

Regular meeting of the Board of Health, February 22, 2018. In attendance: Chairman Bernard Horowitz; Thomas Durkin; Dr. Leigh Ann Mansberger; Health Department Director Sharon Cameron. The meeting was held at 5:00 p.m. in the lower level conference room, Peabody City Hall, 24 Lowell Street, Peabody.

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
APPROVAL OF MINUTES from January 25, 2018 meeting.	At 5:00 p.m. BH called meeting to order. BOH unanimously accepted minutes.	
<b>HEARING</b>		
Hearing regarding Order to correct violations issued for 1001 Pine Brook Way. Vote anticipated.	Scott Eriksen was present representing Pine Brook Estates. Adam Buckley was present representing City of Peabody. BH read hearing notice. LM explained that she would recuse herself from this hearing since she knows the property manager at this property. LM left the room. SC brought in Health Inspector Bill Pasquale to give a summary of the issues. BP explained that he had been called out on Jan.8 2018 by condominium owner Ann Saturnelli and her husband Phillip McCarthy in regard to water infiltration issues at their unit. Upon arrival he saw that there appeared to be water coming in from the second floor of the two -story townhouse unit in a sitting room off their bedroom area and coming down into the kitchen area on the first floor. A video was taken that day by unit owner’s attorney Rob Nislick which shows the issue, including the trash bags being used to try to funnel the water into buckets. In both areas the carpet was wet, and the owner mentioned that there had been previous issues with ice dams but it was unclear to the inspector if that was what was causing the water to come in. BP wrote a violation letter. The day he was there were workers shoveling snow off the roofs. BH asked if there were any other water sources that were near where the water was coming in like bathrooms above that could have caused the water to come in. BP replied that there were none above the second floor where the water was coming in. BH asked if unit owner Ann Saturnelli was present, and she replied that she was, and asked her if that was an accurate description of the water issue and what had inspired her to call the Health Department. She said that it was accurate and said that she had called because she had tried in prior seasons when this had occurred to remedy this when this had occurred, which only happened when	Condo association to submit a plan to BOH by May 1, 2018 for repairs to building as indicated by qualified contractor, which may include roof/fascia boards/gutters/insulation, and others. Repairs to be completed by October 1, 2018.

there were ice dams, adding that this never occurred when it rained. She had asked the property owners to address this, and there had been some minor fixes but nothing had solved the problem and last time they had a terrible winter they had more damage but nothing had been done to solve the problem or to repair the damages. BH asked how long this had been going on and the owner and owner's husband, Phil McCarthy, replied that it had begun in the winter of 2009-2010, which was the first time they had brought it to the property owner's attention. BH asked if they have had to do interior repairs due to this and AS replied yes, repeatedly, and currently has six buckets ready waiting and keeps pliers nearby as this is ongoing. BH asked Robert Nislick if he was the attorney representing Ms. Saturnelli and he replied that he is, explaining that he was first contacted by PM and AS in Feb, 2015, when they had that historic winter, and on multiple occasions in 2015 after they had snow, freezing, melting and refreezing there were melting ice dams and water would pour into AS's unit. At that time photos and videos of this were taken, which were recently forwarded to the BOH for review. RN stated that he had communicated on the Saturnelli's behalf on at least three occasions with the board of trustees requesting a fix of this problem that they deemed a violation of the state sanitary code. 105 CMR 410.500 deals with the owner's responsibility to maintain the premises in a water tight and weather tight condition which is free from chronic dampness and there is a specific provision in the state sanitary code that defines owner of certain exterior and common areas as the condominium trustees. On many occasions the discussion with condo owners led to the fact that if they owned a single family home there was no way that they would allow this problem to go on so long and would have found someone to fix the problem, but since the condominium association owns the roof and is responsible for repairs to the roof the situation is out of their hands and in the hands of the condominium trustees to fix it Attorney Nislick went on to say that they had written at least three letters in 2015 asking for a permanent fix and the board communicated through its attorney and management company saying things such as they had an engineer go out who was assessing all of the roofs and looking for ice dam issues, that they did not see anything in their unit and that they are closing their file. He added that they are taking a proactive approach to trying to get ice and snow off the roofs,

