

BOARD OF HEALTH MINUTES
TOWN BUILDING- HEALTH DEPARTMENT OFFICE
FEBRUARY 5, 2018

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Elisabeth N. Brewer, M. D. Chair (EB), Susan Green (SG) and Brian McNamara (BM). Also present were Julia Junghanns, (JJ) Director of Public Health and Patti White Department Assistant. The meeting was recorded by WayCam.

7:00 p.m. Public Comment- There were none

7:05 p.m. Review and discuss memo dated 1/22/18 title “Environmental Impact Assessment for 2 CH40B applications”, from Dan Hill, Planning Board Chair- Guest Dan Hill, Planning Board Chair

Mr. Hill has come before the board to discuss his memo to the Finance Committee requesting town funding for potential independent analysis on CH 40B projects that are before the ZBA at this time. The 2-40B projects that are presently before the ZBA are Cascade Wayland (113-119 BPR)and Winsor Place(24 School Street). The Planning Board is concerned about the environmental impacts of these projects and the accuracy/quality of peer reviews being conducted using the 53G account (40B funds from ZBA). Ch40B is a one shot comprehensive permit from the ZBA; both projects are asking for waivers from Zoning, Conservation and Board of Health bylaws and regulations. Mr. Hill believes the ZBA does not have enough information to balance local concerns with housing needs, to make their final decision. Through the process the ZBA can approve and issue the comprehensive permit, deny or issue with conditions. Local concerns have to be tied to environment, health, planning or specific bylaws in Wayland. The Planning board feels there is incomplete information from both Applicants. The Planning Board is concerned for the impacts from the septic to downstream wetlands and streams and possible issues with storm water/thermal impacts as well (Pine brook is a cold water brook). The Cascade project on Boston Post Rd. is the most concerning project.

BM: Do we have an official septic plan for the Cascade project? JJ: No, we have not received an official septic design plan. DH: Conceptual (preliminary) plans have been submitted, they are not detailed plans- we may not get details until after the comprehensive permit is issued. The Applicant says he is doing a hydrogeo study (and agreed to do this study at the beginning of the project). The Planning Board believes we need some type of independent analysis. Mr. Hill works with other towns as an attorney working with 40B projects. The towns of Norfolk, Grafton, Carlisle and Sherborn have done town funded independent analysis for 40B projects. Carlisle and Sherborn have private wells and studies were done involving potential impacts on private wells (Wayland has public wells and very few private wells), as they feel that the Zoning Boards need more data and evidence to make their decisions.

JJ: We understand the ZBA is looking for feedback, but we still do not have information from the Hydrogeo study that is being done by the project applicant (for the Cascade Project). This study should give us some detail we are looking for.

DH: I don't expect to receive the level of analysis we need; in the proposed scope (as drafted/shared by D. Hill), we have concerns about a concentration of phosphorus going into the stream. We don't know what will be coming from the septic system and the Stormwater system.

EB: Does the owner of the property have to allow access to the property for investigation? DH: We may or may not need access to the property; if we need to enter we will need their permission. JJ: there are some areas that should have more test holes where the septic location has been shifted from the previous location(due to the large size of the leaching area and the concern for ledge).

Brian: I don't think we are in disagreement for the use of town funds, I just don't know that we will get access to the site. DH: I don't think we need access the site, if we have groundwater and soil testing data, we need someone to do modeling; I don't know if we will be able to get them to supply that. Brian: We have modeling data, observation holes and soil testing data. JJ: They have supplied some of the information, but not a plan

including useful information; the test hole numbers/percs and details, monitoring wells and data, for the shifted septic system on the revised plans. There was a discussion regarding this information, the large size of the leaching area, varied soils and percolation rates, ledge, wetlands, the brook, trout spawning, thermal impacts on the brook, etc.

DH: I am trying to understand what studies have been done and will be done by departments so as not to duplicate any of that work. The Conservation Commission has not started any work on Cascade (the project proponent has not yet submitted/filed an application to Concom). I am gathering information (data plans) the Conservation Commission is hiring Norvo Armstrong to look at the Stormwater system, it could be possible to expand the scope to do some of the work I am looking for. I would like to get a good understanding of where we stand with existing studies and review with a defined scope of services.

