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THE MODERATOR: All Town Meeting Members please take your seats. Okay, don’t forget to check in, Folks. Attendance will be published in the Falmouth Enterprise. I want to remind all speakers tonight that we are being broadcast on FCTV Channel 15. So please identify yourself by name and precinct each time you speak. It also helps our stenographer get you on the record accurately.

Okay, Folks, here we go. We’ve got a long night. We’re going to come back on Thursday if we don’t finish tonight, because tomorrow’s Veteran’s Day, and if we don’t finish on Thursday, you’re going to come back on Friday night. So let’s get going.

Okay, my 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 Mrs. Long.

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

I want to make an important announcement.
Because of the impending weather, the Falmouth Veteran’s Council is moving the Veteran’s Day Ceremony to the Falmouth High School tomorrow. Same time, at eleven o’clock. But there won’t be the parade. We’ll be doing the ceremony up at Falmouth High School at eleven o’clock tomorrow.

So if you could help us spread the word to the community. And I know I was speaking to Chief Dunn earlier and they’ve got a sign down there and they’ll make sure that people know where to go. But if we could spread the word, that would be great.

[Pause.]

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

MR. NETTO: 52.

THE MODERATOR: 52.

In the third division, Mrs. Long?

MS. LONG: 53.

THE MODERATOR: 53.

In the second division. In the second division Mr. Dufresne? Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 100.

THE MODERATOR: 100.
By a counted vote of 205 we have a quorum and I call the Special Town Meeting into session.

All present please rise for the presentation of the colors by Cub Scout Pack 39.

[Colors presented.]

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

[Pledge of Allegiance taken.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time I'd recognize Heidi Marotta for our invocation.

MS. MAROTTA: Oh, God, creator of us all, we ask your blessing on this Town Meeting. Let each one of us here this evening recognize our differences and our similarities. Let us listen to each other thoughtfully and guide us to vote on the issues before us with an open mind.

We ask you to watch over our words and our debates so that the result of our meeting will be beneficial to all. Amen.

THE MODERATOR: Remain standing for our moment of silence in honor of our veterans and our active military personnel serving in harm’s way.

[Moment of Silence held.]

THE MODERATOR: Colors post.
[Colors posted.]

THE MODERATOR: All right, Cub Scout Pack 39, we'll see you back when you're Boy Scouts. Good job tonight.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Thanks to the Boy Scouts of Troop 42 that are teaching the young men that are doing the flag ceremony. Good job, Scouts.

[Continuing applause.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time, I'd ask for a motion to dispense with the reading of the warrant. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, I move to dispense with the reading of the warrant.

THE MODERATOR: You've all heard the main motion to dispense with the reading of the warrant except for the officer's return. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

By virtue of this warrant, I have this
day notified and summoned the inhabitants of the Town of Falmouth qualified to vote on town affairs, as said warrant directs, by posting an attested copy thereof in Town Hall and in every precinct in the town. Signed by the Constable Ron Braga.

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

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

FROM THE FLOOR: So moved.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

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

FROM THE FLOOR: Moved.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

At this time I recognize the Planning Board for notification of public hearing.

MR. DREYER: Mr. Moderator, my name is Paul Dreyer, precinct 2, Town Meeting member and Clerk/Secretary of the Planning Board.

In accordance with Chapter 40A, Section 5, Massachusetts General Law, and Article 43 of the Falmouth Zoning Bylaw, a public hearing was held on October 20th, 2015 on Article 3 for the Fall Special 2015 Town Meeting and all those who wished to speak were heard.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

So, no blanket tonight. There’s three articles on the Special Town Meeting.

So we’ll start with Article 1.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN VOGEL: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 1 as recommended.
THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This is to vote to appropriate and transfer the sum of $200,000 from Certified Free Cash into the Energy receipts Reserved for Appropriation Account.

Discussion on Article 1.

Mr. Moriarty.

MR. MORIZARTY: Good evening, everyone.

Dave Moriarty, precinct six.

I'm opposed to this article for several reasons. I don't think we should spend another hard earned dollar of a Falmouth taxpayer on this failed project, and I think it's the Mass. Clean Energy's responsibility to absorb any losses that are incurred by the turbines being shut down. So I urge that we vote this thing down and don't give them another dime.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct one.

Mr. Moriarty expresses concern for the taxpayer, and then he says that the state of Massachusetts Clean Energy Committee should pay for this. Where does he suppose that the state is
going to get the money? It’s going to get it from the taxpayers. Everyone in this room and everyone in the whole state. To solve the problem that is – maybe it is a problem for a handful of people. That is bad public policy. That is bad fiscal policy.

