



**TOWN OF BOURNE  
BOARD OF HEALTH  
24 Perry Avenue  
Buzzards Bay, MA 02532  
Phone (508) 759-0615 x1  
Fax (508) 759-0679**



Cynthia A. Coffin,  
Health Agent

**MINUTES  
JANUARY 11, 2012**

**Members in attendance: Kathy Peterson, Chairman; Stanley Andrews, Vice Chair;  
Don Uitti; Carol Tinkham  
Absent Members: Galon Barlow**

**Support Staff in attendance: Cynthia Coffin, Health Agent; Melissa Chase, Secretary  
Absent Support Staff: Carrie Furtek, Health Inspector**

**Meeting was called to order at 7 pm by Kathy Peterson.**

**1) 5 Bayside Lane: Bracken Engineering for Kenneth and Sandra Leibowitz: request  
for waiver to continue the use of existing septic for proposed renovations**

In attendance for this item was Zack Basinski, professional civil engineer for Bracken Engineering. Due to the site topography and existing plumbing within the structure, the house is serviced by two separate and functional septic systems. The first is located in the front of the property and is comprised of a 1000 gallon septic tank and 1000 gallon leach pit. System 2 was upgraded in 2009 and is comprised of 1000 gallon septic tank, d-box and (2) 500 gallon leaching chambers. The proposed project would renovate the inside of the dwelling, and add a 3- season, one story sunroom to the north side of the house. The proposed renovations will result in no change in bedroom count from the existing home. The original proposal was going to drop to 3 bedrooms, but the owners have opted to remain at 4. The net bedroom space will decrease by 3%; the non-bedroom space will increase by 37%; the total area of the structure will increase by approx. 20%. Since there is no increase in bedrooms on the lot, the nitrogen loading will remain the same at 9.7. Because of this, they are asking to maintain the existing septic systems and requesting a waiver from two resource areas. The first is the mean high water mark at Phinney's Harbor; the second is the coastal bank as defined by DEP. The setback request for System 1 from the high water mark is a 29' variance and from the coastal bank is a 110' variance. For System 2 they are requesting a 36' variance from the high water mark and an 80' variance from the coastal bank. Ms. Peterson questioned why there were two systems on the property. Ms. Coffin explained that an inspection showed that there were 2 systems, one to the front, the other to the side based on elevations and existing plumbing coming out of the home. When the Title transfer inspection was done (possible '08 or '09), the older system to the side failed, the front system passed. The failed system was upgraded and can handle 3 bedrooms. The front system also functions for 4 bedrooms. Ms. Peterson asked how many bedrooms there would be. Mr. Basinski said there are 4 existing and would remain at 4 with the proposed renovations. Ms. Peterson asked if there was a chart of neighboring properties and what they were asked to do with their systems. Ms. Coffin said no, but she acknowledged that she was aware of an alternative system up the street. Mr. Andrews pointed out that the nitrogen loading calculations in the existing house is listed out as 4

bedrooms; the proposed is listed out as 3 bedrooms. Mr. Basinski stated that the client was originally going to drop down to 3 bedrooms, but changed their mind and decided to stay at 4 bedrooms, keeping the nitrogen loading at 9.7. Mr. Andrews pointed out the proposal sent in was for 3 bedrooms. Mr. Andrews asked Ms. Coffin where the property was in relationship to the railroad tracks near Tahanto Road. She explained where it was in relationship to the resource. Ms. Peterson asked for clarification as to whether one system was in failure. It was explained that one system had failed and was upgraded in '09; the other was functioning properly as of the Title Transfer inspection in '09. Ms. Peterson was concerned that one system had not been inspected since 2009. Ms. Coffin said, if memory served her from looking at the report, there was very little staining in that first system. She pointed out that it could easily be opened and reinspected. Mr. Basinski pointed out that there may be a report in 2011 when the property was sold. Ms. Coffin felt that it may have been sold within the valid 2 year time frame of the report. Ms. Peterson had looked at the title at the registry of deeds and found that there were no transfers of ownership other than this one that would have resulted in a hearing before the Board. Ms. Coffin said that the upgrade in '09 was an in-office decision that didn't need a hearing. She confirmed with Mr. Basinski that the storage space on the existing floor plan was going away. Her other concern was the sunroom and its future use by other owners, and wanted a deed restriction that would disallow it being used as a bedroom. Mr. Basinski confirmed that it was calculated into the non-bedroom space, which made Ms. Coffin feel more confident of its use. Mr. Andrews asked if the front addition was also included in that calculation; Mr. Basinski said it was. Mr. Andrew was concerned with granting a waiver without denitrification so close to a resource. Ms. Coffin felt that the Board needed to be consistent in their judging, and that the plans fall into the parameters of bedroom/non-bedroom space, so it does meet the standards that are generally held. Ms. Peterson would like the front system checked before a decision is made. Mr. Andrews pointed out that the water line for the neighbor runs right through the soil absorption system. Ms. Peterson said that once the front system is checked, if it is found to be in passing condition, she had no problem moving forward without another hearing with Ms. Coffin's approval of the system. Ms. Coffin did not recall the neighbor's waterline; Mr. Basinski stated that it was drawn in from the old water records from the water department. Ms. Tinkham questioned why this request had to come before the Board when it seems to fall within the guidelines; Ms. Coffin said that because they were asking for variances from the resources that, by law, the abutters need to be notified at a public hearing.

