



TOWN OF BOURNE BOARD OF HEALTH

24 Perry Avenue
Buzzards Bay, MA 02532
www.townofbourne.com/health
Phone (508) 759-0600 ext. 1513
Fax (508) 759-0679



RECEIVED
2023 FEB -9 AM 10:39
TOWN CLERK BOURNE

Meeting MINUTES

January 11, 2023

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 P.M.

Kate McCarey acknowledged that she was recording the meeting.

1. **Attendance. – Board Members:** Stanley Andrews, Barbara Princiotta, William “Dusty” Meier, and Don Uitti.
Support Staff: Terri Guarino, Health Agent & Kaitlyn Shea, Assistant Health Agent

Mr. Andrews takes a moment of personal privilege to recognize Gary Maloney of Buzzards Bay. Mr. Maloney states that he is an active member of the community and that he often attends or listens to the meetings so that he is aware of what is happening. He continues on to thank the Board for their diligence in compiling a unified response from the Town for the upcoming Mass DEP regulations. Mr. Maloney shows appreciation for their efforts to understand and analyze the new regulations, and states that he wishes that the Board of Selectman were as prepared at the sessions. He requests that there is another public meeting to discuss these regulations, and that there is a video recording option so the public can have more access to ask questions and comment. He hopes that the avenue of communication between the Town is not closed, and that there is another chance to communicate and learn about the new regulations.

2. **7 Wales Dr – Down Cape Engineering, Inc. – Daniel A. Ojala, P.E., P.L.S. on behalf of property owner Christine M. Moscatiello – Continued from Dec. 14, 2022 – Requesting relief from 310 CMR 15.00 and Local Board of Health Regulations for the installation of an Innovative/Alternative sewage disposal system at 7 Wales Dr. including: 15-.405 (1a): Reduction in setback, SAS to Lot Line (10' to 5.1'). 15-.405 (1b): Reduction in setback, SAS to Foundation (20' to 7.0') & Septic Tank to Foundation (10' to 5.0'). 15-.405 (1e): Reduction in setback, SAS to BWJ (50' to 26.2') & Septic Tank to BWJ (25' to 14.8'). 15-.405 (1f): Reduction in setback, SAS to Coastal Bank (50' to 16.2') & Septic Tank to Coastal Bank (25' to 6.4') 15.555 (5): Reduction in lateral removal of unsuitable material (5' to 3'). Bourne Board of Health 150' setback regulation: Reduction In setback, SAS to Watercourse (Coastal Bank) (150' to 16.2').**— Ms. Princiotta states that she considers this application to be incomplete because the Board had specifically asked for the nitrogen loading calculations sheet from the Bourne Board of Health variance packet. She reminds the Board that this form was specifically requested by the Board, and that the calculations provided were not per that form, and that it is the standard form utilized for their decisions on variances. Ms. Princiotta reminds the Board that in June of 2016 they voted on the utilization of the form, emphasizing it's historical and relevant significance. She states that she does not believe they can approve this variance until they acquire those documents. Mr. Danny Gonsalves introduced himself as the representative of the project. He states that from his understanding, they were looking for a copy of the Excel spreadsheet and a reference to where the values came from. He states that he asked prior if they would like to see the original form, to which the Board told him no, and that an explanation for the values and the copy of the spreadsheet would be satisfactory. He states that he also provided an additional nitrogen calculation form. He states that he would have done the written form if that was the request, but that was not what he believed was required. Ms. Princiotta replies that she appreciates his efforts and recognizes that Mr. Gonsalves provided the Excel spreadsheet, but that there is a form that is standard, and that she did request Mr. Gonsalves to provide that

