

IN BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1979

Present: Chairman John E. Murray, Robert J. Hotch and William J. Cossart.

The statutory requirements as to notice having been fulfilled, the meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman John E. Murray.

Current Items of Interest

School Bus Problem

Present: Frederick R. Kobrick and David Navisky, Moran Circle; Carole Daniels, Normandy Drive; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dowdy, Fairbank Road; Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Bloomenthal, Intervale Road; Alan Grace, Barton Drive; N. Cornell Gray, Chairman of the Sudbury School Committee; Juvenile Officer William Carroll; and other interested parents.

Chairman Murray opened discussion with many concerned parents and Town Officials over the recent school bussing problems associated with the route schedules and, more directly, with accusations against the M&S Bus Company regarding safety problems.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson made an opening statement relative to some concerns raised last week at the Selectmen's meeting by Mr. Kobrick, and Mr. Navisky, speaking to Moran Circle neighborhood bus-related problems, relative to inspection of the M&S buses and, in some cases, lack of safety equipment. Mr. Thompson reported that he was in touch with Officer Carroll following that meeting and learned that the Registry had inspected on September 4 all the M&S buses to be used in Sudbury and that three buses did not pass the inspection. Upon a second inspection on September 12, two out of three passed, and according to Officer Carroll, he still does not have any information regarding the last of the three. Mr. Thompson stated that Officer Carroll confirmed this information with Mr. Arthur Doucette at the Marlboro office of the Registry of Motor Vehicles and also informed Mr. Thompson that school busses are inspected by the Registry every eight weeks.

Mr. Thompson stated that every so-called safety complaint made through the Selectmen's office, and at the Selectmen's meeting last week, was forwarded to Officer Carroll and to Mr. Doucette for their follow-up investigation.

Chairman Murray requested that Officer Carroll pursue information regarding the one bus which did not pass inspection on both dates.

Relative to the question raised by Selectman Hotch involving new safety requirements and compliance to the same by busses more than three years old (1976 model or older), Officer Carroll stated that most of the busses have these new safety devices, but it is not mandatory that they do.

Mr. Kobrick, who was present at the Selectmen's meeting of September 10, 1979, distributed a list of serious concerns relative to major safety problems. He stated that copies have been sent to the Superintendent and the Chairman of the School

Committee. Mr. Kobrick said that the parents of the children in his neighborhood want to put their children back on the school bus but will not do so until they are supported by the School Committee and the School Administration relative to their concerns of faulty or no safety equipment, judgement of drivers and other issues.

Mr. Kobrick expressed the concern of many that the M&S Bus Company was selected without credentials and that the Selectmen should review the procedure whereby the Bus Company was chosen. He said that parents are especially concerned about the coming winter weather.

Mrs. Dowdy read a statement and indicated that a petition had been submitted to the Fairbank School prior to tonight's meeting, signed by 150 Fairbank School parents relative to school bussing contract faults and scheduling problems. Mrs. Dowdy summarized their opinions relative to safety-related problems and financial burdens. The statement also stressed bid irregularities and questioned the qualifications of the M&S Bus Company. At the request of the Executive Secretary, Mrs. Dowdy submitted a copy of her statement to the Selectmen.

Mrs. Dowdy's final comments pertained to and stressed mostly that the Fairbank School parents were being discriminated against because of the many bussing problems and the new time schedule for the Fairbank School, especially as it relates to working parents who now must change their work schedules to accommodate early dismissal of their children.

Later in the meeting, the Chairman of the School Committee explained the new schedule and the hours at Fairbank School and stated that there appeared to be no flexibility to revert back to last year's scheduled hours at Fairbank School. This new schedule may have to be used in other elementary schools in the near future, mostly due to decreasing enrollment.

Mrs. Daniels submitted a copy of a Statement of Qualifications (School Transportation Contract Proposal), filled out by the M&S Bus Company, and said that a group of Fairbank School parents questioned the School Committee on the Statement and its decision to contract this Company without verification of the information on said Statement. They asked the Selectmen to resolve the procedure by which a school bus company is chosen.

