



CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

131 Pleasant Street
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

www.nantucket-ma.gov

Thursday, January 22, 2026 – 5:00 p.m.

This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube:

<https://youtube.com/live/NR4b9nR8Na4>

Commissioners: Seth Engelbourg (Chair), Linda Williams (Vice Chair), Tim Braine, Mike Misurelli, Joe Plandowski, John Schafer, and RJ Turcotte

Called to order at 5:00 p.m. by Chair Engelbourg

Staff in attendance: Will Dell'Erba, Conservation Agent

Attending Members: Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, and Turcotte. Williams arrived at 5:02pm

Absent Members:

Members Left Early:

I. Call To Order

II. Acceptance of the Agenda

Discussion: (00:01:40)	Engelbourg notes the continuances
Motion:	Motion to accept the agenda (Made by: Misurelli) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Vote Carried: 6:0 Engelbourg, Misurelli, Braine, Plandowski, Schafer, and Turcotte (aye)

III. Announcements

Discussion: (00:03:33)	Engelbourg announced that the meeting is being audio and video recorded.
------------------------	--

IV. Update on Public Comment Questions from Prior Meetings

Discussion: (00:04:00)	none
------------------------	------

V. Public Comment

Chair Engelbourg called for public comment

Discussion: (00:04:02)	Burton Balkind, Nantucket Coastal Conservancy - D Anne Atherton and I sent a letter to the Select Board and Commissioners that outlined that the geotube project has not been maintained and no significant sand mitigation has been put on in the last three years. - We have been asking that it becomes an agenda item soon about how we are going to move forward with this project, which has a removal Order for.
------------------------	---

VI. Public Hearing

A. Notice of Intent- No Waiver Required

Discussion: (00:06:35)	Engelbourg - Announces the motion to accept the withdrawal for Maloney- 15 Old North Wharf (42.3.1-26) SE48-3924 - Asks Commission and public if there is any interest in opening SE48-3952 or SE48-3955. Commissioners and Public don't see a need to open the following: - 86 PR U/D/T & 88 Pocomo Trust- 86 & 88 Pocomo Road (15-33, 41, & 42) SE48-3952 - *Del Balzo- 6 & 8 Grove Lane (41-162 & 162.1) SE48- 3955 Dell 'Erba confirms that staff has everything they need to close
Action:	Motion to close SE48-3952 & SE48-3955 (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)

Vote:	Vote Carried: 7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)
-------	--

1. Maloney- 15 Old North Wharf (42.3.1-26) SE48-3924

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, and Turcotte
Recused:	Williams
Action:	Motion to accept the request to withdrawal: (Made by: Misurelli) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried://6:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli Plandowski, Schafer, and Turcotte (aye) Williams (recused)

2. 86 PR U/D/T & 88 Pocomo Trust- 86 & 88 Pocomo Road (15-33, 41, & 42) SE48-3952

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Mark Rits, Site Design Engineering LLC
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Action:	Motion to close: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

3. *Del Balzo- 6 & 8 Grove Lane (41-162 & 162.1) SE48- 3955

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Mark Rits, Site Design Engineering LLC
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Action:	Motion to close: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

B. Notice of Intent- Waiver Required

1. Robert F. Greenhill Revocable Trust- 16 Hoicks Hollow Road (23-1) SE48-3917

Action:	CONTINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY 19 TH , 2026
---------	--

2. Chardonnay Group, LLC- 54 Washington Street (42.2.3-9) SE48-3942

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Art Gasbarro, Nantucket Survey & Engineering PC
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	Burton Balkind, speaking on behalf of himself
Discussion: (00:09:41)	Gasbarro - The applicant is back for the second hearing of the application to lift the house up, which is in the flood zone. - The Commission requested the applicant to go to the CRAC committee to review the application, so we have continued for that purpose. - There was a general list in the packet from CRAC, but we didn't receive a specific response regarding the application. - Reminds the Commission that the project is not moving the structure into the area of concern and just lifting the house within the footprint that exists. - The residential home predates the enactment of the Wetlands Protection Act and doesn't believe there is any conflict with any potential Coastal Resiliency projects that the town or other entities are considering.

