacated during construction, given that the existing leaching field would be replaced. Ms. McCarey responded that septic system installation generally took a matter of days and that the house would not necessarily need to be vacated. She added that the existing leaching field would be removed where necessary and abandoned.

Coordinator Capone noted that the existing house had four bedrooms and that the proposed septic system was designed for five bedrooms. She asked whether the increased capacity was intended to accommodate a future addition to the house, as she had understood that the homeowners were upgrading the system in preparation for resale.

Ms. McCarey confirmed that the homeowner wanted a five-bedroom design to accommodate increased flow associated with plans to increase the number of bedrooms. She stated that the future changes could involve an addition to the garage or conversion of another area of the house. The specific configuration had not been determined, but the applicant wanted the increased flow capacity reflected in the septic system design.

Coordinator Capone stated that the Conservation Commission preferred leaching fields to be located outside the Buffer Zone wherever possible. She noted that the proposed system would be installed within an existing lawn area and would not create new impacts to resource areas. She had asked whether the system could be shifted farther from the resource area along the driveway. However, an existing gas line in the front yard restricted movement of the proposed system, and the applicant did not want to relocate the line.

Coordinator Capone explained that another option would be to locate the system in the backyard if the homeowners were undertaking an addition and substantial reconstruction of the property. However, relocating

the system to accommodate a future project that might not occur would not be an ideal option for the applicant.

Coordinator Capone stated that the file number had not yet been issued, requiring the hearing to be continued. She understood that the Board of Health had reviewed the septic system design but was unsure whether formal approval had been issued, as the they might be waiting for the Conservation Commission's review.

Ms. McCarey confirmed that she had spoken with the Board of Health agent and that the design was acceptable to that office, which was waiting for the Conservation Commission to issue its permit. She also explained that the septic system could not be located in the backyard because the house had a walkout basement, which would make reconfiguring the existing plumbing difficult.

Chair Henkels thanked Coordinator Capone and asked the Commissioners whether they had questions. He then invited members of the audience to submit questions or comments.

Chair Henkels informed Ms. McCarey that the next available meeting dates were September 28 and October 19. Ms. McCarey confirmed that she could attend the September 28 meeting.

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

Request for Determination of Applicability: 181 Dutton Road, RDA #26-16

- *RDA Application package, received August 26, 2026*

Chair Henkels began the meeting for the project to remove three trees within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and the 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Gary C. & Dorothea Christelis were the applicants.

Mr. Christelis stated that they had lived at the property since approximately 2008. He explained that the property was historic and had been part of the original Wayside and campus built by Henry Ford. He and his wife occupied a freestanding structure that had been part of the original Wayside and Boys School, built in 1931.

He reported that three trees on the property had been at risk of failure. One large oak tree to the left of the house had split approximately one-third to one-half of the way through and fallen during the preceding weeks. He requested permission to remove the oak and two pine trees within striking distance of the house. He stated that the pine trees had been making cracking noises and dropping large branches during recent storms, prompting him to submit the application before winter.

He stated that he and his wife were committed to preserving natural habitats and had donated a conservation restriction to the Town of Sudbury in 2011, permanently protecting approximately four acres of their property. He explained that they planned to have Lynch Landscaping remove the three trees and had submitted an arborist report supporting their removal. The work would use a crane positioned on the driveway because, according to his understanding, large equipment could not access the yard directly.

Coordinator Capone explained that all three trees were within a lawn area, with one tree located within the Buffer Zone and all three within the Riverfront Area. She stated that she did not consider mitigation necessary because of the trees' locations, noting that one was near the tennis court and the others were at the edge of the lawn.

She also explained that a wooden structure resembling a treehouse was attached to one of the pine trees. Her understanding was that the applicant intended to lower the structure to the ground and use it as a shed. Although the proposed location would remain within the Riverfront Area, it would be more than 100 feet from the resource area. She stated that placing the structure there would qualify for an exemption under the Wetlands Protection Act and the Bylaw because the location was within the existing lawn area.

