

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 14, 2018

Present: Chairman Stephen Garvin, Vice-Chairman Peter Abair, Justin Finnicum, John Hincks, Charles Karustis, Nancy Kilcoyne, Meagen Donoghue (Director of Planning and Community Development) and Beth Suedmeyer (Environmental Planner).

The statutory requirements as to notice having been complied with, the meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m. in the Lower Town Hall.

Public Hearing – Proposed Zoning Amendment Article for 2018 Annual Town Meeting

At 7:30 p.m., Chairman Garvin called the meeting to order.

At 7:35 p.m., Planning Board Clerk, Mr. Hincks read the Public Hearing Notice to see if the Town's Zoning Bylaw by adding new definitions to Article 7000, Definitions, and Section 2230 (Appendix A), Table of Principal Use.

Mr. Hincks read the proposed bylaw amendment by detailing "Marijuana Cultivator", "Marijuana Establishment", "Marijuana Product Manufacturer", "Marijuana Products", and "Marijuana Retailer". He continued with "And by amending Section 2230, Table of Principal Use Regulations, by inserting as a principal use under C. Commercial uses, the following use: "Marijuana Establishment" and placing an "N" in the column for each district on the Table of Principal Use Regulations. Or act on anything relative thereto."

Chairman Garvin asked if there was anyone from the public who wanted to speak about these mentioned articles. He asked Ms. Donoghue if she received any letters, or comment about these mentioned articles.

Ms. Donoghue replied that she did not at this time.

On motion duly made to close the Public Hearing and seconding: vote unanimous.

Minutes for Review

Vice-Chairman Abair asked why the Minutes from January 25, 2017 were included.

Ms. Donoghue explained she found it difficult to complete after the previous recording secretary called out sick that evening. Therefore, the new recording secretary offered to complete those minutes.

On motion duly made and seconded, 3 abstained and 2 ayes:

VOTED: To approve the minutes of January 25, 2017.

Administrative Report

Mr. Hincks commented about an article on the Town website, regarding the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT). He asked if an upcoming agenda item was necessary to update the Board on the BFRT. Ms. Suedmeyer stated that the Board could request an update for a future meeting. She added that the Town recently submitted a grant application to the Recreational Trails Program, administered by DCR. She detailed that the grant application request would go to funding the acquisition of a section of the CSX-

owned corridor (from near Station Avenue to Route 20). She added that the grant limitation was for \$100,000, and if secured, it would enable the BFRT section currently in design to link to Route 20.

Ms. Suedmeyer said that the most recent conversations with CSX, have indicated that they are interested in selling the property to the Town, and they are willing to do it in phases so that the Town does not have to come up with all the money at one time.

Public Hearing – Stormwater Management Permit – Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road, (Assessor’s Map D09-0400)

Present: Thomas Peterman of Peterman Architects, Inc.; Marilyn Reid, Head of Willow Hill School, David Heinsohn-Roe, Director of Facilities at Willow Hill School, and Paul Avery, Civil Engineer with Oak Consulting Group, LLC.

At 7:45 p.m., Chairman Garvin opened the public hearing for Willow Hill School.

Mr. Peterman presented the plan for the Stormwater Management Permit and introduced Civil Engineer, Paul Avery. Mr. Avery explained the proposed addition increases the impervious area by 1,130 sq. ft. and explained the increase. He continued stating the proponent proposes constructing a small rain garden to receive the runoff from the rooftop of the addition plus any surface water coming off the vegetated areas within the watershed area. He said it was sized to accommodate one inch over the net increase in impervious area, and the plan meets groundwater and detention requirements. He added that the stormwater report was also submitted to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Finnicum asked what kind of maintenance the rainwater garden required. Mr. Avery answered it is detailed in the Operations and Maintenance Plan and based on standards required by DEP. The Plan also includes maintaining the vegetation and removing any silt or debris. Chairman Garvin stated that in the Operation and Maintenance Plan before him, he did not see anything about the rain garden. Mr. Avery replied with there should be mention of infiltration basin.

Chairman Garvin recommended more detail is needed, specifically for the rain garden. He also commented on the water table, outlining a seven-inch separation where the Board typically looks for 2 ft. and if less than 4 ft., to have a mounding analysis. He stated he wondered how that separation would be handled to meet the stormwater management requirements. Mr. Avery indicated they did the best they could given the constraints, and we can't achieve the 2 ft. of separation there; so we just kept it shallow.

