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PROCEEDINGS

THE MODERATOR: Town Meeting Members please come forward, take your seats. Don’t forget to check in this evening. I want to remind all Town Meeting Members that the attendance will be published in the Enterprise. So don’t forget to check in.

Tonight we’re going to begin with the Special Town Meeting. And when we complete the two articles on that, we will go back to the Annual meeting.

Okay, this evening, our tellers in the first division will be Mr. Netto. In the second division will be Mr. Dufresne. And in the third division tonight will be Mr. Johnson. Mr. Hampson had a previous engagement that he couldn’t break and he won’t be with us, so Mr. Johnson will be the third division teller.

All Town Meeting Members present please rise for the establishment of a quorum and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: And our constable this evening will be Mr. Braga.
In the first division Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 45.

THE MODERATOR: 45.

In the third division, Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: 64.

THE MODERATOR: 64.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 97.

THE MODERATOR: 97.

By a counted vote of 206, we have a quorum and I call the Special Town Meeting to order.

At this point, will all members and guests please rise for the presentation of the colors by Boy Scout Troop 40.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Tonight we have all of Boy Scout Troop 40 to be with us for the Pledge of Allegiance. Please follow me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[Pledge of Allegiance taken.]  

THE MODERATOR: In carrying on with our tradition with all of us singing the National Anthem together last night, tonight we have the new
school chorus from the North Falmouth Elementary School. They were just founded last year and this is their first, debut performance in front of Town Meeting.

And with that, would you please follow us in the National Anthem with the North Falmouth School Chorus.

[National Anthem sung.]

[Ovation.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time I’ll recognize the new President and CEO of the Falmouth Chamber of Commerce Mike Kasparian for the invocation.

MR. KASPARIAN: Heavenly Father, may our meeting this evening be not only an exercise of care and concern for our community and its residents, but also an example of how a community can agree and disagree and still be a community.

We ask you to watch over and protect our families, our community, our nation and our world. May your gift of peace become a reality for all.

Amen.

THE MODERATOR: At this point we’ll have a moment of silence for our previous members who
passed. And for those of you who may not know, Frank Shephard, a former member, passed last evening and so we specifically remember Mr. Shephard and the Shephard family at this time.

[Moment of Silence held.]

THE MODERATOR: Colors post.

At this time the colors will be posted and Troop 40 will be walking out and the chorus is going to stay and do another song for us. So. The Boy Scouts were taller than the elementary school, so I’m going to ask them to go out first. Thanks, boys.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, members may be seated for another presentation by the North Falmouth School Chorus.

[Whereupon, a song was sung and a standing ovation was given.]

THE MODERATOR: A great way to recognize National Education Week.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time, I’ll read the Officers Return of the Warrant.

By virtue of this warrant, I have this
day notified and summoned the inhabitants of the Town of Falmouth qualified to vote on town affairs, as said warrant directs, by posting an attested copy thereof in Town Hall and in every precinct in the town. Signed by the Town Constable Paul Byrne. At this time, I’d recognize Madame Chairman for the dispense of the reading of the warrant.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Mr. Moderator, I move to dispense with the reading of the Warrant, except for the Officer’s Return.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, you’ve all heard the main motion to dispense with the reading of the warrant.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Mr. Clerk, I ask that the warrant become an official part of the record.

At this time the chair would recognize a motion for non-Town Meeting Members to sit up front
with their respective boards or committees.

FROM THE FLOOR: So moved.

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

At this time the chair would entertain a motion for all Town employees who are not residents of the town to speak on any article before the Special Town Meeting.

FROM THE FLOOR: Moved.

THE MODERATOR: So moved.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

We won’t use a blanket tonight since there’s only two articles.

We’ll begin with Article 1, to see if the
Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to petition the court.

Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I move that the Town vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to petition the legislature for special legislation relative to construction of the sewer in the Little Pond Service Area for the following purposes, and further to authorize the Board of Selectmen to accept changes recommended by legislative counsel or bond counsel to further effectuate the purposes of this article.

An act to authorize the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Falmouth to expend borrowed funds to offset certain costs associated with the installation of low pressure pumps on private property in the Little Pond Sewer Service Area.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of same as follows. Notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Falmouth may
expend a sum of money from the funds appropriated 
by Article 28 of the April 7, 2014 Annual Town 
Meeting held in Falmouth and borrowed under 
authority of Mass. General Law Chapter 44, Section 
7, paragraph 1, as authorized by said Article 28 
for the purpose of reimbursements to certain 
property owners in the Little Pond Sewer Service 
Area for costs associated with the purchase and 
installation of low-pressure pumps on private 
property necessary to connect each property to the 
Town’s sewer and/or wastewater system.

The Board of Selectmen may further 
determine the amount of such payments, provided, 
however, that the payment shall be the same for 
each private property and payment shall follow 
installation and inspection of the low pressure 
pump by the Town Wastewater Superintendent. 

This act shall take effect upon its 
passage.

MR. JONES: For an explanation on this 
article. The proposed special legislation will 
allow the Town to utilize a portion of the 
previously authorized $49.82 million wastewater 
appropriation to equalize sewer connection costs of
low pressure pump residential properties to cost comparable with residential gravity connections. It is not a request for additional appropriation. At present, bonded funds may not be used for this purpose. The actual amount to be expended for this purpose is not yet known, but based on prior estimates by the Town’s consultant, approximately $3.2 million - around $4500 per pump installation - has been included within the project budget.

It has been the Board of Selectmen’s articulated goal to equalize typical connection costs between the gravity and low pressure system properties, and this legislation will provide the opportunity to offset some of those costs.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any discussion on Article 1?

Mr. Donahue. With a microphone, please.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, Precinct 3.

If I understand this correctly, the people will be reimbursed for the cost of putting in this grinder pump on their property. Will the electric bill also be assumed by the Town, or will the people have to pay for the electric themselves?
And if so, why? Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Flynn.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: The answer to that is

that the individual home owner will be responsible

for the electricity cost related to the pump.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Thank you, Leslie

Lichtenstein, precinct 8.

It was my understanding that the grinder

pumps specifically were not included in the plan

that we had – or we voted on last spring. So will

this money come from the six million that was in

the contingency fund? And if that’s the case,

that means half of the contingency fund has already

been spent and we haven’t even broken ground on the

project.

Could someone answer that, please?

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Flynn.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Now, the funds for the

reimbursement were included in the original budget,

and as approved on the ballot.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further

discussion? Hearing none, then the – oop. Mr.
Netto? No.

Okay. The question will come on the main motion.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 2, Madame Chairman for a main motion. This is also to petition the legislature.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: I move indefinite postponement on Article 2.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we have an indefinite postponement of Article 2. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous, and that one’s indefinitely postponed.

And by call of the chair I will dissolve the Special Town Meeting.

All Town Meeting Members present please
rise for the establishment of a quorum and the
tellers will return a count.

If you have a white Ford F-150, your
lights are on. Plate #62 – it starts with a 6 and
a 2 and there’s two more digits. [Laughs.] So,
if you’ve got a Ford F-150, the lights are on.
Maybe that’s 622A?

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 45.

THE MODERATOR: 45.

Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: 65.

THE MODERATOR: 65.

Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 95.

THE MODERATOR: By a counted vote of
205, we have a quorum and the Annual Town Meeting
is back in session.

At this point, the chair will entertain a
motion to take Article 18 off of the table. We
left the omnibus budget – we put it on the table
last night to go around it.

MR. NETTO: So moved.
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto’s going to make the motion to remove Article 18 from the table.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it and Article 18 is removed from the table.

Article 18, the main motion that was on the floor that was put on the table is as printed, but adding $200,000 for the line item for Consolidated Dispatch, and making the necessary adjustments in the final figure. The final figure being $4,179,770.

Last night we were prepared to have a general overview presentation of the Capital Budget, so I’d recognize the Town Finance Director Ms. Petit.

MS. PETIT: Thank you and good evening.

I’m going to stay on this slide just for a minute. This is our FY 2015 Capital and one time expenditure plan. I attended most of the precinct meetings and there was some concern that I wanted
to address right off in this Capital Plan.

There are some items that you would not categorize as capital, that is correct. It’s organized in this way because we are using Free Cash mostly, which is a one time revenue source for one-time expenditures. And I just want to assure Town Meeting that we do not categorize some of these as assets and depreciate them; it’s really just for organizational purposes that we’ve put them in one article.

The alternative is to pull out ten or eleven items and just do a bunch of separate articles, but it’s all funded from the same Free Cash.

And we still are looking at putting some smaller re-occurring Capital items and working them into the Annual Budget, and hopefully you will see that in April.

First slide, please. So, as I just stated, Free Cash is a one-time revenue source for one-time expenditures. So we earmark our one-time expenditures with Free Cash. We continue to make progress funding Capital items. Last year we funded about three million. And this year in this
Capital plan it’s 4.2. And we continue to move
some of the reoccurring Capital expenses into the
Operating Budget.

As you’ll notice, last April we did put
some money in for, you know, police cruisers. We
have some money in for, you know, reoccurring IT
Capital items, and in the Fire budget for some
smaller equipment. Just, you know, years ago we
had some in there, so we’re trying to, you know,
move that back in but not put too much pressure on
the Annual Budget.

Next slide, please. And so really the
highlights in this Capital Plan this evening are
your consolidated dispatcher equipment, the
consolidated dispatcher facilities upgrade, fire
ingine, work on some water mains and the Morse Pond
School roof re-coating is in there, too. And
those are some of your larger items.

In your warrant booklet you do have
explanations for all the items that have been
requested tonight at Town Meeting and you do have
your ten year Capital Plan in the back of the
warrant booklet.

And, with the ten year Capital Plan,
that's really just what we're looking at ten years out. What we really do focus on is what we want to fund in FY '15 and what we did fund in FY '14.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any general questions?

Yes, Ms. Flynn.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I don’t have a question but I wanted to make a few comments related to consolidated dispatch. This is not new. Some of you may remember that early on in Governor Patrick’s administration he proposed to the Commonwealth that they should consider having three regional dispatch centers for the entire state. He mentioned that the State of California has three for the entire state, and the State of Maryland is now working on five regional dispatch centers. They have just completed one which includes the entire Eastern Shore of Maryland plus all the central part of the State of Maryland.

Obviously in Massachusetts this is an entirely different approach because we are all
governed by home rule, and it isn’t as easy to
consolidate services on a state-wide basis as it is
in other states.

However, about two years ago the Towns of
Hanover, Hull, Hingham and Norwell got together and
the Town Managers worked together to propose a sub-
regional dispatch center for those four towns.
They were able to obtain $6 million from the state
to build it and they were to - and they proposed to
staff it with the current dispatchers they had in
each of the towns, to combine them and have them
perform the same services they would as they did in
their own towns.

And that’s been about -- I think Troy
Clarkson is the Town Manager in Hanover. I don’t
think he’s here tonight, but he could tell us how
well that has worked in those four towns.

So, now for us we are faced with a
situation where our dispatching equipment, our
technology, is on life support and it doesn’t have
long to serve its purpose. So that was one of the
reasons why the Town Manager considered
consolidated dispatch.

The other reason is that two years ago
the Selectmen proposed to the Town Manager that
that should be an objective that he should consider
as a way to continually look to create and provide
efficiencies not only in service but certainly
efficiencies in cost. So last year, when the
Selectmen had their discussion with the Town
Manager on his performance evaluation and goals for
the coming year, that was a goal that the Selectmen
outlined for the Town Manager to complete for this
fiscal year. So that is now why we are bringing
this before you now.

Consolidated dispatch really does make
sense and there is an opportunity now with the
planning that has been done by the Town Manager
with both the Police and Fire Departments to make
this work.

The important piece truly is the fact
that the equipment is in desperate need of repair
and it makes a lot more sense to have equipment for
one than it does for two. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we have a
budget here. So what we’re going to do is we’re
going to do it by sections. And the first section
is General Government, of which the dispatch line
item is in.

So, any further discussion on any of the line items within the General Government section of the Capital Budget?

Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: I think you can officially put me in the old dog curmudgeon category at this point in my life. I like the old definition of capital versus operating, myself. And I understand that Free Cash is a one time kind of thing, but I really would rather see a Capital Budget separated from things like licenses and training and financial reports and DEP compliance charges. I just think those don’t belong in a Capital.

And I know you’ve explained it. I’m just here to register my unhappiness with mixing those things together. So I chose the licenses here as a chance to get up and say that. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, precinct 3. Through you, Mr. Moderator.

We are consolidating our Fire Department
and our Police Department and the DPW in this communications system. Have we looked into the Sheriff? I believe he is offering to have a central dispatch system and is he prepared to do that now? And if so, what would the cost of that be? I assume it’d be on a yearly basis against the 755, well, $800,000 that we’re talking about to do it internally rather than going out. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Certainly, thank you, Mr. Moderator. Julian Suso, Town Manager.

We have explored that and in fact we’re in ongoing communication with Sheriff Cunningham. Pardon me, Sheriff Cummings. And we have in fact visited his dispatch facility. I and several others in our Internal Review Group has visited a number of existing dispatch centers, including the one in Hingham that Selectman Flynn referred to a few moments ago. As well as others. And, again, including the Sheriff’s.

Currently the Sheriff does no dispatching for police departments. Does perform some dispatching for a selected number of fire
departments on the Cape. Our understanding is that the Sheriff’s Department is from three to five years away from having the capability to consider doing that.

So the Town is in an imminent situation, as Selectman Flynn has noted. We must move forward and make a decision about what the most cost effective way for this Town to move forward is.

And we have a PowerPoint presentation to further discuss that, Mr. Moderator, at your pleasure.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, if a member requests the full presentation, we can do it.

Mr. Noonan. Yes?

MR. NOONAN: [No mic:] Can we hear the presentation first?

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. NOONAN: [No mic:] It may save some questions.

THE MODERATOR: Yes. Sounds good.

Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you again, Mr. Moderator.
Distinguished Members of Town Meeting,

Julian Suso, Falmouth Town Manager.

The consolidated communication center, as Selectman Flynn has noted, has been in discussion for multiple years; has been a goal throughout this year specifically delineated by members of the Board of Selectmen. The Board adopted that goal, as you note, in 2014 for the calendar year and the work has been in progress throughout.

A consolidation study is underway by Matrix Consulting. A technical study group has been convened and has been meeting regularly. It includes police, fire, marine and environmental services, Information Technology and Town management personnel. Also, I should note Public Works is an integral part of that as well.

We have a request before Town Meeting for Capital funds in the amount of $755,000 for equipment replacement for dispatch and communications and a very necessary $250,000 for building improvements to house that important equipment in a new communications center.

Continuing, in 2013, both the Fire Chief and Police Chief submitted requests to replace
their outdated computer-aided dispatch consoles and
related equipment. That’s part of our normal
capital planning process. So this has been known
about for multiple years. Both departments have
received end of life notices for their existing
equipment. Replacement is critical and cannot be
delayed.

This is a matter of public safety, and
that’s why I bring it to you, respectfully, as a
matter of urgency.

A study was initiated to evaluate the
potential for a free-standing and stand alone
Communications Department. All affected unions —
and there are multiple ones — involved in this were
invited to impact bargain in a written
communication I transmitted to them in August of
this year. Pursuant to state statute, that impact
bargaining process is underway and ongoing as we
speak.

There’s a potential for $100,000 plus
each year savings, operational savings, mostly
attributable to reductions in overtime occurring as
a result of our two existing independent
departmental dispatch operations. So that is a
potential cost savings annually that would supplement the budget that this Town Meeting has to consider on the revenue side each year.

The next center planned for includes four dispatch locations, four separate stations, with two full-time dispatchers assigned 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The organization plan was presented to and approved by the Board of Selectmen at their recent November 10th regular business meeting and it will retain jobs within the Town of Falmouth rather than moving to a regional model, and maintain the highly qualified and highly trained dispatchers that we currently have on duty both in police and fire on the full-time side.

Any changes to existing classifications as a result of our analysis will be bringing forward and presenting to Town Meeting for your review and action at your Annual Meeting in April.

We have looked at preferred potential locations, fundamentally the Edward Marks Building and the Gus Canty Center. I also want to affirm that early in the process we also did not rule out existing locations in the Police Department and in the Fire Department, as we know that’s where the
two stand-alone locations are currently.

More recently we have – still on that same slide. More recently we’ve focused on the Edward Marks Building and Gus Canty, looking at structure, function, architecture and opportunity. Also working with an architect and our Building Commissioner and others. Both are adjacent to the police station and proximate to fire headquarters, which is an important element.

Gus Canty appears at this point to be most clearly cost effective. We’ll have a few comments about that yet to come.

The features that are within Gus Canty that are already existent in a primarily vacant and unused stage area adjacent to the gymnasium, they are supported by an existing underutilized locker, shower and restroom facilities already constructed already within that building, and they also have access to kitchen facilities.

Next slide, please. A comparison of status quo with the proposed consolidated communications facility, status quo I mentioned the capital request which both the Police Chief and the Fire Chief transmitted through our normal capital
budgeting process back in FY 2013. The estimate for replacement of the two stand-alones in that Capital Budget: $1,025,000 for that equipment. Our estimate continues to be $250,000 in facilities support to allow those to be property cited within a renovated facility.

You will note that I’m skipping over to the right-hand column. Under the proposed consolidation, a consolidated single-point equipment is estimated to cost $755,000, including equipment and software. So we can all do the math and see the hundreds of thousands of dollars of difference there to be considered by Town Meeting in that decision to move forward.

Again, we’ve noted and it’s in your Capital request a request for consideration of $250,000 in facilities, renovation and upgrades.

The annual cost for the status quo based on the previous annual assessment in the budget: $889,540 for the status quo. Those operating costs included $148,000 in overtime attributable to the dispatch function alone. The proposed consolidation estimates $719,288 in annual operating cost and an estimated reduction in
overtime. We still frankly liberally estimate we may have up to $50,000 in overtime with that consolidated function. But we see annual opportunity for $100,000 savings in overtime alone, not to mention savings which we have not gone into in detail for operational considerations related to having a single consolidated facility, manpower working together side by side: maintenance on a single package of consoles for dispatch, etcetera, etcetera. That will be fully articulated as time goes on.

This is a photo you all recognize of the facade of the Gus Canty Center. This was taken today. The arrow – the peaked roof section immediately behind the American flag, that’s where the stage is located. I don’t know how many of you may have seen that stage.

Honestly, I’m embarrassed to tell you that, although I’ve toured the Gus Canty Center, in my three years here as Town Manager, including multiple visits, I had not been on the stage before and was not aware that it was there. It’s immediately adjacent to the gymnasium. It is very infrequently used and we have some information on
that we’re happy to share at an appropriate
time if that becomes important.

But I wanted to show you in terms of the
massing of the building, the stage area is within,
again, that peaked roof section of the Gus Canty
Center and it is a fundamentally an internal space
that does not require separate access to other
areas of the building. It does, however, come in
through the main access doors to the Gus Canty
Center itself.

So we can go to the next slide. We have
some more information. On the left is a closer
view of that peaked roof section, which includes
the stage area. It is a high roof, a lot of
natural light there and it has a raised stage like
you see in many elementary schools. Not unlike
the stage here in front of us. Although the stage
there is considerably smaller, but it is the same
concept. It is a raised stage with an open area
underneath. You see there is a sliding door that
drops down and it connects to the existing
gymnasium in the lower level of Gus Canty. So that
is it from the inside as you stand in the
gymnasium.
Two other views of this same stage area.

If you go in the main doors to Gus Canty and either take the elevator to the lower level or walk down the flight of stairs that you encounter immediately when you walk in the door, when you step off the stairs you see a door to your right. That is the stand alone doorway to the stage. That takes you directly to the stage and you do not encounter any other offices or rooms.

The photograph on the right shows you the stage itself, the ample natural light that comes into that area, and again it is a stand alone facility.