but it is not enough because the building is not water tight and weather tight and able to maintain the premises in a way that is free from chronic dampness. In winters subsequent to 2015 the weather has not been quite so bad, however, in January of this year there was a similar snowstorm with about six inches of snow and some melting and refreezing and some ice dams had formed and on January 6, 7 & 8<sup>th</sup> Ms. Saturnelli and Mr. McCarthy experienced water infiltration into their unit that was caused by ice dams. He stated that AS forwarded photos and videos showing water coming right in from the outside streaming down the windowpane. Their standard practice is to use black garbage bags as funnels to direct water into buckets to protect the floors and such, and that they have carpets pulled up and back and towels down to absorb water. Their view is that this is a violation of the state sanitary code and appreciate that Mr. Pasquale came out to inspect. They were aware that management company representatives were coming out to investigate on Feb. 7<sup>th</sup>, of 2018, in response to the order to correct. BH asked about from 2015, in 2016 and 2017, were there similar issues. PM replied that this happens when there is significant snow and freezing/refreezing, and that until now there had not been a repeat of the specific circumstances that led to the problem, except that once last year there was an occasion with significant snowfall and freezing but they had the roof shoveled immediately after a storm and there was no problem. AS stated that this year after the storm in February for several days the roofs had not been cleared. RN added that in response to inspector BP's order he had tried to arrange a time for the associations contractor to come out to have access. They now understand that the contractor had come out on Feb.7<sup>th</sup>. At that time they were not aware that any work had been done, and did not learn about something being done until they saw a letter yesterday stating this. In regard to satisfactoriness of the fix, there is no way to know if the fix that was done is sufficient, and it will take having a similar large snowfall and freezing conditions to know if the fix was a success. Based upon the fact that it is a recurring situation they feel that the Board should keep the order open until they have that kind of significant snowstorm again to see if the fix has corrected the issue. Tom Durkin asked if he should view the video, and SC replied that she had not been out to the unit, but the video was useful to support BP's observations. SC showed TD one of the

videos from January 6<sup>th</sup>. TD commented that he saw the water coming down and the garbage bags. BH asked if Attorney Scott Erikson, representing the Condo Association, had seen the video, and he had not, so BH suggested that he watch the video as well. RN showed videos on a laptop of the videos he had taken when BP inspected the premises. He also showed a second video of that day, noting that water was coming down the wall. Mr. Erikson spoke representing the condominium association, said that he also had property manager Rhonda Ziner and two condo association Board members there tonight, as well as a representative from SPS Construction who did the work on the unit, Jeff Pike. SE said that the winter of 2015 was a horrible winter, and that they represent about 700 condo associations and about 500 of them had ice dam issues. He noted that the letter from attorney Nislick states that they are grateful for the responsiveness that the management company has shown especially during this challenging winter. He stated that the association diligently addresses issues, but unfortunately they do live in New England and so ice dams do happen. They said that they do not want this to rise to an issue where it consumes too much of the BOH's time but that having been said they want to be sure that this is dealt with in a complete manner, and they think they have done so. If there are additional fixes needed they can explore them in the spring. There is some long term planning that needs to be done here, but the way he sees it is that this hearing is related to this particular incident. BH asked building manager Rhonda Ziner if there were any other complaints from any other units about these issues. RZ asked for clarification on when he was referring to. BH replied clarifying since 2015. RZ replied that in 2015 they had many units complain of ice dams. BH asked how they dealt with those complaints. RZ replied that they did roof raking to try to minimize whatever damage they could, and then they hired SPS, and Jeff will be able to discuss what they had done, but they had done inspections in 2015 to see what they could do to avoid or minimize ice dams given the reality that ice dams are going to occur. She also stated that they do not have any roof leaks when it rains. It is all ice and snow related. BH asked how old roofs are, and RZ replied 14-16 years old. BH said that if the issue only happened once that would be one thing, but since it continues to happen the condo association has to do something. SE added that they

had also submitted some photos showing that if there was buildup in certain areas where snow rakes may have damaged roofing, there would be water seeping in between the seams, which has since been corrected and hopefully that will resolve the ice damming. RZ said in 2016 and 2017 the board made a conscious decision that they did not want to experience what they had in 2015, and so they took the proactive approach that, if they had a certain amount of snow, and the temperatures would be 30 degrees and below which could lead to ice dams, they hired SPS to do roof raking. She added that Ann is correct that they did not leak because they did roof raking last year and this year in 2017 when they had 12-15 inches of snow, unfortunately what happened is that during that weekend temperatures dropped to zero degrees and it was unsafe and roofers could not get on the roof. What then happened is that on Monday the roofers got out there and raked the roofs, which the inspector saw when he was there. She added that they had received a call from Ann on Saturday saying that water was coming in, but they could not rake because it was unsafe for roofers to go up. BH asked that Jeff Pike from SPS speak. JP asked if they had seen the pictures of the ice dams. BH replied that they had seen the pictures of the damaged shingles, adding that that appeared to be a lot of damage to be done by roof rakes, that it looked like a mess with the gutters and other issues. JP showed photos from two days after the snowstorm, explaining that this was an ice dam that was a foot and a half thick. He added that it was a day and a half after the snowstorm, adding that this is what they would call excessive heat loss from the interior of the unit. If you have that amount of heat loss, you will get that size ice dam developing that quickly. Typically in 2015 those ice dams took a month to develop, because it happened gradually. They should be able to get out there two days later to remove snow and not have foot and a half ice dams. He added that roof damage can happen from raking. BH asked about ice and water shields, JP replied that there is 100 percent ice and water shield on the roof, but none of these leaks occurred in the roof, which is why the leaks are showing up along the walls. He added that occupant does not have any interior damage on the ceilings, because water goes down the walls. There were some issues with the new roof originally because they didn't replace skylights, but they have been back there to replace skylights, to do chimney cap work, but the roofs themselves have not failed.

