

**Maryland Environmental Trust  
Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes  
June 2, 2025**

This meeting was held in person at 100 Community Place Third Floor, Room 3.218 (MHT Boardroom) Crownsville, MD 21032,  
and virtually via Google Meet at: [meet.google.com/sze-ynpy-wdk](https://meet.google.com/sze-ynpy-wdk),  
and by telephone conference call at:  
1-662-639-4221 PIN: 612 785 050#

**Trustees Present:**

Gary Burnett, Chair  
Lori Lynch, Vice Chair  
Thomas (Toby) Lloyd, Secretary  
Mark Hoffman, Treasurer  
Keith Colston  
Julia King  
Diana Conway  
Megan Benjamin  
Crystal Chissell  
Megan D'Arcy  
Craig Highfield  
Hillary Bell (representing the Governor of Maryland who is an ex-officio trustee)  
Delegate Natalie Ziegler (representing the Speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates who is an ex-officio trustee)

**Trustees Absent:**

Nathan Volke  
Alice Chalmers

**Others Present:**

John Turgeon, Director, Maryland Environmental Trust (MET Staff)  
Paul Peditto, Assistant Secretary of Land Resources (MD Department of Natural Resources)  
Josette Markline (MET Staff)  
Wendy Foster (MET Staff)  
Cindy Hoffmann (MET Staff)  
Kelly Price (MET Staff)  
Matt Ludington (MET Staff)

Michelle Grafton (MET Staff)

Dan Skalos (MET Staff)

Kevin Bull (MET Staff)

Cynthia McCann, Assistant Attorney General (Office of Attorney General)

Talley Kovacs, Assistant Attorney General (Office of Attorney General)

Mandee Heintz

Tom Prevas

Kathy Pontone

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Burnett called the regular meeting of the MET Board of Trustees to order at 4:06 p.m.

**II. Minutes of the May 5, 2025 Regular Meeting**

**Chair Burnett asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees held on May 5, 2025. Mr. Lloyd motioned to approve the minutes; Ms. Lynch seconded the motion. All voted in favor**

**Chair Burnett asked for a motion to change the order of the Agenda, moving Section V, Item 4 before Section V, Item number 3. The motion was moved by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Ms. Conway. All voted in favor.**

**III. Board Chair's Report**

Chair Burnett opened the floor for discussion on the nomination of David Satterfield from the Eastern Shore Land Conservancy to serve on the MET Advisory Council. There was no discussion.

**Chair Burnett asked for a motion to approve David Satterfield to serve on MET's Advisory Council. Ms. Conway and seconded by Mr. Hoffman. All voted in favor.**

Mr. Turgeon noted that Mr. Satterfield will serve on MET's Land Trust Outreach Committee, representing Forever Maryland.

Chair Burnett announced that the Board Meeting outing to be held at the Royce Hanson Conservation Park in Poolesville, MD will take place on Wednesday, June 25th at 10:00. The Park's Project Manager will be on-site to talk about the current and future state of the

project. Lunch will follow at a local restaurant. Further details will be forthcoming via email from Chair Burnett.

**IV. Director's Report**

Mr. Turgeon updated the Trustees on the recent projects that MET staff has been working on. He stated that MET expects this fiscal year will be another record year for easement monitoring reports completed. Mr. Turgeon informed the Trustees that, at the September regular meeting, he will review the FY25 Managing For Results (annual performance report) provided to DNR's Executive Staff and the Maryland Department of Budget and Management.

Mr. Turgeon thanked the dedicated MET staff for their hard work and also MET's legal counsel for providing tremendous support.

**V. Committee Reports**

**A. Lands**

Ms. Benjamin reported that the Committee met on May 21, 2025 to review the items on the Consent Agenda.

Consent agenda - Lands Committee recommendations to approve new conservation easements to MET.

- a. Stiles Colwill and Jonathan Gargiulo to MET, 117.51 acres in Baltimore County
- b. Stiles Colwill and Jonathan Gargiulo to MET, 8.1 acres in Baltimore County
- c. Eccleston Land Company to MET, 45 acres in Baltimore County

Approval of actions affecting existing MET easements.