And if you can flip back to the previous slide just one moment, thank you. And as you will note, with that existing door closed down, there is no interaction between the stage and the gymnasium activities there. Obviously if this alternative were to be considered ultimately by the Board of Selectmen for locating a consolidated facility if this does go forward, there would have to be some improvements made to this area, including soundproofing and some adjustments. But essentially I want to underscore the fact that this
is an existing, stand-alone area with adjacent
restrooms, locker rooms, shower and kitchen
facilities that you - you and the taxpayers have
already paid for. It’s already in place. It’s
already constructed. You don’t have to pay for it
again.

Next slide, please. This is a sketch
that we’ve just completed in the last several days
of the - one possible layout of a four console
dispatch operation within that existing stage area.
We’re not changing any of the layout on the stage,
we’re just merely siting those four consoles and a
related office within that same area. And, as you
can see, there’s still considerable remaining area
within the stage itself, allowing for access and
other activities.

And you see to the left of that sketch is
a handicapped access ramp and a stairwell down to
that separate access door that we showed you a
photograph of, coming in off the lower level. So
it’s a fairly remarkably situated stand alone area.

I will confirm there is some extremely
modest use of that stage area, but it is not
regularly used. We’ve reviewed that in some detail
and it - that is the major reason that it is under primary consideration is it is the lowest cost alternative to site such a consolidated operation by far of all those we have considered.

So I bring it forward. Again, it’s only a conceptual piece. I’m not asking for Town Meeting’s approval of a location. That ultimately would be discussed and determined by the Board of Selectmen from my understanding of their role and authority under the Charter. But we have some work to do yet.

I have yet to meet with the Recreation Committee. I know Recreation Chair Sandy Cuny and I have had a conversation about this and I do have some work to do in this regard and we want to respect - fully respect the processes and the circumstances and the working order in place and we fully intend to do that.

But this is what I’m able to share with Town Meeting to date as to the limit of our thinking, and the reason that this has been identified at this moment as a likely alternative is, again, strictly due to cost savings which are considerable based upon the information I’ve
already presented to you.

Why don’t we jump to the next slide if we might. This – I thought I would just show Town Meeting a copy of a letter that I addressed to Sandy Cuny, the Chairman of the Recreation Committee. I neglected to meet with Sandy and the Recreation Committee prior to discussing publicly with the Board of Selectmen the concept of possibly using the Gus Canty Center. And as Sandy’s aware, I offered my apology for that. It’s not my intention to slight Sandy as chair or any member of the Recreation Committee. I value and respect their role.

We are in an expedited public safety process and there were matters that time dictated I had to discuss with the Board of Selectmen, and in moving forward that is a step that I overlooked. And although I don’t expect that you can all read this letter, in it I extend my apologies to Sandy and members of the Recreation Committee and my resolve and willingness to meet with them and discuss potential impact if this concept at the Canty Center would be viewed as appropriate to go forward. And again, that is still unfolding as we
Another comment that I'd like to make to Town Meeting. This forum is really not an appropriate forum to debate location of a proposed new department.

The reason I raise that is that I want Town Meeting to understand that, as I've already noted, we are involved in impact bargaining with multiple employee unions involved currently in our two stand-alone dispatch operations. And that is a collective bargaining process that’s governed by state statute, and part of what we’re discussing is the potential location of this dispatch facility.

And I am, as Town Manager with respect to the statute, I’m somewhat limited as to what I can say and how far we can take the concept of location and the details.

But I was happy to reveal what I’ve talked about so far and so assure Town Meeting that my purpose, subject to a concurrence with the Board of Selectmen and involving as many parties as we possibly can, and including the Recreation Committee and others who would care to be involved, is to bring forward to Town Meeting if we’re able
to embrace this concept and all the cost savings
that you will realize going forward annually, I
intend to bring forward the most cost-effective
physical solution to Town Meeting.

I believe it’s our responsibility to be
good stewards of the precious revenue that we’re
entrusted with, and that’s why we’re sharpening our
pencil and taking a look at what’s available, what
you’ve already constructed, and trying to be as
cost-effective as possible.

So, I assure you that drives us
fundamentally. And beyond that we are involved in
collective bargaining and that process is going to
take several months going forward.

A couple of last comments, Mr. Moderator,
if I may. Just a couple emphases, with the
patience of Town Meeting.

Again, the current dispatch equipment is
technologically outdated. We have end of life
notices. There is some urgency to move forward.
If all goes forward as we hope, we would have a new
dispatch operation initiated one year hence,
essentially in January of 2016. That is the
timetable we are on.
There are many – this is a complex process, many steps to take. We’re well under way, but we bring these capital proposals to Town Meeting in the spirit that we do have a schedule to meet and we’re happy to answer your questions and appreciate your consideration for what we’re trying to do.

There’s a proposed new consolidated Communications Department that would provide enhanced and expanded services to multiple departments – we’ve touched on those – and the public at a reduced annual operating cost. This Communications Department requires an exclusive and dedicated area which supports its important public safety purpose.

The final location decision is ultimately within the authority of the Board of Selectmen.

As Town Manager, I’ve been working on the Board’s behalf on this important goal for the past year. The police chief and the fire chief have been heavily involved in this as well.

We’ve also had the involvement of the Public Works Director Ray Jack and Marine Environmental Services Director Greg Frazier.
Their functions would also be integrated as an important part of this facility. It’s not only a dispatch, a 24 hours, seven day a week dispatch facility, but a communication center to serve the public and the residents of the community.

The details related to the final location of the consolidated department, as I’ve noted, are subject of impact bargaining presently underway with multiple collective bargaining units.

As I’ve noted, this is a matter of critical public safety and I bring it to you in that spirit.

I do appeal to Town Meeting to provide the funding to allow timely and cost effective equipment replacement and the funding to allow the placement and integration of this new equipment within an existing Town facility. To delay the funding necessary is to risk the possibility of critical equipment failure and to put off the responsible work necessary to locate and operationalize this cost-effective public safety function.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring this to you and address your questions.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion.

Yes, Ms. Cuny.

MS. CUNY: Mr. Moderator, were you going to go through this by line item or?

THE MODERATOR: Or, by section. So we’re in General Government but –

MS. CUNY: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: let’s focus on dispatch –

MS. CUNY: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: because this is where we’ve ended up.

MS. CUNY: Sandra Cuny, precinct 2. Chairman of the Falmouth Recreation Committee.

As you have been told, we didn’t know anything about it. I didn’t find out until precinct 1 and 2 meeting, when Ms. Magnani appropriated – was going to make a motion for 250,000 because they found a facility. So I wonder: where’s the facility? It’s the Gus Canty Recreational Community Center.

And I did see Mr. Suso at the Veteran’s Day ceremony, and I asked, “What area are you
looking at?” And he told me the stage area and
behind the stage. And I said, “But we use that.”
So we briefly talked and he did write me a letter
the next morning. I told him that I’d like to
bring it before the Recreation Committee because we
happened to have a meeting that following night.

So the letter that he wrote me I brought
before the Committee. And I will just read a part
of it. “Thank you for you comments on the topic
during our conversation at yesterday’s Veteran’s
Day ceremony. The Gus Canty Center is indeed
among two locations we are actively exploring for
the potential future location of this public safety
function. We are also exploring the Eddy Marks
Building. While this remains exploratory, at this
time it appears the Gus Canty location is the more
likely of the two. The space we are considering
within Gus Canty is the little used side stage area
immediately adjacent to the gym. As this is yet
exploratory, we have no firm plans to present at
this time.” And he did apologize and he did say
that he would like to meet with us.

And so I brought this letter to the
Recreation Committee meeting that night and we
discussed it. And what I’d like to do is bring
you some of their thoughts and their comments and
their questions.

Why weren’t we informed or included in
the discussion? I guess that was the first
question on everybody’s mind.

The building was built and designed for a
purpose; is this the proper use?

They felt the process was not done
properly; it was not transparent.

What are the other options? Does it
have to be in this location in town for a reason?

They had a number of questions and we
would be happy to meet, but because we had no time
to meet, I had to bring this here tonight.

One member said, “I honestly cannot say
if this is a good thing or a bad thing because I
don’t know anything about it.”

What I can tell you is that in that
entire stage area that they want to use has been
used in the past. We’ve had dance concerts,
musical bands, fund-raising events, the Margaret
Rogers Dance Studio, the jugglers have used it,
Aikido has used it. The after prom high school
has used it every year for the last 20 years. And even the Assistant Director at our meeting said the recreational summer camp of 150 children on a rainy day, they’ve utilized that space because they have to split up the children for different activities.

So while it may not be used on a daily basis, it has been used and it does serve a purpose.

In doing some of my other homework, I obtained a copy of the minutes from the Finance Committee of October 28th, and this is when Mr. Suso went before the Finance Committee to ask that they change the amount from 50,000 to 250,000 because they had a site, with the primary focus on the stage area of the Gus Canty Center.

Well, in my letter on November 12th, it’s still exploratory, but on October 28th I guess it was definite.

The Recreation Committee is an appointed committee by the Board of Selectmen. We oversee Falmouth’s recreational activities, policies and programs and yes, we make recommendations to the Board of Selectmen, which we have not been able to do as of tonight.
If you think, you Town Meeting, you think this is the best location, then you have a chance to vote on it tonight. But if you have a shadow of a doubt, I would hope that you wouldn’t. If you vote yes on the $250,000, you can rest assured that this will be placed at the Gus Canty Community Center. If you vote no, it wouldn’t leave any money in that line item.

So at this time I would like to entertain a motion – an amendment, excuse me, an amendment to Article 18 in this line.

May I do that now, Dave?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, go ahead. That’s the one the Clerk has?

MS. CUNY: No.

THE MODERATOR: No, okay.

MS. CUNY: An amendment to Article 18 for the Facilities Improvement Consolidated Dispatch Line. That the Town vote to keep $50,000 in this line item until there is further discussion on a location and a definite plan on where the dispatch center would go before approving a facilities upgrade. And that was taking it from what the Finance Committee originally did in the
warrant booklet.

And I would hope that the Recreation Committee would certainly be part of the discussion. So thank you for your time.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we’re going to open up discussion on the amendment to bring this line item down to $50,000 and have further discussion on it.

So let’s start a new list. Mr. Suso, did you –

MR. SUSO: [No mic:] Mr. Moderator, I’m just available in case –

THE MODERATOR: Oh, okay, I didn’t know if you were –

MR. SUSO: I apologize.

THE MODERATOR: No, that’s – I saw you standing there and I didn’t know if you wanted to – yes, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct 9.

I would like to take the podium to speak in favor of the amendment. I would like Town Meeting to know that before I speak to you that I have gone to see the Chief of Police on this issue, briefly talked to the Fire Chief and have talked to
three out of the five Selectmen. So, what you’re about to hear they’ve already heard and these are my beliefs.

Obviously we cannot get into deep discussion and detail as to the location because, as the Town Manager has told us, of collective bargaining. So I would like to start out with some history in support of Mrs. Cuny and the Recreation Department. And it’s been told to us, it’s nice to know the decision for the location rests with the Board of Selectmen. So I’m pretty sure that the five Board of Selectmen that are sitting here tonight — I don’t know if you were here, but I know I was here and many of you in 1984 we passed the article to tear down the wooden structure known as the Gus Canty Center and we passed that article for 3.5 million dollars to build the current Gus Canty Center. Approved recreation facility, as Mr. Dufresne’s telling me. In 1984 we did that at this Town Meeting. And as I look across the audience, I see many of you I know were there, and a lot of new faces here tonight.

And we occupied the building in 1988.
The article that went for the Prop 2 ½ override was for a community recreation center located at the present site. And we built it because it passed.

Approximately, what, 13 years after that, in 2001 — and many of you were probably here — we put an addition on that community recreation building known as the Teen Center. So obviously we have had use of the building. So much so that after its original construction we had to put an addition.

As far as the actual room that’s being proposed in the presentation, I too have been in that room, as Mrs. Cuny just said. And to use the term “underutilized showers” and this and that, I think is a misconception. I currently am taking a class at the Recreation Center on Thursday nights.

That’s the history that when you decide where you’re going to locate this. We asked the taxpayers to fund this and we told them, “This is what we’re going to do with the building.” And I think this is a big departure from that.

Next I’d like to try to segue into the concept of an emergency communications center that’s a 24/7 operation, 365 days a year. So not
only do we have the physical reconstruction of the plan, but we have also an operational that comes with a cost.

Fellow Town Meeting Members, I am wholeheartedly for this consolidation. I don’t question the amount of money, but the process.

When I met as a Town Meeting Member with the precinct meeting 8 and 9, there was no site. The process of the precinct meeting is to discuss this warrant booklet, and something as important as this should have been decided long before, not the week before Town Meeting. I think precinct 3 also met that same night that 8 and 9 met.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Lowell, who said according to this Enterprise article of November 3rd, on the Finance Committee, Mr. Lowell said he would like community input on the site location before the project goes forward. I think he’s 100 percent correct. This is our community; we are vastly going to change the use of that building that the taxpayers gave us the money for. And it’s the process that we’re talking about.

In support of Mrs. Cuny’s article of reducing this to 50,000, it’s doable. When I
asked the Chief of Police, “Could this wait?” He said, “Yes, but there’s no guarantee that the equipment’s going to work.” Okay, how long do we have to wait? Let’s just look at the calendar.

Five months from today is April. We will be sitting here; this article could be re-presented to us in the Special Town Meeting of the Annual in just five months from now.

I would hope you’d support this. I am for the equipment, I’m for the consolidation. I—you know how upset I get with the process and to say I’m sorry later. Let’s get the community involved in this.

In the brief discussion – and Chief Dunn, if I’m wrong, you correct me – in the brief discussion that I had with Chief Dunn, we came up with two other ideas. When you put more people and you add more parts to the pot, you come up with a better solution.

In closing, Folks, I have to give you one anecdotal historical Town Meeting. We were all here last night on Article 19. It cost us 435, and then someone said the asphalt. You know, almost $600,000. One of the reasons the location for the
current fire station was given was it was going to save us money.

Now, I wanted to put the fire station on Dillingham Avenue; I lost that argument, and history’s come down. But ask yourself this: 20, 15 years after we built the fire station, those people that told us it was going to save us money, add another $600,000 to the figure. I don’t want that to happen with this article.

Let’s get a committee together. Let’s look at some alternatives. And if the best location is this location, and that’s what the input is, we’ve waited five months. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Allegro.

MR. ALLEGRO: Mark Allegro, 7th precinct.

It looks like a wonderful facility, but it would be helpful, I think for me anyway, to know just how frequently the stage area is used currently. The information was a little bit spotty. If not used on a daily basis, is it used on a weekly basis? Every couple a weeks? A few times a month? Because although we would like to see a facility not re-purposed, and even though it
was originally designed and budgeted as a recreation facility, if it’s not really being used, that weighs into the decision.

So, anyone that could answer that would be appreciated.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: I’m certainly happy to answer that, Mr. Moderator.

I have a report from the Recreation Director and the members of her staff who’ve confirmed this. They go on to say the stage room is not used on a daily basis; there is no pattern of use. Two small groups use it for practice; they are a juggling group and a Aikido group – which is karate with sticks, I guess. They use it once a week. They are not charged for the use and they could be moved to the gym area if necessary.

On a yearly basis, very few events use the actual stage. The after prom party uses the lip of the stage. That event is held in early May. But not the stage itself.

The high school has one dance per football season on homecoming and they only use the lip of the stage for their disc jockey, not the
stage.

Five years ago there was a ballet class held there, but the teacher retired.

The room has been used occasionally over the years but not heavily. That’s the report I have from the Recreation Department.

One additional item, because I don’t want to overlook anything: “Our summer camp may use the stage for one talent show during the summer. Most of the time the show is held in Room 1 and not on the stage, but once during the summer they may use it for a talent show.” And that’s the report I have from the Recreation Department.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Thrasher. Mr. Noonan, I’ve got you on the list.

MR. THRASHER: Scott Thrasher, precinct 4.

I’ve never been so anxious to talk about a subject on Town Meeting floor because I wear two hats here and it’s a little difficult for me. But I’m speaking – excuse me, I’m sorry – I’m speaking out of concern as a precinct 4 member, Town Meeting Member and I have to voice my concerns. And this time I’m not in agreement with the proposal.
I’ve been skeptical at first because it’s something new to me. I used to dispatch. And I have had a hard time getting information as to what’s going to happen and how it’s going to occur.

And a study was done, and about a year ago when I heard about the study I went to the Selectmen’s Meeting and we received a grant I believe for $25,000 to do a study. And I participated in that study. I came in off duty. I wanted to talk to them. I gave them my name and phone number, asked them to talk to me. I had questions, concerns. And I went in and I got to participate; made me feel good.

I still don’t have any information; there’s no study out yet. I did talk with Mr. Suso; within the next 30 days he told me that the study would be out. So this seems to me as though we’re putting the cart before the horse. I don’t have any information.

I’d like to see the recommendations and if this is supported. And the cost to me, being a former electrician, I’m thinking, $250,000, that’s not a lot of money to get a dispatch room ready to take equipment.
So this is what I’ve learned since my precinct meeting. Because when I was at my precinct meeting, that’s when I found out that it may go in the Rec building. And I talked to a FinCom member; there’s not much knowledge of the study through them, either, who are making the decisions here.

So, Mr. Suso answered my emails: the study’s not out yet. I called Ralph Swenson at the Barnstable County Sheriff’s Office. He’s the Technical Services Director; he’s done three to four combined dispatch centers. And he’s currently getting ready to re-do the Sheriff’s Department again. And I threw out what I knew to him and he was concerned about he thought it was kind of low.

We need a full standby generator, wherever it goes. We need a radio tower. Everything needs to be hardwired. It needs to be stand alone. You can’t have wires connected from the Fire Station to the dispatch and have a pole hit and not have communications.

He also mentioned terrorist concerns because that’s the first thing they go for.
wasn’t thinking of things like that. He didn’t think that site – it needs to be a secure area. That was one of his concerns. And he said I could reference to him.

I asked him to speak, but he’s in a – he’s with the Sheriff’s Department; he thought – but he was concerned as a taxpayer where the money was going.

I went and visited the Rec Center. I looked at the stage. The stage looks great. I walked in there; I’d never seen it before, either. And I thought, “Wow, this is a nice space.” The space stand alone for a communications room is nice. It is.

But what concerns me is where are the rest of the facilities. There’s no generator. There’s no generator at all at the Rec Center. And where’s the bathroom? It needs to be close by. Where’s the locker room?

How about a bunk room, because when you go to storm coverage for four days straight, which has happened in the past, you may need to take a nap. And four consoles may not be enough.

I did call my friend Troy Clarkson,
because they have one up in Hanover. And he did
rest my fears is that maybe consolidated dispatch
might be a good thing for the Town. Because I’m
used to the old way: they’re in my station. But
he said there needs to be a lot of details to this
plan. There needs to be, you know, where is this,
I mentioned the study. He said the study would be
nice to have. And he said you need Departmental
involvement.

And I called — I was reached out to by my
friend Alden Cook; he’s a former firefighter. Some
of you might know the old timer. And he works at
Cape & Island EMS still, and he warned me about how
about there are two completely different jobs,
Folks.

Police and Fire dispatch are different.
It’s not to say they can’t share the same room.
It’s not to say they can’t help each other. But
right now you have an officer on the desk with a
dispatcher; so that’s two people. And you have a
dispatcher at the fire station. I got three. And
right now we’re talking about two at a dispatch
center. We lost somebody.

So, a lot of what I’m hearing raises
concerns. Mr. Suso’s right, we are on borrowed
time, and that’s the rush. I do appreciate that.
I understand that. We’ve been band-aiding it for
years and we’ve got filler programs trying to do
our dispatch right now. There is a rush, yes.
But I don’t believe these costs are accurate for
the infrastructure and I think we are rushing.

I want what’s best for public safety, I
do. And I think you should, too. And dispatch is
key. I appreciate the fact he’s trying to keep it
in town, because one thing Mr. Clarkson did say is
once it goes regional to the Sheriff’s Department,
you will save money. And Mr. Suso is exercising
due diligence in making sure that it does stay
here, and maybe combined dispatch is the way to go.
But let’s do it right. Let’s do it right. Let’s
not spend – ‘cuase – let’s not spend more money the
wrong way.