What they have there is a roof system integrated with a fascia system that has a gutter system that was not replaced, so you're trying to integrate flashing systems into an existing wood fascia board system that is outdated. Construction has changed. The other issue is that you have a California style building that the first question is what can SPS or any building company do to help ice dam issues, and the only thing they can do is increase ventilation from the soffits and the ridge vent, and that has been done, ventilation has been maximized, and you can't add any more ventilation there. It is now up to the homeowners to get an insulation company out there to stop the heat loss that will prevent the ice from forming. BH asked if it was just on their building or if it was everywhere. JP replied that it is everywhere. He added that they are doing a project in Hingham being proactive with insulation through the Mass Saves Program. BH asked how confident he is in his fix from ten days before. JP replied that he has been with the company for 25 years and has seen every type of leak imaginable. He added that he has the best ventilation system in his own home, and even he had ice dams in 2015, so nobody is immune to it, it is unavoidable. 2015 with the really bad snow year the board contacted him because they had spent a tremendous amount on snow and ice removal. He had good success with detail along the fascia lines which basically covers the entire fascia line and is integrated with the roof. SE suggested that JP walk the BOH through the photos to explain the repairs. Ice dam was on the gutter, the water backed up behind the strip edge. He pointed out where the ice and water shield was, saying that it is wrapped over the fascia board, and stated that you can see that there is a void there. That is below the drip edge, and referred to the good shape of the surface and doesn't know where the broken shingles were in the pictures the board had mentioned seeing earlier, but suggested that it could have been from during the time when they were making the repair. JP explained that the water backed up behind the fascia board, travelled down the walls and came in through the windows. BH asked what is his opinion of putting in those electric drip conduits that can be plugged in to remove the snow and ice. JP replied that there are a couple of things that can be done. One is to remove the gutters, but then you have to worry about water getting inside but then you have water coming down and dripping off roofs onto people and causing damage. BH asked JP as

someone with 27 or so years experience, has he done this type of fix before. Yes, but it was a test over here. He implements it on all his jobs now, puts a sub-fascia on and runs the ice and water shield all the way around and put the fascia board over it so that they do not have any infiltration. The problem is that he is trying to do this with an existing roof system. He would not look anyone in the eye and guarantee that it is going to work here, but would say that the next time they install a roof system they should use this technique. BH asked about the two fascia boards that had been referenced. JP replied that they have to implement a sub-fascia because the ice and water shield has to go up against a smooth surface otherwise the ice and water shield will not work. They wouldn't be able to guarantee tying into the whole roof. BH stated that it doesn't seem to be a unique problem, and someone like him in the roofing business must see this all the time, and there might be some sort of fix that they could fairly guarantee. JP replied that once again, this is a California style building, but if he could introduce the proper insulation, and ventilation, yes, they do it all the time. BH asked what the plan is for the next snow storm. JP said he would like to go through the rest of the description of the repair. This repair is designed to do, when they remove the bottom piece of drip edge, similar to when they found the void, they put in a new strip of ice and water shield that is wrapped down under the fascia board, the drip edge then goes back on and they wrap the drip edge in a waterproof membrane. That gives coverage there at the fascia line. BH asked if the job is done now. JP replied that this was a repair because weather was coming, and this was an investigation to see if water was actually getting in there. SC asked if they just did a short segment, about 8 inches of uncovered area, and JP replied yes, they found 8 inches, can't tell you why it was there, is assuming that the fascia board was probably replaced there at some point, and when the fascia board was replaced the covering may or may not have been torn out. BH asked what work remains to be done there to complete the project. JP replied that he would probably recommend that they do the same repair that they had done on the other home, but they need to understand that these pictures are not indicative of what you have, you have gabled ends that have little corners, and turns and it is tough to get this water tight with waterproofing membrane. BH asked when they would decide that roof raking would

