



Committee on Community Resources and the Northampton City Council

Committee Members:

Chair: Councilor James Nash

Vice-Chair: Councilor Alex Jarrett

Councilor Karen Foster

Councilor John Thorpe

Meeting Minutes

Date: April 26, 2021

Time: 5 p.m.

Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

1. **Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call.** At 5:01 p.m. Councilor Nash called the meeting to order. Present were Councilors James Nash, Chair; Alex Jarrett, Vice-Chair; Karen Foster (5:04 p.m.) and John Thorpe. Also present were Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch and Administrative Assistant Laura Krutzler.
2. **Announcement of Audio/Video Recording**
Councilor Nash announced that the meeting was being audio and video recorded.
3. **Public Comment**
Councilor Nash opened the floor to general public comment. He advised members of the public that they would be able to interact with councilors during discussion of the individual agenda items, so they should hold their comments if they are related to specific items. There being no general public comment, Councilor Nash proceeded to the next agenda item.
4. **Updates and Announcements from Committee Members**
Regarding municipal broadband, Safe Tech Northampton is holding a forum at 6 pm. today on municipal internet, Councilor Nash announced. The Zoom link can be found on Facebook.

Councilor Foster joined at 5:04 p.m.
5. **Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2021**
Councilor Jarrett moved to approve the minutes of January 27, 2021. Councilor Thorpe seconded.

Approval was tabled until the next meeting
6. **Items Referred to Committee**
 - A. **21.217 An Ordinance to Move Zero Lot Line from Section 10.14 to Section 6.13 - referred by City Council 4/1/2021**

B. 21.218 An Ordinance to Amend Zero Lot Line Section of Code - referred by City Council 4/1/2021

Councilor Nash introduced Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch. He framed the discussion by saying it is meant to be an opportunity for the public to engage with councilors on the committee around these particular zoning proposals.

Councilor Jarrett asked if they would be voting on a recommendation and Councilor Nash said yes.

Ms. Misch gave a brief Powerpoint presentation [see attachment to master version of minutes].

Zero Lot line Modifications

Ms. Misch gave a brief history of the zero lot line (ZLL) ordinance, which has been on the books for over 20 years in various forms. Initially it was adopted to allow for a variety of layouts. In residential cluster developments - developments of at least four acres where lots are clustered with some land permanently protected as open space – it was one option an applicant could use to locate buildings in a cluster.

A few years later, it was adopted for use in Urban Residential B (URB) and Urban Residential C (URC) districts, generally the neighborhoods that surround downtown Northampton and Florence center. When adopted there, it was initially frequently used to enable a reduction in the frontage requirement for lots.

ZLL means one lot line has a zero side setback, she clarified.

Ms. Misch showed examples of its use in years past and currently. The frontage requirement for standard lots used to be larger, so ZLL was a way to reduce frontage as well as to reduce the side setback. Frontage was initially 75 feet and but was later dropped to 50 feet. After frontage requirements in URB and C were reduced, the use of ZLL to reduce frontage was no longer necessary. It was still a good tool to allow more flexibility in locating structures on a property.

She showed an example of the use of this provision when it allowed for a reduction in frontage. The house isn't right at the lot line but maybe three or four feet away. She showed two other examples on Crosby Street. There, it allowed a slightly bigger house footprint.

She showed an example of ZLL use on Emerson Way allowing a lot line to run down the middle of a two-family structure. This scenario was the initial impetus for creating ZLL. It arose through conversations with Habitat for Humanity about their interest in allowing homeowners to each own their own property even though sharing a party wall. It afforded each unit owner ownership of the land beneath their unit.

After changes in 2012 and 2013 in frontage, the use of ZLL became more about creating opportunities for flexibility in side setbacks. The ordinance before them is another step in tweaking ZLL. It was specifically put forward because of concerns heard about the designs of ZLL developments, in particular, the concern that, without greater setbacks, house placements create the sense of an alley between houses. Also, there was a concern that ZLL wasn't clearly enough defined as being only applicable to single-family homes and therefore could be interpreted as being able to be applied to duplexes.

This language clarifies that. It increases the setbacks and sets out clearer standards through the use of graphics to illustrate what ZLL means. Over the years she's been with the planning office, she has always had to explain ZLL to builders. She hopes the graphics will eliminate the need for a verbal explanation.

