

Newburyport Board of Health Meeting  
November 01, 2016

Date of Approval: December 15, 2017

Attendees:

Dr. Robin Blair, Chairman  
Dr. Sam Merabi, Board Member  
Dr. Robert Slocum, Board Member  
Frank Giacalone, Health Director  
Patricia McAlarney, Note Taker

Speakers – as listed below in bold.

**Call to Order:** Dr. Blair called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes:** Motion to approve the Minutes of the Board Meeting from September 22, 2016 was made by Dr. Sam Merabi. Board Member, Robert Slocum passed on the vote.

Votes to approve: Dr. Merabi and Dr. Blair

Votes to oppose: None

Motion passed. Minutes of the September 22, 2016 Board of Health Meeting approved as submitted.

**Energy and Recycling Update:** Energy and Recycle Coordinator, Molly Ettenborough, was at a conference and was therefore unable to attend the meeting.

**Public Health Nurse Update**

- Flu Clinics have been completed, as well as offering vaccination to employees of DPS and Fire Department. The Health Department is currently offering vaccines on a walk-in basis for residents. This is the first year that the Health Department has had high dose vaccine available. There has been a high demand and feedback from seniors has been positive.
- Hepatitis B vaccine series for DPS staff was completed last month.
- Nourish the North Shore (NNS):
  - NNS received a community recognition award from Opportunity Works.
  - A fundraiser for NNS will take place on November 30 at Dos Amigos. A percentage of the food sold that day will be donated to NNS.
- Food Recovery from the Bresnahan and Nock Middle School continues to be successful with significant inventory of unsold food items being donated to local food pantries.
- The vegetable garden preparation at Bresnahan School is now complete
- The Health Department and Youth Services will be offering CPR classes in November. A community-wide class and a class for employees of the Sewer Department will be offered.

**Animal Control Services Update**

- Extra patrols covering a larger patrol area was accomplished by adding an Assistant Animal Control Officer during the summer and early fall.

**Boutique's - Microblading – Leah Lynch**

- Ms. Lynch came before the Board to request approval of her application for a license to perform Microblading at Boutiques in Newburyport. She explained that microblading is a new semi-permanent cosmetic tattooing technique, introduced in the United States approximately one and half years ago. Unlike traditional tattooing and micropigmentation which access deeper layers of the skin, Microblading implants a pigment to the outer layers of the dermis using a hand-held tool to create the look of a more natural cosmetic eyebrow. The pigment used is an FDA approved liquefied makeup. Patients do not bleed during the procedure because only the outer dermal layers are impacted. The technique is often used as restoration for patients who have undergone cancer treatment, suffer from alopecia, have scars or diminished brows due to the aging process, or for cosmetic purposes.

She explained that all of the tools and implements used during a procedure are disposed of immediately and, since none of the equipment is reusable, an autoclave is unnecessary. Disposal of sharps will be through an approved sharps hauler. Treatment rooms all provide privacy and are equipped with sinks, VOC air purifiers and 18 inch extruder fan that provides air exchange every 60 seconds. All chairs and treatment surfaces within the room are sanitized between patients.

In addition to being licensed to perform tattooing, the technicians are all certified aestheticians, OSHA certified, vaccinated for Hepatitis B, and are knowledgeable in precautions for bloodborne pathogens. Boutiques has an aesthetic nurse on staff and Medical Directorship.

The Board questioned the difference between microblading and micropigmentation. Lynch explained that micropigmentation is performed using a motorized digital rotary pen or 'gun' to apply liquid makeup. While micropigmentation does not transcend as deep into the dermis as traditional tattooing it does go deeper than microblading. Some of the equipment used in micropigmentation is reusable and therefore, requires use of an autoclave.

The Board questioned whether the pigment is disposable and were informed that only single use portions are dispensed for each treatment, and any excess pigment is discarded immediately following the procedure.

A video of the microblading procedure was shown to the Board Members.

Ms. Lynch stated that skin infection or cellulitis has not been associated with the procedure and that screening for skin thickness is not necessary due to the limited depth of the technique.

**Motion:** Dr. Merabi made a Motion to approve the application for Boutique's to perform microblading. The motion was seconded by Dr. Slocum.

