



# TOWN OF WARE

## Planning & Community Development

126 Main Street, Ware, Massachusetts 01082

t. 413.967.9648 ext. 120

### Planning Board

Meeting Minutes from

**Thursday, November 3, 2022**

Ware Junior/Senior High School Auditorium

237 West Street, Ware MA 01082

**Planning Board Members in Attendance:** Rick Starodoj, Chairman  
Nancy Talbot, Clerk  
Ed Murphy, Vice-Chairman  
Ken Crosby (Remote)  
Chris DiMarzio  
Elizabeth Hancock, Alternate

**Staff Members in Attendance:** Rob Watchilla, PCD Dept. Director  
Kristen Jacobsen, PCD Dept. Admin  
Anna Marques, Building Commissioner  
Stuart Beckley, Town Manager

**Members of the Public in Attendance:** Matthew Darling  
Claudia Kadra  
Jodi Chartier  
Bernard Bergeron  
Janet Ciejka  
Andrew Surprise  
William Jackson  
Ray Harlbough  
Denis Pelletier  
Dennis Pasternak  
Karen Hubaz  
Marilyn Sloper  
Tom Murphy  
Ira Cameron

\*See attached for complete list in attendance

---

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman R. Starodoj called the meeting to order at 7:05pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

**Approval of Minutes from October 20, 2022**

**Motion** made by N. Talbot to approve of the minutes as submitted from Thursday, October 20, 2022. Seconded by E. Murphy. There was no additional discussion.

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| R. Starodoj | Aye |
| N. Talbot   | Aye |
| E. Murphy   | Aye |
| K. Crosby   | Aye |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye |

**All in favor. Approved 5/0/0.**

### **ANR-2022-11 (Campbell Road)**

Proponent seeks to section a piece of their property for the purpose of selling it.

C. DiMarzio and R. Watchilla spoke about the property confirmed that there were no existing structures on the land.

**Motion** made by C. DiMarzio to approve ANR-2022-11. Seconded by N. Talbot. There was no additional discussion.

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| R. Starodoj | Aye |
| N. Talbot   | Aye |
| E. Murphy   | Aye |
| K. Crosby   | Aye |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye |

**Four in favor, Approved 5/0/0.**

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **Zoning Public Hearings**

Rural Business Overlay District

- Proposed overlay district along the route 9 corridor to allow for limited commercial uses. Recommendation for vote before Town Meeting.

N. Talbot read the legal notice

R. Watchilla presented the addition of the Rural Business Overlay District and read through the additions to the zoning bylaw.

R. Starodoj asked if board members had any comments.

E. Hancock requested the floor and stated the following:

- The proposed overlay district requires that properties must be at least 5-acres or more to qualify for rural business use. Therefore, this would be inconsistent with the Town of Ware Zoning Bylaw. None of the other zoning districts were established using landowner acreage as a necessary condition. Acreage is used for a specific type of property use. Two examples of property use that require acreage of at least 5-acres or more could be a Marijuana cultivation structure of up to 5,000-square feet in the Rural Residential District a minimum of 5 acres. A mobile home park at least 10 acres.
- Except for the propane storage tanks. I believe all other listed uses allowed by Special Permit in the new Rural Business Overlay District do not require 5-acres or more. This would be an unfair thing to the property owners with less than 5-acres. Therefore, only property owners with 5-acres or more would benefit from this overlay district.
- The proposed Rural Business Overlay District is split into 3 separate sections. (E. Hancock read the memo from the Zoning Board of Appeals dated September 28, 2022) I do agree with that, but I would add that I do not think this would be fair for landowners that have less than 5-acres. Along this route 9 corridor.
- Other than the propane storage tanks, the Planning Board did not discuss any of the other business uses proposed for the overlay district. The one that I really feel that should not be allowed here is laboratory and research facilities. I was very surprised to see we don't even have a definition for laboratories and research facilities other than what I could find that it was in the Suburban Residential, it needed to be near a hospital and needed to be medical. In light of what we have seen with the Covid Epidemic and the Wuhan labs and everything else that we have. I think we need to be very careful about what kind of labs or research centers we do put in this town. We need to go over this with our boards and make sure we have a definition of what a lab and a research center is. On this route 9 corridor we are not that far from the University of Massachusetts that is taking grants from the Institute, the National Institute of Health that is Dr. Faucis department and there is a level 4 lab the Boston area in the South end. Because, things weren't covered there that way, so we must be very careful about this, I feel and that is connected with the (I think) the Boston University, so, I'm very much against putting any kind of laboratories or research centers in this area until we have a direct definition of what that means in this town. And then I looked at auto service, and this was not allowed in the former Residential Business District and the only thing I have of concern here is that this may include fueling and I don't know if that would be gasoline tanks, you know, for gassing up vehicles or just to store things on, so I think that needs discussion. Light Industry was allowed in the former RB district and I just don't know if this would concur with the towns Master Plan. And then when we get to the tank farms, this is classified as Industrial use in the towns zoning use table allowed by Special Permit only in the Commercial Industrial and Industrial Districts of our town. I think we would need to look at the Use Table for this and make amendments in it. And what I would like to bring up about this what this is interesting is that in the Massachusetts Department of Revenue Property Type Classification codes, tanks are classified as Industrial Utility Properties. And I bring this up because we also have solar and wind that are also classified as industrial in the state code under electric generation plants (renewable), but we also classify them as utilities in our town. And so, they are allowed in the Rural Residential District. So, I think we need to look at this. So, my question is solar and wind renewable electric generation plants

