

Regular meeting of the Board of Health, March 22, 2018. In attendance: Chairman Bernard Horowitz; Thomas Durkin; Dr. Leigh Ann Mansberger; Health Department Director Sharon Cameron and Recording Secretary Lisa Greene. The meeting was held at 3:00 p.m. in the lower level conference room, Peabody City Hall, 24 Lowell Street, Peabody.

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
APPROVAL OF MINUTES from February 22, 2018 meeting.	At 3:00 p.m. BH called meeting to order. BH had one question on minutes, a reference to the word “they” in notes regarding who was putting forth the regulations regarding tobacco regulations, asked to change to “BOH.” SC will change minutes to clarify that point. BOH unanimously accepted minutes as amended.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC will change language from “They” to “BOH” under summary of Tobacco regulations.
HEARING		
Hearing regarding Non-compliance with Tobacco and Nicotine Delivery Products Regulations at 117 Newbury St. A Vote may be taken to uphold, modify, suspend, or withdraw fine and whether to suspend or revoke Tobacco/Nicotine Product Delivery Sales permit.	At 3:02 BH read the Hearing notice. Owner of the business at 117 Newbury St., The Market and Liquor Store, Sajad Sofi was present. BH explained that SS had requested the hearing, and summarized that the violation took place on Feb. 20, 2018 during a compliance check by the NS Tobacco Control Program, and Joyce Redford, the Director of that program, was there at the time, when a person who is less than 21 years old was able to purchase a tobacco product. This was a second offense. The first offense happened several months ago and Mr. Sofi claimed that the sale had not taken place; the BOH upheld the violation but waived the fine. BH invited SS to speak, but SS requested that Joyce Redford speak first. JR confirmed that on Feb. 20 th at 1:45 during a full round of compliance checks, which means they attempt to visit all permitted establishments, which they did over the course of three days, and this sale occurred on the last of the three days. JR referenced a list she had given the board of all of the compliance checks completed during that review, and explained that of all inspections only one had a sale to a minor and it was this establishment. JR explained that she sent a 16-year old female in, and reviewed the procedures for training the youth who participate in the compliance checks. She explained that the youth are not allowed to take anything in the store with them, they empty their pockets and can only take a phone and the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous vote to impose a fine of \$250 and a 3 day permit suspension for this second offense. • SS will contact SC by Monday to indicate which 3 days the suspension will take place. • SC will subsequently send a letter to SS to summarize the requirements for the suspension.

amount of money needed to purchase the item. At the point of purchase, the youth interacted with the cashier, who could not figure out how to give back the customer/youth the correct change, and SS came over to assist and gave the correct change and apologized for the youth having to wait. JR presented as evidence the pack of cigarettes purchased along with the cigarillo purchased during the first violation which had not been brought to the earlier hearing. JR explained that the establishment had not been open long, and that they had only done two compliance checks there and both times sales were made. She said that SS acknowledged that the person who made the sale was his daughter. BH asked if his main product was liquor, and SS replied that he sells beer and wine. SS explained that his mother was ill and that the family was having a meeting and his daughter, who is 23, jumped up to wait on the customer to allow him to continue with his family meeting. He explained that he had to close the store and his mother was in the hospital. He confirmed that he was running late and confirmed that he had given the person the change. He said that he had told her that he cannot read or write but that he would sign the notice. He said that he asked his daughter later if she had asked for an ID. She said that she had checked the girl's ID and that the City was just going after him, and that the City was there every day trying to get him. He explained that he has a rack which blocked his view of the person who was at the counter, and his daughter, who doesn't work there, had jumped up to wait on the customer. SS added that he asked JR how many times they send kids to his store. He said they send kids every week. He said his wife said the City is watching him for when he leaves to send someone in. BH explained that JR is required to document when she does these compliance checks. He showed the list of all of the checks conducted and said it was not just him being checked. BH asked if SS meant he did not read or write English, and SS replied yes, does not read or write much English. He said that he and his family do not have any intention to sell to youth. BH asked if his daughter admitted to selling to the youth. His daughter said she saw

