



Terri A. Guarino  
Health Agent

# TOWN OF BOURNE BOARD OF HEALTH

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



RECEIVED

2018 MAY 25 AM 8:40

TOWN CLERK BOURNE

## MINUTES

March 28, 2018

Members in attendance: Kathleen Peterson, Chairperson; Stanley Andrews, Vice Chairperson; Galon Barlow Jr.; and Kelly Mastria via conference call

Support Staff in attendance: Terri Guarino, Health Agent; Zackary Seabury, Health Inspector; Kayla Davis, Health Inspector; and Meghan McLean, Administrative Assistant

### Meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

Ms. Peterson asked if anyone was recording at this time. Mr. Philip Austin, operator of The Park at Pocasset, and Mr. Michael Rausch, were recording audio.

Ms. Peterson asked for a roll call vote to call Board member Ms. Mastria for remote participation. Roll call vote: Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrews, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes.  
Ms. Mastria is now participating via telephone.

- 1. Charles W. Austin Trust---The Park at Pocasset---Request for modification of conditional license to operate the manufactured housing community located at 141 Barlow's Landing Road, formerly known as the Pocasset Mobile Home Park, as heard before the Board of Health on February 28, 2018.** Phil Austin was present for this hearing. Mr. Austin has legalities which forbid him from operating the park under name Pocasset Mobile Home Park, even though the community knows it as such. The land is owned by the Charles W. Austin Trust and is operating under the Trust. The generic name he has been using is the Park at Pocasset and he is requesting to change the park name on his newly issued permit. He explained that he initially filled out the application as the Trust and would like the ownership and the new park name listed on his permit. Ms. Peterson stated that she had asked Atty. Kraus for some form of communication with the Atty. General's office, whether it be verbal or written, stating that they approve of this name change. She asked Ms. Guarino if any such documentation or communication was received, and Ms. Guarino said she hadn't received anything. Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Austin if he had received anything, and Mr. Austin said that he had not and this was the first he had heard of it. Atty. Kraus had previously categorized this request as an administrative change only. Ms. Guarino read the submission from March 5<sup>th</sup> that stated, "Per M.G.L c. 140, Section 32B, I am asking that the Board amend the license to reflect these requests. Please put the Charles W. Austin Trust on the Agenda for this amendment for the March 14, 2018 meeting." The name change was provided to the Atty. General's office, which is on file. Ms. Peterson reiterated to the Board members that the rules and regulations were submitted to the Atty. General's office, and shortly after that there was another copy submitted to the Atty. General's office with the new park name on them. Mr. Austin stated that the rules will take effect July 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Mastria said if the Board has a notification from Atty. General's office that they accept changing the name to 'The Park at Pocasset', the Board should allow the name change on the permit. Mr. Austin explained that at the last meeting, the concentration was on the wording of the conditions and not how the park was to be named. He stated that neither he nor his attorney have ever used the name Pocasset Mobile Home Park in any of the documentation specifically because they are not tied to the LLC. Ms. Guarino clarified that there have been several names provided in their correspondence such as Pocasset, Pocasset Community, Pocasset Mobile Home Park, and now The Park at Pocasset. It wasn't until February 26<sup>th</sup> that it was referred to in correspondence as The Park at Pocasset, which was with the new Rules



and Regulations that were submitted. The Health office has new license application that lists the name as The Park at Pocasset with the Charles W. Austin Trust as the owner that was submitted on March 9<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Peterson said that there has been enough information submitted that the Board can tentatively approve the name change provided that Atty. Kraus submits confirmation from the Atty. General that this is acceptable. Mr. Andrews made a motion that the Board allow the name change for Charles W. Austin Trust form Pocasset Mobile Home Park to be recognized as The Park at Pocasset contingent upon the written confirmation from the Atty. General's office. Mr. Barlow seconded the motion, Kathleen Peterson, and Kelly Mastria were in favor. It was a unanimous vote.

