

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)  
MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2024**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inlands Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), along with Ms. Suzanne Simone, Environmental Planner, in attendance held a Meeting via ZOOM video conferencing.

**ROLL CALL**

**Commission Members-Present**

Frank Kaputa, Chairman  
Mark Temple, Vice-Chairman  
Kim McClain, Secretary  
Justin Blain  
Brian Davis

**Commission Members – Excused**

Anna Gault Galjan  
Dustin Kach

Chairman Kaputa called the meeting to order at 6:31 P.M. and explained the public meeting process to the applicants and members of the public.

**I. Data Discussion of the Glastonbury Forestry Inventory Project - Connecticut DEEP Urban and Community Forestry Planning Grant, presented by consultant Carina Hart, Mosaic Eco-Solutions**

Ms. Carina Hart of Mosaic Eco-Solutions said that the focus of the presentation would be on the methodology and would include example inventory and community survey. She displayed the project description:

- CT DEEP Urban and Community Forestry Planning Grant
- Grant Award Amount of \$30,000
- Includes Town effort (accumulated hours) to match grant
- Comprehensive Forestry Action Plan/ Forest Inventory
- Research and Mapping Project
- Intended to inform the future development of a forest management plan
- Focus on Town-owned forest lands
- Funding to support urban forestry projects that will help municipalities collect baseline data that can be used to inform future management decisions
- Urban trees and forests help mitigate extreme heat, conserve energy, provide shade, absorb storm water, create wildlife habitat, and filter air and water

Ms. Hart displayed the Blackledge Falls parcel and parcel 168, located near the Chimneysweep Hill Road area. Information detailing the methodology was read out:

- Total of 1,500 acres
- Contiguous Town owned parcels
- Potential for recreation use
- Locations with minimal information
- Locations frequently used by the public
- Balance of forest vs grasslands
- Presence of native and sensitive species

Ms. Hart provided a demonstration on how to view the data on each parcel. A site map with data points was shown, along with the information on each parcel. Ms. Hart pointed out the legend on the map and read out some of the miscellaneous features observed, which include a stone wall and plant species. She added that photos will be included and added that Town staff will incorporate the inventory study into the GIS system. Ms. Hart displayed the field investigation and methodology:

- Observation Points
- Tree Stands
- Overstory & Understory
- Species ID & Count
- Living vs Dead Trees
- Forest Health
- Wildlife Habitat
- Photo Documentation

Ms. Hart presented some of the field data from parcel 168. The list of overstory species includes Black oak, Eastern hemlock, White Oak, American Beech, Northern Red Oak, Hickory, Chestnut Oak, Sweet Birch, Tuliptree, American Sycamore, White Ash, Sugar Maple, Red Maple, Yellow Birch, and Black Locust. Ms. Hart displayed additional information on the methodology for parcel 168:

- Diameter (DBH)
- Timber Quality (Acceptable/Unacceptable)
- Living or Dead
- Saw Height
- Wildlife cavity present or not present
- Coarse Woody Debris presence
- Species

Ms. Hart displayed the understory inventory for parcel 168. The list of understory species includes Cucumber Root, Ghost Pipes, American Wintergreen, Hay-scented Fern,

Partridgeberry, Christmas Fern, White Wood Aster, Striper Wintergreen, Rattlesnake Plantain, Huckleberry, Clethra, Wild Sarsaparilla, Cinnamon Fern, Winged Euonymus, Wood Fern, Rubus, Virginia Creeper, Winterberry Holly, Princess Pine, Canada Mayflower, Oriental Bittersweet, Japanese Barberry, Linden Viburnum, Barberry, Multiflora Rose, Ostrich Fern, and Witch Hazel.

