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PROCEEDINGS

THE MODERATOR: Will all Town Meeting Members please come forward and take your seats.

All Town Meeting Members please come forward, take your seats. Don’t forget to check in.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, here we go, Folks, we’re going to establish a quorum and start the Special Town Meeting.

The League of Women Voters has asked me to make an announcement to Town Meeting Members who are seeking re-election. Town Meeting Members who are seeking re-election, the League of Women Voters invites all Town Meeting Members seeking re-election to attend the Candidates Night on Wednesday, May 6th at the Morse Pond School at 7:30. At the beginning of the event you’ll be given an opportunity to briefly introduce yourself and make a statement on why you’re seeking re-election, and the program will be televised on FC-TV.

Our tellers this evening: in the first division will be Mr. Netto; in the second division will be Mr. Dufresne; and in the third
division will be Mr. Hampson.

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

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the case that we
convene again tomorrow night, we are in need of
microphone carriers. So if anyone knows of a
couple of individuals who might be interested in
carrying mics for us if we’re here tomorrow
night, please contact the Town Clerk’s Office
tomorrow during the day so we can make sure that
we have that accommodation.

In the first division, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 38.

THE MODERATOR: 38.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 81.

THE MODERATOR: 81.

Third division, Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: 60.

THE MODERATOR: 60.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: By a counted vote of
179, we have a quorum and I call the Special Town Meeting to order.

All present please rise for the presentation of the colors by Boy Scout Troop 42.

[Pause.]

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Please follow me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[Pledge of Allegiance taken.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time, I’ll call on Sandra Cuny for our invocation.

MS. CUNY: Lord, when it comes to meeting and communicating with other, help us to be good listeners. Help us to be open-minded, putting aside our own agendas. Help us to be honest, without being insensitive. Help us to be respectful, without being too formal or artificial. Help us to question and to challenge, without being harsh. Help us to be aware that this is just one moment, just one meeting. And lastly, help us to remember that you, too, are always meeting and communicating with us. Amen.

THE MODERATOR: We’ll pause for a
moment of silence.

[Moment of silence.]

THE MODERATOR: Colors post.

[Pause.]

My alma mater, Boy Scout Troop 42 from East Falmouth.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: If anyone in the room or on television is connected with one of the girl scout troops, we haven’t had them in in the last couple of town meetings. So if someone could reach out to myself, we’d like to get one of the girl scout troops, and the contact I had is no longer there.

So, we’d like to share the opening ceremonies with all of our youth scouting groups.

Okay, at this time I’ll ask for the dispense of the reading of the warrant.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JONES: 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.

At this time, I’ll read the Officer’s 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 Constable James Crossen.

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

At this time the chair would entertain a motion for non-Town Meeting Members to sit up front with their Boards or Committees.

FROM THE FLOOR: So 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.

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 this 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.

Okay. Tonight, we’re going to start off without a blanket on Article 1, go through the Special, and when we complete it we will come back to the Annual Town Meeting.

So, Article 1. This is to transfer $1,240,000 within the Fiscal 2015 budget.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I
move Article 1 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: Article 1 as recommended. Any discussion on Article 1?

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.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 2. The recommendation is indefinite postponement. This is to appropriate a sum of money to supplement the 2015 budget. Anyone need to make a positive motion?

Hearing none, Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 2 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This is indefinite postponement. 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 3. The recommendation is indefinite postponement. This is the contract between the Town and the International Association of Firefighters.

Anyone want to make a positive motion? Hearing none, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 3 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended, indefinite postponement.

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 4, this is contract with the Lieutenants NEPBA Local 165. Does anyone want to make a positive motion?

Hearing none, Madame Chairman for the
main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 4 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended: indefinite postponement.

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 5, this is a contract with ASFME, Unit B. The recommendation is indefinite postponement. Would anyone like to make a positive motion?

Hearing none, Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 5 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended: indefinite postponement.

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 6. This is to change the Town’s Classification Plan to add a Communications Officer, a Senior Communications Officer and a Communications Administrator.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 6 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. As recommended. We have a presentation, Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Julian Suso, Town Manager.

I do not have a PowerPoint on this, just a few comments. There’s an explanation, as well, in your Town Meeting booklet.

Special Town Meeting Article 6 includes the creation of the adjusted job titles for the new Communications Department. All current police and fire dispatch positions are civilian positions. This will remain the case in the new
Communications Department. The job titles will simply change from dispatcher to communications officer.

Each shift, which will include two communications officers, will include one of those two positions in the position of senior communication officer, and there’s a five percent differential anticipated in the hourly rate between those two positions. Final hourly salary ranges are subject to collective bargaining under state statute, as noted in the booklet.

The communications administrator position will supervise the Communications Department function and will be overseen by the Communications Department Oversight Committee, which consists of the Town Manager, the Police Chief, and the Fire Chief.

To continue our progress in implementing this Department, we ask for Town Meeting to add these positions to the Town Position Classification Plan. Thank you for your consideration.

THE MODERATOR: Discussion on Article
Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, precinct three.

Through you, Mr. Moderator, to the Town Manager. Are these three additional positions over and above the positions that we have now? And how many do we have now? And what about the part-timers that we have now? How are they going to - are they going to be able to get one of these positions or what - do you have some information on that?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: The dispatcher positions will be transformed into communications officer positions as noted. The full time dispatchers that are currently in the employ of the Town will automatically become full time communications officers with the Town.

The final hourly rate has to be bargained under state statute. We respect that and can’t foreordain or confirm exactly what that final hourly rate will be. The rate represented in the Town Meeting booklet is consistent with
the overall ranges currently paid to the
civilians in Police and Fire that are undertaking
those responsibilities currently.

We will have nine full-time dispatchers,
including the senior positions, as well as the
standard communications officer positions and the
- all of the part-time positions that are
currently working with the Town cannot be -
cannot be guaranteed a full time position,
because all of our communications officers in the
future will be full time and none of them will be
part-time as we anticipated.

But, all full-time positions currently
in place will automatically transfer to that
department; that has been our representations to
those bargaining units that have met with us.

THE MODERATOR: Any further discussion?
Yes, Mr. Noonan.

MR. NOONAN: Just one more question on
that. The salaries - are you asking for money
under this article? And if you're not, what is
the anticipation of paying - where these are
going to be paid for, out of what account? And
will the Police and Fire dispatchers, the money
that’s put up for them, will that come out of
those accounts and go into this account?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Again, the final amounts
have yet to be bargained, so I cannot give any
guarantee on what those final hourly rates will
be. That’s a matter that’s ordained in state
statute. Our anticipation is that within the
existing FY ’16 budget, which Town Meeting has
approved last night – thank you – funds are
available for the positions which we are
proposing.

THE MODERATOR: Further discussion.

Mr. Noonan.

MR. NOONAN: Were the salaries for the
dispatchers deducted already from the Police and
Fire or is that anticipation of that revenue
moving into that account?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Funds for Police and Fire
Communications Officers are within those existing
departments for FY ’16. Those funds were
appropriated last night by Town Meeting.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Peck. No, back
there first. Mr. Peck.

MR. PECK: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Bill Peck, precinct 9.

I just had a question here. I think presently the Police Department has one patrolman on the desk, one civilian on the desk, and a sergeant that monitors that area. You were talking about having nine people, three per shift, is that correct?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: As the Matrix study indicates, two Communications Officers would be on duty 24 hours a day. In addition, in the daytime there would be an administrator during the normal working hours in the daytime that would be on duty. But only two Communication Officers 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

MR. PECK: Okay, I don’t know, having been around that dispatch area in the Fire Department - I’m not sure about the Police Department but I know they handle a lot more call volume than the Fire Department does. There’s presently one full-time person at the Fire Department each eight hour shift, and it’s really
borderline. It’s been questionable for years whether there was actually a second person needed during the daytime shift.

But the Police Department has two people to answer the calls and handle the dispatch and all the other stuff that comes into the emergency centers. And I’m just wondering if the people that have done this study have actually sat in the room and witnessed the call volume and so forth, because you’re talking about emergency services. Police and Fire work close side by side. If there’s a car accident, you know that the Police are involved, Fire is involved, Rescue is involved. So there’s a lot of stuff going on, happenings in that room, and I just don’t think that two people are going to be able to handle that.

And then if - if while that’s going on - we have five ambulances. So that’s got to give you a little idea of the kind of volume that’s just happening in the Fire Department, and we’re not talking about the five, six, seven cruisers that are on the roads responding to domestics, overdoses, car accidents, break-ins, whatnot.
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So, I just hope this – this is going to work, but I don’t think it is.

I just don’t think you have enough people to do it. I really don’t. And I just think this body should just slow down a little bit here and if the radios break, the radios break and we’ll figure a way.

But there’s just a total crazy number of phone calls and radio communications, it goes back and forth. You got county, you got mutual aid, you got everything going on. So that was my -- my two cents.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: If I may, Mr. Moderator.

Again, I wanted to confirm a comprehensive study was conducted, presented to the Board of Selectmen in December. It’s been posted on the Town website and discussed at great length. By Matrix Consulting. And I’ll be talking about that a little bit later this evening in more detail.

But Matrix Consulting analyzed an entire year of Police and Fire dispatching, all the calls for 365 days, working with the Police
Chief, the Fire Chief, other personnel. All existing dispatchers were interviewed as part of the process. They made themselves available. They were all contacted. In addition, a number of personnel in both Police and Fire.

We are aware of the call loading. Matrix is fully aware of the call loading, and the projections they have made take that fully into account. We are totally comfortable with the analysis, the facts and the information which has been reviewed by the internal team and Police, Fire, Public Works and Marine Environmental Services that reviewed all the call loading and all the call numbers. It’s all in the report and we know exactly how many calls we get by time of day, by day of the week, by month of the year. It’s all in that report.

And the proposed staffing will accommodate those calls and more – and in significant excess. There is a factor that Matrix placed here to insure that we can more than accommodate all the calls needed with two dispatchers on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And that is all well documented.
Mr. Donahue.

The question that I have is: when do you anticipate the earliest that this new call center will be up and running? And going back to the budgets, if this is a new department, then are you going to take money out of the Police and the Fire and the DPW to pay for these people? How are you going to do it? You don’t want to – you don’t seem to want to answer that question.

Thank you.

[Laughter, applause.]

Mr. Suso.

Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I think I indicated in the budget that Town Meeting adopted last night are 12 months of Police and Fire dispatching. Police Department and Fire Department. If all goes as well as we would hope, the cut-over is expected to be in January of 2016, which will require that those funds that are set aside currently in Police and Fire for dispatching will be paid for those same full-time personnel that are now working, merely occupied in another department.
So that is anticipated and those funds are set aside and Town Meeting has already, in your action yesterday, set aside the funds to allow that to occur.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Leslie Lichtenstein, precinct eight.

Is there any contingency plan just in case we have another four feet of snow or a hurricane or something else and we discover we need another person in that center? Is there any contingency plan for that or would it have to wait half a year for us to come to Town Meeting and vote such a person?

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: The Town has standard operating procedures. We work well under the Emergency Operations Director, our Fire Chief Mark Sullivan. Our procedures in place are the same ones we have now. If you need more dispatchers, you call more in. We do that currently. That’s what will occur with a consolidated department, except it will be much
more efficient. We will not have calls bouncing back and forth, as we had in the recent blizzard and the winter storms between Police dispatch and Fire dispatch at disparate locations.

Dispatchers will be in one place, and they will handle all the emergency needs for Police, Fire, Public Work and the Marine and Environmental Services from a single point of contact. There will not be the delay of needing to move from one department to another if that arises.

Frequently during emergency situations the Fire and Rescue Department that does such a marvelous job in those situations has to respond, and in January past they would need to respond sometimes to roads that needed to be plowed. So we had to have a dispatcher call out and notify Public Works, frequently through our Emergency Operations Center, but this could be handled as efficiently by our consolidated dispatch operation. So that, a single point of contact can go out, provide the snow plow, have the rescue squad follow the snow plow and have a police vehicle also respond to the extent that
that is necessary.

So, by consolidating everything you’ve enhanced efficiency, lowered cost, and provided a higher level of service to residents whether it’s an emergency or a quiet time in April or a busy time in the summer.

THE MODERATOR: Gentleman in the center back row.

MR. TOMPKINS: Jacques Tompkins, precinct seven.

How many part-time dispatchers will be affected by this change? And what is – are they experienced, have they been in their positions a long time?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: We currently have four part-time dispatchers, and they’ve been there, they’ve been working with the town for various times. I can tell you and I know that Chief Dunn and Chief Sullivan can confirm those are positions that are very difficult to fill. They have a considerable amount of turnover and we’re very pleased with the opportunity to go to full-time positions here as we’re proposing because it
makes for greater continuity, allows for enhanced insurance or training and a more predictable level of service to residents.

So there are four currently, but we do have significant turnover and I believe one of those positions we’ve recently just filled.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else on Article 6?

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 7. This is to authorize the Board of Selectmen to petition the General Court relative to room occupancy tax.

Mr. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for our main motion.

CHAIRMAN JONES: We have a slight change in the motion. Just – at one of the precinct meetings, we had some questions and we
want to clarify exactly what the purpose of the motion is going to be. So I’ll read it to you.

We also have a slide for this.

The main motion is to see if the town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to petition the General Court for special home rule legislation as follows:

“Notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, the Town of Falmouth may impose a room occupancy tax, in addition to such occupancy tax currently allowed by law, on any vacation or leisure accommodation, including but not limited to apartments, single or multi-family housing, cottages, condominiums and timeshare units, as well as any other vacation or leisure accommodation not expressly taxed pursuant to the provision to General Laws Chapter 64G.”

And here’s the change from what’s written: “At the same rate as the Town taxes commercial accommodations.” And that’s replacing what’s in there at the rate of ten percent – six percent.

Continuing: “Vacation or leisure accommodation is further defined to include only
paid occupancy for a period of 90 consecutive
days or less, regardless of whether such use and
possession is as a lessee, tenant, guest or
license, but excludes those accommodations
specifically exempted from General Laws Chapter
64G in Section 2 of that chapter.”

“And to state the legislature may vary
from the form of the enactment in order to
properly achieve its objectives, or to take any
other action relative thereto.”

And I’ll just give a little explanation.
The question was right now the current rate is
four percent for the rooms tax, and the original
recommendation was that we were going to increase
the places that could be taxed and have the rate
go to six percent, and that just seemed a little
confusing and may have also been in conflict with
what the law was allowing.

So, to be clear, what we’d like to do is
just to add other places that are going to be
charged a rooms tax. Everyone would be at four
percent.

We do feel that right now it’s an un-
level playing field. That there are places that
are abiding by our rooms tax law, paying the
rooms tax as requested, and there are other
people that are doing the exact same, offering
the same service, and not paying any rooms tax,
and we’d like to have that fairly consistent.

There are a few other towns on Cape Cod
that are petitioning the legislature at the same
time with very similar language. We have asked
the legislature in the past to consider this.
They have not taken action on it. We’re hoping
by grouping with other towns and pushing our
legislatures – legislative lobbying fully, we may
be able to get this passed this time.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Moderator, I’d
like to make an amendment to this motion and then
I’ll speak on the amendment.

Line number 7 states “only paid
occupancy for a period of 90 consecutive days or
less”. I would like to amend that to read:
“only paid occupancy for a period of 30 days or
less”. And if I can speak on the motion – on
the amendment.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we’re going to change the 90 days to 30 days.

MR. MURPHY: That’s correct.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: I was a champion of this for many years in regard to the fact that the hospitality industry continues to be the only ones, meaning the bed and breakfast, hotels, motels, to be taxed, those people who have more than three rooms. Although I think it is fair to say that none of those establishments rent for in fact more than 30 days.

In my discussions with some individuals at hotels, motels, B&B’s, rarely is anybody renting for more than 30 days.

To go on and elaborate a little bit more on this issue, many of those longer term rentals, meaning 60 or 90 days, typically are in the summer. Those folks are work force housing. Those folks are seeking places to stay who come here and work in our shops, work in our restaurants, work in our housekeeping for those folks who own those motels, hotels, B&B’s.

Also, we have a large contingency of
students that visit from throughout the world that come to our institutions to study in the summer. Very few of them, very few of them stay for under 30 days. Most of them stay for 30 days or more.

So my motion would be to keep it in fact on a fair playing field, that it would be for 30 days or less. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on the amendment of changing the 90 to 30.

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

Mr. Latimer, you were on my original list.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct 1. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I just have a question. I’m not familiar with what the provisions of Chapter 64
G, Section 2 provide and I think I’d like an explanation of that.


MS. HARPER: It’s my understanding that’s the local options tax. It allows communities to adopt the local options of rooms tax and meals tax. This is expanding that to allow for these seasonal accommodations.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Yes. With the microphone, please.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Latimer, I happen to have a copy. You’re welcome to it. I will print another one out for myself tonight. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: Ralph Herbst, precinct eight.

