

TOWN OF STOW
PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of the December 5, 2023, Planning Board Meeting

Planning Board members present: Lori Clark, Nancy Arsenault, John Colonna-Romano, Margaret Costello, Karen Kelleher, Debbie Woods (voting associate)

Lori Clark called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Public Input

There was no public input from attending residents.

Planning Board Member Updates

Lori Clark asked the Board to consider having two meetings per month on weeks that the Select Board does not meet. She stated that this change will allow for the Planning Board and Select Board to attend each other's meetings and can make joint meetings easier when needed. Karen Kelleher supported Lori Clark's idea and added that more Board meetings could be scheduled if needed. Nancy Arsenault agreed with Karen Kelleher and Lori Clark.

Lori Clark suggested that the Board should revise their process of reviewing meeting minutes. She stated that members should review the minutes prior to the meeting and send any amendments to Staff; during the meeting itself, the discussion will focus on content of the minutes instead of typographical errors. Nancy Arsenault stated that minutes could also be reviewed at the end of a meeting. Karen Kelleher suggested that minutes could remain at the start of a meeting to avoid them being moved to another meeting.

Lori Clark suggested that appointments with the Board could begin at 7:15pm instead of 7:30pm. She stated that this will allow for public hearings and appointments to be earlier, and administrative discussions could be later.

Planning Director's Report

Affordable Housing

Two existing deed-restricted affordable housing units are being sold. The current owners of the properties are working with the Town's consultants at MetroWest Collaborative Development to sell the properties to income eligible families and/or individuals.

Stow Acres Planning

The Stow Acres Comprehensive Permit application has not yet been filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals. The developer has informed Staff that the application will be filed in the coming days.

The owners of Stow Acres Country Club are proposing to relocate the driving range from the North Course to the South Course. An application is expected to be filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals soon.

Housing for Adults with Disabilities

Staff met with residents who proposed a “micro-unit” style house for adults with disabilities, such as autism. These units resemble small accessory dwelling units (bedroom, bathroom, living space, and kitchenette) connected to one another with a common living room and full kitchen within one structure. The over structure would resemble a single-family house. Staff have connected the residents to developers seeking permits in Stow with the idea that micro-unit model could be retrofitted into a proposed single-family house.

Non-Residential Special Permit Inventory

Staff have compiled a list of non-residential Special Permits granted by the Board. The list includes existing business, wireless service facilities, solar arrays, and municipal properties.

Nancy Arsenault asked why some businesses do not have a Special Permit even though some other businesses (of the same nature) do have a Special Permit. Valerie Oorthuys responded that some business have a Special Permit granted through the Zoning Board of Appeals instead of the Planning Board. Margaret Costello asked why the list does not include Special Permits granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction over permits granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Debbie Woods asked if there is a page on the Town’s website where all Special Permits granted by the Board are available. Karen Kelleher stated that the website has recent Special Permits but not older Special Permits; she added that a copy of a Special Permits not on the website can be requested through the Planning Department.

Margaret Costello asked what determines if an application goes to the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals. Lori Clark responded that the Zoning Bylaw lists land uses and the land use’s Special Permitting Granting Authority, such as the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals. Karen Kelleher added that the Zoning Board issues Special Permits to all pre-existing non-conforming properties.

Lori Clark reminded the Board that the purpose of the inventory is for the Board to assign priorities to the existing Special Permits and periodically review them. She stated that the Board in the future can assign priorities to Special Permits and begin to review them.

Margaret Costello stated that there may be some duplicate entries on the list, noting that there appears to be four Special Permits for two solar energy companies. Valerie Oorthuys responded that the duplicates are an error, and that there is only one Special Permit per solar energy company.

Mark Forgues, 1 White Pond Road, asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals is required to review the Special Permits that it grants. Lori Clark responded that there is no requirement for the Zoning Board of Appeals to review Special Permits that it grants; she stated that she cannot speak on behalf of the Zoning Board of Appeal regarding its desire to review Special Permits it granted.

Draft Letter Regarding Recording of Meetings Policy

Lori Clark stated that Staff have drafted a letter to the Select Board regarding the Recording of Meetings Policy based on the comments heard during a previous meeting discussion. She asked the Board for any comments on the letter.