Mr. Kobrick indicated that the mutual feeling of parents is that the M&S Bus Company's credibility is questionable now and should be questioned in terms of accepting future statements from them as reason to retain them.

Mrs. Daniels questioned where the responsibilities of the School Committee end.

Chairman Murray stated that all public safety issues are properly addressed by the Selectmen, and the Selectmen are working with the School Committee on these safety-related concerns. Mr. Murray stated that Mr. Kobrick's list of safety and other concerns will be forwarded to the School Committee and Town Counsel for clarification and answers.

Mrs. Bloomenthal asked if a Town Meeting would help; she later stated that perhaps the safety issue could be a breach of contract.

Selectman Hotch stated that at this point a Town Meeting would not be advisable since it is not known whether a Town Meeting appropriation would solve the problem. Mr. Thompson stated that Town Counsel would address this question later in the week and will be meeting with the School Committee Wednesday night.

Mrs. Daniels asked how many families it takes to testify to safety-related incidents, and other areas of major concern, before the Town will break their contract with the M&S Bus Company.

Mr. Kobrick stated that if they have to go outside this Town to solve the bussing problems, it will be because the Town Officials will not answer their questions. Selectman Hotch assured him that this would not be necessary, that the Selectmen and the School Committee are making every effort to answer their questions.

Mr. Gray could not give the Selectmen an update of facts since the School Committee meeting last week, but stated that the School Committee is pursuing the problems associated with the Bus Company - legal contracts, scheduling, faulty judgement of the School Committee, safety: number of children at bus stops - and requested that all concerns be related to school principals.

Alan Grace added that he did not feel that the people in the Fairbank School District were getting an equal share for their tax dollar.

Selectman Cossart expressed his strong sympathies with the parent groups and related his attendance at the School Committee meeting last Thursday at which time the School committee admitted to certain mistakes in the school bussing scheduling and other related problems. Selectman Cossart summarized by expressing his hope that the Selectmen could lend their support to having the School Committee rectify the concerns expressed tonight and on other occasions, as soon as possible. Chairman Murray elaborated on the Board's concurrence.

There being no further discussion, the Selectmen thanked everyone for attending, sympathizing with their frustrations and assured them that the School Committee, Town Counsel or the Selectmen would respond to their questions.

Site Plan #79-210 - Joseph C. DeFranco, 1 Union Avenue

Present: Francis E. White, Building Inspector; John C. Cutting, Chairman, Planning Board; Joseph C. DeFranco of Witherell Drive, and Robert F. Dionisi, Attorney for applicant.

In accordance with Article IX, Section V, Paragraph A of the Sudbury Bylaws, the Board considered site plan application #79-210 of Joseph C. DeFranco of Witherell Drive, for property located at 1 Union Avenue, formerly owned by Peter Cam Realty Trust.

The Executive Secretary reported that all appropriate abutters and Town Officials had been notified, and that the following communications have been received regarding the same:

- from Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Agent Francis E. White, dated August 21, 1979, recommending approval;
- from the Town Engineer, dated August 31, 1979, recommending approval;
- from the Planning Board, dated September 7, 1979, recommending conditional approval;
- from the Board of Health, dated September 14, 1979, recommending approval with the stipulation that a detailed plan of the subsurface sewage disposal system be submitted for approval. Mr. DeFranco later indicated that this had been done.

Mr. White explained, with respect to the Planning Board's concern, that the reason for the elimination of the berm on the site plan between 1 Union Avenue property and the abutting property, owned by Northern Farms, was that the berm would be restrictive of delivery trucks on the right-of-way easement of Northern Farms located between the two properties. Mr. White informed the Board that Mr. and Mrs. Calareso, who were present as abutters, had left because he had explained the same to them and they were satisfied.