I think most of you probably received an email from a local realtor who claims to have a lot of clients that rent properties, and that person was worried about some of his clients not using him anymore and going on their own to avoid paying the tax.

And I would think that would be a very
dangerous thing to say about people who were your
clients, to indicate that they might be willing
to participate in some kind of illegal activity.

[Laughter.]

MR. HERBST: So I – that kind of email
when it comes to me, I mean, it ends up in my
wood burning stove.

[Laughter.]

MR. HERBST: And so I just find this is
such an important thing to level the playing
field here in town. And all of the people that
come here, whether they rent long-term or short-
term, they all use the amenities that this town
has to offer. And what we’re trying to do is to
ask them to pay back to the town a small portion
of what is available to them.

So I highly recommend to everyone that
we adopt this procedure. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: The exemptions in 64G are
as follows: the provisions of this chapter
shall not be construed to include lodging
accommodations and federal, state or municipal
institutions. Lodging accommodations including
dormitories at religious, charitable, educational and philanthropic institutions, and privately owned and operated convalescent homes or homes for the aged, infirmed, indigent or chronically ill; religious or charitable homes for the aged, infirm, indigent or chronically ill, and summer camps for children 18 years of age or under.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Good evening, Rebecca Putnam, precinct nine. I am also a real estate broker here in town.

I will say this: I am in support of this article. I think anyone who sends out a scare tactic like that or mis-speaks about clients without even knowing how they truly feel is incorrect.

But, number two, I know there is always a question of how is it going to be enforced. We do have a zoning officer, and I know many folks here in town, if they find that their neighbor is cheating, generally makes a phone call.

[Laughter.]

MS. PUTNAM: That’s how it is.

But this would generate quite a bit of
revenue for us. And as was just stated: these folks are coming into town, they’re using all of our amenities. They’re using our Police Department when they have a problem. They’re using our Fire and ambulance when they have an accident.

This town does need some income. And if it’s a way to get more income, we should do it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on Article 7?

Mr. Heath.

MR. HEATH: Austin Heath, precinct eight. I approve of the amendment, but I have some other problems with this. Hotels, Bed and Breakfasts and so on provide services, often meals, restaurants, bars, making beds. I have a problem with the people who rent a house. They do all this themselves. People who rent houses for a month or two months pay their money for a residence; they take care of it, often bring their own bedding. It’s not the same thing and it’s not competitive.

We have to remain an attractive
destination.

Secondly, I hear that these people should pay something. They do. Whoever owns the property is paying the same full property taxes that everybody else is paying. When they pay the rent, a part of their rent goes to the Town. For timeshares that operate like a hotel, I don’t have any problem whatsoever with this, but for the rental cottages, and many people in this town - well, not many - some people in this town will rent their house that they live in all year long with the exception of a month to help defray the expenses of keeping a residence on Cape Cod.

I don’t disapprove of the idea, I think that this needs substantial re-working so that we’re not taking people who want to rent their house for one month or two weeks aren’t penalized. And people who maintain their cottages aren’t penalized. They are not in competition with a hotel. They’re two different things.

I don’t know how I’ll vote on this when we come down to it, but I think it’s flawed.
Enforcement is very difficult. What do you do to Joe who owns a cottage and rents it to his brother-in-law for two weeks, how do you enforce it? How do you enforce someone who owns a vacation cottage and rents it for a couple of two week periods to people he works with? For a figure that may or may not really even be a competitive rent?

These are the problems I have with it and the problems that I see. I think it needs a little re-work. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Siegel.

MR. SIEGEL: Deborah Siegel, precinct six.

One point is that the renters are – the owners are not being penalized, it’s the renters who are paying the tax. And the other point is that there are businesses in this town who are trying to make a living, and they earn their living by owning a motel or some other type of business, and at the moment they are in – people are competing with them for the same business who are not paying the same fair amounts.

So I urge us to pass this.
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM: good evening, ladies and gentlemen, Brent Putnam, precinct nine.

I’d like to save you all ten percent on your lodging and accommodations here in Falmouth. That was a statement that was actually said to an owner of a B&B a few years back and that’s what changed my mind about this particular Article.

Some of you may remember a few years ago me standing up in front of this body and arguing against an article like this. I can’t remember, five, six, seven years ago. And when I became a Selectman, one of the things that we did was to start proposing this article. And we’ve passed it before like this. And we’re trying again. Thank you to the Board for trying again because it is about a level playing field.

Concerns about what services a house might provide versus a hotel or a motel, well, let the market work that one out. You know, you go to a B&B, you might pay $300 a night. You rent a house, you might pay $200 a night because you don’t get all the amenities. But right now we’re not being fair because we’re already
charging, between the state and the local options, it’s 9.7 percent on top of any accommodations.

So, what you have is an immediate ten percent right on top of whatever it is that you’re paying for a B&B or a hotel or a motel versus a private residence or a private room.

Go on AirBnB. Airbnb.com. I did a search the other night on it. Found a dozen places within the confines of Falmouth, rooms for a few dollar – less than a hundred dollars to up to $500 a night for the July 4th weekend. These are all people, not just businesses, but private homes – you can even find them in various neighborhoods scattered throughout the town – homes, rooms, apartments, they’re all being rented and they’re all on line, you can find them. They’re not just businesses, brokerages here in town where you can find these. You can find them online, as well. And we’re just trying to bring them all under this umbrella. Level playing field. So the government, us, so we’re not giving an unfair advantage to one business. Because, essentially, if you’re renting a house
all summer long, you’ve got a business, folks.

So, let’s take that unfair advantage out and let the market work out whatever room rate is going to be, but let’s not penalize the businesses that are established by making them charge ten percent more right on the top. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Smolowitz.

MR. SMOLOWITZ: Ronald Smolowitz, precinct eight.

Philosophically this sounds like a good idea. But I have a few questions.

Has anybody done an analysis of how many units this town might have that would fall under this and what it would generate for income? Is there any system for registering these type of units, for posting rates on the doors, checkout times, keeping track of hours, how many people are we going to have to hire to monitor and enforce this? What – what sort of thinking has gone in establishing the program?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: Currently we already have a process by where anyone who’s renting a house is
supposed to be getting a permit. It’s $25 a year permit charge. We are asking the townspeople to abide by that law. This would be very similar to that. We are hoping that people abide by the laws that we provide in the town. The enforcement is going to be up to the department to be able to come up with that.

The other towns have looked into this. We don’t know exactly the number of places that would fall into it. It’s hard for us to get that information. It’s been projected in other towns of around the neighborhood of about a million dollars per year that it could bring into the town.

MR. SMOLOWITZ: How many permits, then, have last year or the last couple of years have been issued, being that the Town is issuing permits? Just curious.

MR. JONES: I don’t have that number.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Mattison-Earls.


I was speaking with my daughter last
night; she lives in San Francisco. And, as you know, that’s a very expensive place to live. What they have done is they have looked at two different tiers to this option.

The people who own property and live in it three-quarters of the year are able to rent their homes while they’re away or whatever so that they can afford to live in San Francisco.

The people that purposely buy properties so that they can do short-term hotel stays, but they call them vacation homes, are taxed at the same rate as hotels. It seems to me that we don’t want to penalize the people that are trying to live here in an expensive location and they live here basically year round. But we don’t want to just say, “Oh, sure, come and buy a house, rent it out for as much as you want”, and you know, that to me is a hotel.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, you want to just pass the mic to your right, please.

MR. MCCAFFREY: Charles McCaffrey, precinct five.

I participate in Airbnb and have been very successful in renting room in my house. I
pay my taxes, which provide me the benefits of a residence. I get extra income and I bring people into town and the town is not getting the benefit of that. I should be taxed for the income I get from the people I rent a room to.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, here we go.

So as been amended. So the main motion as amended. 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 8, Madame Chairman, for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 8 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This is to vote to transfer the amount of $400,000 from Certified Free Cash for the contract for the reconstruction of the Town Landing parking lot stone retaining wall and wooden wharf located at
Old Dock road in West Falmouth.

Discussion on Article 8.

Yes, Mr. Wilber.

MR. WILBER: Jude Wilber, precinct eight.

In recent discussions by the Town Engineer and the Department of Public Works Ray Jacks, we’ve noted now the issue of rising sea level. And, whether you believe it or not, it seems to be gaining traction.

When I speak on these coastal articles, I’m often in the minority, but however I do question – and I will question three articles tonight on the wisdom of spending money in a short-term fix of what in perhaps 20 to 30 years is going to be a lost cause. $400,000 invested for what, the usable town landing over the next 20 or 30 years, may be a good investment. I support the access to the water by the townspeople, particularly public town landings.

But I really, really have a problem now, more and more as data comes in, that this is not the wisest way to pursue the management of the coastline, in bits and pieces, substantial sums
of money invested in short-term solutions. And that’s what I have to say.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Further discussion on Article 8?

Ms. Hayward.

MS. HAYWARD: The – excuse me.

[Laughter.]

MS. HAYWARD: The dock is definitely in need of repair and it’s an historic dock. As far as the need of repair is, I know of one person personally who has gotten hurt at this dock. They did not sue the Town. I think, that is I would say it was financially imperative for the Town to repair the dock so that there isn’t a major accident there.

I would suggest that we proceed with this unless we’re going to make some sort of a blanket Conservation Commission regulation of taking away docks. We really, I don’t think, can go into the argument of sea level rise; if the dock is there for 20, 30, 40 years, I think it will get good use. I don’t think we need to look 100 years ahead about whether the dock will
be there.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on Article 8?

Mr. Herbst.

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

I’d just like to remind this body that in November of 2014 the Town Engineer through the Town came to the Community Preservation Committee and asked for $300,000 to begin the restoration of this dock and landing. And this body voted to approve that $300,000.

So the $300,000 that was approved in November, plus this $400,000 tonight will cover the cost of restructuring and returning this dock and parking area to a safe and usable place for the town.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion, Article 8 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 9, Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 9 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This is to transfer the amount of $200,000 from Certified Free Cash for the purpose of funding physical improvements to a portion of the Recreation Center to accommodate a Department of Communications Center.

Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: The Finance Committee recommends Article 9 as it makes sense to combine dispatch centers at this time to eliminate purchasing equipment for both Fire and Police Departments and to increase operating efficiency and the resulting projected savings.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, are we going to do a presentation, Mr. Suso?
MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, and Madame Chairman of the Finance Committee for your comments.

I’m joined by Police Chief Edward Dunn, Fire Chief Mark Sullivan. The chiefs join with me as the Oversight Committee that will be overseeing the Consolidated Communications Department and insuring that it operates in a manner fully supportive of the public safety needs of the Police Department and the Fire Department. So the three of us, under the structure which the Board of Selectmen has approved, had that role and I appreciate both chiefs joining me here for this presentation and questions as they may arise.

We do have some PowerPoint slides. First a little history. At the November, 2014 Town Meeting, Members voted full funding for the acquisition of equipment in furtherance of this Consolidated Communications initiative.

The target was announced as January, 2016, which I’ve noted earlier this evening. This target date is strategic and the Fire,
Rescue and Police CAD dispatch systems are beyond their useful life and are losing vendor support, thereby greatly increasing the risk of catastrophic failure.

Mandatory impact bargaining outreach had already occurred in August, 2014 to the four impacted labor unions consistent with and with respect for the state collective bargaining law. Three of the four unions responded in a willingness to cooperate.

At the same meeting, Town Meeting Members voted partial funding for necessary facility improvements, with the request that we provide further details and information and analysis on the facility improvement and return to Town Meeting in April, 2015. And here we are joining you again.

I do recognize that I had mistakenly skipped a step in bringing forth a preferred site to Town Meeting prior to a full public review and discussion of reasonable available alternatives. To correct this oversight an expanded process was initiated with the goal of returning to Town Meeting tonight in the month of April.
In December 2014, the Matrix Consulting report on consolidated dispatch was presented at a public meeting to the Board of Selectmen and has been posted on the Town website since December. This comprehensive consultant’s report was financed through the extraordinary assistance of State Representative and our Town Moderator David Vieira, who was able to secure a legislative earmark to facilitate this professional analysis and report to benefit the Falmouth taxpayers.

Mr. Moderator, Thank you for your leadership in that regard.

This is a photograph of the Matrix Consulting Study, the presentation, some information, a partial photo - a photo of portions of the management team that include the Town Manager, Police Chief, Fire Chief, Director of Public Works, Director of Marine and Environmental Services, Assistant Town Manager, Personnel Director, Matrix Consulting as noted, Labor Counsel D. Maschos, and multiple others I’ve noted this evening that were involved in direct interviews and participation by the Matrix
Consulting in their study.

That consulting report, to quote: a sharing of CAD and RMS systems can bring service level improvements through improvement of operability. Only the full consolidation alternative may result in cost savings from a reduction in duplication of technology and facility resources.

Salary and benefit costs will decrease approximately - according to the consultant, again - $165,000 per year. That’s every year. From a consolidated approach. Due to eliminating the use of using sworn police officers to staff dispatch. And other items, including overtime. A consolidated dispatch agency requires fewer total dispatch positions than independent Police and Fire Department dispatch agencies.

The Town has conservatively estimated - that’s me - salary, wage and benefit savings of $100,000 a year every year if Town Meeting in your wisdom allows this to go forward.

A little more on the history. An expanded analysis of alternative potential sites for Consolidated Communications Department was
then conducted. Again, I noted that I
inappropriately skipped a step. Including
twelve-plus potential alternatives with varying
cost ranges and complexities, this analysis was
summarized on a spreadsheet which was presented
at a public meeting to the Board of Selectmen on
March 2\textsuperscript{nd} and is also posted on the Town website.

Selectmen held a public review and
comment meeting exclusively on the topic of
potential alternative sites. This was held on
March 10\textsuperscript{th}.

These are the 12-plus sites that we
referred to. It’s a baker’s dozen. And I would
assume that Town Meeting members probably have
seen them all, as it’s been posted, it’s been
well reported on, et cetera. So, I’ll skip
beyond this slide unless we need to come back to
it later.

Further history. Following considerable
public input, on March 16\textsuperscript{th} the Selectmen voted
unanimously to utilize the stage area of the Gus
Canty Community Center for the Consolidated
Communications Department as the most reasonable
and cost effective of the multiple alternatives.
I assure Town Meeting that I would not bring this back to you if I did not believe as Town Manager that this site is the most responsible option and in the best interests of taxpayers and public safety communications.

A little bit on location. The Town Manager and Selectmen place a high priority on the concept of a neutral site, meaning not within either the Police Department or the Fire Department. Chief Dunn and Chief Sullivan agree with that assessment. They’re both with me here this evening and you can hear from them if you care to.

The Board of Selectmen voted to place the Department in the underutilized stage area, as I’ve just noted, in the lower level of the Gus Canty Center. The use of the Police Department or the Fire Department is contrary to an already bargained agreement specifying a neutral location. Use of a location in either department will require additional time and additional money to bargain to reach either agreement or impasse.

This is a graphic showing the location...
within the Gus Canty Community Center of that portion of the building that includes the stage area. You see the arrow there on the right, and right behind the flag.

The next slide is a closeup of that same roof peaked area that includes the stage. Already constructed along with a number of improvements already paid by taxpayers for the improvements needed to serve such a consolidated communications center.

This is a conceptual layout of the – of a – one of a draft floor plan within the existing stage area in Gus Canty. And you will note that it includes four dispatch stations as we’ve noted. That’s as provided for in the Matrix Study. It includes the office for the administrator. It includes a nearby elevator, equipment room. It preserves the existing stage, which is untouched.

Pardon me, the lip of the stage, which is untouched. It is a six to eight foot projection in the front of this area, upon which includes fundamentally all the regular activities -- those few activities that are regular that
occur there fundamentally utilize the lip of the stage. That are regularly scheduled.

You can see the walkway down past the elevator on the left and there is an elevator room there.

And we’ll skip to the next slide and it’ll show you the short distance that would have to be traversed to an existing locker room and men’s and women’s rest rooms, which taxpayers have already built, have already constructed, it’s in place, and it’s 45 feet from the entrance to this what would become the secure dispatch consolidated communications area located on the stage.

Another major advantage of the stage is, as all stages are, it is raised. Which means that very cost-effectively you could provide all of the conduit needed underneath the stage, underneath the existing platform, without having to tear down walls and tear down ceilings. All of the spine and access points for electricity, communications, fiber network, which is a key part, a cutting-edge part of this concept, can all be prepared and presented in a very cost-
effective way.

We’ll give our cost ranges here in a moment.

But I wanted you to see how close this is to the existing elevator, which would serve the lower level; to the stair well, as well. Forty-five feet to the restrooms and lockers and the other appurtenances are accommodated here, as well; a few more comments and in future slides.