- d. Request for modification to the Second Amendment and approval of an addition to and renovation of an historic protected residence (MET file #0797QUI04.ANNE).

**Ms. Benjamin asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as stated above. Mr. Lloyd moved to approve it; Mr. Colston seconded. All voted in favor.**

Mr. Skalos gave an update on the easement projects in progress and their status. Mr. Skalos reported that MET expects 13 easements, totaling about 1,300 acres, to be recorded by the end of FY26. There are a number of additional projects waiting to be started. He specifically called attention to one in Montgomery County. The 700-acre

Property is an old coal fire power plant, of which, about 200 acres are heavily industrialized. The owners have expressed interest in placing a conservation easement on the remaining acres and allowing access to the public.

Ms. Markline reported that Stewardship staff has been performing on-the-ground monitoring visits, catching up with new successor landowners, and checking on potential violations. Since the approval of MET's Easement Enforcement Policy, at the last meeting, staff have been working on putting together a summary of active violations and their status. Ms. Markline stated that they are pushing to get as many on-the-ground monitoring visits conducted as possible. She reported that she has been working with a contractor to assist in making the database more efficient in managing stewardship activities. She noted that the Stewardship Team will begin sending follow-up monitoring letters in the next few weeks.

Ms. Markline referred to Agenda Item 4 "Request for approval of activity on existing MET conservation easement 0458BLA98.KENT". This item was not placed on the original Consent Agenda as the information for the request was not received from the landowner in time to be presented at the recent Lands Committee. The request is in reference to planting a buffer along a waterway. Ms. Markline gave an overview of the request.

**Chair Burnett moved to approve the planting of a buffer along the waterway on Easement 0458BLA98.KENT; Mr. Highfield seconded. All voted in favor.**

Mr. Turgeon referred to Agenda Item 3 "Stewardship matter on existing MET conservation easement 0525IRV00.BACO". He noted that the Lands Committee considered this matter at its last meeting and recommended to the Board that it affirm staff's determination that the Irvine Nature Center ("Irvine") is in violation of its conservation easement. Since that meeting, MET has continued to review the following stewardship issues:

1. Wedding and event rentals on The Irvine Nature Center's property
2. Plans for construction of a building

Mr. Turgeon stated that this is a stewardship matter that is planned for the Board's discussion in a closed session with counsel.

He noted that MET had taken no formal action, and no violation notice had been sent to Irvine, and that discussions had taken place only among the staff and at the Lands Committee meeting.

Chair Burnett opened the floor to anyone who wished to speak on the matter.

Mandee Heint and Tom Prevas, legal counsel on behalf of the Irvine Nature Center (“Irvine”), presented Irvine’s views on why wedding and event rental activities are allowed under the conservation easement, and provided their interpretation of the easement’s terms.

Kathy Pontone, legal counsel for Caves Valley Land Trust, which co-holds the conservation easement with MET, was also present. She gave Caves Valley Land Trust’s perspective on why wedding and event rental activities on the property violate the easement’s terms as prohibited commercial activity.

Ms. Heint and Ms. Pontone answered questions posed by Ms. Conway.

### **Closed Session**

At 4:50 p.m., Mr. Colston moved to go into a closed session, seconded by Ms. Lynch. All voted in favor. Megan Benjamin and Craig Highfield recused themselves from the closed session. The meeting was closed under the Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article, §3-305(b)(7) to consult with counsel to obtain legal advice. The topic discussed was the status of the Irvine stewardship matter and options moving forward in light of MET staff’s and the Lands Committee’s recommendations. MET staff set up a breakout session in Google Meet where only MET Trustees, counsel, and staff were in attendance.

Trustees present for the discussion were Gary Burnett, Board Chair, Mark Hoffman, Keith Colston, Hillary Bell, Crystal Chissell, Megan D’Arcy, Lori Lynch, Julia King, Toby Lloyd, Diana Conway, and Ex-Officio Trustee Del. Natalie Ziegler.

John Turgeon, MET Executive Director, Josette Markline, Stewardship Manager, Kevin Bull, Easement Stewardship Specialist, Dan Skalos, Conservation Easement Program Manager, Matt Luddington, Conservation Easement Planner, Cindy Hoffmann, Technology and Records Manager, Kelly Price, Administrative Director, Wendy Foster, Easement Monitoring Specialist, Michelle Grafton, Outreach and Engagement Program Manager; and Cynthia McCann and Talley Kovacs, Assistant Attorneys General, were also in attendance..