Mr. Cutting of the Planning Board stated that site plans usually have arrows showing drainage flow and suggested to the Selectmen that, since this plan does not, when the paving takes place, it meets the Town Engineer's approval as to adequate storm drainage to prevent flooding on adjacent property and Union Avenue.

Mr. DeFranco explained some of the finances surrounding construction of rental property and the reasons for easier rental by changing from a 2½-story office building to a two-story structure.

Following further discussion it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve site plan application #79-210 of Joseph C. DeFranco of Witherell Drive, for property located at 1 Union Avenue (formerly owned by Peter Cam Realty Trust), subject to confirmation by the Town Engineer that final surfacing of the property will allow for proper drainage addressing the concerns of the Planning Board as expressed in their letter of September 7, under item 1; and it was understood that no occupancy permit would be issued until the foregoing confirmation was given to the Building Inspector by the Town Engineer.

It was further requested of Mr. DeFranco that he make every effort to comply with the Planning Board's recommendation in their letter of September 7 under item 3, relating to parking.

General Meeting with Goodnow Library Trustees and Director

Present: Helen Lowenthal, Director; Carol Hull, Chairman, Charlotte M. MacLeod, Virginia L. Howard, Anne W. Donald and Sylvia M. Throckmorton, Goodnow Library Trustees.

Chairman Murray welcomed the Goodnow Library Trustees and Director for a general meeting and discussion concerning their general needs and specific problems, if any, and asked the Chairman to introduce the new members.

Following introductions, Chairman Carol Hull informed the Board of some anticipated repairs and construction at both entrances to the Library - cement work on outside stairs and overhead hanging roof construction to alleviate puddling at the entrance to the Children's Library which floods periodically.

Following some discussion relative to the Goodnow Library Fund accounts, it was agreed that the Library Trustees should receive a quarterly report of these accounts from the Town Accountant, and the Executive Secretary was directed to so inform Mr. Wilson.

Relative to a question raised on the Sudbury Supervisory Association, the Executive Secretary responded that once a Town group, exclusive of schools, takes the necessary steps to be recognized by the State Labor Relations Commission as an Association, the Labor Relations Counsel and the Executive Secretary handle collective bargaining as the Selectmen's agents. Mr. Thompson explained how the Library Trustees would be informed regarding the bargaining sessions and allowed to give input and make recommendations.

Charlotte M. MacLeod reported on the fund raising and public relations work being done by the Friends of the Library, a volunteer association working very closely with the Library staff. In answer to Selectman Hotch, Mrs. Lowenthal stated that they are satisfied with the present hours of the Library, but that they have had several suggestions/requests from parents that the Children's Library to opened at least one night a week, which is being considered.

The Selectmen commended the work of the Friends of the Library, noting them to be a wonderful asset to the Town.

There being no further discussion. Chairman Murray thanked everyone for attending and for the good work they are doing.

Dog Complaint Hearing - Russell/Simon

Present: Dog Officer Francis E. White; Assistant Dog Officer Betsey M. DeWallace; Estelle Simon; Susan Adametz and Ethel Rigsby, witnesses for Mrs. Simon; Donald Russell, complainant.

Chairman Murray reconvened a Public Hearing under G.L. Chapter 140, s. 157 on the Dog Complaint dated December 8, 1978, of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Russell, 30 Surrey Lane, against two dogs owned by Estelle Simon, 27 Surrey Lane, (1978 License #1161 and #1160), "Big Boy" and "Little John", both German Shepherd/Collies; said complaint states that, in addition to the dogs having vicious dispositions and barking excessively, other disturbances have included scattering garbage and killing another dog (the Russells state fear for their 4-year old son).

