



**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
June 1, 2011**

Members Present: Kathleen Peterson; Chairperson, Stanley Andrews, Vice Chairperson; Galon Barlow, Don Uitti and Carol Tinkham.

Support Staff: Cynthia Coffin, Health Agent

Call to order: Meeting called to order at 7:00 P.M.

Working Session on draft wind turbine regulations-Ms. Peterson stated that the only topic of discussion that will take place tonight is the regulations on wind turbines that the BOH is adopting. Ms. Peterson stated that she met with Town Counsel today and Mr. Wall feels they are on track and they have held all the proper hearings. Ms. Peterson stated that, having never done this before, Mr. Andrews and herself are having a little problem getting the regulations on paper in the proper form. Mr. Wall has given Ms. Peterson a lot of ideas and they are going to meet again on Sunday and add what else he believes should be added. Ms. Peterson stated that they need to clarify exactly what the applicants need to know and what is expected up front. Mr. Wall would like them to consider certain submittal requirements such as basic information about the applicant and existing conditions, plans, distances to neighboring properties and residential homes, and plans depicting the proposed WECS. He would also like them to state what the filing fee will be. Mr. Wall would also like stated what would happen if the turbine was not running for five days and what is expected of the applicant. Ms. Peterson stated that other than that he thinks they are right on track. They have to come up with a time amount that a WECS would be considered abandoned and they have to come up with the noise level that should not exceed a value. Ms. Peterson stated that on June 8th, 2011 the actual regulations will be provided to the Board for any final additions. June 15th will be public comment. The text of the regs will be available June 8th for the public to review. June 22nd the regs will be adopted if all the members are in agreement. Ms. Peterson stated that there has been a lot of time and effort put in and Mr. Wall will be available to the Board June 15th and June 22nd. Ms. Peterson stated that she would like to go over any changes or concerns that the other Board members may have. Mr. Andrews stated that it was

suggested to use the definition from the zoning bylaw for Wind Energy Conversion System. Ms. Peterson stated that they will provide both and let Town Counsel determine which wording would be best. Ms. Peterson stated it would be very helpful if the other Board members had any concerns or anything to add tonight. Mr. Uitti stated that they should consider the fact that at one of the past meetings he asked one of the engineers what the nearest distance would be that there would be no possibility of the flicker or noise affecting any residents. Mr. Uitti was told by the engineer that that would be approximately 3000ft. Mr. Uitti stated that he believes 1800 ft is much too close. Mr. Andrews stated that the issue he has with setting that definitive setback is that this is a regulation for all turbines so if there was a 5 or 10 kilowatt turbine there is no affect out that distance compared to a larger one. Mr. Andrews stated that if you set it to a noise or flicker value then it is a measurable value that Ms. Coffin can actually check on. Mr. Uitti stated that there should be something in the regulations regarding the size of the turbine. Mr. Andrews stated that turbines change all the time. You could have two of the same size with totally different characteristics. Mr. Uitti stated that the distance could be brought down to 2000 ft. for a smaller turbine. Mr. Barlow stated that he does not have a problem with the setbacks but believes that Mr. Andrews thoughts about keeping the flicker on your own property so it is not a nuisance to the neighbors makes a lot of sense. Mr. Barlow stated that if you are going to put something up that you know is going to be a nuisance and you know that it could cause an epileptic seizure then you are responsible for it and it should be kept on your property. Ms. Peterson stated that she agrees with that but there will be a certain amount of nuisance or aggravation there. You can't expect your neighbor to not produce some sun and that is why they have to come up with an actual figure amount to put in the regulations. Ms. Peterson stated that there are a number of nuisance chapters under 111-31 that the BOH can fall under on something like that but you also want to make sure that they are not being unreasonable either. Mr. Barlow stated that he agrees and they have had evidence presented to them that the shadow flicker can trigger epileptic seizures and epilepsy is not uncommon. Knowing that the BOH is within their rights to say that if you are going to create a moving shadow that can trigger issues with people it should be kept on your own land. Ms. Peterson stated that people have to expect a little bit of nuisance. Just driving on the road can be a nuisance but it can't danger the health of people. Mr. Barlow stated that they have been given testimony that this has a definite health effect and can trigger epileptic seizures and that is a serious issue. Mr. Uitti stated that he suffers from migraines and that is another good reason to consider the regulations. Mr. Barlow stated that he does not feel that is unreasonable if someone wants to put up a small turbine on their property and keep the shadow on their property or do something to address the shadow flicker when it is off of their property. Mr. Andrews stated that the epilepsy foundation says between 5-30 hertz is the trigger point and they suggest no greater than 3 hertz. Some turbines work under that and some would be more than that. Ms. Peterson stated that one of the things they can say is a homeowner that wants a small turbine may not have to provide the same acoustic noise study by a qualified engineer that an industrial turbine has to. Mr. Andrews stated that a value is a value and it doesn't matter if it's a 500 watt turbine or a 5 megawatt turbine. You know if that value has a health effect. Ms. Peterson stated that people have to reasonably apply for the permit. You can't have those regulations so strict that nobody is going to meet the requirements. Mr. Andrews stated that what is a nuisance to one person

