Approved 3/12/14

RECEIVED
2014 MAR 13 AM 11:59
DARTMOUTH TOWN CLERK

Town of Dartmouth
Board of Health
Minutes of the Meeting of
05 March 2014

The meeting notice was duly posted.

This meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Thomas W. Hardman, Leslie E.J. McKinley, and Lynne Brodeur, were present. Wendy Henderson, Director of Public Health was also present.

The Minutes of the meeting of February 26, 2014 were accepted as corrected by Thomas W. Hardman, Lynne Brodeur, and Leslie E.J. McKinley.

Appointment 7:10 PM RE: Wendy J Heiger-Bernays, PhD- Noisome Trade – MGL, Chapter 111, Section 143- & Cecil Smith Landfill Capping and Closure - Wendy Heiger-Bernays, PhD presented to the Board of Health a document that identifies the potential public health issues associated with movement and use of Comm-97-001 soils. The following material was addressed by Ms. Heiger-Bernays presentation/document: background on the contaminant levels allowed in contaminated soils, testing frequency, testing for contaminants, averaging soil concentrations, maximum contaminant levels, Public Health issues relative to Comm-97 soils, risks to public health, other materials than Comm-97 soils of concern can be imported, risks to safety, risks to public welfare. Also Ms. Heiger-Bernays went over tools available to the Board of Health to regulate industrial activities and surveillance issues prior to and during operations. Ms. Heiger-Bernays document is attached and on file at the Dartmouth Board of Health office.

Ms. Heiger-Bernays, PhD, Christine R Leblanc from East Coast Engineering, Inc., and Town Counsel Anthony Savastano were present and answered questions from the Board and residents.

It was an unanimous decision of the Board members to have Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health and Town Counsel, Anthony Savastano work on a draft regulation to be presented at the next Board of Health meeting on Wednesday, March 12, 2014.

RE: State Road Cement Block (SRCB)/Plat 164, Lot 46, 656 State Road – Dust Complaint – 7/21/2010 – No new complaints have been received.

RE: Institute of Advanced Sciences, Inc./Research Laboratory proposal/Plat 45, Lot 29, #166 Chase Road- Attorney Mark Deshaies-
The Board perused the draft letter that Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public health had submitted. With some minor corrections to the letter, the Board members unanimously approved sending the letter.

Boston University School of Public Health

Department of Environmental Health

715 Albany Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02118-2526
T 617-638-4620 F 617 638-4857

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

March 3, 2014

Ms. W. Henderson, Director of Public Health
Town Of Dartmouth Board of Health
Town Hall, Room 119
400 Slocum Road
Dartmouth, MA 02747

Dear Ms. Henderson,

At the request of the Dartmouth Board of Health (BOH), I attach a document that identifies the potential public health issues associated with movement and use of COMM-97 soils. The document also presents a brief review of the tools available to guide the BOH as it makes decisions regarding the import of COMM-97 soils, and other fill materials.

Sincerely,

Wendy J Heiger-Bernays

Wendy Heiger-Bernays, PhD
Associate Professor of Environmental Health (whb@bu.edu)
Lexington Board of Health, Chair

Identification of Potential Public Health Concerns Relative to COMM-97 Soils [and Other Solid Waste Materials] for Daily Cover, Grading, and Shaping in Support of Landfill Closure Town of Dartmouth Board of Health

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, local Boards of Health (BOH) are responsible for the protection of the health of the local community. The authority given to BOH derives from Massachusetts General Law and its local regulations. As with all public health issues, the preferred approach to protection is to prevent the conditions that are risk factors in the development of illness. This document provides the Dartmouth BOH with a review of issues relating to the import and use of contaminated soils and solid waste materials for fill, daily cover, and grading and shaping in support of lined and unlined landfill operations and closure projects as it relates to potential public health issues.

Background

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) has established policies and guidelines, which allow for the import of contaminated soils and other solid waste materials for reuse, recycling and disposal at solid waste landfills, and for grading and shaping materials in support of landfill closure activities. These policies are: *"Policy COMM-97-001: Reuse and Disposal of Contaminated Soils at Landfills, August 1997"* (referred to as COMM-97 Policy) and the July 2001 *"Revised Guidelines for Determining Closure Activities at Inactive Unlined Landfill Sites."* (referred to as the July 2001 Guidelines)

This document summarizes the types of materials and testing requirements allowed by these policies and identifies the limitations of these policy/guidelines in protecting public health and the environment.