Each person planning to give testimony or comment at tonight's hearing was asked to do so under oath, which was given by Chairman Murray at the onset of the hearing.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson stated that the complaint which was filed in the Town Clerk's office on December 8, 1978, was done so under oath and a hearing was held on January 16, 1979, at which time Mrs. Simon was incapacitated and unable to attend. The vote of January 16th restricted Mrs. Simon's two dogs to the dogs' run during the day and to the house or barn in the evening, and allowed Mrs. Simon a reopening of the public hearing at her convenience and request. Mr. Thompson referenced Mrs. Simon's letter dated August 3, 1979, requesting the reopening of the January 16th hearing and letters dated September 6 to both Mr. Russell and Mrs. Simon informing them of tonight's scheduled public hearing on the same, at the request of Atty. Sheldon H. Pitchel, on behalf of Mrs. Simon.

Mrs. Simon stated that the purpose of her request to reopen this public hearing is three-fold: 1. to request the removal of the restraining order placed on her dogs as a result of the complainant's fabricated charges of her dogs' viciousness; 2. to have Donald Russell examined under oath to put an end to his false statements of record; and 3. to have Mr. Russell cease and desist by both ending the interference he continues to create on her life (by telephoning her during the nighttime and trespassing on her property), and by ceasing to complain to Town Officials and the Police Department.

Mr. Russell confirmed that his statements made at the previous public hearing (January 16, 1979) were accurate and factual to the best of his knowledge. He stated his opinion that his statements differed slightly from the recorded minutes of that hearing, in that the minutes emphasized the viciousness of the dogs owned by Mrs. Simon rather than the disturbance charges of his complaint; namely, barking. Mr. Russell continued to say that two separate issues are at hand: 1. barking annoyance of Mrs. Simon's dogs; and 2. Mrs. Simon's violation of the Selectmen's January 16th ruling. He continued to state that Mrs. Simon is correct in stating her opinion that her dogs are not vicious; but his opinion remains the same - the dogs are vicious based on personal experience of the dogs' action and knowledge of the dogs' nature and capabilities. Mr. Russell asked for the Selectmen's guidance tonight in determining the degree of viciousness and to act accordingly on the complaint.

Atty. Pitchel stated that if in fact the dogs are not vicious, as Mr. Russell just stated, and the issue tonight is not barking, he questioned the Board's January 16th decision to restrain the dogs, suggesting that the dogs were of a vicious nature, based on the testimony at that last hearing.

Chairman Murray pointed out that testimony presented at the last hearing by the Dog Officer relative to the attack and killing of a small dog by Mrs. Simon's dogs confirms the capabilities of her dogs.

The Executive Secretary referenced Mr. Russell's complaint on the 8th of December (1978), filed under oath, which stated more than one reason for the complaint - that the dogs have a vicious disposition, barking and other disturbances - and suggested that it would be appropriate for the Selectmen to address all complaints tonight. Assistant Town Counsel Thomas French concurred.

Mrs. Simon related the incident of her dogs' attack on her neighbor's (Mr. Welch) dog, which resulted in the dog's death, by explaining that the reason for the attack was that Mr. Welch's dog came into her yard and stole a bone away from one of her dogs. Mrs. Simon stated that Mr. Welch never filed a complaint.

She continued to say that she has testimony from seven people saying that her dogs, whom she has had for nine years, are not vicious and that they are very friendly; she stated that if they were vicious, the dog officer would have had complaints before (referring to before Mr. Russell's complaints).

Mr. Russell stated that he would like to clarify his initial complaint, which, he stated, was barking; however, he stated that on two occasions Mrs. Simon's dogs displayed a vicious disposition on his property in front of witnesses. He later stated that he has the most to gain if it can be determined that Mrs. Simon's dogs are not vicious.

Atty. Pitchel again pointed out that the only indication of viciousness was the testimony relating to the Welch dog. Mrs. Simon added that a dog has to bite someone before it can be restrained.

Chairman Murray stated that a public nuisance is enough reason to restrain a dog.

The Dog Officer confirmed that the complaint on Mrs. Simon's dogs, through his office, was excessive barking. He referenced G.L. Chapter 140, section 157.

