

**Conservation Commission  
Monday, January 13, 2020 at 6:30 pm  
Town Hall, 40 Center Street  
Fairhaven, Massachusetts**

1. **Chairman's Welcome and Media Notification**

Chairman Jay Simmons opened the meeting at 6:32pm and advised the public that the meeting was being televised and recorded.

2. **Quorum/Attendance:** Chairman Jay Simmons, Vice-Chair Geoff Haworth, Dan Doyle, and Nick Carrigg

Absent: Nick Sylvia, Amy DeSalvatore, Gary Lavalette

Conservation Agent Whitney McClees was also present.

3. **Minutes**

a) **Approve the minutes of November 25, 2019**

Geoff Haworth made a motion to table November 25, 2019 minutes until next meeting, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

4. **Offer to Donate Land to the Conservation Commission**

a) **Akin Street, Assessors Map 30, Lot 34B**

Ms. McClees explained that the parcel is located adjacent to the Nasketucket Woods Conservation Area and would become part of that area if it was accepted. When letter indicating the property owner would like to donate the land was sent, there were no taxes owed but she needs to verify that this is still the case.

Mr. Haworth voted to accept the land on Akin Street, Assessors Map 30, Lot 34B and forward that acceptance to the selectmen for approval, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

b) **Fishermans Road, Assessors Map 43A, Lot 308**

Ms. McClees explained that it is a single parcel and really wet at this time. When letter indicating the property owner would like to donate the land was sent, there were no taxes owed but she needs to verify that this is still the case. There are other wetlands in the area, and nothing has been built on it in the past from her understanding that could pose a legacy contamination issue.

Mr. Haworth voted to accept the land on Fishermans Road, Assessors Map 43A, Lot 308 and forward that acceptance to the selectmen for approval, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

5. **Requests for Extensions:** none

6. **Requests for Certificates of Compliance:** none

7. **Public Hearings** pursuant to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. c. 131, s. 40) and the Code of the Town of Fairhaven Chapter 192, Wetlands:

**Continued Public Hearings**

a) SE 023-1302, CON-19-066: **6 Emerson Avenue – continued to March 9, 2020**

b) SE 023-1297, CON-19-051: **Hiller Avenue & Timothy Street, Assessors Map 28C, Lots 71 and 71A – continued to January 13, 2020, request for continuance to January 27, 2020**

Mr. Simmons noted that a request for continuance has been submitted for a continuance to January 27, 2020.

Mr. Haworth stated that he would like to definitively see them in front of the Commission on January 27.

Mr. Simmons requested that Ms. McClees communicate that to the applicant.

Mr. Haworth made a motion continue Timothy and Hiller, Map 28C, Lots 71 and 71A to January 27, 2020 at the applicant's request, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

- c) SE 023-1296, CON-19-050: **46 Sconticut Neck Road** – *continued to January 13, 2020, request for continuance to February 24, 2020*

Mr. Simmons noted that there has been a request to continue to February 24, 2020 and asked Ms. McClees for a status update.

Ms. McClees noted that the applicant is still working through permitting processes with other agencies, such as Army Corps and MassDEP.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to continue SE 023-1296 46 Sconticut Neck Road to February 24, 2020 at the applicant's request, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

- d) SE 023-1299, CON 023-081: **Bridge Street, Assessors Map 36, Lot 15** – *continued to January 13, 2020*

Ms. McClees noted that there was a request submitted today to continue to January 27, 2020 to allow time to address stormwater peer review.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to continue Bridge Street, Assessors Map 36, Lot 15 at the applicant's request to January 27, 2020, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

- e) SE 023-1308, CON 023-095: **Huttleston Avenue, Assessors Map 31, Lots 115A & 117C** – *continued to January 13, 2019*

Ms. McClees noted that there was a request submitted today to continue to January 27, 2020 to allow time to address stormwater peer review.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to continue Huttleston Avenue, Assessors Map 31, Lots 115A & 117C to January 27, 2020 at the applicant's request, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

### **New Public Hearings**

Jay Simmons recused himself at 6:42 p.m and joined the audience as an abutter.

Mr. Haworth assumed the role of Chair.

