

Parks Commission Meeting

August 11th, 2026 at 5:30pm

645 Pine St., Front Conference Room & Zoom

Staff in Attendance: Lewis, Sauve, Cahill, Comai, Schmidt, Madalinski, Gustin, Holmes & O'Daniel

Commissioners in Attendance: Lantieri, Boehm, Mobley, Davis, Bergmann, Mamo & Etter

Lantieri opened the meeting at 5:31pm by welcoming everyone and introducing the newest Commissioner, Frank Mamo.

1. Agenda

1.1 Motion to amend/adopt agenda

Lantieri noted that there was one amendment to the agenda needed, which was to include the June minutes as an item to be approved with the Consent Agenda.

Bergmann made a motion to amend the agenda to include the June minutes as an item to be approved with the Consent Agenda, Mobley seconded.

All were in favor of the amended agenda, none opposed.

2. Consent Agenda

2.1 Burlington Greenway Special Use Permit Request (Old Spokes Home)

2.2 Burlington Greenway Special Use Permit Request (Sarah Ramsey Strong 5K)

2.3 Calahan Park Special Use Permit Request (GBGSL Fall)

2.4 Pomeroy Park Special Use Permit (Momo's Market)

2.5 June minutes

Davis made a motion to accept the consent agenda, Bergmann seconded.

All were in favor, none opposed.

3. Public Forum – Time Certain, 6pm

3.1 Verbal Comments

Public forum was opened at 6:02pm.

Colin McNeil was present online and wanted to make a comment about Smalley Park. He shared that it doesn't feel like it is being maintained and wanted to put in a request that the City keep this park in mind and keep maintaining the softball field so it is available for all users now and in the future and so that it doesn't go into disrepair.

Scott Gustin and Zoe Richards were present in person and noted that this was a sneak peek of an action item that will be in front of the Commission next month. Gustin began by sharing that they are talking to trust for public land about doing an ecosystem services analysis for Burlington.

Richards introduced herself as a long-term member of the Conservation Board. She then explained that ecosystem services are a way of recognizing the value that many of the healthy ecosystems that are present within the City have, like street trees, wetlands and

functional forests, which is an infrastructure that we rely on as a City. She continued that they reduce storm water and air pollutants and keep us cool, among other things, and that there is a goal of calculating some of those benefits so that when an appropriate use for an open space is being discussed, there is a way of calculating what that value is. She shared the example that a relatively healthy ecosystem will absorb more stormwater than any built green stormwater infrastructure. She continued that it is really worth understanding what Burlington already has and what its value is, especially when trade-offs are needed when discussing how to approach open space, like when building is involved. This will be helpful for the important process of thinking about the value that natural systems and healthy ecosystems play within the City because it will allow for continued investment in those being healthy. Richards shared that nature-based climate solutions are one of the most impactful climate solutions that you can have for a City because it is things that people can really feel and see and understand, like dropping the temperature of the City by growing enough trees. She shared that she feels this will set the stage to continue to invest in the City's existing healthy ecosystems.

Gustin shared that ecosystem services are a recurring theme in both the new open space plan that was adopted earlier this year, but also in the 2022 nature-based climate solutions addendum, including a few action items related to execution and implementation of nature-based climate solutions and evaluation modification of those processes. He continued that this study will be looking in City-wide green spaces, which includes public, private and institutional properties including the core ecological areas like Rock Point and Arms Forest but also the green connective tissues through the neighborhoods and community at large. Gustin noted that fundamentally, it is about improved decision making for important decision making, like building more housing. He continued that by doing this study, it will give the City an opportunity to better understand and quantify the multiple public benefits of the open spaces and incorporate that information into future decision making. He shared that there are 2 primary components to this study that they are anticipating: the economic benefits of open spaces and the climate cooling benefit of these green spaces throughout the community. Gustin then shared that there are 3 primary topic areas: humanities climate solutions, stormwater management and air quality. He concluded by explaining that they are hoping to fund this out of the Conservation Legacy Fund, for roughly \$79,000, and will need the Commission's approval to do so.

Richards chimed in that this was something that the Planning Commission requested during the Open Space Plan planning process.

Mobley asked if they felt this would be done in time to impact the Plan BTV work that is happening.

Gustin and Richards answered yes.

Public forum was closed at 6:12pm.