Votes to approve: Dr. Merabi, Dr. Slocum, Dr. Blair

Votes to deny: None

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Food Establishments – Frank Giacalone**

- Paddle Inn - Renovations are underway at the previous site of Loretta at State Street.
- Brick & Ash - Site visits have been performed to oversee additions such as janitorial sinks, etc.
- The Juicery – This is a fruit juice bar which will be located at the previous site of Gram's Icecream.
- Newburyport Olive Oil is establishing a small kitchen area from which samples for tastings will be prepared.
- Famous Pizza - Construction will begin soon on a complete renovation of the establishment.

#### **Evergreen Commons –**

The Board of Health has been asked by the Planning Board what effect the development will have on Well #2 and the water supply for the City of Newburyport.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Lisa Mead:** The Applicant has applied to the Planning Board for a Special Permit for an Open Space Residential Subdivision, OSRD. If the Planning Board does not approve the OSRD then the applicant will file a conventional subdivision plan. The Board of Health will have the opportunity to review the plan with regard to public health. There is a specific section in G.L. 41 - 81U which indicates that the Board of Health and the Planning Board have the right to review the plan for subdivision. However if the Board of Health votes to deny the subdivision it must be based upon the statutory standard, specifically that the proposed buildable area would harm the public. To date, a definitive plan has not been filed. The Applicant has filed for a standard preliminary plan which is NOT the OSRD plan. The local Planning Board Regulations give the Board of Health the right to comment on the standard preliminary plan. Because the subdivision is in Zone II, it is likely that there would be a requirement to provide plans related to storm water plans and possibly road plans. Ms. Mead noted that the plans that the Applicant has currently put forth are not detailed enough for any Board to make a final decision under the WRPD. This evening, Jay Billings, will summarize the results of GeoScience's testing

and their recommendations. She noted that none of the experts that have been brought forward have determined that the construction of single family homes on sewer in a Zone 2 creates a public health risk. Ms. Mead previously provided to the Board an email from Doug Gove (AECOM) relative to a conversation with DEP. In the email DEP indicated that they have no issue with single family residential homes in a Zone II area, particularly those on sewer; and they have never had issues with chemicals or road salt impacting wells in Zone 2 in the Commonwealth of Mass.

**Jay Billings - Northeast GeoScience** – Mr Billings introduced himself as a hydrogeologist who was hired to study the well impact at Zone 2. Mr. Billings referenced slides to demonstrate the location of existing wells and newly bored wells for the purpose of evaluating the soil conditions in the area. The proposed development is a 36 acre parcel of land that will include a 38 lot subdivision as part of an OSRD. Well #2 will be 758 feet away from the closest part of the project. Well #2 currently provides excellent quality water with sufficient capacity (currently running below capacity at 225 gallons per minute.) A soil evaluation determined that the deposits onsite are glacial outwash deposits from a former gravel pit. They did not find any evidence of layers of excess loam that had reportedly been added years ago. The average depth to water is about 12 feet, and there was a confirmed bedrock-high on the site. In 1999 a company named TEEM, LLC delineated the Zone II recharge area which is the area of the aquifer that contributes water to Wells 1 & 2 under the most extreme pumping conditions. Once the Zone 2 recharge area was delineated, there were two other determinations that were part of the assignment: (1) to identify any other existing source of contamination in Zone 2 under existing conditions relative to water quality and (2) to determine what type of zoning should be passed to protect the water for future usage. The study found four potential sources of contamination: Evergreen Valley Golf course, I-95, St Mary Cemetery, Gravel Pits off of Ferry Road. Residential homes existed but were not considered as potential contaminants. Mr. Billings showed a graph that showed that nitrate concentration peaked in 2004 at 2 mg/l - which he stated was within drinking water standards. The trend seems to be decreasing but it is not known why. Sodium concentration also peaked at 2004 at about 50 mg/l and continues to decrease (currently 30 mg/l.) There is no standard for sodium in drinking water; however there is a 'taste threshold.' The City initiated Well Head Protective Ordinance which protects Zone 2 and prohibits specific land uses in Zone 2 (ie. landfills, gas stations, etc.) At the time the Ordinance was accepted, the golf course was grandfathered as a land use. Mr. Billings noted that residential housing is not prohibited in Zone 2.

If this project is approved, a nine hole golf course will be eliminated (which was one of the identified potential contaminants) removing 23 acres of managed turf and will be adding nine acres of lawn (62% reduction.) Applicant has offered to use a single landscaper for the development.. There will be an addition of 1.4 acres of roadway which will add road salt that is expected to affect the well water and cause an 8% increase in sodium levels (to about 28.7 mg/l). Mr. Billings noted, however, that the anticipated sodium level would still be within commonly acceptable standards. There are also two irrigation wells in the area that will be eliminated with the proposed development; thereby increasing the amount of water potentially available to Well #2. Northeast Science concluded that this project will NOT affect city's ability to replace Well #2 because there is a fair amount of land that allows for the 400 radius that is required for a new (replacement) well.