	- The project represents a net benefit by allowing flood waters to pass benefit the structure. Braine - There's a list of advice essentially from CRAC to ConCom that's in the packet which is up to the discretion of the Commission whether we want to add any of them to the Order of Conditions. Engelbourg - A lot of things on the list are pieces of advice that concern the long-term future, and we can potentially incorporate some or all of them into the additional findings. - Asks Braine if he could speak a bit about the discussion of the FEMA elevation related to the flood insurance rate map. Braine - The building isn't as high as recommended by the FEMA regulations and there doesn't seem like there's a way of doing it practically. - CRAC recommended that the building go higher, but it can't. Gasbarro - Mentions that lifting the building higher would get into a much more complex foundation structure and support system to get it up to the higher elevation. - Essentially, we are trying to improve what exists without going to a level of full compliance where there's no expansion of the structure. Engelbourg - The reason that the full compliance elevation is not required is due to the structure not being increased in size by the amount that would require it. Gasbarro - Confirms that Engelbourg is correct and mentions that it would be a building commission determination. Misurelli - I think that the applicant did due diligence to our request and it's reasonable to proceed forward as presented in the packet. Williams agrees with Misurelli Balkind - Asks if the project is not brought into full FEMA compliance, are there any negative effects or all just net benefits for not bringing the structure up to compliance. Engelbourg - Elevating the structure to the full compliant level from a flood perspective would be better doing what they're proposing is significantly better than doing nothing at all, which is the alternative. - If it's not required by the building commissioner or other regulations, I think we should be satisfied by it being a benefit to coastal resiliency. - I think we should create a finding that says that "the Coastal Resiliency Advisory committee has reviewed the project and provides the following advice letter and just attach the letter to the Order. Williams - Mentions that if the Commission attaches a letter to the Order, it will be binding and it is not comfortable attaching it if it's not going to be binding as there could be some legal issue there. Engelbourg - It's binding what the document says, but the document doesn't say anything from a regulatory perspective. - We can talk about it further in the Order of Conditions as it makes more sense there.
Action:	Motion to close: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

3. Town of Nantucket- Baxter Road Alternative Access (various) SE48-3945

Action:	CONTINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY 19 TH 2026
---------	--

4. *Nantucket Islands Land Bank- 22 Cathcart Road (43-68) SE48-3954

Action:	CONTINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY 5 TH 2026
---------	---

5. *13 Commercial Wharf LLC- 13 Commercial Wharf (42.2.4-10) SE48-

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Chloe Coggins, Nantucket Surveyors
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	Robert Bates, property manager for an abutter at 24 Washington Street
Discussion: (00:19:48)	Coggins - Describes the proposed project of the construction of a shed within Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage and a buffer zone to a Coastal Bank. - The applicant is requesting a waiver for this application as the shed location is within the 50 foot no buffer zone to Coastal Beach. - Refers to the site plan to reference that the property has very limited additional space and the proposed area was previously approved by the Commission in 2024. - We are supplementing the construction of that shed with a 300 square foot beach grass restoration area. Engelbourg - Ask if Coggins has elevations or a cross- section of the shed. Coggins - Mentions that the plans are before the Historic District Commission, so the exact height elevation of what they are proposing but we will eventually have those. Engelbourg - Mentions that there's a policy that indicates that applicants have had to obtain or applied for all other permits. - Explains that when the Commission issues an Order of Conditions, we request that an Amended Order has to be filed with the final site elevations. Bates - Refers to the site plan to emphasize that the shed will be placed within the 50-foot no build and will restrict access to the property as it's going where a gated area is. - The shed is also proposed over a propane tank, which isn't allowed and questions if there is enough clearance from the dwelling and property lines. Engelbourg - The Commission doesn't regulate zoning setbacks, and those questions would be for planning, zoning, or the Historic District Commission potentially. - Related to the propane tank, the Commission also doesn't regulate that either. - Our Commission is specifically related to wetland resources and the setback so we can only fully discuss the placement of the shed within the 50-foot no-building area. Bates - Mentions that the proposed 300-foot restoration area with dune grass may be a pathway to the beach, which will be taking away public access. Coggins - It's located adjacent to the Nantucket Islands Land Bank property, which is all public, but the restoration is all within the property site. - The applicant will set the minimum above grade which is 12-18 inches for the shed and the project meets all the zoning requirements.