are classified as industrial in the state codes, tanks are classified as industrial utilities are the listed tank farms proposed for the Rural Business District an appropriate use, just as solar and wind by Special Permit? All are utilities. And so, can tank farms, they would be classified as major utilities I believe and if so, should these tanks be listed in the public and civic uses section in the zoning use table instead of being under industrial where they are now like solar and wind facilities? And then I would also want a report from the fire chief about safety concerns such as leaking tanks, human error, human intrusion, fire and explosion risks and I would here note that solar and wind facilities are also not free of environmental and safety hazards either.

- And I need to go to the overlay sections, I'm gonna look at overlay district number 1, I'm calling it number 1, it's ah, closest to the, to the center of town. And I question here why we would put the Holy Cross Polish-National Catholic Cemetery into this district, this overlay district and I don't see the reason for that. And, then we've got two other properties, let's see, 219 Belchertown Rd and another one that just says 0 Belchertown Rd. and these properties including the cemetery are split, in other words the front almost to the back there in the new overlay district but the rest of the property isn't, so I question why would we do that if you don't have the whole piece of the property in it? And I'm also looking there in that particular district at the oil company that is there, and this is again, going back to the 5-acres or less. This would not qualify in the overlay district to get any benefit cause it's only 1-acre, so I really question doing it this way. And then I look into the overlay district number 2 which is the center one, and that would be just one property owner that would have, be in that overlay district, so I would question if this could be thought of as a spot zoning because no one else is in it and also this property would not benefit either because it's less than 5-acres and yet there is a, you know there was a business here too, this is the DeSantis property. And I'm looking at Overlay district number 3 I think it believes it starts with number 375 Belchertown Road and then ends on 435 and there's more properties beyond that and I just wonder why they were not included. It would be from 437 Belchertown Rd. to I think Mr. Lemons property. So, there are 7-parcels that are over 5-acres, 7-parcels, 4 are over 5-acres and 3 are under 5-acres.
- The Master Plan of the Town of Ware lays out a roadmap for the future. Part of the Master Plan intent is to establish a clear policy for the Planning Boards for future decisions for land use. We must make sure that there is no conflict with the Master Plan. There was only a brief discussion of it at the Planning Boards August 4, 2022, meeting in relation to the route 9 corridor. I believe there are still many questions to be answered, more homework, and discussion needed and joint meetings with the Zoning Board of Appeals before going forward with making any zoning amendments to the Route 9 Corridor.

Thank you Mr. Chairman I yield back.

R. Watchilla displayed maps showing the inspiration for the proposed overlay district and also the agricultural lands surrounding it to demonstrate how the overlay district parcels were selected.

R. Starodoj stated the oil company, and the DeSantis properties are both grandfathered uses. E. Hancock inquired what would happen to that use if the property were sold. R. Starodoj answered the grandfathered use would remain with the property despite being sold. E. Hancock asked what would happen if the owners wanted to change the use. R. Starodoj answered that the owners could apply for a Special Permit or seek a zoning appeal.

