``REGULAR MEETING BRIDGEWATER PLANNING BOARD JUNE 19, 2019

Members present: Mr. Driscoll, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Sullivan and Mr. MacDonald

Also present: Mr. Geller, Associate member; Ms. Burke, Director, Mr. Romulus, Asst.

The meeting convened at 6:21 pm.

AUBURN STREET SOLAR DISCUSSION

The public hearing was closed at the meeting.

Discussion with board members prior to vote.

Mr. Ajemian stated that he was on the Board in the 1980's and this has been the most complicated decision that he has had to make. He explained this thought pattern and how it has evolved over the last three years. The opponent has argued that we should simply deny this based upon the fact that it is in a residential neighborhood and his belief is that we can't do that because we have a solar bylaw. Proponents argue that they have met all the requirements, therefor we should approve it. We make the decision on whether it meets our requirements or not. His opinion is simply structured around the size of this project. The proponents argue that they have decreased the size from 17,000 to 14,000 panels. That may be true, he said, but he doesn't consider that a major deduction. At the last meeting, he asked whether the solar panels could be eliminated near the Clapp house and the answer was no. He referred to May 3, 2017 meeting when he asked Mr. Gallagher if the proposal could be decreased in size dramatically. Mr. Gallagher responded that this is the size that the applicant has requested to meet the agreement with power company. He said he understands that; that is a given in his mind. Then the issue comes up about screening, and we had a long difficult discussion about that over the past few years. He said there were several instances in 2016 and 2017 when Mr. Gallagher indicated that the natural vegetation would be enough for screening, with no need to do anything else. We disagreed and a proposal came up for screening and we denied the whole thing. We went to mediation. We had three sessions of mediation, and he thought we were moving in the right direction. There was extensive screening put on the plan and he thought we might have a resolution and approve this project with restrictions. Then at our first public hearing after the remediation, screening came up again; Mr. Holmes questioned whether the data was correct…his data showed that it wouldn't be screened property and there was give and take on that. He was discredited, but at the same time, there was recognition that screening wasn't enough, and this was a serious thing in him mind. The berms then went from 4' to 6' and the trees went from 12' to 14' in height. As we talked about this more, he questioned the fact that the berms were 4' wide and the proponent agreed that 4' wasn't enough. In other words, if we had approved what had come out of the mediation, most likely, the trees would have died in a year. He spoke about an article in the Globe last Sunday concerning trees and the response from the writer was the same as he had when a smaller development was put in by his house, and he put up 5 pine trees. The nursery where he bought them said that you must water these trees thoroughly twice a week for the entire summer. The response to the question in the globe was forget the fertilizer, just water them deeply through August during the crucial first three summers of adjustment to make them survive. He questioned whether the proponents realize that. The maintenance plan they have says that will look at it every six months; it does not include the berm and he questions if the trees will survive. Even with a bond, he questioned if the town had the resources to keep the trees going.

Another issue that came up is the amount of fill that needs to be brought in which will be about 800 truckloads of 18-wheelers going thru that neighborhood.

He mentioned three things that Attorney Pacella said that he felt was crucial:

1. He argued that our bylaw doesn't mention total screening and that the panels don't need to be totally screened. - At the same time, we were getting information that there would be gaps in the trees that they were planting. He stated that throughout this process, he was under the impression that it would be totally screened from day one.
2. Attorney Pacella talked that they would grow to a certain height. He also mentioned the word "loyalty" and that this Board should be loyal to the Town and he is right…..It depends on how you define "the Town"….if you define it as simply the finance of the town and getting a nice tax benefit. But he defined the town as people and if we can bring in a project in without disrupting the residents, then, by all means. That is not to say that disruption is sometimes not occurring, but in this particular case, this project may work if it is much smaller
3. Attorney Pacella also stated that the State is promoting solar and thus our restrictions should not be such as we have had in the past. Mr. Ajemian stated that he might be right, but that is not our decision to decide. He said we get to decide on what we think is best for the town.

Basically, he said, what he is saying is that he thinks this project is too big; it requires extraordinary screening, which is questionable in terms of survival and he still questions the Clapp residence being right next to the field. There also seems to be question that the closer you are to a solar field the more chance that the evaluation will go down.