- f) SE 023-1273, CON 023-106: **3 North Street**

Request for Amended Order of Conditions (DEP File No. SE 023-1273) filed by Lee and Elizett Miguel to add sod and stone to stabilize the area beyond the approved work limit at the property located at 3 North Street, Assessors Map 13, Lot 4. Work to take place in Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage/Zone AE and buffer zone to Salt Marsh.

Mr. Haworth noted that the hearing could not be heard due to lack of a proper quorum.

Steve Gioiosa, representative, requested to continue to January 27, 2020

Mr. Haworth noted that was the conclusion of 3 North Street and asked Mr. Simmons to return as chair.

Mr. Simmons returned as chairman at 6:44pm

g) **CON 023-107: 55 Goulart Memorial Drive**

Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Fairhaven Harbormaster for the trimming of vegetation on the southwestern side of the parking lot at the property located at 55 Goulart Memorial Drive, Assessors Map 42, Lot 23A. Work to take place in Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage/Zone VE and buffer zone to Coastal Beach, Coastal Dune, Salt Marsh, and Rocky Intertidal Shore.

Ms. McClees noted that there had been a request to table the hearing until after the petitioner's arrive.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to table 55 Goulart Memorial Drive, seconded by Dan Doyle, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

h) **CON 023-108: 4 Pequod Road**

Notice of Intent filed by Sheldon Scott, United States Postal Service, for parking lot resurfacing, concrete walk replacement, and related exterior maintenance measures at the property located at 4 Pequod Road, Assessors Map 36, Lot 13C. Work to take place in buffer zone to Bordering Vegetated Wetland.

Kevin Nagle, Gordon Archibald Incorporated, was present representing the US Postal Service and provided the Agent with green cards for abutter notification.

Mr. Nagle provided background of their relationship with the United States Postal Services. He noted they typically do exterior design for USPS projects in Massachusetts. He also noted that the 4 Pequod Road facility is leased to the Postal Service, but that the Postal Service is responsible to all maintenance. He stated that the 4 Pequod Road facility is more of a distribution center, located in a light industrial area. He noted that the current facility was constructed in 2003 under an Order of Conditions and reviewed some of the aspects of the 2003 project, including the stormwater that was designed for that facility. He noted that the applicant is looking to repave the existing lot, involving removing and replacing pavement. No drainage patterns will be changed. There are two proprietary units that are still functioning, but Mr. Nagle is unsure of the maintenance history of those units.

Mr. Simmons questioned the maintenance history of the drainage facilities east of the retaining wall as well as the parking lot.

Mr. Nagle noted that he didn't think any maintenance had been done on the parking lot.

Ms. McClees showed where the wetlands are noted on the plans. She noted that it appears that the extent of the resurfacing will match the existing paved limits and there will be no change in impervious cover or existing drainage patterns across the site. She stated that the applicant notes in their stormwater report that due to no increase in impervious surface, the stormwater system that was designed when the building was constructed will continue to serve the area in compliance with the regulations. She noted that they have proposed erosion control consists of a compost filter sock that runs the perimeter of the pavement to be replaced.

Ms. McClees asked the applicant if there are site constraints that prevent the use of both silt fence and compost filter sock.

Mr. Nagle stated that there were not and they would be happy to modify the erosion control where feasible given the paved nature of the site.

Mr. Simmons questioned if any of the existing rip-rap on the western side of the property would be touched.

Mr. Nagle noted that it would not be.

Mr. Simmons questioned if there is anything in the plans addressing maintenance of the existing stormwater facilities on site.

Mr. Nagle noted that they plan to clean and flush all piping, clean all drainage manholes, and all other stormwater facilities as part of this project.

Ms. McClees confirmed that those items were included with the application.

Ms. McClees questioned if there was a location for concrete truck washout or if they were planning to conduct that offsite somewhere.

Mr. Nagle noted that they will be able to modify the plans to address concrete truck washout.

Mr. Simmons noted that MassDEP has not issued a file number yet.

Ms. McClees confirmed that no DEP number had yet been issued and, as such, the public hearing cannot be closed but it can be opened and the project discussed.