may not be to another and they have to find a reasonable value that is black and white so that an applicant can work through it. Ms. Peterson stated that noise level should not exceed a value above ambient. Mr. Barlow asked Mr. Andrews if he had developed any numbers. Mr. Andrews stated that he has taken numbers from information that was given to them and has looked at doubling of the noise but there is also a max limit that you can set. They would have to relate that back to noises that they know. If a car at 40mph at 100 meters is 55db, a drill at 7 meters is 95db which is too much. Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Barlow if he had a max value. Mr. Barlow stated that he did not and did not believe that he is in a position to determine a max value. Mr. Barlow stated that you can read all you want but he works in a restaurant under fans all day and his hearing is probably more sensitive but it really comes down to an individual. Ms. Peterson stated that one of the requirements will be that an acoustical engineer be hired for the Board of Health to determine what those are to be for that particular site. Ms. Peterson stated that she comes back to where it says a quiet bedroom. The fan she had on the other night was annoying because it is a constant sound. Ms. Peterson believes that that is what the Board keeps coming back to is the constant sound that will become a nuisance to people that live among the turbines. Mr. Barlow stated that he believes the noise is an issue but believes that the shadow flicker is an issue they can address because that is something physical that you can see. People that live near a highway can hear cars all night or near the canal can hear boats going through. Ms. Peterson stated there is a distinction under the nuisance law if you move into a place that has these nuisances already then you are reasonably informed that they are going to make noise but if you don't you can not aggrieve someone else's land after they have already bought it. There are allowances under the BOH law. If you buy a house near the train tracks you know a train is coming. Mr. Barlow stated that they have documentation that indicates that flicker can trigger a seizure and does not believe it is unreasonable if it is required that you keep the shadow on your property. Mr. Uitti asked if they should consider lot size. Ms. Peterson stated that they should leave that up to zoning. The Board members agreed. Mr. Barlow stated that he is looking at what they can actually get a handle on. They have heard so many different presentations as to what you can stand. Ms. Peterson stated that they are close to putting them on paper but right now it is just an outline on how to write the regs and what should be looked for in each regulation. Mr. Uitti asked if there was an outline that they could look at. Ms. Peterson stated that they will get the outline through email before the next meeting on Weds. Town Counsel will review it and then Ms. Coffin will pass it along to the Board Members. Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Barlow if he prefers the setback that flicker does not leave the property. Mr. Barlow stated that that seems most reasonable to him. Mr. Barlow stated that he questioned Mr. Andrews about it last week and then thought about it and looked over the epilepsy study and thought that where there is a known medical issue it is a reasonable requirement. Mr. Andrews stated that because they allow a variance he believes they should put a cap and that cap should be related to the numbers that the epilepsy foundation came up with that that frequency could not be greater than 3 hertz which is what they suggest as a trigger point of 5-30. They should window out an area from 3-50 and not be allowed. Ms. Peterson stated that that is reasonable because they can ask for a variance from that. Mr. Andrews stated that they can ask for a variance from zero off the property but they can't get a variance out of those values because you can't give a variance that can create a health issue. Mr. Barlow stated