4. Deliberative Agenda

4.1 Tree Ordinance Update

Gustin began by sharing his screen with the current working draft of the tree and vegetation ordinance, noting that this was not an action item tonight, but another review of a draft that had been updated since the initial review by this body, the Conservation Board and City Council's ordinance committee. He continued that there will be one more round of revisions before coming back as an action item for support for an adoption in September. He then went through the changes that were made by other bodies from the last draft. The highlights were that the authority section definitions were fleshed out a bit, the City Arborist and City Land Steward titles in regards to trees were solidified, definitions about climate resilience were added and definitions about different types of vegetation were discussed.

Cahill noted that the introductions in the definitions were related to some pieces that were added around removing plant material from City property and then providing clarity around what that process is, which is coming up more and more in the realm of seed collection for native seeds to make sure there are enough for the birds, insects and natural processes as well as folks who are interested in growing from seed.

Gustin continued that this part also provided more detailed provisions around removal, cutting and pruning vegetation and trees on public property. He shared that they also articulated the role of the Conservation Board a bit more and added in reviewing the annual goals and objectives prepared by the City Arborist and/or Land Steward and also serving as a public forum for the community around things like the ash tree management, for example. He continued that they fleshed out more detail around obstruction of streets, which he shared articulates the responsibilities for the private property owners who have trees or shrubs that are on public street right of ways with the potential of encroachment and enables follow-up and enforcement action to compel compliance in those instances. Gustin continued by touching on shade trees, which are a tree on public property planted by a public entity – like a street tree or a tree in a park, but not trees in public forests. He then mentioned an additional category called “other trees” that was added and noted that where zoning is involved, it refers to the comprehensive development ordinance. Gustin shared the final highlights that they worked out a bit more were mitigation measures or applications that include tree removal. He shared that if someone requests approval to remove a certain amount of trees and approval is given, there are mitigation measures on a caliper caliper basis. He used the example of someone removing 100 inches, which need to be replaced, which can happen on-site or off-site, and off-site requires a consultation with the Land Steward or City Arborist. He continued that if off-site is not feasible, a payment based on plant appraisal needs to be made into a tree fund. He shared that the other option is installing and maintaining on-site green infrastructure.

Mobley asked if there was a storm event and someone were to lose trees in their yard, does this come into play in this scenario?

Gustin answered no, only if someone sought approval to intentionally remove trees on private public and institution properties, with private property governed by the zoning code in this ordinance-based reference to that.

Mamo asked if there was any consideration to change or review the way trees on public lands are reviewed or approached, noting that the removal of ash trees in the Old North

End altered the neighborhoods noticeably. He shared that he felt the communication from Parks about why they were removing the trees was excellent, but that it created a renewed understanding of how important trees in public spaces are, especially in the ONE where people don't have large yards so most of the trees are public trees.

Cahill answered that after the ash tree removal, there were lessons learned and space for adaptations to be made. He did note however, that adding complexity and process to work plans when the department and City are working with less resources and employees would be a challenge, but one worth meeting.

Gustin noted that the process for removing shade trees is articulated in the state statute and a primary point in this ordinance is to provide a defined community process.

Cahill chimed in that it also allows for it to be staff-led in the way that integrating the process with a body allows for diverse and robust dialogue. He feels there could also be space for community process and engagement with mourning the loss of trees, like honoring them with other plantings.

Comai agreed that having a really active tree board on the Conservation Board will be helpful in the future to have an open public discussion about what the tree team is doing and for presenting their yearly plans and long-term goals. He continued that he has heard of communities who review every public tree that might be taken down and shared that this would not be helpful here. He shared that his team often runs into situations where there's a storm-damaged tree and they make the decision on the spot when they respond to the call if the remainder of the tree needs to come down because it is a public safety issue. Comai continued by reflecting on how he and his team feel the impacts of all of the ash removal in the Old North End every day, noting that they're out there caring for and growing the trees. He shared that they have been planning for this for 8 years and have been planting new trees ahead of removals as much as possible, including planting 214 trees in Wards 2 and 3, in addition to other trees since then across all of the Wards.

Lantieri asked if his team is aware of where they will be planting and removing every year.

Comai answered for the most part, yes, and that they have been very systematically removing ash trees since 2024, which included removing all of the ash in one area at the same time to streamline the process. He shared they are currently aware of some larger, older trees that looked okay last year but will need to come down this year due to drought conditions and sidewalk replacement work. He continued that outside of things like that, removals aren't always known ahead of time, especially when storm or vehicle damage is involved. Comai shared that they do know in advance where they will be planting and shared that they currently have a list of 110 locations that could be planted this fall. He noted that their policy is to plant a new tree in a removal location within a calendar year if the site is viable. He closed by sharing that yes they have a work plan but it can change daily with incoming See Click Fixes and emergency calls consistently coming through.