	Engelbourg - Asks if the Order that permitted the expansion of the dwelling is still open. Coggins - Confirms that the Order was closed due to the property being sold. Engelbourg - It's up to the Commission to determine whether structural elements in that area cause impacts on the performance standards of Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage and or the 50 and 75 foot no build setbacks to the Coastal Beach. Williams - It's already been approved once, and I don't have an issue with it as that side of Commercial Wharf is already disturbed. I would feel different if it was going down the water side. Engelbourg - If this is within the 50–75-foot area, the project would not need a waiver at all because of the one and a half mitigation. - This is within the 50-foot buffer zone that needs to be waived. - The reason we are deciding whether to permit it or not depends on our opinions on whether that waiver is justified. Misurelli - I know it's a separate application than what was previously approved but it's a smaller footprint. Coggins - Now that you have the elevation information of 12-18 feet, would we need to come back to the Commission with an Amended Order of Conditions. Engelbourg - It may need to be an Amendment or a Minor Modification, but you would need to come back for that. Something will need to be submitted to the Commission and it's up to us to decide which process we would want to use.
Action:	Motion to close: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Misurelli)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

6. *Harbourvue LLC- 94 Hulbert Avenue (30-50) SE48-

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	David Haines, Haines Hydrogeologic Consulting Steve Rothke, Providing Architectural services on the project
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (00:34:08)	Haines - Describes the proposed project of enclosing the existing porch and expanding the dwelling with a second floor, and the construction of an addition on the dwelling. - The property is within 50 and 75 feet from a Coastal Dune, which is across the street and the entire property is within 50 feet of two sections of the Coastal Bank. - The significance of that Coastal Bank is minimal and does retain flood waters, but the house and site itself are outside of the 100-year flood plain. - Everything from the split rail fence down to the edge of the road will be planted with American Beach Grass. - The other mitigating factor that we're proposing is to plant a vegetated strip of American Beach Grass also along the Coastal Bank. - Reviews the waivers that the applicant is requesting as they believe it will not alter the resource area, there are no other reasonable alternatives, and the work would provide a net benefit to the site.

	Williams - Mentions that there is a substantial amount of work in the 50-foot buffer zone as by enclosing the porch it's going to be a solid ground cover instead of just a deck. Haines - There's a slight expansion of 23 square feet in the northwest corner of the property which is within the 50-foot buffer zone. Schafer - Asks Haines if the chimney that's there is going to be removed. Haines - Assumes it will be and will be disposed of properly. Misurelli - There's quite a bit going on in some spall space here and I'm thinking a site visit with things staked out would be beneficial to look at. Plandowski and Turcotte agree that a site visit may be a good idea. Rothke - Clarifies that the applicant is not enclosing the entire porch that's representing on the site plan. - There's a wrap around porch on the north and east sides but we're only closing the area near the chimney that Schafer just mentioned. - We are only proposing work on two sides of this building and clarifies that they are not doing work on three sides. Williams - Asks the applicant if the project has the Historic District Commission's approval. Rotheke - No, it has not and didn't feel like we could get to the HDC without some preliminary understanding from the Commission first. Engelbourg - The Commission requires that all applications that require permitting outside of our Commission must either obtain or apply for other permits prior to coming before the Conservation Commission. Williams - In this particular case with so much going on north and west of the property, we should see a rendering of that. Haines - The whole northern part of that property has a building restriction on it so that's why we can't go up towards that area. - Is it possible to come back with an Amendment or a revised plan once it's been approved by the Historic District Commission? Engelbourg - You have to at least apply and not necessarily obtain a permit through HDC in that case so that the processes can happen at the same time. - I know it's complicated but that's what the regulations require. Roethke - We have conceptualized what this addition looks like and obviously could have certainly filed a concurrent application. Engelbourg - We don't want to make it too difficult for applicants but that is what the regulations say so we are beholden to it. - Policy Banks are an area that, even if they may not have as much value today as some other areas but will become important. - There is potential for those Banks to take on the additional values that they do over time including prevention of storm damage, erosion and things like that.
--	---

	- The purpose of the project is to increase structural area for building use, but I think there are going to be adverse impacts and there are plenty of reasonable alternatives. - The requested waiver on the basis of proving a net benefit to the site seems strictly on the planting of American Beach Grass. - We need to carefully consider whether that would be enough of a net benefit to overcome the significant impacts of all the proposed increase in structural area. - Misurelli's proposal to schedule a site visit is a good idea but has significant reservations about this plan as proposed. Misurelli - For the site visit, if we could have things staked out that may save everyone a bit of confusion. Haines - I was trying to increase the lawn area's significance by providing wildlife habitat, wetland scenic views, while still providing all the flood control and were considering that to be an improvement. Engelbourg - The scheduled site visit for our next meeting is February 3rd and asks the representatives if they have availability that day. Commissioners, representatives, and staff agree they can all be available on February 3rd for a site visit.
Action:	CONINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY 5 TH , 2026