A quick summary. Recreation Department stage area use log; I won’t belabor this. I mentioned there are locker facilities 45 feet from the entry point to this secured area. It’s open to the public as noted for adult activities within certain areas. It’s closed to the public in the afternoon when children are in the gym because those lockers cannot be monitored at that time. That’s standard operating procedure.

The lip of the stage, as I noted, six to eight feet is used for dances in the after prom party. That is an extraordinary event that’s held annually. That will be untouched in this proposal. No impact there.

There’s no other formal use of the stage
area recorded. There’s an occasional Tuesday evening juggling practice with two to three individuals, an occasional Thursday evening martial arts practice utilizing two to four individuals, as well.

Next slide. These are - this follows, two slides, giving you some idea of what a four station dispatch looks like. This is an example of a four station dispatch. And the next slide is another view of the same four station dispatch.

So it’s a very compact area. It doesn’t need a whole lot of room. That was laid out and programmed by Matrix Consulting and that is the guideline that we followed.

The estimated cost of the stage area conversion we presented at all the precinct meetings, presented at the Finance Committee, discussed at some length with others. These are cost ranges that have been developed internally. We have a high level of confidence in those cost ranges. Town Meeting in November voted $50,000 for facility improvements. This evening we’re asking your consideration for $200,000 more.
That is the question that is before you this evening: to allow us to meet the targets we have in this cost range and get this conversion completed in a time sensitive way.

Parking, a quick comment on that. There are currently two personnel in the Police station, one dispatcher, one police officer assigned to the desk who park at the Police station in the Gus Canty Community Center parking area. They do that routinely. In the consolidated department, there will be three spaces, including those two that I just referred to. Two for full-time communications officers and one during the daytime for an administrator. Four to five spaces would be needed temporarily during shift change only. And when shift change is over, we’re back to two to three spaces around the clock.

Let’s take a look at a comparable facility to convey some additional information to Town Meeting members that I think you’ll find helpful.

The South Shore Regional Emergency Communications Center, this is the Commonwealth’s
prototype, state-of-the-art emergency dispatch center, having come online in 2012. All police and fire/rescue dispatching and communications is routinely conducted by this facility. It’s located in the town of Hingham; serves the Massachusetts communities of Cohasset, Hingham, Hull and Norwell. Maureen Shirkus is the facility’s Executive Director and Administrator and we’ve made multiple visits to this facility. I with a larger group and I individually.

It is physically located within an existing building in Hingham which also houses the School Department, a Senior Community Center, and a Recreation Center which includes a child daycare center. It has been confirmed that no concerns whatsoever have arisen regarding any threats to the physical security of this facility or those multiple Community Center activities that are also contained within the same building and have been existent there for three-plus years.

To quote Maureen Shirkus, the administrator of this state-of-the-art facility, Maureen says, “To maximize success, the combined
police and fire dispatch facility should be located at a neutral site.” I’ve already commented on that.

This is a photograph of a portion of the building within Hingham that houses the consolidated communications facility. You see that modest antenna on top? And I’ll also note in this photograph there’s a door here, and there’s a door here. This door here on the left is the main entry door to the consolidated dispatch center, which has been in place since 2012.

The next slide will show you what else you access from that same door. This is the School Department.

The next slide will show you what is on the right hand door immediately adjacent. That’s a senior center for the Town of Hingham.

On the back side of this same building, the next slide will show you what’s located there. See the arrow? Recreation center. It includes a child daycare center attached to and part of this same building.

Next slide. These are - this
summarizes the options available to Town Meeting this evening. If Town Meeting would consider a vote for passage as written, this is what it will result in. A consultant estimates savings in wages, salary and benefits in excess of $100,000 every year. That’s a conservative estimate, as you’ve heard.

You will also have an additional police officer available to the Town on every shift if you vote yes on this. 365 days per year. That’s the equivalent of adding three plus, over three police officers to the Police Department all within the existing budget you adopted last night. You need no additional money to do that. This will allow Chief Dunn to expand community policing, public safety assignments within his authority and management oversight as police chief in town neighborhoods to ensure and enhance public safety. Again, at no additional cost.

This will result in, if you approve it, an increased level of routine communication services available to the public as the Communications Department will be expanded to routinely service emergency needs in marine and
environmental services, water, wastewater, solid waste and highway and public works. A matter of routine out of this center: evenings and weekends emergency coverage.

Again, if you vote for passage, this will further result in reduced annual operating, maintenance costs for consolidated dispatch organization, as opposed to the present inefficient and costly stand-alone approach. Who drew this conclusion? The Matrix Consulting.

Taking full advantage of the already-voted equipment replacement funds for consolidated communications for the CAD and related equipment replacement of considerable dollar cost savings compared with the present inefficient stand-alone approach. You voted these funds last November; thank you. That is a process that is moving forward.

Next, the ability to move toward anticipated cut-over in January, 2016. Moving forward is time critical. Responding responsibly in the face of the obsolescence of the existing Fire and Police CAD systems, loss of
vendor support for the Fire CAD.

Next slide. Very near the wrap-up now.

I want to summarize if Town Meeting

fails to receive - Article 9 fails to receive

majority support. The recurring annual wage

salary benefit savings of $100,000-plus every

year will be lost. The additional police

officer available on every shift, 365 days a

year, the equivalent of adding over three police

officers to the Police Department within the

existing budget, will be lost. The increased

level of routine communication services available

to the public as an important product of a

consolidation, will be lost. The reduced annual

operating maintenance cost savings for

consolidated dispatch will be lost.

If we fail to receive majority support,

cost savings available and already voted, as I’ve

noted, for equipment, will be lost. The ability

to cut-over to consolidate a cost saving

communications in the timely fashion we need,

will be lost.

The increased risk of catastrophic

failure will be enhanced. This may require a
system replacement that is at a consistently higher cost according to the Matrix report.

Time is of the essence.

A commitment to the process. This is my final package of slides in this presentation, Mr. Moderator and members of Town Meeting.

Following the November Town Meeting, I had a meeting with the Recreation Committee on December 10th, 2014. At that meeting I affirmed the analysis of multiple alternative locations we’ve shared with you and affirmed that no final site decision at that time had yet been made by the Board of Selectmen.

A second meeting with the Recreation Committee was held on March 25th of this year. I reviewed the alternative locations spreadsheet with members of the Committee, to which we’ve referred this evening, and we’ve had multiple presentations and meetings with the Board of Selectmen as well. I confirmed that this modest conversion would proceed in a manner which would not compromise the functionality or integrity of the Gus Canty Community Center.

Following our discussion, the Recreation
Committee members voted five to one to oppose the placement of the consolidated communications facility in the stage area.

Next slide, please.

The Town’s dispatch circumstances are extremely time critical. Fire and Police CAD systems are beyond their useful life and are losing vendor support. The potential for catastrophic failure in the fundamental public safety area is flat out unacceptable. It’s important to act responsibly and expeditiously and the time is now.

Given the modular nature – and I want to emphasize this to Town Meeting – given the modular nature of the dispatch consoles – I showed you a photograph of those, they are modular – and the related functional layout, the communications center could conceivably be relocated to another site at a later date in the event that a more appropriate option would become available over the coming three to five years. That’s been taken into account. We’re well aware of it. And the modular nature of the package would allow it.
I am now respectfully seeking Town Meeting members' support for this critically important cost saving and service expanding initiative. This represents a one time opportunity for taxpayers which is not likely to be available in the future.

Should Town Meeting members extend your support to this initiative, with your positive vote on Special Town Meeting Article 9, I also extend my commitment and my pledge to you that this modest conversion of the Community Center stage would proceed in a manner which would not compromise the functionality or integrity of the community center in its service to the youth and adults of Falmouth.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Cuny.

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

At the last November Town Meeting I stood before you and asked you please not to support the funding of Article 18 for 250,000 for a facilities improvement because the location target was the Gus Canty Community Recreation
Building. And we, the Recreation Committee, Town Meeting, and the public at large were not properly informed.

I want to thank you for that vote, because in the last five months we’ve all had a chance to be educated and better prepared to vote tonight.

We all know now that Mr. Suso approached Recreation Director Helen Kennedy last year in a private meeting and brought his thoughts about a consolidated dispatch center to her and asked her if there was any room available at the community center. Keep in mind that Mr. Suso is her employer, he oversees her budget, so they do meet often.

She complied to offer the back stage area to the gymnasium as she felt it was the most underutilized area. In her explanations to the Recreation Committee, she maintains that she thought it was a good idea. She felt that it would upgrade the building, we’d get a generator, security cameras, it would save the Town money that would go back into the budget and she would welcome them if that is what the town wanted.
The Recreation Committee by large did not share the same enthusiasm.

We all know now about the 50,000, 65 page Matrix study. We all know now about the spreadsheet that listed 13 alternatives, although it was not 13 sites. It listed twice the Police station, twice the Eddie Marks, twice the Gus Canty. It listed a lease space that I’m not sure where and a new building that we don’t know where.

There were a number of questions about the spreadsheet. The spreadsheet was not prepared by a site review committee, which was recommended in the Matrix study to evaluate potential sites for a consolidated dispatch center, but by our own town administrator.

When Mr. Suso attended our December 10th meeting last year, he began his presentation by first apologizing that he hadn’t come before us, and second by reviewing the details concerning the dispatch center itself. He outlined the pros and cons of the two most likely sites: Gus Canty and the Eddie Marks. He maintained that Gus Canty is among the lowest cost locations and that
no final decision had been made.

He also presented at that meeting that proposed floor plan that you saw, that he asked our town engineer to show us how all the work stations and office fit nicely in that stage area. There were no other conceptual floor plans created for any other sites.

The Committee asked questions. We renewed our concerns, we made some recommendations, but it was still all so new to us.

Then the next month, in January at a Recreation Committee meeting, we discussed further the possibility of a dispatch center being located there. We still had questions, we still had concerns. Selectman Jones attended that meeting. He stated that comparative cost figures would be prepared between Gus Canty and other competitors and that there was still a long way to go before a decision would be made.

Well, that long way to go came a little over a month later, on March 2\textsuperscript{nd} at the Selectmen’s Meeting. They announced to have the public hearing a week later, on March 10\textsuperscript{th}. I was
out of town, but two members of the Recreation Committee attended. And then the following week on March 16th the Committee made their – the Selectmen made their choice, with the spreadsheet of 13 location alternatives in front of them.

The Recreation Committee couldn’t meet again until March 25th and it was the first chance that we had publicly to discuss the spreadsheet, the Matrix study and the public hearing that took place. We invited Alden Cook, Deputy Director of Cape and Island Emergency Medical Service, and Mr. Suso attended that meeting so that we could gather more information and ask questions. And it was that night, on March 25th, that the Recreation Committee voted five to one opposed. But the Board of Selectmen had already voted, which shows the rush for this project in getting it on the warrant for this Town Meeting.

That Matrix study clearly states on page 60 that while the Town desires to have a separate, stand-alone location for the center, such as Eddie Marks Building or Gus Canty Recreation, the project team recommends the Town keep an open mind in also evaluating the current
dispatch sites, existing fire stations and/or other possible sites for the use of this consolidated dispatch environment.

And I reiterate: a site review committee was not recommended to evaluate the potential sites.

To my knowledge the Board of Selectmen only visited two sites; at least, that’s what we were invited to. I couldn’t attend but Dave Jarvis, long-time Recreation Committee member, was present on that tour when they toured the Eddie Marks and the Gus Canty. I’m sure many of you have read by now the news articles, the editorial, Troy Clarkson’s take on the subject, and some of you have visited the Gus Canty to view the area.

I’ve worked with Helen Kennedy a long time, and I have a good rapport with her. It was duly noted at the public hearing her comment of having worked at Gus Canty since 1988 and knowing this building better than anyone. Respectfully, I disagree. Growing up in Falmouth and going back to the old Gus Canty Recreation Building, not only did I attend the many youth activities
there as a child: bumper pool, ping pong,
basketball, and I have to say roller skating
every morning -- Saturday morning. It only cost
ten cents.

But then, later on in life, I enrolled
my children, as well. I was a Town Meeting
member when the new building was proposed. I was
a volunteer, coaching recreational programs in
the old building as well as the new, and I’ve
been a member of the Recreation Committee for 25
years, knowing this building as well as anyone.

The stage area next to the gym, as I
mentioned last fall, quickly, it’s been used for:
dance concerts, musical bands, fund-raising
events, the jugglers, aikido, Rogers Dance
Studio, the annual after prom, and even the
Recreational Summer Camp on rainy days and hot
days. It does serve a purpose.

In all conversations with citizens in
town, it is agreeable that consolidation is a
good way to go. But at what cost?

Someone summed it up nicely:
unfortunately, most of the reasons for not using
Gus Canty involve things that can’t be measured
in the same way that square feet or cost savings can. The culture of the building, a very important quality for a facility such as Gus Canty, is something that is built over many years of accumulated experiences there, and can't be reduced to a square on a matrix.

Please vote no.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. McNamara.

Let's go. Come on. Mr. McNamara.

MR. MCNAMARA: Thank you, Matt McNamara, precinct 7.

Boy, this topic has really got some tense feelings surrounding it. So, I would like very much to try to get us all to step back from the emotional aspects of this and try to apply a little bit of logic.

Tonight, as well as over the past several weeks, there's been a great deal of focus on why we should have a consolidated dispatch center. But that really doesn't need to be discussed. We've already appropriated $755,000 for the equipment. Conceptually we've bought
into it. Tonight we even appropriated or approved the range of salaries.

The scope before us tonight is simply whether or not there is a need for the appropriation of an additional $200,000 for facility improvements.

Now, this body does not have the right to decide where that communications center is going to go. However, we need to consider the options of the locations to ensure that we appropriate adequate funds.

Now, to prepare myself for this – and I try to be thorough – I have done a lot of research. I’ve visited the sites. I’ve read the 63, 64,000, 50,000 – I mean, 64 page, $50,000 Matrix Consulting Group report, and I have reached out to some other experts, including at least in my mind experts: the Barnstable County Sheriff’s Office and the Massachusetts State 911 Department.

Now, my focus was solely on building needs, such as equipment space and infrastructure, not personnel, because I think we’ve already done that.
Bob, if you could put up the first slide, thank you.

Now, I won’t go into this because Julian has already presented this and it was on the spreadsheet that was presented to the Selectmen.

Bob, you can go right to the next slide, as well.

Thirteen options. Again, as it was stated, it is not necessarily all different sites but different options. What I’d like to do is again apply the logic and quickly go through each of these sites, because that’s what we’re focusing on: which site do we need more money.

Bob, the next slide, please.

All right, here’s the criteria. And there will be more criteria and there is more in the Matrix study, but here are the ones that I felt were at least the important ones for me.

As Julian stated, January 1, 2016 implementation. I think that’s a good goal. We don’t want our equipment to fail. We’ve already at least appropriated the funds for it, so we need to do that.

Near the Police and Fire headquarters.
Now, I wasn’t sure why. I’ll take everyone’s word for it, because we perhaps need to be closer communication to these headquarters.

Cost efficient. Of course we need to do that.

The Matrix study also suggested that we needed 1500 square feet in order to put not only the four consoles – and if you’ve been to any of the current dispatch sites you’ll see it’s really an old console model. The new consoles are a lot larger in terms of the screens that are needed and the space for the furniture.

There’s also, already discussed tonight: independent, in a neutral location. I’ll talk more about that later.

Security, and also discussion regarding the necessary amenities.

So I’d like to try to start eliminating some of these based on that criteria. Again, a logic approach.

January 1st. Well, I drew off the Eddie Marks Building, both the first and second floor, because there would be a need for major renovations to that building and site. In
addition, we have some preservation restrictions already on that building. So in order to properly permit that, get by the restrictions and do the major constructions, those have got to be gone.

The School Administration Building was another location. Yet, as I watched the Selectmen’s meeting when they discussed this in the presentations, there were no discussions with the School Department or the School Committee regarding that site. You also know we used CPC funds a few years ago to preserve some of the history of that building, so I would imagine not only an old building, but not having communicated with the School Department and the historic aspects of it, January 1st would be probably pushing that, as well.

The Water Department Garage and the Water Pump station. Interesting places to go look at, and again, when I watched the Selectmen’s meeting, those were basically thrown out, too, because they wouldn’t be available to us until after we design and construct the water filtration plant. Now, we know that won’t get
done by January 1st, as well.

   New construction. My guess is even if
we were to find a pre-fab metal building and we
located it on Main Street, I doubt that we would
have it available in time.

   Next slide, please.

   All right, the DPW is on the list.

   Now, to me, the DPW building was attractive in
many ways. The size of it, the parking,
relatively new construction. There’s a
communication tower already on the site. But
it’s not on Main Street. So, if we use that
criteria that was raised before, we’ll take that
one off the list, as well.