**Ms Peterson moved to approve 5 Bayside Lane for Kenneth and Sandra Lebowitz through Bracken Engineering (floor plans received January 3, 2012, septic plan received January 3, 2012): approval of a 40' setback for system 1 and a 70' setback for system 2 from the coastal bank, and a 121' setback for system 1 and a 114' setback for system 2 from the high water mark. Addition conditions are that system 1 be checked before being signed off by the office; deed restriction to 4 bedrooms total on the house regardless of how many systems are functioning on the property, red stamped by the office when the system is checked. The waterline needs to be properly relocated on the plan. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**2) 29 Bell Buoy: Bracken Engineering for Matthew Cusick: request for waiver to continue use of existing septic for proposed renovations.**

In attendance for this item are Zack Basinski, professional civil engineer for Bracken Engineering and Paul Cusick, father of home owner Matthew Cusick.

Mr. Basinski stated that the property is a developed single family lot comprised of two dwellings located near Hen's Cove in Pocasset. The main home is a 2 bedroom dwelling; the second is a 1-bedroom cottage/bungalow. The main house is serviced by an existing septic system comprised of a 1000 gallon tank and 1000 gallon leach pit. There currently is no record of where the cottage is tied into, but it is assumed that it is tied into the existing system. They are looking to demolish the

existing cottage and reconstruct it on the same location. It will be approximately 19 sq feet larger than the existing cottage, and moved slightly to conform to set backs from the property line. The project will keep the same number of bedrooms for house and cottage, thus nitrogen loading will be the same as existing conditions. They are requesting a waiver from two resource areas: approximately a 3' variance from the high water mark of Hen's cove and a 110' variance from the defined coastal bank. The plans have been reviewed and approved by Conservation and Preservation. The applicant has submitted a deed restriction to limit the main house to two bedrooms. Ms. Coffin stated that, if the Board approves the request, that the plumbing tie-in to the existing system at the cottage be verified. Mr. Basinski said that they have assumed it is tied in. Ms. Coffin expressed concern that it wasn't, that it may just go to a cesspool or other tank. The existing system is easily sized appropriately for at least 3 bedrooms, which would cover the house with the deed restriction to 2 bedrooms plus the cottage. Mr. Basinski said that it would be easily verified during deconstruction. Ms. Coffin wants to verify that the plumbing before she will sign off on the demo/reconstruction permit. If it is not tied in, it needs to be done properly and any old cesspool pumped, collapsed and filled in. Ms. Peterson wants it worded that the office needs to be satisfied that the cottage is properly tied in and any old system is properly decommissioned. Mr. Basinski stated that the intention is for the cottage to be tied into the existing system, and he was comfortable with the stipulation of shutting down any old system found.

**Mr. Andrews made motion to grant a waiver to continue use of the existing septic system at 29 Bell Buoy (site plan and architectural received January 3, 2012) with a total 3 bedroom deed restriction combined for house and cottage; variance for 110' variance from the coastal bank and 3' variance from the high water mark; and that the office be satisfied with the connection of the cottage to the existing system and any old systems properly decommissioned. Ms. Tinkham seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Peterson reiterated to Mr. Basinski that he was to call the office once he got into the cottage system and saw where it was, and suggested that he may want to inform Donovan Construction of the approval letter and conditions.