SG: When does the ZBA need to make their decision? JJ: March 24 for Cascade, School St is May 1st (extensions have been granted) the next ZBA meeting for Cascade is 2/27- we will be having an in-depth discussion later in our meeting tonight regarding what is to be studied and your proposal. We have not received any revised plans from our septic plan review for 24 School St., we understand they have changed the footprint of the project; we have not received any information regarding the redesign of the project. SG: So Cascade is now out 7 weeks, if we need to proceed with additional analysis, it needs to be done soon. DH: I would like to have comments by next week.

DH: The EPA has research on the concentration of contaminants in the runoff from a parking garage; what is expected to be in the runoff and create a model of the size of the garage, number of parking spaces and number of units to analyze what might be expected in the runoff. JJ: We have been told they will follow our Floor Drain Regulations; in the original submittal they include a request to waive all BOH regulations. Joe Peznola has responded, but we need the Applicant to respond with an updated list of specific regulations that will be waived. EB: If the garage had a tight tank will that take care of that? JJ: They are showing a Stormwater drainage basin that goes to an infiltration area close to the brook, (from the roadway in the site, and possible Rt. 20 runoff. At this time we have not received any data from the soil testing for this Stormwater drainage area. SG: What is the source of phosphorus you are concerned about? DH: I have been told this is in runoff from the septic? EB: I am favor of protecting the environment and streams, but before we spend this money, I would like to know what this involves. BM: I did not know the ZBA can approve the project without all the important information. The State Regulations say they have to locate a septic system, how can they issue the 40B permit without an approved septic design? JJ: They are not required to apply to us for a septic permit before the Comprehensive Permit is issued. We have to advise them on any BoH waiver requests. DH: I think we need an expert to tell us what the risks are, to advise us what to look at and look for. Under the 40B guidelines, peer review is limited to look only at the preliminary plans that have been presented by the Applicant. JJ: We do have a lot of information about the soils; there had been ledge encountered on the site and I have concerns for potential fractures in the ledge and effluent getting through the fractures. Title 5 regulations, when written in 1995, did not consider 9,900 g.p.d. sized septic system, when they wrote their regulations they expected WWTF's to handle these larger flows. I don't feel the 50' state offset to wetlands was put in place for a project this size. DH: Under the Wetland Protection Act, a title 5 septic system is not under the Conservation Commission and they cannot look at the environmental impact of the septic system.

Linda Hansen Conservation Administrator: The Cascade project is very different due to the cold water stream; the plans will require a review by a fisheries biologist, peer review to determine how the volume and temperature will affect the cold water stream. I have concerns regarding the Stormwater design that does not appear to be sized for larger storms and a 9800 g.p.d. septic system will be putting a large amount of warm water into that cold water stream. The Conservation Commission does have a say in the septic system as it is considered to be a 'Critical Area' DH: Wetlands Regulations say a Title 5 compliant permit will not be impacted. LH: This is a "critical area". DH: The Town of Sherborn tried to use "critical area" last year and lost, I am concerned that there will be loopholes. JJ: We need to think about this info and we will be in touch.

Michelle Galias, 20 Aqueduct Rd. The Town of Wayland received a DCR grant for the rehabilitation of bridges on the Mass Central Rail Trail and \$12,000 for anti-pollution work on Lake Cochituate. The proposed septic

system for the 40B project at 24 School St. feeds to Snake Brook which goes to the Middle Pond at Lake Cochituate. We should do our due diligence for downstream contamination from a septic system.

7:20 p.m. Information and updates regarding wireless issues- Guests Cecelia Doucette, Technology Safety Educator and Resident Peggy Patton and Cecelia Doucette, (CD) Technology Safety

Ms. Doucette is before the Board with Ms. Patton with concerns regarding the Town Meeting article for the new proposed wireless residential water meters. Ms. Doucette has done extensive research and has compiled industry and non- industry studies from all over the world including the recently updated Bio-initiative Report. The link below is for the updated Bio-initiative report

<http://www.bioinitiative.org/>

Senator Karen Spilka and Senator Michael Moore are re-introducing 7 bills related to EMF, wireless radiation and public health, the link below is to a website with information regarding EMF's and the senate bills.

