



Town of Ashland, *Office of Conservation*

MEETING MINUTES
ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION
March 2, 2026

1
2
3
4
5
6 Present: Gregory Wands (Chair)
7 Carl Hakansson (Vice Chair)
8 Owen Ackerman
9 Preston Crow
10 Gene Crouch
11 William Moulton (Attended Remotely)
12 Gabriel Toledo
13

14
15 Agent: Becca Solomon
16 Assistant: Sofia Chrisafideis
17

18 Meeting held in person in the Select Board Room and remotely via zoom
19 Call to order: 7:00 P.M.
20

21 **Chair Gregory Wands read the Ashland Conservation Commission virtual meeting protocols, and meeting**
22 **recording announcement. Mr. Wands announced that the Conservation Commission was implementing a**
23 **three-minute limit for each resident comment per hearing.**
24

25 **Notice of Intent, 10-60 Main Street, Map 14 Parcel 128, SLV Ashland, LLC, % Lucas Environmental, LLC, DEP**
26 **95-1018**
27

28 The Applicant representatives all appeared remotely for this hearing.
29

30 Mr. Hakansson stated that this is the first hearing for 10-60 Main Street, known as the Mill Buildings, and
31 that this meeting will set the guidelines for future meetings for this project. Mr. Hakansson summarized that
32 the proposal site is across the street from the current meeting location, and consists of about 250 residential
33 units with some commercial space. Mr. Hakansson summarized that Massachusetts General Law Chapter
34 sets forth the 40B process for building affordable housing, allowing the applicant to circumvent local Bylaws
35 and present a comprehensive plan to the Zoning Board of Appeals if a certain percentage of the proposed
36 development is reserved for affordable housing. Mr. Hakansson continued, that the Zoning Board of Appeals
37 has approved the comprehensive plan for this project and has set forth conditions to be met by the
38 Applicant. Mr. Hakansson continued, that the Conservation Commission has limited jurisdiction and can only
39 look at how this application adheres to the State Wetlands Protection Act and Massachusetts Stormwater
40 Standards Handbook, not local Bylaws.
41

42 Mr. Hakansson asked if Christopher Lucas (Wetland and Soil Scientist, Lucas Environmental LLC, representing
43 the Applicant and appearing remotely) and John Kucich (Engineer, Bohler LLC, Representing the Applicant
44 and appearing remotely) have been authorized by the applicant to answer questions presented by the
45 Commission. Mr. Lucas confirmed. Mr. Hakansson explained that he will be going through five stipulated
46 facts for this proposal, and asked that Mr. Lucas and Mr. Kucich either confirm or deny those stipulated
47 facts. Mr. Hakansson stated that approximately 95% of the site is within floodplain (Stipulated Fact #1).
48 Mr. Kucich responded that he does not know the exact number, but agreed that a substantial amount of the
49 site is located within floodplain. Mr. Lucas agreed with Mr. Kucich. Mr. Hakansson stated that the
50 Conservation Commission has jurisdiction over the activities that alter a floodplain (Stipulated Fact #2).
51 Mr. Kucich and Mr. Lucas agreed. Mr. Hakansson stated that the site and buildings have historically flooded
52 (Stipulated Fact #3). Mr. Kucich responded that the site has flooded, but was not aware of the buildings
53 flooding. Photos of the Mill Buildings during the Flood of 1955 were shared, showing that the buildings have
54 historically flooded. Geoff Engler (SLV Ashland, LLC, Applicant, appearing remotely) asked that the photos
55 are shared with the applicant team, and stated that he cannot authenticate these photos at the time and
56 will not stipulate to anything they have not seen before this evening. Mr. Lucas asked if dates from each of
57 these photos are available. Mr. Hakansson responded that the photos were taken in 1955. Mr. Engler asked
58 if there is evidence of the buildings flooding within the past 50 years. Mr. Hakansson responded that that
59 will be looked into, and that the stipulated fact presented was that historically, these buildings have flooded.
60 Mr. Engler responded that they will stipulate that a significant portion of the property is within floodplain,
61 and will investigate the photos further and provide a response at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Lucas added
62 that the storm event from 1955 can be looked into further and that as a part of the Order of Resource Area
63 Delineation (ORAD) process, it was assumed that the building did not flood [Scribner's Note: the ORAD
64 certified the flood line at the 187-foot elevation, which includes the building]. Mr. Hakansson stated that the
65 site is contaminated (Stipulated Fact #4). Mr. Engler responded that they are comfortable stipulating that
66 there are reportable materials on site. Mr. Hakansson stated that the site is within 100- and 200-foot
67 Riverfront Area (Stipulated Fact #5). Mr. Lucas agreed, and added that the site is a historic mill complex, and
68 there are certain performance standards and exemptions for certain portions of the site.