Debbie Woods supported the section of the letter that states that the Board has the responsibility to be transparent in its process to residents and business owners in Stow, but the Board does not have the responsibility to be transparent to the world.

Lori Clark suggested adding the word “indefinitely” to the section referring to the length of time the meetings will be available.

Lori Clark proposed an edit to clarify the Board’s fear around information security, artificial intelligence, and the global distribution capabilities of using YouTube for video uploading. The Board agreed with Lori Clark’s proposed edit.

Lori Clark proposed to separate the recommendations in the end of the letter. Margaret Costello and Karen Kelleher agreed with Lori Clark’s proposal.

Setting Upcoming Meeting Dates

The Board set the following meeting dates:

- February 6, 2024
- February 27, 2024

Public Hearing: Special Permit and Site Plan Approval to Allow the Inclusion of Artist Spaces and Gun Manufacturer Spaces, 501 Gleasondale Road (Gleasondale Mill)

Margaret Costello motioned to continue the Public Hearing for Special Permit and Site Plan Approval at 501 Gleasondale Road (Gleasondale Mill) to January 9, 2024, at 7:15pm without testimony.

John Colonna-Romano seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Lori Clark - **Yea**; Nancy Arsenault - **Yea**; John Colonna-Romano - **Yea**; Margaret Costello - **Yea**; Debbie Woods - **Yea**.

Special Event Permit Regulations

Nancy Arsenault asked how the Collings Foundation was able to host an event with an estimated 1,000 people in attendance. She also asked if Stow Public Safety was aware of the event. Lori Clark stated that the outdoor events hosted by the Collings Foundation are regulated by a Court Decision, but the decision does not reference indoor events.

Lori Clark stated that Staff have provided the Board with the Select Board’s Special Event Permit Regulations. She stated that the Board often references the regulation in Special Permit decisions, and the discussion at this meeting is to ensure that all members understand what is in (or not in) the regulation.

The Board discussed what qualifies as a special event. By reading the regulation, a special event is determined by impacting public property (such a park or public way) or having 35 people in attendance. John Colonna-Romano questioned if the attendance requirement is in addition to the normal number of attendees or total number of attendees at a business. Valerie Oorthuys clarified that the intention of the regulation is to require a permit for 35 people at one time.

Lori Clark interpreted that a Special Event Permit would be needed if an event impacts traffic on public streets, or if an event impacts other town properties. She stated that the regulation does not require a

Special Event Permit if an event only impacts abutters. Karen Kelleher agreed with the interpretation that a Special Event Permit is needed if an event impacts traffic.

Lori Clark stated that the Board may have previously misinterpreted the authority of the regulation. She believes that the Board interpreted the Special Event Permit as a tool to mitigate impacts to abutters, such as noise.

Nancy Arsenault noted that the Special Event Permit has a section on noise, which would then require an Entertainment License. Lori Clark responded that the license would only be required if the event is deemed a Special Event; if not a Special Event, it would not require the license.

Lori Clark concluded that the Special Event Permit is a tool that is used when an event of at least 35 people impacts town owned ways or property. She stated that understanding this can assist the Board in future decisions. She stated that another mechanism to regulate events could be created if the Board intends to regulate other impacts of an event.

Guidelines for Public Input

Valerie Oorthuys asked the Board for their opinion on creating guidelines for public input. She stated that the guidelines would allow public input during the time allocated on the agenda, public hearings, and public forums. She expressed concern about receiving comments during discussions, which can take the conversation off topic, can be inappropriate or can regard ongoing litigation against the Town. She asked the Board to consider developing guidelines that emphasize the designated time for the public to speak and have a member of the Board facilitate public input. Lori Clark asked for comments about the idea of creating public input guidelines.

Karen Kelleher supported the idea of public input guidelines. She stated that she has similar concerns to Valerie Oorthuys.

Nancy Arsenault stated that a public input policy could provide integrity to the meeting minutes as there will be separation of the public and Board's comments.

Karen Kelleher questioned how the Board will proceed with allowing the public to comment on discussion items as the public input section of the meeting is for items not on the agenda. She stated that the Board could allow for a designated period for public input during a discussion, but the Board would need to remember to not get distracted from off topic comments.