<https://sites.google.com/site/understandingemfs/ma-emf-bills>

Smart meters wireless transmitting devices are set up in a network, readings are taken on house 1, sent over to the next house and down the street collecting readings then up to pole and sent off to third party. SG: Are the meters on the outside of the house? CD: Yes, but the signals are able to go through the walls, these constant signals can causing biological problems. Sleeping with wireless technology surrounding you; phones, routers, laptop, roku are all disturbing our sleep cycles. EB: With all the current wireless devises in my home; what percentage of additional exposure will I have from the one additional meter? CD: I don't know what the percentage for that would be, but this type of signal is one of the worse types of exposure, and it is not under your control. EB: Can you quantify it to a cell phone signal? BM: The manufacturer of the wireless meter should be providing that information. CD: It is all biologically hazardous, it is a huge risk. EB: The public schools have wireless internet throughout the buildings.

CD: 2013 American Academy of Environmental Medicine issued position statement that children should not be exposed to wireless signals, and that schools should be all hardwired. France has passed a national law regarding a ban of wireless use near nursery schools, preschools and kindergartens.

Additional information can be found at:

<https://www.wirelesseducation.org/>

Generation Zap- screening video can be found at: <https://generationzapped.com/>

8:00 p.m. Review ATM Article 'Advanced Water meter reading infrastructure' Mike Lowery, BoPW and Tom Holder DPW Director

The DPW is proposing an article for Town meeting to install wireless water meters on the exterior of homes and businesses. The meters work on a timed cycle collecting hourly readings and once a day (approximately a one second reading transmission) all the readings are sent to the DPW.

BM: Why are you coming here with this information? JJ: They are coming to inform and educate us on this proposed project that will be going before Town Meeting. EB: What is your time frame for this process? ML: This will be an article for Spring Town Meeting.

The current process involves a meter reader walking up to the home or business and tapping a hand held devise to the meter on the outside of the house. With a wireless meter, the DPW would be receiving daily water readings which can alert the DPW to problems at a residence or business that could avoid costly and damaging water leaks and floods. The meter can also be called to emit final water reading that would be needed for real

estate closings. These meters would also allow the residents to monitor their own water usage. The DPW is required to report water usage to the State and this is one of their recommended water conservation measures. The city of Boston has 88,000 of these meters in operation.

These meters will save the town money with the ability to bill in a more timely manner; the existing system is not allowing for timely billing and collection of fees. BM: Will this save money with not having a hand reader?

ML: The meter readers, will be doing other customer service duties, the savings from these meters will reduce abatements. ML: we have given \$186,000.00 in water abatements, about ¼ of that money (\$120,000.00) was for water leaks we could have found in a more timely manner. These meters will also allow us to read more frequently, instead of 6 months we have the ability to bill either quarterly or monthly. These additions to water readers will be placed over existing meters.

SG: What is the cost? ML: 1.6 million dollars, if the Finance Committee can finance this with the request for funds to replace existing meters, we can save \$300,000.00 by doing both at the same time.

Tom H: If suddenly we see readings 3 times over your regular bill, we will be able to work on it right away to avoid damage by water and expenses for unused water. JJ: An example was the breakout at the Town Center WWTP recently, it was discovered that the cause was a running toilet in one of the buildings in Town Center.

The American Cancer Society published information regarding smart meters and Health effects.

BM: what is the RF being generated by the product? Can we get the RF generated numbers? Can you explain how the signals will travel? ML: It is my understanding that there may be a Mesh network of repeaters to be installed around town to transport the readings to the DPW office. Mr. Lowery has presented the board with studies done by Public Utility Commission of Texas and Health impacts of Radio Frequency from Smart Meters. Links will be sent to Julia with the full documents for our records.

The DPW will allow for residents to opt out for a manual reading with a fee of \$20 per read; now we do twice a year, they would have quarterly readings for \$80 per year. EB: If a resident chooses to opt out and cannot afford the fee is there assistance? ML: We do have the option for a financial hardship.