69
70 Mr. Hakansson stated that there are four main topics for discussion that the Commission will go through:
71 contamination (Release Abatement Measures (RAM) Report); Stormwater; Floodplain; and
72 Wetlands/Riverfront Area. Mr. Lucas suggested that floodplain and wetlands/riverfront area be combined
73 into one hearing. Mr. Hakansson responded that he does not disagree, however, should see how those
74 discussions go first. Mr. Hakansson requested that the applicant team provides an updated RAM report, and
75 that the Commission believes that the current RAM report is invalid. Mr. Lucas responded that the Licensed
76 Site Professional (LSP, hazard response professional) on the site and that MassDEP reviewed the first RAM
77 report completed in December 2022 and had a series of comments and was later revised in response to
78 those comments, status reports are required every 6 months, and that the most recent status report that
79 the Commission was provided a copy of was conducted in January of 2026 which is valid. Mr. Lucas
80 continued, that MassDEP has indicated to the LSP that the earthwork is likely more than a year away, the
81 applicant will have to provide an updated report to MassDEP in order for earthwork to be approved to
82 begin, and that if there are any additional records that the Commission would like to have on record, they
83 can provide that before the next hearing. Ms. Solomon clarified that an email received by the Conservation
84 Office from MassDEP on February 13, 2026 stated that, as RAM activities were not conducted within a one-
85 year period, the pre-existing RAM Plan will need to be closed and a new RAM report should be submitted in
86 the future. Mr. Lucas clarified that a new report will have to be resubmitted, but will not be done now to
87 reduce duplication of effort, as earthwork is still more than a year away. Mr. Lucas added that the LSP is
88 planning to attend the meeting. Mr. Hakansson stated that he received an email that MassDEP has sent to
89 the LSP that the RAM Completion Statement should be submitted by March 13th. Mr. Hakansson added that

90 the Commission will be asking for the RAM Report to be peer-reviewed, and wants to make sure they have
91 the correct version before that happens. Mr. Lucas asked that and any future correspondence with MassDEP
92 on this matter is shared with the applicant team.

93
94 Mr. Hakansson stated that the Commission is also requesting a peer review for Stormwater, a peer review
95 for Wetlands, in addition to the RAM Report. Mr. Engler responded that, in general, they do agree to a peer
96 review for wetlands, stormwater, and floodplain, but would prefer one peer review to review those three
97 items, that scopes of services and estimates are provided for 3 qualified respondents. Mr. Hakansson
98 responded that they are in the process of getting proposals and service scopes for the peer reviews.
99 Mr. Lucas asked which firms they are in correspondence with so that they may avoid any potential conflicts
100 of interest. Mr. Hakansson responded that for the sake of time, that can be discussed offline. Mr. Engler
101 asked why a peer review should be required for the RAM Report, as that is not jurisdictional to the
102 Conservation Commission, in his opinion. Mr. Hakansson responded that, as contamination is within
103 floodplain, the contamination aspect of the proposal would be jurisdictional to the Conservation
104 Commission. Mr. Engler responded that a full review of the RAM Report is not agreeable. Mr. Hakansson
105 responded that the Conservation Commission does have jurisdiction over contamination as that is a risk to
106 environmental health. Mr. Engler responded that he can discuss further with the application team, and
107 would like to review the proposal scopes for the wetlands, floodplain, and stormwater reviews. Mr. Crouch
108 explained that the Conservation Commission is responsible for ensuring that no contamination migrates into
109 the Sudbury River or wetlands during construction, and is the reason why the RAM report is jurisdictional to
110 the Conservation Commission and that remediation work will be taking place within floodplain, which is
111 jurisdictional to the Conservation Commission, as agreed to in Stipulated Fact #2. Mr. Hakansson explained
112 that MassDEP is looking at remediation, whereas the Conservation Commission is concerned with the
113 impact to resource areas. Mr. Hakansson asked that all correspondence between the Applicant,
114 Representatives, LSP, MassDEP, and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are shared with the
115 Commission in relation to the RAM Report as the documents should be provided as a part of their
116 application and be a part of their record. Mr. Lucas agreed.