She noted that Comm. Sulkowski intended to recuse himself from the hearing. Comm. Sulkowski explained that he served on the board with Mr. Christelis at Wayside Inn and was involved in preparing the treehouse for removal. He stated that the same crane would be used to lower the structure and that these connections provided two reasons why he could not participate in the Commission's deliberations, although he remained available to answer questions.

Coordinator Capone stated that the project would have on-site oversight and recommended a negative Determination of Applicability. She explained that she did not consider a pre-construction meeting necessary because she had met with Mr. Christelis several times and the parties understood the expectations for the work. Her only proposed condition was that the applicant provide photographic documentation to the Commission after the work was completed to confirm compliance with Determination.

Chair Henkels invited the Commissioners to ask questions or provide comments.

Comm. Holtz asked whether Mr. Christelis had considered leaving the removed tree as a snag to retain the treehouse. He suggested that a structure on the ground might be more useful than one in a tree. Mr. Christelis responded that his children were 30 and 26 years old and had not used the treehouse for many years.

Comm. Holtz then sought clarification about whether the trees would be cut to grade and what would happen to the stumps. Mr. Christelis stated that he was considering grinding at least two of the stumps. He also explained that he planned to plant three replacement trees somewhere on the property, as close as possible to the locations of the removed trees.

Comm. Holtz acknowledged the plan and noted that the Commission had a native plant list available for Christelis to review. Mr. Christelis responded that he would be willing to consider the list provided the replacement trees would not grow to 100 feet.

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

Notice of Intent: 46 Witherell Drive, DEP #301-TBD

- *NOI Application package, received August 17, 2026, including Landscape Master Plan, prepared by Maria von Brincken Design, dated August 24, 2026*

Chair Henkels opened the Hearing for the project to install a firepit and patio, native plants, and remove invasive plants within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Christine Maitland was the applicant.

Christine Maitland, resident at 46 Witherell Drive, stated that she grew up in Sudbury and had purchased her house eight years earlier. She explained that Coordinator Capone had visited the property early in the planning process to provide guidance on the proposed work. Ms. Maitland presented a landscape design plan intended to convert vacant lawn space on the left side of the property into a usable area with a fire pit, patio, and native plantings. The plan also included improvements to existing planting beds and the addition of new beds.

She explained that the project included removing two invasive trees and adding native plants within the 100-foot Buffer Zone. Additional plantings were planned for the front of the house outside the Buffer Zone. She identified a small stream along the rear property boundary as the resource area that triggered wetlands protection requirements. The landscape plan aimed to fill the 100-foot Buffer Zone with native plants and remove the remaining invasive vegetation along the rear property boundary. Her husband had been removing invasive plants over time, and the project would continue that effort, including the removal of burning bush.

She described the proposed patio as an irregular bluestone patio with pavers leading into the yard. Construction access would use the existing lawn, and she stated that the septic system was located elsewhere on the property and would not be affected. The lawn used for access would be restored after construction. The existing lawn area would be replaced with the patio and a range of native trees, shrubs, and flowers.

The plan also included expanding two existing planting beds with native species. She identified a natural depression in the landscape that resembled an empty riverbed and proposed adding rocks to create a dry creek bed. Other existing beds would receive additional native plantings to provide privacy screening and increase plant variety along the rear of the property. Outside the 100-foot Buffer Zone, the front planting beds would be modified to reflect the owners' preferences, and a new bed would be installed at the corner of the property. These areas would include trees, shrubs, and flowers.

She stated that the work would take place in phases. The initial phase would focus on the rear area containing the fire pit and native vegetation, with the remaining landscape improvements completed over time as approved.

Coordinator Capone asked about the sizes of the proposed plantings to assess the anticipated disturbance and the machinery that might be required. Ms. Maitland explained that the tree heights listed on the plan represented their mature heights and that the project would use small and medium-sized trees rather than mature specimens. She had obtained estimates from several landscape companies and was finalizing the selection of a contractor. The planting sizes would be selected to provide an established appearance while limiting the cost and disturbance associated with installing mature trees and shrubs. She estimated that approximately 29 trees would be planted in the rear area.