I suggest we vote this article to give the Selectmen the tools they need to keep what we have, not lose what we have in promotion of sound clean energy policy and not spend money to come up with nothing. Which is what Mr. Moriarty is suggesting that we do. Taxpayer money. To come up with nothing. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion? Yeah, in the center.

MR. COOK: Peter Cook, precinct six.

I read a couple of days ago, Mr. Suso, you had put on the Town website the affidavit that you had given giving the history and the money spent for the Town turbines.

About a month ago I sent an email to the Town Manager’s office and the Board of Selectmen, asking for before we vote on any more money, as a fiscally responsible project we should be
indicating exactly, in a spreadsheet, what the expenses are in this project, what the outgo is from this project, and that includes legal fees and everything, before we actually are authorizing more money.

I’m in total support of clean energy and support climate change, but as a Town Meeting member I’m supposed to be voting on something and know exactly now the money has been spent.

I found the affidavit very interesting. It had a lot of good information, but it didn’t really paint a clear picture as to where these devices are financially. Thank you.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, we’re going to actually have a presentation and I’ll add you to my list.

MS. PETIT: Good evening.

Slide one, please. Thank you.

This information was presented to the Board of Selectmen and was on a handout for the precinct members for the precinct meeting. So I’m just going to go over the information that was presented.
When we looked at deficit, you know, what would a six months shutdown of Wind I be, we looked at estimated revenue and a refund payment that we would owe to the Mass. CEC and a six month loss of NSTAR revenue, and we looked at the deficit around 169 to 212. So, around 200,000. The policy from the Board of Selectmen and the Town Manager is to fund, you know, a six month deficit into the Receipts Reserved for Appropriation Account.

Next slide, please.

This was another part of the handout that was given to precinct members. So, if you look – people were asking what would the expenses be. In your warrant booklet you vote every year on the annual budget. It’s under Renewable Energy. It’s the line item in the warrant booklet, and that’s: $187,931 goes to the Vestus contract for the maintenance of the turbines. Approximately, for electrical equipment inspections, around 11,000. For insurance, it’s 50,000. For cable, phone and software support, it’s around 10,000. And the debt service is about 400,000. And the cost of electricity provided to the Wastewater Treatment Facility is about 120,000, which is behind the
grid.

And I just want to explain that these numbers aren’t in just one place. There are – you have to pull them out of the budget, because I know people will ask, “I want to see it”. And it’s not: a push of a button, it all comes up. We have to pull them out of different parts of the budget and I just wanted to explain that.

But this is what we looked at, is estimates, when we were looking at operating expenses.

Next slide, please.

So the total estimated revenue is about 212,000 to 168. And the estimated expense, which you just saw, is 787,000. So the operating deficit would be about 570,000.

And I just want to note, too, that in your Town Meeting warrant booklet in April, when we look at the budget, we do transfer that amount of debt service from the Receipts Reserved from Energy Account into the Operating Budget for the debt service. So that’s clearly, you know, every year you can see, you know, what that debt service is. And next slide, please.
FROM THE FLOOR:  [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR:  Yeah, could you just read the red number off again.

MS. PETIT:  Yeah, it’s –

THE MODERATOR:  574 –

MS. PETIT:  – yeah, 574,873 to 638,513.

I apologize for the red.  We were trying to show that it was in the red.  It should be a darker red, so I apologize for that.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay.  So, next on my list, Mr. Shearer.

Thank you, yeah.  Mr. Shearer, you were next on my list.  Oh, the other Mr. Shearer, okay. I knew I wrote Mr. Shearer down.

MR. SHEARER:  Douglas Shearer, precinct 6.

Over the last couple of weeks I’ve been asked by many people, both in my precinct and town-wide, how I was going to vote on this article, or these articles.  So, and quite honestly, until probably last night I really hadn’t made up my mind.

A brief history on how I got to where I stand now.  I am a new Town Meeting member.  I
had left the Town of Falmouth, my home town, about
ten years ago under circumstances that weren’t the
best. I was kind of resentful and very spiteful,
as we talked about last night a little bit. And
because of that I moved to the Town of Bourne. And
to do my part I joined the Planning Board in the
Town of Bourne.