form. She states that she is unsure if the Excel spreadsheet was approved by the Board of Health, and that the form that she requested is the standard for that is utilized. Ms. Princiotta emphasizes its significance in creating consistency between the projects with the Board of Health, and that it is a standard that is recognized and utilized. She states that it was voted upon by the Board, and that she wants to ensure that the Board is being methodical and careful in what they are approving. Ms. Princiotta reiterates and emphasizes that she does not believe that the application is complete since the Board specifically asked for that particular form. She states that for consistency, she would like to still see that. Ms. Princiotta entertains a motion to allow Mr. Gonsalves to continue with his presentation, so that per Mr. Andrews suggestion, he will only have to come back to provide the form asked for. Mr. Meier and Mr. Uitti agree. Mr. Gonsalves states that from the previous hearing, he believes that the only question was regarding the nitrogen loading. He continues, stating that if the Board has any other questions, he is more than happy to answer them. He states that this property currently has a cesspool that is in a coastal bank, so he would like to ensure that this project is completed soon. He explains that they have put out quotes to construction companies for their help in this so that they can remedy this as quick as possible as to avoid further environmental impact. Miss Guarino agrees that it is a cesspool over a coastal bank, which emphasizes the importance of an upgrade. Miss Guarino explains that in regards to the nitrogen loading calculations, it was determined at the last meeting that the data and application was incomplete. She states that per the typical procedure of the Board of Health, they do not require the nitrogen loading calculation sheet specifically for an upgrade that meets the other requirements. She states that in this instance, there is the property line setback variance that triggers abutter notification and the public hearing requirements. She states that the Cape Cod Commission and Conservation Commission have been working through the improvement of the form. She states that she does not think that this form should not be specifically required, and that it is essential to understand how significant of a change it will be. Mr. Andrews continues and emphasizes that the Board voted prior that the documentation in question needs to be provided, so that the Board is unable to approve it since they voted on it. He states that if they need to update the nitrogen loading form, they can vote to update it. Mr. Andrews states that he is willing to allow the document to be submitted to the office and distributed to the Board for the issuance of the permit. He emphasizes the large number of variances, and how they are regarding property setbacks, but that it is important to note that the current system is a cesspool in a coastal bank. Mr. Meier states that the replacement will be a super big improvement, and that the goal of the Board is to protect the coastal waterways. He states that if Mr. Gonsalves submits the nitrogen loading calculation form to the office and Miss Guarino forwards it to the Board for the permit issuance, then he is in approval. Ms. Princiotta explains that she also agrees, but that going forward, that would not be her preference. She states that she agrees that this is an improvement, and she is appreciative of the spreadsheet, but that the excel spreadsheet had a discrepancy between the other applicant in the last meeting, which is why the provision of the data calculations was important. She states that she knows the discrepancy was not in his numbers, but that the form is essential, and the submission of the form will be okay since the new plan will be a significant improvement. **Ms. Princiotta made a motion to approve 7 Wales Drive requesting relief from 310 CMR 15.00 and Local Board of Health Regulations for the installation of an Innovative/Alternative sewage disposal system at 7 Wales Dr. including: 15-405 (1a): Reduction in setback, SAS to Lot Line (10' to 5.1'). 15-405 (1b): Reduction in setback, SAS to Foundation (20' to 7.0') & Septic Tank to Foundation (10' to 5.0'). 15-405 (1e): Reduction in setback, SAS to BWJ (50' to 26.2') & Septic Tank to BWJ (25' to 14.8'). 15-405 (1f): Reduction in setback, SAS to Coastal Bank (50' to 16.2') & Septic Tank to Coastal Bank (25' to 6.4') 15.555 (5): Reduction in lateral removal of unsuitable material (5' to 3'). Bourne Board of Health 150' setback regulation: Reduction In setback, SAS to Watercourse (Coastal Bank) (150' to 16.2'), under the condition that they receive the nitrogen loading calculation form and that the majority of the 5 board members approves it prior to any official approval being sent. Mr. Meier seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, all were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.** Miss Guarino asks for clarification for what form the Board of Health is seeking specifically. She explains that she did clarify that the nitrogen loading calculation form from the Conservation Commission has not been on the Board of Health site since the summer. She states that that form has been updated to an Excel doc, so she is confused on what form the board is looking for, if not any of the forms provided by the application. She asks if this is a continuance or an approval, and questions why the paperwork provided is not acceptable for the Board of Health to make a decision. Mr. Andrews states that in 2016, the Board of Health voted to utilize that form for nitrogen loading calculations. Miss Guarino questions the exact date of the meeting, and Ms. Princiotta

responded stating that it was June 22nd, 2016. Mr. Andrews clarified that they voted to utilize the Conservation Commission's nitrogen loading calculation form. Miss Guarino responded explaining that the information that Mr. Gonsalves provided is no different than the Conservation Commission's form, and that she does not see why or what makes it not acceptable as presented. Mr. Andrews states that the Board approved the Conservation Commission form, and that they previously voted to utilize that document. Miss Guarino states that a corrected version of that has been provided, and Ms. Princiotta explains that the meeting date was June 22nd, 2016, and that she has the form, but they can discuss the future usage of the form at another time.