Mr. Billings showed a list of chemicals applied by Evergreen Golf Course from 2014 to 2016 and explained that golf courses often use stronger chemicals (and fungicides) than homeowners to maintain the golf course turf. Northeast Geoscience has requested permission from AECOM to test Well #2 for some of these products; they are awaiting approval to perform the tests.

The results of current well testing of two monitoring wells and one irrigation well located near Well #2 were shown. The results from the monitoring wells were similar to results from Well #2. Sodium and Chloride were both found to be elevated (likely due to road salt) Potassium and phosphorous were elevated (likely to be related to fertilizer applied at the golf course.) A test for VOCs showed that very small amounts of iso-propyltoluene (used in fuels and cleaning products) were present. The origin of the compound was not able to be identified, however, Mr. Billings noted that due to the low amount it was Northeast Geoscience's opinion that the compound would not 'make it' to Well #2. No synthetic organic compounds, SOCs, that are commonly found in 'weed and feed fertilizers' (ie. 2 4D and Dicamba) were identified in the well water.

Model calculations for the entire Zone 2 recharge area and for just the Zone 2 recharge area for Well #2 (which is located on the east side of Rt 95) were discussed. Focus was drawn to the model for the Zone 2 area for Well

#2 to demonstrate a comparison calculation that was made comparing mass balanced nitrogen loading under Existing Conditions and under Simulated Proposed Conditions (with the proposed development.) The resulting calculation showed a proposed drop in the nitrogen level from 1.04 mg/l which was stated to be due to the fact that there will be less managed turf due to the elimination of the golf course.

Mr. Billings stated that he has concluded that the proposed development does not pose a public health risk and is a lower risk of use of the area than the golf course presented. The proposed development is compliant with the by-laws. DEP has confirmed that residential use has not been identified as a big threat to wells, especially in the absence of any septic systems.

Dr. Merabi asked how many of the herbicides/pesticides that have been identified as having been used on the golf course can be tested for in the well? Mr. Billings said that there are two lists: The SOC which are required by DEP and are already tested for by the City. The second list are not being tested for and are not on the SOC list. He has found a research test lab that will test for six compounds. Because many of the products use the same active ingredients, the tests will effectively test for approximately half of the chemicals that were known to have been used. A request to have the soil and wells tested was submitted to the City a week and a half ago.

**Lisa Mead** - Stated that the request to have the soil and water testing done was approved by the Water Commission. The Commission then asked AECOM to develop the list of chemicals that would be included and the list of locations to be tested.

**Jay Billings** - Mr. Billings explained that the plan is to take a sample from the end of view 7 which is the closest monitoring point to Well #2 and is downgrading of the golf course so that any chemicals from the course should show up in this area. The second sample would come from Well #2 which is a very representative groundwater sample. Mr. Billings stated that in his expert opinion the water quality from Well #2 is currently excellent and poses no harm to public health.

**Steve Sawyer**, Civil Engineer with Design Consultants - In response to a question from the Board regarding possible contamination from flood waters that could be pumped from basements of residential dwellings, Mr. Sawyer explained that Board of Health Regulations require that foundations be two feet above the seasonal high ground water levels. Alex Parker, Certified Soil Evaluator, has already examined thirteen holes of 100-112 inches that were dug in January and no weeping was found from any of these holes. Ten or eleven of these holes were over seven feet to seasonal high. There is an isolated low level area that is subject to flooding. Using a calculation directed by DEP which takes into account the volume of groundwater that drains to the area and extrapolating it over the entire contour they were able to arrive at an elevation of approximately 55.6 for foundations to be at least two feet above the seasonal high water level; more likely to be three to four feet above. They will not be asking for any Administrative Determination; all foundations will be at or above the two foot required minimum elevation. Storm water design and grading will be included in the final design plan. Currently Boyd Drive storm water is directed to a chain of ponds. Part of this project would include construction of a storm water treatment system that meets DEP requirements and would direct road runoff away from the direction of Well #2.