be done. Property manager RZ replied that they had entered into a contract with SPS before the season and are considered what they call a prioritized client, and any time the conditions warrant roof raking, they will call and they come. BH asked for an idea of what triggers it. RZ replied that they had already called for the roof raking for Pine Brook in the most recent storm but the conditions made them unable to get workers on the roof safely. BH asked how many inches would decide to call for roof raking. JP replied that if there is a foot of snow and if the forecast is for temperatures below zero they are going to recommend that they remove the snow. Also, in cases like just the prior week, when they had 6 inches of snow, and it was going to be above 30 degrees all week they are going to say don't waste your money because it will melt, and the ice won't form unless the temperature is below freezing. At Pine Brook the situation was that they had gotten 4-5 inches of snow a couple weeks before, then the temperature was 10 below zero for two weeks solid, then they got the 12 inches of snow. They were already scheduled for two days later, again, that amount of ice, they had done the same snow removal on 15 other properties and didn't see ice like that. BH asked if they have to call for the roof raking or if the roofers just come. RZ replied that they call them. She added that the condo board members live on the property and work with her to determine how much snow they have gotten, and they then discuss by e-mail and contact the contractors when needed. Resident and chairman of the Pine Brook Board Mark Frechette stated that he lives in the unit behind AS. He stated that he has lived there for 18 years and that he also has had leaks in his condo. He said that you can see the ice dams begin to form on the gutters in one day. He added that RZ called him and said that there had been a great deal of snow and asked for an update. He told her that there were huge ice dams and icicles forming along the north side of the building. She sent the email asking the board if they wanted to do the ice raking, and they all voted yes and she contacted SPS, and unfortunately in between some water got in. JP said that it is really a double-edged sword, and told of a property they have in Wayland that had 91 leaks in 2015. They implemented this system last year and this year. This year they spent \$70,000 in snow removal, and they didn't get one leak, but he was called in there for a special meeting because the homeowners are upset about spending so much for snow

removal, so it is a no-win situation. BH said that in 2015 he understands, because he knew many people who also had ice dam issues that year, but this year he hasn't heard of ice dams being a big issue. JP replied that there are ice dams, and he had done \$225,000 of roof raking in three days. RZ said that a lot of their associations have been proactive because they don't want to see what happened in 2015 happen again so they are doing the roof raking. JP stated that he wanted to be clear that there is nothing that he can do on the outside of that building that can prevent the ice dams from happening. There is nothing more that can be done, can't add additional soffit vents because of the style of the building. The only way to stop the ice dams is to stop the heat loss inside the building, and he stated that he wants to be clear on this. BH replied that the other thing is to remove the snow. And JP said yes but that comes at a cost. RN asked what they need to do to reduce the heat loss out of the buildings. JP replied that they need to have the homes properly insulated, and said that if you have 1 ½ feet of ice on the gutter in two days then you have a heat loss issue. RN asked where should the insulation be put. BH suggested that they have Mass Saves come out to tell them where to put it. Attorney RN replied that they had Mass Saves come out and put in insulation a few years ago. RZ said that the condo association had Mass Saves come after the 2015 storms to do an assessment, and they gave suggestions on sealing the attic areas, on areas needing insulation and other things. She added that the association actually paid for these things to be done because they wanted 100 percent participation. She added that it is possible that the contractor did not do the best job, and that perhaps another source that specializes in insulation needs to come out and do an assessment. RN stated that the area where the insulation was placed is also within a common area of the condominium, so in an area where the condo association has the obligation to repair, maintain and replace. It is not something that AS and RM can say that they need more insulation or that they can call somebody to install more insulation, but they need the condo board to be doing that. JP replied that they had just heard that they did because Mass Save was brought in after 2015. RN stated that the main thing is that they did something, a section of the roof, but not the whole thing, they did insulation that was not a complete job, because it didn't stop the problem. BH interjected that he is not sure how much heat