2. **Attorney Charles Sabatt--Pocasset Mobile Home Park, LLC—Request for Board of Health to consider abating or rescinding any/ all fines or penalties assessed against Pocasset Mobile Home Park, LLC or Charles W. Austin Trust during Receivership.** Attorney Charles Sabatt was present for this hearing. He stated that he has submitted, via email, a written request for an abatement of the fees assessed to him during his time with the Pocasset Mobile Home Park. He request that all of the fines be rescinded commencing in December of 2017 against the Pocasset Mobile Home Park LLC, which at that time was the licensee. At the outset of the receivership, this is a very unique relationship different than any other could be anticipated in terms of a mobile home park. As he reviewed regulations that the Board cited in a letter to him on December 21, 2017, he explained that all of those regulations are motivated by a situation of the mobile home park industry in general. For years this particular industry went virtually unregulated. As a result, many of the residents in these facilities were taken advantage of, mistreated, discriminated against and their health and safety was not guarded. Ultimately, the legislation enacted a scheme that was intended to regulate those who had a "profit motive". This is also why one of these regulations states that any adopted rules and regulations must be submitted and approved by the Atty. General's office. In this case, commencing on February 18, 2011 until approximately February 9, 2018, the park was managed by a court imposed, court ordered receivership. The orders establishing that receivership state that he was to undertake the construction of a wastewater treatment plant and provide for health and safety. There were no personal profits taken out of the operation and everything he did was out of benefit for the residents. When he took over, there was no money left in any of the accounts that funded the park. The system was being pumped every day and that specific account was drawn down within a week. Atty. Sabatt explained that he was not receiving rent at that time. He established protocol that someone notify the Health Agent immediately and a repair person to correct any issues with the system. The regulations that the Atty. General rejected in 2014 said that the residents were required to hook up to the sewer system. He was only there to make sure the units were safe and sanitary and authorize repair. He has completed his task in repairing the sewer system and some unit's bathrooms as well. He did not want unsanitary conditions on his watch especially when he had funds to make those repairs. This receivership was very different than normal regulated parks such as a private owner. The first issues with the Board of Health permit started in September 2017. The overall concern was the water system and the prospective new owner or operator had not come forward to discuss plans. He offered some defense for the new operator and asked the Board to give them time to put a plan together. During another meeting in September there was a motion pending within the Superior Court to terminate his receivership and he was prepared to end, so the license was extended to the end of his receivership. The court did not terminate the receivership at that time and from that point on, the first notification for fines was issued to him. He stated that he did not willfully or intentionally evade or disobey the Board in any way. His record is clean and has done everything the Board has asked of him. Most importantly he has fulfilled the mission. He had the same objective as the Board and he felt throughout this receivership that he was an ally. He complied with everything in letter, corrected rules and regulations, and communicated with the Atty. General's office. He has paid excise tax in a timely manner and compiled a list of residents. The rules and regulations were not created by him, they were in effect when he took over at the park. He is asking the Board to consider overall performance of receivership, uniqueness of receivership, fulfillment of every objective, and compliance of everything the Board has asked. Atty. Sabatt reiterated that he wishes to abate, in full, all of the fines that the Board assessed at that time. Rereading the order, he could have appealed this to the Superior Court and they would have had authority to get rid of these fees but he did not want to battle the Board, he wanted to work with the Board. Ms. Peterson reads the dates and total of fines aloud. Mr. Andrews asked Ms. Guarino if the rules and regulations are outlined as a requirement for a permit, to which she replied yes. Mr. Andrews asked when the first letter was issued and what date did he address the contents of that letter. Mr. Guarino stated that there was a tremendous amount of communication, including the



letter from September 21<sup>st</sup> and the license application from Atty. Sabatt, and that it is all filed chronologically with the Health office for anyone who wishes to review it. Mr. Andrews is concerned that there was a month's time in which there was no push to address the violations. He explained that it wasn't until the second letter for the abatement request to come in. This has taken up resources and time from the office, the Board's time, and everyone has to spend more time the longer it continues. He does not want to abate the entire fine while there was a month in which nothing was being addressed to his satisfaction. Atty. Sabatt stated that although he is not trying to diminish the importance, these regulations that were cited really were written for preventing the abuse of residents. He could not violate his appointment by the Superior Court. He explained that he was in violation for operating without a license but he did submit an application as requested. The next concern addressed were the rules and regulations with the Atty. General which he hadn't written himself but were in place when he came to the park in 2011. Mr. Andrews said he submitted them back in the beginning when he took over and the Atty. General's office sent him a letter explaining that they wanted things changed. Atty. Sabatt stated that he does not recall ever submitting them it was so long ago. Ms. Peterson said that the reason the rules and regulations become so important is because they allow the state to determine whether someone received a license through the state. Mr. Barlow stated that when the Board first started focusing on the park in 2005, kids were riding motorcycles through sewerage. It took 5 years to get receiver and took him even longer to correct this. He does not want to fine Atty. Sabatt due to the immense task of repairing the park. Ms. Mastria agreed that it has been a hard task to complete and Atty. Sabatt has done that and been cooperative throughout. He has always reported promptly and done exactly what was asked of him, therefore she does not want to fine him. Ms. Peterson asked for any comments from the audience, in which there were none. **Mr. Barlow made a motion to dismiss the fines accrued by the Pocasset Mobile Home Park, LLC of \$100.00 per day starting November 2, 2017 and ending February 28, 2018, totaling \$47,600. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion and commended Atty. Sabatt on all of his hard work over the course of his receivership. Roll-call vote: Ms. Mastria, yes; Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrew, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. It was a unanimous vote.**