that he agreed and if those are the numbers he wants to use and everyone is in agreement with it then throw it out there. All the Board members agreed. Mr. Andrews stated that shadow flicker cannot occur between 3 hertz and 60 hertz. Ms. Coffin asked if it could be more than 60 hertz. Mr. Andrews stated that it could be more than 60 because it's outside of the threshold that the epilepsy foundation has put out. They say the trigger point is 5-50. There was general discussion regarding how long someone can put up with the flicker coming through a window before it is a nuisance. Mr. Barlow suggested that that may be about 10 minutes. Ms. Coffin stated that she is a little confused by the variance. Mr. Andrews stated that if they went with a zero flicker value they could allow a variance to have flicker exceed off that property onto the next. They need to put guidelines in so that they know in advance when they apply for a variance that these are the values. Ms. Peterson stated that the applicant will be required to state the maximum projected noise level or shadow flicker from the proposed WECS. Ms. Peterson stated that it could be worded *shadow flicker shall not extend beyond the lot lines of the property upon which the WECS is located. A variance can be obtained to allow shadow flicker to extend beyond the lot lines as provided for in the section on variance.* Mr. Andrews added *the frequency shall not fall within the range of 3-60 and shall not exceed ____amount of time in a day and ____amount of time annually.* Mr. Barlow asked how much time a day. Mr. Andrews stated that this is a nuisance issue and asked what is reasonable before it becomes a nuisance. Mr. Andrews suggested five minutes. The Board agreed. Ms. Peterson stated that what she believes is reasonable is that the responsibility is going to be on the applicant to provide to the Board of Health reasonable expectations as to what the people who will be adjoining their property can expect. At that point then she believes the BOH can make a determination. You can't just say that every wind turbine is going to cause five minutes per day of flicker which, if you multiply by 365 days per year, you can't allow anymore than ____amount. She does not agree with that but does agree with the fact that flicker is a nuisance and they have testimony that states that and no one should have to deal with more than five minutes a day of nuisance. It is up to an applicant to prove that it is not going to be anymore than five minutes per day. Ms. Peterson stated that you want to make sure, when you are saying that you don't want anything off of the property, that you are not being judge and jury too. Ms. Peterson stated that they have to allow people the opportunity, because they are elected to do it, to apply for a permit because they have determined that a permit from the Board of Health is necessary to operate a wind turbine in the Town of Bourne. It will be the last permit that they receive. They will get all other permits in place from all other entities before the BOH permit is issued. Ms. Peterson stated that, in speaking with Town Counsel, they have every right to do that. In the application they have to know what the variance is that they have to ask for. Mr. Andrews stated that by putting values in it allows the applicant to know that is what they will gain out of it and they can figure out if it is worth it or not. Ms. Peterson stated that they will also have the right to revoke or modify a permit issued after the proper notifications. The permits will have an ambient noise study with that because that will be part of the application process. To apply for your permit from the Board of Health you must provide an ambient noise study that determines the baseline levels. It's up to the applicant what they really want. If they are going to tell the Board that one particular neighbor will only suffer five minutes a day with shadow flicker but if they suffer six minutes a day it will be a violation. That's why you have to allow people to ask for a