Ms. McClees questioned Mr. Nagle whether they anticipate doing any dewatering.

Mr. Nagle confirmed that they do not anticipate needing to do any dewatering.

Ms. McClees noted that because this is a redevelopment project, the applicant is required to meet the stormwater management standards, some only to the maximum extent practicable, and to improve existing conditions. Ms. McClees reviewed comments from the applicant regarding stormwater. The applicant notes that the approved stormwater management facilities are in place and functional. The USPS has maintained these facilities in a state of good repair, will be cleaning and flushing system elements as part of the pavement resurfacing project, and will continue to maintain facilities following completion of the work. The practicability of implementing improvements to these existing stormwater facilities is limited given that (a) the entire portion of the parcel outside of the Buffer Zone is fully developed (parking lot, building, etc.), with the limited remaining area of the parcel consisting of undeveloped woodland within the buffer zone; and (b) reconstruction of these facilities would be well beyond the scope (and cost) of the maintenance-level activities that the USPS is seeking to implement (for the purpose of restoring the existing parking lot to a state of good repair).

Ms. McClees noted that they have provided a signed and stamped stormwater checklist, but not any calculations aside from the ones that were submitted with the NOI for the construction of the building in 2001. Ms. McClees questioned Mr. Nagle if it was their assertion that the stormwater facilities that were originally installed are functioning, the calculations from 2001 are still valid.

Mr. Nagle indicated that the system met standards at the time and explained what it was initially designed to do. Mr. Nagle reviewed the stormwater system and how it is currently functioning. He noted that the system was slightly oversized for the use. Mr. Nagle indicated that they examined the 2001 calculations and he feels that what is currently onsite is an acceptable system.

Ms. McClees noted that the Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan should provide a signature block for responsible party/operator signature. She also noted that the Commission should consider whether or not stormwater peer review is necessary.

Mr. Haworth questioned the wetland lines and if line has been looked at.

Mr. Simmons stated that he felt that the Commission would be able to approve the project with the line proposed, but not approve the line.

Mr. Haworth questioned the similarity between the wetland line from the 2001 filing and the current filing.

Mr. Nagle stated that they are similar, but that in the initial development there was wetland replication done.

Mr. Simmons questioned whether the applicant felt there was a need to approve the line.

Mr. Nagle stated that they will be working within the buffer zone, but will not be getting closer to the wetland than about 50 feet.

Mr. Haworth stated that a maintenance schedule will be needed.

Mr. Nagle requested a continuance to the January 27, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to continue 4 Pequod Road to January 27, 2020 at the applicant's request, seconded by Dan Doyle, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

i) **CON 023-109: 40 Wapatma Lane**

Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Ecosystem Solutions, Inc. for the adjustment of the existing fence to allow for 25-foot setback from wetlands and the creation of a 12-inch soil berm to prevent agricultural runoff from entering the wetlands at the property located at 40 Wapatma Lane, Assessors Map 29, Lots 28-29. Work to take place in Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage/Zone AE and buffer zone to Bordering Vegetated Wetland.

Brandon Faneuf was present and provided the agent with the green cards.

Mr. Faneuf stated that he located the wetland line and the fencing onsite. He is proposing a plan to keep the fencing 25 feet away from the wetland boundary and constructing a 12-inch high berm as a means of preventing runoff from entering the wetland. Mr. Faneuf reviewed his submitted plan.

Ms. McClees reviewed the history of this filing. This application has been submitted in response to a violation that required the applicant to submit a filing within 90 days of October 28, 2019. The fence is positioned on the upgradient side of the berm, preventing runoff from entering wetland resource area. Between wetland flags B5 and B7, the fencing is proposed to remain. This is likely due to the fencing being more permanent post and rail fence as opposed to more temporary fencing like the remainder of the fence to be removed. It does appear that the berm on the downgradient side of the fencing between wetland flags B5 and B7 will be constructed partially within the resource area. Ms. McClees asked if the applicant could estimate the area of wetland that will be impacted by that construction.

Mr. Faneuf stated that the berm could be located directly underneath the fence, which would result in de minimus wetland impact.

Ms. McClees asked if the applicant has proposed any erosion and sedimentation control measures, especially for the areas in close proximity to the wetland.