One of the very first projects that I had
the privilege – or maybe it was karma – to deal
with was a wind turbine issue. I fought very
hard, because I believed in that applicant’s
property rights and their ability to put up a wind
turbine. That project was voted down 5 to 2,
myself being one of the minority voters for it.

It was a learning lesson for me. I
believed in green energy, I still believe in green
energy. I thought they had every right to put up
a wind turbine where they wanted to put it up.
They didn’t get that opportunity.

Shortly, a year or two after that,
another project came before our board and that was
proposed by a couple of Falmouth residents. It’s
a great project, the board actually thought it was
a wonderful thing. There was only one problem:
every person against it came in loaded for bear

with “We can’t do this because of you’ve seen

what’s happened in Falmouth.” Over and over and

over again, project after project in Bourne was

shot down, given up, taken off the drawing board

because of Wind I.

Doing my due diligence, I’ve spent many

of hours sitting under there, under that turbine,

driving through the neighborhood, trying, reading

endlessly about health effects, flicker, shadow, on

and on and on. All of which you’ve all heard

about more than enough already.

I truly, truly believe green energy is a

wonderful thing. It’s much better than most – wind

turbines are much better than most other green

energy opportunities.

However, when you do something, you need
to do it correctly, by the board, above board, and

you need to have the trust of the people, the

understanding, a financial game plan. And, as we

have heard and as you guys are so tired of

listening to, not all of that has happened over the

past few years.

As a couple other Town Meeting members
have asked us to turn to page two in our booklet, I wrote them down for you so you don’t actually need to. Even though they’re not numbered, the third one down says “What will it ultimately cost us?” We still do not have that answer. We may never have that answer.

The fourth one down, “How will it affect our basic liberties?” For most of us, it’s not going to make any difference at all. For a few of us, it will. Again, like I said, I fought very hard for wind turbines in my past. I’m not sure I fully believe all the studies on or I’ve had plenty of experts tell me that there aren’t health effects. Some tell me that there are. That’s for the experts to decide; it’s way above my pay grade.

The fifth one down says “Is it in the best interests of all?” I think I just answered that question.

And lastly, “Does it square with my moral convictions?” Well, at this point I would love to see turbines that are operating properly, put up properly, in the right areas, for the right reasons. Do we have that? Again, it’s for you
guys to decide. I’ve already made up my mind for myself.

Just talked about resentment and spite, which were personal feelings of mine. I believe we all have an issue of trust that we also have to deal with. Even last night, which may be the catalyst for my decision on how I vote for the next three articles, trust lately in the Town of Falmouth is a sore subject, I think. I have a list here of the examples I was going to use tonight on what they were. That doesn’t do us any good, it just adds fuel to the fire, so I’m going to skip over that part.

We have gotten to the point where I believe – but it’s tabled, so I’m not really sure yet because we don’t have a required report on what our litigation costs are going to be, but I’m just going to assume because no one’s told me otherwise, that the 350,000 of litigation in a previous article is for wind turbines. Another 200,000 here. Ongoing, ongoing and ongoing.

So, I want everybody – it’s my opinion, it’s my vote – you make up your own minds. Even though I believe in green energy, I believe in the
right to have them up there, and I sure don’t like wasting tax money. And I sure don’t want to see additional monies added to my tax bill. But, enough is enough. Truly, enough is enough.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Dick.

The article 8, with the legal fees and the report, we do have copies of the report on the stage in front of me. So we’ll deal with that after the break. So, folks that want copies may want to review that during the break; you can pick up a copy up on the stage.

Mr. Dick.

MR. DICK: Good evening. It’s nice to be back from a temporary retirement from Town Meeting. My travel schedule has kept me in the air and away too much, so I had to resign my position because if you’re going to be a Town Meeting member, you’d better be there.

I came out of retirement tonight to speak against this article and the other articles that follow.

I have many times stood up in this meeting and championed the underdogs, the place
where the housing lot was going to be turned over
for a very good reason, but in a very inappropriate
place for cranberry growing, because it’s important
to the Town and culture. And every time I feel
like I run up against people who have very good
principles, who are really interested in the right
thing. And it’s a frustration to me that it’s
hard to find balance. And for some people, it’s
very hard to find balance.

I’m a believer in clean energy. I voted
for these windmills as a Town Meeting member and I
feel I was misinformed. I feel that Town Hall did
not do due diligence.

I recently read the full lawyer’s brief
on this from one of the hearings, and I was
appalled. I was appalled at what had happened in
Town Hall, and I was appalled with this proceeding.
I wish everyone in this room could read those
briefs, they’d be equally appalled.