variance. Mr. Barlow stated that Ms. Peterson feels that it's a nuisance but does she believe that it is a medical issue. Ms. Peterson stated that she believes it is but she is just stating how the regulations have to be written. Mr. Barlow stated that he understands that. Ms. Peterson read over the outline of the regulations with the Board. Ms. Peterson stated that they are talking about wind turbines for the next 30-40 years and you still have to be reasonable but you don't have to have it be a nuisance on public health. Ms. Tinkham asked if they had to state flicker in terms of yearly. Mr. Andrews stated that they don't care what the annual is as long as they don't create a nuisance on a daily basis. Ms. Coffin asked how you would determine that flicker lasted for five minutes. Mr. Andrews stated that it will have to come down to what they require from the owner of the turbine keeping clear records. Ms. Peterson stated that they have testimony stating that they can predict when flicker will occur for the next 6 or more years. Ms. Coffin stated that there is a maximum based on sunny skies but what if there are clouds. Mr. Barlow stated that, just like the automatic switches that turn the street lights on, there will be a light level meter on there and when the light gets bright enough to cause a shadow it will shut off. Mr. Andrews stated that in the regulation they could state that they are required to dump that data down to them. Ms. Peterson stated that, according to everything that they have been told, the turbines can be programmed to shut off at any time. They can be turned off with a phone call. Ms. Peterson stated that, in answering Ms. Coffin's question further, under emergency access you can say three neighbors have to complain in the same day or the same time. You also can't have people saying there is a nuisance when there isn't one. Ms. Peterson stated that because the turbines are supposed to be computer operated it should be easy to tell if it was operating when it shouldn't have been. Ms. Peterson asked the Board what their thoughts on noise were. Ms. Tinkham stated that she keeps hearing that it is 10 decibels over ambient. Ms. Coffin stated that that is the existing State regs. Mr. Andrews stated that 10 is a doubling of the actual noise. Ms. Peterson asked if they should adopt somewhere in the middle and allow a variance to be asked for. Mr. Andrews stated if it wasn't a residential property and just a commercial property you might allow it to go up higher because it won't be a nuisance. Ms. Peterson stated that they will separate day and night and feels that they should stay somewhere in the middle of what the State allows which is 10 above background. Mr. Andrews stated that a value of 6 and the fact that they can request a variance would be reasonable. The variance would be up to 10. Mr. Andrews stated that he feels the cap should be about 65. Ms. Peterson suggested 50. Mr. Andrews felt that was too low and stated that a car at 40 mph 100 yards away is 60. Ms. Peterson stated that you can change that between residential areas and industrial. Mr. Barlow stated that any of the variance requests will be like any other variance and will require green cards and neighbor notification. Mr. Andrews stated that when someone applies for a variance now they know what the Board's policies are in advance. Mr. Barlow stated that to a point they do. Mr. Andrews suggested 65 as a cap and then allow a variance from there but they would determine it case by case. Ms. Peterson asked if that would be in all areas or just commercial. Mr. Barlow stated that they could put 65 in as a number and then that number could be changed as they write the regulations. Ms. Peterson stated that one on MacArthur Blvd would not be the same as one in Cataumet or Pocasset. Ms. Peterson wanted to clarify that you cannot put wind turbines at the landfill so they don't have to worry about that. Mr. Andrews stated that they should take the same logic that they used and use 60db as your increase at night as

well but a cap value, because you are dealing with a residential area, of about 40 which would be a rural nighttime background. A quiet bedroom is around 35. Ms. Tinkham stated that maybe somewhere that is noisy at night could go up to around 40-45. Mr. Andrews stated that if it was a commercial area they could request a variance. Mr. Barlow stated that 40 would be the maximum and they can go from there with variances. Ms. Coffin asked Mr. Andrews to explain what modulation was. Mr. Andrews stated that in this instance the noise level increasing and decreasing at a certain frequency so you would hear the louder and softer in that repetition becoming an annoyance even though it may still be within the constraints of the max value. Mr. Andrews stated that they have heard that you can get a fluctuation in the sound and that he stood over at Taylor's Point a few times at night and when the wind is coming parallel with the building he could hear that swoosh sound and he was over close to where the Army Corps building is. Mr. Andrews stated that that sound was a little annoying. Mr. Barlow stated that he understood it was from the flex of the blades. Mr. Andrews stated that it doesn't matter what causes it, the sound that is fluctuating becomes annoying. Mr. Barlow stated it becomes annoying just like a flicker. Ms. Peterson asked what Mr. Andrews figure on the modulation was since he has done such a good job on them. Mr. Andrews stated that he was hoping the Board would do a little more on it because it was on the list that everyone has had to work on. Mr. Andrews stated he was not sure yet. Ms. Peterson stated that once the regs start going in with the proper verbiage it may not come out right on that end but they now have what the Board thinks is reasonable. Mr. Barlow asked if they think the amount of modulation is an issue or just the fact that there is modulation. Mr. Andrews stated that if it modulates in a smaller range you can't detect it as much. It's when there is a big swing in it that it's noticeable to you. Ms. Coffin asked if modulation can change based on wind speed or wind direction and can a remote or device measure that. If not she is concerned that there is no way to investigate a complaint. Mr. Andrews stated that yes, there is. Ms. Peterson stated that it is up to the applicant to provide this information and if a complaint comes in they have to prove if it didn't happen and they will be given a reasonable amount of time to do that. Mr. Andrews stated that they will have to prove that it did happen as well. Ms. Coffin stated that it can be subjective and some people may be more affected than others so it may be difficult to enforce. Mr. Andrews stated that if you get enough complaints you are going to have to set out a device to record and measure it. It will have to be figured out whether you work with them through the mitigation process or the permitting process or whether it becomes something that you have someone you have to call. If it's proved right or wrong it could be part of the fine process. Mr. Barlow stated that it could be made part of the requirement that they have a machine to measure the modulation or a service that measures on a regular basis. Mr. Andrews stated that it would only need to be measured if there was an issue. Ms. Peterson stated that the applicant should be required to state the maximum projected noise level from the proposed WECS and the study should be prepared by a qualified engineer. It should certify that the ambient study and projects were calculated using accepted practices stated by the Board of Health. It has to be certified by an engineer. That will include modulation, ambient, night and day. Mr. Andrews stated that regarding catastrophic failure, they talked about requiring the applicant to provide an engineer supervised failure modes analysis and part of that should be the safety manuals from the manufacturer so that they can see if there is anything else.