Coordinator Capone noted that the planting schedule listed 17 trees and contained two charts, which made it unclear whether the schedules applied to the Buffer Zone or the entire landscape. She also noted that serviceberry appeared as a tree in one chart and a shrub in the other. Ms. Maitland agreed to clarify the discrepancies with the landscape designer. She explained that one list covered all plants proposed across the property, while the other listed only the plants to be installed within the 100-foot wetland Buffer Zone.

Coordinator Capone discussed erosion controls along the rear of the property. Because the work would occur in phases, she explained that erosion controls could be installed only in the area being worked on during each phase, allowing the project to proceed incrementally across the landscape.

Coordinator Capone asked how the invasive plants would be removed, recalling that bittersweet was among the species present. Ms. Maitland confirmed that the removal had been carried out by hand and that no herbicides or other removal methods were being used.

Coordinator Capone asked about the proposed stone dry creek bed, which extended from the rear basement door. Ms. Maitland explained that the basement door was rarely used and that access would remain available. The design would transition from a gravel base near the house into a dry creek bed with larger stepping stones and small gravel.

Coordinator Capone asked about a note on the plan referring to a small pooling area for water. Ms. Maitland explained that rainfall could pool in this area.

Coordinator Capone also asked about a note on the driveway recommending a catch basin to replace a large depression. Ms. Maitland stated that they are not considering changes to the driveway asphalt and that the driveway work was not part of the requested approval.

Coordinator Capone commented on the scope of the project and noted that completing all of the proposed work would take several years. Ms. Maitland agreed, explaining that the plan represented the overall vision rather than a short-term project. Coordinator Capone then confirmed that the non-native plants shown on the plan would be located in the front yard outside the Buffer Zone. Ms. Maitland confirmed this was correct.

Chair Henkels invited questions from the Commissioners.

Comm. Hoffman asked how long the project would take and whether the plant selections were fixed or could change. He also asked whether significant changes to the plan would be reported. Ms. Maitland explained that the rear portion of the property was the priority for the initial phase. The mason estimated that constructing the fire pit and patio area would take approximately five weeks. The planting schedule was less certain because it depended on the season and whether the work could be completed in the fall or spring. She anticipated that the

planting work would also take several weeks. She stated that she intended to follow the landscape designer's plan as closely as possible because it had been developed through detailed planning. If particular plants were unavailable when installation took place, they would select comparable alternatives from the native plant list.

Chair Henkels asked Coordinator Capone to explain the time frame for completing the work. Coordinator Capone stated that the Order of Conditions would remain valid for three years and that the Commission could grant a one-year extension under the Bylaw, allowing up to four years. She explained that the Commission could consider additional extensions, but the bulk of the project would need to be completed during the initial three-to-four-year period for further extensions to be considered. The project would also need to remain in good standing. She added that the plantings were landscape improvements rather than mitigation plantings. Although mitigation plantings were generally subject to a two-year monitoring period, the requirements for these landscape plantings would be determined by the Commission.

Chair Henkels invited questions from the audience.

Chair Henkels informed Ms. Maitland that the project did not yet have a file number. He stated that the next meeting date was September 28, and requested Maitland's permission to continue the matter to that date. Ms. Maitland agreed to the continuance.

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

Continued Wetland Applications:

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, April 6, and August 24, 2026.

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

Other Business :

Coordinator Capone announced that a public meeting on the draft Open Space Plan would be held on October 15 at 7:00 p.m. at the Fairbanks Center. She referenced Comm. Sulkowski's earlier remarks and encouraged the Commissioners to attend. She explained that the meeting would provide an opportunity for members of the public to offer feedback on actions they would like to see implemented over the next 10 years.

Coordinator Capone stated that staff were providing initial comments to the consultant for incorporation into the plan before the public meeting. She asked the Commissioners to send her any comments they wanted considered in advance. She also stated that she expected to distribute the final draft, or a working draft, shortly before the meeting so the Commissioners could review it. She invited anyone with questions to contact her.

Comm. Sulkowski asked whether the public meeting had been officially posted. Coordinator Capone responded that she did not believe it had been formally posted yet.

Adjourn Meeting

On motion by Comm. Hoffman to adjourn the meeting at 7:52 PM, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.