Lantieri thanked him and reiterated that the Tree Board will be a great venue to see what the work plan is while also understanding the pieces can that ebb and flow.

Gustin chimed in that the next step will be to update the draft to its final form to be approved by the Conservation Board, this body and then City Council, ideally in September and October.

4.2 Trail System Review

Cahill opened by sharing that the Department is on the cusp of kicking off some of our trail system maps of the parks and coming to this body to review system alignments with the trails has been a helpful step in this process. He noted that trails have been ranked highly as a beloved and vital asset within the park system, so anytime there is work being done to align those trails, forest stewardship and system development can come along with it, which is why giving the Commission a chance to be involved and ask questions is so important. He continued that while they're not expecting controversy, but when and if there is community dialogue, having the support of a space where that can happen is helpful for the staff doing the work. Cahill noted that while this is a bit of alignment of a process it is also celebrating getting better wayfinding for the parks system. He closed by sharing that the plans in the packet were all guided by safety, sustainability and accessibility, which is how these trail system changes are developed. Schmidt introduced himself and explained that in his role as Conservation Field Coordinator, he oversees the natural areas and trails and conservation projects happening in those areas. He reiterated what Cahill noted about safety, accessibility and sustainability and shared that they don't actively make changes to trail plans by looking through the lens of user conflict, unsafe conditions or ecologically unsustainable conditions, which all prompt trail changes. He continued that because they are doing this new wayfinding thing, they wanted to make sure there are trails that they want to put on maps and for people to know about. He then shared the Leddy Park map, noting that there are a lot of social trails that have bisected the 2 main trails. He noted that this is an area of user conflict so the hope is to take an area with old social trails and put a little more attention into it, recognizing that there are a lot of people who walk there but now there are a lot of bikers because of the bike park. He continued that they want to do work preemptively to make sure that each of the user groups feel like they have a space that is safe and accessible and where there can be different types of experiences on the trails. He continued that with all of this in mind, he is proposing 2 separate trails, a pedestrian and a multi-use trail, going the same directions and closing the little cross social trails to eliminate all of those intersections. He noted that this would involve minimal trail development, but give folks a nice option for walking. Schmidt then shared that something they do now when building trails is purposely slow the flow of traffic of all kinds, which is done so that multiple user groups can use the trail safely. He continued by noting that this is in a lower priority ecological zone of Leddy Park. Schmidt then brought everyone's attention to another trail connecting to Leonard Street that community members have been asking for for a long time. He shared that he has been working with Madalinski from the Planning Team and that it would be an incredibly easy spot to put a trail in and it would be a really nice access point for the community. Schmidt then touched on Kieslich Park, noting that they will not be changing the trails that are present, but have rehabilitated some old social trails that

had become overgrown and will be adding in a wayfinding kiosk. Next he showed the Arms Forest map, noting that no changes will be made to this trail system either, but the already approved trails map will be on the kiosk that has been installed at the meadow. Mobley shared that Arms Forest was mentioned on her tour of the new high school, which she felt was extremely positive and exciting.

Schmidt shared that he worked with a BHS YES class to rehabilitate the trail that runs from the high school into the forest, which was just a first step in more thoroughly integrating BHS students into that forest system and having them play a role in the stewardship of it.

Cahill noted that there was some minimal disturbance to the forest during construction and the school district was great about working with us on how to restore different pieces of it. He continued that there's aspirational intention to have students help with that restoration work over time.

Schmidt continued by touching on Oakledge, noting that a majority of the social trails at Oakledge are not safe, accessible or sustainably built, so the goal is to close those, especially the really dangerous ones that are very steep and eroded. He continued that part of that process will involve making the safe trails that they want to make the official trails more inviting to encourage use of those instead.

Davis asked how they close the social trails.

Schmidt answered that closing a popular social trail is a work in progress and involves brushing in to discretely dissuade use over time. He continued that the other trail at Oakledge that goes from the upper parking lot through the meadow, is a great birding area and one of the few areas in Burlington that could actually be ADA accessible with a durable surface that has the right grades to actually accommodate a wheelchair. He noted that these trails exist already, but are often wet so putting in something like a gravel path would make them accessible in many different ways. He shared that the trail map that would be posted at the site would ideally include these for future use.