At 5:42 p.m., on motion by Del. Ziegler, seconded by Mr. Colston, the Board members in attendance unanimously adjourned the closed session and reconvened in open session.

**Open Session:**

Chair Burnett stated that during the closed session, the Board discussed where the Irvine stewardship matter was in the process and potentially how it wanted to move forward, and he reiterated that no decisions were made. He offered the opportunity for the Board to ask questions or address anything else on the matter. No further discussion ensued.

Chair Burnett moved to take legal counsel's advice and to delegate to the Executive Director and staff of MET to work with Irvine Nature Center and Caves Valley Trust to discuss the potential easement violation and whether an agreement could be reached to move the stewardship matter forward, and to have the Director provide a review of those discussions at the next Board meeting on September 8, 2025, when the Board would have further discussion. Delegate Ziegler seconded. All voted in favor, except for Megan Benjamin and Craig Highfield who abstained.

**B. Land Trust Outreach**

Ms. Grafton reported that staff is wrapping up fiscal year end projects and organizing beginning similar projects for the next fiscal year. Some of these projects are communications, land trust assistance and education, working with our partners on reviewing and submitting co-held monitoring reports, and addressing issues as a result of those. Ms. Grafton reported that 559 co-held reports have been reviewed and processed for calendar year 2024. Starting in July, MET will begin reviewing and processing co-held monitoring reports conducted during the first half of calendar year 2025.

Ms. Grafton noted that MET held its land trust roundtable on May 15, 2025 on how Maryland's land mapping tools support conservation strategy. There were about 50 people in attendance. Presentations were given by units within the Department of Natural Resources, as well as the Maryland Department of Planning. More details can be found on MET's website.

Ms. Grafton stated that the Land Trust Outreach Committee did not meet in June but are planning to meet over the summer. A new Committee Chair will be appointed at that meeting.

**C. Governance**

Mr. Lloyd noted that there are two votes this evening.

**Mr. Lloyd asked for a motion for the approval of the fiscal year 2026 Board Roster as distributed in the Board Packet prior to the meeting. Chair Burnett moved; Ms. Lynch seconded. All voted in favor.**

**Mr. Lloyd asked for a motion to approve adding Alice Ewen to MET's list of recommended Trustees. Ms. Lynch moved; Ms. Benjamin seconded. All voted in favor.**

#### **D. Finance**

Mr. Hoffman referred to the four documents distributed prior to the meeting:

1. MET Balance Sheet as of April 30, 2025
2. Budget vs. Actuals: FY25 July 2024 - April 2025
3. Revised MET Budget FY 2026 MET Board Administered funds
4. Letter from the MET Chair to Governor Moore re: Maryland the Beautiful Act funding

**Mr. Hoffman asked for a motion to approve the financial statement ending April 30, 2025 as distributed in the Board Packet prior to the meeting. Delegate Zeigler moved; Chair Burnett seconded. All voted in favor.**

Mr. Hoffman noted that the Finance Committee strives to target about 4% of the money under the Board-Managed funds for distribution to MET as its annual operating budget. Mr. Turgeon and his team generally utilize a bit under that amount. This year, the allotted allowance is about \$156,000. The funds were expanded some this year to incorporate an increase to the Keep Maryland Beautiful grants that MET administers. Mr. Hoffman noted that Kelly Price and John Turgeon managed to move some funding for information technology to State funding.

**Mr. Hoffman asked for a motion to approve the FY 26 budget for MET's Board-managed funds. Chair Burnett moved; Delegate Ziegler seconded. All voted in favor.**

Mr. Hoffman informed the Board that MET wants to keep the statutory provisions of the Keep Maryland Beautiful Act in front of the Administration and the Budget Committee of the General Assembly. Mr. Hoffman proposes drafting a similar letter to the one submitted in previous years to accomplish this goal.