Ms. Sullivan read a statement:

"Special Permits are intended to provide a mechanism for flexibility to integrate land uses within the Town in consideration of uses that may have potential to serve the public interest but might create conflict due to the intensity of the development. The special permit process allows for thorough and careful examination of potential impacts, thoughtful public engagement and discussion in order to protect health, safety and welfare and attempt to mitigate adverse impacts to ensure that the proposed use can exist in harmony with the intent of the zoning ordinance and will not adversely affect the adjoining area.

The Planning Board's primary responsibility is to develop the Town in a manner that best meets public needs and conforms with public interests. The need to develop renewable low carbon energy, the applicant's financial investment or potential gain, the prospect of potential tax revenue or prior history to condition and approve projects does not automatically override other legitimate concerns.

The proposed utility-scale solar facility is in close proximity to two adjoining, existing and established neighborhoods, in a Residential A/B zone, on a site with a former agricultural use, surrounded by a wetland resource area along what was described in the 2002 Master Plan as a scenic roadway where abutters also reside.

The applicant's task was to show that the facility can be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be compatible with, and not significantly alter the existing or intended character of the general vicinity in consideration of aesthetic views, environmental impacts, property values or similar impacts.

I have not been convinced that the proposed siting of a utility scale solar facility on this site won't have an impact on the adjoining residential land use or that the project can be properly buffered. Presentations and a subsequent site walk have left me to believe that the potential use will diminish the current views of adjoining properties on Auburn Street, Old Farm Road and Hopkins Drive, despite the developer's willingness to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in landscaping improvements and to alter the topography by filling and grading 10.7 of the 13.5 acres of the area which is necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of the solar farm. The physical characteristics of the site and its ability to accommodate the anticipated use are at the core of my concern. The site was a former cranberry bog/low lying area and the adjoining neighborhoods are at a higher grade, making the site unsatisfactory and inappropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed operation.

Aesthetics are a legitimate concern. When you cannot mitigate the impacts of a commercial/industrial use on a particular site in a Residential A/B zone, it is reasonable to restrict or limit the use.

It is reasonable to contemplate that the siting of a utility scale 4.99 MW solar facility with 14,240 panels in close proximity and in view of adjoining land will create an unnecessary financial hardship for the 13 or more adjoining residential landowners, resulting in diminishing property values and limiting the number of potential future investors who might perceive a utility scale solar facility in close proximity and in view from their property as a benefit or at the very least, rationale for a price reduction. It is important to note that there are more than 5,400 single family homes in Bridgewater that are not similarly impacted.

The Planning Board has demonstrated that they are reasonable in their consideration of siting solar facilities on suitable sites, and in fact has approved and successfully mitigated impacts of three large

scale solar projects in the past, through thoughtful mitigation, conditioning, effective communication and dialogue with developers, the public and adjoining landowners. The conditioned approval of special permits can be credited in great part to careful site selection, as it is imperative that the use be properly sited, properly buffered, appropriately sized/scaled in relation to nearby uses, while respecting natural resources, historic and cultural assets, scenic views, agricultural reserves and migratory habitats and in select cases improving, replacing or camouflaging a previously unappealing use like a former landfill.

It is important to note that the applicant has indicated a willingness to increase the $50,000 landscaping bond by an additional $10,000, while at the same time indicating that they are only required to make a reasonable effort to screen/buffer the project from a viewpoint that does not extend to decks, first floor or second story windows. The applicant was asked by a fellow board member, if they would consider discussing reductions in the scale of the project and this was met by an outright rejection/unwillingness to compromise on size and scale.

Despite attempts to mitigate impacts through design modification and public hearings, this board member does not anticipate that the proposed utility-scale use solar facility can be conditioned effectively to mitigate the adverse impacts on the surrounding area." She would like to enter her statement for the record. Ms. Burke noted that the record is closed.

Motion: Ms. Sullivan

THAT: The special permit be denied based upon the fact that the site is not suitable for this large-scale solar project. It will affect the character of the area and the esthetic views, property values, will impact the neighbor and the site cannot be properly screened.