C. Amended Orders of Conditions- No Waiver Required (none)

D. Amended Orders of Conditions- Waiver Required (none)

IV. Public Meeting

A. Orders of Conditions/ Amended Order of Conditions- No Waiver Required

1. 86 PR U/D/T & 88 Pocomo Trust- 86 & 88 Pocomo Road (15-33, 41, & 42) SE48-3952

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Mark Rits, Site Design Engineering, Inc
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (01:09:22)	Dell 'Erba presents the item
Action:	Motion to issue OOC as drafted: (Made by: Misurelli) (Seconded by: Williams)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

2. *Del Balzo- 6 & 8 Grove Lane (41-162 & 162.1) SE48-3955

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Mark Rits, Site Design Engineering, Inc
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion:(01:11:23)	Dell'Erba presents the item
Action:	Motion to issue OOC as drafted: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Misurelli)
Vote:	Carried:/7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

B. Orders of Conditions/ Amended Orders of Conditions- Waiver Required:

1 Chardonnay Group, LLC- 54 Washington Street (42.2.3-9) SE48-3942

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Art Gasbarro, Nantucket Engineering & Survey, PC

Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (01:13:32)	Dell 'Erba presents the item Engelbourg - Requests to edit additional finding #2 involving the Coastal Resiliency Advisory Committee's review to determine if the applicant was compliant with the CRP plan. - Asks Dell'Erba his opinion on whether the review should be included in the Order. Dell'Erba - I don't believe that including those recommendations in the Order is binding as it's an advisory committee but doesn't think it matters. Commission has decided not to include the review in the Order.
Action:	Motion to issue OOC as amended: (Made by: Misurelli) (Seconded by: Williams)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

2. *13 Commercial Wharf LLC- 13 Commercial Wharf (42.2.4-10) SE48- 3956

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Chloe Coggins, Nantucket Surveyors
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (01:18:36)	Dell 'Erba presents the item Engelbourg - We need to discuss how we're going to handle the final elevations of the shed. Williams - Requests to reference the revegetation of the eastern side in the Permit Overview section. Dell'Erba - Adds Condition #27 that mentions that the applicant shall present a plan showing final elevations through a Minor Modification.
Action:	Motion to issue OOC as amended: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Misurelli)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

2. Siasconset Beach Preservation Trust- 59-83 Baxter Road (various) SE48-3759

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, and Williams
Recused:	Turcotte
Representatives:	Dwight Dunk, Epsilon Associates
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (01:25:00)	Dell 'Erba presents the item Engelbourg - Dell'Erba, Carlson, and I have done a very thorough review of this Order and the previous Orders for SE48-3736 and NAN-142 to see if we could standardize the Orders across this project area as much as possible. - There were some questions in regard to the failure criteria, which are all the same as the other Orders and included in this one for SE48-3759. - The sand compatibility, monitoring, and maintenance are all the same.
Action:	Motion to issue OOC as amended: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Braine)
Vote:	Carried://6:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, and Williams (aye) Turcotte (recused)

C. Request for Determination of Applicability- Delineation Only

1. *Vigneau- 15 Meadow Lane (41-406.2) (Rits)

Sitting:	Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams
Recused:	-
Representatives:	Mark Rits, Site Design Engineering, PC
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Public Comment:	There were no public comments.
Discussion: (01:34:13)	Rits - Describes the application to confirm the extent of a wetland boundary and associated buffer zones. Dell’Erba has visited the site and recommends a +2A Determination
Action:	Motion to issue the RDA with a +2A determination: (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Misurelli)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

D. Request for Determination of Applicability- Work Requested

1. *Town of Nantucket- 59-83 Baxter Road (various)

Action:	CONTINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY 19 TH , 2026
---------	--

E. Minor Modifications (none)

F. Certificate of Compliance (none)

G. Extension Requests (none)

H. Other Business

1. Approval of Minutes 01/08/2026

Discussion: (01:36:12)	No questions or comments from the Commission
Action:	Motion to Approve Minutes for 01/08/2026 (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried:/ 7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

2. Monitoring Reports

Discussion: (01:36:48)	Engelbourg - Nantucket Islands Land Bank has submitted about 15 Monitoring reports from their various properties. - Direct any questions to Commission staff and he will connect you with the representatives.
------------------------	--