BM: I would like to get the information and for the public regarding the RF signal strength. ML: We will be having public forums and we will get that information.

PP: American cancer society is in bed with the wireless communication, the utility group in Texas is part of the industry.

EB: The American Cancer Society is a well-respected organization. PP: if you have read any recent information, they are no longer well respected.

Stanley Robinson: Water meters are not on outside of house, they are proposing to do two installations- one inside and one outside. Project can be split up. I heard one pulse per minute. If you have a leaking toilet and want to know about it, you can get software to let you know about that. The sales material says it reads every minute.

BM: They will be supplying the information regarding the transmission.

8:10 Review and discuss memo dated 1/31/18 to WWMDC Update on High School and Town Center Wastewater treatment facilities

On January 27, the Director of Public Health was contacted by Fire Chief regarding wastewater flowing out of a vent pipe and overflowing into a catch basin and parking lot area at the wastewater facility in town center. The alarm was going off earlier in the day and the operator could not find a problem and had left the scene and then returned later. The wastewater was flowing into a catch basin drain that is connected to an infiltration basin. The Plant Operator arrived, the septic pumper arrived and was pumping the catch basin and the infiltration area, it was not believed that the overflow left the infiltration area. The next day Ms. Junghanns drove by to check on the situation and the overflow was occurring again (same as the day before) also alarm was sounding and the

operator was there, she was told it had just happened. She was told there were potentially a few problems occurring (a problem with one of the pumps, and/or a problem with the level of flow not being adjusted properly, also a large amount of extra gallonage going in that was not accounted for) and a large amount of gallons of sanitary sewer wastewater was again overflowing from the vent pipe into the catch basin. They ended up identifying a running toilet in Town Center that was found and repaired. Other problems are still under investigation.

The Board reviewed the Director's Memorandum dated 1/31/18 to the Chair of the Wastewater Management District Commission regarding the incident and emergency procedures, MassDEP visited the site Friday 2/3/18. DEP issued a list of items to be addressed/responded to by the town.

High School Treatment Plant- Paul Brinkman – Town Engineer is organizing a meeting to discuss the facility; MassDEP also stopped by the High School on a site visit (the same day as the Town Center visit) to review the plant operations due to all the problems and current shutdown. This is again a membrane issue again (new membranes being plugged up for an unknown reason). BM: Has this been maintained regarding the O & M manual? JJ: I believe that is one of the things being discussed this week. JJ: We believe that the town will be hiring a new employee to manage both of the Waste Water Treatment Plants (WWTP) and eventually blend in/take over operations and maintenance (it must be approved at town meeting). The job description/responsibilities is being worked on.

8:25 p.m. 40B projects- Cascade at Mahoney's and 24 School St.

Cascade-113-119 Boston Post Road

This is presently the timelier project; the ZBA deadline is March 24th the next meeting of ZBA is 2/27/18. We are still waiting for hydrogeo study; Mr. Hill from the Planning Board has concerns; he is unsure that we will ever get the study and if we do, will it will be comprehensive enough. BM: Based on witnessed soil testing, are the soils in the proposed locations adequate for 9900 g.p.d. system? JJ: My concern is regarding the test holes that have ledge in them. BM: Based on the test holes you witnessed, are the soils adequate for a 9900 g.p.d. septic system? Why can't we ask them to provide more testing information without ledge? JJ: They have to prove 4' of permeable soil, they have shown an area with those suitable soils, but there is ledge below in some areas and we don't have the condition of the ledge and what type of ledge it is. Some of the test holes are in a different area, the foot print of the building has been moved and the septic system has been moved as well. I have asked the applicant to provide the test holes detail information/locations (in a legible format); it has not yet been received. EB: Would we be entering the property for testing? SG: If we have the testing information, are we paying for them to do modeling? JJ: I am unclear what the Planning Board is going to do. The Applicant provided a scope of services for the hydrogeo back in October; it has been being worked on since 10/31/17. Joe Peznola (Mass Housing Consultant) has advised us that the Applicant told him the study is expected about 2/19/18. Our recommendation- we need more time. BM: I don't think we have enough information to advise the ZBA; we have been requesting information since October and still have not received it. JJ: For a system that size to have ledge areas, that is a concern. EB: Are they required to provide this information. JJ: The ZBA has to make decision on which town waivers they may be granting. My first question to the Applicant is for a clarified written list of all waivers being requested. I have requested this, I now believe this needs to be more formal request to the Applicant and ZBA. BM: Based on the last site visit we have unresolved concerns. JJ: I have the concerns about the ledge and additionally the offset to the wetlands for a system that size, and floodplain elevation, as well as other concerns. Title 5 says 50', but I do not believe that was intended for a system this size; the town regulations allow for us to require a greater distance. SG: Are you comfortable for the number of test holes? JJ: I am not sure if there are enough. BM: Do we know for sure what type of system they are proposing? JJ: They have stated it will be a septic system and they show I/A technology. BM: Our written request states our concern and that we are still looking for more information. EB: What is the approval process? JJ: If the ZBA denied the project, there is an appeal process to the State. EB: If the ZBA approves the plan do we see a septic design plan? JJ: Formal septic design plans would be submitted and staff would go through the