**Lisa Mead** stated that DEP is aware of the extent of the proposed subdivision. She also noted that the project at this location would be allowable by DEP standards even if 36 homes with septic systems were to be built here. Ms. Mead referenced her October 31, 2016 letter to the Board of Health which outlined the following conditions that the Water & Sewer Commission listed as requirements for the subdivision and noted that the Applicant is amenable to these conditions:

1. Undertake baseline water quality and soil quality testing to understand any future impacts.
2. Design the storm water systems and home construction in a manner that mitigates or reduces any possible risk, if any to the well head.
3. Employ a Home Owner's Association Restriction whereby a single lawn care / landscaping company is hired by all the homeowners and any lawn care products are from an approved list. Ensure that each deed refers to the Home Owners Association Restrictions
4. Provide a method of ongoing testing.

Ms. Mead indicated that the Applicant and eventually the Homeowners Association (not the City) would be financially responsible for the cost of 'ongoing testing.'

With regard to sodium levels in the drinking water, Ms. Mead stated that to a certain extent the level of sodium can be controlled by the City and noted that the City currently adds sodium to the drinking water. The Board responded that the added sodium is part of public health program to fluoridate the water supply and is not analogous to this discussion.

Ray Talkington, GeoSphere - Mr. Talkington informed the Board that DEP's standard that allows residential developments in a Zone 2 is not being disputed; rather, it is the conversion of a highly regulated, single point source, golf course to a development of 38 to 44 individual lots that are unregulated. The golf course was highly regulated with regard to turf management and the use and application of chemicals such as herbicides, pesticides, fungicides etc. over the past twenty plus years. Although the Applicant's plan calls for Home Owner Association regulation, he does not believe that it will be longstanding. Mr. Talkington pointed out that even with the highly regulated golf course, the required annual monitoring and reporting of results to the City did not occur. At the Planning Board meeting it was requested that water quality data from the course be provided but none was available. Mr. Talkington said that he applauds the Water Department for wanting to do soil quality testing since the soil is going to be disrupted. It is important that multiple samples at multiple depths within the soil profile be taken so that it can be determined whether contaminants are at the organic profile at the top or if it has leached down into the sands. This is a highly disturbed area and it is unclear what soil profiles currently exist especially since much of the ground soil was removed years ago during the gravel operation. Also the area had been contaminated with fill material containing sodium chloride which affected Well #2 and subsequently the material had to be removed. A major concern is the highly transmissive material that exists beneath the site and regardless of the existence of bedrock high in the area, the fact is that the predominant flow of groundwater is toward Well #2. Given the velocity of the flow of groundwater it could only take a short amount of time (several months or less) for contaminants to reach the well and we do not have sufficient tests, methodology or standards to identify and address the issue if contamination were to occur. Once this property is developed, this natural resource for the City is lost. Newburyport has unsuccessfully sought new sources of water. If these acres are kept undeveloped they may provide a long-term supply of clean groundwater. Mr. Talkington mentioned that Attorney Dunning's letter to the Board that included a list of lawn care products and their impact on the environment. He informed the Board that the Town of Wayland has produced a report that looks at residential lawn care products as potential sources of contamination. Massachusetts DEP Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) identified the top five potential sources of contamination of public water sources in Massachusetts and listed lawn care products as the number one contaminant, and septic systems as the number two.

**Anne-Marie Vega**, 21 Boyd Drive - Ms. Vega noted that it is important to look at the specifics of the area. She stated that although it was reported by Mr. Sawyer that the seasonal highs for the 13 soil tests were up to nine feet, her chart shows the high is actually five and half to seven and a half feet. She noted that there is only so much fill that is allowed to be brought into a Zone 2 area and questioned how high the foundations would need to be and what the impact would be on the flow of groundwater. Another consideration are potential contaminants from petrol and animal feces. Contaminants can reach the well in 35 to 70 days and yet we only test every six months, and we don't test for all of these chemicals. It should also be taken into account that 30 feet is not the natural topography of this land.

Also, these two wells will be used as city supply if there is an issue with the usual water supply from the Artichoke, we would have to rely on these wells to supply the City with water by operating at their maximum pumping capacity (408 gallons/minute) which would reduce the amount of time it would take for contaminants to reach the well. Ms. Vega encouraged the Board to ensure that they follow the correct process since in 1985 it did not go properly which led to an appeals process.