Seconded: Mr. Ajemian

DISCUSSION: Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Sullivan to restate her reasons. She stated that she did not feel this was in keeping with the character of the general vicinity and not in consideration of esthetic views, property values, or similar impacts, She doesn't think the site is appropriate as it supported a cranberry bog in the low-lying area and the neighborhoods are at a higher grade making the site unsatisfactory and inappropriate to the proposed operation. She believes the scale is too large to be put between two residential neighborhoods. She doesn't think it can be properly buffered. She feels it will result in a financial hardship for the abutters and reduce their property values.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

SOUTH FARM ESTATES PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing convened at 6:49 pm.

The public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 6/5 and 6/12 was read into the record.

Green cards were submitted by Mr. Koska. Not drainage calculations received. Mr. Koska said he was in the process of preparing them; didn't think they were necessary for a 4-lot subdivision. He is going before Conservation on June 27th and asked that this hearing be continued. He will send over a request for continuance.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Sullivan, the hearing was continued to August 7th at 6:30 pm. It was seconded by Ms. Sullivan and unanimously voted.

851 BEDFORD STREET SOLAR FARM SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing convened at 6:49 pm.

Public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 6/5 and 6/12 read into the record.

Notification on May 18th from the Board of Health that they have no jurisdiction over solar farms.

Email May 14th from Water/sewer indication that neither is required.

April 1, 2019 letter attached to application from Cypress Creek.

Brad Saunders, engineer on the project, explained that the applicant proposes to develop a 2.5 MS Solar energy facility on a 45.6-acre parcel of land fronting on Bedford Street (Map 133, parcel 88). It is located in the SBD. There are 14 ½ acres of vegetated wetland with 3 intermittent streams channels that run thru the wetland areas; no perennial streams on or adjacent to the site. The area of clearing is about 14 ½ acres or 32% of the site and the area of the panels is approximately 10 ½ acres. The area of regrading is approximately 6.8 acres. It is all balanced grading, cuts and fills will be balanced so there will be no

soils removed; from the property; will need gravel (less than 200 yards) to be brought in for access driveway. Setbacks from the property are quite substantial; The nearest residential house is greater than 500' away from the solar panels and will be separated by extensive wooded wetlands. The transformers and inverters are approximately 700' from the nearest property line. The entire facility would be surrounded by a security fence as required by Federal regulations. They designed this to be outside the wetland areas and outside off all the 100' buffer zones around the wetlands. The wetland boundaries have been reviewed by the Conservation and approved by them. They have designed this in accordance with the zoning bylaws for solar. He said he had a representative from Cypress Creek, Alex Shild who can answer any questions the board members may have.

Mr. Ajemian said he would like to have a site walk. He asked how much clearing there will be? Mr. Saunders said there will be 14 ½ acres of tree removal. (32% of the site) Mr. Ajemian questioned how many panels are there? Mr. Saunders said he didn't know but will get back to the Board with that information.

Mr. Saunders reviewed the site plan. There will be a single access roadway from Bedford Street; it will be a gravel surface road so it will be a pervious surface. It will be 20' in width; there will be a single parking location for maintenance vehicles. They anticipated 1-2 maintenance vehicles per month. The only impervious surface that will be constructed are associated with the equipment pad itself which is for the inverters, transformers, and battery storage.

Mr. Driscoll questioned what will be under the panels? He was told grass. He asked if there would be pollinators underneath the panels? He was told if the Board wanted that to be part of this project, they would comply. Mr. Romulus noted that was one of the conditions that he had drafted if the board chose to approve. They have done that on other sites, and he thought it was a good ecological value for the site.

The shaded strip along the edge will have tree removal but the berm and trees will stay along Bedford Street. Mr. Driscoll noted that many trees along there are dying and falling and asked if there were plans to enhance the berm with additional plantings? He was told by Mr. sanders that they could certainly do that. He said that they certainly recognize the need to water those plants and that is something that would have to be considered.

Cuts and fills are less than 200 yards for access driveway. They also have two infiltration basins on the site; they don't show on there but are indicated as grey areas that are designed to infiltrate the storm water. They will also be used during the construction period as sediment traps. Upon completion of the construction, the material within them will be excavated and placed on the site and will be used for the infiltration basins. They included a stormwater management report with their application that needs to be considered ty the Planning Board because they are not going before Conservation Commission. It was noted that the Town Engineer review report was not back yet.