We can’t rush now because things are
failing. We knew they were failing a little while
ago, you know? We need to stay on top of it.
It’s a 24/7 operation. 6500 calls a year for the
Fire Department, 30,000 calls a year for the P.D.
right now as it stands, and they’re not going down.
I’d like to see the study.

I support the amendment, because we can still buy the equipment if we needed to do it as a filler if something did break.

When you go to the Town website, there’s a Current Topics link, and I would love to see a consolidated dispatch link with information.

Thank you for your time.


MR. SUSO: Mr. Moderator, may I respond?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, sure. Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I just believe the Town Meeting – I mentioned to Town Meeting Members that we’re involved in impact bargaining with the collective bargaining units that are affected by this, and I believe Town Meeting Members should be aware that Captain Thrasher, for whom I have great respect, is a member of the collective bargaining unit that we are currently involved in impact discussions with.

So, please understand my reluctance to engage in collective bargaining discussions with 250 Town Meeting Members. It disrespects you, it disrespects state statute, and it’s not proper for
this forum. So I felt that Town Meeting Members should be aware of that and should understand it going forward. Thank you.


MS. KOSINS-LONG: Wow. Lot of dirty laundry tonight, huh?

On that note, I don’t agree with the amendment. I propose a second amendment that takes the facilities improvement consolidation dispatch and zeros it out until management gets their collective act together.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the second amendment, the amendment on the floor is to zero out the entire line item on consolidated dispatch.

MR. NOONAN: Mr. Moderator, point of order.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Mr. Noonan, point of order.

MR. NOONAN: John Noonan, precinct 6. Are we allowed just two amendments on this entire article?

THE MODERATOR: No, on the omnibus budget no more than two amendments per line item, because it’s an omnibus budget, that’s the
exception to that.

MR. NOONAN: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: I wanted to make one clarification to Captain Thrasher’s comments, and they are that we did have an interdepartmental staff team including Marine Environmental Sciences, Information Technology, Department of Public Works, Police and Fire in drafting the budget that the Finance Committee reviewed. That final budget was adopted and reviewed by both Deputy Smith in the Fire Department and Captain Smith in the Police Department. Both of those had signed off on that and that following a detailed specifications by Comptronics, which is the Town’s consultant that provides equipment to both the Police and Fire Department currently, as well as a quote from Watson Furnishings that provides furnishings – actually provided the furnishings for the Barnstable County Sheriff.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any discussion on just the amendment to get rid of that line item completely?
Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Thank you. Leslie Lichtenstein, precinct 8.

I know it’s very tempting to say we don’t like what’s going on, let’s just take our ball and go home. But the Finance Committee did recommend $50,000. If we eliminate this money completely, are we cutting our nose off to spite our face? I mean, it sounds like a consolidated operation center might be a good idea, and if we totally eliminate the $50,000, I mean, does that really put us behind the eight ball? I’d like to hear someone from the Finance Committee address that, please. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman.

MS. MAGNANI: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

The Finance Committee originally voted $50,000 for this line item because they felt that they didn’t have enough information. And that was on October 21st. On October 28th the Town Manager came to our meeting and did a presentation. And he explained what he’s explained here to you tonight and the Finance Committee agreed with it and they voted for it with one abstention.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on this amendment?

Ms. Lowell.

MS. LOWELL: Maybe everybody’s clear on this, but I think we need to make progress on this, so I - $50,000 would be a good half loaf for those who want to go forward, and so I certainly would encourage Town Meeting not to vote for zero and then they can decide whether they want to do the other option by themselves based on what they’ve heard. But please don’t vote for zero.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, all those in favor of striking the line item completely signify by saying aye.

[No audible response.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the no’s have it and we go back to the other amendment and Mr. Noonan was on my speaking list for the amendment to go to - go down to 50,000.

MR. NOONAN: John Noonan, precinct 6.

Sorry. My concern is not just the
$250,000, but it’s also the consolidated dispatch
communication equipment radios. Between the two,
we’re looking at a million and fifty thousand
dollars that you’re asking us to approve and we
have no idea where it’s going.

I don’t think it’s a smart thing to do to spend a million dollars and have no idea where that money is going to. I think we have to do your bargaining, come back to the Town Meeting and say, “This is where we want to put it. This is the amount of money we need to put the radios in."

Finish your conversation with Sheriff Cummings. Find out if it’s going out to the Sheriff’s Department. Or is it going in town. If it goes out to the Sheriff’s Department is it a different kind of communication radios that we need because of the distance that it’s out of town?

There is a number of different items that should be looked at before you spend a million dollars. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Pinto and then Ms. Schneider. Mr. Young, I had you on the list from the main motion. Do you want to go on this list? Okay.
MR. PINTO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Greg Pinto, precinct 9.

Many of you probably think I’m going to call the question, but no.

[Laughter.]

MR. PINTO: I have a couple of questions. The first question, Mr. Moderator, through you either to Town Manager or the Police or Fire Chief. Is there – could you please give us the reason why this dispatch facility needs to be located centrally somewhere along Main Street is the impression I’m getting. Why does it need to be there as opposed to you know somewhere else, anywhere else?

MR. SUSO: The primary reason for that is ease of access to the Police and Fire Departments that are fundamentally served.

MR. PINTO: All right, fair enough.

In regard to the underutilized — so-call underutilized space of the stage, I knew it was there. I’ve been on it. I’ve used it; been a while. My thought here, though, however, is as we all know meeting space at times can get difficult to come by. Last night we approved $435,000 to
purchase property behind the fire station.

Once we’re done with this budget, we’re going to go to Article 20, where we’re going to be asked to appropriate some more money. Which will bring the total for that parcel behind the fire station to $600,000. I believe last night we were told we get 28 parking spaces out of that.

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

MR. PINTO: No, no, no.

MR. PINTO: What’s that?

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

MR. PINTO: 20 – thank you very much. I had a slightly lower number, but I’ve been told that’s 22,400 per parking space.

[Laughter.]

MR. PINTO: That’s a lotta coins for parking. I hope we’re putting in meters.

Some of you might know where I’m going with this. How much would it cost to put some tables and chairs on the side of that stage, set ‘em up if you need a meeting space and turn a couple lights on? How many parking spaces are there already paved and painted at Gus Canty
Community Recreation Center? We already had meeting rooms there that we use. I’ve used those, too.

Last night at the end of Town Meeting, I said to another Town Meeting Member, “Why do I get the feeling that we’ve wasted a lot of money?”

Right now, I think that amendment is a good amendment. Let’s keep it at $50,000. Let’s keep the process moving because I do believe in a consolidated dispatch center. I believe that’s a good idea. I happen to have a very good friend of mine who is a sergeant in the Communications Department up at the Sheriff’s office and I know from talking to him that this is a good idea. Maybe not at the Recreation Center; that needs to be explored some more.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Schneider.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Barbara Schneider, precinct 4.

Last night we heard several things that I’ve pulled together to make you think one more minute about this amendment which I am in favor of. We heard last night from Ms. Flynn that in 1964 there was a vision and that that vision was
something that was put into play to create what we have today. We also heard from in a report given, that one of the three things to be considered for a senior center is in fact Gus Canty. Why would we not wait to see what we’re going to do if it involves Gus Canty for the senior center before we change anything more, something especially this expensive? Why not look at the big picture and wait and put all this together then?

We don’t ever think big enough in this town and we need to do that, and we need to take a pause here. I appreciate that Mr. Suso was given a goal, a personal goal to achieve. He’s got us all thinking. He’s got a lot of people talking. But we’re not ready to say where it’s going, and there’s a lot of possibilities to be explored.

I hope you will support this amendment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’ve got a good speaker’s list here. Mr. Jones, you’re next on that. But I’m going to ask if there’s anybody who wants to speak in favor of this amendment.

FROM THE FLOOR: Against.

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, against the amendment, yeah. Is there anyone who wants to
speak against the amendment?

Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Douglas Jones, precinct one.

What we’re really voting on is not the location. It’s on the idea of a consolidated dispatch center, and where we’re going to put it will cost money. Mr. Suso has said the Gus Canty will be the least expensive, with an estimate of $250,000. So it will at least cost that.

The determination as to where it’s going to go is going to happen later and certainly the Board of Selectmen will be taking input from the community, but we’re going to have to spend at least $250,000. That’s what it will cost to Gus Canty. If we go someplace else, we’re going to need even more money. But the minimal need to be able to put it someplace and to change whatever facility we use to house it will be that amount of money.

And then, in April, if we go someplace else, we may have to come back to get some more. So I would hope that you’d keep it at least for the 250 so we can move forward with this process, so we can make sure we have this
consolidated dispatch as soon as we possibly can for the safety of our community. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG: Bob Young, precinct 5.

This subject came up at precinct 5 and that was the first I heard of it that they were going to use the Gus Canty for this expanded communication center and I asked at that meeting if the Recreation Committee had to vote on that and I was told they didn’t have to, which surprised me.

And Barbara stole my thunder. I wanted to bring up the report for Mr. Vieira: we’re going to put a senior center I there, possibly. One of the top three sites.

Let’s pull back on the reins a little bit and go with the $50,000 and try to find a site other than the Recreation building and go with the original Finance Committee of 50,000. Thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I think we’re ready to take a vote on this amendment. The amendment is on reducing the line item back to 50,000.

All those in favor of the reduction
signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the ayes have it by a majority and the line item is now 50,000.

And further discussion on the General Government section of the Capital Budget?

Ms. Fenwick.

MS. FENWICK: Judy Fenwick, precinct one.

I just have a small question on a little bit more detail on what is meant under the Board of Selectmen Meeting Room Upgrades. I understand it’s being funded through the easement from the Mill Road work that Comcast and NStar did, but I’d just like to know what comprises the $42,000.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

As Ms. Fenwick has noted, this money was forthcoming from the – as part of the package of settlement projects that Town Meeting approved allowing the easement for the telecommunications
cable to the Vineyard to go forward with excavation at the Mill Road parking lot.

What is anticipated is a renovation of
the heavily used Selectmen Meeting Room, including
the internal communications system. Those of you
who’ve experienced that know that we are not as
high-tech as would be very helpful, given the many
meetings that we have there.

We’ll be working with our IT Department and we also may re-arrange, adjust the location of
the furnishings and the way the seating works,
subject to the Board of Selectmen’s preferences if we determine that that will allow the more
efficient functional use of that space.

But, bottom line, the equipment there is
well beyond its useful life, including the
furnishings, the chairs, some of them are broken
and not operational, and certainly the very
important audio and video equipment that broadcasts
every meeting of the Board of Selectmen to the
general public is in need of upgrading, as are the
accommodations for the many speakers that come and present PowerPoint presentations to the Board and for the public’s information.
So it’s for a wholesale upgrade of that room to better service the communication needs of all.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion in General Government?

Mr. McNamara.

MR. MCNAMARA: Matt McNamara, precinct 7.

Just a point of clarification, Mr. Moderator. I know you indicated that each section you will allow amendments, but –

THE MODERATOR: Each line item.

MR. MCNAMARA: Each?

THE MODERATOR: Each line item. We’ve always done that in the omnibus budget for both the capital and the –

MR. MCNAMARA: Each line, but will you also entertain an amendment to the overall article at the end?

THE MODERATOR: Well, depending if it’s within the scope.

MR. MCNAMARA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Because that should just be a consolidation of numbers and funding sources.
MR. MCNAMARA: Well, if I might, then, while I’m here. Peter Clark earlier stated I think that he was old and a curmudgeon. And I would tend to agree with him.

[Laughter.]

MR. MCNAMARA: Actually, I agree with the point that he was making.

[Laughter.]

MR. MCNAMARA: And that — but I come at it a little bit differently. If you look at the back of our warrant book, there’s a definition of terms, and the definition of the Capital Budget is an annual appropriation or spending plan for capital expenditures, tangible assets or projects that cost at least $25,000 and have a useful life of at least five years.

Well, if you look at Article 18 in its entirety, there’s $182,500 in excess of that definition, and I actually believe that Article 18, all of these items are beyond the scope of Article 18.

Article 18 says to see if the town will vote to appropriate a sum of money for the purpose of funding capital improvements. Not as Ms. Petit
stated that for one time only costs. I believe that what we have before us is Capital improvements in this article, and to go beyond that and to say one time only costs is beyond the scope of this article.

So, I don’t know whether you would entertain a motion one by one to pull all of those out.

THE MODERATOR: No, no. This is what I’ll do. I’ll make it very clear to the folks that sit with me on the stage that the paradigm of the Capital Budget, the definitions as they appear in the book, should be reflected in the articles that I see at future town meetings relative to the Capital Budget, and that one time purchases from Certified Free Cash would be appropriate to consolidate into one article at future town meetings.

And the paradigm that you have in your warrant booklet of the Capital Plan, the terms and definitions that Mr. McNamara is referring to, are the paradigm by which this Capital Plan is developed, and so in the future I think it’s clear from Town Meeting Members and I want it to be clear
from the chair to the Board of Selectmen: when you
post the next warrant with a Capital Budget we’d
like to see a Capital Budget that reflects the
definitions that the Working Group that I appointed
had worked out a few years back when Mr. Anderson
chaired. And then I want to go forward and have
an article that has all of your one-time purchases
from Certified Free Cash.

So that Town Meeting doesn’t get caught
in spending a lot of time arguing about how the
format is, let’s just do it that way, and then we
can all agree that’s a good way to do it. Okay?

MR. MCNAMARA: Okay.

Mr. Moderator, one final point. I’d
also suggest that some of these items are not one
time expenditures.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. MCNAMARA: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Augusta.

MS. AUGUSTA: [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: You’re all set.

I saw another hand earlier back there.

Was it – yes, Mr. Bidwell.

MR. BIDWELL: Good evening, Todd
Bidwell, precinct 4.

Through you, Mr. Moderator. This is not regarding location of the consolidated dispatch, but rather a question about consolidated dispatch. And I wondered if either of the Police Chief or the Fire Chief have any concerns regarding the consolidation.

THE MODERATOR: Chiefs?

CHIEF DUNN: Hi, Edward Dunn, your Police Chief.

Concerns. No. I believe it is the way to go. It will streamline things. As far as on the Police Department side, it’s going to give me an officer that I can utilize, whether within the building or on the streets.

The only concern I do have is by delaying it, as we’ve all said. And I can’t speak for the Fire Chief - or, I could, at this point. As far as our equipment-wise, it’s close to failure. Our dispatch center did go down last month and it’s held together with band-aids.

So, by delaying the process, at some point this forum here is going to have to spend a lot of money to get us up and running again so that
we can give you services that you need.

That’s my only concern.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Chief Sullivan.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: Hi, I’m Mark Sullivan, Fire Chief.

I’ve had discussions with both the Police Chief and the Town Manager, and I did initially have some concerns over a combined dispatch center. And if money and fiscal responsibility weren’t an object, and I had my withers, I would just leave things the way we are because I think we have a good system. We have well-trained people. And there is a difference between dispatching Fire and Police. But there are some issues and if we do go to a combined dispatch, then we can – they’re not insurmountable and they can be trained. People can be trained to do dual roles.

But, we have to realize there are two distinct differences between Police and Fire dispatching.

And I do like the idea of the combined dispatch. In keeping it in town, it gives our people that are working here that have jobs that are good at it and very professional, it’ll
maintain them in those jobs. And certainly it is, I believe, a much better option in my opinion than going to the county and going to any type of regional outfit, because you do - you get what you pay for when you go to a regional. You see, all the people that are being dispatched by the County are smaller communities and maybe they don’t have the needs and the unique resources that Falmouth has.

So, those are the concerns I have, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion of the General Government section?

Mr. Noonan.

MR. NOONAN: John Noonan, precinct 6.

Before I make an amendment, I would like to ask through you, Mr. Moderator, to the two chiefs: would the equipment that you are asking us for of $755,000, will that equipment be able to be used whether we go - no matter where we go, our locations in town? Or will we - is it equipment specific to the location, or will that equipment be able to be used anywhere?

THE MODERATOR: Chief Sullivan.
CHIEF SULLIVAN: I don’t believe that it could be used – I’m not – maybe you can try and explain the question a little better.

THE MODERATOR: Let me try this. Mr. Noonan? This appropriation is an amount of money to buy equipment. It doesn’t say what equipment we’re buying. So if Town Meeting were to authorize this, the administration would decide what equipment they were going to buy based on where they’re going to go.

So we’re not actually buying equipment. We’re authorizing that amount of money to be used to purchase consolidated equipment. So the technical aspect of what equipment we’re going to buy would be done when they know what equipment they need to buy.

MR. NOONAN: So with that answer, what you’re asking us to do is to allow $755,000 to be spent so they can put it in a certain location and then you’re going to come back and say to us, “We need an additional $600,000 to build a building to put this equipment in. That we’ve already spent $700,000 on. So you really need to spend the money to put it somewhere.”
So I would suggest that we not spend the money on the equipment right now until we know where it’s going. And I would like to make an amendment to that line item to zero that line item out.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so dispatch equipment. This is the $755,000, to zero out the line item.

Discussion on zeroing out the line item?

Yes, Ms. Liechtenstein.

MS. LIECHTENSTEIN: Lesley Lichtenstein, precinct 8.

I have a Question. If we appropriate this amount of money and we give the Selectmen the authority to spend it when they need it, if we have a failure, as both the Police Chief and the Fire Chief have said we may have, it’s my understanding that the software will no longer be supported. That’s what it means when a system becomes terminal, the company no longer supports the software with updates.

If we suddenly lack the software to be able to run the dispatch centers that we have now until we’ve built a new one, wouldn’t it be a good
idea to have this money already appropriated and
the Selectmen had it in their authority to use it
to get the system that - they could use it to make
sure we have a system that runs until we get
something else?

That’s my question, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman or Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Yes. Yes, absolutely.

I guess I’m on now. Yeah, the answer’s yes. Town Meeting, I would just refer you to the other option available to you: maintaining two stand-alone centers, but you’ll need to change the 755 to a million, twenty-five thousand. So that is another option available to you, but I would hope that you would take our recommendation to go to consolidation seriously and give us the ability to act if a catastrophic situation occurs as the Police Chief has referred to.

We have had some episodes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Mustafa.

MR. MUSTAFA: Mr. Moderator, Ahmed Mustafa, precinct 4.

Has anybody given any thought to renting
or leasing the radios rather than buying them?
That way there you’re getting the best and the
newest item on the market and then you can have
them take that back and rent a newer item. Rather
than purchasing an item and then you’ve got the
police radios, they’ve been there over 30 years, so
they definitely are in bad shape.
I would strongly suggest you look at
leasing the radio equipment.

You’re all set.
Mr. Pinto.

MR. PINTO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator,
Greg Pinto, precinct 9.
I guess this question will go through you
to the Town Manager. My warrant booklet says,
“Consolidated Dispatcher Communication Equipment
Radios”. Number one, I am – I am – I am
assuming, and please correct me if I am wrong, that
these are not just radios, these are also computers
and computer systems.

My question, however, is if there were a
catastrophic failure at the Police Department or
the Fire Department and if we had approved this
money, would this money be used to purchase equipment for a consolidated dispatch center or would the money then be used to purchase equipment for the one system that crashed?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: As I noted in my presentation, the Board of Selectmen have voted to create a consolidated Communications Department. I would act accordingly.

MR. PINTO: Okay, but my point is that my booklet says that this money is for consolidated dispatch equipment. It is not listed for police equipment, it is not listed for fire equipment. It is listed for consolidated equipment.

So if we appropriate this money for consolidated equipment, will you use it for one or the other if one or the other crashes – [Telephone rings.]

MR. PINTO: I’ll wait.

[Pause.]