an ID and that the City does not like him and was out to get him, and sending kids every day to try to trap him. JR replied that SS was involved in the transaction himself, and that he handed her the change. TD asked JR how she selects the stores to check. JR replied that she conducts one full round of compliance checks, which means that all 43 stores get checked, and then they comply with a process called Sinar, where the state sends a list of stores that must be checked. She added that also if a sale occurs there will be additional checks. TD asked what order they do these checks in, and JR replied that they mix it up and it is random. TD asked how many times she had been to this establishment. JR replied three times, the two compliance checks and one inspection which DPH assigns them to do, which includes a check of items being sold, locations of products, and pricing checks. BH asked how long that inspection takes. JR replied usually not more than 15 minutes and that she tries to stay out of the way since these proprietors are trying to run a business. BH asked about how many second offenses. SC replied that they usually have about 2 or 3 repeat offenders per year but added that this is the first time in her experience that an establishment has failed all of their compliance checks. JR said that she is concerned that this establishment sells alcohol products and they should be familiar with checking IDs. TD said that he is concerned as well that SS says that the City of Peabody is out to get him because that is not the case. SS said that somebody is doing it because it happens often. BH said that since this establishment is on Rt. 1 the kids will get in a car and go from one store to another until they get someone who will sell to them. BH explained that there is a situation now where a second violation has occurred, so there is first a \$250 fine, and they need to discuss the suspension of the tobacco permit, sometimes it is for 7 days and sometimes less. TD said that they want him to succeed, but he can't sell cigarettes to youth, SS said there is no intention to do that. SC said that there is a need for policies and procedures to be put in place and trainings for staff to ensure that this does not happen again. SC said that she is very

concerned hearing that SS says he cannot read or write English and with the non-compliance with the inspection requirements, and that is another violation that they have not written him up for, but he needs to be aware of all of the requirements for this type of permit and if he does not he should not apply for a permit. The permit application he signed says he has read and understands the regulations. JR said that she would be happy to offer her time and an opportunity to go over the regulations with him but said that she thinks the Liquor Licensing board should be made aware of these violations. SC replied that the Liquor licensing board is informed of any tobacco violation. JR reminded SS that when you sell age limited products you are governed by many bodies, city, state, and federal, and said that all are watching over these businesses and it is your responsibility to ensure that you are following the rules. BH asked about the recommendation for suspension of the permit, and SC replied that it has been the general practice of the Board to institute a three-day suspension for second violations. SC explained that during the 3-day suspension they will not be allowed to sell any tobacco or nicotine products, all tobacco and nicotine products must be removed from the store, and the Health Dept will check in at the start of the business day to ensure that they are removed and will make spot checks during the suspension period to ensure that they are not selling the products. She added that it has been the practice of the board to allow the owner to decide what three days the suspension will take place so as to not interfere with their business too much, and she said that SS must call her by the following Monday to let her know which 3 days he has chosen. She will then send him a letter which will restate the requirements that the product be removed, etc. JR said that he should expect to see her during that time because that is part of the suspension. SC reminded that there is also going to be a \$250 fine for this second offense. SS asked if a product is legal for sale in his store and showed a photo on his phone. JR replied that those items, CDB Gummies, are not under her jurisdiction, she that can tell you what is going on in the collaborative's jurisdiction. She