E. Hancock stated that homeowners with properties under 5-acres are unable to benefit from the overlay district.

R. Starodoj opened the discussion up to members of the public.

C. Kadra asked how the farmland was determined. R. Watchilla answered stating data was used from the MA GIS database which according to the state designates those areas to be farmland. C. Kadra asked if this meant all farmland would be unbuildable from a commercial standpoint. R. Watchilla responded stating it was only the case in this corridor. R. Watchilla and C. Kadra discussed the agricultural lands. C. Kadra inquired how far grandfathering reached back and mentioned the DeSantis property. R. Watchilla stated if a grandfathered property is abandoned or unused for a period of 2+ years it may not revert to its former (grandfathered) use. C. Kadra asked if the business had a current license and R. Watchilla responded he was not aware and was not aware of when the business there ceased to exist. C. Kadra stated as per the Ware GIS the property is 2 separate parcels and neither are 5-acres and asked if that belonged in the historic district and the overlay district of it didn't fit the criteria. R. Watchilla stated it was discussed in a previous meeting to include those parcels. C. Kadra asked if they were public hearings\* (\*there was no formal Public Hearing before the Planning Board there were Public Meetings) to which R. Watchilla responded that they were, and originally those parcels were not included in the overlay district because of the points C. Kadra had made. R. Watchilla stated that he believed the intention of limiting the parcels to 5-acres was to limit the development that would go into the district and create it in a way that would be broader than just a few parcels. R. Watchilla and C. Kadra discussed the possibilities of future use.

C. DiMarzio inquired why the 5+ acres was set as criteria. R. Watchilla stated it was to prevent widespread development in an area where they are trying to preserve the scenic character while allowing for commercial uses. C. DiMarzio inquired about the possibility of relaxing the 5+ acre restriction. R. Watchilla responded that the current proposal was drafted based on prior hearings and could be amended to include the smaller parcels. R. Starodoj asked if it was uncomplicated enough for an amendment or if it would be better to work on it further and bring it back in the spring. R. Watchilla agreed, stating more feedback from residents would be needed and incorporate them into this process.

J. Chartier spoke stating it was discriminating to include one property under 5-acres and not others. Also, she read the definition of spot zoning and that it applied to the area since this was accommodating three businesses. R. Starodoj stated he did not disagree\*(corrected as per 11/17/22 Planning Board Meeting). E. Hancock suggested the middle portion should be looked at regarding spot zoning because it only included one owner there who had two parcels which individually are approx. 2+ acres and unless combined are under the 5+ acre requirement. R. Watchilla stated that the overlay district should be reviewed and the smaller parcels in question had been recommended to be included during public hearings and the district does not conform to spot zoning as it is 200+acres and there are zones in town which are smaller. R. Watchilla spoke of the possibility of revisiting the Overlay District.

N. Talbot spoke stating her concerns about rushing the district and felt there should be more input from the town departments and discussed the benefits of postponing.

C. DiMarzio spoke stating it didn't seem as though there was a lot of opposition in the room and that if the 5 acres was the sticking point then perhaps that could be relaxed that might go a long way, however he stated he could also see how immediately amending it could be problematic. R. Starodoj agreed

adding that it does not lend itself to amendments on the floor. R. Starodoj inquired if the proponents had any remarks.

B. Bergeron spoke stating that they were not notified of the change in their district when it was rezoned in 2012 and while he understood a postponement, they would like their original zoning category. E. Hancock stated that from what she could see it does not seem that Mr. Bergeron's property was included in the Residential Business District. R. Watchilla confirmed that Mr. Bergeron's property was not included in the original district.

J. Chartier presented the insert to the Ware River News from January 1987 which contained the zoning changes and the announcement of proposed changes. R. Starodoj stated there were many meetings on it and it took 1 -1.5 years to go through the process and revisions.

S. Beckley inquired about the use of the term proponent in regard to Mr. Bergeron and wondered if the board saw this as Mr. Bergeron's proposal or the Planning Bards proposal. R. Starodoj stated that Mr. Bergeron came to the board with the proposal. He continued by stating that this proposal had been discussed at public meetings and what was presented had input from the Planning Board and Mr. Bergeron and R. Watchilla. R. Starodoj continued, saying he calls Mr. Bergeron the Proponent because he had been the initiator in this process. C. DiMarzio stated that it is not uncommon for zoning changes to be proposed by citizens who are aggrieved by the zoning regulations. He continued by stating that at he had been a proponent himself when he proposed Estate Lots to the Planning Board and that another resident had been a Proponent of a zoning change when they had requested putting in an automobile service area near Walmart. S. Beckley stated that the issue was whether or not they make a recommendation for Town Meeting. R. Starodoj discussed the options of recommending the proposal to go before Town Meeting or not.