**Mr. Hoffman entertained a motion to approve the submission of a letter from MET Chair to Governor Moore re: Maryland Beautiful Act funding as distributed in the Board Packet prior to the meeting. Delegate Ziegler motioned; Chair Burnett seconded. Ms. Bell abstained from voting. All other Trustees voted in favor.**

**E. Ad-hoc Committee Re: Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project**

Mr. Lloyd stated that there is nothing to report.

**VI. Other Business**

No other business was brought before the Board.

Mr. Burnett thanked legal counsel and all Trustees for their attendance and participation over the last Fiscal Year.

**VII. Adjourned**

**Chair Burnett called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Delegate Ziegler moved; Ms. D'Arcy seconded. All voted in favor.**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

The next regular Board meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2025.



Maryland Environmental Trust  
Board of Trustees Open Meeting Minutes  
June 2, 2025

**CONFIDENTIAL CLOSED SESSION MINUTES**

**Trustees Present:**

Gary Burnett, Chair

Lori Lynch, Vice Chair

Thomas (Toby) Lloyd, Secretary

Mark Hoffman, Treasurer

Keith Colston

Julia King

Diana Conway

Crystal Chissell

Megan D'Arcy

Hillary Bell (representing the Governor of Maryland who is an ex-officio trustee)

Delegate Natalie Ziegler (representing the Speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates who is an ex-officio trustee)

**Trustees Absent per Recusal:**

Megan Benjamin

Craig Highfield

**Staff Present:**

John Turgeon, Director, Maryland Environmental Trust (MET Staff)

Paul Peditto, Assistant Secretary of Land Resources (MD Department of Natural Resources)

Josette Markline (MET Staff)

Wendy Foster (MET Staff)

Cindy Hoffmann (MET Staff)

Kelly Price (MET Staff)

Matt Ludington (MET Staff)

Michelle Grafton (MET Staff)

Dan Skalos (MET Staff)

Kevin Bull (MET Staff)

**Legal Counsel:**

Cynthia McCann, Assistant Attorney General (Office of Attorney General)

Talley Kovacs, Assistant Attorney General (Office of Attorney General)

There were deliberations in setting up the meeting room including considering Mr. Peditto's participation in the closed session as a designee of the Secretary of DNR. Mr. Peditto did not participate in the closed session.

Ms. McCann had prepared and distributed before the meeting a legal memorandum addressing Irvine Nature Center's ("Irvine's") past and proposed activities on the property under the terms of the conservation easement to which the property is subject. She asked if any Board members had questions regarding the legal advice and recommendations in the memorandum.

Mr. Hoffman raised a question about how the support activities are defined. Ms. McCann read the relevant sections and Exhibit H from the Conservation Easement, which provide that the Support Activities are not an all-inclusive list; the easement allowed for Support Activities to change over time.

Chair Burnett asked whether, if a new support activity were to be developed, Irvine had an obligation to seek approval of the activity by MET and other interested parties. Ms. McCann stated no approval is required, but the activity must be in support of Irvine's mission.

Ms. Conway questioned whether the easement language in question is standard. Ms. McCann responded that the language is unique to this easement and property.

Mr. Colston asked whether catering is considered a commercial business. Ms. McCann's opinion was that it is. She noted that there may be events where refreshments are potluck style but that would be something to be researched by the Stewardship Team in order to get a better understanding of how those support activities were being conducted. She noted that Irvine requires use of approved caterers. Mr. Colston pointed out the terms "fundraiser" and "donations." He asked if a fundraiser can be such that there is a set price for an event that is continuous. Assume there is a set price for weddings, and the caterer is connected to the wedding, then Irvine adds an opportunity for fundraising. Would that be considered a fundraiser or is that constituted as having an event where you are charging a specific price for it, and it is continuously taking place. Ms. McCann stated that there is a distinction to draw where Irvine holds a fundraiser to raise awareness and is catering the event and inviting people to come to it but they are not charged. Ms. McCann further stated that there are a lot of activities that we can come up with as hypotheticals that may or may not be allowed under the easement. Ms. McCann reviewed the section in the easement specifically pertaining to catering.

