

# PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY  
P.O. BOX 602  
TOWN HALL ANNEX  
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568  
(508) 696-4270  
Fax (508) 696-7341  
www.tisburyma.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** March 2, 2016

**TIME:** 6:02 PM

**PLACE:** Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane

**ATTENDANCE:** D. Bellante-Holand, C. Doble, B. Robinson , H. Stephenson  
**ABSENT:** Seidman

**BILLS:**

CPTC Spring Conference.....	\$150.00
Vineyard Gazette.....	\$588.00
MV Times .....	\$870.70
Comcast.....	\$ 27.30

**MINUTES:** As referred in the February 3, 2016 Meeting Agenda

12 August 2015	m/s/c	4/0/0
20 January 2015	m/s/c	4/0/0
03 February 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0

### APPOINTMENT:

6:00 PM Douglas Best and Douglas Hoehn, SB&H Inc. re: Douglas Best, AP 14C01 & 14C01.2 (property line adjustment), R20 District

D. Hoehn submitted a Form A division of land adjusting the property line of a previously endorsed Form A application for two lots. He explained that the applicant, D. Best needed the additional land area on Lot 143 to accommodate the setback requirements for a pool and deck and a future garage and workshop on Lot 142.

C. Doble inquired about the applicant's choice for the location of the access, when it appeared to her that it made more sense to come into the lot from the opposite end of the lot. D. Best replied that the location was intentionally selected to minimize the impact a garage/workshop would have on the abutting neighbors. He wanted to protect his investment in the property and house, and the integrity of the neighborhood. The access dictated the location of the garage and workshop to the lowest elevation on the lot so that it was well hidden from view.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson moved to endorse the Form A application for Douglas Best as presented by Douglas Hoehn under the Subdivision Control Law as an ANR. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0

6:37 PM      Public Hearing: ZBL Amendment – A) to relocate the definitions for a “Well Site Reference Line” in s. 04.05, an “Accessory Apartment” in s. 04.03.13, a “Wireless Communication Facility” in s. 07.16.02, and the following definitions for an aquifer, Groundwater Protection District, impervious surface, mining, potential drinking water sources, recharge areas and toxic/hazardous material in s. 09.11.03 into s. 02.00 of the Tisbury Zoning Bylaw, entitled “Definitions” and B) to modify section 09.05.01, the Floodplain District  
Attendance: None

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:37PM. C. Doble, Planning Board Chairman Pro Tem noted that they were scheduled to have three hearings. Two of the hearings dealt with modifications to section 02.00 entitled “Definitions”. The third hearing pertained to the modification of section 09.05, entitled “Floodplain District”, and required the adoption of a few definitions that were incorporated in Section 02.00.

With the Board’s consent, C. Doble wanted to combine the hearings since they were interrelated in an attempt to simplify the process for the Board. There being no comment from the Board, C. Doble entered the hearing notices into the record, and introduced the members of the Board. Board members were asked to refer to the recommended modifications for any questions or comments.

The board secretary clarified for the record that the duplicate hearing notice for the modifications to section 02.00 (Definitions) was required to accommodate A. Turner’s recommendation to the Board to consolidate the definitions throughout the bylaw into section 02.00. Board members each had a copy of the bylaw amendments for their review.

C. Doble inquired if this would impact previous discussions for the initial hearing. The Board secretary advised her that tonight’s session would be considered a continuation of those discussions, and subject to the same procedure outlined in state statute and the open meeting law.

Board members were reminded that in the last hearing on Definitions, they agreed on the definition for ‘height of structures’, and added language to the definition for “Toxic and Hazardous Material”. The only other modification to section 02.00 were the addition of the definitions for a “Well Site Reference Line”, an “Accessory Apartment”, a “Wireless Communication Facility”, and the definitions for an aquifer, Groundwater Protection District, impervious surface, mining, potential drinking water sources, recharge areas and toxic/hazardous material.

The board secretary notified the Board that she asked E. Carlson to review the proposal once again, and to respond to questions about the accuracy of the zone designations, because it omitted a few that were reflected on the maps. The board secretary assured the Board that E. Carlson confirmed that the two zones listed in sec. 09.05.07 was correct. B.

Robinson inquired if he had an opinion about the data plans. The board secretary replied that he did not.