same review process that we do for any project. EB: If they hit ledge during the installation what would happen? JJ: If that happens, the system is shifted/ a bit or relocated if possible, this is such a large project there is no area to move the system to. We will do multiple inspections during installation, but there can be multiple problems that can arise during installation, with this size project there is no wiggle room to move the septic system. BM: There are 3 big issues for this system, the water table, the ledge and the cold water stream. EB: These concerns need to be noted in the memo. SG: When they apply for a septic permit, what happens if you don't think they have a workable system? JJ: We review the plans that are submitted and if they cannot meet Title 5 requirement, we cannot issue a septic permit. They are presently asking for a waiver from the Wayland regulations for offset to wetlands, a waiver for sizing the leach field at 110 g.p.d vs our local requirements of 165 g.p.d. and a waiver for dosing of septic. They also state, waiver from all of our regulations.

BM: Are they asking for offset to groundwater? JJ: It depends on the perc rate; if it is less than 2 minutes per inch, they need a 5' offset, if it is greater than 2 minutes per inch or more, they would need a 4' offset. I am very concerned about the thermal effects of the septic for the brook; I understand that will be decided by the conservation commission. The mounding analysis that is part of the hydrogeo will show where the mound extends; I would recommend that the 50' offset should be from the edge of the mound to the stream. BM: We should state that we have concerns regarding the setback for the mounding of the septic system and that we have concerns regarding the temperature/thermal impact of the septic effluent into the stream. The stormwater is also a concern. BM: The Stormwater is also a concern; did they ever locate the drain easements from Rt. 20; is there any update on those? Are they active? Will they remain active? JJ: That is a good question, I will remind others to look into that as it had been discussed.

24 School St. Windsor Place

Key dates ZBA deadline May 1 and the next meeting is March 20.

We reviewed the original septic plans that they submitted and provided comments; we have not received a revised septic plan. A revised building layout has been done; I am not sure if any parts of the septic system will be impacted, it appears the leach field is in the same location. We are waiting for the cumulative mounding analysis as was requested and has not been received. That missing information includes some of the same concerns as we discussed about the Cascade septic system. SG: Have the boundaries of the property been confirmed? JJ: The cost for the survey work was significant, we have asked if the new town surveyor can do some research/review the information we have so far and provide some assistance. They are proposing to use an I/A system(although it is not required). It will not be a nitrogen removal system; we could suggest a nitrogen reduction system, due to the offset to wetlands. I would like to see the groundwater mounding analysis.