Mr. Saunders stated again that the nearest house to the property line is to the northeast and is over 500 feet beyond wooded wetlands.

Ms. Guarino questioned the storage…Mr. Saunders explained that was for storage of the of the power when there isn't much sunlight and it can continue to supply to the grid. It is stored in Lithium Ion batteries. Mr. Ajemian questioned the size of the storage batteries. Mr. Saunders said about the size of

a small shipping container. Mr. Ajemian questioned if it would be separately screened? They are not proposing a separate fence around the pad. Mr. Ajemian felt that it should be fenced.

Mr. Silva-615 Bedford Street-stated that he had no problem with the use; he advised that there was a residential home located on Mae Ave which is just to the south east of the project and closer than the ones spoken about on Flagg St. He felt there should be some buffering from Bedford Street and that a berm with low growing shrubs would be better rather than tall trees.

On a motion by Mr. Macdonald, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to conduct a site walk on June 27th at 5:00. (meet at the corner of Mae Ave)

On a motion by Mr. Macdonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to July 17th at 6:30 pm.

900 ELM STREET-MODIFICATION

Recommendation from Mr. Romulus read into the record: The applicant has not completed portions of the previously approved site plan and is seeking a minor modification determination to complete. The incomplete portions of the plan are: •Final Pavement & Stripping• Cape cod berm• Landscaping & Signage• Sloped faced granite installed entrances • Drain and sewer manhole covers to final grade• Guardrails along western edge of parking lot . The minor modification requests are for: •Wall not installed north of parking lot (grading was possible)•Fence not installed as visual barrier between maintenance building and exiting buses (yellow line used for separation.)•Guardrail not installed between bus and employee parking areas (guardrail would impede snow removal).The Planner finds issue with granting a minor modification request based on the history of the project: The site plan was approved on May 5, 2015 with the notice of no appeal issued on May 26, 2015. The first minor modification for stormwater management and phasing was approved on June 1, 2015. The second minor modification for reshaping the maintenance building, minor grade changes, and changes to the office building was approved on April 4, 2018.The Applicant should complete their work per what was previously approved. The newest requests to not put up any barriers per what was previously approved (no wall, no fence, no guardrail) pose safety risks if the bus lots are not separated from the general business lots. In addition, I will reiterate our Highway Superintendent's comment: "they have not installed any granite curbing at any of the entrances to lot remaining consistent with other businesses. Nor is there final coat of pavement on lot.The applicant has not submitted any new plans or narrative since appearing on the agenda on March 20, 2019 and the subsequent continuations to the June 19, 2019 meeting. The Applicant disagrees with the Department recommendation since the guardrail and fencing were not related to public access or parking. Both features were proposed by the owner, one to separate employee parking and the other to separate maintenance from exiting vehicles. Further review by the owner resulted in better operations if these features were not utilized.

The Economic and Community Development/Planning Department recommends the board deny the minor modification request, determine it a major modification and have the applicant reapply accordingly.

Larry Silva, Engineer representing the applicant, Mr. Lucini, explained that when they set out to do this project, there was no model for how this would work for his business. They had proposed a separation between the employee parking and the buses that are stored here. It was not working out well and Mr. Lucini wanted to change it for easier plowing and to make it easier for the employee to get to the bus that they were assigned to. He said Elijah referred to "general business parking" which it is not; that is out in front and they are not altering that. The other one they wanted to eliminate was a fence that Mr. Lucini wanted in there originally because his bus drivers are primarily female, and he thought he might want a visual separation between them and the maintenance men working on vehicles. There was no big issue, so he decided to not put this one in. He said these were the two modifications requested and he didn't feel they rose to a major modification. The other issues are a problem; he is trying to get the site 100% finished, but his bank won't give him anymore money until he has an Occupancy Permit. He needs a letter from the Planning Board to the Building Inspector, indicating that it is "substantially complete" before he will issue that Occupancy Permit. The building itself is 100% done. He requested that the Board deem that the plan is in substantial compliance, but not completed. He needs to free up money so he can complete the paving. He has re-landscaped because the hydroseeding didn't take. He has added more guard rails and has done everything he should do. He has not done the curbing due to the reconstruction of Elm Street but will be done when that is complete; he will comply with everything on the site plan. He asked that the Board be sympathetic as Mr. Lucini has invested a lot of money into this project and the community. His temporary OP has expired; he took occupancy on January 1st. He can't get bank financing until he has that OP and he needs that to complete the work.