Chairman Garvin asked if the Conservation Commission issued an order of conditions. Mr. Avery said that they had and DEP had not commented on that aspect.

Ms. Suedmeyer said that the draft decision would be ready for the next meeting. Vice-Chairman Abair reiterated that typically, the Board does not have a vote until there is a Decision is in hand, which includes any conditions the Board may have. He said that this hearing could be continued until the Board has a draft decision at the next meeting on March 28.

Chairman Garvin told the Willow Hill School representatives the draft decision could be viewed before the meeting on March 28, and that if they had any comments, they were welcome to come to the hearing. Mr. Peterman requested a continuance to March 28, 2018.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue Stormwater Management Permit – Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road, (Assessor’s Map D09-0400) to the March 28, 2018 meeting.

Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan Modification – Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road, (Assessor’s Map D09-0400)

At 8:05 p.m., Chairman Garvin recused himself from the hearing because he was not present at the last hearing. He assigned Vice-Chairman Abair to conduct the hearing. Vice-Chairman Abair asked Mr. Peterman if there had been any changes to the site plan. Mr. Peterman indicated nothing changed, and provided a summary of the scope of the project. Ms. Donoghue stated that she provided the draft decision for this evening’s meeting and added that this draft is a modification, and not a full plan review.

The Board agreed that they would add the condition that the Stormwater Permit must be completed as part of the Site Plan Modification Decision.

On motion duly made and seconded, there were two abstains and three ayes. Garvin – Abstain, Kilcoyne – Abstain, Abair – Aye, Hincks – Aye, and Karustis – Aye.

VOTED: To approve the continued public hearing – minor site plan modification for Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road, (Assessor’s Map D09-0400)

Continued Public Hearing - Stormwater Management Permit - 69 & 71 Brewster Road, (Assessor's Map H10-0100 & H10-0900)

Present: Molly Obendorf, of Stamski and McNary, Inc., and Matthew Watsky, Attorney for Applicant.

At 8:14 p.m., Chairman Garvin opening the hearing.

Ms. Obendorf stated that Stamski and McNary made one revision to the plan, which was the extension of the treatment trench towards Brewster Road. Mr. Watsky said the only comment he had about the draft decision was clarification about the posting of a performance bond. He added he wanted to confirm the bond could be posted as either a cash or a surety bond. Mr. Hincks mentioned that there was also a question about timing of the release of the bond. Mr. Karustis stated that much information came in today and needed more clarification on this matter in terms of the decision regarding the amount of the bond, the timing and how it is going to be released. He also queried if the Fire Department water supply issue had been resolved.

Ms. Suedmeyer mentioned that in her communications with Mr. Watsky, they discussed how the bond was going to be handled and when the bond could be released. Ms. Suedmeyer stated that normally the owner may request the Planning Board to release the bond in phases as compliance is met for each phase of the project. She added that documentation would need to be provided to show that compliance had been met with each phase. She detailed that DPW and Engineering initially planned to help with the development of the cost estimate, but revised that request, due to unexpected time restraints. DPW and Engineering prefers the design engineers develop a cost estimate for construction of the components of the site plan in regards to stormwater management, which the Town Engineer will review and approve.

Mr. Watsky stated the applicant’s engineer could provide the valuation. He added the engineer will come up with an estimate to build the driveway and the water infrastructure, and will focus on that work. He

said that he was comfortable with the hearing closing now with the draft decision as revised. Chairman Garvin stated that the hearing is to be continued.

Mr. Karustis added he was not sure how the deed restriction factored into the decision on the permit itself. Mr. Watsky stated at the last meeting, the Board expressed that the placement of the deed restriction was not going to be this Board's concern and the details of it were being left to the Conservation Commission. He added that he prepared a draft Deed Restriction, and the last review with the engineers is going on now, and they are preparing to pass that along to the Conservation Commission for review with Town Counsel. He stated that it would be a deed restriction that can last "in perpetuity," and there is more than one way to create an "in perpetuity" deed restriction. He continued saying he was not viewing this as a deed restriction that would not go through the full Executive Office of Environmental and Energy Affairs (EEA) process, because that process is so cumbersome and takes so long.

Chairman Garvin stated that one of the main reasons for the deed restriction is to ensure that further development will not happen. He added that the Board wants to see that restriction, both in writing and on the Plan.