	<p>explained that if you look up CDB, it is hemp, which is legal, but when this product was found in other stores in another community, the police there sent them out for testing and found that the chemical TCB is present in them, so the product is not legal for sale. She said that edibles should not be sold in a convenience store. She added that SS has a lot of drug paraphernalia in his store , but he is not authorized to sell the CBD items. SS said that he sees these in other stores in Peabody and wonders why other stores can sell these but he is being targeted. He said 7 Eleven on Newbury St. sells these. BH explained that it is a police matter. JR said that she has been asked to track these and other items such as Kratom which has been identified by the FDA as a synthetic opioid, which they have found in some convenience stores. They are out there with no jurisdiction over these items but they are the eyes and ears and are in the stores regularly, and will call in any violations that she sees to the appropriate authorities. She added that SS can contact her any time if he is aware of any violations in any establishments and that she would follow up on them. The hearing was adjourned at 3:50 P.M.</p>	
<p>Hearing regarding application for an Animal Permit submitted for 45 Coleman St. A vote may be taken to grant, modify, or deny permit application.</p>	<p>3:50 PM. BH read the hearing notice. Stephanie Magnarelli, owner of the property at 45 Coleman St and applicant for animal permit to allow 6 hens on the premises, was not present, but neighbors from 34 Coleman were present and BH said that since they had come out he would like to hear what they had to say. Michael Liggiero introduced himself and his wife Susana and explained that another neighbor, Susan of 39 Coleman could not make it to the hearing but asked them to represent her there today and had e-mailed SC her concerns. SC distributed e-mails received, and after reading them for the record BH explained that Susan Sharbano wrote that she is concerned about rodents and mice in the area, and Mike Liggiero wrote asking about wildlife in the area, and another comment was received from John DePico who said that he has no problem with Stephanie having the animals there because she is a veterinarian and will take good care of them. Mike Liggiero said that they abut wetlands and encounter turkeys,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant was not present, so this hearing was continued. SC to notify applicant.

	<p>raccoons, possum, coyotes, and pheasants, and their concern is because of the area because they abut conservation land and there have been rats seen by neighbors in the area. He also has an issue with the size of the lot, all of the yards are the same size and they are not very large spaces, and he wonders about putting a coop there. BH replied that each applicant submits an application with a plan of where the coop will be located and how they will dispose of waste, etc. He added that on the issue of rodents that all across the region mice and rats have been a problem lately, not just here, and they have over 30 permits for chickens here in Peabody and have not had any reports that anyone with a chicken permit has created a rodent problem. BH states he understands that chickens can be one of many things that can be a draw to rodents, and for that reason the BOH has considered requiring all such permit holders to agree to contract with exterminator services. BH thanked the Liggieros for attending and said that all of this may be a moot point and that Ms. Magnarelli may have changed her mind, or this may be brought up again at next month's meeting, but thanked them for attending and giving their views on the subject. He said that at this point they would hold off on voting on this permit. TD asked if we would continue this hearing, and SC replied yes, the applicant could come in next month or another month, we don't restrict their ability to come back in.</p>	
<p>Hearing regarding application for animal permit submitted for 8 Gardner St. A vote may be taken to grant, modify, or deny permit application.</p>	<p>4:10 pm. BH read the hearing notice, and owner of 8 Gardner St., Randy Robinson, was present. BH explained that this was an application to have 6 hens at this address and asked why they want chickens. RR replied that his husband grew up a hobby farmer in rural Iowa and wanted animals. He is a big fan of home grown foods and fresh eggs. BH asked about the shed, and RR replied that the shed is already in place and that inspector John Yale has inspected it and said it was impeccable. BH noted that they plan to compost the droppings, and asked where they would do that, and RR replied that they have rodent resistant metal barrels behind the coop. BH asked if he would also put food scraps in there and RR replied that he would not, just dry hay and droppings as food would attract animals. BH asked about</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit was granted unanimously. Fee was already paid so SC will mail permit to property owner.