One of the things about principles is
that it often causes one to override concerns about
human suffering. And that’s a tragedy.
Indifference to the suffering of others is really a
terrible thing.
Now, I know these people, many of them. And I have watched them in their lives and what a horrible time they’ve had. And if you think it’s expensive for the Town to fight for the windmills, think of what it’s costing these people out in East Falmouth to fight this.

I am totally unaffected by these windmills, but I’m deeply concerned about what kind of town we are. What kind of town we are. And I say that how we treat our citizens is key. And I say indifference to human suffering is terrible. And I urge you all to think about the old joke about the lawyer and the judge watching a hanging. And the judge said, “She really shouldn’t have been hung, but it was a matter of principle.” And the lawyer replied, “Your principle, Your Honor, his life.” So, please vote against this.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Heath.

MR. HEATH: Austin Heath, precinct 8. At our precinct meeting I said to support this I’d need hard figures. They haven’t come. Year after year we vote deficits to make up what we’re not making. But many of those deficits came from the order that we had to limit the hours of
operation.

When this was first presented, and I remember this distinctly, we were told that these windmills would have a 38 percent efficiency. I have friends that were in the utility business, and they said they didn’t believe it.

What we have never seen and what I asked for in the meeting is actually income and expense, operational figures, both on what we’ve actually gotten over the years, each year. Are these making any money? And that includes debt service. And even if you raise those figures to account for 24/7 operation, would we ever make any money out of these? Because it makes a big difference of whether if we’ve got a problem that we cannot solve operationally no matter what we vote, or whether or not it’s time to just say we made a mistake, and start working to how we reduce or meet the expenses incurred.

I had my own business for quite a few years. But when I went into that business – and it was my money – I found that if you make a mistake, the best thing you can possibly do is admit it right away and then see where you go from
I don’t think – I’d like to see the real figures before I vote for any more money on this. And we don’t even get them. What is the efficiency rating? What are we getting for a rate as opposed to the alternative rates? Can we ever make any money on this, no matter what we do?

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, Brent Putnam, precinct 9.

I’m going to echo what Mr. Cook and what Mr. Heath have said. This body has two primary responsibilities. One is to vote and approve bylaws, and the other is budgets and money.

And what we’re lacking tonight -- and I appreciate what Ms. Petit put up there this evening, but first of all I couldn’t read the red, either, even from my angle. And I’m not even sure were those numbers for six months, for one year? There was no time frame associated with the numbers that were put up there.

THE MODERATOR: It said six months at the top of the slide.
MR. PUTNAM: Did it?

THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Put the slide up.

MR. PUTNAM: My apologies. I may have –

THE MODERATOR: Why don’t we leave the slide up, so they can see the numbers while we’re debating this.

MR. PUTNAM: But there’s something missing from this and that is, as the last several speakers have mentioned, is the overall numbers. We keep coming back here, being asked for more money, for more money, for more money. And, as many of you know, I was a little bit closer to this, having been a Selectmen myself throughout much of this process, and I know for example that a lot of our legal expenses are being covered by our liability insurance, our liability carrier. But there’s still money coming out of our pockets, and frankly at this point I’d like to see a complete accounting of where everything has gone and where we’re going with this. Because there comes a point in time when you’ve really got to cut your losses. You know, the old saying, “Fish or cut
bait”, because we’re going to keep throwing money
at this.

For most of us in this room, we can go
home and we’re not going to really have any vested
interest in whether those turbines spin or they
don’t. And we can talk about global warming, we
can talk about air pollution, we can talk about all
the benefits of wind turbines, but all of that is
sort of ethereal. It’s not a direct benefit that
any of us can see or touch or taste, and so it
really doesn’t matter to us. When we go to bed,
it’s going to be outside of our minds. But the
neighbors who live there, Folks, these turbines are
still there, they’re still in their minds. And
regardless whether there’s one study that says that
they’re beneficial or one study that says they’re
not, regardless of whether we believe that it’s in
their heads or whether it’s real, it’s real for
them.

And they’re going to continue to fight
this. They’d been fighting this when I was a
selectman, they’re fighting this now and I’m not a
selectman. They have a vested interest in this,
ladies and gentlemen, that most of us don’t. And
they, as just pointed out, they’re continuing to
spend their own money and their own energy and
their own time to fight this, and guess what?
They’re winning.