Mr. Romulus commented that there have been piecemeal modifications over the years, and he would like to see a site plan that is up to date and go through the correct process. Ms. Sullivan expressed concern how this will be done by a date certain and she would like to know Azu's take on the elimination of the wall and whether it was, in fact, not needed. Mr. Silva noted that must be cleared by conservation anyway.

Mr. Driscoll questioned if there was a mechanism to protect the town if items not completed? Mr. Silva noted that it will all be completed upon release of the money and that won't be released until they are issued the OP. Right now he is operating without an occupancy permit and that isn't protecting anybody right now and we have to find a way to get there, he said. He commented that Mr. Lucini is in "substantial" compliance at this point for the Board to at least allow the building to get a final OP. He said there are two issues: he is asking that the Board determine that the two changes are a minor modification, so they can make the adjustments to the site plan. The second item he is asking is for the Board to agree that they are in substantial compliance that will allow them to get to the point where the board is not preventing the Building Inspector from issuing a final occupancy. Mr. Driscoll questioned if there was an as built? Mr. Silva said that an interim one was submitted, with the notation that these six things needed to be completed. It was submitted in December and then it became the modification plan because it was rejected as a final.

Mr. Romulus interjected, in the interest of time, that his recommendation still stands that this is a major modification; there was no additional information submitted prior to this evening and he felt we should go through the process for major modification. Mr. Silva stated that those to modifications do not warrant a major modification. Mr. MacDonald commented that we are looking at one that is mainly decorative and one that is no longer needed; he didn't think the process had to be started all over again.

Ms. Sullivan stated that she would like engineering to comment on the wall and she would like to look at the guard rail. She agreed with the curbing being installed after the Elm Street construction.

Mr. Silva said that the guard rail was initially on the plan to separate the employee parking from where the buses were located. Mr. Ajemian said he felt uncomfortable stating that it is in substantial compliance with so many items needing completion. There is no safeguard for the Town.

After a bit more discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, It was unanimously voted to deem the three requests as a minor modification subject to review of the wall and the need of the guardrail for which it was intended, by Mr. Etoniru.

This discussion put on the July 17th meeting.

JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ORDINANCE F 18-003-AMEND TABLE OF USES-CULTIVATION, Manufacturing and testing of Recreational Marijuana.

The public hearing convened at 7:58.

All members of the Planning Board were present.

Mr. Colombotos and Mr. Chase present from the committee.

The public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise was read into the record by Mr. Colombotos

Pursuant to section MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5, notice is hereby given that the Community and Economic Development Committee and Planning Board will hold the following joint public hearings on June 19, 2019 in the Academy Building, Council Chambers, 66 Central Square, Bridgewater, MA 02324 to receive public input on the proposed Zoning Ordinance listed below. 7:30 p.m.: Ordinance D-FY19-003: Zoning Ordinance – Amend Table of Uses – Cultivation, Manufacturing and Testing of Recreational Marijuana: which seeks to amend Section 6.30 Table of Use Regulations by adding the following: G. Industrial Wholesale and Transportation Uses 10. Cultivation, Manufacturing and Testing of Recreational Marijuana.

Res. A/B Res. C Res. D CBD SBD BUS B Gate -way E.Gate -way IND A IND B IND E PD DIST MHEC DIST N N N N SP SP N N SP SP SP SP N The detailed Ordinance is available on the following pages and are on file in the office of Town Clerk.

Ms. Burke noted that the Special Permit criteria has been adopted by the council and is in effect.