   Okay. That leaves us with – I’m sorry, I threw this little criteria in, myself. It was
called the irrationality factor. Now, it’s been
mentioned before that the equipment is modular in
nature, so it can be moved. But if you
appropriate $200,000 tonight for whatever the
location might be, it’s not the equipment we’re
talking about moving, it’s talking about the
modifying a building that we will walk away from
and we won’t be able to take that $200,000 with
us. In fact, when you think about the temporary
dnature of the Gus Canty stage area, we would
probably walk away without being able to take the
$200,000 with us. We’d have to restore it to
the use of a stage, which would cost us more
money, or we would simply have sunk money into
what really amounts to a single purpose
renovation that wouldn’t be able to be used for
any of the recreational purposes.

In terms of a lease, well, you know, if
we don’t have a long-term lease – and again, this
would have to be on Main Street, at least 1500
square feet according to the Matrix study – it’s
not going to do us much good. And again, it
seems to me to be a little bit irrational why we
would go out and consider leasing with the
inventory of unused Town-owned space that we have
currently.

But, thank you, the next one.

What about the costs? Well, I’ve
already mentioned that I’ve already eliminated
because of the January 1 category, but the Marks
Building is just going to cost way too much and I
think everyone recognizes that.
The Gus Canty stage area, well, I don’t really know. I think we need to talk about that. What is the real cost? Now, the ranges that were presented to us at our precinct meeting, and they were tonight, ranged anywhere from 200,000 to 300,000 dollars. I’ve read in the paper that it could be as much as 400. And actually, when I was gathering additional information from the Sherif’s Department, that the thought could be as much as $500,000. And in fact, if you looked at the Matrix study, the vast majority of this $50,000 study talks about whether or not we should have consolidated communication; we’ve passed that.

The last four pages all you really have to do is look at. And Matrix actually went into giving some numbers such as radio infrastructure, which is $362,000; security systems, 12,000; a generator, $100,000. And I guess what troubled me a bit was that the summary that we received at the precinct meeting didn’t appear to be created by an architect, a communication engineer; it was a summary of numbers.

Now this, whether you think in terms of
the size of the building or the room, 1500 square feet doesn’t sound like much, but think about it: this is a serious public safety public works project, and it’s not simply the relocation of clerical people. We’re talking about our 9-1-1 services in consolidated communication.

All right. Go to the next slide, if you would.

Now, if you look at the size, the current Police Department, the existing Police Department, has 449 square feet used for dispatch. The existing Fire Department dispatch area has 272 square feet.

Now, the option -- just a quick comment in terms of the Fire Department. If you look at the spreadsheet that was presented to the Selectmen, it was the existing space perhaps being blown out into taking over a vehicle bay. But it wasn’t any other space in the Fire Department, it was the existing space.

Now, Gus Canty has 830 square feet. Now, Matrix is saying – the $50,000 Matrix study - 1500 square feet. This is only 830. Now, the 830 is just marginally more than the combined
Police Department existing space and the combined
existing Fire Department space. So, we’re going
to put a lot of money into perhaps cramping
people into a space that Matrix doesn’t think
would be adequate simply on size alone.

I guess the point I wanted to also –
Bob, I’m sorry, if we could go back
there.

I guess what troubles me is that these
12 options, 13 options, are so easily discarded
with a little bit of objection that I have to
question why they were even presented. And I’m
worried to think or to conclude that they were
designed only so that the only viable option
would be Gus Canty.

What about the option that was never
presented to the Selectmen -- it’s not a surprise
to any of us because we’ve read about it -- and
that’s the third floor of - and to try to use the
same words - a building that we’ve already paid
for as the taxpayers, that already exists and in
my humble opinion - and I’m not in the trades. I
don’t know any of these things, but trying to
gather it.
Bob, the next slide.

I’ll compare the two of them.

square feet at Gus Canty, significant

construction, electrical communications work and

a fear that I understand that it may not be able

to connect well without some major additional

efforts such as a tower for an antenna, conduit

work, et cetera, that could be anywhere from 200

to 500,000 dollars. Pick a number; I don’t

really care. Even use the 200, the lower

figure.

At the third floor of the fire station,

there’s 1225 square feet. It already has

showers in the area; you don’t have to walk 45

feet. It already has bathrooms in the area. It

already has room for equipment. It has a

separate area for an administrator’s office.

There is, at least in my – what I did in terms of

the tour looking at it, yeah, there’s some

weights up there that are used for, you know,

those gym kind of weights that I don’t know much

about, but can be moved. In fact, I’ve offered

to supervise the movement. I don’t want to lift

them, but I’ll help supervise them, for free.
Some minor electrical, because conduits already there. Some minor air conditioning work. Unlike what the Matrix report said that I’ve referenced a moment ago, that at the fire station third floor there’s already radio infrastructure in the building. To put that at Gus Canty, at least as I read Matrix, $362,000.

Security systems. The fire station has already got a security system. In fact, in Article 12 tonight, I think it’s Article 12, you’ll be asked to perhaps transfer $60,000 out of existing accounts to upgrade security at the fire station and maybe to secure Town Hall. So, if the security system at the Fire station is inadequate –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McNamara, you’ve hit the 15 minute mark. Do you want to request a specific amount of additional time?

MR. MCNAMARA: Five minutes, please.

THE MODERATOR: He’s asking for an additional five minutes.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

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

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it. We have an additional five minutes.

MR. MCNAMARA: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

In terms of the neutrality, Sandy already talked about that the Matrix study didn’t say neutrality over anything else. It said consider these things.

So, I checked to find out. Taunton has a consolidated communication; it’s located in their Fire Department. Hanover has a consolidated communication; it’s located in their Police Department. South Worcester County, which has the towns of Webster and Dudley, are located in the Webster Police Department.

Wachusett Regional Emergency Center, which includes the towns of Holden, Princeton and soon West Boylston, are all located in the Holden Police Department.

Folks, we’re talking about professionals. I don’t think we have to worry about our professionals being concerned about
what the location of the building might be.

Security I already mentioned briefly.

There’s none at Gus Canty; it would have to be put in there.

In terms of amenities, as I said, there are bathrooms, showers, lockers already on the third floor of the Fire Station.

And I just want to leave you with this final thought as I look at it. Mr. Suso has said that the third floor of the Fire Station is not a viable option because the firefighter’s union refuses to bargain. The union says that’s not true. You know, I don’t really care who you believe. The third floor is a viable space that seems to me to be tailor-made for this project without the appropriation of additional money. So I say we can consolidate our communication with the money that was already appropriated in November.

And I guess I’ll finally say that, to whomever the party is that’s holding this up: get it done. We’re watching.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, let’s go, folks.
Ms. Lichtenstein.  

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Lesley Lichtenstein, precinct eight.

I don’t know how you feel; I don’t like to be threatened at Town Meeting. Particularly: if you don’t do this, the sky will fall on you.

But, I’m all for consolidation.

I have major problems with the Gus Canty Center. We don’t want to let registered voters, our neighbors, go into our schools for a few hours twice a year to vote for the safety of our children. But tonight, we’re being asked to put the main crisis center, which is target number one if there’s any wacko out there that wants to do us in, right next to our children 24/7, 365 days a year. I think this is the wrong place to put it; I’m sorry.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’ve got – I’ve got a long list. I’m going to ask: does anyone want to speak in favor of this?

Okay. Ms. Kennedy.

MS. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Good evening.
I speak to you tonight as your Recreation Director and also as a Town Meeting member in precinct 4. I have worked for the Recreation Department for the past 27 years since the Gus Canty Center has been open. I’ve had the pleasure of also being a Town Meeting member for over 15 years. I’m a very committed member of this community.

I’ve raised my children here. I take a lot of pride in all my decisions.

No one in this town knows better what goes on in the Gus Canty Center than me. I’ve spent in the last 15 years as I’ve been your Recreation Director, close to 50 hours a week in that building. I would not endorse this idea of a dispatch center in the community center if I thought in any way if it would impact any of the existing recreational programs or any future recreational programs or the safety of our children.

Most people don’t know that the stage area even exists in the Gus Canty Community Center. And if a dispatch center is placed in the Gus Canty Community Center, residents won’t
even know it’s there. The stage area is
unutilized space in the Gus Canty Center. Two
very informal groups do use that, but the Gus
Canty Center is open an average of 77 hours a
week and these two groups can easily be put in
another location at a different time or in the
gymnasium where they can practice their crafts.

The lip of the stage in front of the
metal door will remain the same. The stage lip
is used on occasions for various special events
in the gym throughout the year and is used as a
shelf to place your coat if you’re in the gym
playing sports or walking. The main stage room
behind the metal curtain is not used except for
uses I have mentioned, and if it is soundproofed
no gym noise will enter the room.

It has been proven at other locations in
other towns in Massachusetts that a dispatch
center can coexist in a community center and be
successful, and this was highlighted in the Town
Manager’s presentation.

Also highlighted in his presentations
were the savings to the Town if the dispatch
center is placed, and also the recommendations of
our Finance Committee.

I ask you to support this article.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Latimer.

Mr. Cook, you’re on the list. It’s a really long list, so let’s be to the point, because every time I look up there’s more names added to the list.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct one.

A longtime resident of Falmouth. I actually knew Gus Canty. I used to go over to the old rec building. He would whip our ass in ping-pong. You’d go over there, try to play him in a game of ping pong, man, you lost. I mean, he was a great old guy, and I’d hate to see a building that’s named for such a great guy be put to such an inappropriate use, frankly.

Now, we heard a lot about this underutilized stage. But we haven’t heard from Mr. Suso about how the gym area on the third floor of the Fire Department is also underutilized. And to the extent the firemen need some gym space, it would be most appropriate
to say, “Well, let’s move their gym area over to
the rec building”, which would be an entirely
consistent use. Which would be something that
Gus Canty would surely approve of.

Now, so basically what we’re getting
here from Mr. Suso is that the real sticking
point, and I mean, this is real important, is a
turf issue between the police and the fire
unions. A turf fight? And for this we’re going
to spend $250,000 needlessly? I would say to
them: grow up.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, folks.

MR. LATIMER: I mean –

THE MODERATOR: Come on.

MR. LATIMER: Matt McNamara told us
about all these other towns where it’s either in
the Police station or the Fire station. And
that makes perfect sense. Because on one end or
another it’s going to be very close to where the
vehicles are.

Now, in this case, it’s the Fire
Station. The emergency vehicles are right there.
It doesn’t -- you know, in the Police station,
they may be all over town, but -- and that goes
out on the radio. But, in the Fire station,
it’s right there. The call comes in and it goes
out on the radio; it also goes down on the
intercom: “get out”. I mean, that makes sense.
That’s logical.

This is – by the way, all this talk
about a neutral site. This is going to be a
separate department, no matter where it is. If
it’s in the Gus canty Center, if it’s in a rented
building, it’s going to be a separate department,
just the way those – that dispatch center in
Hingham with all those other departments is a
separate department within the building’s uses.
It’s a separate department. So it’s not the
Police Department or the Fire Department to which
these people are responding, it’s just some space
in an public building that we already own that
will be a separate department space.

I would strongly recommend we vote this
down, charge Mr. Suso to come back next fall with
a proposal to rehabilitate the third floor of the
Fire Station, and get this job done.

It is a necessary and desirable object
to consolidate. Let’s do it right.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Herbst was next on the list. Are you – do you want to speak in favor of this?

MR. HERBST: [No mic:] No.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Bidwell’s next on the list. Do you want to speak in favor of this?

MR. BIDWELL: [No mic:] No.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto’s next on the list. Do you want to speak in favor of this?

MR. NETTO: [No mic:] I have information, sir.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, then Mr. Netto. I’m getting a sense of this body. I don’t want us to stay here for another half hour and you’ve got your decision made already.

So, Mr. Netto, you’ve got new information?

MR. NETTO: Yes. Joe Netto, precinct nine.

I know we’re tired of this; we’ve discussed this. I am very, very upset now at
the tone that’s taken here.

This is the article that I spoke about last night, the second one. It’s, you know, who’s going to give in first. But in the presentation of Mr. Suso, I had to agree with 90 percent of what he said. Yes, I do. And I came to this side because I didn’t want to have my back.

A couple – but there’s ten percent that I totally disagree with, and I will prove that by the facts if you look in your warrant booklet.

What does voting no on – excuse me – on this article do? You saw a slide, and that’s why I have so much umbrage about this, the slide that says if you vote no, you’re basically throwing this plan out.

Would you put it back up there, please, Bob.

We have voted the positions. We have voted all the money. There’s a slide there that says if you vote this, you’re going to miss this opportunity. There’s only one thing you’re going to do that I agree with him: we’re going to push the date back. I would hope you would vote
And if you can find it, fine. If you can’t, I think you folks know what slide I’m referring to.

So – and I have some other – Article 9:

To see if the Town will vote to appropriate a sum of money for the purpose of funding the physical improvements to an existing public facility to accommodate the Department of Communications.

That doesn’t say we’re going to throw the plan out, and yet we saw a slide – look at it -- if you fail to vote the majority.

All you’re voting on -- I told you last night, you control the money. You’re voting on $200,000 that would be needed to move the Communications Center into the rec building.

You’re not voting against the concept. Everyone in this town, everyone in this Town Meeting knows the importance of public safety. I think that that slide is uncalled-for. It’s not the truth.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, folks, let’s –

MR. NETTO: And, in closing, I have two more points.
THE MODERATOR:   I’m going to just make one comment.   If we’re going to start clapping and hooting out of order, I’m going to take a call of the vote from the chair.   So if you want to hear future presenters on this list, let’s act like a civilized, democratic institution and let’s listen to the speakers.

Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO:   Thank you.   I’ll be brief.  I know – okay.

One quick one: the word “unanimous”.

The Selectmen unanimously voted for this plan. That’s correct.   Failed to mention: three of the Selectmen; two weren’t there.   Forty percent of the Board of Selectmen.   We have two members of the Board of Selectmen that weren’t there.  Three out of the five.   But it was unanimous of the three that were there.

The second thing, and this will be last. There were many other things I wanted to speak about, but we have come into question the use of the stage.   Well, last Friday -- I have the letter to the editor page of the Falmouth Enterprise -- a lifelong citizen of the Town of
Falmouth who I do not know -- know of him --

Allen D. Moniz, signed this letter. He took the
time out of his day to write a letter to us, to
the Town Meeting members that are going to
determine the fate of this building.

Space not at all rarely used. And two
speakers, Mr. Suso and Mrs. Kennedy, have
mentioned stage. Yet this comes from someone
who says, “It makes me sad when I hear that the
town is thinking of taking away the stage room at
the Gus Canty Community Center where the Falmouth
Juggling Club has practiced almost weekly for
nigh onto 20 years.” Well, I don’t know about
you folks, but that means something to me.

There’s a group of people that have been doing
this weekly for 20 years? And we’ve tossed this
stage area out like nobody uses it?

In ending, he says, “But what might make
me the saddest of all is to keep reading in the
paper that the space is rarely used. To me, it
has an immeasurable use over the years.”

Again, I would hope you would defeat the
allocation of $200,000 to make the Gus Canty
Center our Communication Center. You are not
voting against the concept of public safety.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Cook. Mr. Cook.

Alden Cook. Oh, two Cooks, sorry. [Laughs.]
I’ll add the other Mr. Cook to the list.

MR. COOK: Luckily I don’t hear very well, so.

[Laughter.]

MR. COOK: Good evening, Town Meeting members, my name is Alden Cook. I am a retired firefighter/paramedic from the Falmouth Fire Department. I’m also the deputy director of Cape & Islands Emergency Medical Services, an organization that administrates and trains paramedics and EMT’s for the entire Cape.

I am not associated with any labor organization whatsoever. Not the firefighter’s union, not the Fire Chief, not the Police Chief, not any police organization, either. I speak for myself and other interested citizens in this community.

My talk this evening will pertain only to the location of a public safety dispatch center, and there are certain issues that are of
primary concern. One is the suitability and permanence and security of the structure. For what purpose was the building designed and what is the present usage of the space available, for a communications center? What is the building’s existing infrastructure? And, last but not least, of course, what is the cost to perform this task?

You will see some dollar figures as we go through this screen, and they are approximate and they have been calculated on the low end of verbal estimates in my telephone and personal contacts with contractors in the electrical, structural, and communications industries, as well as end users of the systems.

In the proposed combined dispatch center are a variety of systems: radio, Internet, GPS, data storage and display, fire alarm, and many, many permanent telephone circuits.

Absolutely the most important factor is reliability. Every dispatch center strives for maximum reliability. This means placing all personnel and equipment in one location.

Dispatchers, dispatch consoles, interfaces,
interconnections and radio transmitters and
towers and the antennas should all be together.
The worst possible situations are long and easily
interruptible interconnections between any of the
functions and infrastructure and hardware, either
by telephone circuits or by microwave lengths.