Mr. Watsky said that he provided the deed restrictions to Ms. Suedmeyer. Chairman Garvin said that the draft was not received. Mr. Watsky apologized and said that he was mistaken. Ms. Suedmeyer confirmed that an email defining restricted areas was sent to her but not the proposed draft deed restriction.

Mr. Karustis said this is an important aspect, and said that a related communication mentioned that the deed restriction was reviewed, but did not have the "in perpetuity" meaning included. Mr. Watsky asked what correspondence Mr. Karustis was referring to. Mr. Karustis said that it was a communication with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Watsky said the Conservation Commission has not seen the draft of the Deed Restriction and told Conservation Coordinator Debra Dineen he would send it to her along with copies of cases and court decisions explaining the statute. He added that it is a matter of law, and granting a deed restriction does not necessarily have to be an EEA restriction. Ms. Suedmeyer said that the comments received from Ms. Dineen were in general reference to the deed restriction options in consideration. The Conservation Commission and the Planning Department had not received the draft restriction; therefore, it is difficult to speculate what is included within the document. She added it has been the experience of the Conservation Commission to endorse the restriction under the specifications of EEA because it is a more certain mechanism.

Mr. Karustis said that he was curious about the issue with the fire hydrant and the water pressure and asked for an update. Mr. Watsky said the Sudbury Fire Chief and Town Engineer are in communication and working out the details. He added it includes a booster and increases the flow and the pressure within the line itself, downstream of the existing hydrant.

Vice-Chairman Abair said that he had no other issues, other than those raised. Ms. Suedmeyer stated Janet Bernardo of Horsley Witten, had previously commented on a landscape plan requirement and the planting notes included. Chairman Garvin said it looks like the main vegetation is grass with no specific bush type proposed. Ms. Obendorf stated that these are general planning notes, detailing stabilization of the site. Chairman Garvin asked if the Conservation Commission requested plantings that are more specific. Ms. Obendorf indicated the Conservation Commission did not comment. Mr. Hincks opined whether the Board should consider this is an adequate planting schedule, or if the Board should put additional conditions in. Ms. Kilcoyne stated she had questions regarding the landscape plan, mentioning hay bales stating they "maybe put down at low points." She questioned if this meant that the berms may

not be high enough to prevent a low point, so can either require the hay bales, or make the berms higher. Ms. Obendorf stated that the plan says to divert, if needed.

Chairman Garvin said that the only other aspect in addition to landscape plan and the bond is the draft of the Deed Restriction. He added the bond is not just about the driveway, but also erosion control. Therefore grading of the walls should be included in the bond cost. He stressed that bonds have been one of the biggest issues before the Board in the last few years, especially on a site of this nature, having an extensive slope.

Ms. Suedmeyer said she did receive the revision on the limit of work from Ms. Obendorf today, but will be distributed to the Board to review for the next meeting. Chairman Garvin stated that at this point, the Board has asked for a few more items. Mr. Karustis stated that the Board is going to have to include a condition about the bond and the amount.

Chairman Garvin asked if the Board felt comfortable using the design engineer as opposed to the Town's peer reviewer to put together a draft estimate for the bond. Then the Town Engineer would review the estimate. Mr. Karustis said that he did not have an issue with it, as long as the Town Engineer is reviewing it. Chairman Garvin said that he was fine with that also.

Chairman Garvin stated he would like to see the deed restriction detailed in writing. Ms. Suedmeyer explained at the last Planning Board meeting, the Board expected the Conservation Commission would have review the Deed Restriction language at their meeting two nights ago, and then the Board would have been discussing it this evening. Mr. Finnicum asked if anyone had reviewed the language of the deed restriction yet. He added the Board does not know if the objective of the deed restriction has been met. No one has received the draft Restriction to date.

Chairman Garvin opened the Public Hearing to any Board comments. Mr. Karustis opined that the limit of work is a bigger issue.

Ms. Obendorf pointed out a new label on the plans indicating an additional line to the tree line. She added the tree line is the limit of work. Mr. Karustis said that it is difficult when documents are presented the day of meeting, giving no time to review. Vice-Chairman Abair recommended moving to continue this hearing until the Board has more information regarding the resolution of the deed restriction. Ms. Kilcoyne and Chairman Garvin agreed.