Mr. Ajemian asked Ms. Burke to clarify for him if what we have before us now is what we recommended to the council the last time? Ms. Burke said that what the Planning Board did last time was send a NO recommendation because you wanted to see SP, so that is what is before you now. He referred to Pat Neary's 6/14 email and questioned if it was in fact true? (When any measure has been finally rejected by the Council, no motion embodying substantially the same subject shall be presented to the Council within six months of

its previous writing for resubmission, except where otherwise provided in the Bridgewater Home Rule Charter and unless approved by a majority of the full Council.

A zoning ordinance which is voted down may not be reconsidered within two years unless the

Planning Board makes a recommendation to do so, [MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5].) Ms. Burke explained, although not about this Ordinance. (FY 18-008) Legislation was not acted favorably by the Planning Board, so the council cannot reconsider it. They are the legislative body, so they are the only ones who can bring something before themselves.

Janet Hanson,665 Pleasant Street-commented that this ordinance is definitely an improvement on what was originally submitted; So she is happy with this because it has no Y's.

Mr. MacDonald stated he was satisfied with this; it is a compromise Ms. Sullivan agreed.

Mr. Colombotos stated that he thought it might be a good idea to break out testing separately as a use, and maybe they might consider that later. Ms. Sullivan asked him that if and when they do that, to do an investigation on how much marijuana is held on-site; what is the security and how money changes hands. Ms. Guarino added "odor".

The council committee closed their portion of the hearing on a motion by Mr. Chase, seconded by Mr. Colombotos.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino the Planning Board closed the public hearing at 8:11.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Sullivan, it was unanimously voted to recommend Ordinance F18-003 to the Council

MORSE BROS. -1893 PLYMOUTH STREET-MINOR MODIFICATION REQUEST

A minor modification request received from RYCO for hours of operation in conjunction with their earth removal project issued on 9/20/17. Hours in decision were from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm and they are requesting 7:00 am to 4:00.

Mr. Driscoll felt that neighbors should be involved; Elijah agreed since the Building Inspector and Town Engineer had complaints from the neighbors. Ms. Sullivan would like to know the need for the request.

The applicant was not present.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted to continue this discussion to the next meeting and asked the applicant to notify the abutters and state their reasons for this request.

GADSBY DRIVE MINOR MODIFICATION REQUEST

Received a request to change hours of operation from Samuel Shoney. He is seeking to change the current hours from Monday-Friday 8:00 am-5:00 pm and Saturday 9:00 am -5:00 pm to Monday-Friday 7:00 am-7:00 pm and Saturday 9:00 -7:00 pm.

Gino ? stated that they would like to be able to complete the roadway quicker.

Mr. Romulus noted that there have been many complaints from the existing neighbor. Mr. Ajemian questioned what the complaints were. Mr. Romulus said trucks blocking their driveway and noise from the construction.

A gentleman from the construction company stated that this is would benefit the neighbors because they would like it done as soon as possible; he said 8 hours isn't enough and they would like to take advantage of the daylight. Mr. Driscoll stated that he would like the Smiths notified about this request. Ms. Guarino questioned if this would extend the hours of construction for the houses? Mr. Romulus noted it was for the roadway. Ms. Sullivan noted that our next meeting isn't until the middle of July and they would be done with this and she, personally wouldn't be inclined to approve 7-7 construction Monday thru Friday and 9-7 on Saturdays in this residential area.

On a motion by Ms. Sullivan and seconded by Mr. Ajemian, the request to extend the hours of construction was unanimously denied.

OLDFIELD ESTATES, II ANR PLAN

Lee Castignetti present representing Long Built Homes. The plan is shifting lot lines from left to right to widen lots at setback line of lots 53-56 on Oldfield Road to accommodate increased dwelling footprints.

Mr. Romulus said there was no problem and recommended that the plan be endorsed.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Sullivan, and unanimously voted, the plans were endorsed.

Mr. Driscoll left the room.

STONEHILL LANE BOND RELEASE

A request received from Paul Cincotta to release $13,500 of the bond currently on deposit for the completion of Stonehill Lane. Mr. Etoniru and Mr. Ladue are ok with the request. This will leave a balance of $24, 712.90 in the road bond.

On a motion by Mr. Macdonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to release $13,500.00 of the road bond currently on deposit.

On a motion by Ms. Sullivan, seconded by Ms. Guarino, the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED:_____