Ms. Hart continued to demonstrate how to view the parcel information. She clicked on a few more data points to provide examples of what field studies were conducted. Ms. Hart noted that a forest inventory and assessment report will be provided, summarizing the following:

- Project Description
- Community Survey Results
- Project and Parcel Boundaries
- Data Collection Methodology
- Summary Tables of inventory data
- Summary Maps of inventory data
- Raw data will be provided to Town for further use
- GIS Files
- Spreadsheet data
- Pictures

A map detailing the 12 parcels was displayed. Parcel 168 and the legend were highlighted. The legend contains information on plant species, utility right-of-way, drainage, trails, stone wall, boundaries, etc. Ms. Hart displayed the potential uses of the inventory data:

- Inform future management plans
- Locate areas to focus management activities
- Provide support data for further state and federal grant funding
- Assist with Town budgeting process
- Locate areas where non-native invasive species area affecting forest health
- Focus current forestry projects to areas with the greatest potential
- Habitat
- Climate resiliency
- Education tool for the public
- Identify encroachments
- Identify areas where land is not being utilized appropriately

Ms. Hart said that they received nearly 300 surveys designed to measure the public opinion for Glastonbury's open spaces. She noted that the survey is still on the Town website. Ms. Hart asked the Commission for some feedback.

Chairman Kaputa inquired about the progress of the data collection. Ms. Hart responded that the field work had been completed. She said that 3 out of 12 parcels had been completed. Ms. Hart asked for some feedback on how the data would be useful for conservation efforts. Ms. Simone

replied that the watershed maps might be beneficial and would provide data on the species in the 150-foot upland review area. She explained that these maps would tie in to the National Diversity Database (NDBB) and added that another potential benefit is information on how close non-native species are to a watercourse. Ms. Simone explained that, with the increasing storm events, there is concern for seeds carried downstream, and added that this inventory study gives them a better understanding on the conditions in order to implement measures where needed. The Commission discussed the values of the inventory study and agreed that it is a valuable tool. Vice-Chairman Temple remarked that the Town and public will be able to utilize this system and added that the information will be tied into the GIS system. Commissioner Davis said that it is a wonderful and comprehensive evaluation and explained that Ms. Simone can use it to make determinations on applications. Ms. Simone agreed with the comments. Mr. Kaputa asked how often an evaluation is done. Ms. Hart answered that she is not sure and will check in with the forester on this. She explained that the next step is a management plan to guide future efforts and added that another comprehensive study can be done in 5-10 years to look at the changes. Secretary McClain noted that the system is user-friendly. The Commission thanked Ms. Hart for the presentation. Ms. Hart said that Ms. Simone helped with the process.

## **II. INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY**

### **1. Application of 2283-2289 MAIN STREET, LLC, MAIN STREET DEVELOPERS, LLC & MAIN STREET GLASTONBURY 2341 LLC for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow redevelopment to include residential and retail with new parking – 2277-2289, 2327-2333, 2341-2345 & 2389 Main Street – Town Center Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC – Peter J. Christian for HB Nitkin, representing the applicants**

Mr. Kaputa asked Ms. Simone about the scope of tonight's presentation. Ms. Simone replied that the most recent revised plans were submitted and added that the test pit information was also submitted. Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC noted that the comments from the Town Engineering Department had been incorporated into the plans. The updated plans were displayed. Ms. Hope recapped that the Gatesy Building and the Willard Building will remain and added that a parking lot connection is proposed. She explained that they are going through the PAD process and have filed the wetlands application; they will come back for a recommendation from the Conservation Commission. She continued to recap the proposal, which includes demolishing the Healthtrax building and replacing it with a new building with parking infrastructure. Ms. Hope explained that the intent is to construct the new building on a podium to screen the parking that will be underneath. She explained that they are using the drop in grade to their advantage to conceal the parking. Ms. Hope stated the wetlands are outside of the development area and added that there is no direct wetlands impact. She said that they kept everything close to the existing building envelope.

Mr. Will Walter, P. E., addressed the comments from the last meeting. Mr. Walter stated that the first comment was how to maintain and access the stormwater management area. There is a foot path located near the parking lot and explained that the area will be maintained about 2 to 3 times a year with a hand mower and a string trimmer. Mr. Walter said that a conservation seed mix is proposed and added that it is a low maintenance area.