Mr. Faneuf stated that he didn't feel it was necessary.

Mr. Haworth stated that on every project that has come before the Commission in the past has required erosion and sedimentation control near wetlands. Mr. Haworth asked the applicant why they should make an exception in this case.

Mr. Faneuf stated that taking out the fence isn't going to cause much disturbance. The disturbance and exposed soils will be limited to the berm.

Mr. Haworth stated that his concern was exposed soils until the berm is stabilized.

Mr. Simmons stated that straw mulch or straw wattle would suffice.

Mr. Faneuf was in agreement.

Ms. McClees stated some of the options that the Commission has used in the past for erosion and sedimentation control.

Mr. Haworth requested that the plans be revised to show erosion and sedimentation control and clarify the berm location underneath the fence between wetland flags B5 and B7.

Mr. Simmons recommended sending the revised plan to the Agent so that she can review them for completeness prior to the next meeting and as long as there are no major changes from what has been discussed, then the applicant does not need to be present at that meeting.

Kathleen Webb, member of the Widemarsh Beach Association, questioned the notification of the next meeting.

Mr. Simmons clarified the process of continuing a hearing.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to continue 40 Wapatma Lane to January 27, 2020 at the applicant's request, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

## **8. Ongoing Projects**

### **a) SE 023-1291: 497 Sconticut Neck Road**

Brandon Faneuf, representing Martha Tichon. He explained that the owner received the letter that stated they were not in compliance and some work has been done since the letter was received. Jordan Klinka, the owner's grandson, took down fencing in big paddock, which means that horses are no longer in the wetland. He explained that a paddock has been built in the already approved area connected to the existing barn at least 25 feet away from the wetland.

Mr. Simmons stated that the concern was getting the horses out of the wetland.

Mr. Faneuf stated that the horses are no longer in the wetland. He did state that no replication has been done but will get done in the spring. In the meantime, the family has decided that the paddock north to the barn is more space that what they need. They would like to scale down the size of the paddock. This would be best in formal amendment to the Order of Conditions. The plan is to revise paddock area to be smaller and build already approve replication area.

Mr. Haworth questioned when the amendment might be filed by.

Mr. Faneuf stated that it depends on when the engineer can revise the plans.

Ms. McClees stated that the replication and replanting of the paddock area can happen whether or not an amendment is submitted because it has already been approved by the existing order of conditions. She noted that the replication and replanting should not wait on the amendment to be done.

## **9. Violations/Enforcement Orders/Cease and Desist Notices**

### **a) 44 Torrington Road**

Ms. McClees explained that she has received the green card back, indicating that the property owner has received the letter that was sent informing him of the violation, fine, and enforcement order. She has not yet received any further communication but will follow up at the end of the month.

Mr. Simmons requested an update for the January 27 meeting.

Mr. Haworth questioned what the timeline was for action to be taken.

Ms. McClees noted that a restoration plan had to be submitted by March 9, 2020.

## b) 7 Waybridge Road

Ms. McClees pictures of Waybridge Road and shows a large tree that was cut and a second stump that was ground out.

Ms. McClees noted that it wasn't entirely clear where the ground out tree location was in relation to the property line, but that 7 Waybridge Road has the same property owner as 44 Torrington Road. She noted that it appears the trees were cut at the same time as the ones on the 44 Torrington Road property.

Mr. Simmons stated that he felt they could wait for more information to determine follow through.

Ms. McClees noted that a letter had not yet been sent because she was waiting for a more definitive determination from the Commission regarding one vs. two trees.

Mr. Simmons stated that a letter should be sent stating that it appears there have been two trees cut down on the property and the cutting is to cease there as well. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Haworth made a motion to un-table CON 023-107: 55 Goulart Memorial Drive, seconded by Nick Carrigg; this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

7. (g) CON 023-107: **55 Goulart Memorial Drive**

Request for Determination of Applicability filed by Fairhaven Harbormaster for the trimming of vegetation on the southwestern side of the parking lot at the property located at 55 Goulart Memorial Drive, Assessors Map 42, Lot 23A. Work to take place in Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage/Zone VE and buffer zone to Coastal Beach, Coastal Dune, Salt Marsh, and Rocky Intertidal Shore.