The other piece is to change the location of the ZLL section to be within the dimensional standards of zoning (Section 6). Since the concept originated in the context of special permits for cluster developments, the standard has lived there for 20 years although it is referred to in the by-right standards. As they did for flag lot standards, etc., they have moved it into Section 6.

Ms. Misch showed examples of three different scenarios in which ZLL would be allowed:

- 1) if a property owner is creating open space, he/she can put a structure right on the property line adjacent to the open space with no setback. This wouldn't be applicable for lots abutting existing city-owned open space, she clarified.
- 2) in a duplex scenario, the property line can be located right down the middle of a structure.
- 3) if a property owner had a series of lots and wanted to create three lots with zero lot lines, they could do so with each structure being on the opposite side lot line but the last parcel in the series would have to serve as a 'bookend' and create the standard separation with an adjacent parcel not under the same ownership.

She doesn't know if two and a half times (2.5x) the regular setback is the right standard, Ms. Misch said. Planners proposed the higher standard with the goal of trying to create a bigger buffer between the series of ZLL lots and other lots in the neighborhood, she explained.

Effect of Change

Beyond reorganizing the zoning and creating graphics to help explain the text, the proposed change eliminates the option of reduced setbacks, instead requiring that the setback be either zero or meet the standard requirement, she continued. The downside is that it reduces flexibility. If there is nothing between zero and 15 feet, a property owner is really confined to a small house footprint.

There are many examples of setbacks in URB and URC that are 10 feet. In URC, side setbacks are ten feet, so residents can have a 30 foot-wide house.

One thing to consider would be eliminating the two times minimum setback for the last structure in a series since this is twice the width of many of the standard setbacks. An alternative would be to require 15 feet of total separation between the last structure and the structure on an adjacent lot under different ownership to avoid the 'alley' effect, she suggested.

Another alternative would be to look at URA, B and C districts in total and think about reducing all setbacks in those districts to match what many setbacks are already. In many cases, existing setbacks are 12 feet.

She showed an example of the use of ZLL where the houses are about five feet from the property line on both sides.

Councilor Nash asked Ms. Misch to explain the 'alley' effect.

It's the idea of having houses really close together and a small pathway between two structures, Ms. Misch explained. It is meant to describe the proximity of two structures to each other.

Councilor Thorpe moved to make a positive recommendation on the ordinances. Councilor Foster seconded.

Councilor Jarrett noted that ZLL developments in URB and URC are by right. He asked if she could explain why they don't require site plan review. Looking at a townhome style ZLL development in URA, it creates a two-family in appearance but doesn't have the fossil fuel-free requirement or trigger the significant tree ordinance. Why does the city not require site plan review for ZLL? He asked.

On Emerson Way, six lots were created as duplex lots way back in 2003, Ms. Misch related. Over time, the developer amended the cluster/open space project to propose two structures on two separate lots instead of one lot with two structures.

Structures built using the ZLL provision have always been viewed as single-family homes. Although from the street it looks like a duplex, it is defined as a single-family because it consists of one unit on a parcel. ZLL is only applicable in the case of a single-family residence and single-family homes have always been by right.

ZLL is a type of zoning bonus, Councilor Jarrett noted. Since zoning requires more trees for ZLL lots, he asked if they could also require fossil fuel-free heating systems.

It is a single structure on a single lot so essentially it is considered a single-family house lot, Ms. Misch clarified. They are still treating them as single-family homes and not duplexes.

The provision for requiring more trees has been in zoning for 15 years. As he mentioned, ZLL was like a density bonus because it allowed lots with less frontage and setbacks. That being the case, they wanted to incorporate some elements that would enable a new structure to fit into an existing neighborhood, such as matching the number and types of plantings on the lots of existing homes.

Site plan is the creation of a local community so they can add any things they want. The idea is just to include in zoning features planners want to see instead of sending the project for site plan approval.

Councilor Jarrett expressed his understanding that they cannot require fossil fuel free heating systems for ZLL because it is still a single-family home on a single lot.

Councilor Foster expressed her understanding that one of the uses for ZLL would be to free up space on the lot for a larger home. Rather than a 20-foot wide house, it could allow for a larger house.

A wider house may not necessarily allow for a larger footprint but just an easier footprint in which to work, Ms. Misch countered.