Atty. Pitchel pointed out that the statute (Chapter 140, section 157) is very explicit as it pertains to excessive barking or other annoyances to a sick person etc. . . and added, "Mr. Russell is not a sick person".

Atty. Pitchel questioned the Assistant Dog Officer regarding the length of time she has known Mrs. Simon and her dogs, and whether they had ever attacked her while on Mrs. Simon's property. Mrs. DeWallace responded that Mrs. Simon's dogs have never given her any trouble; she also responded to Mr. Pitchel that Mrs. Simon never asked her to leave her property on the two occasions when she was on Mrs. Simon's property.

Mr. Russell explained that his testimony (stating that Mrs. Simon had asked the Assistant Dog Officer to leave her property) at the January 16th hearing was incorrect - that he was later informed by Mrs. DeWallace that he had misinterpreted what she said.

Assistant Town Counsel commented on G.L., Chapter 140, section 157, by stating that there are two instances upon which a complaint can be made: 1, vicious disposition, barking, other disturbances; and 2, annoyance to a sick person.

Selectman Cossart asked the Dog Officers if there are records of either dog demonstrating vicious behavior.

Dog Officer Francis White stated that if a dog is capable of tearing apart another dog, then it's indeed vicious behavior.

Selectman Cossart asked if there have been complaints that these dogs have shown aggressive or vicious nature other than in circumstances where the dogs have been provoked.

Mrs. DeWallace stated that there have been no other complaints and commented that two dogs will work harder at something - such as in the case of the Welch dog -

than one dog alone. Mr. White commented that this young dog took a bone away from the Simon dogs and that could easily have been the act of a child.

Selectman Hotch asked Mrs. DeWallace if she thought this was "typical" behavior for a dog.

Mrs. DeWallace commented that in the case of a sheep or pig attack, there are generally two dogs working together.

Again relating instances whereby Mrs. Simon's dogs displayed vicious behavior on his property, Mr. Russell offered names of people who would be willing to offer their opinions relative to the degree of viciousness of Mrs. Simon's dogs. Mr. Russell emphasized the fact that Mrs. Simon does not observe the Town's leash law.

Susan Adametz, 18 Lillian Avenue, (Mrs. Simon's daughter) stated that there is a lot of trouble with dogs in her neighborhood; she does not see the leash law enforced in Town.

The following comments were taken from Mrs. Simon's testimony, which she read in full:

- owned dogs for nine years - Mr. Russell's is the first complaint.
- accused Mr. Russell of trespassing, threatening and telephone harassment.
- informed Mr. Russell of G.L. Chapter 269, section 14A relative to telephone annoyance by putting a copy of the same in his mailbox.
- requested the Police Department not to call her in the middle of the night following several nighttime calls; on one occasion when called by Mr. Russell, the Police log shows no barking.
- has complied to the Selectmen's restraining order of January 16, 1979, and expressed annoyance because the January 16 hearing was not postponed on her behalf as requested due to her illness.
- has seven letters of witnesses stating that her dogs are friendly (three of which were referenced at the January 16 hearing and the other four were later read by her and Atty. Pitchel).
- fabricated complaints of viciousness by Mr. Russell include: 1. her request that the Dog Officer leave her property; and 2. several statements by Mr. Russell indicating discussions with or alleged accusations by Mrs. Simon. (Mrs. Simon stated that she has never spoken to Mr. Russell on the phone or in person since August, 1978, when he started invading her property.) Mrs. Simon, therefore, questioned Mr. Russell's credibility.
- accused the Selectmen of conducting a one-sided public hearing on January 16 because her 5-page testimony was not publicly read in her absence nor her letters of testimony from witnesses; rather, they were referenced.
- her dogs are her protection and she expects them to bark when a stranger approaches her property and questioned a District Court hearing based on a barking complaint.