George Bernard, East Plain St. -abutter to project - Is there someone out on the property to identify that samples submitted for testing are actually from that property? JJ: We are required to witness any soil testing that is done, but we are not required to witness the monitoring well readings for the groundwater mounding analysis. We have asked to be there, but we have not been invited, the engineer of record is on site. We received an email that they had been checking the monitoring wells, and they were low. I recommended they do additional readings of the wells, as we just had significant rain and snow melt. JJ: We have reviewed a septic plan and we have soil logs. BM: There will be an engineer of record who will be on site when the wells are being read and when testing is being done. Had modeling been done? JJ: There is a water table and it gets higher as you get closer to the wetlands and the soils get poorer in areas as well(although there is a steep slope as you approach the wetlands). BM: I think we should share that info with planning, as he was looking for info. JJ: we have a septic design, we have all that is required for a design, logs and readings(except the mounding analysis). I don't know what the cost would be for the hydrogeo work he is suggesting to use the money for.

George Bernard: I have been attending meetings, (ZBA and conservation) this mounding analysis has been talked about since October, there have been several dates mentioned that it was to be received by and they have all passed by. Can BOH or someone send a request to ZBA to push them to supply the information? JJ: The

mounding analysis is required by the Title 5 regulations to be done for any system over 2000 g.p.d. there is no requirement as to when it is to be submitted, but it is required for us to issue a septic permit.

BM: Why are we allowing the project to be approved? JJ: The septic plans are under review, the mounding analysis is a missing piece of the septic review and we have a concern for lack of information. Without the mounding analysis (which is required for a septic design with this gpd/flow), we cannot say if the project can meet Title 5 requirements.

GB: I have been watching this since 2015; their consultant/hydro expert Mr. Wang came out and took readings/testing during drought conditions, now they cannot do it because it is winter. SG: We have asked several times over, can the ZBA deny the permit due to missing information? BM: How do you approve this without the information needed to make a decision?

Brett Leifer, E. Plain St. I have been told that if this is denied by the ZBA and sent back to the State, there is a 90% or greater approval rate from the State. JJ: If this is approved by the ZBA, we still need the mounding analysis to know if the septic design will meet Title 5 requirements(although this is not required for a 40B submittal, they submitted a septic design that is under our review). If they cannot meet Title 5 requirements, they would have to revise the septic design.

GB: At the last ZBA we were told that the Mounding analysis (Winsor Place 40B) would be received by today and nothing has been received at the Building Dept.

Sheila Carel, Joyce Rd. This process is new for all of us, the developer had not been providing info to Conservation and BOH, can Town Counsel find out how does this unfold and the legal implications, if they are denied and the go to the state? We just want to have a project built that is the right size for the site. JJ: The ZBA has to feel comfortable with the BoH information regarding whether or not to grant the waivers. They are asking for a reduction in the local offset to wetlands and reduction in sizing of the leaching area. They will be designing on State Title 5 requirements, the ZBA wants our input regarding granting the waivers.

Resident: Why does the Planning Board want to hire a person to do a test? BM: This request for funding is to review data to see if there is any inconsistency or serious concern in what the developer is submitting/applying for, the problem is the developer has not submitted the necessary information. Resident: Why would the Planning Board do that? BM: They are trying to be proactive to provide comments to the ZBA, as to where they are in support of the proposed plans or if they have concerns. SG: They are not only asking for the data, but they are looking for some additional modeling of the data that the applicant is not necessarily required to do. Resident: Is this under the purview Planning Board to do that?

JJ: We need to have an idea of how we feel about the Planning Board request for town funding; I have spent a lot of time on this talking to many people. BM: I think it is money well spent if we had something to review, I don't know if we have enough information to be reviewed. JJ: How can the Planning Board determine what information is needed to be studied, the BOH and Conservation are the departments that review the information. George B: The Conservation Commission has a peer reviewer ready to review the mounding analysis. BM: I think the Planning Board proposal is trying to get all the departments and boards together to answer the questions that are being posed; there is a lack of information, so we can't do a review. EB: the ZBA can approve it, deny it or approve with conditions. JJ: even if ZBA approves it, if they go through the permitting process with us and can't meet Title 5, they will be denied for a septic permit.