Tim Cox, Harbormaster, Vinnie Furtado, Public Works Superintendent, and Frank Coelho, Chair of the Marine Resources Committee were present for this hearing.

Ms. McClees explained that the Request for Determination was submitted to trim the vegetation on the southwestern side of the parking lot to be level with the top of the boulders. No trimming is proposed on the beach side of the boulders and the work will take place from the parking lot side only. Ms. McClees noted that the vegetation is assisting in anchoring the coastal beach and coastal dune and the boulders are preventing vehicle traffic in the resource areas. Given the proposed work will only trim the vegetation to the top of the boulders and won't remove any vegetation and that the work is proposed to occur from the parking lot side only, in her opinion it seems unlikely that significant negative impact will occur to the resource areas.

Mr. Cox noted that he will be working with Mr. Furtado on the project. He noted that the vegetation has grown up in such a way that it is impeding view of the water, so as Ms. McClees explained, they are asking to trim the vegetation to the top of the boulders along the southwestern side of the parking lot.

Mr. Simmons shared his opinion that the boulders should remain and the root systems of any of the vegetation should not be removed.

Mr. Cox agreed and noted that he and his crew will be working with Mr. Furtado on ensuring the project is done correctly.

Mr. Simmons explained that when the work occurs, a copy of the permit should be on site and asked that Mr. Cox communicate with the Agent regarding the work.

Mr. Coelho stated that he has no issue with cutting the vegetation. He questioned whether there were two sets of Conservation rules in Town.

Mr. Simmons stated that there were not.

Mr. Coelho stated that there was nothing that came before the Commission to place the rocks in their current location and that the rocks were put there temporarily by John Charbonneau, Highway Superintendent. Mr. Coelho provided a copy of Marine Resources Committee minutes regarding a project that was done a few years ago on the other side of the property to move a debris berm.

Mr. Simmons reiterated that both the root systems and the boulders are important for erosion control.

Mr. Coelho stated that if he owned a piece of waterfront property and he were to put in a stone wall on his property to protect it from storm damage, he would have to come before the Commission for a permit. He stated that the boulders at Hoppy's Landing were placed without permission from the Commission.

Mr. Cox stated that he was unsure of the date of the meeting regarding the removal of the debris pile (a previous, separate project).

Ms. McClees stated that there was a filing to clean up the area near the boat ramp, plant it, and as part of that process, in removing the debris that had accumulated near the boat ramp, some of those boulders would be used to prevent vehicle traffic in the resource area on the end of Hoppy's Landing where the vegetation cutting is proposed. The location of the boulders came about as part of another filing.

Mr. Cox stated that he wanted it noted in the record that he, as Harbormaster/Shellfish Warden, and Mr. Furtado, as Public Works Superintendent, didn't just place the rocks there because they wanted to. The placement was discussed at a Conservation meeting related to the filing associated with the area near the boat ramp.

Ms. McClees noted that the minutes from that meeting reflect that discussion.

Mr. Coelho shared a portion of Marine Resources Committee meeting minutes regarding the potential removal of the boulders.

Mr. Simmons noted that the removal of the boulders from the northern portion of the site and their placement in the southern portion of the site, where they are currently, was an approved activity by the Commission and there are minutes that reflect that.

Mr. Coelho stated that he did not believe it was in the minutes.

Ms. McClees confirmed that it was noted in the minutes.

Mr. Coelho read an email he received from the Agent regarding the 2016 filing for the removal of debris and then stated that the information in the email is not based on the minutes.

Ms. McClees stated that the email she sent Mr. Coelho is based on meeting minutes, a copy of which she previously provided Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Simmons asked that Ms. McClees get a copy of the minutes.

Mr. Coelho described the purpose of the 2016 filing for work near the boat ramp.

Mr. Simmons noted that it is important to deter vehicular traffic in resource areas.

Mr. Coelho stated that he has no issue with that, but that it needs to be permitted through the Commission.