Mr. Watsky asked if the Board is meeting again on March 28, 2018. Chairman Garvin said that the Board would be happy to continue the process, if all necessary information is received by March 21, 2018.

Mr. Watsky requested the hearing for the stormwater management permit for 69 and 71 Brewster Road be continued.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue Public Hearing – Stormwater Management Permit – 69 and 71 Brewster Road, (Assessor's Map H10-0100 & H10-0900) to March 28, 2018.

ANR – 69 & 71 Brewster Road, (Assessor's Map H10-0100 & H10-0900)

Mr. Watsky presented the ANR plan and stated his is just an administrative function and signing it starts the 60-day wait period.

Ms. Donoghue explained the ANR is for the applicant of 69 & 71 Brewster Road to divide the land into two lots. She added that when the applicant first presented the ANR back in the fall of 2017, the Board asked to have the location of the deed restriction illustrated on the plan and listed within the narrative. Ms. Donoghue explained that the term “restriction” was listed on the plan, but did not indicate what type. She noted it was up to the Board to decide, but expressed concern with the vague language rather than explicitly stating “Conservation Restriction” or “Deed Restriction.”

Mr. Watsky explained in the line of title, it establishes the restrictive lines that labels them: Restriction Area A and Restriction Area B. He added that the type of restriction the Board decides upon will be outlined in the Decision. Chairman Garvin said that he was willing to go forward with this as shown in the plan.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To endorse the ANR - 69 & 71 Brewster Road, (Assessor’s Map H10-0100 & H10-0900).

Planning Board members endorsed the ANR with their signatures.

Update on Construction Progress at North Ridge Farm/Anthony Drive and SWMP Compliance

Present: Scott Hayes of FORESITE Engineering and Paul Haggerty, Attorney for Applicant.

At 8:48 p.m., Chairman Garvin opened the discussion and welcomed the proponents.

Mr. Haggerty said he was here to answer any questions regarding the progress of North Ridge Farm. Chairman Garvin indicated the Board had previously provided an extension to allow for continuation of work at the subdivision and required an updated progress report in February, and now it is March. He told Mr. Haggerty the Board will work with the applicant to move the desired closing forward; providing there is timely documentation that ensure steps are completed as stipulated by the Board.

Ms. Suedmeyer said when the extension was offered for the Stormwater Management Permit in December the applicant had indicated progress would be made by February. That said, the Board required the proponent to come back and provide an update to determine compliance in February. She stated she received an inquiry from the Building Inspector regarding lot #2, as the owner was seeking an occupancy permit and wanted to know if they needed anything from the Board. At that time, staff contacted the applicant asking if an as built plan was ready for this Board to review and recognized the deadline for the February update was not going to be met.

Ms. Suedmeyer continued stating the as-built plan originally submitted was inadequate and the Town had not received an update or revision on it. Ms. Suedmeyer maintained that the applicant had not been responsive to her communications about the needed revisions and the Town Engineer’s comments on field observations. When she sent an email on March 5 asking if the Applicant would be present for this meeting, she received a response saying that there had been a miscommunication. The proponent claimed the Town Engineer said everything was fine, so they had not responded to Ms. Suedmeyer’s email. The Town Engineer told the Board that he had not made that indication.

Chairman Garvin said that there were a number of members on the Board who were reluctant to agree to the requested extension of the permit and allow staff to issue a Certificate of Compliance without the progress update presentation. He maintained that while the Board works with the Town Engineer, the Board does not rely on the Engineering Department and specifically asked our staff to obtain and review the as-built per the Town's Stormwater Regulation requirements. Ms. Kilcoyne and Chairman Garvin clarified the Board requested an "as-built" and wanted to see where foundation, utilities, final grades were, and that this would be confirmed by field inspection and compliance with the Permit. Mr. Hincks stated there is a pattern of not responding to requests from the Board or from Town Staff. He added the Board provided much latitude with this case, and it seemed that with each Board/Staff request deemed no response. He added that the Board should not be flexible at all, on anything we ask for now.

Vice-Chairman Abair said that he wants to listen, as there are many Board requests. Mr. Karustis stated that he has significant concerns and wants to hear what Mr. Hayes had to say.