R. Starodoj closed the Public Hearing at 7:55pm

**Motion** made by N. Talbot to make no recommendation for the proposed zoning amendment. E. Murphy seconded the motion. There was additional discussion by C. DiMarzio who spoke asking if postponing the amendment would mean that the current progress would be lost. S. Beckley clarified that because it was less than 21 days before Town Meeting the amendment would be dismissed and not go before Town Meeting. C. DiMarzio inquired if there was a timetable for it to be readdressed. S. Beckley responded stating that because it was dismissed and not voted down so it would not need to wait. R. Watchilla stated that this would enable more research to be done and seek the opinion of residents in the proposed overlay district.

|             |                                 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| R. Starodoj | Aye                             |
| N. Talbot   | Aye                             |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye                             |
| E. Murphy   | Aye                             |
| K. Crosby   | Absent (disconnected from Zoom) |

**Four in favor, one absence. Approved with no recommendation 4/0/1.**

### **Residential Business (RB) District Boundary Adjustment**

- RB District Boundary Adjustment at 256 West Street. Recommendation for vote before Town Meeting.

N. Talbot read the legal notice

R. Watchilla stated the purpose of this zoning bylaw amendment was to change the district boundary of 256 West Street which is split between two zoning districts.

R. Starodoj stated there was a petition signed by numerous residents in opposition. R. Watchilla responded that he was only shown the petition and had not been given a copy for the record. The Planning Board was presented with a copy from a member of the audience. R. Starodoj reviewed the petition and stated there were 50 residents and abutters who indicated their opposition as well as two letters that were received from residents stating their opposition. One letter was withdrawn.

R. Starodoj spoke saying the way in which the lot is split does not make sense to him and that it does not seem consistent with other properties along the corridor for the other lots.

C. DiMarzio stated he tended to agree with what Mr. Starodoj stated.

R. Watchilla added that the Zoning Bylaw lists the intended purpose of each district, and this area (Residential Business) was intended to be a transition zone which allows for the continued existence of the residential homes that dominate the area but acts as a zone of transition in which commercial uses would eventually dominate the area in the future. He added that he was unaware of the rationale for dividing the lot in that way.

R. Starodoj opened the floor for public discussion

J. Ciejka spoke stating she assembled the petition because it is a residential neighborhood. Additionally, she referred to a report given by McCabe Enterprises which was a study on development from the High School area to Main Street. The report found there to be sufficient business along the street and suggested going from three to two lanes due to the excessive traffic. J. Ciejka urged the board to not make a recommendation as she felt to would lessen the rural character of the town. She also recommended that a traffic study be performed as she find the traffic to be excessive. J. Ciejka also stated that was the only road to the hospital and more traffic could impede the ambulance. J. Ciejka finished by stating this was not about Tractor Supply, she feels retail business of any kind in that location are inappropriate.

R. Watchilla mentioned a comment received in the Zoom chat which asked that a letter be read. R. Watchilla read the letter from Patricia Alderige (included in the meeting packet, pg. 24).

M. Darling spoke as the developer of the land at 256 West Street. He stated he had brought his Traffic Engineer and the District Manager for Tractor Supply should the board have any questions for them. He urged the board to make a recommendation for Town Meeting. He continued by stating that the project would require a complete traffic study and he would have to comply with all DOT conditions. M. Darling stated that during the meeting with residents' potential tax revenue was discussed and would be approximately \$118,000.00 per year and bring in 18 – 20 jobs.

R. Starodoj commented that the zoning district change was brought forward by the developer. However, the purpose of the proposal was not solely intended to apply to Tractor Supply, but to make the property more easily developed.

A. Surprise spoke, stating that as the CEO of the Quaboag Hills Chamber of Commerce he is in favor of the project. He added that it restores zoning that had existed in 2009 and would have allowed Tractor Supply to locate there. A. Surprise mentioned that the actions that M. Darling has undertaken as the developer and urged the Planning Board to recommend this for Town Meeting.