4. Reports: CRAC, CPC, NP&EDC, Harbor Plan, Offshore Wind Work Group, etc.

CRAC:	Braine - none
CPC:	Schafer - Meeting was cancelled in January, will have an update in February.
NP&EDC:	Misurelli - The Commission’s article that’s being put forward to Town Meeting, they’re offering a sector appointment for the Conservation Commission. - If nobody on the Commission wants that appointment, the Commission is able to approve of someone going to those meetings and reporting back to us. Williams - It would have to be someone with an environmental background. Engelbourg

	- What would happen essentially is that we would post a notice that would seek at large applicants and we would review them and then pick someone to represent us.
Harbor Plan	Williams - Still waiting for the state.

5. Enforcement Actions/ Potential Enforcement Actions

Discussion: (01:40:48)	34A Grove Lane Dell’Erba - After the 30-day clock, I was informed that at the end of the day a representative for the homeowner had gotten in touch with our office today. Engelbourg - Due to being in a public hearing, I’m going to ask a series of very limited in-scope questions to determine how to move forward. Tori Ewing, representing the homeowner and hired to do the HDC approval for 34A Grove Lane - The violation letter was forwarded by the office, and I went by the site today. - The HDC approval is from about a year and a half ago and I was unaware that a surveyor engineer had not been hired and followed through with the requirements for the Commission. - The applicant is HDC approved for various steps of renovation. Engelbourg - In speaking with the office manager, did you submit anything or just speak with her? Ewing - I got the scope of the situation and called the owners to let them know that I would be present this evening at the meeting. - I just emailed Dell’Erba and Graves to let them know that we would be hiring an surveyor engineer immediately and getting a proper application into the Commission for approval. Engelbourg - An Enforcement action was issued and signed off by staff and, asks Dell’Erba to see if that’s been ratified by the Commission. Dell’Erba - We’re going to ratify it, it was issued, signed off by myself, and delivered on December 22nd. Engelbourg - We will need a motion to issue the Enforcement Order at this meeting.
Action:	Motion to issue the Enforcement Order for 34A Grove Lane (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Plandowski)
Vote:	Carried:/ 7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)
Discussion: (01:44:51)	Engelbourg - Generally, when we issue an Enforcement Order, there’s a letter that has a specific number of days where response is required, typically 30 days. - We haven’t received a response and still haven’t received a formal response. Dell’Erba - The actual requirement that was issued to them in the Enforcement Order was that they “shall appear at the January 8, 2026 meeting.” - It wasn’t delivered until 10 days after, so we often end up extending that 30 days, but there was over 2 weeks to respond to that letter and to attend that meeting. Engelbourg

	- We're going to Amend the Enforcement Order to require the applicant for the violator appear at our February 5th meeting to give us a full update of all the activities that have taken place on site and a plan to bring the violation back into compliance.
Motion:	Motion to Amend the Enforcement Order to include the requirements mentioned (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Turcotte)
Vote:	Carried:/ 7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

6. Commissioner's Comments

Discussion: (01:48:20)	Misurelli - In terms of the application that came in this evening and missed the HDC application, is there something that they should be checking off that we could catch before a meeting? Dell'Erba - There's nothing at this point in existence, but I have an idea. Misurelli - That would be great for our next regulatory meeting. Engelbourg - We talked about a cover sheet check list, but it should be public knowledge that this requirement exists. - We need to put policies and procedures onto the website. Braine - Mentions that he will be unable to attend the February 5th meeting
------------------------	--

6. Administrator/Staff Reports

Discussion: (01:50:18)	Dell'Erba - Asks the Commission who will not be in attendance at the February 5th meeting. - Engelbourg and Braine will not be in attendance. Misurelli - But when a vice chair has a meeting and cannot cover the chair, I'm assuming that someone has to back them up. Engelbourg - We'll see if Williams has conflicts, but you may have to do that. - When the agenda is posted, please review it and notify Dell'Erba of any recusals, then we can see if the applicant can voluntarily continue if needed. Dell'Erba - I had a submission from SBPF identifying a sand plan and source for the Enforcement Order and we'll be pushing that conversation for the February 19th meeting.
------------------------	--

Adjournment:

Motion:	Motion to adjourn at 6:56pm. (Made by: Williams) (Seconded by: Misurelli)
Vote:	Carried://7:0 Engelbourg, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Schafer, Turcotte, and Williams (aye)

Submitted by:
Lisa Graves