John Colonna-Romano stated that guidelines for public input are important. He expressed concern that the Board would not be perceived as open and transparent, something the Board takes pride in. He stated that flexible guidelines will help maintain the openness of the Board while improving the Board's ability to work.

Debbie Woods stated that there needs to be a distinction between public input and discussion. She stated that the Board takes input from the public and discusses; the public just provides input. She suggested having a public comment period at the end of the meeting.

Margaret Costello agreed with the comments made by John Colonna-Romano. She supports keeping the public input section to the beginning of the meeting. She stated that guidelines can help keep the meeting on track, and that the Board should continue to strive for openness.

Karen Kelleher acknowledged Debbie Woods's comments. She added that if there is input received that may lead to a discussion, the Board could add it to a future agenda.

Lori Clark stated that she aims to balance public input without it disrupting a meeting. She stated that in previous discussions, she tries to get the Board's opinion before taking public input. She stated that the process could be: (1) the Board develops an opinion, (2) public input is taken, and (3) the opinion and decision are finalized.

Lori Clark stated that she does not yet have an opinion on having public comment at the beginning or end of a meeting. She stated taking input at the end of the meeting allows for the public to react to what was discussed, whereas public input at the beginning of the meeting is typically for the public to ask a question.

Karen Kelleher stated that the guidelines will need to focus on improving the flow of meetings. She expressed concern that the guidelines could be perceived as a mechanism to limit transparency. She acknowledged Valerie Oorthuys' comment that questions and comments may connect to ongoing litigation against the Town.

Valerie Oorthuys stated that she will work on creating draft guidelines based on the Board's discussion and using policies created by other boards/committees in Stow and other communities.

John Colonna-Romano stated that the guidelines should have a goal, such as openness of the Board, and that the Board should form an opinion before taking comment.

Public Hearing: Modification of a Contractor's Yard Special Permit, Erosion Control Special Permit, and Earth Removal Special Permit and Site Plan Approval, 63-65 White Pond Road

Margaret Costello motioned to continue the Public Hearing for Modification of a Contractor's Yard Special Permit, Erosion Control Special Permit, and Earth Removal Special Permit and Site Plan Approval, 63-65 White Pond Road to January 9, 2024, at 8:15pm without testimony.

John Colonna-Romano seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Lori Clark - **Yea**; Nancy Arsenault - **Yea**; John Colonna-Romano - **Yea**; Margaret Costello - **Yea**; Debbie Woods - **Yea**.

Draft Letter Regarding Stow House of Pizza Special Permit

Prior to the Board's discussion of the draft letter, Valerie Oorthuys stated that an edit to the letter will need to be made based on new information received. She stated that Town Counsel shared that a license cannot be held because a violation of a Special Permit; however, a license could be withheld based on unpaid fines from the violations. She stated that the Select Board could use the fines to withhold Stow House of Pizza's Common Victualler License. She stated that this new information will need to be incorporated into the draft letter.

Debbie Woods asked if the Select Board could withhold issuing a license until the fines are paid. Valerie Oorthuys confirmed that the Select Board could withhold the license until the fines are paid. She added

that she does not know the exact dollar amount of the fines, but it is significant. She stated that the intent of the fines is to push the property owner into compliance, not to collect the money.

Lori Clark asked members of the Board what their intent of the letter is. Karen Kelleher responded that she perceives the letter as a request for the Select Board to take the violations seriously.

Lori Clark asked members of the Board what their desired outcome of the letter is, such as having the Select Board withhold the license. She stated that she originally perceived the letter as an ask to the Select Board for support in remediating the issue of noncompliance.

Margaret Costello stated that her request is for the site disturbance to be remediated, the cause of the fines. She added that limiting the ability of the business to operate will not achieve this goal. Karen Kelleher agreed with the goal, then added that the fees may motivate the property owner to take action towards compliance.

Debbie Woods asked if the Board could collect the fines and use the fines to remediate the site disturbance. Lori Clark stated that the Board cannot use the fine to remediate the site disturbance.

John Colonna-Romano stated that the letter could serve as a way to get the property owner back into conversation with the Board as the Board has been unable to reach the property owner.