EB: We need to decide where we stand with the Planning Board request. Brian is for it if we knew what we were looking for. I want to know how it impacts the process. BM: If you read Nan's email she is asking several valid questions; 1) duplication of studies 2) lack of clarity in scope of work 3) purpose of the work? 4) cost of the work 5) access to the site EB: Dan clearly said we don't need to go on the property. BM: I think Dan is trying to be proactive, but we do not know what they are proposing. EB: does the town have vendors for studies like this? JJ: there have been discussions and questions on the selection process and quality of the peer review. EB:

Sounds like we are saying we prefer to hold off until we have additional information, to clarify what Nan had asked about. JJ: I understand the need for more information, this is a difficult situation; if there is money we want it to be well utilized on specific identified needs. EB: Who would request the access to the property to do additional environmental study? JJ: If it was regarding septic, it would be us, if it was environmental it could be Conservation. Cascade has not applied to Conservation, School St. has applied. If a consultant is hired by the Planning Board, it would depend on what they wanted to test for, for example, we are concerned about the ledge, we would go in to a specific area to do additional testing just for ledge. I believe we should recommend additional testing regarding the ledge on the site. Joe Peznola set up workshops for each project, several months ago, we are unsure of the need to have an additional workshop to discuss further.

Sheila Carel (SC) Joyce Rd. comments, 24 School St. is a very tight property, what are the regulations for the septic setbacks? JJ: Ten feet from the edge of the property. SC: Can you access the town land and test there? Does that have any impact on what is on the 40 B site? BM: An abutting property does not reflect the conditions on the neighboring property. JJ: When the staff does their review of the plans, we look in detail at the breakout elevation regarding distances and the proposed retaining wall.

General Business

We have free flu vaccine still available to the general public, resident or non-resident. We had a mini clinic 2 weeks ago and had over 25 people. We have this information on the website, and we have posted in the newspaper as well.

The potential new board member running for election submitted nomination papers today, Bob DeFrancesco.

BM: discuss fines for the WWTP operators for these issues, consider fineable offenses, 3 strike events, no confidence in operators. Something we can discuss further at another meeting possibly.

JJ: We received an inquiry from a resident requesting to remove fluoride from Town Water. Several years ago we went through the process including a public hearing and we reduced the amount of fluoride to the lowest limit(as now recommended by DPH). EB: Adding fluoride to water helped to prevent cavities. It is additional fluoride besides fluoride in toothpaste and rinses. We reduced it to the recommended limit before national recommendation. JJ: We will have a dentist on the board soon and we can get the information from him.

JJ: I have been dealing with several hoarding issues. One house had a frozen pipe that caused a flood, fire dept. responded, we were notified that the house was a hoarding situation. The house is vacant and the resident passed away several months ago. The daughter of the owner, who lives in NYC, is looking to clean out the house(and has begun doing so); I will be sending a legal letter to the daughter regarding requirements to clean out the house before it can be re-occupied. The fire dept. posted the house as unsafe for occupancy. The second house is under investigation at this time.

Ruth and Julia have been working with the Middle School nurse and principal regarding workload in the nursing office, as brought to our attention by the school nurse expressing the need for help, and meetings have taken place. The responsibilities involved with the job may have changed over the years based on the needs changing. There are many field trips and arrangements/prep done by the nurse, as well as data entry required for immunization records (snap), in addition to involvement w/injuries and concussions. They are reviewing the staffing needs and situation of this nursing office, and discussing the responsibilities/workflow/workload and potential changes to consider for improvement. Once we have more information we will be following up with the school nurse and principal to review and discuss as well as possibly using some grant money for some assistance.

On New Year's Day, we had a flood at the town building from a frozen sprinkler pipe. I arrived just after the Fire Dept., the rugs in the hallway and the front offices for BOH and Conservation were saturated with water. They

had service master come in with blowers and equipment to dry things out. They are recommending the floor to be removed to get to the sub flooring for mold treatment/prevention.

JJ: I will be on vacation the week of 19th of February. Looking at next BoH meeting dates; to schedule the next meeting potentially on the 5th of March. BM: and EB not avail, EB available the 12th. I will reach out to the Board members not present tonight to see if we can seat a quorum.

9:45 p.m. EB: motion to adjourn, BM seconded.

Respectfully submitted.

Patti White
Department Assistant
020518minutes
APPROVED 050718