3. **4 Wenaumet Bluffs Dr – Stephen B. Nelson, R.E.H.S/R.S. on behalf of property owner Kristin Seastrand – Continued from Dec. 14, 2022 – Requesting relief from 310 CMR 15.00 and/or Local Board of Health Regulations for the installation of an Innovative/Alternative sewage disposal system. Including: A 5' reduction in the required 10' setback distance from the proposed leaching to the front and side property line (310 CMR 15.211); A 32' reduction in the required 50' setback distance from the proposed leaching facility to the top of coastal bank; A 132' variance from the Bourne Board of Health 150' setback regulation for the placement of a leaching facility within 18' of coastal bank.**— Ms. Princiotta explains that per the last meeting, the Board was waiting on Conservation Commission's approval, and questions if that has been completed. Mr. Nelson confirms. Mr. Nelson explains that on January 5th, 2023, the Conservation Commission approved the plans, and that he has a copy of the documents if needed. Mr. Nelson states that he submitted the floor plan as requested, and that he has the nitrogen loading calculation sheets. Ms. Princiotta questions where those documents are, and states that she does not have them. Mr. Andrews replies that he does not have them either. Miss Shea questions if the documents are in their packets, to which the board members state they do not. Mr. Nelson explains that he has extras of the documents requested if the Board would like to see them. Mr. Andrews questions when they were received at the office, and Miss Shea said last week. Mr. Andrews questions if there is a stamped copy, and Miss Guarino explains that she would have to check and see, but that if it was received prior to this evening then it would have been posted with the other materials. Mr. Nelson continues, and states that he did send it via email as well. Ms. Princiotta questions if Mr. Nelson also has copies of the floor plan, and Mr. Nelson states yes. Mr. Andrews points out the loft above the garage, and if it can only be entered from the exterior. Mr. Nelson says no, and states that it can be entered from the inside of the garage, or a door at the end of the hallway. Mr. Andrews questions what door at the end of what hallway and explains that he does not see that on the current plan. Mr. Andrews states that under the Board of Health definition, the house qualifies as 4 bedrooms, to which Mr. Nelson explains that he only sees it as 3 bedrooms. Mr. Andrews states that he misread the plans, and that what he thought was a bedroom, is actually the bathroom. Mr. Andrews explains that it is essential to have the documents submitted by the Thursday prior to the meeting so that they can be reviewed adequately, but that the Board was not provided that. Ms. Princiotta questioned if Mr. Nelson did the before and after nitrogen loading calculations. Mr. Nelson explained, yes, and that he has done one with the Title V system calculations, and one with the I/A system calculations. Ms. Princiotta states that she only has one set. Miss Guarino explains that there's been a high level of paperwork for this since July, and some of these things weren't required before for the upgrade. Mr. Andrews states that those calculations were not in the previous packet, and Ms. Princiotta and Mr. Meier agree. Mr. Andrews apologizes for the delay and explains that it is because they did not see these documents prior and that it is important to have all documents submitted by the Thursday prior, but that the Board might not have the documents. Mr. Andrews questions what Ms. Seastrand, the homeowner's, intent with the loft that is over the garage. Mr. Nelson explains that she does not currently have any intention to do something with it. Mr. Andrews asks if she intends to use it as a bedroom, and Mr. Nelson says no. Mr. Andrews asks for clarification, and Mr. Nelson states that her current intention is not to use it as a bedroom, but at some point, she may. Mr. Nelson explains that she has not created any remodel plans yet, but that she is planning to have it be a 3-bedroom home, which is what the septic is designed for. Mr. Andrews states that the house is very close to the water resource, and that questions regarding the size of the home did come up with this project prior, when it was approved for a tight tank. Mr. Andrews asks Ms. Princiotta if she is "crunching numbers over there", and she explains no, and that she had written down that it was purchased as a 2 bedroom, 2 bath, and that she is unsure of what the assessor's card states. Ms. Princiotta states that she has it written down as a 2 bedroom, ½ bath. Mr. Nelson states that that is possible, but that he is unable to confirm with the homeowner because she is out of the country. Mr. Andrews states that the lot is tight for a 3 bedroom, and that he would expect a 3-bedroom design,