Mr. Hayes stated the methods to collect as built information for Lot #2. There was lack of detail about a small straight section of pipe absent from the plan, but added that otherwise the downspout locations are accurate. He said if it's mandatory to produce "as built" survey locations with grades on the actual piping from where underground feeders go to the drywells 20 feet away, that will happen. The area can be excavated and survey performed to update the plan accordingly. He explained that Jim Fenton, the contractor, has expressed reluctance to do that, and our office does what is requested to do. He added that the photos that Bill O'Rourke sent, are good enough to update the plan, and he added that this is a minor deviation from what was submitted originally. Chairman Garvin agreed and stated that amending a 45 degree angle from this picture and depicting it more accurately than the "as built," is a simple and small detail. However, Chairman Garvin indicated there are other inconsistencies with as built requirements and conflicts with the presented as built plan. Chairman Garvin said that there are several necessary items from the plan, including: limit of work, the topography, the final grade, final grade of all structures, the invert elevations on all structures, all structures paving and utilities, off-site alterations and the plan, that must be provide to the Board seven days prior to hearing. Chairman Garvin stressed that if these items are not provided to the Board within that timeframe; there will be no decision. He added that he understood the position that Mr. Hayes was in, but the Board is telling the applicant exactly what must be presented to get a sign-off from this Board. Mr. Hayes added that the joints have been mortared and photographed.

Vice-Chairman Abair said that the Board did not have elevations to compare. Ms. Suedmeyer said that the original stormwater permit decision indicated that for each lot that would have a drywell, that plan was to be submitted to the Planning Board, prior to construction. She added that she had not found records of those submissions, and that detail was not on the permit plan, but was specified in the conditions that should be submitted to the Board. She maintained that this is another required detail that must be worked out prior to further construction. Mr. Hayes said that has been occurring as the development has evolved from lot to lot, and that the level of detail is going to the Building Department, as well as to the Planning Board; showing existing and proposed grading, driveway, actual house footprint, relocations of drywall.

Chairman Garvin said that lot #2 is not signed off by this Board, and needs to sign off on lots 1, 2, and 6. The Board also needs to review the requested information on all of those lots. Mr. Haggerty stated that we are at different points with these lots. Chairman Garvin said he understood that, but design plans for something that is about to be constructed can be submitted. Mr. Hayes agreed with the process.

Chairman Garvin stated that it is the responsibility of the applicant to follow those conditions, and the Board wants this applicant to be very thorough, and do what is needed to meet these requirements.

Ms. Suedmeyer said that she does have the email from Mr. Hayes dated March 7 addressing the miscommunication, which had not transmitted clearly, so she could not share it; it was resent, but still unreadable due to formatting. Mr. Hincks stated that the Town Engineer might tell the applicant an item is ok, but that cannot be precedent for the Board, and the Board still needs compliance with regard to conditions specified. Mr. Karustis said that if there are changes; they must be communicated to Staff for approval. Mr. Haggerty asked the Board what should be done for lots #1 and #6. Chairman Garvin responded that this Board wants every requirement to the letter; including plans that illustrate how any stormwater grades and such, are detailed for those lots before they start. Mr. Haggerty stated that they would be submitting everything that the Board is looking for. Ms. Suedmeyer said that she needs only those plans that relate to the stormwater lots. Mr. Hayes said that he will be providing all information on lot #6, which is no problem. Mr. Haggerty stated that once the information is submitted; he assumes that there will be no “roadblocks” in terms of going forward on that lot.

Chairman Garvin said in February, the Board asked the applicant for a construction schedule. Mr. Haggerty said that the schedule was submitted on March 7, 2018. This schedule was part of the meeting packet. Chairman Garvin said that was fine. Mr. Hincks said that for a long time there was no activity, and that is how the permits lapsed. Mr. Karustis told Mr. Haggerty if he wanted to send the schedule before the required date of submission; that would be great. Mr. Haggerty stated that the Board will have an update when he submits all the information requested. Mr. Hayes stated that things have been at a standstill for the last couple of months, primarily due to the weather, and he thought that when the weather improves; there will be substantial progress. Chairman Garvin said another update should be submitted by June 7th similar to the format of the update provided on March 7. He added that a three-month update to this Board would make sense.

Chairman Garvin said that the next hearing is on March 28, and the Board requires that everything requested, be submitted seven days before meeting; so that would be by March 21.

Discussion of Master Plan Process

At 9:53 p.m., Chairman Garvin opened the discussion to review the Master Plan Process.