As we have seen before, the
administrators of the Town of Falmouth and the
Selectmen, Finance Committee have voted for the
preferred public safety location at the rec
center. Here’s a picture of the building in
which it will be in. Inside those windows would
be the stage area.

The recreation center lacks many of the
requirements for a combined public safety
dispatch center. The proposed location on the
stage requires construction of a secure building
within the building. You will see as we go to
the next slide: there is the stage of the rec
center and one cannot put a dispatch center in
there without isolation and soundproofing.
Available 800 square feet space will be reduced
by the amount of soundproofing for the new room
which must have four walls and a ceiling. And
this space has to have four dispatch consoles, the computer servers, the battery back-ups, racks for telephone cable terminations, technical interface racks and equipment, electrical transfer switch for the generator, and power distribution panel and racks for the fire alarm systems and receivers.

There is a space available.

Within this space must be a room built within this room; it must have four walls, a ceiling, and it must be soundproofed. It must be separately air conditioned. This building is open to unmonitored public access 12 hours or more per day. There are no proximate toilet, showers, cooking or eating facilities. Modifications to the interior and exterior doors will be required as well as installing a closed circuit T.V. system for a cost of approximately $30,000.

Now, security systems are required regardless of what building a dispatch center goes in.

Here’s a view of the stairs going up to the first floor, the elevator, go through the
door, and then you end up up in the stage area. Here’s the corridor leading to the public facilities. Here is a gymnasium and the locker room. Keep in mind that the public is in here during all times of the day and the evening. And if the dispatchers want to use this as a locker room, it may be full of people, teams, et cetera.

It’s necessary to have an emergency generator in order to power this in case of a failure of the commercial electrical system. Now, in order to power the entire building, it takes a good size generator. The administration has said “We will just power this room. We don’t need to power the entire rec center.” There are some problems with that. One of the problems is if you want to go to the bathroom and it’s dark, it makes it difficult.

[Laughter.]

MR. COOK: The other problem is that there is a boiler in this building. If there is a power failure in the middle of the winter, one would like to think that you are able to run the boiler and keep the dispatch center warm.

Also, comments have been made about
breaking out the circuitry and just having the
lights in the corridors and in the bathrooms, et
cetera, et cetera, and hitching that to the
emergency generator. If there are any
electricians in this room, they will tell you
that breaking out electrical circuits in a
municipal building inside power panels and
integrating them with an emergency generator is
not an easy task and it’s very expensive.

Connections by microwave radio and hard
wire phone cable with links to the Fire
Department headquarters for all the radio
transmitters for the Fire Department, the Police
Department, the Marine and Environmental Services
and DPW would cost about $50,000. Relocation of
the hard wired and radio municipal fire alarm
systems would cost $100,000. There are nine
hard-wired fire alarm systems coming into the
Falmouth Fire Department. As you all know,
there are fire alarm systems on all the buildings
in this town: scientific buildings, schools,
churches, commercial buildings; these have to be
supported. There is no way to connect these
without hard-wiring.

Tinkham Reporting
You must have a designated air conditioning system for this area. This would cost about $10,000. The reason it has to be a designated system, even though the rec center is air conditioned, is because even in the wintertime, or in times of cold weather, it’s necessary to keep that room cool where the dispatch consoles are and the computer servers, et cetera.

The telephone system coming into the headquarters Fire Station is a 200 pair cable. This would cost $60,000 to get it down to the rec center. That sounds expensive, you say. You have to hire a line crew of four people. You have to hire four police officers to do the traffic control. Have to run it from pole to pole. Two hundred pair cable is very expensive.

We would have to relocate the special Verizon phone circuits for the Police Department radio system.

As stated before, there’s limited parking during events. It’s nice to say we’ll reserve a couple of spots, but what happens when the other dispatchers come on duty and the cars
are in the way? That can be difficult.

This building is designed and used as a recreation facility. Not a secure public safety facility. Total estimated modification expense is $373,600.

How about the Fire Department headquarters on the third floor? It’s currently used as an exercise area. You have heard another speaker say that the firefighter’s union has publicly declared at the public hearing held in the Selectmen’s Room and at Town Hall that they are in favor of putting the communications center on the third floor of the Fire Department.

The area was built for future public safety use and not exclusively designed as a gym. There’s over a thousand square feet, including the vestibule, as I call it, or the entryway. It’s adequate for dispatch consoles and administrative functions.

As you will see, all of the equipment is already in place except for the new dispatch consoles.

Here’s the Fire Department main entrance on King Street. As you can see, there are three
floors. During the time of the renovation of the Fire Department, I was on the Building Committee. Chief Brodeur was our leader at that time and I said to him, "Chief, we can save a lot of money by knocking off this third floor. It’s quite costly," when we were doing the architectural drawings. And he said to me, "Alden, someday we’re going to need that floor for something important for public safety." And that time is now.

Here’s the main lobby of the Fire Department. There’s a stairway that goes to the basement, second floor and third floor and the elevator is right there.

Here’s the third floor entryway. For security, it’s easy to put keyless locks on that door coming up from the second floor with card slider. Same thing with the elevator. It’s current technique to limit elevator travel by use of an electronic interlock and you just have a card slider in the elevator. If you want to go to the third floor, put the card in or else you don’t get there.

Here is the space, currently occupied by
the exercise machines, none of which are bolted
down. They’re all free-standing. As you can
see, this is a long and jagged building - room,
and there’s space along the walls to put dispatch
consoles, more than adequate.

This is a full view, looking back
towards the doors.

Importantly, this room requires no
structural changes. Not one nail, not one
board. Only the addition of security features,
about $20,000. It also has to have a separate
air conditioning system, $10,000. It has
handicapped accessible toilets and locker room
facilities exist within the current third floor
space, both men and women. Dual means of egress
already exist for this area, which includes a
handicap-accessible elevator.

There are the men’s and ladies’ rooms.
You can see it’s handicapped accessible; I
measured them again to be sure.

Here’s the egress from the third floor
down to the second floor. This comes out in the
fire prevention room. After six o’clock at
night, this is locked up solid. Same deal here:
put a card slide lock on the door; no one can get out. On the inside, you put a panic bar so people can always get out.

Already in place and operating and requiring no modifications: the radio tower with antennas, the transmitter building, the interconnecting wiring and control circuits, the emergency generator for the entire building and for the EOC, Emergency Operations Center, 225,000 watts with a four days’ supply of diesel fuel built into the bottom of it.

The telephone cables are there, the fire alarm circuits are there.

Extending all of this from the current first floor dispatch through existing raceways is about $40,000. Moving the police radio transmitters and antennas is about 2,000.

Here you see the transmitter building. Inside are the transmitters right now for the DPW, the Water Department, the Fire Department transmitters, the coaxials going out to the antenna.

Notice in the middle on the bottom there are tubes, steel tubes, four inch steel tubes
which are buried ten feet underground across the driveway of the Fire Department. I was there; I saw them buried. They come out in the basement of the Fire Department under the apparatus floor, and as you can see there are plenty of empty tubes left for adding on more transmitter circuits. It goes up to the first floor dispatch area which can then be extended to the third floor.

There’s the generator, with the fuel underneath. There’s the radio tower. It’s 110 feet high. It’s rated for 110 mile an hour constant velocity wind and it cost $120,000 to erect. It’s buried in 15 feet of concrete; I watched them do it.

This is the electrical room on the second floor. Obviously this would not need to be duplicated should it be somewhere else, but if you’ll notice the picture on the top left, there are plenty of spaces for new circuit breakers and a circuit to go up to the third floor would not require any new panels to be installed; instead, just a new circuit-breaker.

On the bottom left is a transfer switch
for the emergency generator. See the size of it; it’s voluminous. It’s already there.

There are two rooms on the second floor; this is in the second floor lobby. There is a telephone room and there is a communications room. The communications room holds the interfaces for the radios and you can see in the picture on the right-hand side you can just see some of the terminals where the 200 pair telephone cable comes into the building.

Here’s the technology room. Here are the computers, servers for all the dispatch consoles down below, and you’ll notice there’s an orange thing up at the top of that; that’s the – the new OpenCape – what am I trying to say?

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

MR. COOK: Yes, thank you. Dementia.

[Laughter.]

MR. COOK: In addition, the Emergency Operation Center is located on the second floor which is just below the proposed combined dispatch center. Administratively this is an excellent feature. Why? Because people can run back and forth from the dispatch center? No.
Because the interconnections are inside the building from the dispatch center down to the EOC which is already wired. An excellent feature.

Kitchen facilities are –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Cook.

MR. COOK: – available adjacent –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Cook. Mr. Cook.

MR. COOK: – to the EOC on the second floor.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Cook, we’ve hit 15 minutes, so we’ve got a rule that they have to vote. How much additional time will you need?

MR. COOK: About 30 seconds.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

MR. COOK: So the total estimated modification expense is $72,000.

Here is the EOC in operation. And the top slide shows how it is as a training room when it’s not used as an EOC. And there’s the little
kitchen next to it. This is on the second floor, easily accessible by coming down one flight of stairs from the third floor.

Ideally isolated from the general public yet easily accessible for dispatchers and administrators.

No parking issues whatsoever, as a new parking lot area has recently been purchased and will soon be added.

The cost difference between these two sites is $301,600. If for no other reason, we should pay attention to that.

Town Meeting members, I ask you to use your common sense. Which is the best site for this communications center? The rec building, which was never designed to be a public safety building, or this building?

When you’re on the third floor, it’s totally isolated. No one can get up there as soon as you lock that door. There’s nothing else up there. It’s not accessible from the outside unless you raise the aerial ladder.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]
THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Suso.

Folks. Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I wanted to put my slides back up there and the PowerPoint, if I may. I’d like to go to slide number 36, please.

[Pause.]

MR. SUSO: 36. That’s okay, yeah.

[Pause.]

MR. SUSO: Yeah, go back a bit, sorry.

Yeah. Go back some more. You should have some photos in there. No, sorry, go forward.

There we are. Go back, now. One more.

One more. Stop right - no.

Go back to 37, please. Stop right there for a moment.

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Moderator, and Town Meeting members. I just want to indicate I had the opportunity to hear a presentation from the last speaker before and - and from some others who have made presentations and I respect the fact that there’s a lot of experience there.

There are cost estimates there. The Town has cost estimates, as well.
In my view, the estimates for conversion, suggested conversion in the third floor are understated by a major amount. I’ll comment on that in a moment. And the estimated costs to convert the stage based on all the information we have is overstated by at least a factor of two. Considerably higher than we feel, and we have looked at that.

But I understand little is to be gained by dueling costs. I noted that there were no justifications in those costs; they were just tossed out there.

But let’s just flip to the next slide, if you would. This is, again, the third floor of fire headquarters. This is the fitness room on the third floor, looking from just inside the doorway down toward the internal stairwell and you can see it has considerable amount of existing exercise equipment, some of it quite expensive.

And let’s go to the next one, next slide.

Now here’s a view in the other direction toward the main entrance. One of the things
you’ll note on these slides is the proliferation of windows. There are windows on three sides of the third floor. Windows everywhere. Those windows need to be dealt with, and they’re going to be dealt with in a costly manner. That has not been mentioned, but they’re a fact of life.

Three sides are windows.

There are also two porches on the third floor that you can access through doors and sit outside. It’s very accessible to the exterior, very public, very open with windows.

Next slide, please. This is the view that you saw earlier, including the stairwell to the lower level, really making a considerable part of this space unusable for the kind of function we’re talking about.

And now to my last couple slides.

This is another shot of the single bowl rest rooms. Totally inadequate for the kind of use we’re talking about. Dispatch facilities we have visited, given the level of activity, you can’t have dispatchers waiting in line to use the toilet.

FROM THE FLOOR: [General talking and
laughing.]

MR. SUSO:  This is – this is totally inadequate.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay, folks.

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 and we’ll stand in a 15 minute recess.

[Whereupon, recess taken AT 9:15 p.m..]

THE MODERATOR:  Let’s re-establish a quorum.

I have an announcement from the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, wants to remind you that, in supporting the Falmouth Cleanup Week, please recycle.  Do not put plastic bags into the recyclables.  You can go to the Town’s website under DPW Waste Management Facility for information on what materials are recyclable.

Information sheets and labels for
containers used for curbside recyclables, if your blue bin is no longer usable, are also in the front lobby. So on your way out tonight, if you need to grab some of that information, it’s in the front lobby. Courtesy of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Let’s re-establish a quorum. All Town Meeting members please rise for the establishment of the quorum and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

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

MR. NETTO: 41.

THE MODERATOR: 41.

In the third division, Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: 59.

THE MODERATOR: 59.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 85.

THE MODERATOR: 85.

By a counted vote of 185, we have a quorum and we’re back in session.
We are on Article 10, Madame Chairman.

MR. PUTNAM: Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM: Mr. Moderator, Brent Putnam, precinct nine.

I would ask reconsideration of Article 9 based on some additional information and an amendment to try to move this process forward instead of waiting six months.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, what’s the new information?

MR. PUTNAM: A change in the cost estimates and the location.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. All those in favor of reconsidering the last article signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor of reconsidering, signify by standing and the tellers will return a count. This is a majority vote.

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

MR. NETTO: 26.

THE MODERATOR: 26?

MR. NETTO: Yes.


[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Third division, Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: 35.

THE MODERATOR: 35.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 55.

THE MODERATOR: 55.

All those opposed, signify by standing and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: First division?

MR. NETTO: 11.

THE MODERATOR: 11.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Third division.

MR. HAMPSON: 16.

THE MODERATOR: 16.
The second division.


By a counted vote of 116 in favor and 53 opposed, the motion to reconsider passes.

Mr. Putnam are you going to put a positive motion on the floor?

MR. PUTNAM: Ladies and gentlemen, Brent Putnam, precinct nine. Thank you for the opportunity for this.

Let's make some lemonade.

The proposed amendment to the recommendation that we change the amount from $200,000 to $75,000 and that we change the words Recreation Center to Fire Department.

The logic behind this, ladies and gentlemen, is as noted by Mr. McNamara, we really don’t have control -- or, not in a direct way -- over where this is going to go, but we do have control over the funds. And a vote of this body, an affirmative vote of this amendment and this article as amended, if you so choose, will send a message to the Board of Selectmen asking them to direct the Town Manager to consider this...
alternate location and, obviously, if there is
the possibility of it moving forward, they will
have the funds and they will have the permission
to do so.

If we wait, obviously, six months is not
good for any of us or any of the situations that
have been presented to us. So this gets us a
move on according to this body’s desires and
hopefully to get it done.

THE MODERATOR: Discussion on the new
main motion.

Yes, back there, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Dana Smith,
precinct six.

I assume that is specific to the Fire
Department headquarters. I think I just heard
him say Fire Department. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Putnam, do you want
that language to be the Fire Department
headquarters or just fire – okay. Fire
Department headquarters.

Okay, yes, Ms. Moran.

MS. MORAN: Yeah, okay. There we go.

Okay, I would just like to ask the Fire
Department and Police Chiefs if that would be enough money to appropriately outfit that space which had all of those windows and open spaces.

THE MODERATOR: Chief Sullivan.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: I honestly don’t know.

[Laughter.]

CHIEF SULLIVAN: We’d have to have a little time to look at it. I would say that it is very - it would be possible, but I mean to give you a number off the top of my head would be not right.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Putnam.


Brent Putnam, precinct nine.

The $75,000 was based on Mr. Cook’s recommendations or his estimates in his presentation. But let’s not forget also that there was an additional $50,000 that this body provided last fall. So there’s a little bit of a buffer there. There’s a comfortable buffer. And, more importantly, like I said, if we move this along now and they come back to us and they said, “You know, we’re short 25,000,” at least we can start moving it along now. They can come
back in the fall, get the extra money and make this happen.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, precinct three.

I’d like to ask Mr. Suso, one, his reaction to this. Two, he must have looked at some numbers for the fire station just in case this happened. I can’t believe that he didn’t cover his bases with a couple of locations. And we’re talking about $200,000 for the Gus Canty Center. We’re talking now, with the last appropriation and this, basically a hundred and a quarter.

Is that enough, sir, or do you feel — where do you fit — feel on this, Mr. Suso, in regards to the amount of money might need for this?

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. DONAHUE: I’d like to hear your opinion.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: You’re asking me how I’m feeling?
MR. DONAHUE: No, sir. No, sir.

MR. DONAHUE: We’re in a public setting, here.

But can we talk numbers?

MR. SUSO: I’m honored to be here, truly.

MR. SUSO: I do not have any type of expert opinion, but if you don’t mind me expressing a little bit, there, I would be happy to.

I have viewed the third floor space in the Fire Department and, you know, my concerns have been noted. I do believe that there will be needed significant construction, there. I don’t believe it can be done without driving a nail. I believe some walls will have to be moved.