- because her dogs were penned, in accordance with the restraining order, her house was broken into.
- accused Mr. Russell of overreacting when her dogs are loose in her yard, by staring at them and provoking them.

Mr. Russell commented as follows:

- Mrs. Simon's statement that her house was broken into only because her dogs were penned contradicts her statements that her dogs are always penned; he later stated that Mrs. Simon's dogs roam for hours.
- has witnesses on two consecutive days when Mrs. Simon's dogs were left unrestrained while she was away from the property.
- recounted Mrs. Simon's statement that she admittedly had kept her dogs penned for five months so as not to disturb her neighbor, Mrs. Pattack, 24 Surrey Lane, who was ill - summarizing that in his opinion Mrs. Simon understands that her dogs create annoyances.
- that Mrs. Simon had called Mrs. Russell and accused Mr. Russell of causing her heart attack.
- that he respects Mr. Kanakaris', 36 Surrey Lane, opinion (see letter January 14, 1979) that Mrs. Simon's dogs are not vicious; however, wondered if he had ever witnessed the dogs in a "pack" situation and stated that Mr. Kanakaris did not witness the dogs' attack on him.

Atty. Pitchel read Mrs. Solo's (61 Surrey Lane) letter indicating no problem with Mrs. Simon's dogs and referenced three others, which Mrs. Simon later read. Mrs. Simon was asked to make copies of these four letters, as well as the statement read earlier by her, available to the Selectmen for the record.

The Executive Secretary noted that previous letters and testimony received from Mrs. Simon were reviewed by the Selectmen prior to their decision of January 16.

Mrs. DeWallace commented that dogs are very smart and for some unknown reason they like some people and hold a grudge against others.

Ms. Adametz spoke about when her mother was in the hospital and she had to care for her dogs, commenting that they were always restrained and only barked when another dog or stranger came up the driveway.

Following further discussion it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To take under advisement the dog complaint dated December 8, 1979, of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Russell, 30 Surrey Lane, against two dogs owned by Estelle Simon, 27 Surrey Lane, (1978 License #1161 and #1160), "Big Boy" and "Little John", both German Shepherd/Collies, until September 24, 1979, for the

purpose of making a decision; there will be no further discussion on that date; the decision of the Board made on January 16, 1979, will remain in effect until that time.

Board of Health - Stream Monitoring Program

The Board reviewed a communication dated September 10, 1979, from E. Lawrence Gogolin of the Board of Health relative to the Board of Health's stream monitoring program. Selectman Cossart pointed out that the Board of Health and Water District conduct independent water tests, that it appears the Town does not now have a problem with its drinking water, and that the ongoing testing programs should continue for informational purposes so that we may remain aware of the overall quality of Sudbury's water. It was also the consensus of the Board to proceed with the recommended course of action to pursue a Town Meeting article and funding for surface/subsurface water testing as proposed by Mr. Cossart's Ad Hoc group.

Appointments

Special Police Officer - Traffic Duty Only

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson explained that the Highway Surveyor has requested that the Selectmen appoint Highway Department employee Douglas Fowle, a former Maine police officer, as a Special Police Officer on Landham Road, as well as Concord Road, in anticipation of the necessity of a Traffic Officer on both roads during Highway construction/work. Responding to Selectman Cossart, Mr. Thompson stated that Mr. Fowle will not be on two payrolls, but will be paid at the higher Special Police Officer rate rather than his present employment rate, only when performing as a Special Police Officer. Selectman Hotch requested that the Selectmen receive Mr. Fowle's payroll record following his appointment. The Executive Secretary was so directed to provide the same.

In answer to Selectman Cossart, Mr. Thompson stated that Police Chief Nicholas Lombardi has consented to the appointment of Mr. Fowle through the Selectmen's office.

Following further discussion it was on motion by Selectman Cossart unanimously

VOTED: To appoint Douglas Fowle, 273 Boston Post Road, Marlboro, as Special Police Officer for Traffic Duty Only on Landham and Concord Roads, as requested by the Highway Surveyor.