	<p>Matthew who is listed as the co-owner, and RR replied that he is his husband and was currently at work. BH told RR that they might be asking for holders of these permits to hire exterminators if rodents are an issue in the area, to which RR replied that they would be amenable to that. BH asked if the board had any questions or issues and all said that they were fine with this application. BH explained that they were granting a permit for keeping no more than 6 hens, and RR asked if at a later time he wanted to expand to up to 10 hens, which he would be allowed given the area of his property, would that be possible, to which BH replied that they hadn't granted more than 6 hens in a long time, over 2 years, and would question why they would need to have that many. He said that they would grant the permit for six and he could see what his needs were later. SC indicated that abutters were present to speak on this issue as well. Tom Depaulo of 15 Gardner Street said that he was there in support of RR's application. He said that the petitioner keeps the property immaculate and they have no problem with this. Steve Ferrante of 13 Gardner also stated that he is in support of this. BH said that they are issuing the permit which will be good through the end of the year, and SC said that she would mail it out to him.</p>	
<p>Other item: Discussion on possibility of adding requirement to animal permit owners to hire exterminators.</p>	<p>SC explained that the City's contracted exterminator has expressed the opinion that chicken coops could be a contributor to the rodent problem, and recommends that the City consider it as one of the factors that could impact the number of rodents. SC suggested that all animal permit holders be required to bring in a professional exterminator to inspect and treat if rodents are present. SC added that there are many things that could have an impact on rodents, and this is just one. LM asked if anyone has compared the areas with the most chicken coops with the areas with the biggest rodent infestations. SC said she would provide information on that. SC will work with health inspector John Yale to create some language to consider adding to permit application process, informing applicants of the BOH's right to require pest control where they have seen increased rodent activity or in neighborhoods or where there are unique property conditions that could</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC will create proposed language regarding exterminator requirements to add to animal permit regulations and application process.

	contribute to rodent problems,. SC said that she would have the proposed language for the next BOH meeting.	
Permitting updates		
Review of list of permits issued in February 2018- Vote anticipate whether to accept list.	TD asked about list of permits to Funeral directors. SC explained that the list shows the directors permitted this month, and TD commented that there are 8 there. BH asked if there are any inspections of the funeral homes, but SC replied that they permit the directors and not the facilities, and said that she would bring in the permitting requirements for the BOH to review the next month. BH noted that a new smoke shop, Boston Smoke Shop, had opened and asked where this site was located. SC replied that it is on the corner of Main Street near Sports Collectibles. She explained that there are no food permits at that site so they do not even sell mints or gum. BH commented on hen permits and noted that he counted 29 of these permits. BH asked about some violations in the report. SC explained that there was no corrective action being taken at 22 Pulaski St. despite being issued tickets so that case may be going to court. She added that she had waived fee for 17 Central St. since they cleaned up the area as requested. She explained that there has been no response from the owner of CVS plaza on Lynnfield St. about rodents and that they have not paid the \$100 fine.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC will bring in permitting requirements for Funeral directors for BOH review.
Environmental updates- no votes anticipated		
Rousselot Complaint	BH noted that an anonymous complaint had been received about Rousselot regarding an offensive odor, and SC clarified that the complaint was given to the ward councilor and that it is difficult to address without speaking to the complainant directly. SC said that she would be in contact with their contact, Corey Carter, at Rousselot about this complaint.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC will contact Rousselot regarding complaint
Rodent Complaints	Reviewed.	
Information from Physicians for Social Responsibility re: Natural	SC explained that some time ago the Mass Association of Health Boards was asking for communities to sign on to a letter regarding fracking, which the City of Peabody BOH did not do at the time, but subsequently SC had	

<p>Gas Infrastructure and Health</p>	<p>attended a full day seminar on this topic. She explained that the letter on this issue was being sent up by the MAHB as a follow up to that. BH said that he has an opinion on this, and said that statements in the document like “the extraction of methane gas poses serious harm to public health and no regulatory framework in place to address this” should be an issue for DEP to deal with and not the local boards of health to address. He suggested that if gas were escaping and causing all of these diseases, DEP should step in and require a scrubber to be installed or some other remedy. LM suggested that DEP has recently reversed many of the environmental regulations that had previously been put in place . SC explained that this information was being put forth not to ask BOHs to enact regulations around this issue, but rather to have them weigh in on the need for alternative energy sources, which was the idea of the seminar. LM said that she is not surprised by the this and reminded how long we went without any regulations about smoking. TD said that he would be in support of doing more research on this issue. BH said that the issue becomes a political one, similar to the coal issue, and people would have to pick a side.</p>	
<p>Aggregate Industries 2017 Annual Report</p>	<p>SC distributed draft of memo to City Council summarizing BOH review of Aggregate’s annual report. SC highlighted that the BOH had been concerned about noise levels creeping up at one site and Aggregate had installed rubber screens which seems to have helped mitigate the noise. SC also discussed the air quality standards. It appears that for the compounds for which standards are available, they meet the standards, but there are some things that they measure that have no set reference standards. They said that since there are no standards, they can stop testing for them, but SC said that she wants them to continue to test for them, and wanted to know if the BOH agrees. She said that last year she had asked them, even though there is no standard, if they could they give some reference information for what other compounds these items are similar to and they could not do that. BH asked why there are no standards for some compounds, and theorized that it could be a cost issue for them, but SC replied that it is not Aggregate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOH members will review and submit any comments to SC.