Lori Clark suggested that the Board could ask the Select Board to issue a partial license renewal. She stated that this could allow the Board to meet with the property owner and develop an action plan for compliance.

Nancy Arsenault stated that the property owner (or family member of the owner) should be present at a future meeting of the Board instead of having just an engineer present. She expressed concern regarding holding back a license. Lori Clark responded that the Board does not want to hold up the license. Instead, the request for a partial license renewal would allow the business to operate and emphasize bringing the property into compliance by the time the partial license is sought to be renewed. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Town Administrator has informed the property owner about the partial renewal option and that the goal is compliance, not collecting fines.

Valerie Oorthuys suggested that the Board should focus on the desired result instead of the technicalities and history of the project.

Lori Clark asked Nancy Arsenault to elaborate on her concerns previously stated. Nancy Arsenault responded that she fears that the property owner may become overwhelmed when they see the fines. She stated that a detailed, step-by-step plan will be needed. Lori Clark responded that the letter will not be focused on the fees, and rather be focused on the desire the Board has for a site plan, a condition of the Special Permit.

Margaret Costello stated that the letter should emphasize that the Board is looking for compliance with the conditions of the Special Permit. She added that once the conditions are met and the site is remediated, the fines could be waived by the Board. Lori Clark questioned if the Board has the authority to waive fines since they are not the body that issues them.

Lori Clark summarized part of the letter stating that there has not been any action for compliance for 2 years and that the property owner has been unresponsive to the Board for 3-4 months.

Debbie Woods added that the property owner has been out of compliance and has not received any repercussion, which she believes to be a major issue. Lori Clark agreed. She stated that the closing of the letter should emphasize the lack of action over 2 years and that there has been no response for 3-4 months without repercussion. She stated that the Board could tell the Select Board that it is not interested in collecting the fines, rather keeping the business in business and having an action plan for compliance. Lori Clark stated that a temporary license could be the Board's ask for the Select Board as it could be a solution to meet the Board's goal.

Nancy Arsenault supported a temporary license issuance instead of nonrenewal of the license. Lori Clark stated that the temporary license would require the property owner to come back in, something that will help achieve an action plan for compliance.

Lori Clark suggested adding a statement that tells the Select Board that taking no action towards remediating noncompliance will result in more properties in noncompliance, defeating the purpose of the Zoning Bylaw.

Lori Clark stated that fines are the only way that the Building Commissioner can address nonconformities and that the Board cares more about conforming to the Zoning Bylaw than receiving money from fines.

John Colonna-Romano stated that the letter should clearly state that the goal of this site is for compliance and an action plan as fines have not resulted in any action in over 2 years. He stated that asking the Select Board for help in achieving this would be appreciated by the Board and the town.

Lori Clark provided additional edits to the letter including:

- Clarifying that the original Special Permit was for remediation of the site disturbance only (and that outdoor dining could be considered at a later).
- Emphasizing that no site plan was provided after the Special Permit was reissued.
- Explaining that the site plan is the way that the Applicant and Board agree on the end state of the project, and that a site plan is a typical request of the Board.

She emphasized that providing context of site plans is important to share with the Select Board as a site plan is used for almost all applications.

Lori Clark suggested clarifying that the property owner has had years past the original deadline to provide a site plan.

Valerie Oorthuys suggested adding the request and goal of the letter to the beginning to ensure that it gets read in the event that a Select Board member is quickly reading through the correspondence.

Karen Kelleher suggested providing the Select Board with details about the conversations with the property owner's engineer. She stated that the engineer may provide details that are unrelated to the Special Permit, as this may confuse the Select Board and diverge the discussion. Lori Clark agreed and stated that the letter will need to include what the Board told the engineer at each meeting.

Valerie Oorthuys stated that she will send a revised copy of the letter to Lori Clark prior to sending it to the Select Board.

Debbie Woods asked if a member of the Planning Board should be present at the Select Board's December 12 meeting. Members of the Board agreed. However, Valerie Oorthuys reminded the Board that the Select Board meets at the same time as the Board, and that there is a Public Hearing scheduled for the consideration of a Special Permit. Members requested that Valerie Oorthuys attend the Select Board meeting on their behalf, should any questions on the letter arise.