J. Ciejka stated the issue was not about Tractor Supply, it was about any retail business, and they would like the zoning to be left as is.

B. Jackson spoke stating he believed Tractor Supply would not have a noticeable impact on traffic on Route 32, and he hoped the Planning Board would endorse the zoning change.

C. DiMarzio clarified that any endorsement the Planning Board makes would only send it to the Town Meeting. He believes it should be brought to the voters and let them decide.

D. Pelletier stated that he would like his name to be withdrawn from the petition against Tractor Supply. He stated he believes it would be beneficial for the town to have Tractor Supply.

D. Pasternak mentioned that if Tractor Supply goes in the area will be barren and that the traffic issue is serious.

R. Starodoj mentioned that any business that goes in will have to meet state DPW requirements and approvals for any type of traffic movements there.

M. Darling spoke of the zoning use table and how limited the uses are for that zone and the lot.

T. Murphy spoke, he is one of the owners of the property and purchased the property 15 years ago. He stated when it was purchased it they were not aware of the zoning change that reduce the depth of the zone and asked for the board's consideration in this matter.

R. Starodoj asked if there were further comments on Zoom, R. Watchilla responded that P. Alderidge stated she was opposed to the zoning change and that was the only comment he had so far.

E. Hancock asked if the other letter (meeting packet pg. 25 written by Y. Fares) should be read. R. Starodoj responded that the author of the letter chose to withdraw it.

M. Darling left notifications through town for people to sign. It asked if Tractor Supply would be welcome in town on that property. R. Starodoj advised M. Darling to stop into the office to make a copy of the signatures to keep on file.

J. Ciejka mentioned that the names on her petition are abutters and neighbors, and she hoped their desires would be taken into consideration.

M. Sloper spoke stating the opinion of the abutters and neighbors should carry more weight as their lives will be impacted by the decision. M. Sloper cited the ambiance as one of the reasons she chose to



reside in Ware. M. Sloper stated the board members would not be affected by the change since they did not reside in town. She is against the zoning change as she believes it will negatively affect the area and raise the prices of rentals.

R. Watchilla addressed a point M. Sloper had made and informed the audience that all the Planning Board members live in the Town of Ware.

M. Darling spoke regarding the clearing of the property. He stated that the area where the Tractor Supply would be built is already clear and the back of the property (the wetland portion) will remain untouched.

M. Sloper asked if that meant no more trees would be removed. R. Starodoj responded that this meeting was to discuss the change in the zoning and not the details of that project which would require various other Public Hearings. C. DiMarzio spoke showing the audience the conceptual design of the Tractor Supply and showed where the trees would remain. He stated the only thing they were voting for tonight was to give the voters the decision. M. Sloper asked if the Town Meeting could be postponed in order to let more people know. R. Starodoj stated the Town Meeting doesn't get pushed, the choice is to put it in front of the voters or not. M. Sloper said that she is an abutter and hadn't heard of anything until now, she was not aware of the efforts put forth by M. Darling. R. Starodoj asked M. Sloper what her address was, M. Sloper disclosed her address as a renter of a nearby property and R. Starodoj surmised that was why she hadn't received notification.

T. Murphy asked to show the plan on the screen. He spoke of the area proposed for parking is a substantial distance from Malboeuf Rd he believes it is a perfect fit for the area and will preserve the vegetation in the area. T. Murphy asked that the town be able to vote.

R. Harlbough spoke stating he would like his name withdrawn from the petition against it. He is concerned about the traffic, but he stated he is for the proposal.

B. Jackson spoke stating the town desperately needs the tax money and that the revenue would be beneficial to the town, and he believes it's a good company for the town to have.

R. Starodoj closed the Public Hearing at 8:53pm

**Motion** made by C. DiMarzio to recommend the Rural Business District Boundary Adjustment at 256 West Street to Town Meeting and if it passes, the board will do its due diligence address the traffic, setbacks, buffers, are addressed to protect the abutters. N. Talbot seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion.

|             |        |
|-------------|--------|
| R. Starodoj | Aye    |
| N. Talbot   | Aye    |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye    |
| E. Murphy   | Aye    |
| K. Crosby   | Absent |

**All in favor. Approved 4/0/1.**

**A brief recess was taken between 8:55pm and 9:00pm**

**Urban Fill Prohibition**

- Prohibition on the use of contaminated soils and sediments as fill material. Recommendation for vote before Town Meeting.