would be in a common area. RN explained that the common area begins with the ceiling up and their unit begins with whatever is inside the walls. The common area isn't all common, but refers to the areas that the association is responsible for, sometimes referred to as the difference between studs in and studs out. Generally speaking studs out is called a common area. BH asked if Mass Saves did the entire building. JP replied that typically where the heat loss comes in is between the ceiling and the attic. BH asked if when they had Mass Save out there they took care of those areas. The association members replied yes. AS said historic winters aside, they had problems before the 2015 winter, caulking, etc., had brought in contractors to replace something around the windows to try to fix these issues as well. On the insulation issue, they had no way to get in to the attic areas and had to cut holes in the closet ceilings to get up and put in insulation. BH said that it seems that the condo association had made an effort, they had seen pictures of the repair that had been done, that they are doing roof raking, and don't know if they can ask for them to do anything else at this point. Unfortunately they may need to wait for another snowstorm to see if that fix worked. JP added that they are going to recommend making the repair, that they need to remove the gutters and wrap 100 percent, but added that they are only going to prevent water infiltration but it will not prevent ice dams. BH said that there is at least that measure, but they would need a timeframe with that, and it can't wait until next November or December. SE said that they took care of the one section that affects the owners there, but the association understand that it is contractually obligated to take care of the common areas and will continue to do so. BH said that the type of solution that JP has recommended, as the expert in the field, he would put that in writing to say that the solution that you recommend including the extra fascia board and the drip edge, be done in a timely manner before next season, with a deadline of by October 1<sup>st</sup> 2018. AS asked if the repair to be made is the same one that was done on three other buildings as a test case, did any of those leak this last storm. RZ replied that they had leaks but not in the areas where they had repairs. AS said that was one of the things she has concerns about. JP said that roofs are designed to shed water, but with ice dams everything goes backwards, so if you have a roof vent or anything on the roof, you could potentially have leaks so

you just have to remove the snow because no system is going to stop it. RN remarked on the need to remove the snow. In particular, in 2015 when more than half of the units had leaks, there came a point when the board and residents came to the conclusion that when additional snows were expected then the snow would have to be removed in a timely fashion and after the first series of weeks that was done. There was discussion of doing so in succeeding years. In the last couple of years the snowfall wasn't anywhere as voluminous and there may have been one or two instances where they came out and did so in a timely fashion. But here, in the most recent incident, they are not hearing about things being done in a timely fashion for this recent storm. The storm happened on a Thursday and they were unable to get there for roof raking until Monday. They have a long history, several units have a long history with this, and the day after the storm was perfectly fine, and they may be busy, with plowing or such, and Rhonda said she had called three companies, but none could come out until Monday. The snowstorm was predicted all week and no pre-planning had been made. JP said that none of his crew worked on Friday because of the dangerous conditions. RN said that Saturday and Sunday were terrible conditions, but the weather on Friday was fine. JP said that everyone was busy digging out on Friday. RN said that the issue was about planning not about their availability. SE said since it is a volunteer board coordinating as quickly as possible with a property manager who then coordinates with the contractor, and if weathermen were perfect it would be a different thing, but planning a week in advance based upon a forecast is inconsistent or incompatible with their fiduciary obligations to maintain the association funds, so there is a balance to be made here, but he would argue that Monday removal for a Thursday storm is responsive given the circumstances. BH stated that these occupants have a history of these things happening, with water coming running down their walls. SE replied that they did in 2015. AS and PM interjected that they have evidence of these things happening since 2009-2010. SE replied that in 2016 & 2017 there was nothing, and now since Mass Save had been in, since they had implemented a roof raking program, the association's mind is that they have taken these steps, the protocols are in place, and it was only recently with the perfect storm of circumstances in place that this happened again. BH stated that

moving forward it looks like there is a solution, but they are just looking for it to be done in a timely manner, before ice dams form. Board member stated that the people living there are working class people and cannot pay \$5,000 each, every winter to clear snow, and added that there is no way to know if ice dams will form, and if ice dams form they have the raking done. RZ interjected that she had to correct that, it is not just waiting for them to form, but they monitor the temperatures and amount of snow as well. Attorney RN said that the point is that it is not just a matter of shoveling off the roof, but that discussion was heard on additional building issues that need to be addressed, so it has to be both. If this snow clearing was a little late and they will be more proactive in the future that is great, but when it comes to the building work that part of the fix should not be lost because based upon everything that we heard something more can be done. BH stated that the condo association must put something in writing that says they would be proactive, that the snow will be taken off in a timely manner, and that the work that was described today that needs to be done will be done by a specific timeframe, by October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018. SE asked for clarification from BH of what the scope of work that they are referring to because they heard about a lot of things today. BH replied that this is the fascia replacement, how many feet it will be. The BOH would like to see that plan of what changes will be made and what exactly the work will be, and when completed by. RZ asked if they could have some time to get this done. BH said they could have two months and asked if that was enough time. The association board chairman said that while it is reasonable to have all of the repairs done by October, the planning and implementation is the most important part of that, and they don't want to rush it. They want to have time to investigate and to make sure they have a workable plan in place. BH asked when they think this could be done. RZ asked if June 1<sup>st</sup> sounded ok. BH said that was too late. RZ said that they still have to hold a board meeting and get it approved and get pricing. BH said they can send the BOH their plan subject to review and approval by your board. BH pointed out that the sooner they get the BOH a draft proposal the better to ensure that they are not delayed in meeting the October 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for completion of repairs. The BOH wants to approve as well and will have some people look it over who are experts in the field. SE suggested April