Lower Village Public Water Feasibility Study: Test Well Report (Phase 1 of 4)

Lori Clark acknowledged that the Test Well Report was on the Board's previous agenda as correspondence but asked for it to be a discussion topic at the present meeting.

Lori Clark asked Valerie Oorthuys if the Select Board has reviewed the Test Well Report. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Select Board and the Conservation Commission have received the Report, but she is unaware if they have discussed it yet.

Karen Kelleher asked Valerie Oorthuys what the next step would be for the study. Valerie Oorthuys responded that this completes the first phase of the project which focused on gathering data on the test wells. She stated that consultants are now focusing on understanding current and future water needs and usage in Lower Village. Following this, the consultant will review how to develop the water system management and implementation strategies. She stated a public meeting will be held to discuss the strategies.

Lori Clark shared that the Report indicates that the site off Heritage Lane did not get optimal results but could possibly work. She stated that the test wells within the Red Acre Road property were more successful than at the Heritage Lane site. However, there were not funds available to re-test the Heritage Lane parcel to find a better location and the Red Acre Road site has a higher cost as it is further away from Lower Village.

Lori Clark noted that the Report states that for \$100,000.00, the Heritage Lane site could be further investigated. She asked Valerie Oorthuys what that spending would provide. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the money would go towards further well testing since the results on Heritage Lane were unexpected. She stated that because the results were unexpected, they did not do further well testing; however, the consultants did do additional testing at the Red Acre site despite getting unexpected results there initially.

Valerie Oorthuys stated that for \$250,000 there could be further investigation at the Red Acre site. The concerns at the site are related to contaminants as the wells at that site are shallower than what may be possible at the Heritage Lane site.

Lori Clark asked what spending the funding for further investigation would provide. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the final three phases of the feasibility study would need to first be completed before a path forward could be determined. She stated that more information from the consultant in terms of management or ownership of any potential future system will need to be understood before consideration of spending additional funds.

Members expressed concern about the uncertainty of the previously described further investigation as there may not be a sufficient yield of water or the appropriate wellhead protection area. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the wellhead protection zone has been considered.

John Colonna-Romano suggested considering a phased approach that could work in the meantime and be expanded in the future. He stated that the Heritage Lane site could possibly provide this.

Lori Clark asked who is responsible for deciding what the next steps for the study are. Valerie Oorthuys stated that a staff working group is managing the scope of work with the consultant and that a public meeting regarding the study will provide additional guidance for a decision.

Nancy Arsenault agreed with John Colonna-Romano that the Heritage Lane site may work in the present and provide water to the properties in need. She acknowledged that it may provide water to a smaller number of properties, but it will be a step forward at a lower cost.

Margaret Costello asked if the Town has the authority to drill a well within conservation land, citing that the Red Acre site is conserved. Valerie Oorthuys responded that the Town has an envelope in which a well could be drilled. She stated that any potential water piping from the well would need to exit the conservation land by the most direct route, which would likely be through the Bird Meadow Land, and travel down Red Acre Road.

Lori Clark asked for clarification on the next steps of the study. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the consultant is working on defining a service area (including existing water usage of properties and needs of a full buildout of each property) and developing a management plan for the water system operation.

John Colonna-Romano asked if the wells servicing Stow Shopping Center could be used for Lower Village. Members of the Board responded that it is unlikely that the owner would want to offer support to competing properties. Karen Kelleher shared that Meeting House at Stow was previously approached to see if their wells could help service Lower Village; however, they did not support the idea possibly due to concerns of the impacts to their own access to water.

Hector Constantzos, 34 Meeting House Lane, asked if the residents at Meeting House at Stow were assured that they would have enough water, could the feasibility of using Meeting House at Stow's wells be further investigated. Valerie Oorthuys stated that it could be possible, however the condominium association would need to hold a vote and provide the Town with a letter outlining its interest, such as evaluating if the site is feasible. Hector Constantzos stated that he will share this with the condominium association president and property manager.

Hector Constantzos shared that there had been discussions between Meeting House at Stow and the previous owners of Stow Shopping Center to connect both water systems to one another, backing up each water system when needed.