C. Doble understood that the regulation was reviewed with the Building Inspector and FEMA's representative, but was concerned about the town's reception and the consequences if they did not adopt the revised bylaw. B. Robinson inquired about the consequences. He was advised that the property owners within the AE and AV zones were no longer going to be able to insure their properties or receive federal assistance. The board secretary advised the Board that she had left a message with C. Seidel to ask for assistance in calculating the total acreage and number of properties within the flood zones and the difference from the last update.

H. Stephenson inquired if the increase in land area and properties was the result of sea level rise. B. Robinson and C. Doble replied in the affirmative. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the revisions reflected the correct zones. The board secretary replied in the affirmative, and explained that the bylaw was designed to regulate the properties most impacted by storms, which will be in the AE and VE zones. The board secretary invited the Board to meet with E. Carlson tomorrow at 12 PM to ask questions about the program and regulations. Board members and staff from the other towns were invited to the meeting.

B. Robinson referred the Board to sec. 09.05.07 and recommended a revision that would extend the requirement for a Coastal Elevation and Data Plan (CEDP hereinafter) in all zones and not just the AE and AV zones. He felt the language should give the special permit granting authority the discretion to determine if a CEDP was necessary to provide the details they needed in their determination, and could be accomplished by revising the language to state "may be required". He further noted that the state's flood maps were drawn at a scale that did not provide the detailed information needed for the review of an application. It was the reason for suggesting that it be required in all zones.

C. Doble thought they could consider modifying the language to state "within all the zones as defined by the Floodplain..." or "properties within the Town of Tisbury located within any of the flood zones as defined by the Dukes County Flood Insurance Rate Maps." B. Robinson recommended "within all the zones as defined by the Dukes County Flood Insurance Rate Maps." D. Bellante-Holand agreed with B. Robinson, but felt they should be consistent in the use of terms and suggested that they add "**flood hazard zones**". C. Doble noted that the regulation mentioned "flood hazard **areas**". Board members agreed.

D. Bellante-Holand asked B. Robinson about the cost of a CEDP. He replied approximately \$1500.00. Board members were advised that the state required the use of the CEDP in lieu of the flood maps when they were available.

C. Doble inquired about the definitions. The board secretary advised the Board that the definitions included the previously agreed upon revisions, the definitions that were in various sections of the bylaw and the additional definitions recommended by E. Carlson for the Floodplain District.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson moved to close the public hearing and to enter into deliberations. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

4/0/0 The hearing closed at 7:00 PM

7:00 PM Public Hearing: ZBL Amendments (Cont'd.) – Sec. 02.00, Definitions and Sec. 09.05.01, Floodplain District

Attendance: None

The discussions were held in conjunction with the aforementioned hearing by vote of the Board.

6:37 PM Deliberations: ZBL Amendments – Section 02.00 Definitions and Sec. 09.05.01, Floodplain District

B. Robinson thought it was important to produce a fact sheet explaining the purpose for the revision and delineating the properties impacted by the regulation. H. Stephenson inquired if the information could be produced by C. Seidel when she produced the maps. The board secretary did not know, but agreed to follow up on the suggestion. C. Doble questioned whether people understood the ramifications of being designated within a velocity zone. H. Stephenson thought the fact sheet should make this clear, and more importantly why it was important to adopt the regulation, because there were serious ramifications to the town if they did not. They did not have a choice. C. Doble concurred.

D. Bellante-Holand thought the fact sheet should be designed to address the questions they want the town to consider i.e. the town's liability without FEMA funds. She thought it was important for people to understand what the impact was if they did not approve the regulation. Board members were advised that they had the opportunity to ask E. Carlson about the program and the information they should include in their fact sheet. Board members were advised that if the town did not adopt the regulation, homeowners within the flood hazard districts were not going to be able to insure their homes so that they could be replaced. These same properties were also going to be subject to a more stringent building code, which was going to increase their replacement costs. Without insurance, these homes may not be rebuilt, which will impact the town's tax base. B. Robinson thought their best argument was to explain to the town that if they did not adopt the regulation they would not qualify for federal assistance (funding).

C. Doble mentioned that it was just as important to have a plan that addressed the issues presented in the aftermath of a catastrophe. The MV Commission's Hazard Mitigation Plan basically addressed what one should be doing during a hazard, but nothing about the rebuilding, and she felt the town was very vulnerable.