117
118 Mr. Hakansson stated that the Commission is also requesting a site visit. Mr. Lucas asked if the Commission
119 has a preference. Mr. Hakansson stated that Saturday mornings are best. The Commission and the applicant
120 team discussed a potential site visit date. The Commission, Mr. Lucas, and Mr. Kucich agreed to a site visit at
121 9:30am on March 21, 2026. Mr. Hakansson asked that a subsequent meeting date be scheduled, and that at
122 that subsequent hearing, Mr. Lucas and Mr. Kucich can provide a presentation on the proposal. Mr. Lucas
123 agreed. Mr. Hakansson added that they will be listed 2nd on the agenda.

124
125 Mr. Dasoni, 119 Main Street, asked if the buildings will be resistant to flooding, and why the applicant is
126 hesitant to agree to the RAM Report peer review. Mr. Hakansson responded that the floodplain will be
127 discussed in-depth at a subsequent meeting, and that the RAM Report explains what is currently
128 contaminating a site and how it will be remediated, and is usually handled in entirety by MassDEP, however,
129 as the site is within floodplain, contamination is jurisdictional to the Conservation Commission due to risks
130 regarding environmental health.

131
132 Ms. Nardone, 86 Eliot Street, stated that the Rivers Act Exemption for Historic Mills exists to readapt or
133 restore historic mills, not demolish them, and asked why there would be an exemption for a proposal that
134 will demolish the mill building. Ms. Nardone asked that a representative from the State with expertise in
135 historic mills and the exemption standards/requirements attend a future hearing. Mr. Hakansson responded
136 that the Commission will have a discussion regarding that issue in great length going forward.

137

138 Mr. Hakansson asked if they have reached an agreement on the next hearing date. Mr. Lucas confirmed, and
139 asked that at the next meeting, they can expect to present the project summary and answer resident
140 inquiries. Mr. Hakansson confirmed. Mr. Lucas asked that the order of discussion will be as was presented
141 by Mr. Hakansson. Mr. Hakansson agreed.

142
143 **Motion:** Mr. Toledo moved to continue the hearing for the Notice of intent at 10-60 Main Street, Map 14
144 Parcel 128, SLV Ashland, LLC, % Lucas Environmental, LLC, DEP 95-1018 to Monday, March 16th, 2026, at
145 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

146 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GT, GW)

147

148 **Mr. Hakansson left the meeting room.**

149

150 **Mr. Wands called for a five-minute recess.**

151

152 **Mr. Hakansson returned to the meeting room.**

153

154 **Mr. Wands ended the recess session.**

155

156 **Notice of Intent, 61 Waverly Street, Map 15 Parcel 12, The Gutierrez Company, DEP 95-1016**