	<p>because these standards are established by national bodies. She explained that one of the things there is no standard for is a 1-3 dichlorobenzene, but there are standards for 1-4 dichlorobenzene and for 1-2 dichlorobenzene, and both are up around 400,000 parts per million and the test result numbers are coming back around 1.2. She said that because of examples like this, the data without standards is still of value to her. BH agreed, but pointed out that carbon monoxide is very different form carbon dioxide, but said that they should continue as they have and ask for the testing to be included. SC said that she does not have to submit the response right away but asked the BOH to review and if they have any suggestions for edits to send it to her but not to all BOH members.</p>	
<p>Third Party Inspection report for Peabody Ash Monofill.</p>	<p>BH noted that the processing plant is currently shut down for maintenance for a few months. Also they noted that the inspection showed a fence that may need repair.</p>	
<p>Public health nursing updates- no votes anticipated</p>		
<p>Review of surveillance data</p>	<p>SC distributed surveillance data. TD asked to discuss how workplace cases of TB are followed. SC explained that patients with an active case of TB undergo a course of medication treatment with regular visits from a public health nurse to observe that medications are being taken. SC called in the city Public Health Nurse, Chassea Robinson, to provide further detail. CR explained the process, beginning with diagnosis and then discussing treatment and monitoring procedures, as well as contact testing. TD asked SC why TB was not included on the surveillance list, and assumed that that must mean there are 0 cases in Peabody, and SC replied that yes, the report</p>	

	is 70 items long so they only include those items where there have been more than 0 cases.	
School Nursing Updates- no votes anticipated		
Monthly Report	Reviewed.	
City Physician update	SC explained that the Mayor has identified a candidate for City Physician who will be going before City Council and directed BOH to his resume. BOH reviewed. SC also told the BOH that there is a shortage of epi-pens, there is a backlog of orders and the distribution company cannot meet the need. She is working on trying to get a prescription to go to pharmacies to purchase epi-pens before the dates expire on the current pens.	
Grant updates- No votes anticipated	Reviewed.	
City Council responses		
210 Andover St.; 139 Lynnfield St.; 3 Technology Dr.; 55R Walnut St.; 59-61 Walnut St.; Motion P182-18; P183-18	Reviewed. SC explained that the City Council had asked for proposed language regarding pest control and trash, etc., but she has asked for them to defer that issue until the regional work group, of which she is a part, has completed their regional IPM plan which will cover these topics. BH pointed out that there needs to be better communication between departments, building, fire, and all of the departments, so that there is a sign off to inform the health department of blasting, excavation, or anything that could trigger rodent infestations/migrations. SC said that in the IPM plan there will be a requirement for departments to take responsibility for different aspects of the plan and to be involved in the process.	
Review of enforcement cases- no votes anticipated		