MR. PINTO: My point being that we’re being asked to appropriate money for one purpose and what I think I heard you say was that if necessary you will take this money and use it for a
different purpose.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. PINTO: Yes. Because if we’re buying equipment for a consolidated dispatch center but then it ends up going into say just the police station, Mr. Suso just explained to us if that happens and then the Fire Department’s equipment goes down, he’s going to need this amount of money again to replace that equipment and we’re going to end up with two stand alone systems again.

MR. NETTO: Point of information.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Yes, Mr. Moderator, I think I confirmed that the Board of Selectmen has made a decision. They’ve created a consolidated – they’ve approved the creation of a consolidated Communications Department and those are my marching orders. That is how I would proceed.

MR. NETTO: Point of information.

THE MODERATOR: Joe.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct 9.

I think I’d like to try to clear up this cloud somewhat with – okay.
chairman of the FinCom.

Mrs. Magnani, if I’m not mistaken, if there was a failure in the communication system tomorrow in the Fire or Police Department, wouldn’t that come under the Emergency Reserve Fund Transfer clause of the FinCom so that we would be up and running, correct, Mr. Moderator?

THE MODERATOR: That’s what I just told her, yes.

MR. NETTO: That’s what we have that clause for.

THE MODERATOR: There’s $325,000 in there.

MS. MAGNANI: Mr. Netto.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman.

MR. NETTO: Yes, Ma’am.

MS. MAGNANI: We have $325,000 right now.

MR. NETTO: Okay, so there’s –

MS. MAGNANI: And that’s all.

MR. NETTO: That’s all, but 325,000.

So if something happened tomorrow, and I’m not the electronics expert to repair it, I’m sure that we have some funds to cover that. And that’s another
thing Town Meeting Members look at when you spend money because these are our reserve funds. That’s—we should somehow try to put even more money in there.

Okay, but I thought hopefully this clears up this grey area that if things fail tomorrow we have money to fix it. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman of the Finance Committee.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator—

THE MODERATOR: I’ve got you on the list, I’ve got you on the list. I’ve got you on the list. I’ve recognized the chair of the Finance committee.

MS. MAGNANI: Oh. Mr. Moderator, I would like to ask the Police Chief and the Fire Chief if $325,000 would take care of a problem with all of this equipment in either department and can it be fixed. The companies are telling us they can’t be.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: I think that depends on the problem, Madame.

[Laughter.]

CHIEF SULLIVAN: I mean, no, I’m not
trying to be funny. I mean, it depends on the amount and the scope of the problem. If you had a, you know, a hurricane and it wiped out your whole infrastructure, then no, it wouldn’t be enough money.

If you had, you know, one computer or maybe if you needed a software program to replace the CAD, then yeah, that probably would be enough.

THE MODERATOR: On the police side?

CHIEF DUNN: Same answer, it would depend on the system.

If the console itself goes down for good, from the prices we got on the console, that might not be enough. But if it’s a software issue with the console and things like that, like, right now, they’re repairing our console with used parts because Motorola no longer makes that console. So it would depend on the situation.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Thank you, Chiefs.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moran and then Ms. Flynn.

MS. MORAN: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I think we just need to step back to a few minutes ago. And the vote was, really, as I
understood it, to let the Recreation Committee take
a look at this and work with Selectmen. And also
to allow Selectmen to have a chance to look at the
sites.

I think what, you know, this is –

MR. PINTO: [No mic:] Point of order.

Mr. Moderator, we’re not talking about
sites. We’re talking about equipment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. MORAN: I’m talking about a process,

and the –

MR. PINTO: [No mic: inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, just let her
finish so we can get off – we’ve been almost an
hour and a half on one line item.

Go ahead.

MS. MORAN: So – so, in terms of the
appropriation, this is – this is going to take some
time to put together. And before there is an
emergency, I think we need to think sensibly and
allocate the money as it makes sense, and also give
the Recreation Department and the Selectmen time to
put the plan together cooperatively.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Flynn.
MS. FLYNN: Well, I was going to say something pretty much along the same lines.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, then, Mr. Heath -

MS. FLYNN: What you indicated tonight is -

[Laughter.]

MS. FLYNN: What?

THE MODERATOR: If you’re going to say the same thing, I’ll go to the next speaker.

MS. FLYNN: No. I just -

THE MODERATOR: Oh.

MS. FLYNN: I just want to say, what you’ve indicated tonight is you have some displeasure with the idea of using the Gus Canty Center, and we get that. But we need to start working on a site tomorrow. We can’t wait. We have to get this process moving, whether it’s - whether it’s somewhere else, it’s up to us to find it. But please don’t withdraw the funding.

Because we may find something in another month or two and we’re going to need the funding for the equipment. Maybe we don’t need money to improve a site; maybe we do. We can come back to Town
Meeting in April. But if the funding isn’t there, we will never be able to move forward on this. So please support the funding.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Heath.

MR. HEATH: [No mic: inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Yes, with a mic, please.

MR. HEATH: Austin Heath, precinct 8.

We’ve talked on this for a long, long time. There seem to be merit on both sides. We need to do something. We need to do it very quickly or we may have a catastrophic collapse of our communications.

On the other hand, this comes before us as an incomplete product on which we’re supposed to make a decision. It seems to me there’s a sentiment not to put it in the Gus Center.

However, to get started, I think – and I hate to suggest this – that if we leave it at the $50,000 –

THE MODERATOR: We’re on the line item of $755,000.

MR. HEATH: $750,000. If we vote that, they can get started. But until they have the other appropriation, they can’t move too far forward.
If they get a site and need the money for it so that they can install that equipment, we have a Special Town Meeting on one subject but at least we get started. Because right now, we can talk all night and it’s going to be the same thing: both sides have merit.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so I’m going to call the question on the amendment to strike out the $755,000 for the equipment radios. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair is that the no’s have it by a majority and this section is not stricken out.

I’m going to go on to Public Safety, the second section. Any discussion on the line items under Public Safety?

Mr. Eastman? Mr. Hunt. I’m having trouble because of the light over there.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, Carter Hunt, precinct 7.

I have a question on the Director’s
Vehicle, a Ford Explorer being replaced with an
Interceptor. I did a little research on the
Interceptor. I’m not quite sure why the Director
of Marine and Environment needs a pursuit vehicle
that can do 131 miles an hour.

[Laughter.]

MR. HUNT: The question really comes to
- and this really isn’t about money, because the
vehicle that I’m suggesting that he probably needs,
which is a pick-up truck, a Ford F-150 crew cab, is
probably more expensive than is currently there in
the line item.

However, the pursuit vehicle has no
towing capability, does not have four wheel drive
and it has no hauling capability. And given the
duties of the Marine and Environment, one would
think that they would be using a vehicle more
appropriate such as a pick-up truck for their
activities.

Could someone please explain why he needs
a pursuit vehicle that goes 131 miles an hour?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Certainly, Mr. Moderator.

With regard to the speed, that is not an issue
which we looked at. There was not a request for a pick-up truck. There was a request for a replacement SUV, and our experience with the new Ford vehicles has been very good in the Police side.

The Interceptor sounds pretty highfalutin. It’s basically a very small SUV or a large station wagon, depending on how you want to describe it. It does get reasonably good gas mileage, better than most SUV’s, and it is a new technology, a new package that we feel is appropriate.

It does have all wheel drive; I want to stress that; which I think is very important and it has been borne out in use that we’ve had in the Police Department so far.

It is the same vehicle that’s currently utilized by the Fire Chief and we’ve had a good experience with that.

So we are proposing to standardize, based upon this new vehicle that’s offered by Ford, and based upon our positive experience with it. It also is cost effective as well, we feel.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, yes, Ms. Murphy.
MS. MURPHY: Thank you. Carol Murphy, precinct 9.

I have a question regarding the three Crown Vic replacements with police Interceptors and they each have about less than 80,000 miles on them. They’re 2013 vehicles. Where are they going?

THE MODERATOR: Chief.

CHIEF DUNN: The vehicles being replaced, the Crown Vics are not Interceptors. The Crown Vics are the - what you are used to seeing, the regular Ford Cruisers. Ford no longer makes Crown Vics. The two of them that need to be replaced right now are pretty much dead lined; they’re sitting out behind the station. One needs a rear end, another one needs a transmission.

One of the Interceptors that will be replaced, the third vehicle, has over 85,000 miles on it right now. It’s one of the first ones that we received. And we’re starting to have - it’s out of warranty and we’re starting to have problems. In fact, it was towed the other day to the Ford garage because of transmission issues.

MS. MURPHY: Okay, thank you. And then
there are two other police Interceptors that are being replaced, also. So I just wanted to know where the Interceptors are going. The used Interceptors once you get the –

CHIEF DUNN: The used Interceptors?

MS. MURPHY: Yes.

CHIEF DUNN: They’re traded in to the company when we purchase the vehicles.

MS. MURPHY: Okay, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else in this section, in Public Safety?

Mr. Duffany.


I have a question for the Harbormaster Mr. Frazier. If the $50,000 for the dredging, the inlet dredging is – how far that’ll go. It doesn’t seem like a very significant amount of money based on the fact that we’ve been cutting back for years, now. I know when I go in and out of harbors I keep my fingers crossed with all of my instruments running and eyes in the water.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, microphone for Mr. Frazier.

We have historically requested $50,000 in either the Capital – we also get $17,000 in the line item in our budget.

To answer your question, we survey the south-facing inlets every spring and decide, based on the surveys that come back from the county, which ones have to be done as a priority and exhaust that amount of money pretty easily.

We could easily double the amount of money we spend on dredging, but that is the figure that we’ve been using for a while.

We also do get some money from the Beach committee, their line item for beach renourishment, because some places we dredge, like Bourne’s Pond exterior, for instance, that would be beach renourishment versus navigation dredging. So they pay for that.

MR. DUFFANY: Could I –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Duffany.

MR. DUFFANY: – make an amendment to this to add $50,000 to this line item for annual inlet dredging, for the purposes contained in this
THE MODERATOR: I don’t need it in writing. You can just add it from Free Cash. Are we good with that, we’ve got that number there?
Okay.
So there’s an amendment to add an additional $50,000 to make the dredging line item $100,000.
Discussion on the amendment.
Hearing none, the question will then come on the amendment. All those in favor of the increase signify by saying aye.
[Aye.]
THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.
[No.]
THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the ayes have it by a majority.
Further discussion on Public Safety.
Public Works. Any discussion on the Public Works section?
Mr. Finneran.
MR. FINNERAN: Yes, Mark Finneran, precinct 6.
The $75,000 for water meter replacement,
that seems to come up every year, so obviously it
doesn’t really fit into this budget. And also,
aren’t these water meters – don’t they charge for
these water meters when they replace them? So
wouldn’t that $75,000 replace itself on a yearly
basis, so to speak?

And secondly, it’s my understanding that
the water meters are thrown away and not rebuilt.
I know a lot of places rebuild them in-house and
then in New Hampshire many of the prisons rebuild
these things. Is there not a possible cost
savings available there?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jack.

MR. JACK: These are annualized.

There are 22,000 accounts for the Town. We try to
replace approximately a thousand meters per year in
order to keep the meters under 20 years old. As a
meter gets older, it wears in the owner’s favor.
So that means that the Town will consistently lose
money, so it’s in the Town’s best interest in order
to be able to maintain them at all times.

As far as replacing a meter versus
repairing a meter, in the old days, they did that.
And it was relatively cost effective to do so back
then. These are electronic instruments today.

We’ve converted the system over to radio reads. So before, a meter reader had to physically get to your meter in order to be able to read it. Now he only has to get within several hundred feet of your home in order to be able to read the meter. So it is much, much more effective to maintain those types of meters today.

Now, with regard to being cost effective to replace them, it costs money when we send someone out to your home, make an appointment to get in. You have to be there.

We come, go down, take the meter out, bring it back to the shop, repair it. In the meantime, we have to give you a device so that you can continue to use your water. Usually that’s a jumper, which means you’ll get free water in the interim. Then we have to bring the meter back after we repair it, and the cost of a new meter is much less than the overall cost of that overall process.

MR. FINNERAN: Don’t go away, I’ve got another question.

[Laughter.]
MR. FINNERAN: Here under DEP Compliance, $10,000. That sounds suspiciously like a fine. What is that?

MR. JACK: Mr. McConarty will be able to give you more specifics, but the Town over the years has had a number of waste site cleanup areas, if you will. There was a leak at the high school, years ago. There was also a leak that was at the Public Works facility. There was another site that was over near the Senior Center. And when these happen, then the Town has to come under compliance with the state.

That’s a long-range plan where we have to – requires annual monitoring and reporting to DEP. So that’s what the general funding is that you have seen over the last several years.

On this particular line item, for this year’s plan, it would be to try to get one of those sites off of that list on a permanent basis. And that would be the DPW facility.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McConarty, anything to add? No. Okay.

MR. MCCONARTY: No. Peter McConarty, Town Engineer.
That’s exactly correct. We’ve been working with our environmental consultant – well, actually the site we’re talking about is the Public Works facility site and over the years we’ve had to do biannual monitoring through our consultant to go through DEP, and we’re looking at this additional $10,000 combined with a previous year allotment. We’re looking to clean this site up and be able to take it right off the inventory completely.

So in future years we wouldn’t be requesting funds for this particular site.

MR. FINNERAN: What exactly is the nature of this violation?

MR. MCCONARTY: We had – there are several sites in town that we’ve had –

MR. FINNERAN: I mean the particular one at the DPW.

MR. MCCONARTY: Right, it falls in over the past years we’ve had several sites that had underground tank leaks. The tanks have been replaced, but for future years through the Department of Environmental Protection we’re required to do biannual monitoring. So that’s – that’s what this is. That’s what this will be.
And we’re trying to take it offline. We’re trying
to neutralize the site to take it offline.

MR. FINNERAN: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else
under Public Works?

Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Moderator, through you
to - I’m not sure just who.

The police station roof, $125,000, is
this a bid process? Have we gotten the bids and
this is what the low bid is? Or is this just an
amount of money that we anticipate it’s going to
be? Thank you.


MS. NEWTON: Shardell Newton, Facilities
Manager.

That particular cost was estimated from
what we did at the Recreation Center. The original
bid on the Recreation Center was bid for $128,000.
The bid came in at $75,000, so we’ve asked the same
company to give us a number to put toward the
Police station.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Kapp.

MR. KAPP: Thank you, Mr. Moderator,
Paul Kapp, precinct 3.

Shardell, can you tell us how many square feet that roof is?

THE MODERATOR: Just yell it.

MS. NEWTON: [No mic:] I’d have to look at the estimate.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, okay.

MS. NEWTON: [No mic:] To be honest with you.

THE MODERATOR: Not sure.

MS. NEWTON: What we did is we took the three sealed bids that we had from the Recreation Center and the gentleman that came in at the lowest bid, we asked him to give us an estimated price. It could come in conceivably lower. We doubt that it will come in higher.

It’s always better to ask for a little bit more because the Police station’s an old building. They did a roof - they did a 40 square back in 2005, just a patchwork on it.

The Chief can probably tell you a little more than I can about the history of that roof, but the problem is, when you get into an older building like that that was built in the '60's, you never
know what comes underneath the roof. We start ripping stuff apart, we find rot. So, we try to go to the worst extreme.

If you look at last year’s Capital Plan, you’ll see that we are going to give you back a lot of money from the Fire Station paint and the Town Hall paint because, again, we started in with the Town Hall and we found a lot of rot, but we did come in under bid.

So I’d hate to come back to Town Meeting and let you know that we could only do a half a roof.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: Peter Hargraves, precinct 9.

And I’m taking the microphone hopefully in the wake of your direction to separate capital – capital and expense items. Because I spoke on that a year ago and I sensed a lot of support and interest in doing that here.

And I’d like to add something for your consideration as providing direction for the way this information is presented to us.

I chose this moment because the two items
that illustrate my point are in the Public Works arena, here.

If you could direct your attention to the Road Maintenance and Construction. I’ve been impressed this year by the improvements that are very visible around town in improving roads and maintaining the quality of the striping and just the general good looks of the place. And we have spent $400,000 according to this.

The request was 850, but I see that for this year for the proposed ‘15 budget we’re spending or we’re actually allocating half. And notice in the out years that the 850 is consist– or 850 is consistently repeated and increased. I guess there must be an inflation adder there.

But I would hate to think, since I feel one of the primary duties of this body, the elected officials and the management representatives and the department heads, is to deliver a sustainable infrastructure, that we’re going to cut in half the budget to maintain our roads. I think they’re not okay and I applaud the progress and the planning that I’ve seen, but I don’t know how we can cut last year’s – or this year’s spending in half while
the out years show four times as much spending.

So, I guess I would like to understand

the basis for the figures, and encapsulated in that

is my suggestion. Because I used to be in the

budget game when I was working, and I know when

people are competing for scarce resources that they

tend to inflate their figures. But as we start to

look at Capital planning and expenses and look at a

glide path so that we can sensibly allocate the

priorities of, you know, what we’re trying to do

here is delivering a good environment in our town,

then we should have realistic figures in a ten year

format, or else we should address this significant

gap that’s illustrated by these numbers.

The other one, which is similar and but

even more glaring I think, is in the water mains.

And I understand a little bit about this from the

discussions I had with Mr. Jack, we were talking

about the preliminaries to approving the water

treatment plant. But to say that the request was

950,000 and we’re granting 450, and somehow next

year it’s realistic to consider that 4,500,000 will

somehow, you know, drop from the sky so we can

properly address our infrastructure, is
unrealistic.

So I would like to understand the gap that’s represented by these numbers, or are the numbers just wrong?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Mr. Jack.

MR. JACK: They’re all very good questions, and I’m sure everybody would like to hear a good, solid answer.

In defense of the Town overall, budgeting is a process, whether it’s done at the Annual Operating Budget level or whether it’s done at the Capital level. A lot of times what you see, and I think I said this several years ago, too, from a Capital Budget perspective, you are looking at Capital items, which can be depreciated. And what the Town has historically done is also look at annualized capital, or for all intents and purposes annualized operating expenses. Which you then have control over and in difficult years you can scale back on some of those.

So, that’s really what the planning process does here. The Town department heads make the requests, but there are times that we have to defer to other, more important needs of the Town.
And then in other years we may get some of those
requests back.

So I think that that’s just the overall
view.

Specifically with something like water
mains and/or roads, let me spend 350,000 for you
right now on roads. $100,000 a year to stripe
‘em, $100,000 a year to do crack sealing, which is
just a topical surface application, and another
hundred to a hundred fifty thousand dollars a year
to do the hot patching. And that’s depending on
how bad the winter is.

Thus far, for $350,000, we haven’t
replaced anything. We have only tried to maintain
it.

So the cost of actual resurfacing and
rehabilitation of the roads, sidewalks and curbing
is substantially more than that.

If you were to try to fund it annually at
what we really need, you’d be in the $3 million
range.

Similar to the water mains, all right?

We’re probably never really going to be able to
catch up with what we actually need to do in order
to maintain 400 miles of road – or 400 miles of
good question. We have a lot of transmission
mains; several years ago, when the state was coming
in to pave many of the major roads in Town, beneath
those major arteries are also major arteries with
regard to the water system. That’s where some of
the larger mains are, under the main roads.

So we had to come in and pave those.

You put together a $6.6 million bond and most of
those got done. That is infrequent, but it had a
large-scale impact on improving the overall quality
of the water, as well as the distribution of the
water.

Then we will have annualized mains that
our crews will do. To save you a lot of money, we
can put those mains in a lot of times at about half
of the cost, and we used to do that on a regular
basis. Due to the recent economic downturn, we’ve
had to dramatically scale back on that. You’ve
had to dramatically scale back on that, because we
simply did not have the money.

So this is an attempt to start getting
back up to those maintenance and replacement components of the main, specifically with the $450,000 we’re talking about. That’s for 1300 feet of six inch main – 16 inch main, and it’s going in at the Jones Road intersection in anticipation of replacing the main along Main Street, 18,000 feet of it, over three miles, from Oxbow out to Palmer Avenue. That was not historically going to be considered capable of doing that because the cost on that main was going to be in the $5 million range.