N. Talbot read the legal notice

R. Starodoj spoke stating they are trying to keep Urban Fill out of places such as gravel pits.

R. Watchilla reviewed the document in the packet (pg. 28 through 37 of the meeting packet)

I.Cameron inquired how the soil would be tested and how it would be monitored. R. Starodoj answered that the most important thing is to get it into the books so that there can be a regulation for it. A monitoring scheme would need to be created which would need to be approved by other departments.

C. DiMarzio stated the important thing is to have an enforceable bylaw.

**Public Hearing Closed at 9:11pm**

**Motion** made by C. DiMarzio to recommend the Urban Fill Prohibition to Town Meeting N. Talbot seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion.

- R. Starodoj     Aye
- N. Talbot     Aye
- C. DiMarzio   Aye
- E. Murphy     Aye
- K. Crosby     Absent

**All in favor. Approved 4/0/1.**

**SP-2022-10 (Bond Construction Corporation)**

- Applicant is requesting a special permit for earth removal under section 4.8.5 of the Zoning Bylaws, and pursuant to MGL Chapter 40A. Site located at 219 Babcock Tavern Road. Deed recorded in the Hampshire County Registry of Deeds Book 12833, Page 207, and Book 07177, Page 314. Assessor’s Parcel ID 4-0-14 & 4-14-2. Zoned: Rural Residential (RR).

N. Talbot read the legal notice.

R. Starodoj stated it was brought to his attention that the abutters notices had not been sent out. Abutters in the audience stated that they had all received them. R. Starodoj asked if E. Hancock was going to recuse herself. E. Hancock recused herself.

R. Starodoj asked if there was confirmation if other abutters had received the notices. R. Watchilla stated we don’t have official confirmation as to which abutters received the notices but, if he (R. Starodoj) felt they should be resent we could do so. N. Talbot asked abutters were required to call in to indicate that they had received the notice. R. Watchilla responded that there is nowhere in general laws that state that.

E. Hancock spoke stating she is an abutter and did not receive the notice neither did other abutters.

R. Watchilla stated certified mail would be sent this time for proof and confirmation. R. Starodoj asked if the hearing could continue or if it needed to be postponed. R. Watchilla answered that general law states that abutters within 300' of the project location have to be notified in a reasonable amount of time for the proposed Public Hearing. The Public Hearing was advertised in the Ware River News for the site location R. Watchilla stated R. Starodoj could move it to a subsequent meeting if he wanted to give time to readvertise the Public Hearing.

R. Starodoj discussed moving it to the first meeting in December. R. Watchilla stated that would be Thursday December 1, 2022, and could be readvertised at the cost of the town and abutters notices will be sent out 2-week prior. N. Talbot stated she believed it to be wise to start the process over stipulating that they should be sent certified so that it is known that every abutter has received the notice. C. DiMarzio stated he agreed with that running the advertisement in the paper would be wise.

K. Hubaz spoke stating they would have preferred to know this at the beginning of the meeting and had spent a number of hours waiting. R. Starodoj apologized and stated that yes in hindsight they should have.

K. Hubaz asked if abutters were within 300' and asked if that was for 219 and did not include 240.

N. Talbot recommended that the rescheduled hearing be scheduled for 7:05pm

R. Starodoj closed the Public Hearing at 9:21pm

**Motion** made by N. Talbot to continue the Public Hearing that was scheduled for this evening for SP-2022-10 to be rescheduled for December 1, 2022, at 7:05pm based on abutters notices and to readvertise it to the public and resent abutters notices via certified mail. E. Murphy seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion.

|             |        |
|-------------|--------|
| R. Starodoj | Aye    |
| N. Talbot   | Aye    |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye    |
| E. Murphy   | Aye    |
| K. Crosby   | Absent |

**All in favor. Approved 4/0/1.**

**Motion** made by E. Murphy to adjourn the meeting at 9:23pm. Seconded by N. Talbot. No additional discussion.

|             |        |
|-------------|--------|
| R. Starodoj | Aye    |
| N. Talbot   | Aye    |
| C. DiMarzio | Aye    |
| E. Murphy   | Aye    |
| K. Crosby   | Absent |