Additional discussions ensued with this regard and C. Doble asked the Board if they had any questions or comments with regards to the bylaw amendments recommended for sections 02.00 and 09.05.01. B. Robinson moved to approve the modifications that were recommended by the Board for sections 02.00. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0 B. Robinson moved to approve the modifications that were recommended by the Board for sections 09.05.01. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson moved to close the deliberations. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried: 4/0/0 The deliberation was duly closed at 7:15 PM

## **BOARD DISCUSSIONS:**

1. Planning Board Appointments
  - A. Tisbury School Committee
  - B. Policy and expectations
  - C. Committee Reports

### Tisbury School Committee

C. Doble informed the Board that she had reached out to John Custer to inquire if they would consider having two members of the Planning Board serve on the school building committee, and his response at the time was to say no.

She was therefore surprised to hear from him recently with an invitation to participate on the committee. Uncertain as to what may have changed his mind, except to surmise that they were encouraging public participation, she accepted the invitation.

### Committee Reports

C. Doble informed the Board that she added the topic to the agenda to bring to their attention the importance in obtaining reports from them about any of the subcommittees' projects may have some relevance to their goals and objectives. Board members understood and agreed.

### Vision Council

C. Doble reported that the Vision Council agreed to dedicate the next two meetings to the presentation of the special and annual town meeting warrant articles. The authors of the articles were going to be invited to explain their proposals and to answers questions from the community. She planned on inviting Deborah Medders, the Town Moderator, John Custer and others to help people understand what they were proposing. C. Doble noted that it would also give the Planning Board the opportunity to explain their bylaw amendments.

B. Robinson mentioned that the Planning Board also had to meet to discuss what they wanted to present to the town at the special town meeting, and designate members on the articles they were going to present on the floor. H. Stephenson thought it was important to prepare a fact sheet as in years past. B. Robinson concurred, noting that it was an item they had to prepare as a board.

B. Robinson noted that the Vision Council was also going to prepare an annual newsletter (or report) for dissemination at town meeting to report what they've accomplished and hope to accomplish in the following year.

2. Planning Board Projects for 2106/2017  
RE: Assignments

C. Doble explained that the list included new and on-going projects, including topics raised in committees where the Planning Board is represented. She thought it was important to report back to the Planning Board any projects that may have a relevance to the Board and Vision Council's goals and objectives. It was the reason she felt they should have a much more active role in the CPC process. B. Robinson noted that they've discovered a gap in the application process that the Vision Council could help fill by defining the application process, delineating the minimum submittal requirements and providing

H. Stephenson inquired about the relationship between the Planning Board and the Vision Council. B. Robinson replied that the Vision Council operated under the auspices of the Planning Board, and provided a forum for community residents to voice their opinions and to participate in public projects. He and C. Doble have been volunteering on the Council to help residents organize and address issues of importance to them and the town. At present there were four workgroups that were dealing with the improvements of town properties (Owen Park), the preservation of a public park (Tashmoo), etc. All of the council's activities have to be endorsed by the Planning Board.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the town committees and boards are posting their agendas and minutes to secure the information they needed to keep abreast of town activities. She was advised that the town had fallen short on keeping their website up to date, but that with the recent hire of an IT person, that information would be posted in the near future.

C. Doble thought the Planning Board should convene a meeting with the Board of Selectmen and department heads to give them a sense of their priorities for the upcoming year, and to discuss the projects that should be prioritized. It would allow them to plan their priorities. D. Bellante-Holand added that the concept made them proactive.

H. Stephenson thought it was important to protect the Tashmoo Preserve. C. Doble advised the Board that the Town Administrator had sent her a rough draft of the town warrant which included an article to alter the status of the Tashmoo Overlook as a preserve. Given that the warrant was a rough draft, C. Doble offered to contact the Town Administrator to inquire if the article was supported by the Board of Selectmen.

C. Doble advised the board that the projects were not listed in any particular order, and basically based on the topics the Board discussed in the past year. She hoped the Board would be able to review the list and to prioritize the topics. D. Bellante-Holand suggested looking at the projects they could act on and complete. She also thought it would help to include a separate section on the agenda listing the four or five projects they prioritized in addition to the regular house items, so that they are acted on.