However, a couple of years ago we were successful at the state level of getting the Main Street corridor, which is that whole area that I just described from Oxbow to Palmer Avenue, under the Transportation Plan for the state. So now that is going to be coming to fruition hopefully within the next two to four years.

We’re doing a transportation study now of that entire corridor. The hope is the state will fund the road repairs and road maintenance on that by replacing Main Street, if you will.

It would be foolish to replace that road and waste that money of eight and a half million
dollars that the state may give the Town – and that would be given to the Town – without replacing the 110 year old water main that is beneath the road.

So, for this year and next year what was requested was the remainder of the money it would take to replace that main with a 16 inch main for 18,000 feet of it, but the money this year, $450,000, would be to just get that piece in before the state re-paves the intersection. Because then we don’t want to have to come back afterwards and go ripping through the new asphalt in order to replace the main a couple of years from now.

So, I understand it may seem a bit more complicated than it is on paper, okay? But nonetheless, I can assure you that we always do our best not only to give you the best service, but also in deference to the Town, to try to be able to do what’s affordable. And when we can do it.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: So, I would expect nothing less than the excellent answer that you have provided. And I appreciate the work that DPW does.

MR. JACK: Thank you.
MR. HARGRAVES: And let me use it for one last, quick follow-up, then.

In my –

THE MODERATOR: Quick. Real quick.

MR. HARGRAVES: In my request – it will be fast, I assure you, if I’m not interrupted.

In my request to get the financial people to present this information in a way that we can address it, let me ask: is there a Capital Plan that’s rolled out from each department and prioritized so that we can look constructively at how to allocate our capital resources when we look at the budget the next time as it’s the separated the way you directed?

THE MODERATOR: I believe that’s what’s in the warrant, isn’t it? It’s in the warrant book.

MR. HARGRAVES: So that’s all the Capital Plan, and the four and a half million is itemized in there and prioritized according to the other needs in town? That’s just the Water Department. There are lots of other capital needs. I’ve heard – I’ve heard us address them in all the – in many of the articles leading up to
this Article 18, or 19.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, I see Highway Department, M.E.S., Police; it's in here.

MR. HARGRAVES: Let me look at it closer. I apologize, then –

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. HARGRAVES: - if it's already available.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, and so this is the priority document. We are now voting on what we want to be the priorities of the larger requests that are itemized.

MR. HARGRAVES: Ah!

THE MODERATOR: Anyways, it's in there.

MR. HARGRAVES: Okay. I was speaking to the out years.

So, as we get into Capital Planning, this is a ten year plan. If the out years, then, could be more substantially documented so that we understand the nature of - of the out year expenses. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, we go out ten years in what's in you warrant booklet. I'm looking at the spreadsheet, here.
Okay, so the question will now – we’re actually Recreation; we didn’t get there yet.

Recreation? Yeah, in the middle.

MS. VAN MOOY: Tiffany Van Mooy, precinct two.

I’m sorry, I didn’t realize we were going on to Recreation. I wanted to go back to Road Maintenance, Construction and Sidewalks.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. VAN MOOY: My apologies. I didn’t hear anything about sidewalks, actually. And maybe you noticed in the newspaper some kids that are doing a walking school bus, now. And the sidewalks between Mullen Hall and Morse Pond and the Lawrence School are in desperate need of repair.

So, I would love that idea where we added some money for the dredging. So, could we do an increase to the sidewalk, here, particularly in that area for the students? Maybe an amendment for say an additional $100,000?

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Okay, so we do have the flexibility for the amendment from Free
Cash for an additional $100,000 for the road and
sidewalks line item.

Discussion on the amendment. Hearing
none, the question will come on the amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying
aye.

[Aye.]

MR. NETTO: Point of order.

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed --
what? What’s the point of order.

MR. NETTO: Excuse me, Mr. Moderator,
what is the amendment?

THE MODERATOR: The amendment is to
increase $100,000 to the line item for the roadways
and sidewalks. The - the - her interest is
sidewalks, but this line item is roadway and
sidewalks. So it’s to increase that line item
$100,000.

All those in favor of the increase,
signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]
chair that the no’s have it by a majority.

Anything else on Public Works?

Yes, Mr. Kapp.

MR. KAPP: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Paul Kapp, precinct 3.

Actually there’s two line items, one under Public Works and one under Recreation.

Central Park Basketball Court and the Fields Track under Recreation and Trotting Park. Is there any reason why these couldn’t be under CPC? Can anybody answer that for me?

THE MODERATOR: I don’t know what the extent of the work is, but does it meet the criteria for an application to the CPC?

Mr. Herbst?

MR. HERBST: Ralph Herbst, precinct 8. Chairman of the Community Preservation Committee.

I heard the request for the Trotting Park Road and Fields. What was the other one, please?

THE MODERATOR: The Basketball Court, Central Park.

MR. HERBST: And that’s under?

THE MODERATOR: It’s right above the subtitle of Recreation in the Public Works
category.

MR. HERBST: It’s under Public Works?

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, it’s right above

the word Recreation. Central Park Basketball.

MR. HERBST: Okay, I don’t see it. It
doesn’t matter, probably. Oh, it’s above, okay.

Above Recreation, I see. I was looking across the

other column.

No, there’s no reason why those items
couldn’t be brought before the Community

Preservation Committee under the category of

Recreation. But the Recreation Department, the

DPW entered into a software program that

prioritized the Recreation needs for the next few

years, and I don’t have that in front of me and I
don’t know whether those particular items are on

that or not.

But the answer to your question is they
could possibly be funded with Community

Preservation funds.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further
discussion? Recreation section.

Schools. Any discussion on Schools?

Okay, we have the main motion as amended.
Your amendments were around the dispatch, going back to the $50,000, and you added a hundred – or, you added $50,000 to dredging.

Madame Chairman for the new final number for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: I move Article 18 in the amount of $4,029,770 from Free Cash. And then the 44 from the –

THE MODERATOR: And $44,136 –

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Yes.


You’ve all heard the main motion – Mr. Pinto.

MR. PINTO: [No mic:] Sorry. Is that four million [inaudible] total number, or is that [inaudible]?

MS. MAGNANI: Just a minute.

[Pause.]

MS. MAGNANI: I move Article 18 in the total amount of $4,073,906.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the total amount is the $4,073,906, and a portion of that is coming from Article 25 of the November, 2010, which
is for $44,136.

Any – you got a question, or, what’s the problem? Take the microphone, please.

MS. KAPP: Dale Kapp, precinct 3. Have you subtracted the 250 that went back down to 50?

THE MODERATOR: We subtracted the 200,000 and then we added 50,000 for the –

MS. KAPP: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

Okay, all those in favor of –

MR. PINTO: Mr. Moderator, point of order.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the number is $4,073,906 in total, of which $44,136 will come from Article 25 of the November, 2010, Annual Town Meeting and the residual from Certified Free Cash.

Mr. Pinto, you have another question?

MR. PINTO: Mr. Moderator, I beg to differ with your numbers.

THE MODERATOR: Well, they’re not my numbers.

MR. PINTO: All right, then I beg to differ with the Finance Committee –

THE MODERATOR: All right, we’re going
to take an adjournment and somebody’s going to do
the math. Fifteen minutes.

MR. PINTO: I already did.

[Whereupon, a recess was taken.]

THE MODERATOR: All Town Meeting Members
please come forward, take your seats.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Article 18, final motion
on Article 18.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto, Mr. Dufresne
and Mr. Johnson, okay, good.

All Town Meeting Members please rise for
the establishment of the quorum and the tellers
will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, just count
them. They’re going to keep coming in, Andy.

Just count what we have.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: All right, Tellers,
let’s count what we have; they’re going to keep
coming in. Yes.

[Pause.]
THE MODERATOR: In the first division,

Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 35.

THE MODERATOR: 35.

In the third division, Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: 52.

THE MODERATOR: 52.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the second division,

Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 95.

THE MODERATOR: 95.

By a counted vote of 182, we have a

quorum and we're back in session.

Madame Chairman for the final motion on

Article 18.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Yes, Mr. Moderator, I

move Article 18 in the amount of $4,029,770.

$3,985,634 will be transferred from Free Cash and

$44,136 will be taken out of a previous article.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so that's the

final motion as amended.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]
THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 20. Article 20 is a hold by the Board of Selectmen. The original recommendation was indefinite postponement.

Madame Chair. Oh, sorry, Finance Committee.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Is making the Article 20.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move that the Town vote to transfer the amount of $165,000 from Certified Free Cash for the purpose of demolishing a building on King Street and constructing a parking lot, to be expended under the jurisdiction of the Town Manager.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the main motion on Article 20 is $165,000 Certified Free Cash for the parking lot. Any discussion on Article 20?

Hearing none, the question will then come on the main motion.

All those in – whoa, whoa, what do we

Okay, microphone for Ms. Hayward, please.

Yes, with the microphone, please.

MS. HAYWARD: Nancy Hayward, precinct 5.

This is not related to the finances.

What is going to happen to the nine people who live in that house? Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Kind of beyond the scope of the article here. That’s to do with the person who owns the building.

But if you have an answer, you could – yeah, does somebody have an answer?

MR. JONES: The Human Services Department has offered to help those people relocate and find housing for them.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

So – Ms. Whitehead.

MS. WHITEHEAD: This may be a silly question, but do they ever consult the neighbors when they’re putting a parking lot next to the next house when you’re doing something like this? Just a thought.

MR. SUSO: Yes.

[Laughter.]
MS. WHITEHEAD: And then, then an additional question. In what way do you notify them that this may happen, or do you have a hearing? Do you get consult - do you ask them how they feel about it? As neighbors to the firemen and the fire station and.

MR. SUSO: We have been working regularly with the primary neighbor.

MS. WHITEHEAD: The primary neighbor. What about the other side of the street or -

THE MODERATOR: They’re the ones that are always calling; they don’t want us to park on the street.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Well, there’s probably a good reason for that, David, they -

THE MODERATOR: Exactly, because there’s no parking.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay. Just a thought. You know, it’s nice to consult neighbors, one way or the other. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion of $165,000 from Certified Free Cash.

All those in favor, signify by saying
aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

MR. FINNERAN: [No mic:] Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Finneran.

Microphone for Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: This is going back to the Capital Budget. It’s just a question. There was a question about them not meeting the definition of Capital items, which you satisfied by asking them to put it in a different article.

Also, and I’ve mentioned this before – when we used to buy a truck or a car –

THE MODERATOR: No, this is – that’s – we’re not on – if it’s not related to a point of order, then we can meet –

MR. FINNERAN: I –

THE MODERATOR: – with the Rules Committee and talk about rules of Town Meeting at another time.

MR. FINNERAN: Um. I don’t know if it
is a point of order or not.

THE MODERATOR: Did I do something wrong running the meeting? That is the threshold for a point of order.

MR. FINNERAN: Um.

THE MODERATOR: Parliamentarily, did I do something wrong running the meeting?

MR. FINNERAN: Oh, it’s for you? I think – no, it’s something they did.

THE MODERATOR: Then it’s not a point of order.

MR. FINNERAN: Okay. Well, we’ll address it afterwards, then.

THE MODERATOR: Exactly.

Article 24. This is – the recommendation initially was indefinite postponement.

Madame Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for a new main motion.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I move that the Town vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to purchase or take by eminent domain a parcel of land with one building
thereon known as 65 Town Hall Square, Falmouth, Massachusetts. Being a part of Assessor’s Parcel 47A-08-007-000, now or formerly owned by Robert H. Ament, et al., Trustees, and being a portion of land described in a deed recorded in the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds in Book 5890, page 347. That the Town appropriate the sum of $615,000 to pay costs of the foregoing property acquisition, and that to meet this appropriation the sum of $150,000 shall be transferred from Certified Free Cash and that the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Board of Selectmen is authorized to borrow the sum of $465,000 under the authority of Mass. General Laws Chapter 44, Section 7, paragraph 3, or any other appropriate authority, upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Selectmen deems appropriate, and to issue bonds and notes of the town therefore, said property to be under the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen for municipal purposes, with said sums to be expended under the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the main motion has been presented by the Board of Selectmen. The Finance Committee’s recommendation is still
indefinite postponement but the main motion is on the floor.

Mr. Suso, yeah.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, Julian Suso, Town Manager.

This is a picture of 65 Town Hall Square. I’m sure Town Meeting Members are familiar with it. It’s the parcel immediately adjacent to existing Town Hall, and it happens that it is – it and the two companion structures that are part of the same parcel have been listed for sale for the past few months.

Some facts about 65 Town Hall Square. This represents a one time opportunity to acquire a property immediately adjacent to Town Hall in a highly cost-effective manner. There is a creative financing package proposed for Town Hall’s consideration as part of the purchase and sale agreement.

It does represent 3,900 square feet. The agreed-upon sale price is $615,000, as noted in the motion by Selectmen Flynn. The Town appraisal, conducted by a certified appraiser, was for that same amount: $615,000.
We have agreed to, subject to Town Meeting approval, an advantageous structured payment plan that assesses and charges no interest to the Town. The payment would be spread over four different fiscal years, with as you note $150,000 to be paid at closing, another $150,000 in the following fiscal year. And actually a slight adjustment in the last two amounts. The last two amounts should be $157,500 on July 15, 2016 and $157,500 July 15, 2017. The necessary two times 5700 bring you to 615.

There is no penalty for early payment; that’s been negotiated with the sellers, as well.

Next slide. 65 Town Hall Square, the potential uses. Again, this is an existing commercially zoned property that would allow the relocation of the Town Hall archives that are currently spread in several locations in the lower level of Town Hall. They are in harm’s way because, as most people are now aware, the lower level of Town Hall is technically in the flood plain.

It would allow the continued use of that same commercial building for Human Services that
has served as the location of the Human Services Office for many years. It is currently leased for approximately $25,000 per year. It would also allow that building to be considered for utilization for one or more additional municipal offices.

For 65 Town Hall Square we want to advise Town Meeting that a zoning change would also be required to allow the property to be properly subdivided and to effectively transfer only the single commercial structure, which has the address of 65 Town Hall Square, to the Town. The lot currently has three structures on it, including the single commercial building we’re talking about now. That’s the one of interest to the Town.

Behind it, fronting on the street behind, are two stand-alone commercial – excuse me. Two stand-alone residential structures. If subdivided in the current B3 zone, the newly created parcels would be non-conforming. The property may be subdivided within the B1 zone. The owner would effectuate the process of the zone change request which must return to Town Meeting in April, 2015 for your approval of that if you determine you
decide to go forward this evening. No closing will occur or payments made until the zoning change would be approved by Town Meeting in April if that would be you pleasure.
The B1 zone is consistent with the adjacent zoning, as Odd Fellows Hall is B1, as are the adjacent apartments located on the adjacent street, Glenwood Avenue, immediately behind.

This is a map of the Town Hall Square area. You see the Town Hall, which is the dark shaded property to the center left of the picture. The commercial building is immediately to the right. That darker, sort of magenta-shaded area is all the B3 zone and you see the location of Odd Fellows Hall along the avenue or alley adjacent, and Glenwood Avenue to the rear.

So, again, there are three separate parcels, structures on that single property: one, the commercial building, 65 Town Hall Square; and two stand-alone residential structures behind it. The Town is only interested in, and the purchase and sale, if it would be Town Meeting’s pleasure, only involves the commercial building fronting directly on Town Hall Square and that was
photographed in the initial PowerPoint slide.

Don’t know if we have another slide after this. We do not.

Again, this is brought to Town Meeting in the spirit that we have a creative financing package that has been negotiated. You need only make payments of $150,000 per year over four years to acquire this parcel. That’s in recognition of the fact that, you know, we’re bringing two potential real estate acquisitions to Town Meeting. At the same time, we recognize that that’s a tall order. It also does provide for potential borrowing if they – it would be determined that that would be in the Town’s interest.

At the moment we anticipate four stand-alone payments that we would be discussing and proposing in cooperation with the Finance Committee to allow this to be acquired in this creative way over four years and at no additional interest to the Town.

So we bring this for your consideration.

It is not everyday that you have this opportunity to acquire a commercial building with available office space immediately adjacent to Town Hall.
We heard some comments last evening about the Fire station. We appreciate very much Town Meeting’s support of allowing us to rectify a major problem with the proper utilization of that headquarters fire station facility. Comments were made by a couple individuals about real estate that was available immediately adjacent to that fire station in the past and the Town did not move forward with an acquisition which might have alleviated that and avoided the earlier article that we brought to you yesterday.

Here is potentially a similar opportunity, and again it’s being made available at the appraised price and for a creative financing package over four years if Town Meeting in your wisdom would determine that this would be in the Town’s strategic interest.

So we bring that to you in that spirit. Happy to answer any questions you may have and I bring it to you in that spirit as well. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adriene Dufresne, precinct 2.
You know it’s hard for me to stand here
and figure out whose brainstorm is this one.

[Laughter.]

MR. DUFRESNE: That building is over a
hundred years old. It was once the barn in my
back yard. I was born on Glenwood Place. I’ve
been in the building several times. It’s old,
it’s decrepit, it needs a ton of work.

If Mr. Ament wants to get rid of it, you
know, he probably could ask 150 and save us 450.
If we buy that building, we are buying a derelict,
and I would advise the Town Meeting Members please
vote no on this project.

It’s hard for me to even comprehend how
they even thought about it. Does anybody –
anybody in this room – stick your hand up if you’ve
been in that building. Huh? Do you really think
it’s worth $600,000? Huh?

We’re talking $600,000; I don’t care how
you make the payments. Some of us buy houses and
our payments are every month. In this particular
case they want four payments every year. It’s –
it just boggles my mind at Mr. Suso’s presentation
is this is the best offer we’ve had.
Years ago, at a much earlier time, we had a chance to buy the Pafford Building for 75,000. We had a chance to buy a brick building, the bookstore on Main Street, for $175,000 and the guy was going to put a new roof on it.

Thank God we didn’t buy the derelicts that have been offered to us. Town Meeting Members have to make some serious decisions; this is one. If we consider this building and we spend that kind of money, trust me, it’s going to come back to haunt us.

Thank you for listening.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Latimer, then Mr. Shearer.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct 1. I would support this.

We’re looking at real estate values that have escalated and there’s no stopping it. The condition of the building is an important consideration, but I’m sure that the appraiser took that into consideration when he appraised the property at our request.

Much more important is the old phrase: “location, location, location”. And the thing
that gets my support is we are in an era of rising sea levels. All of our municipal records, our building records are on the first floor right barely a couple of hundred feet away from a pond. This building gives us the opportunity to provide decent storage for that. If there’s some maintenance that will be required down the road, that’s good.

At least this is a proactive thing. We just spent $400,000 to tear down a building for 23 parking spaces, and this at least give us, as Mr. Suso said, a proactive way to get at least - despite the building’s condition - get at least the location right next to Town Hall, where if it needs some work in the future, it can be done and we’ve got the facility.

And, you’re right, we should have bought the Pafford building for 75 grand but - but we didn’t. So here we are with this deal; I think we should take it. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Shearer.

Then Mr. Suso.

MR. SHEARER: Dan Shearer, precinct 6.

It’s a nice building. My wife’s office
was in there for a long time. The heat goes to
110, because you can’t turn it down. You have to
open the windows all winter and it costs a fortune
to heat.

In the summer, you boil to death. It’s
a mess.

We should – we bought the Odd Fellows
Hall, and we lost every single penny we put into
it, and this building right here, we’re going to
put $42,000 in the meeting room. Every room in
that house will take another $42,000 to fix up and
make an office out of.

We – unless we have positive use of that
building and need it, we should not buy it. Thank
you, it’s our money, do what you want.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I just want to clarify for the record I
assured Town Meeting I would not insult you by
bringing a proposed real estate transaction to you
without having inspected it. I was – I like to
believe that you would assume as much, but I want
to reassure you.