	<p>30<sup>th</sup> and the BH agreed but said May 1<sup>st</sup> will be the due date and they want to have it to distribute and review. All were in agreement. The hearing was adjourned at approx. 6:00 p.m.</p>	
<p>Hearing regarding proposed apprenticeship program submitted by Luxe Beauty, Inc.</p>	<p>SC invited BOH member LM to return to the meeting, and introduced Darryl McCarthy, Administrative Assistant from the Mayor’s office, who would assist with note taking for the following hearing. Permit holder Hahn Tran was present. BH read hearing notice, explaining that this was being held at the request of Hanh Tran, the owner of Luxe Beauty at 3 Bourbon Street, Peabody, to review and vote on the proposed apprenticeship program at that location. BH asked about the permit issued to their establishment, which covers micropigmentation, microblading, and permanent makeup. BH asked if this was the only type of tattooing they do and HT replied that yes, it was the only type. BH asked how long she had had a permit for this type of tattooing. HT replied almost three years, adding that the reason she came up with the idea of doing this apprenticeship program at her establishment was because when she was looking to be trained in this there was no one in Massachusetts willing to train in it, and she had to go to New Hampshire to get trained and to obtain her permits. BH said in her submission to the BOH, she stated, “I Hanh Trahn, being the master artist...” and asked what that title entails and how one gets that title. HT explained that she is part of the Phi Academy, where she was trained in microblading, and it is a very long process to get trained to become an artist and to slowly build up your experience. BH asked if she was an associate member of the American Academy of Micropigmentation, as it says in the regulations you are required to be, and HT said she is. He said that he went onto their website and saw some of the requirements that they have including 100 hours of required training and a specialized training for certifying instructors. HT replied that she is not really going to be instructing, everyone who comes for an apprenticeship would have already had all of their required hours of training, but she would just be supervising people in the practicum experience. She added that she actually had received over 100 hours of training. BH explained that it is not just the hours, but the Academy site said they require five years of experience. He said that she is going to be teaching things and that these people are going to be poking under the skin and causing bleeding. BH said his concern is not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH asked that HT return next month with more details.</li> <li>• LM asked for the details to include the number of years of practice, the number of times she has performed each of the procedures she would be overseeing, and information on her professional associations.</li> <li>• LM said that she will try to contact one of the professional associations to see if they could give some sort of guidelines for apprenticeship programs.</li> <li>• SC will send letter to inform of the date and time of the next BOH meeting.</li> </ul>

with apprenticeship, but with her level of experience. BH asked where she attended training, and she said the Phi Academy was where she received her extra training in microblading and micropigmentation. TD asked where she trained before Phi Academy. HT replied that she studied with Robert Holmes at the Dragon Clay which was on her licensing application form. She was an apprentice with him. She said she also had experience in Oklahoma before then but was not required to be licensed there. She said that she attended the Cosmetic Tattoo Academy in California which became the Phi Academy, and then to Robert Holmes for apprenticeship. BH asked how many clients she sees per day and if anyone else does what she does at her current establishment. HT replied that she does about three per day as it can take up to three hours per client, and no, there are others but none doing what she does. BH said that he wonders what the difference would be for the American Academy of Micropigmentation's requirements for being an instructor and what the difference would be from what she is doing. HT said that there are many people who are looking for experience and there are not people here willing to take people on as apprentices. BH stated that he is troubled by the part that the Academy says that an instructor must have 5 years of experience. HT replied that again, she does not consider herself an instructor, and apprentices would need to come to her with their didactic training already completed. TD asked when counting her years of practicing, does she include the Robert Holmes years or just the time after that. HT replied that they include the Robert Holmes time. TD asked again to clarify, that she did one year as an apprentice, then two years practicing, and another year here in Peabody. She said that she could take out a Master Artist certification, but she doesn't want to, and doesn't have a curriculum. LM said that what HT submitted looks like a curriculum. HT replied that she was told by John Yale that what she originally submitted for paperwork was not sufficient, so she created a more detailed training document but reiterated that most of the information the apprentice will already have before coming to her as apprentices. LM asked if HT tracks the number of procedures she does. If she is going to supervise an apprenticeship, could she give a breakdown of the procedures she would be performing. HT replied that the most popular is anything related to the eyebrows, eyeliner, and lip pigmentation. LM asked if she could estimate how many of these she