There is no locker room on the third floor. That’s a slide I didn’t have a chance to show you. There’s a heating duct with two
lockers thrown in it. That’s the locker room.

So, to outfit this properly and support communications officers properly, is going to take a reasonable amount of money and I would be concerned that we have sufficient funds to do that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct one. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I was just going to say what Mr. Putnam said, that if there is a shortfall that appears, that as long as the project could get started with the contracting and the estimating, it could get started now, it can get started now. It comes fall we need another 50 - 60,000 dollars, well we can vote it in November and get the job done. That should not be an impediment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Moderator, Gardner Lewis, precinct six.

If we leave the $200,000 in this article, it’s not going to go anywhere else except back into Free Cash if it’s not used for the construction of the Fire Department. So I
would make - I would suggest that maybe Mr.
Putnam could drop that portion of -

THE MODERATOR: Well, we’ve got a motion on the floor, so do you want to make an amendment to make this -

MR. LEWIS: Yes, yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So we have an amendment to this main motion to drop the $75,000 and leave it at the $200,000 of the original main motion.

Any discussion on just this amendment, changing the number from 75,000 back to the 200,000?

Mr. Allegro.

MR. ALLEGRO: If you - Mark Allegro 7th precinct.

If you say 200,000, it will cost 200,000.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Latimer.

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

Mr. Gardner’s suggestion would just be bringing us back to the initial motion, which we just overwhelmingly and resoundingly rejected. I
think if we say –

THE MODERATOR: No, it’s still the Fire Department. It’s just the number.

MR. LATIMER: But if we say $70,000 with the additional 50 that we’ve already voted, that’s 130. And, again, let’s do it right. And then, once the contracts are being put out, if a little more is needed, or even if substantially more is needed for that project at the firehouse, we can do it. It can get done. So, I would just leave it the way it is.

I wouldn’t amend this – this – Mr. Putnam’s motion at all.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. In the center. This is just on the amendment. Yes, right there.

MS. HARRIS: Mary Harris, precinct five, and I have a question. Are there any impediments to the location at the Fire Department being up and running within the time frame that we want of January, 2016 that have not been brought up so far or anything that would prevent this from
interfering with the timetable?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Yes.

We are in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Collective bargaining reigns supreme. We must impact bargain all impacts on any facility within which this is located. And I believe my efforts to impact bargain, where one bargaining unit have been accurately summarized.

So, I would be remiss if I did not confirm to Town Meeting I appreciate what I believe is your recognition of a reasonable sense of urgency, but I would ask your patience and understanding with a direction that you would prefer – which I respect – but understanding that there are realities here in the Commonwealth – and I’d like to suggest that they are not realities, but they are.

I’ve been in this business awhile and collective bargaining will have a significant impact on the ability to get anything done by January not only on the one bargaining unit that has refused to come to the table, but on the other bargaining units that we already have a
tentative agreement with; that this changes the understandings in those agreements. So those could potentially open back up.

So I’d be remiss if I didn’t at least share that with Town Meeting and thank you for the opportunity.


MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, precinct nine.

In regards to upping this up to $200,000. I deal in new construction almost on a daily basis, and the minute contractors know you’ve got 200,000 to spend, you’re spending that 200,000.

Let’s do the 75. We have a basic 125. Let’s get the bids and come back in November if we have to. It’s not that difficult. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Buesseler.

MS. BUESSELER: Thank you. Wendy Buesseler, precinct two.

I have to say I’m feeling uncomfortable talking about the numbers that we think that it might cost to renovate the Fire Department until
we actually have some true estimates in hand. So I just think we’re working in the dark right now. We don’t know if we’re going to have to cover up those windows, are we going to have to block off the balconies, things like that.

I just find I personally would like to see a comparison of renovating that compared to renovating the Gus Canty.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Rhodes.

MR. RHODES: Scoba Rhodes, precinct eight.

I’d like to call the question on the second amendment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, there’s only one amendment, so.

MR. RHODES: No, sir, there are two.

THE MODERATOR: There’s a main motion for $75,000 at the Fire Station and there’s one amendment to change it to $200,000.

MR. RHODES: The –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the main motion that is on the floor is Mr. Putnam’s. And then the one amendment is the changing the number to
$200,000.

MR. RHODES: I’d like to call the question on the changing the dollar amount.

THE MODERATOR: Excellent.

The question will come on calling the question. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

All those in favor of the change of the number. This is the first vote, just the change of the number, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the no’s have it and we don’t change the number.

Further discussion on the main motion.

Mr. Noonan was next on the list.

Mr. Latimer, you’re on the list.

You’re on every list that I have.
(Laughter.)

THE MODERATOR: John Noonan, precinct six.

A couple of concerns that I have. I heard about the windows. The windows are on the third floor. The dispatch units are going to be at the height of the windows. In order to be able to get to the dispatchers for security reasons, you’re going to need to be in a helicopter.

In order to get onto the balconies to get in the doors that go into the third floor, you’re going to need to bring a ladder.

So those are - security concerns are misleading. Those are not a problem.

The dispatch centers can be arranged around the walls that are there now.

As far as needed lockers, you’re going to have three eight hour shifts. That means you bring a coat in, you hang it in the locker. If you need more help, you have the Fire Department downstairs; in the case of an emergency, you can say, “We need help.” They’ll send someone up.

A good example of what we’re running...
into is, this past winter, if they needed more help in a dispatch center that was remote located, how would the people get there? You had snowstorms that were brutal. If you had a hurricane with downed wires everywhere and trees down, how would you get help there? You would have – with this location, you’ll have the Fire Department downstairs, you can request some help.

I understand that there’s bargaining agreement to be had. I don’t think that the unions would hold up the Town as hostage. Now, I know I’m naive, but we also hold the purse strings on the unions.

FROM THE FLOOR: No, we don’t.

MR. NOONAN: When we have a vote, we need to realize we need to do what’s best for the town. We need to put it on the third floor of the Fire Department.

One of the arguments of putting it in the 800 square foot area was: if it doesn’t work, we can move it in three to five years. If it doesn’t work on the third floor in a 1200 square foot area, we can move it in three to five years.

We’re going to be looking at building a
senior center. We can look at putting it in the senior center if that’s where we choose to. But right now it makes the most sense to put it on the third floor, spend the $125,000 total, make it work there and look at it in the future. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Wilber.

Microphone for Mr. Wilber.

MR. WILBER: Jude Wilber, precinct eight.

I think that, aside from a collective bargaining ruling in the state of Massachusetts, that a vote on this amendment, a vote on this motion certainly would send a message to the reluctant party who doesn’t want to negotiate. If you know what I mean.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILBER: If Town Meeting says, “Come to the table”, what are they going to say? “No, we’re not going to come to the table”? Okay? So, I’m just saying that there’s a little leverage here that has been cleverly built into this motion by Mr. Putnam and I support it.
And I’d also like to note that even though there are vagaries in the numbers involved, here, we’re floating around the 200 to 300,000 dollar range, and just moments ago, with only one dissenting vote, Town Meeting just dumped $400,000 into a rickety old pier along the coast.

So, I really don’t think it’s that hard. I think that the $75,000, plus the $50,000 puts us in the ballpark and we can get this done by November. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Potamis.

MR. POTAMIS: Gerry Potamis, precinct one.

I daresay no one in this room, including myself, is an expert on municipal security given the time and age we live in. Listen to the daily newspaper. I’ve had some previous and ancient experience in this, but I guarantee you risk assessment at this level is not “no one can look in the window.”

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: George Hampson, precinct
five.

I'm getting the feeling here we're acting on critical things and not coming up with solutions. And, Mr. Moderator, if we are going to have another Town Meeting tomorrow, I would suggest we move on and take this issue up again tomorrow, when people might help solve this problem. Because I certainly don't know what we're doing here to solve this issue.

We need time to think. That's my - if I have, I would make that motion that we -

THE MODERATOR: A motion to lay it on the table?

MR. HAMPSON: Yeah, yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Now, if we lay it on the table, we can't dissolve the Town Meeting until we take it from the table. So we could table it tonight; if we got to the end of this Special Town Meeting we'd have to take it off tonight.

MR. HAMPSON: Oh -

THE MODERATOR: Understand that? Okay.

MR. HAMPSON: - that's a Special Town Meeting, yeah.
THE MODERATOR: So we’re in the
Special.

MR. HAMPSON: Yeah. Damn.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto. Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct nine.

George, I think you’ve got the right
idea.

I think the Board of Selectmen and the
Town Administrator know how we feel. Really,
folks, it’s not our job to design emergency
communication centers. It isn’t. I appreciate
the motion by Mr. Putnam. I can’t – I can’t vote
for that because I don’t – I don’t have the
expertise.

I was on the site committee for the high
school. I didn’t get on the building committee
because I didn’t have the expertise to build a
high school, thank God.

But, all kidding aside, I don’t think
that this is our function. I respect the
presentation that Mr. Cook made; I don’t want to
hold him liable for all those figures. I really
don’t.
And I think George, Mr. Hampson, it’s getting emotional, now. And we represent, I’ll say it again, the taxpayers of the Town of Falmouth. And I don’t think it’s our function, again, to make the determination that this is where it’s going to go, tonight, for this amount of money.

Let’s use our heads. Let’s get the emotion out of it. Let’s look at what we’re supposed to do. Again, the Board of Selectmen know how we feel. I think they know where we want it to go, but let’s do it right.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

FROM THE FLOOR: What are we voting?

THE MODERATOR: What are we voting?

We’re voting the main motion, which is $75,000 to do it at the Fire Department headquarters.

FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you.
THE MODERATOR: Okay. So, $75,000 at the Fire Department headquarters.

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: In the first division, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 31.


[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the third division, Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: 43.

THE MODERATOR: 43.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 61.
THE MODERATOR: 61.

All those opposed, signify by standing

and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: First division.

MR. NETTO: 10.

THE MODERATOR: 10.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Second division.


THE MODERATOR: 21.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Third division.

MR. HAMPSON: 13.


By a counted vote of 135 in favor and 44 opposed, the motion passes.

Article 10. This is a vote to transfer the sum of $150,000 from the Parking Meter Fund for maintenance, repair and replacement of parking meters.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 10 as recommended.
THE MODERATOR: As recommended. Any discussion on Article 10?

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.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 11. This is to transfer the sum of $100,000 from Certified Free Cash to fund maintenance and extraordinary repairs to the wind turbines.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 11 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Discussion on Article 11?

Yes, Mr. Moriarty.

MR. MORIARTY: Dave Moriarty, precinct six.

Through you, Mr. Moderator, I have a question for the Town Manager Mr. Suso. Is any
of this money – will any of this money be used for legal fees defending the Town of Falmouth?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: No.

MR. MORIARTY: The – absolutely none?

THE MODERATOR: It better not be, because we are motioning this for maintenance and extraordinary repairs. So if they do, [laughs] there will be a bunch of us after them.

MR. MORIARTY: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: They need legal money, they come for legal money.

MR. MORIARTY: All righty, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Any further discussion on Article 11?

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 12. This is to vote to
transfer an amount of $30,000 from the Town Hall exterior paint line item and $30,000 from the Main Street fire station exterior paint line item, for a total of $60,000 from Article 16 (Capital Improvements) of the November 2013 Town Meeting to fund a security system at existing Town facilities.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 12 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Discussion on Article 12.

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.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

Article 13. This is to vote to transfer the sum of $229,283 from Certified Free Cash to partially fund repair and replacement of the Falmouth County Club Golf Course irrigation
system and related equipment.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 13 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Discussion on Article 13.

Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: Yes, I’d like to ask the Town administration if the November 2013 is a misprint. Wasn’t it 2014? I’m sorry?

THE MODERATOR: Under the explanation, is that?

MR. HERBST: Yeah, it’s in the explanation.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, so the explanation is that it was the 2014.

MR. HERBST: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

Any further discussion on Article 13?

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.
Article 14. This is to vote to transfer the sum of $104,686 from Certified Free Cash for the purposes of purchasing Greensprayer, mowers, club carryall and gate system for the Falmouth Country Club Golf Course.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 14 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. Discussion on Article 14.

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 15 is to vote to transfer the sum of $49,900 from Certified Free Cash for the repair and replacement of Beach Department rake
equipment.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 15 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Any discussion on Article 15?

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.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 16. This is to vote to transfer the sum of $40,000 from Certified Free Cash to rebuild the dune wall at Old Silver Beach public side.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 15 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: Article 16 as recommended.

Any discussion on Article 16?
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.
[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 17 is to vote to transfer the sum of $7,500 from Certified Free Cash for the purpose of upgrading the electric needs at the park, removing a sinkhole and adding water service and replacing perimeter fence at Marina Park.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 16 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Article 17 as recommended.

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 18. Article 18 is an addition to the Code of Falmouth Chapter 105, Collection Containers. You’ll notice if you look at your recommendation that there were some auto numbering done. And so, like, under 105-4, Exclusions, the first one starts with c and then it goes to d; that should be a and b. And so all of those auto-corrected numbers should start with a at the beginning of the category and run their alphabetical order down.

Madame Chairman for the main motion on Article 18.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator –

THE MODERATOR: I’m sorry, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 18 as recommended. And I just want to point out the difference between the recommendation and the printing has to do with Section 105-5, the Permitted Locations. In the
printed form, it limits it to the Industrial Districts, and the Recommendation, it’s under the Business District 2.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on Article 18. Yes, with a microphone, please.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Hi, Ted Goldstone, precinct four.

I’d like to propose an amendment, which you have the text for and there is a - this proposed amendment would add additional permitted locations. In addition to the Town Waste Management Facility, we’d like to propose the Fire Stations at the discretion of the Fire Chief, and the schools at the discretion of the School Superintendent.

If you’d go to the next slide, please.

This provides additional sites to recycle; codifies existing practice; is supported by the relevant permitting authorities, in this case both the Fire Chief and the School Board; and does not change the ultimate permitting authority, which is the Town Manager.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we’ve made those corrected changes so the Waste Management
Facility is actually d, and then we’re adding e and f.

MR. GOLDSTONE: Oh, I’m sorry, correct.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. All right.

Discussion on the amendment.

Hearing none, the question – oh, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adrien Dufresne, precinct two.

I’d like to speak against the amendment. I think the article as she’s written covers the necessary areas. I don’t think we should burden the Fire Department, the Police Department or any one of our schools with things that can very quickly become unsightly.

I would ask that you vote against this amendment.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Latimer and then Ms. Fenwick.

MR. LATIMER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I support the idea. I just have a little problem with the explanation and saying that it’s at the discretion of the School
Superintendent or the discretion of the Fire Chief. And the proponent’s explanation says it won’t take authority away from the Town Manager, but once you say “discretion”, that does.

I would say it should be on the application of the School Superintendent or on the application of the Fire Chief. And that leaves the discretion whether to issue the permit with the Town Manager where it belongs.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Fenwick.

MS. FENWICK: Judy Fenwick, precinct one and also member of the Falmouth School Committee.

Dr. Goldstone came to the School Committee to ask if we would support this amendment and we said that we would. And also, there is currently a container at the Woods Hole Fire Station and there are currently two, maybe even three containers at the East Falmouth School. One for books and one for clothing. So, they already do exist and this amendment would allow them to continue.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moffitt.

MS. MOFFITT: I’m quite concerned, in
thinking about these containers in our town, is
the visual part of it. And I thought as you
read this that it would tell us that we are going
to have fewer than more. And I think the idea
is the visual. And the point is the fewer
containers, well, the fewer containers is – is
appropriate.

I want you to think about the look in
Falmouth when you see that the containers have
not been taken care of. They haven’t been
maintained. And I don’t have an issue of
whether it’s a fire station or whether it’s a
school, it’s the number of containers that this
town allows. And they need to be maintained.

I would vote against this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Lowell.

MS. LOWELL: Vicki Lowell, precinct 1.

I think there’s containers and there’s
containers. I think having the opportunity to
have them at schools is a very good idea: teach
kids about recycling for adequate things that
they don’t need anymore, and I can see it part of
an educational experience.

And I think, if a fire - as part of
their outreach to the community, a fire department wants to have a drive with a container, I think they’re perfectly capable of making sure it’s not an eyesore. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Stecher.

MR. STECHER: Bernie Stecher, precinct three.

As I read this, this is not a recycling. This is donations for charity.

Secondly, 105-2, Charitable Organization, “maintains an office or facility within the Town”, that’s going to eliminate a lot of the out of town, which I think most of these containers are. Just a point.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, did I see a hand up there? Yes, Ms. Frazier.

MS. FRAZIER: Ruth Frazier, precinct five. I’m on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

The state recently did a -- commissioned a study at SEMASS, and six percent of the municipal residential trash that goes to SEMASS is actually recyclable or reusable textiles. It seemed to me that this article takes care of the
problem of improper maintenance and unsightliness by licensing these containers.