157 William Park (Senior Civil Engineer, SMMA) introduced Israel Lopez (Applicant, The Gutierrez Company) and
158 Mark Arnold (Wetland Scientist, Goddard Consulting) summarized that the last hearing was held on
159 February 2nd and shortly afterward, and a response package was submitted by the applicant team to
160 comments made by GCG Associates (Representing the Conservation Commission) and a subsequent package
161 responding to comments submitted by the Conservation Agent. Mr. Park added that a 3rd review package
162 was received today from GCG detailing about 20 comments, and that a majority of those comments made
163 are agreeable, and that there are two or three items left outstanding. Mr. Crouch asked that Mr. Park goes
164 through comments that have yet to be resolved. Mr. Park summarized that it is of the opinion of the project
165 team that the 100-year storm event post-construction peak discharge rate (PDR) for the design point (DP)
166 encompassing the Waverly Street Culvert (DP-1) is not a substantial increase, and asked if the Commission
167 would like that increase in 1.15 CFS to be addressed. Mr. Crouch stated that the PDRs submitted on a
168 revised sheet dated March 2, 2026 does not show an increase. Mr. Park responded that those rates were
169 provided today in response to GCG's 3rd round of review comments, and that those numbers resulted from a
170 revision in the stormwater design system that is, in his opinion, overengineered, increasing the stormwater
171 infiltration basins to 4X their previously-proposed size, and that he is asking the Commission if they want
172 that 1.15 CFS to be captured. Mr. Carter (GCG Associates) explained that the Commission has made it clear
173 that they do not want to see an increase of stormwater leaving the site, and the applicant has been asked to
174 achieve that. Mr. Carter continued, that 1 CFS for a 100-year storm translates to about 8 gallons per second,
175 which may not seem like much for one storm, however, can be calculated to result in roughly
176 350,000 gallons of water over a 2-hour period, which is a significant amount of water. Mr. Carter added that
177 the applicant team currently has two options, either increase the size of their stormwater infrastructure, or
178 conduct an analysis of the entire drainage area to show that 1 CFS is insignificant. Mr. Crouch responded
179 that it is currently unknown what that 1 CFS means relative to the drainage area. Mr. Park asked if there is a
180 percentage of their project contribution that would be acceptable to prove that there would be no impact to
181 the downstream resource areas. Mr. Crouch asked which structures are being increased 4X larger. Mr. Park
182 explained that the subsurface system nearest to the driveway would have to be enlarged 4X its previously
183 proposed size. Mr. Hakansson stated that he is concerned with the cumulative effect in the culvert area, and
184 that there is a proposed house directly downstream of that culvert. Mr. Park clarified that there have been
185 several mentions that the stone-box culvert is connected to the wetlands resource areas delineated for

186 proposal at 90 Waverly Street, and that a brief GIS analysis shows that the culvert discharges onto 68
187 Waverly Street. Ms. Solomon responded that the culvert does discharge directly onto 68 Waverly Street,
188 however, water does travel downstream and onto the property of 90 Waverly Street. Mr. Park agreed with
189 that synopsis, and added that the bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) delineated as a part of the Notice of
190 Intent (NOI) for 90 Waverly Street is not connected to the culvert in question. Mr. Park added that an offsite
191 drainage study could be conducted for three months or more, and is assuming that the Commission wants
192 to see no increases in post-development conditions. Mr. Crouch responded that the regulations state that
193 an increase is allowable, so long as the applicant can provide written proof that there will be no adverse
194 impacts to downstream resource areas, and asked for clarification which catch basins feed into the
195 subsurface infiltration system at the driveway. Mr. Park clarified that the subsurface detention system
196 collects water from two catch basins on the proposed driveway and the overflow from the surface level
197 infiltration basin, and the system discharges to Waverly Street, providing a new CB in the right of way and
198 replacing an existing CB with a DMH to serve as the interconnection point. Mr. Park added that the applicant
199 team is under the assumption that they have already provided proof that flooding will not occur on site.
200 Mr. Lopez asked if there is a point in replacing the existing RCP pipe in Waverly Street (extending from the
201 proposed driveway to the culvert), as the proposal now shows zero increases in runoff post-construction,
202 and they most likely would not be contributing any runoff to the stormwater system within the roadway.
203 Mr. Crouch responded that MassDEP has made it clear that no increase in peak discharge rates would be
204 allowed, and that there may be risk for appeal by MassDEP.