has done. BH suggested that the BOH table this issue for now, and HT will return with more complete information on the number of years she has practiced and the number of procedures she has completed, and provide more information on what she would be supervising, would the apprentice be able to jump in with the eyebrows or would they have to watch and how many time watching before practicing. LM also asked if HT is required to or if she takes any continuing education courses in her field. HT replied that she doesn't know the state requirement but she tries to go to at least one conference per year. LM said that she shares some of the concerns of the Chairperson, where the Society of Permanent Cosmetic Professionals which says it requires five years of experience, and trainers will complete no less that 16 hours of continuing education over a two-year period, and each trainer will attend the train the trainer program. LM added that this is again where they get into the question of are you a trainer or are you supervising an apprentice. HT agreed and said that she also needs clarification, because when she was an apprentice her person said that he was not a trainer, that she was her employer, she came in to get her hours, they took before and after photos and went over consent forms, etc., so she is confused about this too. LM asked if HT would be there the entire time supervising them. HT replied yes, she would be there for the whole process. TD said to follow up, she would be observing someone's performance in techniques that she is quire experienced in. LM said that for next time she would like for each technique she would be supervising, a breakdown of the number of times for each she has done. TD asked if she is a member of professional associations, to which HT said she is. TD asked if it was a requirement of those to take continuing education, and HT replied that they do not require it, but she goes because she wants to remain up to date with the products and procedures. BH asked that she also write down for next time the professional associations that she is associated with. LM suggested that she should not presume the level of expertise of any of those who came in as apprentices, because levels can vary. She suggested that she would also need to be sure that there is some way of qualifying people who come to her to be certain that they are ready to practice. LM asked another question, regarding her proposal where she refers to a minimum of thirty times, and asked if there were some sort of industry standard for this. HT replied that

	<p>some people in the field refer to numbers of procedures and some refer to the number of hours, and she did not know which to choose. LM said that she will try to contact one of the professional associations to see if they could give some sort of guidelines for apprenticeship programs. HT replied that it would be very helpful because she had tried to research that and could find nothing on apprenticeship requirements. SC told HT that the BOH would inform her of the date of the next meeting once it has been decided. HT asked if she would receive another letter and SC replied that she would. The hearing was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.</p>	
Hearing regarding proposed amendments to “Environmental Smoke Regulations”	(Please refer to notes taken by Darryl McCarthy)	
Permitting updates		
Review of list of permits issued in January 2018- Vote anticipate whether to accept list.	Reviewed.	List unanimously accepted.
Environmental updates		
Northeast Nurseries – composting report	BH referenced composting report, which describes some changes in operation, a continuing effort to reduce volume of materials on site, screening of tailings to create recyclable loam, all of which should result in more open space for the Spring Season. No recent neighborhood complaints that they are aware of.	
Rodent Complaints	BH referenced the map showing where the rodent complaints have been identified throughout the city. SC explained that she has been asked to go before City Council to discuss the rodent issue on March 8, so she has begun gathering the data on this for that, and it is definitely a problem throughout the North Shore. The Council has also asked that the city’s contracted exterminator to attend as well, who says it is a problem throughout his entire service area. She explained that the regional task force which she is a member of has decided to use some of the remaining money from a grant to do	BOH unanimously approves of existing Health Department protocol for management of rodent complaints.