even if it is a 2 bedroom, because of the nature of the property, which is why he was inquiring about the room over the garage. Miss Guarino explains that from the prior meetings, it was approved as a 3-bedroom system, and there was a 3-bedroom deed restriction that was required by the Board of Health. Mr. Andrews states that that was for the tight tank, but Miss Guarino explains that there is a distinction between a tight tank disclosure notice, whereas the bedroom count deed restriction is different and that is what was recorded and provided previously. She states that December 13, 2022, a 3-bedroom deed restriction was recorded. She explains that the restriction was not specific to any kind of design because it differs from other disclosure notices. Mr. Andrews asks for clarification on if the deed restriction was required for the approval of the tight tank, and Miss Guarino states that under Title 5, that is always required, so yes. Ms. Princiotta states that the prior approved tight tank was the best-case scenario for nitrogen loading, and that the new proposal will increase that to 10.3. She looks for clarification on the installation of the tight tank, and Mr. Nelson confirms that it was never installed. Ms. Princiotta states that she is not sure what is mitigating the change, and that this is completely going backwards in her eyes because the nitrogen loading is exponentially higher with the I/A system. Mr. Meier explains that the nitrogen loading is also a problem for him, because with the tight tank it was at 0, but now with the I/A system, it is at 10.3. He states that he cannot support this design with those numbers. Mr. Uitti agrees.

Miss Guarino explains that that is the point that the Board will need to decide on, whether or not they should sustain the motions to have an installation of the 2,000-gallon tight tank that they voted on November 16, 2022, or, to approve or deny a new proposed system for an I/A system. Mr. Andrews questions if there are any further questions for the Board, or from the applicant. Mr. Nelson states that the original proposal was proposed prior to Ms. Seastrand taking ownership of the property, and that the only way that they could get any mortgage agreement and sold to Ms. Seastrand was to put a plan together that could get approved quickly. He states that it was a Phase 1 plan, and that Ms. Seastrand bought the house with the idea that there would be multiple phases. He states with the I/A plan, which is Phase 2, they would be cutting the existing nitrogen in half, since it is currently 20, and they would be reducing it to 10.3. He explains that it has always been understood that the tight tank would be the last possible option, and that for him, all the tight tank does it move nitrogen somewhere else. He states that it does not truly remove anything, and that the best alternative would be the plan that he presented. He states that the lack of an installation was because they decided to skip Phase 1, and that he wants the Board to understand that they are cutting the current nitrogen in half. Mr. Meier questions if it was brought to the Board's attention that the tight tank that was approved was only a temporary idea. Mr. Nelson says absolutely, and that Phase 2 plan would happen after the home was changed into Ms. Seastrand's hands. He states that this was the only final plan, and that that was in the application. Mr. Andrews states that that was not his recollection of events, and Ms. Princiotta and Mr. Meier agree. Ms. Princiotta states that it is hard for her to approve this project with those nitrogen loading calculations, and that the acquisition of a mortgage has no relevance on their approval. She states that the goal is to protect the environment, and that the tight tank was a fantastic idea, but now the I/A system changes that. Mr. Andrew states that there was some information that was brought in this evening that the office had received the week prior, but that the Board was not able to review it until tonight. He asks that the Board considers fully evaluating the new information, and for the applicant to consider what she can do to alleviate the nitrogen loading so that the plan can be more agreeable. Mr. Andrews states that the variances are very big, and with the numbers provided it is concerning, especially considering the past plan. Mr. Nelson requests that they continue to the next meeting, and questions if they would like a decrease in bedrooms. Mr. Andrews states that to him it sounds more reasonable considering that the property was listed as a 2 bedroom home. Miss Guarino states that she does not have the continuance form, but that there was one filled out at the last meeting. Mr. Andrews responds, asking what the timeframe was. Miss Guarino explains that this was last continued until re-heard by the Conservation Commission, but that this project has been continued since July 27, 2022 by the Board of Health. Mr. Andrews requests that Mr. Nelson comes to the office to fill out another continuance form. Mr. Andrews confirms that Ms. Seastrand can contact Mr. Nelson despite how she is out of the country, and he confirms. **Ms. Princiotta makes a motion to continue 4 Wenaumet Bluffs Dr., provided that the applicant fills out the continuance form. Mr. Meier seconds the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