Incoming Soil Materials

Testing Frequency

In order to characterize the types and concentrations of contaminants in soil, testing is conducted. A large volume of soil needs more samples taken (also referred to as more frequent testing) than small volumes of soil to accomplish the goal of understanding what is in the soil. The testing frequency required by the COMM-97 Policy for incoming soil materials is one sample per 500 cubic yards from a source area. For reference, a pile of soil delivered for use in one's

garden is typically 1-5 cubic yards or similarly, one transfer trailer truck carries 30 cubic yards.

Testing for Contaminants

When determining the types and concentrations of contaminants, there are a set of chemicals commonly tested for, and scientifically accepted methods that are followed for doing the testing. Usually soil is tested for a number of potential contaminants, and the testing is guided by knowing something about the incoming soil including its origin. When it is not known where the soil is from, then more expansive testing of the soil is conducted. The testing relies on a set of protocols that are well established and the results of which are accepted by MassDEP for decision-making purposes. The testing is referred to as analytical testing and is done for the contaminants that are likely to be most toxic to humans and the environment. The contaminants tested for in the COMM-97 Policy, Table 1, includes five metals (arsenic, cadmium, chromium lead and mercury), total volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)). Table 1 does not fully address other contaminants of concern, which could potentially be toxic to humans and the environment, that are typically found in urban fill and used in soil fill projects including:

- vanadium
- polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)
- asbestos
- selenium
- dioxins
- pesticides
- herbicides

Averaging Soil Concentrations

It is not feasible to sample every grain of soil. Therefore, it is industry standard to take samples in a batch, area or volume of soil at given frequencies and represent the concentration of the whole volume as the average (mean) concentration. If there are soils with very high concentrations and soils with very low concentrations, then by averaging, the resultant batch has a concentration that does not reflect the highest (or lowest) values. In this case, the high concentrations will be "smoothed" by averaging with very low concentrations, and vice versa. This is problematic if 1) there are soils with very high concentrations of contaminants that have acute toxicity (such as cyanide or arsenic) and human contact with these contaminants for a short period of time can pose an unacceptable public health risk, 2) the soil is not well mixed and soils of very high concentration are located where human impact is possible

(such as on the top of a batch in a truck as it transports the material) and 3) the frequency of testing the soil is infrequent enough so that the soil is not well characterized and areas of high concentration are not identified.

The COMM-97 Policy allows the test data for soil samples collected from the same source area to be averaged. Averaging can potentially dilute the contaminant concentrations in the soil thus making the material more amenable in meeting the COMM-97 maximum 'reuse' levels.

Maximum Contaminant Levels (how much contaminant is allowed in the soil)

The regulations for hazardous waste in Massachusetts are set forth in the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) and overseen by MassDEP. In these regulations, allowable concentrations of contaminants are derived and listed. The allowable concentrations are based on the toxicity of the substance, the potential for human exposure and the potential of the contaminant to enter the groundwater. Other considerations include the ability to test the material and recognition that some of these chemicals are naturally occurring (e.g. cadmium, selenium, others), or present in soil at low concentrations because of ubiquitous human activity (e.g. lead, dioxins and PAHs). MassDEP has set concentrations (called MCP standards) for soils that can be used in residential yards (called S-1 standards that have the lowest allowable concentrations for each contaminant), concentrations for soils that have contaminants that can vaporize into buildings (S-2 standards) and standards that require that the soil be located deep in the ground (S-3 standards that have higher allowable concentrations), where humans have little contact. In addition to the soil categories, there are also groundwater categories. These are based on whether the groundwater is used for drinking water or not. Groundwater that is used as a drinking water source would have lower allowable concentrations than groundwater that is not a drinking water source. Groundwater in an aquifer district and used for drinking water, is categorized as GW-1, and is required to have the lowest concentration of contaminants in order to protect public health.

The maximum 'reuse' levels identified in the COMM-97 Policy are not consistent with MCP standards which were established by MassDEP to be protective of public health. The Table 1 levels in the COMM-97 Policy assume that contaminated soil will be disposed at a landfill, which will be capped upon closure however, the transfer of these materials to the project site, the potential human health and environmental impacts during the landfill operations/closure and post-closure were not considered in the derivation of the concentrations. The concentrations exceed the MCP standards, which are generally risk based.