Ms. D'Arcy noted that Irvine has been conducting these types of events since the early 2000's and staff are only now bringing them to the Board's attention. Events may not be impacting the easement and MET was not aware of the events until the co-holder made a

complaint. Ms. D'Arcy expressed wanting to see the parties come to an agreement, noting that the weddings are somewhat of a fundraiser because they are providing funds to Irvine to maintain operations. She noted another easement property where MET allows for this. She did not agree with Irvine building a concrete pad and breezeway to accommodate weddings but noted that there is some room for MET to come to an agreement with Irvine that allows maintaining MET's relationship with them and for Irvine to earn some income.

Ms. McCann reiterated the purpose of having the closed session is to receive legal advice about the easement's terms. Topics such as stewardship matters, should take place in open sessions. Ms. McCann pivoted to her recommendation in the legal memorandum distributed prior to the meeting. She stated that, in light of additional information received since delivering the memorandum to the Board, as well as some push back on the process, that her recommendation has changed. The way that staff was advised to proceed was to avoid litigation brought against MET by Irvine. For example, the Lands Committee and the Board were brought in on the process rather than leaving it up to a single staff member to interpret a violation of easement terms, which is different from a dumping violation, for example.

Ms. McCann clarified that her recommendation was for the Board to postpone the vote on the Lands Committee's recommendation which was to affirm the staff's determination that there was a violation of the easement. Instead, the Board could consider a vote to:

- express the Board's concerns about issues under the easement which are (1) the extent of the use and (2) what has been the process for the additional construction; for example, has the Irvine complied with all requirements, what are the plans, has the Irvine consulted with the MD Historical Trust?
- include delegating to MET's Director and staff, the ability to collaborate with Irvine in working towards a resolution on these issues, short of litigation.

Ms. McCann recommended that, after more information was obtained and reviewed, the matter should again be addressed at the September regular Board meeting.

Discussion continued relating to whether certain legal arguments could be successful against MET. Legal counsel advised that generally enforcement activity is not a factor in an easement interpretation case, but it could impact MET's reputation and could be viewed as MET treating Irvine differently from other easement properties.

Ms. Chissell questioned whether public vs. private events would be treated differently? She also queried whether potential litigation should affect MET's decision making. Ms. Kovacs stated that when she advises MET, the threat of potential litigation is taken into

consideration because a court decision could negatively impact future easement law in the State of Maryland.

A circuit court judge unfamiliar with conservation easement law could misinterpret easement terms or potentially rule that free use of land common law should apply, and that landowners should be able to do what they want on land under easement unless specifically restricted. She stated that other states have taken a more adversarial stance to push the law. We have not done that in Maryland. MET considers reputation, donor interest (continuing to donate easements to MET), and the legal landscape for enforcing and acquiring easements, generally.

Ms. King repeated Ms. Chissell's question about public events versus private events. Chair Burnett answered by stating that there is no difference and they are given the same considerations.

Ms. King referenced a comment during the open session in which Irvine was attempting to categorize everything as educational programming. She wondered whether there is a line somewhere that is meaningful for the Board in terms of holding weddings with a theme of educating the attendees about nature. Ms. McCann stated that there is a continuum of uses and purposes and certain uses under the definitions that are allowed under this easement, and that the easement was not necessarily unambiguous, which is why Irvine has been undertaking event rentals.

Delegate Ziegler asked whether the Bordy easement is significantly different from the Irvine easement. Ms. Kovacs noted that the Bordy easement has not been reviewed in connection with the Irvine matter, but her understanding is that Bordy's easement is unique. She explained that some easements have "carve-outs" where a portion of the property is not placed under easement because MET is aware that the landowner's intention is to use that portion for something that would not fall under normal easement terms. When the Irvine easement was placed with MET, there were no structures on the property, but instead rights were reserved to construct two structures plus accessory structures. As of today, there are thirteen accessory structures by Stewardship staff count. The main buildings are the nature center, and the barn and storage facility. The language at issue is that Irvine must consult with MET, the Caves Valley Land Trust, and the Maryland Historical Trust in its development of all permitted structures. Permitted structures are the nature center, and the barn and storage facility but there is also language in the easement allowing for improvement, repair and alteration of the buildings. The question is whether a free-standing structure joined by a walkway is an alteration?