H. Stephenson thought they could decide on a date by which they had to complete their priority list if they wanted to pursue them at town meeting.

C. Doble asked the Board to review the list, and to recommend additional topics. Once they reviewed and edited the list, she thought they could prioritize the projects. Based on previous discussions, she wanted to add the topic of area management plans, specifically for the waterfront area. B. Robinson concurred, but wanted to know the details of the process involved to create an area plan, and offered to speak with A. Turner.

C. Doble volunteered to meet with P. LeClerc to inquire about the Complete Streets program to see if they funded walking and bike paths. H. Stephenson understood the MV

Commission was hosting a workshop on Complete Streets in a couple of weeks. C. Doble concurred and noted that she, B. Robinson and the board secretary were attending the session on 3/16/16.

D. Bellante-Holand was uncertain how the topic related to the prioritization of their projects, if it pertained to a funding vehicle. C. Doble explained that she wanted to know if the program provided funds for some of the projects on the list, so that if they were applicable and available, it could impact the prioritization of the projects. She felt they had to know what was involved. D. Bellante-Holand understood but felt that there had to be some criteria by which to prioritize their projects. She thought they should determine whether the particular project is actionable with the investment of their time and effort. B. Robinson agreed, he thought they should focus on the two or three projects they felt were the most critical or actionable, and not worry about the rest until they were ready to address them. In order to do this, he felt they should know what the process was from start to finish before they prioritized the list. It was the reason for wanting to meet with A. Turner. He thought it was important to understand what an area management plan consisted of and what the process entailed. Once they understood this, they could prioritize the area they wanted to concentrate on first.

C. Doble wanted to add the topic of “communicating and convening”. D. Bellante-Holand asked C. Doble to explain the subject. C. Doble thought the Planning Board should be aware of on-going projects on a town wide basis. B. Robinson thought they should attend the Board of Selectmen, and DPW meetings to report back anything that may have some relevance to their projects. C. Doble thought they could maximize the use of their time if they met with the department heads to discuss the department’s goals and the Planning Board’s projects. H. Stephenson thought they could also monitor the meeting agendas of the various boards and departments to see if they should attend the meeting.

D. Bellante-Holand noted that communication was an on-going issue that they could not resolve. They simply had to rethink their strategy, so that it did not prevent them from accomplishing their objectives. H. Stephenson thought they should continue working on the priority list and sending it out the draft to all of the departments to solicit their feedback, and to inform them if they were working on a project that might be related to one of their own.

D. Bellante-Holand added that they had to strategize how they were going to communicate their priorities to the committee level to solicit their assistance, and what they wanted for a follow up. She also offered to research any of the topics on the draft list to determine if they were realistic, and thought she’d like to start by reviewing the goals and action list in the Vision Plan. C. Doble and B. Robinson thought it would help to determine if any of the goals and objectives in the Vision Plan could be accomplished with related projects.

C. Doble offered to revise the draft list to change the order of some of the projects in light of the discussions. She offered to email the board members a copy for their review and recommendations. B. Robinson recommended the addition of Blue Economy, noting that there could be funds in the future under this program for aquaculture, seaweed and shellfish. He thought they should investigate funding sources in general to find out if any pertain to their list of projects, and what they need to produce in order to qualify for the grants. C. Doble that could be a part of the area management plan for the harbor. H. Stephenson mentioned that the subject of affordable housing could be included in the harbor plan and several others. Board members agreed.

D. Bellante-Holand thought they had to clearly define what they intended to accomplish for each project in the list. The list simply listed the topics, but she did not understand what they were hoping to address or achieve. The information would simplify the search for funding sources.

C. Doble thought they could dedicate a meeting or a portion of a meeting to their projects, and offered to look at the calendar to arrange the schedule with the board secretary. She also agreed that the prioritized project list should be part of the agenda. B. Robinson thought they should be going with the old Fire Station site and the purchase of the Nelson property because it is crucial to the development of the bike path connection and park. C. Doble concurred, and added the Lagoon Park because they could be shovel ready if they invested the time. B. Robinson noted that they already had funds for the fire barn (\$50,000.00)

D. Bellante-Holand reiterated that she was going to review the Vision Plan's goals and objectives, determine if there is a relationship between them and the draft priority list, conduct a preliminary list of funding sources and initiate research on floating structures, because she was concerned that the town may be somewhat exposed without any regulation. B. Robinson was not as concerned because the harbor was regulated as a DCPC by the MV Commission. C. Doble did not understand who was responsible for generating the regulation, and if there were any restrictions in their regulation. It was a matter that had to be clarified before they delegated it to the property department. She thought it warranted further discussion with the Board of Selectmen.