	<p>a regional IPM project. BH asked about a proposed regulation for those who would be doing any road opening, construction, renovation which could create pest issues for abutters. SC said that one of the things that will come out of the regional IPM will be a set of template ordinances for consideration, with the idea that if we are all uniform on the North Shore it would be helpful for people working in the area to know to build this into their projects. BH asked about timing, and SC replied that they are trying to get the plan back from the contractor by June 1<sup>st</sup> so that they can start implementing the recommendations over the summer. SC went over the procedure in dealing with rat complaints. She said that they log all complaints received, and then the inspector will walk the neighborhood and will distribute the educational flyer to all houses in the neighborhood, as he's doing the walkaround will look for any potential point sources like unkempt properties, overgrown vegetation, people not managing their trash well, etc. and will reach out to those properties that are visible to them usually with some education. If they do not respond, they can issue an enforcement order. They ask for neighbors to give some feedback, if they continue to receive complaints they will send out the exterminator and he will do the same walkaround inspection, and will lay bait in the sewers in those areas if indicated.</p>	
<p>EPA Toxic Release Inventory</p>	<p>BH asked for the reason for the EPA Toxic Sites Inventory printout. SC explained that the Patch newspaper nationwide did a story on toxic sites, which is a little bit of a misnomer, and then they personalized it for local communities citing places that could be a danger if they flood. There has been some local press on this. She explained that she went into the EPA registry and was thinking they meant sites where hazardous waste was released (21E sites), but that is not what this is. This list refers to sites that use or handle hazardous chemicals, which are required to do reporting to the fire department, and have plans in place in the event of a fire or flood or some sort of accidental release. These sites will also be considered as part of the Mayor's Hazard Vulnerability Assessment (HVA) process designed to build resiliency around climate change so these sites will be considered as part of that planning process. LM asked if we have mapped these sites against FEMA flood areas. SC explained that these 8 sites are in areas in danger of flooding. BH explained that the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) has authority over such issues, and the Fire Department has</p>	

	information on what materials they would have to deal with should an incident occur at one of these locations. BH explained that these plans are reviewed and submitted to MEMA for review. BH explained that all of the places listed have all been in place for 40 years or more, and have survived flooding since then. BH explained that he feels confident in the system right now in regard to these locations. SC stated she has reached out to DEP to see if there are additional steps that should be taken, and they have not indicated the need for further followup.	
Regulatory updates		
Public health nursing updates- no votes anticipated		
Review of surveillance data	BH referred to the surveillance data report which showed what had gone on with flu cases in January and February. They had 95 cases in January and 100 in the first two weeks in February. TD pointed out that SC had given the prior year's numbers for comparison and it showed that this had been a really bad year for the flu. LM pointed out that there had been 84 deaths this year nationwide from the flu. SC said that she, Brenda Wolff, and Chassea Robinson had done a presentation on the flu on cable TV since there has been so much unease over this issue.	
School Nursing Updates-no votes anticipated		
Monthly Report	TD asked for some clarification on how to read the reports since the numbers do not seem to add up. Reviewed.	
City Physician update	SC reported that no replacement has been found for the City Physician yet.	
Grant updates- No votes anticipated		

City Council responses – 43 Main St., 86B Main St., 36B Walnut St., 7 Washington St., 151 Andover St., I technology Drive.		
	Reviewed. SC pointed out the special permit request by the new owners of 43 Main Street, where Maki Sushi is located. She explained that Maki Sushi will double its restaurant’s size on the first floor, and on the second and third floors the new owner will run a function facility for up to 450 people, and they envision having functions there every weekend. They will not be installing full kitchen facilities, instead they will be bringing in outside caterers. SC said that they are meeting with operator on Monday and will find out more about their plans.	
Review of enforcement cases		
Chapter II: 2 Aborn St., 14 Farm Ave, 3 Abington Ave, 45 Veterans Memorial Drive	Reviewed.	
Nuisances: 17 Central St., 18 Bowditch St.	Reviewed. BH pointed out that the owners of 17 Central St. had been fined \$100 for their lack of cleaning up discarded tires, furniture. SC replied that they have now cleaned it up.	
Capital Improvement Request	Reviewed. BH brought up the budget and suggested that they should think about shifting the responsibility for the school nurses to the schools. SC replied that she would suggest that if he wants to proceed on this issue he should speak to the Mayor to see how he feels on this issue. BH explained that the reason for the City taking the nurses under the City budget decades ago was because under proposition 2 ½, there	

	was a danger of school nurses to be cut so the Mayor shifted them to the City side, but now it is a different time and there is no danger of that. BH said he will contact Mayor and then he will proceed with speaking with acting Superintendent Levine and the new superintendent Cara Murtagh about this. SC made one request, that if BH does proceed with this idea, she would like to see some protections built in for the school nurse leader position because it is the only position that is not in the union and she would not want to see this position adversely impacted by this decision.	
Correspondence for review (no votes anticipated)- From Sovereign Consulting re: 468 Lowell Street.	Reviewed.	
Next Meeting	Thursday, March 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2018 at 3:00 p.m.	
Adjournment	7:46 p.m.	

Filename: 2-22-18 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: 3/16/2018 9:52:00 AM  
Change Number: 9  
Last Saved On: 3/20/2018 2:43:00 PM  
Last Saved By: Sharon Cameron  
Total Editing Time: 84 Minutes  
Last Printed On: 8/21/2018 10:33:00 AM  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 20  
Number of Words: 7,184 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 40,955 (approx.)