It also seems to me that one of the part of our local comprehensive plan goals for solid waste is to reuse and reduce as much as possible the waste stream. So to make – I’m in favor of this amendment because I think we want to make it as easy as possible for people to recycle, reduce and reuse, and in conforming to our local comprehensive sold waste goals.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR:  Ms. Schneider.

MS. SCHNEIDER:  Barbara Schneider, precinct four.

I just want to speak against the amendment. I wrote an article for the Enterprise a number of years ago about these containers. I was dismayed when I found out the truth about many of them.

This certainly does not mean that we cannot teach children in Falmouth how to be conscientious recyclers. We have all kinds of ways that teachers can collect things in their classrooms. It’s not a big deal to deliver –
have parents come and, have a big mass, let’s
take all this to the one big recycling area.

This is – people unfortunately abuse
these containers just like they do all over town
and it’s not always just exactly what’s supposed
to go into them that does. I don’t think you
want these kind of containers where people can
put their trash when they’re leaving town on a
Saturday in a change-up, and I think that’s what
this is trying to do, as well as the
unsightliness.

So it is a safety issue. We still can
teach recycling.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the back row.

Yes.

MS. NICHOLSON: Hi, my name is Beth
Nicholson. I believe I’m in precinct 5.

I think that Falmouth, the Town of
Falmouth, should take an interest in the
maintenance of these bins. Not only for their
own benefit, but because they can be unhealthy.

I’ve spoken with Planet Aid on a few
occasions because when I saw their bins, the
clothes all over the place and everything, I
thought maybe they might need some help trucking the stuff. What I found out was they take all the clothes, not only one time but they - they put them on pallets and they’re taken out to the docks and they’re wrapped and sent to China. So they basically make a profit on this charity and these clothes that are going out of the United States into other countries.

I think that kids could benefit from a program that would launder and re-distribute either a portion of the clothes that are already being donated to Planet Aid and other people or companies and launder the clothes and distribute them locally. And also serve as a model for the nation.

I think that Falmouth DPW would be a good answer, as far as taking control of the health issues and maintenance of these collection bins.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Nicholson, are you an elected Town Meeting member?

MS. NICHOLSON: I’m not.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, you need to be
sitting behind the roped-off section.

MS. NICHOLSON: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: And make sure that

you’re not voting during votes. Okay?

MS. NICHOLSON: Okay, sir.

Thank you.

MR. PUTNAM: [No mic:] Are we on the

amendment or the article?

THE MODERATOR: We’re on the amendment.

Okay, Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Thank you. Richard

Latimer again.

I have to say, the way this is worded

“at the discretion of the Fire Chief and the

discretion of the School Superintendent”, I

cannot support it. “At the discretion of the

Director of Public Works at the Waste Management

Facility”, well of course. Because that’s where

we have trash collection and he has to manage the

trash collection and manage those containers.

But the School Superintendent and the

Fire Chief should not be given any more

discretion than any other private property owner,
especially where those facilities are in public
view, unlike the Waste Management Facilities.

And I would say that that would have to be at the
discretion of the Town Manager upon the
application of the School Superintendent or the
Fire Chief and, without that kind of change, I
can’t support this.

Although, I would support the idea
generally of allowing them at those facilities.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay, Mr. Goldstone.

MR. GOLDSTONE:  So, in answer to a few
of the concerns that were raised.  The reason
for the two site selections was because that is
current practice.  The – to address Mr.
Latimer’s concern about the – and Ms. Schneider’s
concern about the few, these – the bylaw does
state that they would need to be screened from
public view, as with the church.

The fire station and the school both
benefit in different ways from the current
collection containers.  The fire station
supports the Red Cross because the Red Cross
supports the fire activities.  And the school
actually gets some financial benefit from the
recycling of these textiles.  So, there’s
actually some tangible benefits that are flowing
to the Town from these particular sites, which is
why I indicated that they would be appropriate
additions to the bylaw.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. O’Connell.

MS. O’CONNELL: Maureen O’Connell,

precinct four.

First of all, a point of clarification.
The first rendition of this particular bylaw is
being amended here, not the second. So, really -

THE MODERATOR: It’s the - yeah. The

recommendation piece, so -

MS. O’CONNELL: It should say I and j, I think. Instead of e and f.

THE MODERATOR: No, no, d -

MS. O’CONNELL: Well, it says -

THE MODERATOR: The town -

MS. O’CONNELL: If you look at the

first part of this article, it says Collection
Containers, and then the recommendation is that
we adopt the following collection container
bylaw. So we ought to be - that’s the one we’re

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so, 105-5.
MS. O’CONNELL: And then —

THE MODERATOR: Permitted Locations.

MS. O’CONNELL: -- it should be --

THE MODERATOR: Let me speak, please.

Permitted Locations.

MS. O’CONNELL: Yeah.

THE MODERATOR: The first lettering should be a.

MS. O’CONNELL: Well --

THE MODERATOR: Which is permitted property. The second one should be “A church may place”; that’s b. The third one, c, is “A charitable organization”. And then d should be “The Town Waste Management Facility”.

FROM THE FLOOR: Which page?

THE MODERATOR: Well, I —

MS. O’CONNELL: Which page are you on?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I have a —

FROM THE FLOOR: Which page?

MS. O’CONNELL: Which —

THE MODERATOR: I have a single page warrant booklet, so I don’t know what page.

So listen to me —

FROM THE FLOOR: Page 8.
THE MODERATOR: Page 8.

MS. O’CONNELL: Page 8, okay.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So you go to the Recommendation -

MS. O’CONNELL: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: So you have an Article and a Recommendation. So if it’s page 8, go to page 8. It’s the recommendation. We had an auto format issue with lettering, so we start all sub-categories as I said when the Chairman made the main motion and you go a, b, c.

MS. O’CONNELL: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: And then so it ends with the “The Town Waste Management Facility” and he’s adding the additional two.

So The Town Waste Management Facility should be d. That’s incorrect on the overhead as well; that should be d. And then you have e and f, the bolded additions.

MS. O’CONNELL: All right, and now my comment. The person who’s suggesting that we amend this bylaw is suggesting that the Fire Department take charge of these and the school system take charge of emptying these containers
and disposing of their contents.

FROM THE FLOOR: No, no.

MS. O’CONNELL: Well, that’s - that is what he, you know, he said that it would be a benefit. The Red Cross and so on. And I don’t think that’s an appropriate function of either the school or the Fire Department. And, on top of that, the schools - the lots at the schools are empty for a couple of months and vacations and so on; there’s really no one to monitor, as I think they ought to be monitored, what is being placed in containers around schools.

I think there is a safety concern and I think that there’s a trash concern, as well.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Goldstone, did you want to address that?

MR. GOLDSTONE: No, neither the Fire Department nor the schools are responsible for emptying these.

They get benefits in terms of the schools from the recycling companies, which will pay for certain - pay a certain amount of money per ton collected. Or pound collected.

And then the fire station, it’s much
more intangible. It’s in support of the Red Cross because the Red Cross provides support services to—often at fires.

If I might, Mr. Moderator, a suggestion was made that might satisfy some of the members of Town Meeting to slightly change the wording of this; that would make it “upon the positive recommendation of the Fire Chief; upon the positive recommendation of the School Superintendent”.

THE MODERATOR: So you—

MR. GOLDSTONE: I don’t know if that’s—

THE MODERATOR: Do you want to move that as an amendment?

MR. GOLDSTONE: If I could change the—

THE MODERATOR: So we have a second amendment, which is to take out the words “at the discretion of”, and make it “upon the—

MR. GOLDSTONE: At the positive recommendation of the Fire Chief.

So, I don’t know if that’s—

Permission? Permission, that would be—upon the permission of the—so just changing
“discretion” to “permission”.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, upon permission of the Fire Chief, upon permission of School Superintendent.

Okay, here we go. Mr. Smith. On the amendment.

MR. SMITH: Dana Smith, precinct six.

This may be a good idea, what’s up here, this amendment, but it seems to be a sticking point this evening and my suggestion is perhaps we not vote for it. We can move on to the main article and then this can be considered some other time at some other Town Meeting in terms of expanding it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the question will come on the second amendment, which is to change the word discretion up there to “upon permission of”.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]
THE MODERATOR: It is the opinion of the Chair that the ayes have it by a majority.

The question will now come on the amendment as amended. So now you’re adding e and f, with the word “permission”. The amendment as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It is the opinion of the Chair that the ayes have it by a majority.

The question will now come on the main motion as amended twice. All those – yeah.

MR. GOLDSTONE: [No mic:] I actually just have a question.

If I might. On the main bylaw. Through you to the Town Counsel, if I might.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, go ahead. Just –

MR. GOLDSTONE: Does this apply to redeemable bottles? Collection containers for redeemable bottles?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Duffy.

MR. DUFFY: No, it’s not intended to do
THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the question will come on the main motion as amended twice. 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 19. This is to see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to purchase or take by eminent domain a permanent easement to widen and relocate the intersection of East Falmouth Highway, Route 28 and White’s Landing Road in East Falmouth.

Mr. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 19 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended.

Discussion on Article 19.

Mr. Duffy.

MR. DUFFY: There you go. Never had this microphone before. It’s kind of like an
elementary school microphone.

In the recommendation it says that we will have an agreement with the owner of the property present at Town Meeting and I want to report to you that in fact we do.

This is a situation, this property lies out at the intersection of Route 28, East Falmouth Highway and White’s Landing Road. It is called Bosun’s Marine, but many of you probably remember it as Edward’s Boatyard. The intersection there joins at a very strange angle, which makes it very difficult for traffic to negotiate it.

The purpose of this taking is to allow the DPW to straighten out the intersection. The owner of the marina is very much in favor of this, and actually was willing to give us land to do it, except we discovered that because there’s a great deal of marina activity packed onto a very small lot, that he has a number of zoning issues.

So we have agreed that the Board of Selectmen will exercise their right of eminent domain and take the easement. And the reason
for the taking is to avoid the creation of more zoning non-conformities.

But, in the agreement, the owner has waived any rights to damages so there’s no money involved. Okay?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any discussion on Article 19?

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.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 20. This is to appropriate a sum of money for window replacement in this building.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 20 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, as recommended. This is for the replacement of the windows and to authorize borrowing in excess of Proposition 2 ½.
Discussion or presentation?

CHAIRMAN JONES: I believe that Mr. Murphy has –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we’ll do that one first?

Okay, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Moderator and Town Meeting. I’m surely not standing tonight to object to this article. However, I am standing to make an amendment to this article that will best serve the community and the school system.

I’d like to make an amendment to the recommendation on line number seven of your recommendation. And very often, just so folks realize, the recommendation is actually the meat of the article. Line number seven says currently the amount expended under the direction of the School Committee. I would like to amend that to read: the amount to be expended under the joint direction of the School Committee and the Board of Selectmen.

That is my amendment and I’d like to speak to the amendment.
THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

MR. MURPHY: We all know that we had some problems with our High School building project. And the one thing that we found out after we expended the original sum of $65 million: that many minds made the project come to fruition. And the more people that we had working on this project -- meaning those not only on the school side but on the Town side -- we were able to take the additional $18 million that was estimated to bring the project to completion and in fact turn in some of that money. In excess of $2 million.

The School Department is tasked with in fact educating the children of this community. They’re not, and don’t have the expertise, to in fact build buildings and remodel projects. The Town side does in fact have that expertise on staff, and they’re in fact under the direction of the Board of Selectmen, which is ultimately under the direction of the Town Manager. That happens to be the Engineering Department, the Building Department and the Legal Department.

And there is one issue that needs to be
brought up. When we went back to the school building assistance program when we needed the additional $18 million, we struck up a new model, and that model was a memorandum of understanding that was crafted between the Board of Selectmen at the time and the School Committee. What that memorandum of understanding basically said was that we would work together to get the job completed on time and then under the new budget.

The School Building Assistance Program recognized that and then changed their assistance program. And if I could read a quote from their new assistance program that has been written since that. Eligible applicant means the chief executive officer where prescribed by statute or charter in the city, town, regional school district or independent agricultural technical school, or where the context requires the chief executive officer’s agent or staff or local official as submitted by the city, town, regional school district or independent agricultural technical school approved by the authority.

Now, ultimately the chief executive officer here in this town is the Town Manager.
However, the Board of Selectmen act as the mayor in this community collectively. There’s a five member board. So they direct.

I don’t want to see a turf war. I would like to see this project completed. I would like to see it to the benefit of the children of this community, and I want to also remind Town Meeting that there are some issues that we want to see moved forward. We want to make sure that the scope of the project stays within the realm of what we’re talking about. This will help that because both sides, both the School and the Town side, will be looking at it.

Again, we do have the benefit of the Building Department, the Legal Department, and the Engineering Department on the Town side will be at the beck and call of this – this project.

Remember, folks, this has to go to the ballot if in fact it passes tonight. We would like to see a collective body behind this.

Again, I would have probably preferred that it was done under the ESCO, but that’s – that’s passed us. We need to work as a community to get this completed and I think the best way to
work this as a community is that the both the School side and the Town side work to make this completed.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on the amendment. Do you want to discuss the amendment?

MR. LOWELL: I just - Nick Lowell, precinct 5. I’m the vice chairman.

I do have a presentation on the main motion, but I did want to say that I don’t actually have any issue with the changes. The only question I have in my mind is are we still meeting the legal requirements of this article. And so, that’s the question for Town Counsel.

Thank you.

MR. DUFFY: Preliminary to tonight’s meeting, there had been a number of documents prepared by the School Department and the Town Manager that were submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority to get this project underway.

The School Building Authority sent down a rather detailed list of instructions; it was
sort of intimidating, but we followed them we
think to the letter and we identified the
responsible party as the School Committee.

Now, if this amendment passes, and I’m
not speaking for or against this amendment, but
we will have to amend all of the applications.
And how it will be received in Boston, I don’t
know, but we will have to go through an amendment
process, but that’s something we will do if
that’s what you want to do.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. O’Connell.

MR. O’CONNELL: Just before you began,
Mister – Maureen O’Connell, precinct 4, through
you, Mr. Moderator.

      Sorry I didn’t ask you this when I was
speaking with you, but I’m wondering, now that
I’m focused on this more – more closely, why is
this going to be a Prop 2 ½ which gives us a –

THE MODERATOR: Can we just hold that
for a second? Let’s just do the amendment so we
can get that out of the way and then –

MS. O’CONNELL: Well, I guess I don’t
want to –

THE MODERATOR: Yeah.
MS. O’CONNELL: – if there’s another amendment to be made, I maybe want to amend this to an exclusion instead of a Prop 2 ½.

THE MODERATOR: So, ask the question. Whatever.

MR. LOWELL: This article is being funded through a debt exclusion, which is a form of a Proposition 2 ½ override.

MS. O’CONNELL: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else on the amendment to make it joint jurisdiction?

Ms. Moffitt.

MS. MOFFITT: Thank you. I’m just concerned about the legality of this. I do know that when agreements are made with the School Committee and with the state, it’s those two entities. And bringing in the Selectmen is – is another – I don’t know that that’s legal and I don’t know what that involves.

And the other part is that this is to go to the ballot in November, is there enough time to get all that legal part straightened out in order to do this? So I’m just concerned about the legality of it.
Ladies and gentlemen, fellow members, we had a hell of a time with the High School. We do not have a permanent Building Committee here in the town. We should. We’re a big corporation; we should have a permanent Building Committee.

If there’s any doubt, any doubt at all, let’s make it a joint effort. Let’s all take the responsibility. If we’re going to blow the game again, let’s all get in the boat together and we’ll all go down together.

[Laugher.]

So please, I – I – I want to support Mr. Murphy’s motion.

Thank you.

I think Mr. Murphy intended this to be a cooperative effort. I don’t think there’s any reason why the School Committee cannot ask those people to assist them. I don’t know if we have to make it part of the motion, make it a legal
thing.

I mean, do people not speak to each
other around this town in the different
departments? Is the School Committee not
allowed to ask for help from the other
departments? I would think that would be a
nicer way to go.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, precinct

First of all, if I was on the School
Committee I would take great offense being called
an enemy.

Second of all, both the Board of
Selectmen and the School Committee were elected
by the Town of Falmouth; I would expect the Board
of Selectmen to want to stand up and be a
watchdog after the fiasco we had at Falmouth High
School.

It was done before. We had a memorandum
of understanding in which Mr. Murphy I believe
helped serve to get that completed, and we need
to make sure the dollars are watched and spent
appropriately.
And if people are afraid to be sued, well, it happens in this town with every board. I don’t know a single board in the Town of Falmouth that has not been sued yet. So, please step up and protect the taxpayers, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Augusta.

MS. AUGUSTA: Hi. Susan Augusta, Chairman of the Falmouth School Committee.