### 3. Holly Stephenson RE: Affordable/Accessory Apartments

H. Stephenson indicated that she had nothing further to add to the comments and suggestions she submitted at a previous meeting. She felt the topic was much more complicated and warranted further research. Based on past discussions, she was of the impression that the Board agreed to postpone the discussions until they had the opportunity to invest the time needed to pursue a bylaw amendment. C. Doble concurred, and noted that she added the topic on the project list.

### 4. Christopher Dias RE: Modified proposal

### 5. Community Preservation Committee RE: FinCom's Proposal to decrease funding



C. Doble informed the Board that the Community Preservation Committee (CPC hereinafter) was soliciting a letter of support asking the Finance & Advisory Committee (FinCom hereinafter) to withdraw the warrant article in which town residents were being asked to decrease the town's contribution to the CPC fund from 3% to 1%. B. Robinson inquired about the reasons for the FinCom's position. C. Doble replied that they were concerned about the community's reaction to the substantial increase in this year's budget. The CPC countered that their portion of the budget was just a fraction. She explained that they were essentially discussing a difference of about \$300,000.00 between the 1% and 3% contribution. They received \$550,000.00 (39%) this year from the 3% surcharge fee.

Questions regarding the rate of distribution from the state were addressed by C. Doble, who explained that the state distributed CPC funds in three separate rounds, whereby 80% of a fixed amount of state funds were allocated to participating communities based on a complicated formula during the first round. Communities that only collected a 1% surcharge fee for CPC funds were automatically eliminated from the state's second (Equity Round) and third rounds. The allocation of funds from the second and third rounds was designed on a ranking system bases on property values and tax base so that the communities with the lowest scores were allotted a larger percentage of the funds. The Town of Tisbury received 70% (\$54,000.00) of the funds this year in the second round and another \$16,000.00 in the third round. Additional discussions ensued and the Board agreed, after tabulating this year's contributions and receipts from the state, that it made much more fiscal sense to maintain the 3% contribution.

C. Doble thought it was important to impress upon the Finance & Advisory Committee and the community the importance of their contribution to a state funded program that relinquished control to the local communities. She felt it was important for the community to understand and appreciate the fact that decisions on the use of the funds were being made at the local level based on the town's needs. C. Doble did think they could do a better job at managing the application process.

Based on the discussions, D. Bellante-Holand did not have an issue supporting the CPC's request and the content of the letter before the Planning Board, given that it appeared that Finance & Advisory Committee misunderstood the basic information. If FinCom decided not to withdraw their article from the warrant, she thought the CPC would benefit from disseminating a list of all the completed projects that benefited from the funds at town meeting.

There being no further discussion, C. Doble entertained a motion to send the letter to the Finance & Advisory Committee asking them to reconsider and to withdraw the warrant article reducing the town's surcharge fee to the CPC funds from 3% to 1%. B. Robinson so moved. H. Stephenson seconded the motion. 4/0/0

6. D. Seidman

A. Mullen Rule Warrant Article

B. Remote Participation ( Board of Selectmen Mtg. required)

C. Letter to MVC requesting their participation in the Housing Production Plan and applying for grant money

D. Annual Sustainable Communities and Campuses Conference – (4/15 & 4/16/16)

Mullen Rule, MGL C. 39 s. 23D

C. Doble advised the Board that the board secretary drafted the language for the Board's review. It was submitted to the town as a place holder on the warrant. This gave the Board ample opportunity to discuss the subject and to modify the language before the Board of Selectmen approved the final warrant.

B. Robinson noted that the regulation essentially allowed a board member to participate in the hearing process on an application if they missed one session. He inquired if the regulation applied to remote participation. The board secretary explained that they were two different allowances regulated by two different state statutes. Unlike the Remote Participation rule, the Mullen Rule requires a town meeting vote. The latter can be adopted by vote of the Board of Selectmen.