When I was on the Board, we were given
legal advice and, quite frankly, looking back on it
-- because hindsight always is 20-20, isn’t it --
we were told, “No problem, slam dunk”, and then we
lost. “Oh, no problem, slam dunk”, and then we
lost. And then we lost and then we lost.

And right now, Folks, we’re looking at
several articles here that are asking us to spend
more money. One article that’s asking us to
retroactively rezone the property so we can win a
battle that we’ve lost. This is really getting
comical, if not, as one recent writer pointed out,
absurd.

Mr. Moderator, I move that we table this
until we get a full accounting of what we’re
spending and what we’re getting out of this.
Because quite frankly the state is subsidizing
this; I know that. We all know that. Those
things are spinning to satisfy somebody’s ego at
this point.
We’re paying for it, Folks; as Mr. Latimer said, it’s coming out of pockets one way or the other, but the question is are we going to continue to fight the neighbors – because we’re going to pay that way – or we’re going to reconsider this whole situation. Which is why I’d like to have the numbers, so I can see whether it’s worthwhile fighting, or just call it quits and move on.

Thank you for your time.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, now, the question to table, we have to take an action on every article before we can adjourn and dissolve a meeting. And we’ve only got three articles on this warrant. So this is going to require a two-thirds to table it, but we can’t adjourn the Special Town Meeting until we’ve taken action on all the articles. Okay?

So, the question comes on tabling this article. All in favor say aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]
THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the no’s have it and my next one is Mr. Wilber.

MR. WILBER: Good evening, everybody. My name is Jude Wilber; I’m from precinct 8.

And, you know, I really like Town Meeting. I really like Falmouth’s Town Meeting because it’s one of the last holdouts of representative democracy at this scale anywhere in the country. You know, it really is. And I would hate to see it dissolve because of issues like this, where people just can’t seem to come together and make a decision.

This one’s particularly sticky because here we’re running up against principles on one side and money on the other side. Okay? And that’s a hard one. That’s a hard one.

And, you know, I’ve been watching this like many people. I thought Mr. Shearer’s presentation was very enlightening. I’ve been out there; I’ve talked with the people. I was on one side, then I was on another side. And now, as you can see, I’m standing in the middle.

[Laughter.]
MR. WILBER: But, but – haha. I just want to point out that this is difficult. This is a difficult thing, and it’s been made more difficult over the years by I think a lack of -- can I say this? -- a willingness to compromise. And at the point we’re at now, I don’t think it’s -- I think the principle is all wrong to try to retro- zone an area to make something that is already there legal.

I know it’s going to cost money, but the sooner this is taken care of in some sort of a fashion that does not compromise the principles of the town and this Town Meeting, then that’s what I’ll vote for. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Hargraves.

MR. Hargraves: Good evening. Peter Hargraves, precinct 9.

I have a question for the financial director. If we could get to the page that summarizes all the information about revenue and expenses. Maybe it’s a page or two beyond this. Another one.

Didn’t you have one with everything on the same page, Jennifer?
THE MODERATOR: The last slide, I think it was.

MR. HARGRAVES: So, my position and point of view on this, personally, has been guided by an assumption that under the right conditions we could eventually make some money on running the turbines. And I realize that the revenue there reflects 12 hour operation and so the revenue is maybe half of 24 hour operation and there’s a penalty perhaps because of curtailed operation.

So, am I right in assuming, just to settle once and for all, if we ran the turbines 24/7, would the revenue exceed the expenses and so would it be a positive cash flow?

THE MODERATOR: Who’s the best one for this? Ms. Petit?

MS. PETIT: I think it was about -- wait a minute - a year or two ago, there was a presentation to the Board of Selectmen that - I was involved in putting the information together but I wasn’t involved in the overall presentation, and it is on the website. And there’s different scenarios of estimated revenue if you run it 24/7, 16 hour operation, 12, and those are estimates that were
prepared with a consultant. Because, you know, when it’s more windy it’ll generate more money.

So, that’s really where all that information is. There’s different – different scenarios on different hours of operation. It’s on the website. I don’t have it at my fingertips.

MR. HARGRAVES: So, is the short answer then that there are conditions under which they would make money? Because if – if under any condition –

THE MODERATOR: I think we have an answer to that.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JONES: I haven’t looked at the numbers recently, but my recollection is 24/7 they would make money. At about 18 hours, seven days a week, it was about a break-even. And at 12 hours, seven days a week, it was a loss.

MR. HARGRAVES: Thank you.