Chapter II: 22 Pulaski St.; 8 Crowninshield St.; 258 Washington St.	Reviewed. BH pointed out a typo on the one letter, to 22 Pulaski St., which also says another address, which SC said would be corrected. BH pointed out that 8 Crowninshield is a condo owner issue, and questioned whether the BOH should be involved in these types of disputes. SC reviewed the state sanitary code requirements that the BOH must intervene in these instances if requested to do so. In condo situations, for common area issues each owner has a tenant/landlord relationship with the condo association.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC will correct typo on letter to 22 Pulaski St.
Nuisances: 19 Swampscott Ave.; 9 Sunnybrook Ln., 272 Lynn St., 82 Newbury St.; 79 Lynnfield St.	Reviewed.	
Environmental Smoke Regulations: 20 Central St.	BH noted letter from SC to management regarding smoking violation and said it looked good.	
FY19 Budget request- no votes anticipated	BH noted that the budget looked appropriate and hasn't changed much from past year. BH noted a raise is proposed for the health inspectors, and that the memo makes a strong case for the proposed increase. BH added that he is interested in speaking to the Mayor regarding the possible inclusion of the school nurses in the School budget. TD said that from a financial perspective the budget looks good, not too high. SC said the increases are for the purchase of defibrillators and some for pest control. BH asked if she is required to go out to bid for exterminator services, and SC replied that the party they use is on the state contract so there is not a requirement to go out separately to bid.	
Additional Issue: Gun violence letter	SC explained that for the letter re gun violence now 15 communities are involved, and that the word is spreading beyond our region, where originally there was a group of 8 communities who were signing on but now they have heard from people in western Massachusetts and the Greater Boston area. She added that people seem to be reaching out to their consortiums and are suggesting that others sign on to this letter as well. She	

	<p>added that some from the group are meeting with the person from Stop Handgun Violence to see if they can come up with some concrete action steps for local BOHs.</p>	
<p>Peabody Water Quality Concerns</p>	<p>SC informed BOH of complaints of a smell of the drinking water in West Peabody area. SC said that she had met last week with the engineers contracted by the City to provide technical assistance on this issue, and they have assured us that it truly is an aesthetic issue, they have notified the DEP, the disinfection residual in the water continues to exceed all the standards, the weekly bacteriological testing continues to meet all of the safety standards, and the drinking water continues to be safe for all uses, including to make infant formula and for people with immunocompromised systems. The engineers stated conclusively that there are no health concerns with it, it is just an aesthetic issue. They informed SC that they have been flushing the system, have been diluting the tanks with MWRA water from South Peabody, and had been hoping that by this week they would have resolved the issue but hope that by the end of the week it will be resolved. LM asked if this was different from the smell they have yearly, and SC replied that this tends to happen regularly, it was explained that basically something happens with algae when there is an inversion of cold and warm air which gets under the ice and stirs up the rotting vegetation from the bottom of the pond and results in an algal bloom. The engineers explained that this usually happens more in the spring but it is less noticeable then because there is greater water usage and the water is flushed through the system more quickly. It is more rare to have an algal bloom this early in the season but there were some very warm days in February. BH said that he had wondered if it was related to a change in the water filtration system. SC replied that they had not changed the water filtration system but had changed the method of disinfection, and the disinfection residual levels have continued to exceed standards so the engineers do not think that is the issue.</p>	<p>Item to be placed on agenda for next month with additional information forthcoming from DPS.</p>

<p>Template Regulations for marijuana establishments- Vote anticipated as to whether to schedule public hearing on proposed regulations.</p>	<p>SC directed BOH members to the template regulation for marijuana establishments and explained that this was put out by the Mass Association of Health Boards with the recommendation that communities consider adopting this as a placeholder regulation because there is language in the statute that says that the marijuana establishments have to comply with zoning and other ordinances in place at time of applications, and applications can be submitted as of April 1st. MAHB is concerned that if BOHs don't have something in place by then or shortly thereafter that anyone who applies early will slide under a loophole. This template is what MAHB proposes be adopted, very similar to template tobacco regulations. Final regulations for marijuana establishments are being promulgated tomorrow by the Secretary of State's office, and after they are published, they will be able to fine tune this but as of today this is what they are recommending. LM asked about the Mayor's proposed ban on recreational marijuana shops. SC said that it has been proposed, but not yet voted on by the City Council. LM asked whether the current BOH smoking regulations which include marijuana smoking will also apply to cannabis cafes. SC directed BOH to Cheryl Sbarro's memo, who makes the case that the City's smoking regulations would cover cannabis cafes, but it sounds like there may be some conflicting language that gives them a loophole that she is concerned about. LM said that DPH has similar concerns and she wonders if we are covered. SC said that she does feel that our current regulations cover because we have previously interpreted them to prohibit hookah establishments due to the smoke-free workplace law, but she is not sure if there is a special "carve out" for these cafes that may not be covered. BH said that he wonders how these proposed regulation overlap with the smoking regulations we have. SC said that this regulation covers issues such as the need for marijuana establishments to be permitted, the need to allow inspections, but even with our current regulations we may need to do this. TD asked about a reference on page 5 regarding licensing for marijuana establishments, and asked if it will be handled the way we handle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOH members will submit suggested edits to SC by April 6. • SC will make suggested edits to proposed regulations. • SC will add advertise a public hearing for review of proposed regulations next month.
--	---	---