3. **165 Jefferson Road—Jack Landers-Cauley, P.E. on behalf of owner, William Russell---Hearing to request waivers from Title 5, 310 CMR 15.405 and the Bourne Board of Health 150' Setback Regulations for the continued use of the existing septic system to accommodate the raze and rebuild of one of two dwellings on property. Existing septic system permit #128-07 is only 88ft. from the edge of wetland, 5ft off property line, and 6 feet from crawl space.** Mr. Peterson asked for certified mail receipts for abutter notifications which were provided by Mr. Kenneth Breivogel, on behalf of Jack Landers-Cauley's Office. Mr. Christopher Kirrane was also present as legal representation for Mr. Bill Russell. Mr. Breivogel stated that the plans that were originally submitted have been amended and that there were no changes to dwelling, they just added a FAST system to the septic tank. Ms. Guarino referenced the revision date on the site and septic plans as 3-21-18 and 3-22-18 for the architectural, both of which were received by the Board of Health office on March 27<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Breivogel began to describe the project as a reconstruction of the main house, adding a swimming pool, and no change proposed to the existing cottage. The existing septic system was approved in 2007 and received several variances for the upgrade. There was a passing Title V Inspection conducted a year ago when the Russell's bought property. They now are proposing to remove existing septic tank and replace it with FAST system to hook up to the existing cottage and new dwelling. Mr. Breivogel stated that this is a voluntary upgrade and improvement to the system because there is no change in number of bedrooms. The Chair then requested comments from the Health Agent on the project. Ms. Guarino stated that the addition of an aerobic treatment unit is an improvement over the existing conventional system. Unfortunately the revised plans were only submitted yesterday, and are lacking the minimum specifications of Title 5. For example, on page 2, there are no invert elevations or design criteria for the new components. As far as nitrogen loading, we were previously provided with one set of calculations for the proposed dwelling with no change to the septic system. We typically require an additional sheet showing the existing nitrogen loading and additional sheets showing alternatives which may help mitigate the total nitrogen load if it is greater than 5ppm. There are also corrections that need to be made with the percentage of increase worksheet. Mr. Barlow stated that this proposal is better since it has the I/A technology. Mr. Andrews agreed, stating that it offers an improvement to environment and protection to resources in the area. The Chair asked for any comments from the audience. Attorney Alexander Joyce representing an abutter at 163 Jefferson Road submitted a letter for the record. He explained that his clients are very concerned on the impact that this project will