(Item 3 postponed to allow involved parties to arrive)

#### **4) Discussion re: enforcement options**

Ms. Peterson brought up the issues recently encountered over the summer that involved pools and other health/safety issues at private residences. She felt that the Board members and office staff were not "on the same wavelength" as far as fines are concerned and the best way to issue and collect those fines (tickets; issue cease-and-desist order; contact Town Council). She felt that no vote was necessary this evening, but that starting the conversation now and coming up with something by springtime that says the Health Office will use "x/y/z" as means of collecting. It is important to have consistency, regardless of the recipients' reaction/non-action towards the fine. Ms. Peterson wanted the Board and Office to think about it and will have it on the agenda again in a few meetings from now for discussion and vote. Ms. Coffin explained that the issue is complicated. The Board of Health fine regulation was drafted in 2004 and amended in 2008 to allow the issuance of a fine of \$100.00 for a second violation, \$200.00 for a third violation and \$300.00 for any subsequent regulation. Ms. Coffin stated that there is also a section of the Town Bylaws that gives the Board the authority to fine under the Town regulations and Chapter 21D. It also allows the health agent with the agreement of the police to issue tickets for the department, which could be used as a backup. The current regulation gives the Board the right to have a hearing as has been done and the Health Agent sends a letter stating the Board issued fine. Ms. Coffin feels that it is "good in a way" because it allows the option for not going to Court to collect a fine in the hopes that the recipient will pay the fine and correct what needs correction. Ms. Coffin finds that, unfortunately, the letters are most often ignored. Written in the regulations

as well is Chapter 21D, under the enforcement section, which states that the Board can have a hearing and vote at a meeting or can use the provisions of 21D, which is considered non-criminal disposition. It can still be done in the \$100, \$200, \$300 fine increments because of the wording that each day's offense is a separate violation. Ms. Coffin felt that, after talking to Police Chief Dennis Woodside, the major benefit of the 21D ticketing is that the recipient generally won't want to go to Court, so they come in and pay the money to the Town, and the money actually goes to the Town. If it goes to Court (if the ticket is not paid or is appealed), the Court will often settle for Court costs, and the time/effort may be lost. She felt that, while it was essentially the same to send a letter or issue a ticket, ticketing may be taken more seriously because it is a formal legal document. She felt that recipients may be more likely to pay the ticket as opposed to responding to a letter. When it is a case where the office has a license that can be revoked, a letter is effective because there is some leverage. But, with private property violations, there is no real leverage or incentive to respond. She felt that these cases may be better served by the 21D ticketing. Ms. Peterson felt that the ticketing, if paid, does at least go to the town and will help compensate for the time the office puts into the violation. Mr. Andrews asked if the Agent and Inspector are authorized to issue the tickets. Ms. Coffin said the Town Bylaw does authorize them to do so under 21D enforcement. Mr. Uitti asked if there was a clause that if the ticket isn't paid that they will go to Court. Ms. Coffin confirmed this. Mr. Uitti felt this may be incentive enough for them to pay the ticket and correct the violation. Ms. Coffin felt that sometimes the desire to avoid Court has prompted her to write multiple letters of violation in hopes that the recipient will pay and correct the violation. Ms. Coffin said that she has spoken with the Building Inspector Roger Laporte (who issues 21d tickets for building code violations) and he feels that the 21D ticketing works great when it works, but is a waste of time and effort when it doesn't work. It can be frustrating, but the ticketing seems to have "more teeth" than just a letter. Mr. Andrews stated if the tickets are written under the bylaw, it is currently restricted to \$50. But, the Board's current violation increments are much higher. Mr. Andrews said that section 3.44 is all about public health, so he wondered if the Board had to petition the Bylaw Committee to allow for the different fine schedule. Ms. Coffin said that, as a member of the Bylaw Committee, she could propose that to the committee. Mr. Andrews said under Mass General Law, the BOH can set its own fees for permits and fines to a maximum limit. Ms. Coffin stated that she would present the wording of section 3.44 to the Bylaw committee for their review and approval, and it will come to Town Meeting for final approval. Ms. Coffin did feel that it would be confusing and that if she did ticketing right now, it would have to be at the \$50. Mr. Andrews said that was correct, and that does not conform to the current regulation fees. He would not feel comfortable converting to ticketing until such time as it is approved in the bylaws to allow use of the current fees. If it is not approved at Town Meeting to adopt as such, he would not be inclined to change to ticketing. Ms. Peterson stated that was why she wanted to start discussion now. Mr. Andrews felt that the Bylaw committee would have to get started on that soon, in order to get it in for Town meeting. Ms. Coffin said the committee would be meeting again in early February, and she would bring it forward to them. Ms. Peterson asked to move more discussion/possible vote on the subject to a meeting in March (either March 14 or 28, 2012).