permits for alcohol. SC said that it is. BH said on page 6-K -4, says the marijuana establishment shall submit a security plan, and said that this is an issue for police not the BOH. SC suggested that they can always make changes to this template regulations for details like that. LM said that she had not had time to carefully read the regulations and would not be able to vote to adopt them today. SC explained that they could not vote to adopt today but could only vote to hold a public hearing on the matter next month and next month they could vote on that. She added that the only issue is that they are suggesting that cities act quickly on this because if it is not in place then applicants might be grandfathered in. She said that she does not think that there are any filings that are going to be submitted immediately in Peabody. LM asked about whether there was language about "roll your own" since it was in the definition section but not in the regulations. SC said that she would suggest taking the language from Peabody's tobacco regulations and add them to this. BH referred to page 7, section L3 regarding fees, and said it should say fines will go to the city, and on number 4, which refers to fines, we should specify fine amounts. SC said that she could take our current fine amounts from our ticketing regulations and place them here. All agreed. BH also pointed out a typo in number 6 where it says the permit holder shall provide notice to suspend, but it should say the BOH. SC agreed that is a typo and will change. TD asked about on page 5 #12 at the top it says if you are going to sell marijuana you can't also sell tobacco, and he wondered about why liquor stores can. SC replied that she believes that is from the state law but would check on that and get back to them. TD asked under H which refers to no self-service displays, and wondered why. BH suggested that it may be due to shoplifting. SC said we could use our tobacco regulations which allow self service in over 21 only establishments. TD asked where we have those, and SC said the two smoke shops on Main Street are over 21 only, and they can not allow a person under 21 over the threshold, so they can have self service displays. SC explained that all marijuana sales are required to be 21 and over, unless a

	<p>child has a medical marijuana card, and LM said that makes her concerned about children if self service is allowed. TD said that he is agreeable to holding a hearing about these regulations. LM said that she would prefer more time to review these in greater detail, SC agreed that since they had proposed some changes that it would be better to put this off a month. LM said that she would not be comfortable voting on this right after the public hearing next month, and SC replied that they were not required to vote immediately after the public hearing and could take it under advisement. LM replied that in that case she was fine with putting this out to public hearing next month. All agreed to put template regulation on agenda for a public hearing next month, with suggested edits. SC asked BOH members to get any additional edits to her by April 6th and said that she would send out the revised document as soon as possible after for their review.</p>	
Correspondence for review (no votes anticipated)-	Reviewed.	
Additional Item: DEP letter re Crystal Lake	Reviewed.	
Next Meeting	Tuesday, April 24th, 2018 at 3:00 p.m.	
Adjournment	5:52 p.m.	

Filename: 3-22-18 minutes.docx
Directory: C:\Users\scott.west\Desktop\universal\health
Template: C:\Users\scott.west\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title: Regular meeting of the Board of Health, April 24, 2008
Subject:
Author: julie.rydzewski
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 4/24/2018 2:36:00 PM
Change Number: 2
Last Saved On: 4/24/2018 2:36:00 PM
Last Saved By: Sharon Cameron
Total Editing Time: 1 Minute
Last Printed On: 8/21/2018 10:34:00 AM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 16
Number of Words: 5,330 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 30,386 (approx.)