have on the environment and has hired Mr. Bradley Bertolo, P.E. of J.C. Engineering, Inc. as experts on the subject. Mr. Bertolo also submitted a document for the record in opposition to the proposed project. He stated that the site is only 16,980 square feet upland and the applicant has 21,000 square feet on his plan. The variances were granted in 2007, over ten years ago to replace 2 cesspools servicing both dwellings. The distance from the leaching in 2007 was 150 foot setback to 62 feet instead of 88 feet. That application saw variances from property line, depth to ground water, etc. The groundwater in this area is approximately 50 inches below the surface. When considering variances of this nature he is asking board to look at it as it were virgin, not piggybacking on something that was issued in 2007 for an upgrade. He suggests the applicant go through the hoops of getting variances. Last November the applicant took a seasonal cottage and got a special permit to winterize it and now it's a single family home. It will be used year round. More importantly the applicant has submitted architectural and failed to include the cottage in the calculations and it is a single family home under the bylaw. He wants them to come back with revised calculations to see if he is complaint with the Board of Health's policy. Moreover this project is not a simple rebuild, it is new construction under title five and local regulations. Mr. Bertolo asked where the reserve area is for the leach field and feels the leaching should be relocated. Atty. Kirrane stated that they are not proposing installing a new system just swapping out one component and that going from a conventional Title 5 system to a FAST system is going to be beneficial. Additionally, all locations of components have been previously approved where they are now. He believes it is not a necessary to dig up the existing leaching that has passed inspection. He added that his clients are trying to improve the property and do everything correctly. By not increasing bedrooms, whether the cottage is seasonal or year-round he feels there will be no increasing flows. Mr. Breivogel said the house and septic system are as far away from house #163 as possible. Attorney Joyce said setback concerns are regarding the wetland and not the abutting property. Mr. Bertolo stated that the current system was put in under maximum feasible compliance. There are spots on property that would provide better setback from resources. Increase of bedroom area greater than 25% then a micro FAST system should be used. He believes that although they say its voluntary, based on the regulations it is actually mandatory. When reviewing tear down and rebuilding it should be considered as new construction. Title 5 states you need to show both a conventional primary and reserve area which are not on the plans. Setback to wetland is met under title 5 but not the Town's regulations. Additionally, the depth to groundwater variance was under previous system, there should be a 2 compartment tank, and some rooms classify as a bedroom area under local bylaw. Ms. Peterson suggested that the walk-in closet or room labeled as a gym could have a cased opening. The Chair asked if there was anything else to discuss. Mr. Bertolo reiterated the technical issues being septic tank, the Cultec leaching facility having a reduction in effective leaching area, and that the placement of the pool might impact the upgrade of the system a few years down the road since there is no reserve area shown on the plan. Ms. Peterson asked for any other audience comments. Mike and Kathy Hallam of 158 Jefferson Road were in favor of the project. Mr. Hallam said the neighbors have done great job and thinks the improvements to the site will be tremendous. Ms. Peterson asked for any additional comments. Mr. Jack Mulkeen, who did not identify as a direct abutter, but lives in the neighborhood, had questions about the swimming pool being in a flood zone. Ms. Peterson asked again for additional staff comments. Ms. Guarino stated that there was a lot of good points that were presented this evening and there is certainly additional information that will need to be submitted. Ms. Peterson added that documentation needs to be filed a week in advance from the hearing date. It is just that no one has had ample time to review and request corrections or feedback. Normally, if we had a few days to review, the Board could have done a drive by of the property or they could have talked with Terri and got additional feedback for what they will need. They Board members agreed they would like to hear this again on the next agenda. **Mr. Barlow made a motion to continue this hearing to April 11<sup>th</sup>, provided that revised plans and additional information is submitted to the office by the 5<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Ms. Peterson, yes; Ms. Mastria, yes. It was a unanimous vote to continue this item.**

4. **Eastern Inn—6 Bourne Bridge Approach, Buzzards Bay--Divyesh Patel, Owner/ Operator—Hearing to discuss and possibly vote on noncompliance with Bourne Board of Health Hotel, Motel, and Guest Cabin Regulations and violations of State Sanitary Code from inspections conducted on March 9<sup>th</sup> and March 16, 2018.** Divyesh Patel, motel owner, was present for this hearing. Ms. Davis explained that the Bourne Police Department had contact the Health office requesting that room 12 at the Eastern Inn be inspected. She and inspector Zack Seabury went to the motel on March 9<sup>th</sup> and there were numerous violations in room 12. After a re-