One manufacturer will have different issues than another manufacturer. The Board will want to see how they have engineered or mitigated out those potential hazards and show that those potential hazards or not going to create a hazard to public health and safety. Ms. Peterson suggested that they submit a model to scale that the Board can look at. Mr. Andrews stated that every turbine is different and you want to make sure that you are not allowing a manufacturer in that will cause an issue. Mr. Barlow stated that every one of them will have to be reviewed because there are so many manufacturers and so many different kinds and sizes and they all may have different issues. In order to discuss catastrophic failure Mr. Barlow believes that they need all the details of the device that will be put up. Mr. Andrews stated that by putting it in black and white the applicant will know what he is going to be required to bring forward and he can go to the manufacturer with that information. Ms. Peterson stated that she believes that the training of the emergency response team in Town at the applicant's expense is necessary. Ms. Coffin stated that going back to Section 5 they need a definition for catastrophic failure. Ms. Peterson stated that it is the worst possible thing that can happen to any particular turbine and that is not up to the Board to know. Ms. Peterson would like to know from the manufacturer the worst case scenario. Mr. Andrews stated that if they go through some of the engineering books they will find definitions for failure modes effects analysis. The Board wants to know what happens if certain things occur and what effects it will have and what the plan is to correct it. Ms. Peterson stated she would like to go back to the section on permits (2) and add that individual property owners that would be affected must grant approval with a legal document that is to be recorded at the Registry of Deeds should the Board allow a variance. Mr. Andrews stated that the next Section is section 6- Abandonment- Ms. Peterson asked after how many days would you consider it abandoned. Mr. Andrews stated that you have to give them an allotted amount of time to work on a system for repair and parts. He believes they should have a trigger date of nine months or a year. Ms. Peterson believes that if it is not operating for 30 days then they should come in front of the Board to explain why it is going to be shut down. Mr. Andrews believes it should be one repair at a time. Mr. Barlow stated that he does not understand why they should be concerned if it is not operating. Mr. Andrews stated that after it sits for so long if there are fluids stored at the time you want to make sure they are removed from the facility. Mr. Barlow stated they should notify the Board of Health that they are waiting for a part and how long it is going to be. Mr. Barlow stated that you have to be reasonable. Mr. Andrews stated that if they notify the Board that they will be down for 30 days but is not up and running in a year it should be considered abandoned. Mr. Barlow stated that something as simple as a blade breaking could take up to six months or longer to repair. Mr. Andrews stated that they can put a number in and adjust it from that number and agreed that parts can take a while sometimes. There was general discussion regarding how long a turbine be not operating before it is considered abandoned. Mr. Andrews stated that you could always have the hazardous materials removed which are what the Board is concerned about. Mr. Barlow stated that if it's just a mechanical part that needs to be replaced or a brake system that is not working properly he does not believe that it is necessary to make them drain all the fluids out which could actually be a bigger issue than letting it sit there. Mr. Barlow suggested that they also post bond in case after 12 months they have not done anything and the Town has to go in and take it down. Section 7- Variances- A variance can be obtained by a vote of the majority of the full