The table below shows a comparison of the MCP Soil Category S-3 standards (S-3 is the least protective soil criterion) with the maximum contaminant levels

allowed by the COMM-97 policy for four of the tested parameters. Note that the COMM-97 maximum concentrations exceed the MCP requirements for soils.

Parameter	COMM-97 Max. Level (ppm)[1]	MCP S-3 Level (ppm)[2]
	Lined / Unlined Landfill	
Arsenic (As)	40/40	20
Cadmium (Cd)	80/30	30
Chromium (Cr)	1,000/1,000	200
Lead (Pb)	2,000/1,000	300

1. Information obtained from COMM-97 Policy, Table 1
2. Massachusetts Contingency Plan 310 CMR 40.0000: concentrations of As, Cd & Pb are increasing in 2014.

Public Health Issues Relative to COMM-97 Soils

When considering public health issues relative to incoming soils, it is useful to use a conceptual model that identifies the hazards, the source of the hazards and a clear path between the hazards and an individual or a population. For purposes of COMM-97 soils, the conceptual model identified the hazards as the contaminants in the incoming soils. The people potentially impacted include residents (adults and children) along the routes of the trucks carrying the materials, residents who live near the landfill and workers at the landfill. Occupational exposures to the workers who are moving the soils to and at the landfill are regulated by worker health organizations. When groundwater is used for drinking water, and the contaminants can leach from the soil into the groundwater, potential impact to the consumers of the contaminated water is considered as a public health issue.

Risks to Public Health

Human health risk is a function of the magnitude of exposure to the hazards (in this case contaminants in soils) and the intrinsic toxicity of the hazards. Without conducting a full risk assessment to assess risk, MassDEP Soil Standards described above, with exception of lead provide insight into the potential risk associated with contaminants. Contaminants with lower allowable concentrations are more toxic than those with higher allowable concentrations. The soil lead standard is not a health protective standard, but instead reflects the fact that as a society leaded paint and gasoline was used and this legacy remains, leaving a higher "background" concentration. Lead is one contaminant of great concern because evidence demonstrates that there is no safe concentration for the developing infant and young child[1]. It is beyond the scope of this

[1] Canfield, et al., (2003).

memorandum to review the health effects associated with each of the contaminants of concern, but the reader is referred to the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry for information (ATSDR Toxicity Profiles)[2]

Children and the fetus of pregnant women are most susceptible to the effects of environmental contaminants due to their rapidly developing biological systems. Children are more vulnerable because of their increased exposure due to hand to mouth activity, smaller body weights (resulting in higher doses) and higher inhalation rates.

There are several potential pathways (how contaminants in soils move from the soil to people) that are of importance. Of primary concern is the generation of fugitive dusts during transport, when the soils are deposited on the landfill, and when the soils are in place on the landfill. Fugitive dusts are particles of soils that contain contaminants that are either bound to or associated with the soil. Particulate matter, also referred to as PM is described by its size. Large particles (PM >10 μm) do not enter the lungs, but can be swallowed. This means that the contaminants in the soil can enter the body through the gastrointestinal tract. Smaller particles (<PM 10 μg) have differential ability to enter the lungs – smaller particles more efficiently than larger particles. The inhalation of fine particles and ultrafine particles is strongly associated with increases in cardiovascular, respiratory morbidities and mortality.[3] Inadequate cover of the soils and prevention of dust generation of soils in trucks allows for direct inhalation exposure to adults and children along the transport routes. This can occur while people are outdoors and when they are indoors, but windows are open. Wind direction and speed can influence the distance that the dusts travel. In addition to inhalation exposure, the dusts and particles can deposit onto surfaces near homes and vehicles along the roadways. The deposited soils and dusts can be contacted by people directly through hand to mouth contact, or indirectly, when the dusts deposit on vegetables in gardens, soils adjacent to the home, or in-home dust. Both of these latter exposure pathways are persistent and continue long after the trucks have ceased to transport soil.