This has been a co-operative effort. In all the communications that have come down from Boston and the Massachusetts School Building Authority, the main addressee has been to Mary Pat Flynn, Julian Suso, Mr. Duffy, the School Superintendent, et cetera. There’s been an enormous amount of paperwork that has needed to be done.

And I quote now from the letter that I happen to have here. “Pursuant to the terms of the MSBA’s accelerated repair program, the Town has 90 days to acquire and certify local approval for an appropriation.” I’m just concerned that we’re going to mess this up, and at the 11th hour, here, we need to get these windows done.

We certainly want to cooperate with the
Board of Selectmen; we want to work with the Board of Selectmen, but we need to get this window project done.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, quite candidly, I want to get the project done and I think what Mr. Duffy said to you a few minutes ago was in fact what I read to you, that the Town Manager was the applicant on behalf of the Board of Selectmen. But they wrote the article saying that it would be under the direction of the School Committee. And all’s I’m asking for is that we amend the article so it’s now under the direction, so it gets completed, under the Board of Selectmen and the School Committee.

Quite clearly it says in the act that it’s the chief executive officer. Who’s the chief executive officer’s boss? The Board of Selectmen. The School Committee is a no-brainer. We need to coordinate the project with them. Because we have to be able to make sure the education of the students happens simultaneously. I – I – I say to folks that,
you want accountability, this is part of the way you get it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: Ralph Herbst, precinct 8.

Two things. I think if you would have to go back to the state school whatever committee it is and tell them that you want to include the Board of Selectmen, they’re going to think like, “Well, what’s wrong with your School Committee? So why do you have to have some oversight on your own School Committee?” That doesn’t make any sense to me.

The other thing is that the School Committee has a Director of Finance and Facilities, and that person is the person who should be the resource to the School Committee to get these windows replaced.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Magnani.

MS. MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, through you I’d like to tell this body that Nick Lowell, who is the vice chairman of the Finance Committee is on this committee, and I think everyone on the committee would vouch for this: he watches every
penny, makes sure every I is dotted, makes sure
every T is crossed. And he will be a very
valuable person on this committee and I don’t
think anybody will spend money incorrectly.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Shearer.

MR. SHEARER: Dan Shearer, precinct 6.

I was against this article because I saw
the money and thought it was ridiculous until I
went on the walk tonight. And now I’m for it.
And our biggest obstacle is going to get the
voters to vote. And if they don’t think we
have knowledgeable people behind this and working
with it, I’m afraid we may not get the money and
we won’t be able to do it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Allegro, next
on the list.

MR. ALLEGRO: So the question isn’t
whether or not the School Committee and the Board
of Selectmen are speaking to each other or
whether there’s a finance person on the School
Committee. The question is with whom does this
responsibility lie. Is it the purview of the
School Committee or another Town authority?
I just went to the website and, like we all know, the purview of the School Committee are issues of education, curriculum, policy, hiring, maintenance. And, you could maybe squeeze this in under maintenance, but I’m concerned that we’re handing this responsibility to the wrong body and so I would support the amendment that as made.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Heath.

MR. HEATH: Austin Heath, precinct 9.

If you read Article 20, it says if the Town will vote to appropriate a sum of money for window replacement at the Lawrence School, including costs incidental and related thereto, and to determine if the same shall be raised and by whom expended or to take any other action on the matter.

It’s on the request of the School Committee. I can request it. The Town takes the responsibility. We are voting only the money, and it’s up to the Town, not us, unless we want to restructure the Town. We’re voting for the money; that’s it.

We’re not voting who’s running it.
We’re not voting –

THE MODERATOR: But you are. You have
to tell me how much, where it’s coming from and
under whose jurisdiction. Those are the three
things you have to have in a motion to
appropriate money at Town Meeting.

So you’ve got to have it under
somebody’s jurisdiction.

MR. HEATH: Sorry.

THE MODERATOR: It’s okay.

I just would mention that I was also one
of the signatures of the memorandum of
understanding and we never changed the vote of
Town Meeting; we just went together and signed a
memorandum of understanding. So this may be much
ado about nothing. You might still be able to do
it like we did it last time.

But, Ms. Newton.

MS. NEWTON: Shardell Newton,
Facilities Manager.

The Facilities Department is split two
ways. The School Department has their
facilities manager and the Town has theirs. I
can assure Town Meeting and put your mind at ease
that under the new current jurisdiction with
Bonnie Gifford and Mr. Murphy, I’ve been called
several times to ask opinions about different
projects that they’re doing. They’ve asked for
our assistance. I know they’ve talked to Peter
McConarty before. And I have received all the
correspondence on these windows.

So the School Committee does do a good
job of keeping in touch with the Town and they do
ask for our opinion and for our help, just to put
your mind at ease that I can verify that that has
happened.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Peterson, did you
want to speak or are you getting my attention?
You wanted to speak as well. Okay.

MS. PETERSON: Laura Peterson, precinct
3. I’m also the vice-chair of the School
Committee.

My concern with the amendment goes back
to the legality of it, and Mr. Duffy talked about
how daunting the application was and how specific
it was and I just want to remind people that, by
going through the MSBA, they’ve agreed to
reimburse us 37.95 percent. And my concern
would be that we would lose that reimbursement.

And for all of you who have gone on the
tour and watched the video and looked at this
handout, the windows need to be done. So I
would hate to lose that reimbursement money just
over something like this.

And I was happy to hear that we are
doing a good job talking to the Town, because
it’s really important to us that we have a good
relationship with the Town and we’ve come a long
way in the last couple of years.

So, I hope you’ll take that into
consideration and look at how we’re behaving now,
and make your decision based on now.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’m going to call
the question on the amendment to add the joint
jurisdiction with the Board of Selectmen.

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 that the no’s have it by a majority.

The question will now come on the main motion. The main motion requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor of Article 20 as recommended, signify –

Do you – you really need to make a presentation? Okay, go ahead.

MR. LOWELL: Well –

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead. No, that’s fine. That’s fine. Go ahead.

MR. LOWELL: Nick Lowell, vice chairman of the Finance Committee.

I feel like it’s important to give a presentation.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. LOWELL: Because this does involve a tax override. And so I want to get this into the record as to why we’re doing this.

So, okay. So I have with me a couple of people here that I just – if we did get to the point where we want to ask questions, if Shawn Burke could stand up for a moment. He’s from out of town, so if we have to ask him any questions, we’ll have to vote him in.

Tinkham Reporting
And our facilities and money guy for the schools, Patrick Murphy.

And Don Drew, Head Custodian, is somewhere in the building if we needed him for that.

Can we get the first slide, please.

Okay, so, like I said, this is a little bit – been a little bit of a sleeper article, I feel. It hasn’t had the same attention as some other of the big tax overrides have had. So this is why I feel it’s very important that we discuss this at least for a few minutes this evening.

The original school – next slide, please.

The original school was built, this school that we’re in, was built in 1951 to ‘53. Most of the windows in the schools were replaced in the 1985 period. I’m sorry, they’ve got the elementary school microphone here.

[Laughter.]

MR. LOWELL: Most of the windows were replaced in 1985. These are the primary focus of this project, is to replace these windows.
For those of you who went on the tour or have seen the video, the need should be apparent. But we’ll get into that in a second.

There are also some windows that go back to the 1951-’53 construction, principally the octagonal windows.

It’s very important that the windows that were installed in 1997, during the addition, are not going to be touched, it’s not included.

That’ll be clear on the next slide, please.

So this shows a basic outline of the building. The lines in red show the principal areas where the windows, the 1985 windows, will be replaced. The school has a lot of windows. It’s a nice feature for the school, but it is costly to replace them.

In addition, there are the skylights over the gymnasium, cafeteria, and the shop that are slated for being replaced. And then the doors to the front of the building, the auditorium, the main entrances, the gymnasium being the principal doors, those will also be included in the project at this time.
Okay, so the big issue is the safety issue. Lawrence School does not have air conditioning. The windows need to be opened in the warmer months to cool the building. The windows are in deplorable shape. Some of them are not open-able. Some of them – many of them have the ballast, which holds the window open – are broken and the windows can come down like a ton of bricks. It’s a very serious safety issue with respect to pinched hands, fingers; really, more than pinched.

It’s an issue that just has to be addressed.

Next slide.

In addition, there are maintenance issues with the windows. The lintels are rusted. There are wooden sills underneath the aluminum framing that is rotting. There is an issue of combined construction, where some of the doors date back for ‘53 and they have metal frames and some of the aluminum has – some of the ‘85 windows have aluminum framing; there’s corrosion and whatnot issues with that.

A very visual issue is the – there’s a
film, a plastic film that’s between the two layers of glass that has deteriorated; it’s browned. It’s peeled, it’s split. It’s looks terribly, but also that’s the energy efficient coating that reflects good light, keeps – improves that thermal properties of the windows.

You see that more on the backside of the school because they have replaced some of the broken ones in the front side of the school. So this is showing the backside; you can kind of see the brown splotches. And so that’s impacting both visually but also energy efficiency of the windows.

Next.

The skylights, almost all the skylights leak. They are single pane glass. They have a layer of plexiglass over them that was designed to protect – prevent the glass if it broke from falling into the school. But they’re single pane, they leak, they need to be replaced.

The doors on the school do not meet fire code. If we touch the glass around them, we have to replace the doors to bring them up to code. A lot of the doors are in bad shape.
So, quickly to run through the numbers. This is our construction costs breakdown. The lion share of the costs has to do with the openings, the windows and doors. But the total rollout for construction costs: $3.4 million.

And then that’s rolled up in the next slide. We see the construction costs in the middle at $3.4 million, and all the other costs related to the project bring the total project budget to $3.947 million.

Now, the good news – if you can call it that – is for a large project is that the Mass. School Building Authority will reimburse the Town. The official rate is 37.95 percent. The reality, you don’t generally get the full reimbursement. We’re using an expected reimbursement of 35 percent. So, after the 35 percent reimbursement, the cost to the Town will be $2.565 million.

Jennifer Petit ran some numbers for us and assumed that she would bond this out on a 15 year bond with a four percent interest rate. So the first year of payment would be $273,000 for the Town. The impact on the tax rate is 2.47
cents per 1,000. So basically if you had a $400,000 home you’d be paying nearly $10 in taxes for the first year, declining over the next 14 years until the bond is paid off.

Okay, so in summary. The 400 – over 400 windows and doors, most of them installed in 1985, some of them in the early '50's that are in the scope of this project. This needs to be completed for safety reasons, principally, but also maintenance and energy efficiency reasons.

The vote, your vote tonight, authorizes the full $3.947 million, with an expected reimbursement from the Mass. School Building Authority of 35 percent, or $1.38 million. This is important to understand. We actually have to pay the bill and we submit the bill through their system and they reimburse the money to us. It’s a process. It’s the way it has to work.

This vote requires a two-thirds right now. It would then require a two-thirds vote by the Selectmen to put it on the ballot, and then a simple majority vote on May 19th. If this all goes forward, the demolition would start in June, 2016 and it would be completed in the fall of
So, the majority of the construction would occur over the summer while the students are not here, or most of the students aren’t here.

Unfortunately there’s not enough time to get this started for this summer. Just constructing the windows, having the windows fabricated is a 16 week lead. Not enough time from May 19th to the beginning of June to get that done.

So I do have – we have some people here that can answer your questions, but that was the run-through. Thank you for letting me present.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: George Hampson, precinct 5.

I’ll make a motion that we extend past eleven o’clock.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, you all heard the main motion to extend past eleven o’clock. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.
THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by the two-thirds and we’ll extend after 11:00.

Questions on –

MR. HAMPSHON: And hopefully there are just a few words.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Mr. Netto.

THE MODERATOR: With a microphone, please.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct 9.

My question is for the voters. Hopefully the answer to clear up some confusion because people have asked me – they’ve read this article in the paper – what’s it going to cost us for the windows? And I just would like an explanation so that those people watching, the people who are going to go into the polls. And I’ve tried to explain to them we have to appropriate the total amount of money, the $3.9 million.

And the question I get all the time and the answer is: well, when we get this $1.38 million back, where does it go?
Mrs. Petit, I imagine, Jennifer, could answer that. Does it go to reduce the bond bill? Do we pay off the note with it, or does it go into the general fund?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Petit.

MR. NETTO: Thank you.

MS. PETIT: Thank you. When we submit the payment for reimbursement, it will go to - we’ll pay the - we’ll pay the bill and we’ll get the money and it will be money that we will not bond. So we’ll be bonding less. So they won’t be reimbursing the principal and interest, they’ll actually be reimbursing the project costs as we move along the project.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto. No, with the microphone, please.

MR. NETTO: If I follow you correctly, you will not bond the $3.9 million; all we’re doing is asking the voters for the authority to bond that upper level if we need it, correct?

MS. PETIT: Yes. That is a requirement, to put the full project costs into the article, but we will not bond that three point nine - it’ll be less the grant.
MR. NETTO: Thank you, I just wanted
the voters out there to understand the financial
process of this. Thank you very much, Ma’am,
for your excellent answer.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further?
Further discussion? We’ve got Ms. Newton.

MS. NEWTON: Shardell Newton,
Facilities Manager.

The question that nobody wants to hear:
does the price include the asbestos removal?

MR. LOWELL: I ask that we allow Shawn
Burke, the owner’s project manager from PMA
Construction Services to answer that question.
He’s not a Falmouth resident, however.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, all those in
favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: Opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

MR. BURKE: Yes.

[Laughter.]

MR. BURKE: The asbestos removal was
found during the schematic design process by the
architects and is included in their estimate.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jones.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Just to be very clear of the order of events, the Board of Selectmen did vote to put this on the ballot, contingent upon Town Meeting voting it because we actually need to get it done by midnight tonight to make the timetable to get it onto the ballot.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, precinct 9.

My question was actually asked by Shardell about the asbestos, because I know that that was a major problem with the high school and nobody knew, based on the age of the building. So, I’m glad –

THE MODERATOR: Okay –

MS. PUTNAM: – that that was answered.

THE MODERATOR: – Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: Well, let me be clear that I support this article and the need and the purpose of the project before I wade into the weeds lest I confuse people, because the purpose
of my question is to enable understanding for
discussion of Article 13 in the regular Town
Meeting, or the Annual Town Meeting.

And that would be: I think we saw
something similar to this as part of an energy
conservation project that wouldn’t pay out for
150 years because of the cost of the windows, but
at the time the windows – and I don’t know if the
scope was any different – was less than half of
this number.

So, would you consider this to be a so-called legitimate estimate? And is it, you
know, fully – with your full confidence that this
is the top end?

And, also, in the context of
understanding for Article 13, this is the
appropriation event for this project, is that
correct?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Lowell.

MR. LOWELL: Yes, this is the
appropriation event for this project. We do not
anticipate needing any additional funds. Shawn
Burke in particular, as well as our architects,
have spent quite a bit of time coming up with a
detailed estimate. It includes contingencies, et cetera.

I’m trying to remember what your other questions were.

THE MODERATOR: The scope of this being different than the ESCO scope.

MR. LOWELL: Right. Oh, so, this is a very – this is a completely different project, really, than the ESCO project had been. It’s not really – it’s very difficult to compare the two.

The number of windows, the addition of the doors, the skylights, the addition of disposal costs, et cetera. I mean, it’s a different project.

When we have – when Shawn has attempted to compare, they came out to be very similar, you know, of similar scope, but again it’s difficult to turn an orange into an apple.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, precinct 3.

You know, when you talk about asbestos, I’m wondering, do you have an insurance policy that says that if in the middle of this project
you find more asbestos that they didn’t find, will the insurance company come in and pay the tab to remove it?

Or – in other words, is – what I’m afraid of is, in a building this old, you find asbestos and it can – it can just go run on and all of a sudden, you’re buried. You’re taking out a window or a door; you wind up having to take the side of the building down.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

MR. BURKE: My understanding is that during the schematic design process they identified areas that are common to have asbestos-containing material, which is typically limited to caulking materials at the windows.

We also tested for PCB’s and did not find any of those present.

We will, before moving the project forward into bid, do some destructive testing. We will likely pull apart a couple windows to really see what’s behind them to make sure that the scope of asbestos or any other type of
material or disposal required is identified prior to starting the project or going out to bid on the project.


MS. MOFFITT: Yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question, question.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Moffitt and then I’m going to take the question.

MS. MOFFITT: I want to tell you that five years ago we discussed the windows here at the Lawrence School and it was a serious issue five years ago. There was not the financing that we had when we were in line with ESCO at that point.

It has taken five years to bring it to the point of saying these windows have to be replaced. I highly endorse this. It’s been necessary for five years and I encourage you to vote for this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, 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 ayes have it by the two-thirds majority and I so declare.

I’m going to take a majority vote: do you want to do one more?

All those in favor of going on to the next article, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: By a call of the chair, I’ll see you at seven o’clock tomorrow.

[11:07 p.m. Whereupon, this meeting adjourned.]
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