Delegate Ziegler asked whether MET or the DNR Secretary had received a letter from Senator Hettleman regarding the Irvine matter. Legal counsel confirmed that a letter was received in which due process concerns were raised.

Ms. McCann asserted that MET has responded to the due process concerns raised:

- (1) MET has given the stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns to the Board. Irvine has had ample opportunity to present its arguments and to supply information. A meeting took place between counsel for MET, CVLT and Irvine.
- (2) MET is not an administrative body. It does not weigh evidence, or apply standards and rules to facts related to an applicant seeking approval for some use of their property. There is no appeal process involved.
- (3) MET is complying with the Open Meetings Act, and it is allowing comment by interested parties

Ms. Conway questioned whether there is a mechanism in place requiring the landowner to report improvements or changes on property to MET, or if there is something to encourage communication between the landowner and MET about events on a regular basis. Legal counsel responded that it is difficult to predict what kinds of issues might arise when writing a conservation easement but that those mechanisms could be kept in mind for future conservation easements containing non-standard terms.

Mr. Turgeon spoke about uses landowners can apply for under the Temporary Commercial Use Agreement and pointed out a specific easement giving a brief description of the terms of temporary use agreement entered into for that easement.

Delegate Ziegler asked questions about Irvine's financial situation. Legal counsel advised that financial information could be obtained as part of MET's stewardship information gathering sessions with Irvine.

Mr. Hoffman started to give an overview of the history of the Irvine property. He noted that it was state owned property that was gifted to Irvine, a multi-million-dollar property, at no cost. Ms. McCann reminded the Board that factual topics could be discussed in open session.

Chair Burnett sought a motion to adjourn the closed session and return to open session to act on legal advice received. Del. Zeigler moved to adjourn the closed session, seconded by Mr. Colston. All present voted in favor. The closed session ended at 5:42 p.m.

**COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST**  
**FOR MEETINGS SUBJECT TO THE MARYLAND OPEN MEETINGS ACT \***

Name of public body Maryland Environmental Trust Date of Meeting: 6/2/2025

1. ☒ Did you give "reasonable advance notice" and keep a copy or screenshot?
2. ☒ Did you make an agenda available when notice was posted, or, if not yet determined, as soon as practicable, but at least 24 hours before the meeting?
3. ☒ Did you make arrangements for the public to attend?
4. ☒ Is someone prepared to keep minutes in writing or, otherwise, to run the equipment for minutes in the form of live and archived video or audio streaming?
5. ☒ If part of this meeting might be closed to the public, have you first:
  - ☒ Made sure that the public body has designated a member to take training in the Act?
  - ☒ Made sure that the topic to be discussed falls entirely within one or more of the "exceptions" that allow the closed session? (see the other side for the list)
  - ☒ Given notice of the open meeting to be held right before the closed session, so that the presiding officer can hold the required public vote to close?
  - ☒ Made sure that the initial open meeting will be attended by a member designated to take training in the Act, and, if a designated member cannot attend, made sure that the public body is ready to complete this compliance checklist at the open meeting and keep it to attach to the minutes?
  - ☒ Equipped the presiding officer to prepare a written statement with the required disclosures? (for a model form with instructions, go to <http://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/Pages/OpenGov/Openmeetings/default.aspx>)
  - ☒ Equipped the presiding officer to limit the closed session discussion to the exceptions and topics cited on the written closing statement?
  - ☒ Arranged for closed-session minutes to be kept and adopted as sealed?
  - ☒ Equipped someone in the closed session to keep a record of each item of information that must be disclosed in the minutes of the next open meeting? (for the list, see the model closing statement).
  - ☐ For a meeting recessed to hold a closed administrative session, arranged to disclose, in the minutes of the next open meeting, the date, time, and place, persons present, and subjects discussed?
6. ☒ Have you arranged for the preparation, the adoption as soon as practicable, and posting online if practicable, of minutes of the open meeting, including summaries of any prior closed sessions, and this form (when required), completed on this side?