Trucks transporting soil rely on diesel fuel. Diesel exhaust is a mixture of gases and particulates produced during the combustion of diesel fuel. USEPA (2002) conducted a robust assessment of diesel exhausts and concludes that long-term (i.e., chronic) inhalation exposure is likely to pose a lung cancer hazard to humans, as well as damage the lung in other ways depending on exposure. Short-term (i.e., acute) exposures can cause irritation and inflammatory symptoms of a transient nature, these being highly variable across the population.[4]

---

[2] ATSDR. Accessed 2.28.14. http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/index.asp
[3] USEPA, http://www.epa.gov/pm/health.html
[4] USEPA, 2002

In addition to diesel emissions, trucks generate noise. The noise may exceed levels that normally exist in residential areas. Noise can adversely impact health if the levels are sufficiently high and sustained to disrupt sleep. Typical levels generated by a single truck is insufficient to impact hearing. Depending on the number of trucks and the time of day, the increase in noise can exceed levels that are identified by MassDEP as violating noise regulations[5].

Once the soils and [other materials] are brought to the landfill, if dust is not controlled, the dust generated during the deposition onto the landfill is available for continuous generation of particulates (fine and course). The direction and distance that the PM and associated contaminants travels is a function of PM size, wind direction and wind speed. Residents living down-wind are potentially exposed to the airborne PM until the soils are covered. Deposition of the PM onto surfaces remains a continuing source of contaminants and dusts until soils are covered and surfaces are cleaned.

Materials (trash, soils, debris) placed on landfills have the ability to leach soluble chemicals into the groundwater that flows beneath the landfill. This takes time (years), but if rain is allowed to percolate into the landfill, and there is no lining or the lining is breached, then the process of leaching is hastened. Contaminants originating from the soils can enter the groundwater beneath the landfill and serve as a continuing source of contamination. A portion of the Town of Dartmouth is situated in an aquifer protection district. This aquifer is the source for the community water supplies (regulated under Federal Safe Drinking Water Act and MassDEP provisions) and private drinking water wells (regulated by Dartmouth BOH). If people rely on the groundwater to supply their private residential wells or municipal wells downgradient of the landfill, then exposure occurs when people use the water for bathing, drinking and cooking. Additionally, if there are volatile compounds in the groundwater, then there is additional exposure to vapors through cracks in the building foundations[6].

<u>It is important to recognize that materials other than COMM-97 Soils can be imported for landfill closure activities. These include:</u>

Construction and Demolition Fines: The July 2001 Guidelines for landfill closures allow for the reuse and disposal of Construction and Demolition debris (C&D) fines for grading and shaping materials. C&D fines contain sulfate due to the presence of gypsum in the waste stream. Elevated sulfate levels can potentially cause odor (e.g., rotten egg smell) issues.

---

[5] MassDEP Noise Regulations. http://www.airandnoise.com/MA310CMR710.html Accessed 2.28.14

[6] MassDEP (2011). Interim Final Vapor Intrusion Guidance. WSC#-11-435 2*www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dep/cleanup/laws/vifin.pdf*

Asbestos Materials: The MassDEP Solid Waste regulations allow for up to 1%, by weight, of asbestos in soil however, no testing of incoming soil for asbestos is required by the COMM-97 Policy. Asbestos is commonly found in urban soils and remnants of C&D debris in urban fill.

Fly Ash: Fly ash is allowed for reuse in grading and shaping materials in support of landfill closure. Fly ash requires special handling because it is light weight and has the potential to become airborne. Further, fly ash has the potential for leaching of heavy metals into groundwater and surface water runoff.

Dredge sediment, street sweepings and/or material excavated from catch basin sumps: Dredge sediment, street sweepings and material excavated from catch basins potentially contain elevated concentrations of heavy metals, elevated conductivity and petroleum hydrocarbons and can leach into the underlying groundwater.

Residuals from C&D Processing Facilities/MRFs: C&D residuals generated from the processing of C&D debris or from Materials Recycling Facilities (MRFs) are difficult to handle and spread. The residuals have the potential to contain gypsum (i.e., potential to generate sulfur dioxide odor).

Risks to Safety

Safety typically refers to prevention of injury, not due to exposures to contaminants. Injury relative to COMM-97 soils can result from vehicular accidents along roadways used for transport of soils. Movement of trucks in residential neighborhoods has different accident profiles than movement in industrial/commercial areas. Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) Highway Division maintains a crash data portal through which rates and types of crash data can be accessed. These data are available by town and year (1990 – 2012) and can be used to understand the impact of trucking in smaller communities[7].