**No action was taken on this item at this time.**

##### **5) Discussion re: process for emergency notifications to the Board**

Ms. Peterson brought this up due to a recent case of human rabies being discovered in an undisclosed town in Barnstable County. She "spent the weekend" worrying that it was in the Town of Bourne. Ms. Peterson says she knew that Ms. Coffin, of course, would call if it had actually been in Bourne. Mr. Andrews said that the Board could call an emergency session at any time for health related emergencies. Ms. Peterson understood that, but wanted to quickly go over emergency notifications procedures. Ms. Coffin apologized, but didn't feel it had been necessary to notify the Board in this particular situation because she knew that it was not in Bourne because

the Department of Public Health was not in contact with her, and never thought to notify the Board. Mr. Andrews said that he felt it would be helpful in these types of situations for the Board to know, even if it was a non-issue, so that the information was available should the public come to the Board members with questions. Ms. Coffin said that they could call the office as well if they felt they had questions. Ms. Coffin said that she would try to be more proactive with calling the Board in questionable situations.

**No further action was taken on this item.**

**6) Discussion re: existing Wind Turbine Regulations, comments from DEP and further BOH action**

Ms. Peterson stated that Ms. Coffin, on behalf of the Board, has made at least four requests to Town Council as to their thoughts on what DEP had said about Bourne's regulations, and has heard nothing as of yet. There has been one response saying they would get back to next week, and that was in early December. Ms. Peterson felt there was no sense in calling the Town Council's office because there has been no response. She just wanted to make sure the Board was aware that inquiries have been made and there has been no response. As far as Ms. Peterson is concerned, the regulations stand 100%, and feels that they are this town's response to wind turbines. Unfortunately, there has been an inquiry for clarification by the Board and the Health Agent on a letter received from DEP. She wanted it publically known that there has been no communication in regards to that inquiry. Ms. Peterson asked for any audience or Board questions/comments on the issue. Mr. Andrews pointed out that there had been a few grammatical corrections and that sort of thing, and he stated that he was appreciative of the feedback from DEP, but the information has been asked for from Town Council so that the questions could be readdressed. He felt that some of the documents were "living documents" that would be continually looked at in regards to public health and interests of the community. When someone gives feedback to that, he would like to be able to have good discussion on that, and that has not happened because of the lack of response from Town Council. Ms. Peterson said that there is clarification that is needed from Town Council, and feels that the Board must express displeasure with having been put off for so long.

**No further action was taken at this time, but Ms. Peterson requested that it be put back on for the next meeting. She also asked for Ms. Coffin to forward to the Town Manager and the Selectmen the dates and requests of these inquiries to Town Council, and to express the Board's frustration. She also asked that Town Council be asked to be in touch with the Board and/or appear before the Board with their input.**

**7) Licensure status report for 2012**

Ms. Chase shared with the Board the statistics for BOH applications for licenses that expired on December 31, 2011. She felt the overall status was pretty good. Food applications, which include bakery, restaurant, retail food, catering, residential kitchen, and mobile food have about 8 or 9 outstanding out of 122; several of these are seasonal that generally will reapply closer to their opening in the spring. She has been in contact with the outstanding applicants to remind them of their need to relicense. Ms. Peterson pointed out that it is the applicant's responsibility to reapply and not the office responsibility to keep reminding them. Ms. Chase continued, saying that bed & breakfast licenses are in good shape and that the outstanding applications are for seasonal establishments that will reapply in the spring. Body art, motels and rubbish haulers are all at 100%. Septage haulers and septic haulers had a few outstanding, but many of the haulers/installers do not reapply until their first job of the year. Tobacco vendors had 2 outstanding, 1 of which is seasonal. At this point, licensing applications are all totaled at 78% complete. Ms. Peterson felt that was a great job for January 4<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Coffin said that when she started years ago, they would still be issuing licenses in May. Ms. Chase stated that, looking back

at last year, a lot of the establishments that were late in applying were responding faster with a simple reminder letter or phone call.