Mr. Simmons stated that the Agent is getting a copy of the minutes that shows that it was approved by the Commission. Mr. Simmons questioned if Mr. Coelho was asking the Commission to remove the boulders.

Mr. Coelho stated that he was.

Mr. Simmons asked why.

Mr. Coelho stated that removing the boulders would make it easier to cut the brush back because the machine isn't able to get in there.

Mr. Haworth stated that they wouldn't want the machine in there and that it should be cut by hand because the machine would damage the root system.

Mr. Cox questioned if it would be an issue to cut the vegetation by hand.

Mr. Furtado noted that the flail machine could be used from the parking lot side to trim the vegetation without damaging the roots.

Mr. Haworth noted that whatever can't be trimmed with the flail machine could be trimmed by hand.

Mr. Simmons explained that trimming the vegetation to the ground does not serve the purposes of Conservation and that the rocks to stabilize that point.

Discussion regarding what types of activities need a permit.

Mr. Simmons explained that the Commission opts to delineate the edge of resource areas for protection in several different ways, including boulders, as well as some of the activities that are considered minor activities and are exempt.

Mr. Simmons noted that he has allowed discussion beyond the scope of the project for informational purposes.

Mr. Haworth read an excerpt from the March 7, 2016 meeting minutes regarding placement of the boulders, "Mr. Cox said he would use some of the boulders to line the area Ms. Barteau is referring to. Ms. Barteau and Mr. Cox agreed that they will work together on that."

Mr. Coelho stated that the Commission did not approve the placement of the boulders.

Mr. Simmons stated that the minutes clearly reflect that approval was given for the placement of the boulders.

Mr. Haworth stated that based on the minutes, the Commission did say that Ms. Barteau and Mr. Cox could work together on the placement of the rocks. If there is an issue with the placement of the rocks, it needs to come under another filing to be discussed because it is outside of the scope of the filing that is currently in front of the Commission.

Mr. Cox stated that he submitted the application and through discussions with Mr. Furtado, Ms. McClees, and others, that the best place for the boulders is where they are currently located.

Mr. Haworth stated that trimming the brush to the height of the rocks should allow for better view while still preserving the resource area.

Mr. Haworth asked for confirmation that it would be cut with a flail mower, anything unable to be trimmed using the flail mower would be cut by hand, and all debris would be removed from the site.

Mr. Furtado confirmed that was accurate.

Mr. Coelho questioned if they were talking about trimming to the top of the boulders.

Mr. Haworth confirmed that the vegetation would be trimmed to the top of the boulders and that the concern of the Commission is maintaining the soil structure.

Geoff Haworth made a motion to close public hearing for CON 023-107 55 Goulart Memorial Drive and issue Negative 3 and Negative 6 determination with the conditions that no work occur from the beach side of the boulders and the Commission is notified before work is to begin and all debris is to be removed from the site, seconded by Nick Carrigg; this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

Mr. Cox asked for a minute of the Commission's time while both he and Mr. Furtado were there. He noted that he will be before the Board of Public Works on January 27 to discuss the addition of driveway aprons at Hoppy's Landing. He will be filing once he gets further instruction from Public Works. The driveway aprons will prevent people from bottoming out entering and existing Hoppy's Landing.

Mr. Simmons encouraged Mr. Cox to work with the Agent prior to submitting the filing.

**10. General Business**

**a) Bills**

Ms. McClees noted that one bill had been paid since the previous meeting. It was payment of \$925 dollars to Jeff White for the refund of the remaining peer review deposit for the 240 Alden Road ANRAD.

Mr. Haworth noted that he, the Agent, and Gary Lavalette conducted a site visit to the property to look at the debris clean up that had been done. He noted that the site had been cleaned up very well.

**b) MACC Annual Environmental Conference: Saturday, February 29, 2020 in Worcester**

Ms. McClees asked that anyone who has interest in going to send her which workshops and courses so she can get people registered.

**c) Next meeting: January 27, 2020**

**11. Other Business**

Ms. McClees briefly gave an overview of an upcoming invitation-only workshop for the Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Planning Grant.

Geoff Haworth made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m, seconded by Nick Carrigg, this motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

Respectfully Submitted,

Shallyn Rodriguez