Risks to Public Welfare

Public welfare includes those elements or resources of community life that are not easily quantifiable, but are valued by people in cities and towns. These resources can include, but are not limited to natural resources, parks, water supply protection areas, and access to open space. Some less tangible, but equally important to some communities is retention of residential resources

[7] MassDOT. Crash and Accident Portal. Accessed 2.29.14. http://www.mhd.state.ma.us/default.asp?pgid=content/traffic/crashrateeval&sid=about

such as limited traffic and safe access to schools and parks. Odors do not, by themselves indicate a health risk, but they can impact public welfare.

Tools Available to Massachusetts Boards of Health

Massachusetts Boards of Health (BOH) are responsible for the protection of health and prevention of disease in local communities.

Tools to Regulate Industrial Activities

The tools provided under Massachusetts General Law, specifically **Chapter 111 - Selected Sections Pertaining to Local Boards of Health** provide the BOH with the ability to conduct these activities. As described in the BOH Guidebook[8] "The extent of the state's delegation of power varies from designating the board of health as the primary enforcement agent of the state's regulations (as is the case with the housing section of the Sanitary Code) to authorizing the board of health to draft its own regulations regarding public health matters (see M.G.L. c. 111 §31). The only absolute restraint is that such regulations must be consistent with state law."

Local regulations that are most frequently used by BOH to regulate noise, nuisances and trades that generate noise, dust, odors and contamination focus on Nuisances & Noisome Trades, M.G.L. Chapter 111, Section 31, Section 122, or Section 143.

Surveillance Prior to and During Operations

Regulation can also include monitoring and surveillance (these options are akin to restaurant and housing inspections). One of the tools used to understanding the relationship between exposure and disease is surveillance. It is very difficult to recreate exposure patterns, intensity and disease rates after events have taken place. While not primary prevention, the BOH has the ability to require that monitoring for environmental conditions and establishment of disease registries be established prior to, during and after project completion.

---

[8] Massachusetts Boards of Health Guidebook, Legal Authority and Procedures. http://www.mahb.org/Library/Guide%20book/gbook02.pdf

Citations

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/index.asp Accessed 2.28.14.

Canfield et al. (2003). *Intellectual impairment in children with blood lead concentrations below 10 microg per deciliter.* N Engl J Med. 348(16):1517-26.

MassDEP *Policy COMM-97-001: Reuse and Disposal of Contaminated Soils at Landfills, August 1997"* (referred to as COMM-97 Policy) and the July 2001 *"Revised Guidelines for Determining Closure Activities at Inactive Unlined Landfill Sites."*

MassDEP Noise Regulations. Accessed 2.28.14. http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/air/programs/noise-pollution-policy-interpretation.html

MassDEP. *Interim Final Vapor Intrusion Guidance.* Accessed 2.28.14 *www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dep/cleanup/laws/vifin.pdf*

Massachusetts Boards of Health Guidebook, Legal Authority and Procedures (1997). http://www.mahb.org/Library/Guide%20book/gbook02.pdf

USEPA (2002). *Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust* (Final 2002). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Washington Office, Washington, DC, EPA/600/8-90/057F, 2002.

USEPA, Particulate Matter and Health, http://www.epa.gov/pm/health.html Accessed 2.28.14

RE: Brandon Woods – Bullard Center – proposal 01/08/2014- Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health met with the Brandon Woods nurse and Kathy Bohan. Ms. Henderson has some concerns with what the nurse from Brandon Woods expectations might be. The Board discussed sending a memo to the Select Board asking that they delay signing the Public Health Nursing/Bullard Center lease, so Ms. Henderson can review and articulate the Boards particular concerns and assure Brandon Woods addresses them. Also, there may be some alternatives that could more effectively address Dartmouth's needs for Public Health Nursing services.

RE: Letter of support for Braiden Norton tumor treatment - Thomas W Hardman presented a draft letter that he had composed. Leslie E.J. McKinley was very appreciative of Mr. Hardman drafting this letter. Mr. Hardman asked the Board to review the draft, and email him any comments.

RE: Reis Family Cemetery – Town meeting article – 2/12/14- The Reis' have found ten residents to support the Town meeting article, so the Board of Health doesn't need to sponsor the article.

RE: Wendy W Henderson Director's insurance update - Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health didn't have the time to get the information together for the Board. Nothing further was discussed.