Board with the following stipulations: Permit is not transferable without a full vote by the sitting Board of Health. Mr. Andrews stated that that should be back under permits. Ms. Peterson stated that it should be under variances because if you issue the variance it is for one company. Ms. Peterson stated that she wants it known that they cannot go off and sell it two days later to somebody else saying they have the permit in hand. If they are putting up a wind turbine and they decide to sell their house the new people will have to come in front of the BOH and know what their requirements are. Ms. Coffin asked that if someone requests a variance will they have 45 days for it to be acted on. Ms. Peterson stated that the Board shall hold a hearing on the application within 21 days of receiving a completed permit application. *If the Board, after a public hearing determines that the WECS is likely to have adverse affect upon public health the Board, within 21 days of the close of the hearing, shall issue or deny a permit. If the Board issues a permit the Board may impose conditions which the Board deems necessary and desirable to protect public health and the WECS shall be constructed and operated in accordance with these conditions. The Board may deny a permit for failure to meet the requirements set forth in these regulations, for failure to submit information and plans necessary to make a decision and for failure to avoid and prevent adverse affects upon public health. For good cause the Board may revoke or modify a permit issued hereunder after notice to the holder of the permit, notice to the public, abutters and pursuant to the applicable Board of Health procedures and policies.* Ms. Coffin stated that if someone requests a variance and there is a time frame upon which the Board has to act what if a member is away for two weeks. You don't want to have this approved by constructive relief by saying a majority vote of the full Board. Ms. Peterson stated that they will take the word **full** out and say a *majority vote of the sitting Board*. Mr. Andrews stated that there is an Emergency Access section and two other sections that Town Counsel has added which are a section on Notices and Meetings and another section on Information Requests. Ms. Peterson stated that they are not going to go over that again tonight as they have already added a lot of things to that. They will go over the Emergency Access section and discuss security. Mr. Andrews asked if they would discuss financial security or property security. Ms. Peterson stated that she wanted to discuss both. Ms. Peterson stated that she would like financial security to the Town should they have to take a turbine over and security to the people or businesses around the turbines. Mr. Barlow stated that that is why they have asked for a gate and a lock box with a 6ft chain link fence around it because you don't want people standing under it. Mr. Andrews stated that the turbine could be on top of someone's house. Mr. Barlow stated that they have not decided on what an industrial turbine is. Mr. Andrews stated that they do not have to because they have set the limits so they don't have to get in the nitty gritty of one type or another. Ms. Peterson stated that they will have the regs in Town Counsel form on Weds, June 8th which is the regular BOH meeting. Ms. Peterson stated that that should be put on the agenda as Board feedback on the wind turbine regulations and distribution to the public. Ms. Peterson stated that they will need to get a meeting room for the meeting on June 15th because that will be for public comment. Mr. Uitti stated that he would not be here for that meeting. Ms. Peterson stated that it is just a chance to let the public comment on the regulations and they do not have to publish them in the paper. Ms. Peterson stated that their regular meeting on June 22 will need the full board present. That is the night they will adopt the final version of the wind turbine regulations and make any changes from public comment

that they think may need changing. Mr. Wall will be at the meeting and they can make any changes right there and take a vote of the Board. Ms. Peterson asked the Board members if they had any other questions. There were none. There was general discussion regarding the regulations being posted on the Town Website. It was decided at this time to have copies available at Town Hall and at the upcoming meetings. Ms. Peterson stated that at the public comment meeting there will be a sign up sheet and they will limit the comments to 3 minutes per person. Ms. Peterson stated that if it is not something that has been frequently repeated and is pertinent she can allow longer but they do not want to get into the same information being repeated over and over again. Ms. Peterson stated that it will be kept to only the Board of Health regulations that are going to be adopted. It will not vary from that. The Board will not allow any other topics to be discussed. That public comment meeting will on June 15, 2011. Ms. Coffin asked if she should post the public hearing in the newspaper. Ms. Peterson answered yes. Ms. Peterson also asked any press that was there to please put it in the paper so people were aware of it. Ms. Tinkham asked if Town Counsel had made any suggestions as to how to conduct the other business topics at the end of the meeting. Ms. Peterson stated that they are going to break it down into topics and Ms. Coffin will be able to comment on the topics but the Board will not be able to vote on them. Ms. Peterson stated that they can have an emergency health item or health problems as a topic. Mr. Andrews stated that that is what they have submitted to Town Counsel but they have not gotten a response back yet. **Mr. Andrews made a motion to ADJOURN. Mr. Uitti seconded the motion. All in favor and the meeting is adjourned at 8:40 P.M.**

Taped by Cynthia Coffin for the Bourne Board of Health
Typed by Kathy Burgess for the Bourne Board of Health

Respectfully submitted by the Bourne Board of Health

Kathleen Peterson_____

Stanley Andrews_____

Galon Barlow_____

Don Uitti_____

Carol Tinkham_____

cc Board of Selectmen/Town Clerk