Ms. Donoghue indicated that she and the Master Plan Subcommittee worked to tighten up the Request for Proposals (RFP) since the last Planning Board meeting. She indicated she wanted to meet with the Town Manager to find out if the Planning Board had to appear before the Board of Selectmen regarding the RFP. Chairman Garvin thought it wise to contact the Town Manager to understand the process of issuing the RFP.

Vice-Chairman Abair suggested various amendments throughout the document. Mr. Finnicum thought that the revised RFP looked good and referred to page 5 – Section V. He stated that he thought the timeline for receipt of questions, was somewhat restrictive from March 19 to March 23. Mr. Karustis said that he has dealt with many RFPs in the course of his career, and the candidate/firm reads through it in half a day, and there would be questions by the end of that day. He reiterated that a week to come back with questions, is ample time, and he added that the questions should not deter a candidate or firm from moving forward. Mr. Karustis maintained that if candidates are motivated, they will move quickly.

Mr. Finnicum asked if this RFP went through a state database. Ms. Donoghue said that it did, and named several publications that would post the RFP. Mr. Finnicum asked if there are any consultants who know about the opening now. Ms. Donoghue said that she has spoken to some consultants about it.

Vice-Chairman Abair asked if the Board wanted to go ahead with the RFP, pending any small changes that might be recommended, between now and when the Town Manager gets back to Ms. Donoghue. Mr. Hincks said that he wanted to make sure that this process results in some thinking at a greater level of innovation, and he worries that a standard RFP; will attract someone with a standard plan. He detailed that he thinks about what Sudbury could be, and how would that create a valuable proposition that would make the Town more appealing.

Vice-Chairman Abair stated that this is a mission statement, as well as a Master Plan process. Mr. Hincks said that this is exactly what he wants to happen and if that can be inspired by this RFP, that would be great. Mr. Karustis agreed and added when the Planning Board gets to the interview phase, that should be highlighted. He added the Board can ask the candidate at the interview how their plan and strategy would be different for Sudbury, and not just a generic plan. Chairman Garvin agreed and said he hoped the proposals would go this way. Mr. Hincks asked if the Board should be very explicit about what the important vision is. Vice-Chairman Abair agreed and suggested how the Board might include this visionary outlook in the "Background" section of the RFP.

Chairman Garvin said it is within the "Scope of Services" section, but perhaps the Board could add more about the future of Sudbury, and include the vision aspect to a greater degree. Ms. Kilcoyne said she had many ideas about the vision and did not know if it should be part of the RFP. She added that she would be happy to get involved with the subcommittee to further discuss the vision aspect. Mr. Finnicum said that he agreed with Ms. Kilcoyne, and that things are going to move very quickly once the consultant is hired, and the more defined the stakeholders can be, the more encompassing and thorough that process will be. He stated he hoped the consultants would be as inspired as the Board is, so goals must be set and shared now. Mr. Hincks agreed that the consultant will feed off the input that they get from their client.

Mr. Karustis stated the good ones would not just look at this RFP, but look to see how they can differentiate themselves. He added that he was fine if the Board wanted to add more language, but a great candidate will be innovative and will rise to the occasion. Mr. Hincks said that Sudbury is in major transition; with change of population, types of people living here, and what they want from their town. He added that this Master Plan Process is an excellent opportunity to facilitate a new vision for the Town. Vice-Chairman Abair added that it is a new vision and it is about how to get there within an innovative public process.

Mr. Hincks asked the Board if they agreed that these changes to the RFP should be made. He further suggested that in the next agenda, the Board should discuss how to get organized in advance of the consultants coming in. Ms. Kilcoyne said that she had a list of items that she would like to see included.

Administrative Report (cont.)

At 9:43 p.m., Chairman Garvin asked if the Board had any additions.

Ms. Donoghue said there was none.

Chairman Garvin stated that he received an email from Selectman Carty, suggesting that various Town Committee Chairmen and interested members meet quarterly to share various perspectives on an

assortment of issues. Chairman Garvin told the Board that he emailed Selectman Carty, saying that he and the Board would be very interested in this type of opportunity.

Meeting Schedule

Chairman Garvin announced that the next meeting would be on March 28, 2018.

At 9:45 p.m., Chairman Garvin motioned to adjourn the meeting.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To adjourn meeting.