D. Bellante-Holand asked about the circumstances that led to the discussion of the Mullen Rule. B. Robinson recalled that the subject was raised by the Planning Board Chairman to avoid a delay in an applicant's hearing process. They also had to maintain a quorum to employ the rule. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if it was intended to apply to all of the adjudicatory boards or just the Planning Board. B. Robinson and C. Doble replied in the affirmative. The board secretary clarified that the purpose for adopting the rule was to allow board members the ability to continue to participate in the public hearing process if they happened to miss one session.

C. Doble read T. Israel's and L. Gomez' email responses to an inquiry regarding the Board of Selectmen's vote on the Mullen Rule. L. Gomez indicated that he and T. Israel did not vote in favor of adopting the regulation permitting remote participation. T. Israel confirmed L. Gomez's comment. Board members noted that both Selectmen were confusing the Mullen Rule with remote participation. The vote referred to by T. Israel, according to town counsel was not valid because they mistakenly voted to adopt the Mullen Rule, when they addressing the adoption of remote participation. The two were very different procedures governed by two separate regulations. B. Robinson also noted that they were exclusive, so that you can adopt the one rule without the other.

D. Bellante-Holand did not see the harm in allowing a board member the ability to catch up on a meeting using existing technology to act on an application, as if they were present. She inquired about the requirements for remote participation. The board secretary clarified for the record that the topic under discussion was the adoption of the Mullen Rule, which allowed a board member to review the minutes, recording or any other electronic media of a hearing he/she missed to continue their participation in the review process of an application. The Rule, if adopted allowed the board member to miss one (1) session in the hearing process to participate in the determination of an application, and under specific criteria. The remote participation regulation allowed a board member to participate in a meeting via telecommunication, skype, etc. provided a quorum is present on the premises, and the situation meets the criteria listed in the regulation. The regulations require the Board to note into the record that they were employing the regulation, state the circumstances, identify the board member, etc.

B. Robinson thought it was important to meet with the Board of Selectmen to clarify what they were asking and to solicit their support. If they did not support the article, they could withdraw the article.

The board secretary advised the board that the Town Administrator requested written confirmation of the Planning Board's determination to pursue MGL C. 39 S. 23D as a town wide policy. It was suggested that the Planning Board could produce the information in the form of a vote to support the Mullen Rules adoption and to advance its

adoption as a town wide policy with the submittal of a warrant article proposing its adoption. D. Bellante-Holand indicated that she felt comfortable supporting a motion to recommend the adoption of the Mullen Rule. H. Stephenson indicated that she too would recommend and support its adoption. She asked if the other committees had the option to participate or opt out of the rule. The board secretary replied in the affirmative. It was intended to be used as a tool for the Boards if they wanted the ability to employ the rule. B. Robinson noted that the Mullen Rule truly benefited the applicants.

H. Stephenson moved to support the Mullen Rule's adoption and to advance its adoption as a town wide policy with the submittal of a warrant article proposing its adoption. B. Robinson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

#### Remote Participation

Board members did not want to confuse the issue and decided to postpone discussions on the rule.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:**

1. Zoning Board of Appeals

A. Hearing Notice – Evelyn & Joseph Alosso, AP 23A38 (accessory apartment)

B. Hearing Notice – Casey Decker (accessory apartment)

C. Hearing Notice – Valerio L. Destefani, AP 07F13 (outside seating/food service)

2. Oak Bluffs Planning Board

Re: Bylaw amendments

3. West Tisbury Planning Board

RE: Bylaw amendments

4. National Flood Insurance Program

RE: CSR Program (Federal Flood Ins. Discount)

5. MV Commission

A. 26 February 2016 Extended Mtg. Schedule

B. 03 March 2016 Meeting Agenda

C. JTC's Draft Public Participation Plan (February 2016) on transportation projects

6. Quinlan

A. 10 January 2016 Issue

B. 25 January 2016 Issue

7. Environmental Partners - Mark N. White, Sr. Project Mgr.

RE: MEPA ENF – Proposed wastewater treatment effluent disposal facility

#### **PRO FORM**

Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at  
9:45 P.M. (m/s/c 5/0/0)  
Respectfully submitted;

---

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

#### **APPROVAL:**

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

---

Date

---

Cheryl Doble  
Chairman Pro Tem