inspection on March 16<sup>th</sup>, most of the violations had been corrected and the room is in the process of a complete renovation. Mr. Seabury stated that the call from Bourne P.D. specifically included bed bugs, but none were found at the inspection. The P.D. had done a complete search of the room prior to the health inspection so the room was quite messy. The owner could not provide guest logs at the time so the inspectors did not know exactly how long the occupant had been in there, however, there was cooking equipment, dirty clothes, bags, dishes in the sink, pets in the room, etc. which made it clear that they were there for a while. There were no mattress covers, the linens were not clean, and there was evidence of smoking in the room with multiple burn marks on the mattress and behind the bed. It was difficult for employees to get in and clean but not impossible and it should have been done. The owner had made logs as of today and one more inspection will be done before an occupant is able to stay in room 12. The owner estimates that it will be ready next week. Ms. Peterson stated that every time she stays in a hotel or motel, she has to be signed in, a license must be given, and most if not all establishments have electronic logs. She cannot understand how motels don't have anything organized or easily accessible for an inspection to be conducted at any time. Ms. Mastria agreed and thought a more stringent regulation could be enforced. She stated that it is 2018 and the Board should not be accepting pieces of paper instead of electronic logs. She wasn't happy that the Eastern Inn was being heard before the Board again discussing the conditions of motels and hotels in the town of Bourne. Ms. Peterson said that it is great that everything has been corrected but it had to come through the P.D. and the Health Department, and now before the Board of Health. Ms. Mastria asked if the Board can require some sort of computer-generated tracking system for the guest logs instead of paper and pencil. Ms. Guarino said that she has been thinking of this as well since it does seem as though lots of establishments do not use computers. For those establishments, an alternative for using a computer log could be using a bound book or a ledger, something where the pages cannot be removed or if they are it is evident. Ms. Mastria agreed and stated that there are too many inconsistencies with hotel and motel establishments. This must be inspected more frequently because no one is compliant with record keeping. Mr. Barlow suggested reviewing the regulation and seeing all the violations that are recurring throughout all motels in town. Ms. Mastria suggested a grading system or satisfactory or unsatisfactory postings. The Board disagreed with a grading system, but are open to other suggestions because something has to change. Mr. Patel said that he just bought a new computer system and all reports will be on computer so that they may produce them at any time and keep them organized. Ms. Peterson asked if they implement a cleaning list, to which they stated that they do. The hot plates in the room were hidden by the customers. He does enforce it, but he may not enter the rooms without permission and the hot plates are hidden from him. Ms. Peterson asked for any audience comments, to which there were none. Mr. Barlow asked for input from Ms. Guarino. She explained that she agrees the regulations need review. They were previously amended on January 25, 2017, but it is clear that it must be done again. These permit renewals are not going to be automatic going forward and trying to get compliance from these establishments is impossible. If the Health office is not seeing compliance soon these establishments will not see permit renewals until they start complying with regulations. Ms. Peterson stated that if the Eastern Inn is in front of the Board again before their next license renewal, then their license does not get renewed again. Mr. Andrews stated that he would like a license suspension for 1 week. Mr. Barlow stated that the owner had just recently inherited this establishment, and asked Mr. Seabury if the motel has "come up" since there have been different owners. Mr. Seabury stated that this room is the only one he has seen lately and his opinion was that the occupant was living there, but throughout the whole motel, cleanliness has increased significantly. **Ms. Peterson made a motion to take no action at this time. Knowing that the owner must change his check in requirements and keep a neat log. She included in her motion that at the end of every month until the next license renewal he must submit monthly logs to the Health office. Reporter Michael Rausch asked when he took ownership of the Inn, which was July 30, 2015. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Ms. Mastria, yes; Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrew, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. It was a unanimous vote.**

5. **Amend Cannabis Regulations—Adopted April 12, 2017—In accordance with M.G.L. c. 111, §31, Board to discuss and possibly vote to amend existing Bourne Board of Health Regulations Restricting the Sale of Marijuana in furtherance of its mission to protect, promote, and preserve the health and well-being of the Town of Bourne. Add information inclusive of the new State Regulations for the Adult use of Marijuana (935 CMR 500.00) and the Act to Ensure Safe Access to Marijuana (St. 2016, c. 334, as amended by Chapter 55 of the Acts of 2017). Update definitions, inspection requirements, and license and permit conditions.**