One of the concerns they're hearing is the cost of housing in Northampton and incentives for development of larger housing, Councilor Foster related. What she's trying to understand is, if they move toward ZLL, are they incentivizing or making easier the development of larger houses.

"We have ZLL now," Ms. Misch pointed out. What she's heard from builders is that in some situations it is actually harder to build in a skinnier footprint because it requires building something custom. That may add to the cost as opposed to pulling a design off the shelf.

She can't say these changes will result in smaller houses that will be more affordable, Ms. Misch acknowledged. The goal of the changes is to make ZLL easier to understand and to address the design concern about the close proximity of some houses to each other. It's not the intent of the ordinance to try to dictate the size of a house someone might build.

Councilor Thorpe asked what some of the drawbacks are.

The primary drawback is the loss of the flexibility with which ZLL has been used, Ms. Misch said. It has been used primarily to reduce setbacks but not all the way to zero. The biggest downside is the reduction in flexibility, particularly with a 55-foot wide parcel.

With regard to the observation that URB and URC already have different setbacks, Councilor Jarrett asked what she would think about the idea of ZLL being either zero feet or five feet less than the minimum setback; i.e. - 10 feet in URB and five feet in URC. The idea is to key it to the existing zoning requirement and allow some reduction, but not to the point that would go beyond what is typical for those neighborhoods.

Ms. Misch said she thought that is a great approach and would provide/keep some flexibility but not let houses get so close to another structure that it looks out of place for the district.

Councilor Nash asked if the amended ordinance has any impact on a two-family.

Only in that it clarifies that ZLL is only applicable to one principal structure on a property, not to two detached structures, Ms. Misch said.

Councilor Nash opened the floor to comments from the public. He recognized Jackie Ballance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jackie Ballance asked a quick math question. Could a lot with 50 feet of frontage, a house on the absolute zero lot line on one side and a 15-foot setback on the other have a 35-foot façade, five feet wider than the current limit? She asked.

Ms. Misch said her math is correct, but only in the scenario where there are touching structures.

Bill Ryan thanked Ms. Misch for advancing this proposal. It stimulates a lot of thought. He said he thought the point Ms. Ballance is making is that if someone has two structures side by side, it could potentially be 70 feet wide. He thinks her concern is that this proposal would allow for very wide houses. Or, where a property owner has three houses side by side, they could have three 35-foot wide houses with only 15 feet between them. It goes back to Councilor Foster's question of whether this allows larger houses to be built. It's a valid concern because, as they've seen in developments in Bay State, it will lead to wider houses than otherwise allowed.

Ms. Misch said she doesn't think the houses in Bay State are wider than normal.

With ZLL you wind up with much wider houses with less space between them so it changes the rhythm of the streetscape, Mr. Ryan asserted. It allows for wider houses than was originally envisioned. Most of the houses in his area of Bay State are more of the 25-foot scale. "It just sets up a different feeling in the neighborhood when these big square houses come in," he commented.

Ms. Misch said she understands the concern but there's nothing in this proposal that adds to the width allowed. There is no standard width in any of these neighborhoods. Many of the 50-foot wide lots built on have much less of a setback, she pointed out.

He thinks there are ways of figuring out how to deal with this because ZLL has some advantages, Mr. Ryan said. Councilor Jarrett's suggestion that it move to site plan approval makes a lot of sense to him.

Referring to a scenario described in an email from Bill Ryan (see Scenario #2 in attachment to minutes), Councilor Jarrett noted that a developer could *not* have three 35-foot wide houses with three 50-foot lots; only two of them could be 35 feet because the last one would have to have two times the standard setback. A property owner has to have a series of lots in order to have a wider house. He does have some concern about allowing what appears to be a two-family without site plan review, he volunteered. He said he is not sure how to address it.

The problem as she sees it is a matter of proportion, Ms. Ballance remarked. When you have a smaller lot, it begs for a smaller house. A small lot wants something in proportion, in harmony. She said she has other comments for 21.217.

Councilor Nash invited her to proceed.

The administrative assistant screen-shared a series of pictures submitted by Ms. Ballance as Ms. Ballance offered explanatory comments. Ms. Ballance said she would like the city solicitor to look at 350-10.14 Zero Lot Line Developments to see if they require special permits. According to where it sits in the code, she expressed the opinion that it does. She doesn't want to move it from that location, she stressed.