**Allison Macdougall** 19 Boyd Drive. Ms. Macdougall stated that based on the transmissivity of SOC's in Zone 2 they could reach Well #2 within two months, however, the Water Commission stated that SOC's are only tested for every three years. She received significant information from Mass EPA Region #1 concerning stormwater runoff and how deal with other issues in a Zone 2. She relayed an email from Ted Lavery that stated that infiltrated stormwater can contain a wide variety of contaminants and the potential impact on groundwater must

be evaluated on a case by case basis. Since the water from Well #2 is not treated, except for pH adjustment, we must consider that anything that enters the well will enter our water supply. Ms. Madougal referred to the Wayland Water report from 2011 and quoted their summary statement that "...water quality has been taken for granted. This has not been a cost effective approach. In recent years threats to water quality have led to expensive treatment options. This is a clear case of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

**David Brigham**, 7 Boyd Drive - Mr. Brigham expressed his concern that as a golf course this area was highly regulated, however, it will be nearly impossible to regulate multiple homeowners who will be applying chemicals/fertilizers in a more concentrated area. The golf course has experienced flooding in past years, enough so that photos exist of canoes floating on the course. It had been previously believed that the area flooded because of the two feet of loam and clay that protected the whole area. The current testing results show that this is not true. He believes that the high water mark is at the point of the bottom of the canoes in the photograph. He also voiced concerns about contamination from contents of basements if homes were to flood, which happened to his own home in the past.

**Peter Hatcher** 15 Boyd Drive - Stated that since Well #2 is 58 years old it will need to be relocated soon. This problem will continue repeatedly in the future. Newburyport has searched unsuccessfully for alternative water sources. This land and the valuable water resources beneath it should be permanently preserved as a site for future water needs.

**Peter Chu**, 78 Boyd Drive - Mr. Chu referred to the NGI report Page 2, paragraph 3 which noted the presence of 1.8 microgram of the VOC, 4-isopropyl which was not considered a concern. This one chemical was detected, but we do not know how many others there may be. He noted that this VOC that was detected is found in cleaning products and stated that if 38 - 44 homes are built in this area there will be an increase in the use of these types of products that may contaminate the well. It is not known at what level this contaminant will be of concern. Also, the test that identified the 1.8 microgram of the VOC was done on October 12, 2016 during drought conditions which may have affected the result. Mr. Chu asked the Board to consider what new source of water will be available if the well becomes contaminated. The topography of this area will act as a funnel and the groundwater will flow toward the well. This well provides 20% of the City water supply. Mr. Chu stated that this test should have been repeated multiple times over a long duration of time, not just a onetime test. He pointed out to the Board that pages were missing from the AEG Report and encouraged the Board to consider what information was omitted.

**Mark Wu**, 14 Boyd Drive - Mr. Wu explained that he is a neuropsychologist who has professional and personal experience with the effects of neurotoxins on human health and he routinely performs evaluations for neurotoxins in patients. As healthcare professionals we need to look beyond regulations in an attempt to determine what is, and what is not, a healthcare risk. He stated two concerns regarding the project (1) it is unreasonable to believe that the behavior of 44 households can be regulated; and (2) the groundwater runoff from the development would flow directly to a well that supplies 20% of the water to the City.

**Pamela Hatcher**, 15 Boyd Drive - Expressed her concern regarding the inability to regulate human behavior with regard to restricting use of chemicals and pesticides for lawn care. She is also concerned with the possible loss of this source of water; especially since alternative locations have not been found.

**Lisa Mead** - This golf course was built in 1984 and in the late 1990's the City underwent rezoning. This area is private property. Ms Mead stated that the City has had ample opportunity to purchase and rezone the area to deny residential homes but they have not done so. There are already homes located within the Zone 2 area that are not regulated with regard to lawncare, pets, etc. Ms. Mead stated that the proposed development would have many more controls in place and that there is no proof that a public health risk exists in placing residential homes in a Zone 2 area.

**Stephanie Strout**, 7 Boyd Drive - Ms. Strout stated that when she moved to Boyd Drive in 1990 she inquired as to the future use of the area and was assured by the Planning Office that an Order of Conditions was in effect that stated that the area would continue to be maintained as a golf course. Ms. Strout stated that perhaps the City did not rezone the area because they never thought that the Order of Conditions would be released.

**Ray Talkington** – When the Zone 2 delineation went into effect strict guidelines were in place that had to be followed. It was discussed at the time that this was a beautiful aquifer but it was believed that the area was protected because it was never expected that the area would be used for anything other than a golf course.

\_\_\_\_\_ - Stated that he felt that Mr. Talkington, as a hydrogeologist had a professional responsibility to speak up about any concerns regarding the aquifer when the Zone 2 delineation was being done. DEP has weighed in on this project and declared that they don't view it as a problem.