In addition to the appraisal which we
have in hand, I did a walk-through with the Building Commissioner and other qualified individuals, and the assessment of the overall building -- we walked through all portions of the building -- is it is in good condition. Keep in mind we have an existing office there, an existing Town office which we visit periodically and our Human Services Director is -- spends all her days there, along with members of her staff, and it has been well maintained.

It is going to need continuing maintenance. It is an office building. It is an older building, but it is in good condition. And I bring that message to you having had it reviewed by qualified staff members.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Buesseler.

MS. BUESSELER: Hi, Wendi Buesseler, precinct 2.

Could we please go back to the map that was showing previously, it was showing the property in relationship to Town Hall? Yes, that one, thank you.

You had mentioned that one reason why you were -- the interest in this property is because we
could take the records out of Town Hall that are of risk of being flooded if there is a - because the Town Hall is now in the Flood Zone. It seems to me that this property is very, very close in proximity to Town Hall and I don't know exactly where the Flood Zone lines are, but it seems awfully close, and if we had a major hurricane with a high tidal surge, I think that property would also be at risk.

I'm just very reluctant to put any money into property that's at such a high risk. I don't think it's good fiscal sense. I think it would be better to put our resources elsewhere, much higher out of the storm surge location. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McNamara.

MR. MCNAMARA: Matt McNamara, precinct 7.

I don't think the reason to buy property is because it becomes available, but rather because you need it.

During the Senior Center feasibility study, we've learned that there are number of publicly owned buildings in town that are under-utilized, including schools, the School
Administration Building. We heard tonight the possibility of a Gus Canty, although I don’t want to tread on Sandy Cuny or any of her folks.

But we don’t have a great track record in Town Hall Square. We buy property for an adjacent parking lot to Town Hall and we give it to affordable housing. A good use, but not the original use.

We are – Dan already brought up Odd Fellows.

Last year, we appropriated $250,000 for space utilization issues. I don’t know what the results of that was. I’m not sure this body knows at this point.

In terms of archives, do they need to be adjacent to Town Hall? Or could those archives be put anywhere? The Marks Building.

Does Human Services need to be in the building adjacent to Town Hall? In fact, amongst part of the discussion, it was once stated that it would be good for Human Services to be away from the Town Hall Square area for more privacy types of issues.

So, I think before we just buy another
building because somebody wants to sell it to us, we ought to have a good reason to use it and have a good understanding of what the availability of space in our public buildings is.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Anderson. I’ve got you on the list. Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Gary Anderson, precinct 7.

This is the second piece of property that we would take off the tax rolls. Not a significant number. The combination of the lost real estate taxes would be about $9,000 between the two.

I would, however, be interested in the Finance Committee’s position on this, as I understood the Moderator, Mr. Moderator, you said that their recommendation was still IP, indefinite postponement.

Could we hear from the Finance Committee as to their thought process.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Thank you, Mr. Anderson.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: The Finance Committee
discussed this article last night at its meeting before Town Meeting, and it was basically the idea of buying more property, and it was not unanimous but it was a majority vote, and maybe some of the Finance Committee people would like to address it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Lowell.

MR. LOWELL: Nick Lowell, precinct 5 and the Vice Chairman of the Finance Committee.

Yes, we did get a presentation on this yesterday at a little after six o’clock. It was the first time that we had a number or we had a solid plan and my personal feeling was that I didn’t feel like we really knew what we were going to use the property for.

I have never actually been in the property myself, and I just didn’t feel comfortable with purchasing this right now without having a much better handle on what was going on, and that’s the reason that I voted against purchasing the property right now. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Let’s see. Ms. Lichtenstein was next on the list.

Yes, you’re on the list. It’s a big
list.

Yeah, Ms. Lichtenstein, yes.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Leslie Lichtenstein, precinct 8.

I suggest if we need a place for the town archives that we direct the Selectmen or ask the Selectmen to look for a piece of property on the moraine. I don’t think we should buy another piece of property in the 100 year flood plain. I think that’s asking for trouble. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue. No, okay. No. We’ll go to the aisle.

MS. HOFFSTROFF: Ann Beth Hoffstroff [sp?], precinct 3.

So we’re not quite sure what the building is going to be used for. So let’s in fact say - and I’ve been in that building many times, at Human Services, and when the - what was the name of it? - the Falmouth Health Care Center was there.

It’s not handicapped accessible. Has anyone figured in the bathrooms are too small, the stairways are narrow and windy. The Human Service Office is really beautiful, but has anybody figured out if you’re going to use that building for public
use it has to be A.D.A. approved and accessible to everybody? And how much would that cost.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Two issues. One, we’ve confirmed that that building is not in the Flood Plain. Only the lower level of Town Hall is and of course this building as you’re all aware, is considerably elevated above the lower level of Town Hall, so it is not in harm’s way in the – or in any Flood Zone.

Number two, the building is fully handicapped accessible from Glenwood Avenue and includes two handicap parking spaces from that access point.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Thank you, Richard Latimer, precinct 2 again.

Another good reason why this would be a good purchase is right now it was mentioned that there would be some four or five thousand dollar annual tax loss, which would be more than offset by saving the $25,000 rent that’s now being paid by the Human Services Committee for space in that building which we would now own.
And another factor is, the article itself says the Selectmen have the option to lease back to the grantor, that is to the current owner, a portion of the building for office space which would involve more income off of the building.

So, it is not a good argument against this that simply it’s going to be taken off the tax rolls where there would be opportunities to get monies back on it.

And again: location, location, location.

Our Town Hall is where it is. This is adjacent to the Town Hall. If it’s going to need some work in the future, it’d be worth putting it in there because of the location.

And, as Mr. Suso says, it is considerably a taller building and it has much better potential for protection. The Building Department records, the Electrical Department, all the inspection records that are right now on the basement level -- there’s a lot of stuff on the basement level where it is at risk. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Peck. No, you’re all set.

Okay, any further discussion? Yes, in
the center. And then we’ll be ready to take a vote.

MS. HARRIS: Mary Harris, precinct 5 and new member of the Finance Committee and among those who thought indefinite postponement was the right thing to do.

I think location matters a lot, but I don’t see doubling down on a bad location, and we’re aware of what the future brings. I’m thinking if they can find a buyer for that, we ought to offer them Town Hall and move our problems somewhere else.

[Laughter and applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, this requires a two-thirds vote. The question will come on the main motion.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the no’s have it.

Article 25. Madame Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the main motion.
CHAIRMAN FLYNN:  Mr. Moderator, I move that the Town vote Article 25 as printed, subject to receipt of a signed agreement.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay.  Who held this one?  Any discussion on this article?

Yeah, you have a signed agreement, but somebody held it, so - huh?  Okay.  Oh, you held it up here?  We would do it on the blanket, it could have went.

All right, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR:  All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR:  The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 27.

Article 27, Finance Committee for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI:  Mr. Moderator, I move that the Town vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to acquire for nominal non-monetary consideration a parcel of land 500 feet wide abutting the Long Pond, and being a portion of
13.22 plus or minus acres of land, shown on Assessor’s Map 35 04 004 000CR, now or formerly belonging to Arthur L. Chute, Executor et al, upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Selectmen deems appropriate, and further to authorize the Board of Selectmen to do all acts necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes of this article, including petitioning the General Court for special legislation if necessary. Said land to be under the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen as additional watershed for Long Pond.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Johnson, you held this one.

MR. JOHNSON: Would you put up the slide, please.

I just wanted - Leonard Johnson, precinct 5 and president of the 300 Committee. The wording of this article is somewhat confusing. What is happening is that the Town is involved in this transaction but the Chute family is donating the parcel that is outlined up here to the 300 Committee and then the 300 Committee now has an agreement with the Town to transfer to the Town 500 feet along - okay, there you are, the 500 feet
along there.

It’s similar to what was done when the Chute family gave us this parcel about seven or eight years ago and that 500 feet was transferred to ownership by the Town so that it would protect Long Pond.

So that is what the transaction is all about. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion?

Hearing none, the question will come on the main motion as recommended. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[AYE.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[NONE OPPOSED.]

THE MODERATOR: The Ayes have it unanimous.

Article 28. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Mr. Moderator, I move that the Town vote Article 28 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: As printed. This is to vote to ask the School Committee to rescind their
vote to disallow voting at the elementary schools.

Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Thank you. Mark Finneran.

I’d like to put a positive motion on the floor for this.

THE MODERATOR: The Selectmen --

MR. FINNERAN: Oh, they already did.

THE MODERATOR: The Selectmen are in favor of it, so you’ve got the positive motion.

MR. FINNERAN: God bless ‘em.

And as you can see, it’s to see if the Town will vote to ask the School Committee to rescind their vote and disallow voting in the public schools. And the reason why there’s a problem is because it removes the convenience of local voting for some people in East Falmouth only, which isn’t fair or equitable.

There weren’t enough handicap parking spaces. There wasn’t enough parking, period. And the parking that was available, teachers and the poll workers used. And that just made the matters worse.

And, as many of you saw who were there,
it was just downright dangerous.

That slide should flip on its own.

There.

When I first pulled in in the morning, the last space that was available was taken by this woman who’s a teacher, and you can see her walking away towards school. This is very early in the morning as well, and that’s Lot C around the back and you can see that’s all filled.

I turned the other way and there were people already parking on the curb and - as you can see. And this is just seconds later it was filled up and it remained like this for quite some time.

It was no convenience.

Again, this is just moments after that and you can see Gifford Street, I mean, was completely filled. Access was just a problem.

It really wasn’t good.

And the same there. They don’t really show up as well as they did, but you can see that it’s just extremely busy. People went around and around and around, just as they were in May.

There was nowhere to park. It was dangerous. I mean, it’s fairly illustrated by the pictures.
This is going to be a fairly short presentation. I think many of you who were there saw how bad it really was.

And it continues. They’re just starting to park on the side of the road now. And it didn’t take very long before that was all filled up, too, as you can see. It certainly wasn’t a good location.

And here’s in the parking lot again, the cars are backing up. You can see – oh, there’s a lucky man, right there, he found a space to his right.

Here are the handicap parking spaces. Where I circled in red, those aren’t handicapped. The handicap ones are further down, away from the entrance. There was a lot of complaints about that. And you can see: they’re all filled.

There, I believe, I’m not sure, but that’s one of our Town Meeting Members there, doing that maneuver he learned on the mean streets of Chappaquoit.

[Laughter.]

MR. FINNERAN: It was a total nightmare.

And that’s – slightly after that, you can see this
is the first entrance to the school; they’re already parked all the way down towards the light on Brick Kiln Road.

If you brought your Jeep or your truck, you could drive into the woods. Made it handy.

[Laughter.]

MR. FINNERAN: But I don’t think anybody really wants to do that.

And then, again, there’s this side of Gifford Street. People were crossing the road. We saw two women almost get hit. There’s about seven cars in a row and if you turn around there’s seven more cars backed up to the street.

There was just no parking.

This is the back side of the lot. Again, a lot of those are poll workers’ cars and teachers’ cars, but they’re using this. And, again here, they’re all basically standing still. And if you look — it’s hard to see on these, but most of these vehicles have their brake lights on. They’re all the way out into the street. There’s a car parked right across the road, which was also dangerous.

You know, again, I mean, it’s — the pictures — see where I got it all red, there,
there’s a car passing on the left-hand side; it was almost a head-on collision. No one got hurt, luckily, but.

Again, there’s the side of Gifford Street. I mean, they’re just - there was nowhere to go. And it was like this all day, although the Enterprise said it was nice from 7:00 to 8:00, but I was there on and off all day long and it really didn’t improve until dark.

I mean, every picture tells its own story, right there. And more of the same.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, go ahead.

MR. FINNERAN: And there is a difference in the east side of town and the other side of town. And here’s just an example of how that -- the east side was the one that got disenfranchised from this.

And if you look at question one from the last election, in East Falmouth it lost by 104 votes, all those precincts, and then, on the other side of town -- if you could bring that back for one second - it passed by 700 votes.

So there is a difference on either side
of town. And I’m not saying we can’t all live
together, but the side on the left definitely got
disenfranchised, and it just wasn’t right. And I
think most of you should agree with that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Let’s keep it on
voter turnout— not — yeah.

MR. FINNERAN: Well, voter turnout was
down in double digits, mostly in — or, more so in
the East Falmouth precincts, or especially these
affected precincts.

And, like I said, my presentation’s going
to be short. And that’s it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Augusta.

MS. AUGUSTA: Good evening, I’m Susan
Augusta and I’m Chairman of the Falmouth School
Committee, also precinct 9.

In May of 2013, the Town Clerk and the
Superintendent of Schools received a petition
requesting that the Teaticket School no longer be
used as a polling place. Parents, staff and
community members expressed concern regarding the
safety and security of students on Election Day.

The Teaticket School community had been
discussing this for several years, noting in
particular the increased traffic, parking
difficulties, access to the building, as well as
sometimes inappropriate behavior exhibited by
voters and sign holders which had been witnessed by
the elementary aged students.

The Superintendent discussed the topic
with the other principals of the schools where
voting was also taking place and they, too, had
safety concerns.

Mr. Palmer and Dr. Gifford met and the
issue was brought to the School Committee in a
posted and publicized meeting on November 26th,
2013. Mr. Palmer, as Chief Election Officer,
indicated that if the School Committee decided to
exclude any school buildings as voting sites, the
Board of Selectmen would need to seek out other
sites.

Mr. Palmer indicated he had met with Dr.
Gifford and Mr. Driscoll, Falmouth High School
principal, about using the field house at the High
School, as this was a location that could be
secured from the rest of the school.

It is the responsibility of the Falmouth
School Committee to ensure the safety and security
of its students.

Based on the discussion that evening, the School Committee decided to remove all K through 8 schools as voting sites. The vote was unanimous.

We continue to support the use of the High School as a polling site. As the turnout at the last election was a fantastic 59 percent, of course there were some parking issues that will need to be worked out. At any of the schools, parking would be an issue particularly during the time of school opening and dismissal. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Tobey.

Mr. Finneran, if you’d just want to have a seat right there.

MS. TOBEY: Linda Tobey, precinct 4. I taught at the elementary schools in Falmouth for 35 years and I was remembering an experience I had as a child. My parents used to bring me with them when they voted in the town I grew up in.

So, I live in precinct 4 and when we went from voting at the fire station to voting at the elementary school, the East Falmouth elementary, I
had the chance to bring my class; every time I voted, I brought the whole class with me. And they would line up against the wall and they’d get the little stickers, and it was a big deal. They’d never done that before.

And then we would also do a little in the classroom vote. I think it was an important experience. A lot of children got to enjoy it. I never heard anybody at our school say that they felt it was a safety issue. I never felt it was a safety issue. And, at the precinct meeting, several people said to me they missed voting at the school because they missed seeing the children at the schools. One of the few times they were able to come into the school and actually see the children.

So, I hope we reconsider this and I hope we pass this and we’re able to do that again. I think it’s a wonderful experience for young children. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Fellow Town Meeting Members, Adriene Dufresne, precinct 2.

I hope we would follow the
recommendations of the Board of Selectmen. My comments on this particular issue is I was very unhappy that the school board chose to deny the congested neighborhoods of Teaticket and East Falmouth an access to an easy voting location and an opportunity for the children of that school to learn a very important lesson in civics, which is the importance of the ability to cast a vote for the people that you want to run the town, the state or this country.

No matter how we vote tonight, it’s non-binding on the autonomous state autonomy of the School Committee. But it would give the School Committee some idea of how we as the voting public felt that the inconvenience that was caused to some of the elderly people of Teaticket and East Falmouth in going to a very congested high school location.

So, instead of prolonging this with a whole bunch of dialogue, let’s either vote it up or down. My personal feeling is no matter what we do here, the School Committee will only hear your voices and they can do anything that they want on school property. It’s a state law.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’ve got a hand on the far right, here.

MS. WAGGETT: Hi, I’m Tracy Waggett. I represent precinct 9, and I have four children, all of which are either attending or have attended Teaticket School.

I am sorry for anybody that finds it inconvenient to go to the high school, that it’s congested for parking, but Teaticket is not an acceptable voting place. The parking lot is not even servicing the school itself, never mind voters. And it is dangerous. For nine years I witnesses those inappropriate behaviors: people coming into where the busses are dropping off children and not even paying attention to where they’re going and almost running small children over.

So, if it’s dangerous for voters at the high school, I think perhaps that should be addressed, but it should not be returned to the School Committee to go back to elementary schools. Voting does not belong at the schools for safety reasons of those children that attend those schools.
And I challenge people who want to see the children to volunteer in programs that are for the children. We need volunteers; that’s where you should go. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the gentleman in the center.

MR. CALLAHAN: Jim Callahan, precinct 5. I just think we should bring back civics and democracy into the classrooms.

You know, if there’s a concern about safety for the school, there’s such a thing as an in-service day. You can get the voting booths and everything for the kids the day before, they could go in, see what the process is.

And frankly, if people remember how we got rid of smoking and littering, it was through the young kids. Get those young kids the day before voting, the day before an in-service day, and encourage them to bring their parents the next day to the school with them to vote. Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct 9.

That’s exactly what I was going to stand
up. As a retired school teacher, the state of Massachusetts requires that you have professional development days. I’d like to offer a compromise.

As past Director of Transportation for the Town of Wareham, I wholeheartedly agree with the parent over there.

I’m sure everyone in this room when they go to vote is very civil.

As the Director of Transportation, I hated election days at the elementary school. You’d have barriers set up and people would ride over them and traffic was a problem. And with the tragedy that happened in Connecticut, we have to realize it could happen here in Falmouth.

So my compromise to the School Committee and to the Board of Selectmen, I support the civics part of it and the use of public property, is on the professional development days -- we know the dates of the election. The School Committee could synchronize their professional development days that way. A lot of other communities are already doing this.

So, that’s my offer to Mrs. Augusta as chairman and to the article’s proponent Mr.
Finneran. Why don’t we do that? Why don’t both sides meet halfway? We use a public building, save the taxpayers money.

I vote uptown. I’d go to North Falmouth to vote. I’ve never missed an election since I was 21. But we did have a large turnout and Mr. Finneran’s pictures tell the story that also was a dangerous situation.

So, that’s the compromise I offer you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Magnani.

I’ll come back to you.

Yes, Ms. Magnani.

MS. MAGNANI: I’m speaking as Judy Magnani, precinct 2.

Through you, Mr. Moderator, I would like to ask the Board of Selectmen what they have done, as they’re responsible for voting, to look for other buildings in this town. There have to be places where we can have voting without getting it back into the elementary schools. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK PALMER: First I’ll make just a comment that this board has no jurisdiction over the School Committee. We should be addressing all
your issues to the School Committee. So you need
to go to a meeting, get on their agenda and address
all your concerns that you have right now to them.

They voted to not allow voting in the
elementary schools.

As to other locations, several years ago
the principal of the Teaticket Elementary School
came to me and asked if I could search for another
location for voting. I did do a search, I looked
at the School Administration building, which was
unsuitable. I looked at the East Falmouth
library, which is small inside and has access
problems. We looked at the Cape Cod Baptist
Church at one time that we had been using other
churches, and that was for sale and is for sale,
and there wasn’t really a church hall there.

We looked at – I mean, we had been voting
at the PAL building on Brick Kiln Road and now
that’s for sale.

We need to make the decision if
something’s for sale I can’t be called on a Monday
that you can’t vote on Tuesday because we’re
passing papers.

So, by all means, if there are other
locations that people would want to bring forward that can be considered by the Board of Selectmen to vote at, I’m sure they would listen to that concern.

There are problems at the high school. Mr. Finneran is showing you those pictures; that wasn’t the entire day, but that was a situation that did happen. But there are solutions to that problem. We can eliminate the teachers or have the teachers cooperate and park in other parking lots. We can have the poll workers park in other parking lots. We can close the schools every other November when we’re going to have the largest turnouts.