RE: Budget proposal and Assistant Animal Control Officer Discussion - The Board reviewed and discussed the proposed budget for Animal Control. Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health has prepared a balanced budget and a consolidation/wish/emergency response budget to be presented to the Finance Committee. Ms. Henderson informed the Board they have an appointment with the Finance Committee on Thursday, March 13, 2014. The Board was supportive of Ms. Henderson's budget proposal for the consolidation. Ms. Henderson explained that the office staff has not been made aware of this proposal as of yet.

Discussion about licensing, fees, and the possibility of recouping nursing services related fees.

RE: Septic Plans – The following septic plans were reviewed by Health and Sanitary Inspector, Christopher Michaud and approved by the Board.

Patrick & Uta Prevost/Plat 97, Lot 57, 59 Nonquitt Avenue – waiver- Thomas W Hardman recused himself from all discussion and voting on this matter. The Board discussed the aforementioned septic plans and pursuant to the provisions of 310 CMR 15.000, Title 5. Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health informed the Baord the waiver is for a reduction of 5' overdig along porch to 2' to keep 10' from property line with system. 5' required, Soil absorption system to slab 9' proposed. 10' required, and soil absorption system to coastal bank proposed at 89'. 100' required.

Leslie E.J. McKinley entertained a motion to approve the waiver as stated by the Director of Public Health with Lynne Brodeur motioning and Leslie E.J. McKinley seconded the motion. It was voted 2-0-1

Steven Chmielewski/Plat 56, Lot 17-7, Digger Drive-Zabel Filter - The Board discussed the aforementioned septic plans and pursuant to the provisions of 310 CMR 15.000, Title 5, with Lynne Brodeur motioning and Leslie E.J. McKinley seconding, the Board of Health voted unanimously to approve the aforementioned plans with the following stipulation:

- Prior to release of the plans and before commencing with construction of the subsurface sewage disposal system, the Operation & Maintenance Agreement/Contract must be submitted to the Board of Health for the yearly cleaning of the outlet tee filter.

RE: Septic Plans - The following septic plans were reviewed by Health and Sanitary Inspector, Christopher Michaud and approved by the Director of Public Health, Wendy W. Henderson.

David Lima/Plat 33, Lot 18-5, Woodcock Road

RE: Stephen and Marcia Rath/map 18 Lot 16 on 7 Cedar Avenue – well- Marcia Rath was present to explain to the Board the home at 7 Cedar Ave, is experiencing a fluctuation in water flow. Ms. Rath has had someone look at the current well and also experiencing some gravel in the water. Ms. Rath would like to install a replacement well 2' from the current well.

After the Board reviewed and discussed, the memo from Christopher Michaud, Health and Sanitary Inspector, and letter from Ms. Rath's abutter it was an unanimous decision of the Board of Health to allow Ms. Rath to submit plans showing the proposed well location to be drilled.

RE: Electronic Death Registration System – Opt in/Opt out- The Board briefly discussed the implementation of burial permits going electronic. The Board also touched on becoming an Opt in community, so Funeral Homes may be able to print e-permits for the record, and will be able to proceed with the disposition of the decedent, before the final review by the Burial Agent.

Thomas W Hardman entertained a motion to become an Opt in community, Lynne Brodeur motioned to become an Opt in community and Leslie McKinley seconded the motion.

RE: "Tobacco policies address market changes" – Article from February 2014 – The Beacon- The Board perused the article that Thomas W Hardman had brought to their attention at the previous meeting. A brief discussion ensued about age limits.

RE: MPH Student intern volunteer 240 hours- Wendy W Henderson, Director of Public Health was contacted by Susan Barrett who needs to do an internship for her Public Health Master's degree. Ms. Barrett has gone back to school for Public Health, and would like to promote health and disease prevention.

It was an unanimous decision of the Board at this time to decline Ms. Barrett's request for an internship due to other ongoing office responsibilities.

RE: Wendy Henderson – Director's Report- The Board perused the Director's report from February 2014. Not action taken at this time.

RE: Christopher Michaud – Inspector's Report – The Board perused the Inspector's Report from February 2014. No action taken at this time.

RE: Discussion of any item not known 48 hours in advance – Nothing at this time.

RE: Board Signatures – No signatures required.

At 8:58 p.m. Thomas W. Hardman, Chair entertained a motion to close the regular Board of Health Meeting. Roll call vote –Thomas Hardman - yes, Lynne Brodeur – yes, Leslie E.J. McKinley.

With no further business to discuss, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Farias
Administrative Clerk