It started out as an option within cluster development special permits but is now shown as 'by right' in the Table of Use under URB and URC, Ms. Misch reiterated. The table refers the user to Section 10.14 for other layout and planting requirements. At the time when ZLL was added to URB and URC, instead of creating a special section, planners just referred to Section 10.14. It doesn't mean it needs a special permit, it just means that is where those provisions live.

She talked to Attorney Seewald about Jackie's concern and he said he thought it makes sense for ZLL to go in Section 6 and that it is clear in the Tables of Use that ZLL is allowed by right.

"It's under special permits. Leave it there," Ms. Ballance requested.

Councilor Jarrett expressed his understanding that the zoning amendment would not apply to projects already in progress such as 61 Warner Street.

If an ordinance is adopted, the ordinance is viewed as being in effect from the date of the public hearing notice, Ms. Misch clarified. If someone pulled a building permit before the public hearing notice was

published, the new zoning would not apply. If John Handzel already has a building permit, this ordinance would not affect it.

The issue of whether it is a development or a single-family house creates a difficult conundrum, Mr. Ryan suggested. For people concerned about this, it is a development because it is three big houses being built. But the only person to talk to about it is the building department. There is no place in the system where there is consideration of this as a three-family development. All the protections given to single-family homes are basically extended to this three-family home development.

They are now looking at situation where a developer is using ZLL in a different way. It is a whole different use of ZLL and needs to be reviewed in that context. To him, ZLL is an exception to the standard zoning. Normally, to get an exception someone would need to get a special permit. In this case, a developer would get a bonus because ZLL is allowed by right. "It's complicated," he observed.

He expressed hope that they can continue to have a conversation about how to solve this problem.

Single-family house lots are single-family house lots Ms. Misch responded. There have been times when people have created a whole series of lots at once and they were all single-family house lots. It doesn't really matter if someone creating four lots feels like a development if the developer is meeting the requirements and not creating a subdivision – it goes through the Approval Not Required (ANR) process.

This is the first time the ZLL has been used this extensively for this type of series of lots side by side, Mr. Ryan asserted.

No, Ms. Misch said. Each of John Handzel's projects are only two ZLL houses next to each other. That's happened on other occasions.

Reyes Lazaro said it is very hard to follow regulations where language seems to have lost its meaning. Somebody can build 20 houses and as long as they follow regulations for single-family homes, it is not considered a 'development.' To her, something is wrong with this picture. She lives across from one of these projects on Warner Street. This is part of a larger movement in the U.S. economy where these kinds of houses are being built and people who are victims of the economy in their own city cannot afford them. In this context, they are allowing language to lose its meaning to enable things like this and they are being told these are single-family houses. Something is wrong with this kind of regulation that enables things that shouldn't be enabled.

Ms. Misch said she uses the term 'development' loosely to mean anything that's being built. It sounds like people in this neighborhood understand 'development' to mean something requiring a special permit or site plan review. These are single-family homes on single lots and even those she refers to as 'developments.' She wasn't trying to state that the word development doesn't mean development.

Reyes thanked Ms. Misch. She said she supported Ms. Ballance's comment that this belongs in the special permit section of the ordinance.

ZLL as stated does allow for wider, possibly large single-family houses, Councilor Jarrett observed. Without ZLL, larger houses could only be built with larger lot sizes which would either result in fewer houses being

built or smaller houses. Or, a development would have to be structured as a condo association but would then have to go through a site plan review or special permit process. That's the range of possibilities.

He wants them to think about where that threshold is and what it will push development toward, whether it be toward fewer larger units, more smaller units or condo associations with more units but more review.

Councilor Nash asked Ms. Misch if that matches the way she sees things.

She is not sure if ZLL either in its current form or as proposed is necessarily going to dictate building big vs. small, Ms. Misch reflected. It all depends on the size of the lot. On a 50-foot lot, the flexibility of having a reduced setback definitely allows something wider than 20 feet. Many houses are between 22 and 28 feet wide.

For the development at the corner of Warner and Hinckley Street that everyone really doesn't like, if Mr. Handzel couldn't get three lots in there, he could potentially do two lots with two structures on one lot with a condo association or three structures on a single lot under a condo situation. What they have seen is that market drivers are directed more toward individual homes on their own lots.

Mr. Ryan said he thinks the proposal that has been put forth has some potential. Also, Councilor Jarrett's idea of zero or 10 makes a lot of sense to him. 15 feet is too narrow, but 20 starts to get them there.