205
206 Mr. Park continued to go through their response to the 3rd GCG review. Mr. Park stated that they are relying
207 on third party testing of the Contech system, as provided by the NJCAT and have submitted the worksheets
208 provided by MassDEP for Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removals. Mr. Crouch asked about the efficiency of
209 the Contech system. Mr. Park responded that the design of the vortex unit in the structure utilizes a specific
210 sump depth, and that contractors use an inadequate sump depth to save money which contributes to an
211 ineffective system. Mr. Park added that the systems proposed have been upsized, and that there is an
212 internal bypass if flows exceed the capacity of the units. Mr. Hakansson explained that the Select Board and
213 residents alike are concerned that, after clearing the site, how can the Commission ensure that the property
214 and surrounding properties will not be flooded, and explained that the rate of runoff cannot increase after
215 the site is developed, and that the performance standards require that there can be no increase in runoff
216 leaving the site. Mr. Park added that there are two large infiltration systems proposed, and that those
217 systems infiltrate runoff contributed by a 10-year storm. Mr. Carter added that the net runoff leaving the
218 site under pre-development and post-development conditions is 3.18 CFS, prior to the revisions submitted
219 on March 2, 2026 by the applicant team. Mr. Carter explained that the applicant is meeting the intent, using
220 the macro-method (adding up all runoff calculations for each design point). Mr. Crow responded that
221 stormwater is leaving the site in all different directions. Mr. Carter agreed, and added that runoff drains into
222 the Sudbury River eventually, independent of the direction at which it leaves the site.

223
224 Mr. Crouch stated that the culvert under the road does not appear to be in good condition, and asked if the
225 applicant would consider rehabilitating it, such as relining from underneath the road. Mr. Crouch explained
226 that this would have to be evaluated for feasibility, and explained that the culvert would essentially be
227 sleeved with an HDPE pipe and voids grouted around the inlet and outlet to seal the rehabilitated portion
228 from the original culvert. Mr. Lopez responded that they have had some experience with that, and that with
229 a culvert already experiencing structural issues, there is a potential for rubble to pierce the HDPE pipe.
230 Mr. Crouch responded that the HDPE would be fully grouted to prevent that. Mr. Lopez responded that he
231 does not know if that is something they would consider. Mr. Hakansson explained that the drain line that
232 The Gutierrez Company has offered to replace eventually outlets into that culvert, and asked if they would
233 be amenable to rehabbing the culvert in some other alternative way, as opposed to a full replacement.

234 Mr. Lopez responded that they are unsure what that would look like, but can discuss with the team and talk
235 about this further at the next hearing. Mr. Lopez asked that the Commission can further discuss the culvert
236 and potentially draft conditions at the next hearing, and offered to send documentation regarding the
237 culvert prior to the next hearing. Mr. Lopez added that they have provided calculations for that culvert, and
238 a rehab would potentially require them to redo those calculations. Mr. Crouch responded that rehabilitating
239 the culvert with smooth HDPE could potentially increase the capacity of that culvert.

240
241 Mr. Wands opened up discussion to the public. No discussion was made.

242
243 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to continue the hearing for the Notice of Intent at 61 Waverly Street, Map
244 15 Parcel 12, The Gutierrez Company, DEP 95-1016 to March 16, 2026 at 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded
245 by Mr. Crow.

246 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-1 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW) Mr. Toledo abstained.

247
248 **Member Prerogative:**

249 Mr. Hakansson confirmed the next hearing dates with Ms. Solomon.

250
251 **Meeting Adjournment:**

252 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

253 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GT, GW)