He stated that the second comment was to show the snow storage area on the plans. Mr. Walter pointed out the hatched area on the plans. He noted that a lighting plan was requested and explained that those plans have not been finalized. They are still working with the Architectural Site and Design Review Committee (ASDRC). The light poles near the wetlands were displayed. Mr. Walter stated that the proposed light level is 0.0 / 0.1, which is very little light trespass. Ms. Hope said that the list of sustainable features will be addressed at the Conservation Commission meeting when they have more information from the architect.

The applicants moved on to the pollutant testing. A site map was displayed with the targeted areas. The Licensed Environmental Professional on the team, Josh Kaplan, spoke about the soil remediation plan. He explained that contaminated fill would be encased under the parking lot or buildings. Mr. Kaplan said that the exact placement is up to the structural engineer and explained that the material will not be accessible. He stated that any material that cannot be placed will end up stockpiled and taken off site to an appropriate facility. Mr. Kaplan recapped that the management plan includes site survey and identifying the areas where the fill would be located. He had discussed this with Mr. Temple and reiterated that the fill will not be accessible. Ms. Hope asked Mr. Temple if he had any questions. Mr. Temple responded that a great job was done and added that he was on-site with Ms. Simone to observe the test pits. Mr. Temple spoke about the results of the test pits with test pit 3 and test pit 6 having the highest concentration of contaminants. He said that test pit 3 is located up against the Town-owned library. Mr. Temple noted that Town staff have to ensure that construction in those areas is done carefully. Commission members thanked Mr. Temple for his efforts to ensure the area is protected from pollutant exposure. Ms. Hope said that they can provide additional information to ensure they move forward with a favorable vote at the next meeting. There was a brief discussion on the draft motion for the next meeting and the next steps.

## **2. Application of Casamell Realty, LLC for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow a 2-lot subdivision - 1597 New London Turnpike – Rural Residence Zone – Jon Sczurek, Megson, Heagle & Friend Civil Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC**

Mr. Jon Sczurek introduced himself for the record and displayed the updated plans. The changes to the plan include:

- Conservation Easement added to the northerly portion of the lot
- 0.30 acres of Conservation Easement
- 14.7% of the lot
- Town Engineer's comments addressed

Mr. Sczurek recapped that they conducted the well water testing and did not find any pesticides. They addressed the Town Engineer comment to show the limits of the pavement cutting. Mr. Sczurek stated they added the appropriate detail on the plans. The soil testing remediation was displayed:

- 3 Samples in development area

- Impacted soils identified (meet DEC's)
- LEP recommends mixing top foot of soil to reduce pesticide levels
- Wells of nearby properties were tested and no pesticides found
- Only soil within limits of disturbance will be mixed

Mr. Sczurek said that adding the conservation easement was the most significant change to the plans. He reiterated that the applicant is comfortable designating 0.30 acres (14.7%) of the lot as a conservation easement.

Mr. Kaputa thanked Mr. Sczurek for adding the conservation easement to the plans. There were no questions.

**Motion by:** Secretary McClain

**Seconded by:** Vice-Chairman Temple

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency grants an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to Casamell Realty, LLC for lot subdivision and construction of a single family house at 1597 New London Turnpike, in accordance with plans entitled "Subdivision Plan, #1597 New London Turnpike, Prepared for Casamell Realty, LLC, Glastonbury CT, Dated 5.10.24, Revised 9.30.24", 8 Sheets, and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures a minimum of once a week and within 24 hours prior to a forecasted rain event, and within 24 hours of the end of a weather event producing a rainfall amount of 0.5 inch or greater, to be conducted throughout the construction phase and until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Necessary repairs shall be conducted within 48 hours of inspection.
2. The Construction Sequence shall be stringently adhered to.
3. The clearing limits are to be field located and marked. The surveyor shall provide written notification to the Environmental Planner that the clearing limit is accurate and consistent with the approved plans. Once the Environmental Planner acknowledges receipt of the survey confirmation and finds it satisfactory, the vegetation within the approved development area may be cut. The erosion controls are to be installed within two days of clearing vegetation. The surveyor/engineer shall provide written notification to the Environmental Planner within 5 days of installation of erosion controls that the erosion controls are installed correctly and in accordance with the approved plan.
4. The permit is valid for 5 years from date of issuance and shall expire on October 10, 2029.