Councilor Jarrett said he is uncertain how to proceed. He would like to do more thinking. He thinks it is fair to ask Councilor Thorpe to change his motion from a positive to a neutral recommendation with the idea that more discussion is to come.

Councilor Thorpe/Councilor Foster moved to accept this as a friendly amendment. The motion to forward the ordinances with a neutral recommendation passed unanimously with 4 Yes, 0 No by roll call vote.

Councilor Jarrett requested a five-minute recess. The committee recessed at 6:41 p.m. The committee reconvened at 6:46 p.m.

7. Update on Regulation of Wireless Communications Facilities

Discussion with Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch

She asked for this to be on the agenda because she has been hearing concerns from the community about the installation of small cell wireless antennas, Councilor Foster explained. She understands that the city cannot regulate them based on health or environmental factors. Other councilors were reaching out to her saying, 'hey, do you want to work on this.' In order to talk to colleagues openly, she asked for it to be put on tonight's agenda.

A couple of thoughts seem to be worth reconsidering. She asked Ms. Misch how many applications for small cell facilities have currently been approved in Northampton. Is there more they can do to regulate by ordinance? Could they look at the potential for setbacks from residences based on aesthetics, fall zones, etc.? Is there a potential to incorporate a public hearing when small cells are proposed or could the process include monitoring for radio frequency emissions?

Ms. Misch said they haven't had any applications since the council adopted the update a year ago. 'Small cells' are antennas used to fill in gaps between cell towers, typically located within the right-of-way rather than mounted on monopoles. Prior to the council vote, there were perhaps seven. These are not 5G; they are essentially gap fillers between towers.

Because they are filling in gaps in service, they necessarily are in areas with greater populations. She is not sure what a setback from a residence would be intended to do. They have built into the existing regulations standards for aesthetics, including how they want them to be camouflaged or masked to the extent possible, so that's already built-in. She doesn't believe they have the ability to say hard and fast it has to be x feet from a residence.

In terms of a public hearing, the reason they went through the review a year ago is because the equipment will be automatically approved by the FCC if the city doesn't approve it. It doesn't make sense to have a public hearing which might imply that the public has a role in determining whether it can be approved. The idea was to set up very specific criteria that have to be met and to provide for an administrative review.

The application goes to the DPW since the equipment will primarily be within the right-of-way. The draft regulations set up an application process and call for an annual fee to allow regular review. The renewal application has a series of questions and check boxes such as 'are you still meeting the maximum approved FCC radio frequency?' New applications are required to show the need and identify the gap being filled, type of equipment and where located, shrouding mechanism, etc., i.e. - all the information needed for physical equipment going within the right-of-way.

Councilor Foster asked who is responsible for testing, and Ms. Misch confirmed it is the carrier. The city gets a copy of the results.

Councilor Foster said she understood the problem with holding a public hearing but asked if it is possible to give notice of small cell applications to people living nearby. Has Ms. Misch seen this incorporated in other communities? She asked.

Notice goes out for public hearings but not for administrative reviews, Ms. Misch replied. She doesn't think it makes sense to set up an arbitrary distance for who gets notified. Northampton has been trying city-wide to adopt a permitting system that's easily accessible. The planning office has a link to permits issued by the boards it staffs and the building department has a link to building permits. COVID highlighted the fact that they are really far behind in publicly-accessible documents from each department. Planners have advocated for the public being able to go on the website and see any permits that have been applied for.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Councilor Nash recognized Kim Weeber.

Kim Weeber said she is learning some new information today, namely that applicants are required to let the city know which frequencies they are transmitting as part of the permitting process. She asked for copies of the local ordinance.

She understands the bind the city is in because of FCC regulations, which are rather onerous, she continued. She thinks the city has been led to believe it doesn't have a lot of influence when it actually has more than it might think. One thing the city can do is protect property values, she stressed. She related an

experience she had while measuring the frequencies and power output of cell antennas in the Bay State neighborhood. A woman came out of her house to say she was selling. It was a young person who has developed an illness similar to microwave illness. She asked if the woman would be willing to come speak to the city council, and she said, no, she can't be public about it because she is concerned about her property value and her ability to sell the house. Right here in Northampton there is a property value issue due to a cell antenna close to a number of homes, Ms. Weeber pointed out.