Davis asked how this would all work with the budget.

Lewis answered that the Conservation team has been very creative coming up with ways to make lemonade out of lemons. He continued that they have the funds that are available and maximize them to the best of their abilities utilizing the talents they have on their full-time team, seasonal staff and volunteers. He noted that the trail system is not as incorporated into the capital budget program as much as it probably should be, which was identified through the budgeting processes. He feels there is opportunity to tie in some of these efforts to make sure there are appropriate funds for the build out of these capital goods.

Schmidt chimed in that everything in the proposal can be done in-house both by hand and machine, so it's more a matter of time and what we don't do when we do big projects like this.

Cahill noted that the permitting piece will take time and is something that needs to be explored.

Lantieri shared that this is all very exciting and could be a great opportunity to engage the public and volunteers.

Schmidt agreed, noting the positive experience so far with engaging the public in removing buckthorn from Oakledge Park.

Boehm made a motion to support the implementation and alignments needed to achieve the trail plans, Bergmann seconded.

All were in favor, none opposed.

4.3 Burlington Area Community Garden Program Appeal Body

Cahill opened by sharing a brief history of the community garden program, noting that the first site was opened in 1972 at Oakledge park for 1 year and then the idea of community gardens took hold across the US through a private endeavor, Garden Way Carts, who created community gardens to help sell their products via newsletters. Cahill continued that Tommy Thompson's efforts to create community gardens in the Burlington area came from these funds as a part of the back to the land movement, but were lacking any sort of longevity or infrastructure. He continued that eventually Garden Way got out of the business and they hired Larry Sommers from Eating Well Magazine helped these go from private endeavors to public, so in the early 80s it became a nonprofit that had a board. He shared that that board oversaw the community garden program for 4-5 years until they could not fund it anymore, and then Bernie Sanders, who was Burlington's Mayor at the time, made it a program through the Parks and Recreation Department. Cahill continued that the board became an advisory board through the transition and especially during those early years making sure the City held its promise but over time as the City investment into the program was becoming stronger, especially when things turned the corner to having Meghan O'Daniel in her role supporting the gardens, the advisory board eventually chose to disband. He shared that this has not been felt for the most part – there is a robust network of site leaders that Meghan supports and coordinates, who act as a larger body of thought partners and community gardeners. Cahill noted, however, that one specific and important function was lost in the disbanding of the advisory board – being an appeal committee in the event that someone is disinvited from the program and that those individuals have due process to appeal those decisions made by staff. Cahill noted that this is a very rare occurrence and we do our best to work with folks before it gets to this point, but are realizing this is a bit of a gap in the process and sometimes the conversation needs to extend beyond staff. He concluded that we are looking to the Parks Commission to provide that function in the event that there is an appeal where a gardener could come before you and be heard, which would put the board in a place to render a final decision.

Mobley asked if this had been run through legal. She also noted that this would provide a point of engagement, albeit somewhat challenging, which has been a goal of the current commission and there is value in that. She also shared curiosity about potential training opportunities in mediation for Commissioners to be able to participate in this comfortably.

Boehm felt that this was a good idea and agreed that there should be more process figured out. She then asked if there are other examples of this in other aspects of the City that could be referenced.

The group then discussed potential frameworks and policy for this process and the general agreement was to check in with the City Attorney's office next.

Davis asked how many site leaders there are and if they get paid.

Cahill answered that there are around 30 because we encourage more than 1 per site and they do not get paid.

Davis asked if they were the people monitoring the plots.

Cahill answered that yes, they are the first line of interpretation of the plot maintenance policy.

Mamo asked how often this happens.

Cahill answered maybe 3 times in the last 15 years.

The group then discussed how to proceed – noting that they are open to taking on this responsibility but would like to have this brought to the City Attorney's office and have a policy in place.

Boehm made a motion to accept the role of the appeal body for the BACG program for cases that require due process for participants of the program contingent on Parks staff providing a policy and process for the Commission to follow, Mobley seconded.

All were in favor, none opposed.