*\*This checklist is designed for general use as well as for use at open meetings of public bodies that hold closed meetings, when a member designated for training cannot attend the initial open meeting. See GP § 3-213(d). Like the earlier checklists, this checklist gives general guidance, does not guarantee "compliance" with every provision of the Open Meetings Act, and will be revised occasionally.*

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO CLOSE SESSION  
(THE FIFTEEN "EXCEPTIONS")  
General Provisions Article § 3-305(b)**

- (1) To discuss the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of an appointee, employee, or official over whom this public body has jurisdiction; or any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals;
- (2) To protect the privacy or reputation of an individual with respect to a matter not related to public business;
- (3) To consider the acquisition of real property for a public purpose and matters directly related to the acquisition;
- (4) To consider a matter that concerns the proposal for a business or industrial organization to locate, expand, or remain in the State;
- (5) To consider the investment of public funds;
- (6) To consider the marketing of public securities;
- ✓(7) To consult with counsel to obtain legal advice;
- (8) To consult with staff, consultants, or other individuals about pending or potential litigation;
- (9) To conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters that relate to the negotiations;
- (10) To discuss public security, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to the public or to public security, including: (i) the deployment of fire and police services and staff; and (ii) the development and implementation of emergency plans;
- (11) To prepare, administer, or grade a scholastic, licensing, or qualifying examination;
- (12) To conduct or discuss an investigative proceeding on actual or possible criminal conduct;
- (13) To comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter;
- (14) To discuss, before a contract is awarded or bids are opened, a matter directly related to a negotiating strategy or the contents of a bid or proposal, if public discussion or disclosure would adversely impact the ability of the public body to participate in the competitive bidding or proposal process.
- (15) (Eff. 10/1/18) To discuss cybersecurity, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to:
  - (i) security assessments or deployments relating to information resources technology;
  - (ii) network security information, including information that is: 1. Related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a governmental entity; 2. Collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or 3. Related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity; or
  - (iii) deployments or implementation of security personnel, critical infrastructure, or security devices.

**PRESIDING OFFICER'S WRITTEN STATEMENT FOR CLOSING A MEETING ("CLOSING STATEMENT")  
UNDER THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT (General Provisions Article § 3-305)**

This form has two sides. *Complete items 1 – 4 before closing the meeting.*

1. **Recorded vote to close the meeting:** Date: 6/2/25; Time: 4:50PM; Location: 100 Community Pl  
Crownsville MD 21032 /  
Googlemeet;  
Motion to close meeting made by: K. Colston Seconded by L. Lynch;  
Members in favor: All in Favor; Opposed: N/A;  
Abstaining: N/A; Absent: \_\_\_\_\_.

2. **Statutory authority to close session (check all provisions that apply).**  
**This meeting will be closed under General Provisions Art. § 3-305(b) only:**

(1)\_\_\_\_ "To discuss the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of appointees, employees, or officials over whom this public body has jurisdiction; any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals"; (2)\_\_\_\_ "To protect the privacy or reputation of individuals concerning a matter not related to public business"; (3)\_\_\_\_ "To consider the acquisition of real property for a public purpose and matters directly related thereto"; (4)\_\_\_\_ "To consider a matter that concerns the proposal for a business or industrial organization to locate, expand, or remain in the State"; (5)\_\_\_\_ "To consider the investment of public funds"; (6)\_\_\_\_ "To consider the marketing of public securities"; (7) ☒ "To consult with counsel to obtain legal advice"; (8)\_\_\_\_ "To consult with staff, consultants, or other individuals about pending or potential litigation"; (9)\_\_\_\_ "To conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters that relate to the negotiations"; (10)\_\_\_\_ "To discuss public security, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to the public or to public security, including: (i) the deployment of fire and police services and staff; and (ii) the development and implementation of emergency plans"; (11)\_\_\_\_ "To prepare, administer, or grade a scholastic, licensing, or qualifying examination"; (12)\_\_\_\_ "To conduct or discuss an investigative proceeding on actual or possible criminal conduct"; (13)\_\_\_\_ "To comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter"; (14)\_\_\_\_ "Before a contract is awarded or bids are opened, to discuss a matter directly related to a negotiating strategy or the contents of a bid or proposal, if public discussion or disclosure would adversely impact the ability of the public body to participate in the competitive bidding or proposal process." (15)\_\_\_\_ "To discuss cybersecurity, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to: (i) security assessments or deployments relating to information resources technology; (ii) network security information . . . or (iii) deployments or implementation of security personnel, critical infrastructure, or security devices."