"We have the ability to protect our property values and the way we can do that is with setbacks," she insisted. There is nothing in the FCC regulation that says this cannot be done. Shelburne has 1,500 foot setbacks and Burlington has 200 feet. Various communities around the country have various setbacks.

She sent links to multiple real estate studies that show there is not uncommonly a 20% loss of value to homes right next to these cell antennas. "We can take that into account," she asserted.

The city is allowing telecom companies to make decisions about things they could have more input into, she suggested. When Verizon says it has a gap in service and needs to put a small cell antenna for JFK close to a house, they can look at it and say it's going to affect the property value of that home. There's no reason Verizon couldn't put the antenna at Child's Park where it's not right in front of somebody's house. Similarly, the antenna on Spring Grove for JFK could have been put at Look Park, she suggested.

She referred to the survey recently put out by the Mayor's office for municipal broadband. Municipal broadband is faster, more secure and way more energy efficient. Can they hard wire these schools so they don't need small cell antennas? She questioned.

Ms. Misch said she received the information about property values but thinks it is a hard thing to latch onto definitively. Shelburne has several cell towers within 1,500 feet of homes, she noted. It would be interesting to see if communities that have these regulations on the books are actually enforcing them.

As far as city ordinances, it may make sense to evaluate the authority the city has to regulate based on property values, she agreed. In terms of notice, since it is not a public hearing process she thinks they wouldn't be notifying people, but they should be bolstering public access to all permits granted, she agreed.

As far as locating the antennas, when gap analyses are submitted, she doesn't know if providers can just leave one spot and go to another and get the same coverage.

Councilor Jarrett said he spoke with the city solicitor, and his opinion is that they can try to regulate the distance from homes and schools for aesthetic and visual impacts, fall zones, property values, etc. but that this could be overruled by coverage needs. His thought is that it would be better to attempt to regulate and place the burden on the company to demonstrate the necessity for an antenna in a proposed location. It's not going to hurt them to try, but they might be overruled, Councilor Jarrett concluded.

AnneLouise Smallen said that, for her, it is really a question of health. There are certainly proofs that these can be detrimental to people's health, especially children. She wanted to voice that if ever more permits are required, they should have serious review by the Board of Health (BOH) before proceeding.

Unfortunately, even though there has been a lot of discussion about health, they can't review these based on health impacts. That's very clear in the regulation, Ms. Misch stated. Ms. Misch signed off.

The guidance they've received from Attorney Seewald is that they can't regulate based on health and environmental impacts, Councilor Foster confirmed. If they're going to regulate them, they need to be looking at other factors.

"Then let's review for value of our property," Ms. Smallen said.

The original FCC regulation is very clear that *environment* is not to be taken into account but it says nothing about health, Ms. Weeber clarified. Health came in based on lawsuits. That is going through the courts right now and they are going to see some changes, she projected.

One of the things she has been doing is trying to look through regulations on the books in different cities to see which ones make the most sense for Northampton, Ms. Weeber shared. She would like to know where to present those and to whom.

Legislation can either come from the mayor or a councilor, Councilor Nash advised. She has the ear of four councilors now, and his suggestion is that she keep talking to them. If she has more information in the future, he is happy to consider putting this on a future agenda.

Ms. Weeber said she hoped they had a chance to look at the letters Ms. Smallen sent. The real estate studies are really clear. Nationwide and even international studies show that cell antennas cause the loss of property values. Even HUD says that appraisers need to consider whether there's a cell antenna near a property. There's plenty of precedent for using property values to help protect themselves.

Councilor Jarrett said he is very interested in continuing to work on this. The challenge for him is distilling the information into a proposed change to the ordinance. He welcomes continuing to talk about this.

After Burlington passed its ordinance, Verizon pulled out of trying to put cell towers there, Ms. Weeber advised. There are a number of things they can do to protect themselves and community broadband is a good way to go.

8. **Follow-up Discussions on Plastic Reduction and the Waste Stream and Housing Security**

Councilor Nash proposed tabling discussion of these items until the next meeting.

9. **New Business**

None.

10. **Adjourn.** Councilor Jarrett moved to adjourn the meeting; Councilor Foster seconded. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 4 Yes, 0 No. The meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Prepared By:

Laura Krutzler, Administrative Assistant
(413) 587-1210