**3) Pocasset Mobile Home Park: Discussion and possible vote on license extension  
(taken out of turn to allow involved parties to arrive)**

Ms. Peterson had asked for PMHP to be put on the agenda, and had asked for Chuck Sabatt to be contacted. His presence was not required, but requested. Ms. Coffin said he had expressed intention to come. As Ms. Peterson understood it, Attorney Sabatt had not yet reapplied for a license for the PMHP. She understands that he is going through a lot at the moment, but the rules apply to everyone. If a license needs to be applied for, you are required to apply for that license on time, especially if the business is in use. A seasonal establishment is one thing; PMHP is not a seasonal business. It is in receivership, and the Board has tried to be understanding about the problems and issues involved with that. Ms. Peterson asked how the Board feels about talking about the possibility of not re-licensing the Park. Without some word from Mr. Sabatt as to how he is leaning with the recommendation to Suffolk Superior Court, Ms. Peterson does not feel comfortable with licensing more than 30 days at a time. Mr. Andrews pointed out that the Board had extended the 2011 license several times to carry through pending the Court decision, the last extension being until Dec 31 with several modifications approved by the Board in August. All that needed to be done was for Attorney Sabatt to apply for the license. He felt that Attorney Sabatt would do his best as the current receiver of the Park to do better than the previous operator. Mr. Andrews felt that Attorney Sabatt is doing a good job at the Park, and asked how many times he had been contacted about reapplying. Ms. Coffin said that she had not contacted him because she thought he had been extended until January 14 when the report to Suffolk Superior Court was due in. Mr. Andrews was more concerned that the license application be filled out and returned for the office to process. Ms. Peterson was more concerned with the Board thinking about how many days they want extend the license. She feels that if the Board decides to issue the license, it should be for no more than 30 days at a time. Ms. Tinkham asked what happens to the Park if the license is not extended. Mr. Andrews pointed out that there is no license to extend at this point. He wanted Attorney Sabatt to come to the next meeting for the Board to take up his application; review the stipulations; and allow Attorney Sabatt to ask for any stipulations he feels should be removed or amended, and at that time have the Board decide if and how long to issue a license. Ms. Peterson felt that Attorney Sabatt was supposed to come back before the Board with all kinds of information in January, and the last report turned in is December 18. She stated that Attorney Sabatt is the receiver of the Park, and the Board would not allow Mr. Austin (the Park owner) to go this far into the year without doing what needs to be done. Mr. Andrews asked for Attorney Sabatt to be contacted about the license renewal. Ms. Peterson felt that it was fine for the office to send out applications, but it was not their responsibility to continually remind. She felt he was well aware of the need and had been reminded at several previous meetings of the requirement. Ms. Peterson asked if there were any audience members who had questions regarding PMHP licensing. *Joe Pacheco* of 65<sup>th</sup> Ave asked if Attorney Sabatt was aware of the meeting. Ms. Peterson confirmed that he was. Mr. Pacheco asked how he had been notified. Ms. Coffin stated that she had spoken with him on the phone as well as via email, and was aware that he was in attendance at a zoning board of appeals in Barnstable. Mr. Pacheco asked if Ms. Coffin felt that Attorney Sabatt had intended to come to the meeting; she said he had hoped that he would be out of the appeals meeting early enough to attend the Board of Health meeting. Mr. Pacheco asked why the Board did not require his attendance at the meeting since he is currently without a license. Ms. Peterson said it was because she personally asked for it to be on the agenda for the Board to discuss their thoughts in regards to relicensing the Park, and to give the Board time to do that. The Health Agent had expressed a desire for Attorney Sabatt to be present, which Ms. Peterson agreed with. He was not required to be present at this meeting, but will be required to attend the next one. Mr. Andrews stated that