4. **68 Elgin Rd – Zachary Basinski, P.E., C.F.M. of Bracken Engineering on behalf of owner/applicant Timothy & Michelle Bernard – *Continued from Dec. 14, 2022* – Requesting relief from 310 CMR 15.211 for the installation of a new sewage disposal system at 68 Elgin Rd. Variances requested include: A 41'± variance**

to Title 5 setback requirements for a 9'± setback from a fragmented, non-water dependent Coastal Bank to a Soil Absorption System. And a 141'± variance to local setback requirements for a 9'± setback from a fragmented, non-water dependent Coastal Bank to a Soil Absorption System. – Mr. Andrews excused himself from the discussion and voting on the project, and Ms. Princiotta led the discussion. Ms. Princiotta recalls that for this project she believes that they were just waiting for the floor plans, to which Mr. Basinski stated that they were already submitted. Mr. Basinski introduced himself as the representative for the project. He states that he did receive the new Cape Cod Commission's nitrogen loading calculation form. He explains that he understands if the Board needs more time to review them. Ms. Princiotta stated that they are willing to listen to the presentation, but they would like to have more time to review the nitrogen loading calculations. She states that they will need to talk about that, and that they would love to hear the project in the meantime. Mr. Basinski explains that this is one of the last vacant lots on Handy Point, and that they are looking to build a new house and sewage system. He states that the homeowner, Mr. Bernard, also owns the property next door, 72 Elgin Rd. He states that the homeowner purchased the lot in June, and he wants to develop the house similarly to his house next door. Mr. Basinski states that looking at this project, the biggest problem has been regarding nitrogen loading. He explains that the original plan was to develop a 5-bedroom home, but that they are cutting it down to a 3-bedroom home. He further states, stating that they are proposing a nitrogen reduction loading system to start to ensure there is no severe environmental impacts. Mr. Basinski discusses where the resource areas are, and that there is a coastal bank in a flood zone. He explains that there is a slope topography on the property. He explains that the actual water resource area is across the street, and that they meet the 150ft setback, but that they do not meet the setback for the non-water fragmented dependent Coastal Bank. Mr. Basinski states that the homeowner is voluntarily opting to lower the number of bedrooms and implement a nitrogen reduction system, and that he would like the Board to keep that in mind. Mr. Basinski states that there is a coastal bank that meets the slope topography. He explains they are looking to regrade, and that they are building a flood compliant house that meets building requirements. Mr. Basinski reiterates that they are specifically looking for a 41'± variance to Title 5 setback requirements for a 9'± setback from a fragmented, non-water dependent Coastal Bank to a Soil Absorption System. And a 141'± variance to local setback requirements for a 9'± setback from a fragmented, non-water dependent Coastal Bank to a Soil Absorption System. Miss Guarino explains that this application was reviewed by the office staff and deemed to be complete. She states that similarly to what Mr. Basinski explains, this incorporates nitrogen reducing technology and is a good standard for nitrogen loading for new construction. Mr. Meier agrees, and he states that by extending it, they will be able to review the calculations. He explains that he understands that the homeowner is being diligent and working with the Board, and that he would like to recommend extending the project. Mr. Basinski explains that that will grant him the time to get Conservation Commission approval. **Mr. Meier makes a motion to extend 68 Elgin Rd to the next available meeting, which would be January 25th, 2023. Mr. Uitti seconds the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