254
255 **The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 PM.**

256
257 **Documents Reviewed by the Commission:**

- 258 • Document entitled, Meeting Agenda, dated 3/2/2026
- 259 • Document entitled, Agent Report, dated 3/2/2026
- 260 • Document entitled Notice of Intent, 10-50 Main Street, dated 1/30/2026
- 261 • Document entitled, Affidavit of Service, dated 2/6/2026
- 262 • Document entitled, Abutter's Receipts, N.D.
- 263 • Document entitled, Notice of Intent Addendum, 10-60 Main Street, dated 2/16/2026
- 264 • Plan entitled, 10-50 Main Street, Civil Permit Plans, dated 12/18/2025
- 265 • Document entitled, Release Abatement Measure Report, 10-50 Main Street, dated 1/2026
- 266 • Document entitled, 10-50 Main Street Drainage Report, dated 12/18/2025
- 267 • Document entitled, 10-60 Main Street, Flood of '55 Photos, dated 1955
- 268 • Document entitled, Town of Ashland, Mail – MassDEP NOI File No., dated 2/20/2026
- 269 • Document entitled, 61 Waverly Street NOI, dated 10/29/2025
- 270 • Plans entitled, 61 Waverly Street Drawings, dated 10/29/2025
- 271 • Document entitled, Signed ConCom Letter to ZBA, 61 Waverly Street, dated March 2025
- 272 • Document entitled, Town of Ashland, Mail – ConCom Letter Regarding 40B Waiver Requests 61
273 Waverly St, dated 10/23/2025
- 274 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, Beals and Thomas, 61 Waverly Street, dated
275 12/1/2025
- 276 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, GCG, 61 Waverly Street, dated 11/24/2025
- 277 • Document entitled, Peer Review Draft Scope, SW Management and Drainage Infrastructure, N.D.
- 278 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Agent's 1/27/26 letter, dated 1/28/26
- 279 • Document entitled, Agent's Response to Applicant's 1/22/26 Response, dated 1/27/26
- 280 • Document entitled, Applicant's Initial Response to Agent's Comments, dated 1/22/26

- 281 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to GCG Peer Review Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 282 • Plan entitled, Revised Site Design Plans, dated 1/22/26
- 283 • Document entitled, 25 Year pipe sizing, dated 1/22/26
- 284 • Plan entitled, Bedrock contour plan, dated 1/22/26
- 285 • Document entitled, Contech water quality unit sizing calculations, dated 1/22/26
- 286 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 287 • Document entitled, Existing Waverly Street 12-in RCP Capacity, dated 1/22/26
- 288 • Document entitled, Infiltration System WQV, dated 1/22/26
- 289 • Document entitled, Peak discharge rate summary, dated 1/22/26
- 290 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 291 • Document entitled, Recharge and drawdown, 1/22/26
- 292 • Document entitled, SDS-1 Buoyancy Calculations, 1/22/26
- 293 • Document entitled, TSS Removal, dated 1/22/26
- 294 • Plan entitled, Existing hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 295 • Document entitled, O&M Manual, dated 1/23/26
- 296 • Plan entitled, Proposed hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 297 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Beals and Thomas, dated 1/22/26
- 298 • Document entitled, Revised Wetland Flags, dated 1/23/26
- 299 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Agent's 1/27/26 letter, dated 1/28/26
- 300 • Document entitled, Agent's Response to Applicant's 1/22/26 Response, dated 1/27/26
- 301 • Document entitled, Applicant's Initial Response to Agent's Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 302 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to GCG Peer Review Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 303 • Plan entitled, Revised Site Design Plans, dated 1/22/26
- 304 • Document entitled, 25 Year pipe sizing, dated 1/22/26
- 305 • Plan entitled, Bedrock contour plan, dated 1/22/26
- 306 • Document entitled, Contech water quality unit sizing calculations, dated 1/22/26
- 307 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 308 • Document entitled, Existing Waverly Street 12-in RCP Capacity, dated 1/22/26
- 309 • Document entitled, Infiltration System WQV, dated 1/22/26
- 310 • Document entitled, Peak discharge rate summary, dated 1/22/26
- 311 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 312 • Document entitled, Recharge and drawdown, 1/22/26
- 313 • Document entitled, SDS-1 Buoyancy Calculations, 1/22/26
- 314 • Document entitled, TSS Removal, dated 1/22/26
- 315 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 316 • Document entitled, O&M Manual, dated 1/23/26
- 317 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 318 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Beals and Thomas, dated 1/22/26
- 319 • Plan entitled, C-101 Revised Existing Conditions Plan, dated 1/22/26
- 320 • Document entitled, Revised Wetland Flags, dated 1/23/26