We had a 60 percent turnout. The presidential two years from now in November we’re going to have a larger turnout than 60 percent. And I believe the last presidential election, the schools were closed. So that’s not going to be an issue at that. If we can close the school every other November when we’re going to have the 60 percent and then the 80 percent when we have presidential, that would alleviate some of the problems.
So there are some solutions that we can work at. If anybody has any suggestions of other buildings that are large enough and suitable to be voting at, that are accessible, that have the parking, I’d be happy to bring them back to the Board of Selectmen as recommendations for them to vote at.

But, just my – my first comment is this board has no jurisdiction over what happens in the elementary schools; the School Committee does. If you need to address – if you want to send a message to them, you need to vote this that we’re sending a message to them that they should reconsider their vote and then that’s what this body has done: we have voted to ask the School Committee to reconsider what they’ve done. And if that’s what we chose to do, we should do that and move on.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Moffitt.

MS. MOFFITT: I would agree with what was just said. The issue is that your vote yes will be for the Board of Selectmen to ask the School Committee to reconsider their decision about having the voting of the high school.

So the vote is not where they’re going to
be; you’re not making that decision. You’re making the decision of whether the Selectmen should ask the School Committee to rescind their vote. That’s – that’s what the yes vote is.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so one last word from the petitioner and then we’re going to vote.

MR. FINNERAN: As for the suggestion of the in-service day, that was actually the last part of this article and it was left out. I just want to make that point.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So the question will come on the main motion to see if the Town will vote to ask the School Committee to rescind the vote about disallowing voting at elementary schools.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the ayes have it by a majority.

Article 29.

MR. FINNERAN: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: The recommendation of
the Board of Selectmen is indefinite postponement.

       Mr. Finneran, would you like to make a
positive motion?

       MR. FINNERAN: Yes, I would. And,
again, this is going to be a quick one. And it’s
just to see if the town will vote to have the
Office of the Town Counsel to provide a litigation
report for each annual Town Meeting, including the
following.

       The official Town Counsel provide general
legal services of the town and the departments in
the performance of his official duties and
responsibilities. The office staff consists of
Frank Duffy; Patricia Harris, the Associate Town
Counsel; Kimberly Fish, the Town Paralegal.

       The following report includes cases
reported in previous annual reports and that were
concluded during the reporting period, and active
cases, including the cases commenced during the
reporting period. The reporting period is July 1st
2012 to June 30th, 2013. Detailed on any of these
- detailed information on any of these cases may be
obtained by contacting the Town Counsel’s office.

       I’m simply just asking that they be put
into the Town Reports every year.

During the review of this article, it was said that they’re put in the Town Reports, but they’re actually not. The actual cases are, but nothing else.

I have minutes here from the last four Town Meetings. We spend a considerable amount of time on this subject. I’ve asked questions; others have. We have to waste Town Meeting’s time, Town Counsel’s time, when this thing could just be expanded and made part of the Annual Report.

And there’s things in there now like Merflix [sp?] versus the Board of Selectmen. I mean, what does that mean? I mean, there’s just no information here. We don’t know how much money is spent. We don’t know how much is paid by insurance. We basically know nothing other than the cases exist. And, if the information’s already there, it’s needed for an audit, why can’t we have it?

The basic – what I’m asking for you is to tell me why you don’t put it out there. Last town meeting, Town Counsel, when I asked and Mr. Vieira
asked him, he said it could be done. If you don’t do it, why not?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Finneran, your motion says to make a report at each Annual Town Meeting. Do our want that language to actually be in each Annual Report?

MR. FINNERAN: Annual Report, Annual Town Meeting. Somewhere where we can have it. It doesn’t necessarily have to be in this, if they want to make a separate report.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. FINNERAN: I mean, it’s an either/or thing, but there’s just not enough information and we’re told –

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. FINNERAN: – that’s it there and it’s not.

THE MODERATOR: I’m just calling your attention to the fact that your article says Annual Town Meeting.

MR. FINNERAN: Well, if they chose that instead, sure. All we want is the information.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So it says Annual - do you want to make that change, or no?
Do you want it to be at the Annual Town Meeting?

MR. FINNERAN: Or it can be an either/or. All I want is the information and others do, as well.

Yeah, sure. You can amend it. Either way -

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. FINNERAN: - it'd be satisfactory. As long as the information is there.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, okay. So you like the wording the way it is.

Any discussion on Article 29?

Mr. Shearer.

MR. SHEARER: Dan Shearer, precinct 6.

Long ago I made a motion that at Town Meeting we heard about overrides. And yes, it was put in the warrant article. But very few people I believe really read it. But the main reason I asked for it, and this article, too, to be at Town Meeting, is so that we can ask questions. And that's the most important part. If you have a - if it's written down and you don't understand it, why not have it here where we can do it?

And I'd still like my report - a report
at the meetings as we all voted for; which we
didn’t get. Because mine said “at Town Meeting”.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further
discussion on 29?

Hearing none, the question will come on
the main motion as printed.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor
signify by standing and the tellers will return a
count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: First division, Mr.

Netto.

MR. NETTO: 23.

THE MODERATOR: 23.

Third division, Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: 27.

THE MODERATOR: 27.

Second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 60.

THE MODERATOR: 60.
All those opposed, signify by standing
and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the first division,
Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 11.

THE MODERATOR: 11.

The second division, Mr. Dufresen.

MR. DUFRESNE: 32.

THE MODERATOR: 32.

In the third division, Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: 23.

THE MODERATOR: 23.

By a counted vote of 110 in favor and 66
opposed, the article passes.

MR. FINNERAN: Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Article 30.

Article 30, the recommendation of the
Board of Selectmen is indefinite postponement.

This is to take White Pine Lane as a public way.

And is it Ms. Fenwick that held this?

MS. SWAIN: I’m holding this, yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, Ms. Swain.
MS. SWAIN: Brenda Swain, precinct 6.

I’ve been asked by the petitioner to let her speak. She’s not a Town Meeting Member but she is a resident of Falmouth.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I need a positive motion on the floor. Do we have a motion for this article?

MR. NETTO: So moved.

MS. SWAIN: She wants a positive motion, as printed. Right?

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The way the language is written, that’s going to be the positive motion?

MS. SWAIN: Uh.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we can do as printed. I’m not going to hold it up if –

MS. SWAIN: Wait a minute, no. She doesn’t want indefinite postponement.

THE MODERATOR: No, no, no. Yeah, the way the article is written: Town taking White Path Lane as public way and finish repairs to road.

MS. SWAIN: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, that’s the main motion.
MS. FAVREAU: This is the first time I’ve done this, so excuse me if I do anything wrong, could you please correct me.

But I have a PowerPoint.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. You’ve got --

MS. FAVREAU: I have a PowerPoint presentation. A petition to accept White Pine Lane.

The residents of White Pine Lane from the nearby streets have come together to request the Town to solve the following problems and issues with White Pine Lane.

Also, in 1973 - and I have two of the copies - and 1978, the neighborhood requested a Town Way. In 1974 and 1979, the Town Selectmen signed the request of the layout of the Town Way. The Town never fulfilled the promise, is the way we’re taking this.

Also, as you can see, those are the signatures of the Selectmen on both of these things.

Also, can we move to the next slide?

The conditions of the road are very poor. The safety of the children and residents and others are
very high dust from the street and aggravating
asthma in children and adults. Damage is done to
the vehicles because of the deep potholes.
Constant maintenance is needed from the DPW to
level the street and fix the deep potholes several
times a year.

Getting mail from Sandwich Road with no
sidewalk and three feet of clearance is dangerous.
There’s a guardrail in back of the mailboxes that
prevents residents from getting out of the way of
dangerous Sandwich Road. There’s been several
accidents right near our street.

The mailboxes cannot be removed until the
town takes over the street.

Deep potholes and drop-off points risk
the gas lines to – as in some of the pictures,
you’ll see that this is – this is another thing the
town paved about 300 feet, which is roughly half of
the road. And that’s from Sandwich Road to
halfway up.

On the paved parts the town owns a little
parcel of land and also the Housing authority owns
some of the land that was paved. The other parts
of the street you can see goes way up a hill.
There, you can see from here Sandwich Road is on
the bottom; the green line, if you count up six
houses, three on each side, that’s where the paving
stops, and then four houses is not paved.

We’re requesting that the – these are
some of the potholes. They’re not only in one
area, they’re in the middle of the street and
they’re also at the top by Lake Shore Drive.

This is right by the paved part, right in
front of the – where the Town owns property.
There’s a sewage line, so the dirt from the dirt
side of the street is coming down the hill and into
that drainage point.

This is outside my driveway. I took a
string and put it across where the road used to be,
and you can see it’s about 15 inches of the road
has been worn away from the dirt that’s been placed
by the Town.

Also, if you look closely, at one point
this road was paved, and somehow along the way
someone took dirt and put it on top of the road. I
don’t know why someone would do that, but I’ve
owned the house since 1987; this is some of the way
that it’s eroding away. There’s runoff and
there's deep holes. Okay.

You can see where the runoff is.

Underneath that, that's all paved road. We're asking for the road, okay, to fix the problems.

Okay, next slide. This is where the hot top meets the dirt road. It keeps wearing away, there. The road is, as you can see, is in terrible shape. Some of the Town Meeting Members have told me that they know about this street and how dangerous it is.

Again, runoff. This house in particular can't use his garage because there's so much mud in front of it.

Okay, next slide, please. The next thing I want to address is it's a thruway. White Pine Lane is a private road, but it's connected to Sandwich Road and Lake Shore Drive which borders Jenkins Pond. Around the corner from this a few properties up, there are not one but two sober houses that are together, and in those houses is – there's 24 men that are housed there. And their trucks and their cars –

Next slide. They use this road to come back and forth. So, we not only – we don't have a
private road anymore. As you can see, these are
trucks. Every picture I took is not from our
street. These are people that are going all over
the place and on this street.

The second picture I want to point out,
we have two special needs busses coming through
this street every day, and even in the summer, and
you can clearly see that road goes straight. That
this bus is trying to navigate through the potholes
and these kids are being tossed all over the place.
And we feel it’s very dangerous and that it should
be addressed.

This is the dirt, the quality that is
when the cars and the trucks go by the dust is - is
just unbearable. We can’t even stay outside.

Again, just pictures. I mean, I have
other pictures, but these are just the ones that I
chose to pick.

Please. There’s another bus trying to
go through this terrible road. And Sandwich Road,
the reason for the mailbox, those are people going
- you can see they’re coming in from Sandwich Road,
how dangerous it is. There’s no sidewalk to go up
onto that road. They’re coming around blindly to
come into the street. There’s no visibility.

It’s a nightmare up there. You can see that we only have three feet of unprotected areas with nine mailboxes up there. I took mine out after a close call.

There’s a guardrail right in back of those mailboxes that we can’t even get out of the way if there’s a car coming towards us. I really request that you could please consider all the things that I have told you and help us get this street paved and under the town’s Town Way. If you could please take over this street so we can get our mailboxes out and protect our children.

That’s really.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, at this time the chair would entertain a motion to extend past 11:00.

FROM THE FLOOR: So moved.

THE MODERATOR: So moved.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: In George’s absence, I move that we go past 11:00.

THE MODERATOR: Great, thank you, so moved.

All those in favor, signify by saying
Tinkham Reporting
(508) 759-9162

aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by the two-thirds and we’ll extend past 11:00.

Speakers on Article 30.

Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: Well, I had the great pleasure of meeting Ms. Favreau and talking with her about her issues on White Pine Lane. And they are legitimate issues, but they are not unlike the many issues that you’ve seen on the 100 percent betterment roads that have come before this body tens and tens of times over the last 15 years.

Elizabeth Jean Drive has been waiting since 2002 to have the Department of Public Works make similar improvements on Elizabeth Jean Drive. We expect to make those improvements this coming year. It is a neighborhood road. Each and every one of those neighbors is paying 100 percent of the costs associated with bringing that road to subdivision standards.

We’ve just completed the Ashumet Valley
neighborhood, which I know you’ve all heard about
in the last several years, as well.

We’ve recommended that that really is the
method that the Town has created to help
neighborhoods take on these issues so that they can
petition through the 100 percent betterment
program, meeting the threshold of providing the
plan and written description, and then we’ll take
that on and consider it in due time.

It does take a lot of time to get through
that program. Our neighbors have all waited for
that program and we’ve encouraged Ms. Favreau to
pursue that method for White Pine Lane.

THE MODERATOR: I’ve got the gentleman
in the back and then I’ll come back to you. Yeah,
in the back left; I can’t really see. I’ve got a
blind spot with that light up there.

MR. SACCHETTI: Dick Sacchetti, precinct
4.

And through you, Mr. Moderator, to the
Selectmen. The petitioner has shown us, and I’m
sure the documentation is there, that this road has
in fact been accepted on two other occasions in mid
and late ’70’s. And if it was accepted then and
that work was done in the front part, I would like
to know did the Selectmen ever go back and see if
the error here is that it wasn’t transposed onto
the list of accepted streets and therefore it was
accepted but the paperwork didn’t follow the
acceptance?

I would like a reason why –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Har –

MR. SACCHETTI: it could be accepted

on two occasions and –

THE MODERATOR: Let Ms. Harper – no, it

isn’t. I don’t think Town Meeting ever took its

action.

Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: There’s no record of Town

Meeting – only Town Meeting can accept the road.
The Selectmen do not have that authority.

THE MODERATOR: So they do the layout

and then Town Meeting has to accept the layout and
Town Meeting never did its part. Yeah.

MS. SWAIN: I have copies –

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

MS. SWAIN: Oh, I’m sorry.

I have copies from the Clerk’s Office
that was — that was signed by the Selectmen and
filed in the Town Clerk’s Office by the Town Clerk.
Two times. Once in ’73 and once in 1978.

Also I’d like to point out that Elizabeth
Jean, I went to see it. That street is only used
by the residents. It’s not a thruway like my road
is, and that’s why I think that the Town should
take over this street.

We’re talking about 300 feet of pavement.
They already did half the road. They didn’t do a
betterment on that road. They didn’t — they
didn’t — I don’t have any betterment and I don’t
even think they surveyed it.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McConarty.

MS. SWAIN: So for us to do that — and
it’s a very poor street. Across the street, I
have a fisherman living there. There’s — there’s,
like I said, the Housing Authority has someone
there. And there’s retirement people. My
husband and I are retired.

These are the issues that I think are
being overlooked.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. McConarty.

MR. MCCONARTY: Peter McConarty, Town
Engineer.

Knowing that this article was going to come up this evening at this Town Meeting, our office did some research on this roadway and there is a - there is a history to the roadway for White Pine.

Ms. Favreau is correct that it has come up in the '70's several times. In 1976, the Department of Public Works requested from -- excuse me, 1975 -- I have the article, Article 69, the Department of Public Works requested $5,000 to do some drainage repairs on the roadway. It was approved in 1975.

In 1976, the Department of Public Works did the drainage problem. The reason why half the roadway is paved is there was a severe flooding problem on Sandwich Road that was actually going down Sandwich Road and actually going down White Pine Lane and flooding out White Pine Lane. So, that's why the Department of Public Works went in and they did take easements, they did do a survey, they did take easements and we did have plans.

In 1979, this roadway came up with a list of other roadways for a betterment and it was Town
Meeting voted it as indefinite postponement. So I just wanted to give you a little bit of history on the project and that’s where it sat. So, it was interesting to see a signed copy of White Pine Lane because in 1979 Town Meeting, Article 27 of Town Meeting, 1979, did indefinite postponement.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: These streets come up from time to time. I think we had one a year or two ago and I, very frankly, I blame the DPW. I blame the Selectmen. My feeling is if you sign off on something and it should be done. Particularly situations like this, that it takes almost 30 years to get something through.

MS. SWAIN: It’s over 40.

MR. DONAHUE: Well, over 40. It’s – it’s – it’s crazy.

I recommend we vote for this. I know it’s an exception to the rule, but I think they need the relief. And obviously there’s no heart in the DPW or in the Selectmen’s Office to take care of these situations. Thank you.
THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Pinto.

MR. PINTO: Greg Pinto, precinct 9.

Not withstanding the fact that my grandfather’s name was one of those Selectmen’s signatures, I respectfully move the question.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. We’re ready to vote on this, anyways.

All those in favor of Article 30 as printed, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor, signify by standing and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: First division.

MR. NETTO: 20.

THE MODERATOR: Third division.

MR. JOHNSON: 29.

THE MODERATOR: 29.

Second division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 58.

THE MODERATOR: 58? 58.
All those opposed, signify by standing
and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the first division.

MR. NETTO: 17.

THE MODERATOR: 17.

Second division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 34.

THE MODERATOR: 34.

Third division.

MR. JOHNSON: 16.

THE MODERATOR: 16.

By a counted vote of 107 in favor and 67 opposed, the article - the motion passes.

Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: I would like to clarify just for the entire audience what the effect of passing this article does. Which it really has no effect. There's a five step process to getting roads accepted. The last and fifth step is the vote of this Town Meeting.

The Selectmen can pass this - and this is what happened in the '70's is the Selectmen did accept it and Town Meeting in 1979 is the vote that
1 did not accept the road in 1979.

2 We now have to go through the five step
3 process and I encourage the petitioner to go
4 through it, but it isn’t the vote of this body that
5 then makes this now happen. It is the other four
6 steps are going to have to happen first and then
7 it’s going to have to come back to you again before
8 it can actually be accepted.

9 So don’t assume —

10 THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we’re going to
11 leave it at that. Because that’s why I asked if
12 this is the language that the petitioner wanted,
13 and this is the language that the petitioner put on
14 the floor.

15 And Article 31 — I’m not writing
16 articles. It’s not my job to write motions on the
17 floor of Town Meeting, okay? This warrant was
18 posted months ago, okay?

19 This was the motion that you voted on and
20 we’re going to go onto Article 31, which was held
21 by Ms. Fenwick.

22 And the main motion from the Board of
23 Selectmen.

24 MR. NETTO: [No mic: inaudible.]
THE MODERATOR:  Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO:   Selectman Jones, then is

that the same criteria that you’re going to use for

when we took the Crane Street in Woods Hole?

Because nothing was said when we passed that on the

blanket.

So now all of a sudden we have this five

step process? Is that what we’re going to do when

the state made a clerical error and nobody owned

the road? And now we treat the citizens of the

Town of Falmouth this way? The taxpayers?

I’ve been a member of this body and we’ve

voted taking these roads and they’ve been taken.

Against the advice of the administrative and the

Selectmen, because that’s the way the people felt.

And now we’re informed that there’s a five step –

THE MODERATOR:  Okay.

MR. NETTO:  – hoop that they’ve got to

jump through?

THE MODERATOR:  Let’s let Mr. Duffy

give a legal answer to this and put an end to it.

Okay, Mr. Duffy, what is the legal action

that Town Meeting just took?

MR. DUFFY:  I’m not sure.
[Laughter and applause.]

MR. DUFFY: As Mr. Jones has pointed out to you, there’s basically a statutory five step process. Town Meeting acceptance is the last and fifth step. So we’re beginning at the end.

Now, in the case of the Woods Hole property, I treat that as a little differently. That’s a transfer from the state to the Town. That just should have happened back then; it’s not subject to the same procedure.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Article 31. The main motion for Article 31 from the Board of Selectmen.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: Mr. Moderator, the Board of Selectmen moves that the Town vote Article 31 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: Article 31 as printed.

Ms. Fenwick held this.

MS. FENWICK: I’d like to insert one change, not an amendment, to the article as printed, asking you to check –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, this is going to have to be an amendment because the Board of Selectmen put a main motion already on the floor.
MS. FENWICK: Okay, all right, then I’d like to make an amendment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. FENWICK: And that would be to – on page 11 of the warrant book. It is about two-thirds of the way down, section 191-23, second paragraph, second sentence, begins “Establishment may” and we would like that sentence now to read: “Establishments may provide reusable bags at no charge or charge a reasonable fee for each paper or other bag as they so desire.”

And then I’d like to ask the petitioner Don Mallinson, to address Town Meeting.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, do you have that in writing or –

MS. FENWICK: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: – can we go through, it’s charge a reasonable fee?

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Charge a reasonable fee.

So striking out “of at least ten cents”, okay.