FY25 Budget

Valerie Oorthuys shared a memorandum with the Board for the Fiscal Year 2025 budget. She stated that the memorandum includes the Planning Department Office budget, special articles for Town Meeting and a 5-Year Capital Plan.

For the Planning Department Budget, Valerie Oorthuys stated that the budget includes the administration and permitting of the Zoning Board of Appeals. She stated that the requested budget is the same as the FY24 budget. A few accounts within the budget are proposed to be merged as they are similar in allocated use.

Lori Clark asked for clarification about the inclusion of the Zoning Board of Appeals in the budget. Valerie Oorthuys stated that both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals budgets are reflected in FY24 and FY25 budgets.

Karen Kelleher asked if more staffing is needed for the Zoning Board of Appeals. Valerie Oorthuys stated that Staff have been able to accommodate the additional administrative duties of the Zoning Board of Appeals. She added that a Comprehensive Permit is anticipated to be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the Department becomes overwhelmed with work for this permit, the Town Administrator has supported hiring someone to write meeting minutes, a large use of the Department's time. In the meantime, Staff have a plan to delegate the responsibility of meeting minutes based on the Staff attendance at meetings.

For the Special Articles, Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Planning Board's account has \$38,165.95 allocated, of which most has been allocated to projects. She stated that approximately \$22,000 will remain. She stated that funding may be needed for design guidelines and will be needed for the Comprehensive Plan update. Alternative sources of funding for these projects may be available but are not guaranteed. In addition, Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Board has asked for \$10,000 to \$15,000 at Town Meeting annually for the Board's account.

Karen Kelleher supported requesting \$15,000 at Town Meeting. Valerie Oorthuys shared that this funding has been helpful to get opinions from consultants quickly and small plans reviewed.

Lori Clark stated that in the first stage of budgeting, it would be helpful to put down the Board's entire wish list; if too high, items lower in priority can be removed.

Nancy Arsenault asked about the utilization of the GoStow program. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the program is regularly utilized by several residents and has provided some relief to the transportation services offered by the Council on Aging. She added that the service is primarily used for access to medical services.

Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Town is working with the Montachusett Regional Transit Authority (MART) to develop shuttle routes in and around Stow. She stated that GoStow may have the opportunity to be funded through MART in future years.

The Board discussed the usage of the GoStow program and their gratitude for the service it provides.

Lori Clark asked for questions and feedback about the Capital Plan. Valerie Oorthuys stated that she is anticipating questions about the \$450,000 request for 25% design plans for Town Center; she noted that 25% design plans have a standardized level of detail.

Lori Clark asked if the items in the Capital Plan have been shown to the Capital Planning Committee before. Valerie Oorthuys stated that these items are consistent with previous fiscal year requests.

John Colonna-Romano asked if the Town Center Plan will require coordination with the renovation to Randall Library. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the concept plans produced will provide guidance for the integration of the two projects. She added that the improvements to Common Road and the perimeter of the library site will be included in the library project.

Valerie Oorthuys noted that the Gleasondale Road streetscape improvement project has been moved to FY26 after a previous Board discussion. She stated that a corridor study by the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization will be an interim step that will get the project better aligned for FY26.

John Colonna-Romano asked if the Board is responsible for legal fees as legal fees are included in the Special Articles section. Valerie Oorthuys stated that the Select Board is typically responsible for the Town's legal fees. She stated that the amount was believed to be carried over from the Board's acquisition of the former Habitech lot, now Town owned (Map R-29, Parcel 100A); she will ask the Town Administrator if the funds need to be transferred to the Select Board, or if the funds can remain with the Board.

John Colonna-Romano asked if the Board is considering an engineering budget, referencing discussions of the Board from previous years. Valerie Oorthuys stated that engineering is part of the Master Plan/Consulting Account.

Setting Upcoming Meeting Dates, continued

The Board set the following meeting dates:

- March 5, 2024
- March 19, 2024

Adjournment

Karen Kelleher motioned to adjourn.

Margaret Costello seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Lori Clark - **Yea**; Nancy Arsenault - **Yea**; John Colonna-Romano – **Yea**; Margaret Costello – **Yea**; Karen Kelleher - **Yea**.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Slagle