Most water protection resource districts are being updated, not to just have the Zone 2 language, but extra language is being added that encourages cities to consider purchasing properties as they become available. Several Councilors spoke up at last night's meeting and implied that they may start reviewing properties that are available.

### **Board Deliberations**

After confirming that there were no other speakers that wished to participate, Dr. Blair declared the Public Comment segment of the meeting closed. Dr. Blair announced that the Board would now deliberate for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Planning Board with regard to protection of the City water supply while taking into consideration current laws, rules, regulations and the health of the public. It will be up to the Planning Board to make a final decision with regard to approval or disapproval of the final plan.

Dr. Blair stated that the Board needs to determine whether enough evidence has been presented to determine whether the proposed development presents a potential threat to the City's water supply. Dr. Merabi informed the Board that he has discussed this issue with several professors and specifically with Wendy Heiger-Bernays who is on the faculty of the Department of Environmental Health at Boston University School of Public Health and also serves as a member of the Board of Health for Lexington, MA. Dr. Merabi stated that the Board has not been provided with sufficient information upon which to base a decision, namely baseline data of the VOCs from products that have been applied at the golf course. Since tests for these chemicals are not routinely done, no data is available. Studies have proven that golf courses pose a higher threat of contamination than residential areas, however, it has also been stated that this particular golf course may not have been maintained to the same degree as may be expected of a typical golf course. Dr. Merabi stated that the Board should establish definitive requirements for the type of tests, including the proxy and direct indicators, necessary for monitoring the water supply from the well(s). The requirements should be so specific as to list the type and sensitivity of the spectrometer to be used in testing and the exact locations where the testing is to be performed. Dr. Merabi stated that the residents should also be concerned with existing risks associated with the prior use of this land as a golf course; however the Board can only determine the level of risk currently present by reviewing results of tests performed on the area's soil and water. If the proposed development were to be built, the following questions must be answered: what tests will be included in the monitoring of the wells, how frequently will the tests be performed, who will assume the cost of the testing and if future (more sensitive) tests reveal the presence of harmful agents what course of action will be taken. Dr. Merabi noted that if this were to happen it would seem that the only option would be to shut off the water source; which would be an issue that would need to be addressed by the Planning Board. Dr. Merabi noted, however, that the Board of Health should delineate for the Planning Board a recommended course of action should the water supply become contaminated. Dr. Merabi stated that in his opinion this is a good juncture to ascertain exactly what the Developer plans in terms of monitoring of the well(s). Before making a recommendation to the Planning Board, the Board of Health should have as a baseline one year's worth of data related to the water quality of the wells in order to compare the health hazards posed by prior use of the land to potential hazards posed by the proposed residential development. A year's worth of preliminary monitoring will provide data covering multiple seasons, and this data could then be compared against future test results to identify increases or decreases of agents found in the soil or water.

Per Lisa Mead the standards for the Board of Health review of a definitive subdivision plan are very clear, the Board of Health must present to the Planning Board in writing, approval or disapproval of said plan. And in the event of disapproval shall make specific findings as to which, if any, areas shown on such plan cannot be used for building sites without injury to the public health. Since tonight's meeting involves a preliminary plan the Board is not required to make an approval or disapproval. Ms. Mead noted that the State has already declared that residential use is allowed in a Zone 2.

Dr. Merabi stated that there are few other hazards more important to public health than the safety of the drinking water. He stated that it needs to be proven by preliminary testing and future monitoring that the residential development will present a lesser risk than the golf course.

Dr. Slocum questioned whether the creation of a massive residential development that involves changing the topography in the area could also cause a public health hazard to the drinking water. He also stated that the Board of Health should go on record as stating their concerns regarding possible hazards to public health even if the development is ultimately approved.

**Motion to Approve:**

Dr. Merabi made a motion to approve that a letter be sent by the Board of Health to the Planning Board which would state that at this time the Board of Health does not have sufficient information, based on a lack of testing, to determine whether the Board is in favor of the project relative to the safety of the water supply. The Board of Health agrees with the four steps of testing that were recommended by the Water Commission and specifically agrees that the wells should be monitored. Furthermore, the Board of Health wants to have specific input into the plan that will outline the amount and types of testing to be performed and what chemicals are to be monitored.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Slocum.

Votes to approve: Dr. Blair, Dr. Merabi, Dr. Slocum.

Votes to oppose: none

Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned 9:39 pm.