Okay, any discussion on the amendment?

Hearing – let’s just vote on the amendment, real quick, that little language that the petitioner
wants.

All those in favor of the amendment,
signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority and that’s the new language of the main motion and the petitioner has the floor.

MR. MALLINSON: Good evening, I’m Don Mallinson. I’m the sponsor of the petition that led to this article, this article in the Town Warrant.

What you just voted for was to eliminate a charge of five cents per bag to what is now a reasonable charge as so desired by the establishment. So I thank you very much for that one.

All of us in this auditorium are responsible not just for our own environment but for the environment for all animal life. And I make reference to this poor turtle with this plastic bag hanging out of his mouth, and as representative of the effect that these plastic
bags are having on our environment.

And this is what I’m talking about.

[Holding up bag.] Your basic check-out or carry out bag that’s provided by the establishment. It’s plastic; has handles on it. And it’s the only plastic bag that this article refers to.

There are other plastic bags that are not covered by this article. This is it.

So basically I know that the mind can absorb only what the rear end can endure. So, with that in mind, I’m going to cut this short and we can all go home, I think.

So, questions?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion.

Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct 2.

I just make an observation that the entire state of Maryland has similar law and it works fine.

I think it’s important that there is an 18 month adjustment period provided for this for people, customers as well as stores, to adjust to it. Which makes it a practicable article.
Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, and thank you Town Meeting.

I want to first of all apologize for being as passionate as I was last night. Sometimes that doesn’t come off as passion. But it shows how much I care about this community and the community that I chose to live and stay in.

I have a lot of problems with this article and let me explain those to you.

First of all, 20 years ago, I was told that I should use a plastic bag because I needed to save a tree, not use a paper bag.

That being said, we chose to live in this community and our community is not the same community as Provincetown, Chatham, Nantucket and Cambridge, that in fact enacted this same particular legislation.

I counted in my pantry today 22 reusable bags. I use those bags when I go family shopping. But that being said, I don’t always have the time to go home and get one of those bags when I stop at a convenience store, when I stop at a supermarket.
And the working folks in this community don’t always plan going to a store. They run in, they run out.

I believe that the folks -- I had asked to see if I could make an amendment to this motion and the amendment would be that it would be required before this bylaw became effective that it would have to go to the ballot at the annual Town election. Well, that’s impossible to do that amendment to this. However, I would ask that you would indefinitely postpone it and have the Selectmen put this on the ballot.

And let me explain in analogy why. In this community, on Article number 2 or question number 2, recently at the annual state election, this community voted almost two to one against adding an additional deposit or adding an additional charge to non-carbonated beverages.

Alls I say is that we have a great recycling program in this town. We all should educate and continue to try to work to strive to not use these bags. But forcing businesses, forcing folks that - that have to or sporadically go without those bags and have a charge - and it is
a reasonable charge, but it still would be a charge
- is bearing your will on your neighbors. And I
want to try to do that as much as I possibly can to
use a reusable bag, but I don’t think I should bear
my will on somebody else.

What’s next?

I ask that you vote this question down.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Allegro.

MR. ALLEGRO: Mark Allegro, 7th precinct.

I have a couple of problems with this

article, and one is the vagueness.

And I’m reading the first few sentences

and I see “The production and use of single-use ...
bags have significant impacts on the marine and
land environment”. What are the significant
impacts? I see a picture of one turtle with a

piece of bag in his mouth. That doesn’t seem to

me a cause for massive legislation in the town.

I see it has “significant impacts on

marine and environmental – and the environment of

all coastal communities”. Would someone please
describe to me what they are. In the land end of

this, is there a lot of trash on the street? I
drove all the way in this evening; I didn’t see one plastic bag in the street.

As for working fine in Maryland. It’s always questionable what works fine in one state, particularly Maryland. And what does working fine mean? Another vague statement. Does that mean that they got away with charging their citizens for bags? In that sense, perhaps it is working fine. Is it making a difference? I don’t know the answer to that.

I would remind everybody that most other dispose – or multiple use bags – and I might add that these bags are not necessarily single use. I use them time and again. But other bags that are multiple use are also often, if not always, containers of petroleum products as well. So, it’s not like we’re eliminating the use of petroleum products by charging our citizens. And the charge will be passed on to us through the stores.

So, I would urge voting against this. If it’s ever brought back with some specific data indicating the damage, I’d be happy to vote for it. Thank you.
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Heath.

MR. HEATH: I oppose this. But simply because if every town has their own laws, we will become a place where it’s almost impossible to do business.

Maryland passed it for the whole state. Fine. Every store in Maryland has to comply. But how is any retailer going to know if they have more than one town that they do business in and have a different rule in every town? It becomes as anti-business as you can get.

We should not be, and neither should Nantucket or Chatham or any Provincetown, be setting laws if otherwise the retailer is in compliance with all the state laws.

We just can’t do that all the time. We can pass laws of all kinds of things, and no one will know how – what those laws are.

I think doing this on a town level is just plain wrong, and therefore I urge a vote against it.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Buesseler.

MR. BUESSELER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Ken Buesseler, precinct 2.
THE MODERATOR: Yeah, you're on the list.

MR. BUESSELER: And I'd urge a yes vote on this for three reasons. I'll just very quickly. I think we haven't talked about the scale of the problem. Every year every individual has come to use about 500 of these bags. A town this size, we're talking about 1.65 million bags consumed by the Town of Falmouth. A small amount of those are getting in the oceans and our beaches. A lot of them are getting in the waste stream; I think we don't need that.

I think we also need to admit that we might find them useful for a few minutes, but they actually harm wildlife, marine life for decades. They don't go away. They don't degrade. That's why we don't want them affecting our wildlife.

The last point is that I think this town, this body, in many ways has been pro-environment. We're putting a lot of money to remove nitrogen from our estuaries. We had great congratulations yesterday for Mr. Cavossa for introducing recycling programs in the hospitals, in Woods Hole.

So, if we take all those things together,
it’s a pretty simple act. Let’s enact this ban, let’s do it today. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: Ralph Herbst, precinct 8.

I received, and I suppose most of you did, too, via email a memo from the Massachusetts Food Association. Now, that would be an organization that lobbies for food association and food distributors. And I read that and I would like to give you eight reasons why you should support this.

[Laughter.]

MR. HERBST: The Massachusetts Food Association was bragging – if you read it – about the programs that they’ve put forward to try and reduce the number of plastic bags that are discarded when we shop.

First, the Massachusetts Food Association Program is voluntary. So there’s no enforcement there with their program. And the result is that they said they got a 33 percent reduction in the use of those bags. So that leaves 67 percent still out there. I wouldn’t brag about a program like that.
Number three, the effort that they say they put forth reduce but they don’t insist on there being a reduction in the use of the bags.

Then they say - and this is really hilarious - they say banning plastic bags will hurt the recycling efforts. Huh? Well, how ridiculous a statement is that?

Then they say cashiers are trained to ask if you need a bag. That’s not true. The cashier asks you do you want paper or plastic.

And they say, number six, organic recycling program. They talk about an organic recycling program; it has nothing to do with this.

Number seven, think of all the retail stores that offer plastic bags that are not supermarkets. Look at your CVS’s and so forth. They’re becoming supermarkets but they still - they’re not part of this program.

And I asked - my wife uses reusable bags, and I do, too, that are made from old sails that are manufactured down in Australia. They’re great.

We need to pass this. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Siegel.
Quickly, this is getting to be a big list.

MS. SIEGEL: Deborah Siegel, precinct 6.

One of the points I’d like to make in answer to what Mr. Murphy said is that the reason that the voters turned down the expanded bottle bill is because the beverage companies and the supermarkets spent $8.8 million lying to the voters of this state about the terrible hazards of increasing the bottle bill.

We have responsibilities in our lives other than how we spend money in here, and one of the responsibilities is to make the best attempt we possibly can to right some of the wrongs that we’ve inflicted on the environment. We have a chance to do that tonight.

I ask you to vote in favor of this.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Siegel, can you just pass the mic to your right, two over? Yes, and then – no. Yeah, the woman who’s got the mic right now, you had your hand up. And then, you’re next on the list, actually.

MS. VAN MOOY: Sorry, Tracy.
THE MODERATOR: Yeah. You’re next.

MS. VAN MOOY: Tiffany Van Mooy, precinct 2. I vote in favor for this.

Twenty years ago, plastic - or paper bags may have been the angle we were going for, but we know, there’s tons of data out there that plastic bags aren’t going anywhere. They’re going to outlive me and you and everybody you’ve ever met. They aren’t going anywhere, and the sooner we stop using them the better for my children and yours.

And it can be hard to remember to put those recycle bags in your car, but do that. If you put them in your car, then they’re with you when you go shopping. But if you forget, it’s okay, because for a small fee you can buy another one.

So, please vote for this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, just keep passing it down. Yeah.

MR. MINCER: Right. Tracy Mincer, precinct 2.

I’m a scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic and for over three years, now, I’ve worked studying plastic marine debris in the oceans.
And when the wind blows, it can blow a plastic bag straight into the water. We’re a coastal area, here; we need to be mindful of that. When a plastic bag floats through the water, it looks just like a jelly fish, and that’s probably why this turtle went for it. It’s one of its favorite foods.

It takes about a month and a half for a plastic bag to transport all the way to the center of what’s called The Gyre, just off the coast, here, of Bermuda. And there it sits for decades and will turn into a confetti-like substance and float through the oceans and interact with other zooplankton. The stuff just doesn’t go away.

And so I want to urge everyone to -- that there’s -- first off, there’s plenty of data out there that this stuff persists and it’s pernicious and we, dealing with single use plastics and getting it out, this is very important.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Lowell.

MS. LOWELL: Very quickly, a lot of things in this world you have to start at the grass roots. You can’t wait for the county, the state, country, the world to do it. And I think it’s
perfectly appropriate that we’re the grass roots, so we can do this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Leslie Lichtenstein, precinct 8.

The Gyre off of Bermuda isn’t very big yet. California’s banning plastic bags because the Great Plastic Gyre in the Pacific Ocean is larger than the size of Texas, folks. The one off Bermuda, hey, is only the size of Massachusetts. Don’t you think we should stop it before it gets to the size of Texas?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Stecher.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question. Vote.

MR. STECHER: Bernie Stecher, precinct 3. I’m going to be very quick.

Falmouth has always been in the front of conservation. We were probably one of the first towns to vote about smoking in the restaurants. And there was a great hue and cry about all the money was going to be lost. Now everybody’s doing it and no one’s losing any money.

This is a real problem. Millions of gallons of oil are used to make these plastic bags
and there is just no reason for it.

   Europe doesn’t use plastic bags. All of
   Europe. And, as they said, California’s doing
   it. We can be the first town aside from
   Provincetown to start this, and I don’t see why we
   can’t. Thank you.

   THE MODERATOR: Ms. Whitehead, anything
   new?

   MS. WHITEHEAD: No, I mean, we should
   vote. But I just wanted to say one thing. We
   lived in England for a year. I used these bags
   every single day; I keep them in my car; I still
   use them. And I respect what Kevin Murphy said,
   but if I run in for milk, I bring a bag. If I run
   in for a loaf of bread, I bring a bag.

   It’s always in the car. I unpack the
   bags; I put them right back in the car and it’s
   easy to do because you get in a habit and it’s
   great and they’re not made of oil, they’re made of
   cloth and you can wash them and they’re fine.

   So I keep ten in my car at all times.

   And I think we should vote.

   FROM THE FLOOR: Vote, vote.

   THE MODERATOR: Okay. All right, I
think so, too.

Ready for the main motion. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the ayes have it by a majority.

[Applause and cheers.]

THE MODERATOR: Article 36. This is a Community Preservation Committee. Community Preservation Committee for the main motion.

MR. HERBST: Mr. Moderator, Community Preservation Committee recommends Article 36 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

MR. HERBST: As, well, I haven’t offered a -- a --

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

MR. HERBST: Okay, as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, and remember we made a scribner’s change that it’s a two bedroom versus a three bedroom single home. So.

Who actually held this?
Mr. Donahue.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: No, he didn’t go home yet.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Moderator, Bob Donahue, precinct 3.

I’m questioning on this article the cost of the Habitat for Humanity’s house. I believe it’s going to be $284,000, and I thought this was all donated materials, donated labor, donated land, with a few exceptions maybe for foundation or furniture, etcetera.

Why is it such a large sum for retail? That does not seem to be a true low income, moderate income, even, here in Falmouth, that number. Thank you very much.

Most of the homes -- I’ll just add one more thing. Most of the homes in Falmouth are around $300,000 today, and up. With few exceptions.

So, everything being donated, why is it so expensive?
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: All right, I invited representatives from the Habitat for Humanity organization to be here. They were here last night, but they couldn’t be here tonight.

I personally build houses with Habitat for Humanity in my spare time. The reason that this is excessive and more expensive than normal is because the topography of the lot is very unusual. The lot was donated to Habitat for Humanity, as all of the property -- almost all of the property that Habitat for Humanity builds on.

Normally, the donations come from the towns, but in this case the donation for the property was from a private source. But the topography of this lot, originally they had hoped to build three bedrooms on this property, but it was impossible because there was not only a large slope, but there’s vernal pool on the property.

So it’s taking an excessive amount of work to engineer the building on the property. And so that’s the reason why the cost is somewhat higher than what Habitat normally would charge for a home of this size.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion on Article 6? Hearing none, then the question will come on the main motion as recommended.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

Article 39. Article 39 was also a Community Preservation Committee article.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HERBST: Mr. Moderator, the Community Preservation Committee recommends Article 39 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

This was held by Ms. Whitehead. This is --

MS. WHITEHEAD: [No mic: inaudible].

THE MODERATOR: Oh, you’re all set.

Okay.

Any further discussion on Article 39?

Hearing none, the question will come on the main motion.
All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

Article 42. Mr. Chairman of the Community Preservation Committee for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN HERBST: Mr. Chairman, the Community Preservation Committee recommends Article 42 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This is a sum of money for the golf course irrigation system.

Who held this?

MR. FINNERAN: I held this.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Yes, thank you.

My memory may be wrong, but as I recall when we purchased this country club we were told two things. That it was going to support itself, and also that it was going to be used for tertiarily treated septic - or wastewater, sewer
water.

It appears to me that neither of those things are true. Can someone explain that to me?

And how much more are we going to have to put into this great bargain?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. -- whoop. Okay, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HERBST: Mr. Moderator, I would like to defer to the Town management for an explanation since they were the applicants for this particular project.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: I will try to do this briefly, but if I could have a couple of slides, thank you.

And thank you for you patience.

You can go to the next slide, please. I just want to recognize that the golf course has not required a subsidy from taxpayers since its acquisition. The property has generated sufficient revenue to cover its operating costs.

Given the changes in the golf industry over the past decade, revenue generated does not support capital needs. The Town’s financial
analyst has reviewed the performance of the course
over the last ten years and determined that the
Town has earned revenue at or above market
expectations.

I want to talk a little bit about the
second part of Mr. Finneran’s question. This is
just an aerial of the acquisition and I’m going to
just head on two slides ahead. I’m going to skip
the next one.

The green area shows the golf course
acquisition. The orange area is what is known as
the Degnan parcel, and that was acquired with AFSE
funds. And that is still available for the use of
the nitrogen mitigation. And then the two red
parcels are open space parcels.

Next slide, please. The property has
been part of a very large-scale environmental
stewardship program. There’s a conservation
restriction that has been placed on the property in
its entirety.

If you recall, when the Town acquired the
property, there was a 300 unit subdivision proposed
for the area. The Town chose as an open space
project to acquire the entire I think it was 238
acres in total to prevent the property from being
developed. At the same time, we acquired the golf
course and took on the continued goal of sustaining
that operation as a community recreational amenity.

Since the property was acquired by the
Town, we’ve received an Audubon Cooperative
Sanctuary certificate, an Audubon certificate for
wildlife habitat management and a Falmouth Friendly
Lawn certificate.

Now, this presentation can go on for some
time. I don’t want to waste the time of Town
Meeting here, so I’ll stop at this point unless
there are more questions.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG: It’s late. Bob Young,
precinct 5. This is our last article.

This golf – I’m a member or a former
member of the Golf Committee. I’ve been on it
nine years. I wasn’t on the Acquisition Committee,
but I’ve been on the regular Golf Committee.

This golf course is a real jewel to the
Town of Falmouth. It has provided affordable golf
for our residents and guests and it has operated
for nine years without any assessment to the Town.
We haven’t asked the Town for any money on this golf course.

It was built by [inaudible] Rabesa with some associates. Mr. Rabesa took over the golf course and ran it himself for many years. Sold it to another partnership and then the Town acquired it. And we did have a chance to acquire it for less money than we finally got – we did end up with it and a nice 27 hole course.

It’s in fantastic shape and I’m sure a few of you have played out there. It’s a real fun place to be. The Town has benefitted from a public/private successful partnership with Billy Casper Golf and they are bidding again for a new contract. I’m not part of that group anymore, but I’m aware of what’s going on.

The original watering system, what we’re talking about now, is over 40 years old on the old 18 hole course. It’s been talked about for many years and it’s been put off and this Community Preservation Act money will give us a start in helping to prepare that golf course so it stays in good condition.

We need this help and I think it would be
a well spent money from the CPC and I urge you to
support this article and this recreational
facility. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: You know, I don’t like
the lighting in my tennis club and I wonder if the
citizens of Falmouth would care to contribute some
tax dollars to improve that situation. I mean,
this is hyperbolic, I guess, but I think this
article was placed at the end of the warrant to
test our wakefulness and I’m really disappointed
that the authors and supporters of this are tone
deaf to the message that was sent by the voters
when the athletic artificial turf athletic field
was put on the warrant - or on the ballot.

We had here for the last two nights
substantial challenge in resources meeting needs
that far exceed those resources. Not to mention
what we haven’t addressed, the challenges in our
education budget which wasn’t discussed at this
meeting. And I think the business of the Town is
to provide the basic services in education and
public works, safety and health, and it’s fine if
we think we can take on a business that will be
profitable. I know we’ve had some fits and starts in the area of energy generation, but I think if I heard the Town management correctly, the golf business is tough and it’s not a sustainable operation financially.

And I would urge you to vote against this foot in the door, this Trojan horse, which is going to lead, if you look at page one of the Capital Improvement Program, to another $572,680 requested to finish the irrigation project and I just don’t support subsidizing someone’s recreational activity for specialist needs of people who like to play golf.

I don’t expect anyone to pay for my better tennis lighting. The new owner of the facility has raised the rates and, you know, increased the prime time hours.

So, I think the players ought to pay. I do not support this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Mr. Latimer.

Can you just pass it down there? Right in front of you.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct
2.

I’m one of those people – I’m a fisherman, fly fisherman, and I agree with Mark Twain that golf is a good walk ruined. However, I support this article because it is a great amenity for those people, those people who do enjoy golf in this town and others who come to this community. It’s a nice facility. It’s an affordable facility. It keeps the hackers off the trout streams.

But, nonetheless, nonetheless, it is also an environmental asset to this town. It is green space. It is green space that is used for a particular purpose and it does, in the course of normal, annual maintenance, pay for itself. It pays for itself in terms of all the mowing and the normal maintenance.

What we’re talking about here is a one-time capital problem that we’re replacing a 40 year old irrigation system. That’s not something that’s a burden. It’s not like we were going out and voted to build a new artificial turf field, which we, you know, didn’t already have. This is an amenity that we already have and I fully support
this article. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion as recommended.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it by a majority.

Madame Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for notification of the next Town Meeting.

CHAIRMAN FLYNN: The Board of Selectmen have voted to set April 13th for the Spring Town Meeting.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, April 13th will be the Spring Town Meeting.

Madame Chairman for a main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move the November 2014 Annual Town Meeting be closed.

THE MODERATOR: You’ve all heard the main motion to dissolve this meeting.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.
[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it; the meeting is dissolved.

[11:45 p.m., whereupon meeting adjourned.]
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