**Result:** Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

**Motion by:** Secretary McClain

**Seconded by:** Commissioner Davis

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a subdivision, in accordance with plans entitled “Subdivision Plan, #1597 New London Turnpike, Prepared for Casamell Realty, LLC, Glastonbury CT, Dated 5.10.24, Revised 9.30.24”, 8 Sheets, and in compliance with the following stipulations:

1. Permittee is responsible for the proper installation and consistent monitoring of the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures. Permittee or designee shall inspect the sediment and erosion controls and stabilization measures a minimum of once a week and within 24 hours prior to a forecasted rain event, and within 24 hours of the end of a weather event producing a rainfall amount of 0.5 inch or greater, to be conducted throughout the construction phase and until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Necessary repairs shall be conducted within 48 hours of inspection.
2. The Construction Sequence shall be stringently adhered to.
3. The clearing limits are to be field located and marked. The surveyor shall provide written notification to the Environmental Planner that the clearing limit is accurate and consistent with the approved plans. Once the Environmental Planner acknowledges receipt of the survey confirmation and finds it satisfactory, the vegetation within the approved development area may be cut. The erosion controls are to be installed within two days of clearing vegetation. The surveyor/engineer shall provide written notification to the Environmental Planner within 5 days of installation of erosion controls that the erosion controls are installed correctly and in accordance with the approved plan.

**Discussion:** Mr. Sczurek asked if the sidewalk waiver should be included. Ms. Simone replied that this is not included in other applications. Ms. McClain agreed and added that she does not recall this.

**Result:** Motion passes unanimously. (5-0-0)

3. **Application of Rosenblit Enterprises, LLC for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to allow creation of a residential building lot & site plan - 108 Chamberlain Lane – Rural Residence Zone – Denise P. Lord, P.E., Barton & Loguidice  
CONTINUED**
4. **Application of Morello Realty LLC for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit for a CGS 8-30g project; adding a 3.5 story, 42-unit, multi-family building to site with existing 6-unit multi-family, plus parking – [36 Hopewell Road] - Village Residential Zone – Attorney Meghan Hope – Rose Tiso & Company – Landscape Architect Biff Schechinger**

Attorney Meghan Hope introduced herself for the record. Mr. Sal Morello of Morello Realty LLC was also present. An aerial view of the 2.43-acre site was displayed. A site map with wetland boundaries was put up. The wetland limit is approximately 50 feet from the closest point. Photos of the wetlands taken by Soil Scientist Eric Davison were displayed. Ms. Hope

noted that ASDRC requested some changes to the plans and added that an updated plan would be available at the next meeting. The existing multi-family home was pointed out. Ms. Hope displayed the letter from the Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) which indicates that there are no species of concern located on site. The letter expires January 30, 2026. A site map detailing the sloping topography was displayed. Ms. Hope said that the multi-family home and the driveway will remain on the site and added that the accessory garage will be removed. The proposed apartment building will be a 3 and a half story building with 42 units. Ms. Hope said that ASDRC asked them to remove some of the parking; currently they are proposing 84 spaces. She explained that an updated plan will be presented to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) and should be resolved by the next meeting. Ms. Hope noted that 0.23 acres of the site are in the upland review area.

Mr. Manny Silva, licensed engineer with the State of Connecticut, introduced himself. A site plan map with wetlands boundary was displayed. The wetland limit is approximately 50 feet from the proposed development area. A proposed retaining wall was pointed out. Mr. Silva said that the slope will be kept as natural as possible. The shed and garage will be removed, and the multi-family home will be renovated. He explained that stormwater currently discharges into the wetlands without any treatment. The roof leaders were pointed out. Mr. Silva said that they propose a series of catch basins to collect and treat the stormwater. He explained that floatables, oil, and trash will be held in the catch basin. Mr. Silva stated that an underground gallery system is proposed to collect the water and reduce the amount of volume that leaves the site. They met the water quality volume and submitted the drainage report. A diagram depicting the cross section of the gallery system was shown. Mr. Silva said that this system would increase the water quality and decrease the volume going downstream, which would help with flooding; the plans comply with the MS4 requirements. Mr. Silva stated that the notes on the plans indicate that the catch basin and water quality units are to be inspected every 6 months. The property manager will have a log which allows Town staff to check for compliance.