**Continued →**



3. For each provision checked above, disclosure of the topic to be discussed and the public body's reason for discussing that topic in closed session.

Citation (insert # from above)	Topic	Reason for closed-session discussion of topic
§3-305(b) (7)	Irvine Nature Center	For the Board to receive legal advice related to a potential easement violation.
§3-305(b) ( )		
§3-305(b) ( )		
§3-305(b) ( )		
§3-305(b) ( )		

4. This statement is made by [Signature], Presiding Officer.

\*\*\*\*\*

**WORKSHEET FOR OPTIONAL USE IN CLOSED SESSION: INFORMATION FOR SUMMARY TO BE DISCLOSED IN THE MINUTES OF THE NEXT OPEN MEETING. (See also template for summary.)**

- For a meeting closed under the statutory authority cited above:

Time of closed session: 4:50 PM

Place: Google meet and 100 Community Place Crownsville MD 21032

Purpose(s): For the Board to receive legal advice related to an easement issue.

Members who voted to meet in closed session: \_\_\_\_\_

\* Persons attending closed session: T. Lloyd, K. Colston, M. D'Arcy, C. Chissell, L. Lynch, D. Conway

Authority under § 3-305 for the closed session: (b)(7)

Topics actually discussed: A stewardship matter under the terms of the CE.

Actions taken: N/A

Each recorded vote: N/A

- For a meeting recessed to perform an administrative function (§ 3-104): Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Place: \_\_\_\_\_

Persons present: \_\_\_\_\_

Subjects discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

\* H. Bell, J. Twgeon, W. Foster, N. Ziegler, M. Luddington, M. Grafton, K. Price, G. Burnett, M. Hoffman  
D. Skalos, J. Markline, C. Hoffmann, C. McCann, T. Kovacs, K. Bull, J. King

**TEMPLATE FOR CLOSED-SESSION SUMMARY  
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE MINUTES IN THE NEXT OPEN MEETING  
(General Provisions Article § 3-306(c))**

**Instructions:** When a public body meets in a session closed under § 3-305 of the Open Meetings Act, it must disclose the following four sets of information in the minutes either of its next open session or in the minutes of the open session that it held that day, so long as the public knows to look there. This template provides a checklist for the required information. The worksheet at the bottom of the model closing statement contains a shorter form of the same checklist. Use of these forms is optional; the formatting of the summary is up to the public body so long as the public body includes the required information in its minutes at the required time.

The four sets of information required by § 3-306(c) are:

1. A statement of the time, place, and purpose of the closed session.
2. A record of the vote of each member as to closing the session.
3. Statutory authority to close session.
4. A listing of the actual topics of discussion, persons present, and each action taken in the session.

**SUMMARY OF CLOSED SESSION HELD ON [DATE]**

**1. Statement of the time, place, and purpose of the closed session:**

Time of closed session: 4:50 PM

Place (location) of closed session: 100 Community Pl Crownsville, MD 21032/Google meet

Purpose of the closed session: For the Board to receive legal advice related to a potential easement violation

**2. Record of the vote of each member as to closing the session:**

Names of members voting aye: K. Colston, L. Lynch

Members opposed: N/A Abstaining: N/A

**3. Statutory authority to close session:**

This meeting was closed under the following provisions of General Provisions Art. § 3-305(b):

→ **Topic #1:** § 3-305(b) (7) → **Topic #2:** § 3-305(b) ( ) → **Topic #3:** § 3-305(b) ( )  
(add others as needed)

**4. Listing of each topic actually discussed, persons present, and each action taken in the session:**

Topic description	Persons present for discussion	Action Taken/Each Recorded Vote
#1: Irvine Nature Center	T. Lloyd, K. Colston, M. Darcy, C. Chissell, L. Lynch, D. Conway	None
#2:		
#3:		

\* H. Bell, J. Turgeon, W. Foster, N. Ziegler, M. Luddington, M. Grafton, K. Price, G. Burnett, M. Hoffman, D. Skalos, J. Markline, C. Hoffmann, C. McCann, T. Kovacs, K. Bull, J. King

September 24, 2018