Ms. Peterson stated that the Board is not reading any existing regulations tonight. Ms. Guarino explained that a new legislation has been added, including additional information under the statement of purpose. The prevention of illegal sale is significant. Under definitions under section C there were some changes to this. The definitions from existing regulation were from DPH regulations CMR 735. Since then, there has been new legislation. DPH regulations were amended in December 2017. The most important thing will be distinguishing between marijuana establishment and marijuana dispensary, adult use versus medical use. Ms. Peterson said if this amendment is approved tonight, it will be published in full in the newspaper. The reason that the Board of Health has been working so closely on this matter is to get in front of it. The best part about the regulations is that they can be changed that night and published in the newspaper the next morning. Ms. Peterson read through the amendments made to the regulation (see draft attached to minutes). Ms. Peterson explained that regarding Number 9, the Board has chosen to leave blank for a short time until we can have a meeting with the Fire Chief, Police Chief, Selectman, etc. to have a discussion regarding hours of operation. Number 12 is a state law and the Board has stated that in previous regulations, it is not a new item. George Slade, Selectman, stated that he thinks Bourne has 9 retail packages stores including seasonal establishments, and asked how the Board came up with the number 6. Ms. Peterson stated that at the time Bourne's regulation was created, the Cannabis Control Commission had not been created. Rhonda Tobey, audience member, asked if the total number going to be 6. Mr. Andrews stated that the regulations today say 6, but that needs to be researched legally. Regarding number 14, Ms. Guarino said that the existing language should be worded differently by reading, *"the fee for a license is nonrefundable, not prorated and subject to change according to most recent schedule of fees."* Ms. Peterson agreed. Mr. Andrews explained that there are several blanks within the regulation and he wants to fill them in this evening because he doesn't want to approve a regulation with a blank. The Board and Ms. Guarino discussed filling in the blank spaces. Ms. Peterson asked for any audience questions. Ms. Tobey asked why the Board is still using word marijuana. Mr. Barlow stated that was the word of choice at the time we developed regulations. Ms. Guarino explained that the definition of marijuana within the regulation was specifically copied and pasted from the Cannabis Control Commission. Ms. Tobey wanted the regulation name changed to say Cannabis Regulation instead of Marijuana Regulation. She also asked, when it comes exchanging gifts, does that go for anybody or specific individuals. On Page 5 Section E, Ms. Guarino gave an example stating, "We can gift marijuana to each other, however I cannot give you this pen and you in exchange give me a quantity of marijuana. That would be against intent of regulations that the state has put into place." Ms. Peterson stated it can be gifted just not in exchange for goods or money. Ms. Tobey's last question was whether blunt wraps will still be illegal. Mr. Andrews stated the blunt wraps target minors using a variety of flavors and that's where the problems arise. Ms. Tobey explained that many adults use them. Ms. Peterson stated that they can buy them elsewhere, and that Bourne will not be legalizing them. Mr. Barlow explained that the Board attended a presentation which they stuck with. The wrappers contain nicotine and tobacco, and although consumers are using them for marijuana, they are also getting subconsciously addicted to nicotine which the Board is trying to prevent. Ms. Guarino explained that paper wraps do not contain nicotine and that is what is available at retail establishments. Ms. Peterson said if the Board chooses to look at tobacco regulations again residents of Bourne are always welcome to come then and discuss it, but for now they will say illegal. Ms. Peterson asked for any questions from the audience, to which there were none. **Mr. Andrews made a motion to accept the amendments to the current Marijuana Regulations that were discussed this evening including the blank spaces that were discussed and filled in. These amendments take effect immediately and will be published in the local newspaper as soon as possible. Mr. Barlow seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Ms. Mastria, yes; Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrews, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. All were in favor and the vote was unanimous.**

6. **Open Meeting Law Complaint 2018-29—Resolved per letter dated March 5, 2018 from Assistant Attorney General. Mr. Andrews made a motion to take no action at this time. Mr. Barlow seconded his motion. Roll call vote: Ms. Mastria, yes; Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrews, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. All were in favor and the vote was unanimous.**

7. Approve the Minutes from the meetings dated February 14th and 28th, 2018. Mr. Barlow made a motion to approve the minutes from February 14<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Ms. Mastria, yes; Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrews, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. All were in favor and the vote was unanimous.
8. Set tentative date for next meeting and adjourn. The next Board of Health meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 2018 at 7:00 pm.

Mr. Andrews made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Barlow seconded his motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Barlow, yes; Mr. Andrews, yes; Ms. Peterson, yes. All were in favor and the meeting adjourned at 9:36 pm.

Taped & Typed by Meghan McLean, Secretary

Kathleen Peterson

Stanley Andrews

Galon Barlow Jr.

Don Uitti

Kelly Mastria

cc Board of Selectmen/Town Clerk