5. **85 Salt Marsh Ln – Zachary Basinski, P.E., C.F.M. of Bracken Engineering on behalf of owner/applicant CNB Bristow LLC – Continued from Dec. 14, 2022 – Requesting relief from Title 5 for the installation of a tight tank at 85 Salt Marsh Lane. Requesting local upgrade approval from 15.405.1(j) the reduction of a 12" separation from high groundwater to the inlet tee.** – Mr. Andrews rejoined the meeting. Mr. Basinski introduced himself as representative of the project. Mr. Andrews explained that at the last meeting, the Board requested that Mr. Basinski provide the floor plans. Mr. Andrews discusses that Mr. Basinski did mark up the plans at the last meeting to show a change, and thanks Mr. Basinski for completing a new up to date set. Mr. Andrews questions if the Board received the floor plans and they all confirm. Ms. Princiotta questions if it a single floor house, and Mr. Basinski responds that it is a 2-story house, but the bottom floor is only used for storage. Ms. Princiotta states that she is grateful that they received the plans, and she sees it as complete. Mr. Andrews confirms, and states that they did not need anything else from the applicant. Miss Guarino states that the tight tank will require a disclosure notice and a bedroom count deed restriction under Title V regulations. She states that they have been drafted and will be incorporated into permit issuance. **Ms. Princiotta made a motion to approve 85 Salt Marsh Ln, requesting relief from Title 5 for the installation of a tight tank at 85 Salt Marsh Lane. Requesting local upgrade approval from 15.405.1(j) the reduction of a 12" separation from high groundwater to the inlet tee, the bedroom count deed restriction, and the disclosure notice. Mr. Meier seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

6. **Approve the Minutes – Approve the minutes from the previous meetings dated September 14, 2022, November 16, 2022, December 12, 2022, December 14, 2022, & January 5, 2023.** – Mr. Andrews states that he would like to take the minutes of December 12, 2022, out of order of the other minutes since the meeting was the joint meeting with the Board of Selectman. He states that his review of the minutes was accurate. **Mr. Meier made a motion to accept the minutes of December 12, 2022. Mr. Uitti seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Princiotta explained that for the September 14, 2022, minutes, she would like to see them rewritten more elaborately to include more of what was discussed. She explains that the office staff allowed her to come into the office to listen to the recordings, and that she believes that the minutes could have been more comprehensive, and that she thinks that there were discussions and information that did not make it into the minutes. She states that she would like to see the minutes conform more to the Board vote from June of 2016 where they voted to not condense the minutes. She states that she would like the minutes to reflect the actual conversations, especially when they are regarding regulations, and that she would like to adhere to that standard moving forward. Ms. Princiotta explains that she likes that standard, and it allows for more transparency and a lack of questions to be asked about what was in the minutes. She states she wants them more in depth so they can provide the context of the discussion, rather than just the substance of the discussion. Miss Guarino states that this has been continued for a number of months, and that the office has not received any specific written changes to further correct the minutes. She explained that there is a recording secretary that works offline, who has concerns as to why they have not been approved. She discusses that the office staff has reviewed the minutes, and that they all believe that they are as close as verbatim as possible. She states that this is the standard for regulation amendments or promulgation approvals, and that they are to be as close to a transcript as possible, but in general minutes are not a transcription. She explains that the minutes are the best that they can do with the resources that they have. Miss Guarino again articulates that there are not any specific written comments as to what is wrong with the minutes, and she does not know what they can do better after multiple people have reviewed the minutes and the depth of information in there. Ms. Princiotta replies, stating that the office did a fantastic job on the December 12th minutes and that they were very thorough. But that the September 14th minutes were not as close to verbatim as they could be because there were complete sentences missing, conversations were not included, and that things that Mr. Andrews and other Board members said were left out. She explains that she thinks these missing items add value, so she is respectfully asking that the staff rewrites them again, and if there is still an issue, she will sit with them and work through it. She highlights that in the September 14th minutes, there is a lot of essential content and context that is missing. Miss Guarino explains that after Ms. Princiotta reviewed the recording in the office, they received no feedback on what should be modified. She expresses that the staff has reviewed the minutes, and that they are satisfied with the quality of them, so if something specific needs to be changed, that she would like it to be submitted in writing to the office so that they can best correct the issue. Ms. Princiotta states that the way to best correct the minutes is to listen to the recording and type what is actually said on the recording because other than that, it is implying that they would like Miss Princiotta to write out the changes, so she is requesting that someone on the staff look at them. She offers to have a Zoom call with whoever is doing the minutes, if it is Stacey Burgess or a Recording Secretary, so that she can explain further. Miss Guarino states that the Town Administrator's office has a contracted Recording Secretary to accommodate the minutes for the Board of Health. Ms. Princiotta states that she is willing to work with her if she is having trouble with it, especially if she is new, because she knows that there was an open position that must have just recently been filled. She explains that she is more than happy to meet with them via Zoom, and questions if it is Viveca. Miss Guarino confirms. Ms. Princiotta states that she is more than happy to work with her and schedule a Zoom call to offer any guidance on the minutes, and that Miss Guarino can have her reach out to set up a time. Mr. Andrews questions the recording equipment, and asks if they are limited on the equipment that they use, and if there is better equipment that they can use to make it clearer for whomever is typing the minutes. Miss Guarino explains that it is challenging to clearly hear all conversations, based on the location of the microphone and how there is only 1 microphone. She discusses that when the meetings were held on Zoom, there were no issues because people had their own individual microphones and you could see people's lips moving, and that that was the most clear and concise method. She states that the current device is a newer device, and it works fine, but due to the size of the room, it is not easy to hear. Mr. Andrews replied, discussing the past meeting rooms, and how they were smaller, and the Board sat closer together, and the