there were several other outstanding licenses in town that were not required to attend the meeting, and the Board was allowing a little latitude. The Board is not allowed to communicate outside of the meetings, and Mr. Andrews was unaware that the application had not yet been submitted. Ms. Peterson agreed, saying that not being able to communicate before hand, and under the new open meeting laws, to be fair to the applicant, the Board and the public. The way the item was put on the agenda will allow the Board to discuss the matter with all available information. Mr. Pacheco expressed his appreciation for the Board trying to look at things from the residents' point of view as well. Park resident *Rosalie Cole* stated that when the residents are having problems with Attorney Sabatt, they find it easier to go through the Attorney General's office. Ms. Peterson reiterated that the discussion allowed on this agenda item must pertain to the licensing issue; any other items must be submitted to the office for a later agenda. Ms. Coffin stated that there is a lot of communication that the residents may not be aware of; there are bi-weekly conference phone calls with the Health Agent, Attorney Sabatt, the AG's office, DEP, and Attorney Sabatt's engineer. At the last conference call, the licensure issue was broached, and Tracey Triplett of the AG's office is aware of the issue, and Attorney Sabatt had expressed intent of attending the meeting. Ms. Peterson said that either Ms. Coffin or Mr. Sabatt needs to report to the Board as to what is going on. Ms. Peterson felt that Attorney Sabatt, over the last six months, reports what he's doing to the Board after he's done it, and she stated that will not be acceptable if the Board decides to re-license the Park. She wants the Board to know plans before they are put in place, which is why she feels it would be best to license for a short time with each approval, thus making it necessary to make a report for extension each time. Mr. Andrews stated that was similar to what was done with the 2011 license. Ms. Peterson agreed, but said that the Board went too long between approvals last year. Mr. Andrews said he hoped at the next meeting that Attorney Sabatt would have his application in, and be present for a discussion as to the length of term for each license approval. Ms. Tinkham asked why the Board would want to approve it every 30 days. Ms. Peterson pointed out that there were major decisions for him to make, and short term approvals would keep him in front of the Board, keeping the Board informed as to the decisions that are being made. Resident Ms. Cole stated that Attorney Sabatt is reporting to the residents once a month, which Ms. Peterson pointed out, is more than they used to get. Ms. Cole agreed. Ms. Peterson said that, no matter what direction Attorney Sabatt decides to go with the Park, the Board has a lot of decisions to make. The more information the Board has, the better they will be able to make decisions. Ms. Tinkham asked what would be needed every 30 days for Attorney Sabatt to renew his license if it is issued. Ms. Coffin said that it is not really a renewal but an extension that the Board would decide on every 30 days. Mr. Andrews said it would just be a vote by the Board to extend for whatever length of time (30, 60 90 days, etc). But annually Attorney Sabatt would be obliged to apply for the license and conform to all applicable fees and restrictions placed by the Board. Mr. Andrews asked for any requested changes or amendments to the license restrictions be submitted to the Board in advance to be forwarded to the Board in the agenda packets beforehand. Ms. Peterson stated that the Board can place any reasonable conditions they feel are necessary on the license. Ms. Cole asked if it would be helpful for Park residents to call about the issue. Ms. Peterson expressed appreciation for Ms. Cole's desire to help, but felt that this was an issue for the Board to attend to with Attorney Sabatt. Mr. Andrews said he really wanted to be able to discuss the matter with Attorney Sabatt, and that was the reason for taking the agenda item out of turn, to allow him the opportunity to arrive as he had expressed intention to do. Ms. Peterson felt that some of the decisions that the Board is going to have to make will not be "quick answers", even when a quick answer may be desired, and the more Attorney Sabatt is before the Board, the more informed they will be on making those decisions.

**Ms. Peterson stated that there would be no action taken at this meeting in regards to this item. She is, however, requesting that Attorney Sabatt be present at the next meeting (January 25, 2011) for licensure renewal. She expects the license application to be in, and**

**ready for the agenda packets she asked for the application as well as all previous conditions and any requests for changes to those amendments.**

Ms. Peterson addressed Ms. Cole, stating that she felt that Attorney Sabatt was trying hard. She said he took over something that had been severely neglected, and it takes some time to get things back to a point that it can even be looked at rationally, and she felt that “all of us together” can help get the situation resolved in timely manner. Ms. Cole pointed out that there are other issues in the Park that need to be addressed. Again, Ms Peterson pointed out that only the licensure issue could be discussed, but told her that if there were issues that they wanted discussed, they could submit a request in writing to the office for it to be placed on the agenda for the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, before January 19<sup>th</sup> at noon.

There was a brief debate between Mr. Jim Mulvey, Ms. Peterson and Mr. Andrews on parliamentary procedure, setting agenda items, and the new open meeting law format.

**8) Approval of Minutes dated November 9, 2011**

**Mr. Uitti made a motion to approve the minutes dated November 9, 2011. Ms. Tinkham seconded the motion. Ms. Peterson and Mr. Andrews abstained because they were absent at the November 9 meeting. The Minutes were approved.**

**Mr. Andrews moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Uitti seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa A. Chase  
Secretary

Kathleen Peterson\_\_\_\_\_

Stanley Andrews\_\_\_\_\_

Galon Barlow\_\_\_\_\_

Don Uitti\_\_\_\_\_

Carol Tinkham\_\_\_\_\_

cc Board of Selectmen/Town Clerk