Mr. Silva moved on to the erosion and sedimentation control notes on the plans. He stated that reinforced silt fence along with staked hay bales is proposed. Mr. Silva explained that this will keep the area stable and prevent sediment from discharging into the wetlands. An anti-tracking pad is proposed, the details are listed on the plan notes. A diagram of the 4-foot downstream defender was shown. Mr. Silva explained that the system will slow the water and filter out oils, heavy metals, sand, and grit. A diagram of the proposed retaining wall was shown. The photometric plan was also displayed. The proposed light levels near the wetland are 0.0 and are in compliance with regulations. The proposed lighting is dark sky compliant, full cut-off, LED lighting. Mr. Silva moved on to the Water Quality Volume computation notes on the plans. He stated that the proposal meets the MS4 requirements.

Mr. Biff Schechinger, Landscape Architect, displayed a list of the proposed plantings. Mr. Schechinger stated that 85% of the plants are native by species and 82% are native by amount; 7 species are not native. Mr. Schechinger said that ASDRC asked them to add more evergreens and shade trees, and added they have exceeded the number of trees required in the parking area. Mr. Schechinger added that they are looking to add more islands and landscaping in the parking area.



Ms. McClain said that it would have been helpful to have the planting list in advance. Mr. Kaputa asked Mr. Schechinger what he means by native. Mr. Schechinger replied that they have this conversation with every commission. He noted that Ms. Simone gave him a great list and explained that, due to climate change, Mid-Atlantic species are shifting to the Northeast. Mr. Schechinger stated that they can no longer find ash trees in nurseries and added that beech trees are prone to disease.

Ms. Hope put up the revised lighting plan and explained that ASDRC asked them to change the light poles from 18 feet to 14 feet. She said that the proposed light fixtures will be a lantern style. The energy efficiency features were displayed on the screen:

- Tight building envelope, utilizing sill seal gaskets along with spray foam installation
- Energy Star-rated heating and air conditioning systems with programmable thermostats
- Energy-Star windows
- Low-flow fixtures installed to minimize waste
- Appliances meet or exceed Energy Star requirements
- LED lighting
- Water Conservation: Each unit will have sub-metered water to help detect leaks and encourage the preservation of water to help reduce costs
- Sustainable Design: Sustainable materials such as brick, stone, and cement are used in construction. Daylight is maximized with windows in bedrooms, kitchens, and living rooms. Landscaping will feature native plants so there's less need for irrigation and pest control treatments.
- Renewable Energy- Collaborating with local solar providers to prepare for the installation of solar panels within 12-24 months after project completion. Ten (10) Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) Level 2 electric car chargers will also be installed.
- Environmental Responsibility: The building will not utilize natural gas, contributing to a reduction in CO2 emissions. All paint, trim, ceiling, and flooring products will be verified as having low or no volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions.

Mr. Kaputa asked the applicants for more information on the reduction of parking spots. Ms. Hope responded that parking spots are linked to bedroom counts and added that TPZ is not required to adhere to this formula. There is some flexibility and added that one member of ASDRC had a strong opinion that the site was over-parked with 84 spots for 42 units; they are looking to reduce the number of parking spots. Ms. McClain said that over-parking is an issue and applauded the ASDRC member who brought up the point. The Commission briefly discussed the parking and agreed that TPZ will decide on the number of spots. Mr. Davis asked for information on the updated retaining wall plans. Mr. Silva replied that the wall was initially 10 to 12 feet tall and has been reduced to a 6-foot wall. He added that ASDRC also told them to shorten the building and added that they are still working on the design. Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the closest distance to the wetlands; the arrow on the diagram showed 50 feet. Mr. Silva responded that 50 feet is the closest point to the property line. He put up a diagram showing 60.6 feet distance from the building to the wetlands. Mr. Kaputa wanted to confirm that the building will be all electric. Ms. Hope replied yes. Mr. Morello spoke about the lower utility