4.4 Calahan Park – Upcoming Updates

Madalinski began by explaining that he was at the meeting to give the Commission some updates on projects in different stages of design completion that are expected to go into construction at Calahan Park in the next year. He began by speaking to the courts, sharing that they put out an RFP in the spring of 2025 for the design of a bioretention basin, the reconstruction of the basketball and tennis courts and a tree trench stormwater feature that would go in between the two sets of courts, all of which were in the comprehensive plan. He continued that around the same time, the department applied for an LWCF grant with the hopes that it would fund all of this, which was expected to cost roughly in the \$1.2 million range. He then shared that after they got through their contracting and had the design engineer onboard, they learned that they had not gotten the LWCF grant and the official cost estimate came back at closer to \$2 million. All of this resulted in the Planning Team peeling back pieces that the comprehensive plan had initially included, like a large retaining wall near the basketball courts and all of the stormwater pieces, and taking them out of the scope. He continued that this led them to potentially building just 1 basketball court instead of 2. Madalinski also shared that they also did some creative moving around of bond funds so that all of the courts can still be built at the same time and to hopefully put lighting in for each of them. He continued that by peeling back the scope like they did, they are more in the \$700k to \$800k range now and they're just about ready to bring the drawings forward for permitting and to submit them to the zoning department. Because Madalinski was not able to share his screen, he then described what was included on the drawing he had been hoping to share: moving and building 1 basketball court with 10' fencing around it that would be lit, a connecting pathway between the basketball and tennis courts that connects to the new entrance, grading to make everything ADA accessible, one of the sets of 4 tennis courts will be converted into pickleball courts and all of the

tennis/pickleball courts will be lit and controlled by a timer. Madalinski shared his hope for feedback and thoughts on outreach to the community, especially about the lighting and noise considerations that go along with that.

Mobley suggested tabling at events to help get the information out could be a good approach and noted that doing this outreach is a good idea.

Madalinski then gave an update about the Calahan pathway, sharing that after hearing from neighbors about the various trees that were planned for removal, they worked with their design engineer and BED to make some changes so now the sugar maple, Norway maple and the pine tree next to the playground will remain. He noted that the pine tree will need to have some limbing done and BED will need to do some additional work to put another pole in and relocating some cables.

Lantieri shared that he feels the community will be pleased to hear that you all are responding to their feedback.

4.5 Commission Members & Ward Distribution

Lantieri asked everyone to share what Ward they were in.

Davis said she was in Ward 4.

Lantieri, Boehm, Bergmann, Mobley and Etter said they were in Ward 5.

Mamo said he was in Ward 2.

4.6 Comprehensive Plan Update (Intern Surveying Overview)

Holmes introduced herself, sharing that she was one of the Parks Planning interns, and explaining that she would be presenting the Commission with an update on what they have been up to this summer. She continued that they have been gathering community input in parks in support of PlanBTV 2050, specifically in regards to the revision of the BPRW comprehensive plan, which fits into that, noting that they especially focused on the waterfront (Starr Farm, Oakledge and Waterfront Parks) which did not get an in depth look for the 2015 plan. She then shared that over the course of 10 weeks they conducted 15 minute passerby counts in those locations and on the Greenway, noting whether people were passive or active and their demographics. This enabled them to model an average week day and weekend day in each of these locations from 8am – 8pm. She shared that they also conducted 175 interviews in these parks and at events in other locations to gather more individual feedback. Holmes then noted their guiding questions – who is using the parks, how do people use the parks and what do people love the most about the parks/what do they wish was different? She then shared some of their findings: toddlers, youth and seniors were overrepresented in comparison to the overall demographics of BTV, seniors were equally distributed amongst the locations while toddlers and youth were more present at Oakledge and Starr Farm, Oakledge had two times as many passive park users than active while Starr Farm mainly had active users, people spent more time at Oakledge than other parks with over 80% of survey respondents there saying they planned to spend over an hour at the park, more people at Oakledge and Starr Farm were coming from home compared to a higher number of people treating Waterfront Park as more of a stop in their day instead of the destination, around 60% of the people at Waterfront Park were from out of town