Board of Appeals Associates and Earth Removal Board

Following a brief discussion it was on motion by Selectman Hotch unanimously

VOTED: To appoint Harvey R. Peters, 110 Victoria Road, as a Board of Appeals Associate and Earth Removal Board member, for a term to expire April 30, 1980.

Two Policewomen/Crossing Guards

Following a brief discussion it was on motion by Selectman Hotch unanimously

VOTED: To appoint Josephine M. Bisson, 29 Birchwood Avenue, Sudbury, and Lynne Fitzgerald, 12 Sawmill Lane, Sudbury, as Policewomen/Crossing Guards, for terms to expire April 30, 1980, as requested by Police Chief Nicholas Lombardi in a communication dated September 13, 1979, for Nixon and Noyes Schools.

Resignation - Long Range Capital Expenditures Committee

The Board accepted with regret a letter of resignation dated August 29, 1979, from E. James Mulcahy, Jr., from the Long Range Capital Expenditures Committee, effective immediately, and directed the Executive Secretary to acknowledge Mr. Mulcahy's resignation in a letter of appreciation from the Board.

Proclamation - United Way

On the recommendation of the Fire Chief it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To sign a proclamation declaring the week of October 14-20, 1979, United Way Week and the month of October, 1979, United Way Month in the Town of Sudbury.

Temporary License - Wine and Malt Beverages

In response to his request dated September 12, 1979, it was on motion by Selectman Hotch unanimously

VOTED: To grant a temporary license for the sale of wines and malt beverages only, to be drunk on the premises, to Russell P. Kirby, Sudbury Ancient Fyfe and Drum Company, for their Ninth Annual Muster on the grounds of Longfellow's Wayside Inn on September 29, 1979, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. This license shall be subject to the provisions that sanitary facilities shall be provided for the people in attendance, that any required building and wiring permits be obtained, and the approval of the Fire and Police Chiefs be obtained.

Minutes

It was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To approve the minutes of the regular session of September 10, 1979, as amended, and the Executive Session of September 10, 1979, as drafted.

Federal Emergency Building Temperature Restrictions

During a discussion relative to compliance with Federal Emergency Building Temperature Restrictions, the Executive Secretary explained that Elementary Schools are exempt from the restrictions, as well as certain other areas, such as, the computer room(s) and nursing offices, if so applied for.

The Board directed the Executive Secretary to complete the application (exempt forms) for such areas in the Town buildings, to be filed with the Department of Energy, and to forward the same information to the School Departments.

Current Items of Interest

Panel Discussion - Vandalism

Chairman Murray reminded the Board of a panel discussion presented by the League of Women Voters to be held at Curtis Jr. High tomorrow evening at 8:15 p.m.

Massachusetts Audubon Society

Selectman Cossart agreed to attend a Massachusetts Audubon Society meeting to discuss ground water protection on October 3, 1979, at the Stony Brook Nature Center, Norfolk.

Cherry Sheet Receipt Items

The Executive Secretary called the Board's attention to information he had furnished, at their request, showing Cherry Sheet Receipts items relative to shortfalls by the State in funding.

Holiday - Visit of the Pope

The Executive Secretary reported that legislation has been filed to declare October 1, 1979, a half-day holiday in honor of the Papal visit.

New Hours - Sanitary Landfill

It was noted that new signs have been put up at the Sanitary Landfill to inform people of new hours which will be in effect as of October 1. The Executive Secretary informed the Board that permits for use of the Landfill will not be available for mailing with tax bills as originally suggested, but will be distributed at the Highway Offices and Landfill site.

The Board expressed concern with traffic safety if stickers were to be passed out at the Landfill and so directed the Executive Secretary to communicate the same to the Highway Surveyor.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Attest:

Richard E. Thompson
Executive Secretary/Clerk