equipment was closer, leading to clearer recordings to work off of. He states that they can either go to a smaller venue, or they can get a device that has multiple microphones so that they can improve the quality of the recording to assist in crating better minutes. Miss Guarino states that it honestly comes down to people speaking loudly and clearly, to which Mr. Andrews made a joke asking if he is not loud enough. Miss Guarino explains it's hard to hear when people talk over one another, and Ms. Princiotta raised the possibility of getting multiple devices. Mr. Andrews halted the conversation and emphasized people should raise their hand to be recognized so that they can avoid people talking over one another. Ms. Princiotta repeated her prior suggestion and questioned if they can get multiple devices. Mr. Andrews states that he would not entertain the idea of multiple tapes, but rather, he would get a device that has multiple microphones and put them in multiple areas.

Ms. Princiotta suggests that they look at the Town Charter, because the Charter just changed the current meeting parameters, which may help them solve the problem, so they should discuss the new Charter which has been approved. Mr. Andrews states that they can bring it up as an agenda item for the next meeting. Mr. Meier states that he agrees with Miss Guarino about hearing people, because at the meeting, he even had a hard time hearing Mr. Basinski and that it is easier to hear on one side. Mr. Uitti agreed. Mr. Meier joked that it could be because of his age and hearing problems, but that he still struggles as well, and he agrees that it needs to be approved somehow. Ms. Princiotta states that she knows that they are not in violation of the charter because it allows for an extension of time based on extenuating circumstances, and that she believes that this situation falls under that purview. She states that she will work with the recording secretary about how to create the proper minutes. **Ms. Princiotta made a motion to continue the approval of the September 14th, 2022, minutes to 2 meetings from now, to allow time to rewrite. Mr. Meier seconds the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Andrews raised the possibility to discuss the November 16, 2022, minutes. Mr. Uitti seconded the motion. Mr. Meier made a motion to approve the November 16, 2022, minutes. Mr. Andrews stated that he does not have those minutes, and Ms. Princiotta states that she does not have the November 16, 2022, the December 14, 2022, and January 5, 2023, minutes, so she cannot vote on them. Mr. Meier retracted his motion to approve the November 16, 2022, minutes. Mr. Uitti retracted his second. **Ms. Princiotta made a motion to continue the minutes from November 16, 2022, the December 14, 2022, and January 5, 2023, minutes, to the next meeting. Mr. Uitti seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.**

7. Set tentative date for next meeting.

Mr. Andrews confirmed that the meeting was for the 25th of January with Miss Guarino, and she agreed. Mr. Meier states that he does not see that on the agenda sheet, nor does he see the dates for the minutes. Ms. Princiotta and Mr. Andrews showed him the correct agenda. **Mr. Uitti made a motion to set January 25th, 2023, as a tentative date for the next meeting. Ms. Princiotta seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion passed.**

8. Adjourn.

Ms. Princiotta made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Meier seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the meeting adjourned at 6:37pm.

Taped by: Terri Guarino, Health Agent
Typed by: Viveca Stucke, Recording Secretary
Edited by: Kaitlyn Shea, Assistant Health Agent