(destination location) with people from 15 states represented and some people from Canada as well, and over half of the people at Oakledge were from out of town but relatively close by (regional park) while 80% of people surveyed at Starr Farm were from the New North End (neighborhood park). Holmes then polled the group to see which park they thought had the most visitors, the answer being Oakledge. She then shared a graph of the number of visitors to each park by the hour as well as a different graph showing how people got to the parks noting that Oakledge had the most people who came by car, Starr Farm had the most people who came through their own power (biking/walking) and Waterfront had the most different modes of transport, including public transit and boat. Holmes continued that with this data, a deeper picture of each park and how they are used can be painted. She reiterated that Oakledge tends to have younger users engaged in passive activities and is used more like a regional destination for things like swimming, picnics and lawn games, while Waterfront Park is used like an extension of downtown and functions more like a square or a plaza for visitors to Burlington and Starr Farm is used as a neighborhood park for New North End residents. She summarized that changes to the parks should begin with recognizing what they already are and how they are used and can be used to make informed decisions and help determine how to spend resources. Holmes then touched on comment themes throughout the process, noting that most comments were positive and the ones that were negative were mostly about unhoused people in parks, but with the understanding of the complexity of the problem. Holmes then shared that Greenway users shared that they felt it was a “treasure” and a “critical resource for the city”. Holmes then shared that people were overall very happy with the recreational facilities available and felt a sense of community through events such as Juneteenth and Leddy Beach Bites. She mentioned that many people were interested in more bathrooms and waterfountains throughout the park system. Holmes then shared some direct quotes from folks surveyed and what it was like to interact with people in the parks over the summer. She then shared that their next step will be synthesizing this data and writing a report so that it can be used by the Department. The Commissioners shared their excitement about this process and the data gathered.

5. Standing Items

5.1 Parks Foundation Update

Lantieri noted that the Pomeroy playground opening happened, which was a big milestone for the Parks Foundation and their Playgrounds for All campaign. He then shared that they are a separate non-profit that raises money specifically for park projects, and in this case, playground equipment. He continued that the Parks Commission has a member that attends their meetings, which he has been doing, but he became an official member of the Parks Foundation at the last meeting so he asked others to consider being the Parks Commissioner who attends. Lantieri then asked if anyone attended the Pomeroy playground opening. Lewis shared that he attended and that it went well with a lot of positive feedback and energy. He thanked the YMCA for joining the event and bringing children over to use the

new playground. He gave kudos to the Planning Team for putting all of those efforts together.

Mamo shared that he attended the opening and that he and his family use that playground and park daily.

Lantieri thanked all who were involved and thanked the Parks Foundation for the generous donation that made it happen and for continuing to fund the Playgrounds for All campaign.

5.2 Director's Report

Lewis referenced the report and also highlighted the City's July 3rd event, BPRW and PACC engagement with the resolution that was recently passed at City Council, additional conversations in the Ordinance committee around e-motos and measures that staff are taking in the field, summer programming wrapping up and fall programming starting soon and that there will hopefully be a Leddy Manager hired soon.

Mobley noted that in reference to the Burlington Forward resolution, she feels that there is a juxtaposition that she understands but hopes that the cuts that were made to the department in 2025, which were deep and impactful, are not forgotten as engagement and responsibilities are potentially being added with fewer resources to support what is already being done. She continued that she hopes there will be space to have bigger conversations about this.

Lewis shared his appreciation for that and noted that he's confident that the Council recognizes that and is taking that into consideration.

5.3 Commissioner's Items & Volunteer Hours

Lantieri shared that he's been focused on volunteer engagement and will be meeting with Cahill and O'Daniel later this week. He had 25 hours to report since the last meeting.

Davis had 3 hours to report visiting parks, gardens and the bike path.

Etter had 1.5 hours to report.

Mobley had 5 hours to report for various Plan BTV meetings.

Mamo shared that since he had taken his oath at the end of July, he focused on the Pomeroy Playground opening and getting a feel from the community of what is working and what might not be in that park. He also noted that he's a daily bike commuter and uses the Greenway daily and has experienced some of the e-moto issues. He also met with Lewis prior to the meeting. He had 3 hours to report.

Bergmann had 2 hours to report.

Boehm didn't have any hours to report, but noted that she's organizing a get together for Champlain parents who are becoming Edmunds parents, and will be getting food from the new vendor at Oakledge.

Lantieri thanked everyone and brought up reviewing Commissioner roles, noting that this is the time for nominations and to vote on the vice chair and chair roles. He continued that if anyone is interested in the roles that it will be discussed and voted on at the next meeting.

Boehm noted that while she is technically Vice Chair and is more than happy to continue in the role, she is not trying to position herself for the Chair position so invited anyone who may be interested in that to explore stepping into the role.

6. Motion to Adjourn

6.1 Motion to adjourn

Boehm made a motion to adjourn, Bergmann seconded.
All were in favor, none opposed.