bills. Ms. McClain thanked the applicants for incorporating solar into the plans. She asked if geothermal was looked at. Mr. Morello replied that it is done on larger projects and explained that there are no incentives and it is not cost- efficient. He explained that all units have individual heating and geothermal would not work in this case. Ms. McClain remarked that 18-foot light fixtures were too tall. Mr. Morello reiterated that the proposed fixtures are dark sky complaint. Ms. McClain asked about bike storage. Mr. Morello answered that there will be bike storage in the basement and there will also be bike storage near the patio area. Mr. Schechinger added that there are 2 bike rack areas proposed outside, one for 4 bikes, the other for 8 bikes.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on installing the solar panels in the future. Mr. Morello replied that their intention is to put them in and added that one of his good friends owns a solar company. He said that they will put in conduits in the future that will be hidden in the roof line and added that they cannot do it during the initial construction period. Ms. McClain asked the applicants to look into Connecticut Green Bank and explained that they work with developers. Mr. Morello replied that he will call them tomorrow. Mr. Kaputa asked for clarification on the required number of EV chargers. Mr. Morello responded that 84 parking spot amounts to at least 9 chargers and added that they come in pairs and that is how they came up with 10. There was a brief discussion on the EV charger regulations. Ms. Hope stated that they will provide updated photometric and landscaping plans at the next meeting. She added that TPZ will decide on the parking spaces and added that the Police Chief was happy with the number of parking spots. Ms. Hope remarked that they hope to find a compromise. Ms. McClain thanked the applicants for reaching out to the community and getting their feedback. Mr. Davis said that it is a large-scale project and added that he appreciates the effort to mitigate and make it as appropriate as possible. Mr. Morello thanked the Commission. Mr. Kaputa noted that they will see the applicants again in two weeks.

### **III. CONSERVATION COMMISSION - NO BUSINESS**

### **IV. APPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS - NO BUSINESS**

### **V. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE**

### **VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 26, 2024**

The minutes were approved as presented (4-0-1), with Mr. Temple abstaining.

### **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **1. Administrative Approvals Quarterly Report – DISCUSSED**

#### **2. Engineering’s General Permit Quarterly Maintenance Report- No Activity to Report DISCUSSED**

### **3. Chairman's Report**

Mr. Kaputa noted that Glynis sent out information on the upcoming Connecticut Association of Conservation and Inland Wetlands Commissions (CACIWC) conference taking place on November 16, 2024 in Bristol. The Commission briefly discussed the upcoming event. Ms. Simone said that she will attend.

### **4. Commissioner's Report**

Ms. Simone displayed the proposed agenda for the upcoming joint meeting scheduled for October 23, 2024. She asked Commission members to email her with any feedback.

Mr. Temple said that the point brought up earlier about the encroachment of Mid-Atlantic species becoming native is a topic that should be addressed. He remarked that change is happening and added that it should be on the agenda. Mr. Kaputa agreed that the issue was worth discussing. The Commission agreed to add this topic to the upcoming joint meeting agenda. Ms. Simone agreed to change the agenda. Mr. Kaputa suggested adding a discussion on definitions, such as genus, species, hybrid, cultivar, nativar, etc. He explained that not everyone is a botanist or scientist. Ms. Simone agreed with the suggestion and added that she will share this with Commissioner Gault Galjan.

### **5. Environmental Planner's Report**

Ms. Simone provided an update on 769 Hebron Avenue. She recapped that the streambank was eroding and there was discussion about armoring it with stone and spacers for vegetation. Ms. Simone displayed photos of the site and added that the work had been completed. Mr. Davis remarked that it looks great. Ms. Simone added that the project turned out well and explained that the whips will vegetate and fill in, leaving the stone less visible. There was a brief discussion on the plants and how the project will turn out over time. Several Commissioners suggested another photo in one year to compare.

Mr. Kaputa noted that the next meeting is in two weeks and there is also the in-person joint meeting with the ASDRC in Council Chambers, scheduled for October 23, 2024.

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Kaputa adjourned the meeting at 8:26 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

***Nadya Yuskaev***

Nadya Yuskaev

Recording Secretary