So, the comment I’d like to make, and it’s a little different point of view than some of what we have heard so far. And frankly I had second thoughts about getting up here. And I’m embarrassed to say that because this should be a
safe environment. But anyone who’s read their
e-mail over the last two weeks and sees what’s been
flowing on this issue might share some concern and
trepidation about speaking on the wrong side of
this issue.

And I’m basically supportive of it if
it’s a money-making proposition. And the reason
for that I guess is because there were some
decisions made – there are all kinds of
insinuations about our appointed and elected
officials and others, but until malfeasance or
criminal behavior is proven or until someone is
accused, my assumption is that everyone was acting
in their – in the best interest of the Town and
performing their function in a, you know,
professional manner, when these decisions were made
and the turbines were installed. In spite of the
emotional arguments on both sides of those issues.

And to think about it as raising your
kids. You look back and you say, “Gee, I wish I
hadn’t”, or “I wish I had”, but you do the best you
can at the time and you can’t turn the pages back.
And part of the problem we’re having here, I think,
is that we keep trying to turn the pages back and
re-visit decisions that have been made, and we have
to get into a mindset that we’re in this place
today and we have to move forward.

The second thing I’d like to add is I’m
kind of disappointed with Town Meeting as a whole,
because when I joined up I -- being elected, my
understanding from the training I got was this is a
representative Town Meeting. The 27 members of
precinct 9 stand up for 3,000 voters in precinct 9.
And I have several colleagues here who were against
running the turbines and they said, “Gee, we almost
took ‘em down, you know? It was 63 to 37,” or
whatever it was. But it went to the ballot, and
guess what? The citizens of Falmouth said, you
know, more than two to one majority, “We want to
run them.” And I thought I was here to do the
bidding of the citizens of Falmouth. And yes, my
personal point of view and values gets folded in,
but frankly, I’m supposed to be representing those
people who voted out there in the ballot box.
And so I think Town Meeting should scratch their
chins and wonder if they’re not standing on their
own personal platforms, or if they’re truly
representing the people who put them here.
And frankly, you know, I stand here with some trepidation because of what I told you about the email messages. But I, you know, I don’t believe that democracy should be driven by fear and intimidation and name-calling, so I choose to make this statement. And if this is a viable financial proposition, I stand for the article 2, which says that we have to figure out how to make it as such.

I do not vote that I support the people who want to cut off the funding if we don’t have the courage to execute. The people of Falmouth have already given us the vision. They say, 70-30, “Run the turbines”. The leadership responsible for implementing that vision has not had the courage to do it, because the tools are at their disposal.

And, irrespective of everything that’s gone on in court -- which is a bunch of hand wringing. So I would say, you know, we should treat everyone fairly and with sensitivity, but understand that not everyone is going to be a hundred percent satisfied in a democracy. And 70-30 wins in any democracy that I’m aware of.

So, thank you for listening.
Mr. Smolowitz, Mr. Smolowitz.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Let’s go. I’ve got a growing list, but let’s let the folks speak. Go ahead.

MR. SMOLOWITZ: Ron Smolowitz, precinct 8.

I’m just interested in talking about the money aspect of this thing. Back in the Special Town Meeting in July, 2009, when we voted for Wind II, a few of you might remember it was myself and one other person that spoke out against this wind turbine. And it was strictly on a financial standpoint.

I had said to Town Meeting at that time and on numerous occasions before, that it would have been better off going with the 600 kW turbine and the million watts of solar. Because the numbers didn’t make sense to me. The financial numbers did not make sense.

But, Town Meeting in its wisdom voted for green energy of this particular nature, put up the turbine and now it’s up.
So now I have to re-evaluate the situation.

I’m really disappointed at the group up there because you’re not doing a real good job of presenting the information. Saying, “Oh, it’s on the website”. You mean you didn’t come prepared to present the information that that turbine, if it’s running 24/7, those two turbines will produce somewhere between 200 and 300,000 dollars, and as the debt service goes down they’ll be producing $500,000 a year in revenue, net revenue? And you haven’t presented what it would cost to take them down, which is a part of the economic situation. You’re really not doing your job. You’re not explaining the economics of the situation that we’re in. Forgetting all the other issues.

So, I – I mean, you haven’t even presented – there’s another similar turbine, a third turbine up there, and it’s production and it’s dollar value is available online. Anybody could go and see what these things can produce. And, yeah, I think I was right. We would have been much better off going solar. Again, economically. It would have produced more money because of the 50
cent RECS, which were not taken into the calculation in 2009.

So we’re in a particular situation now. But financially, again, just looking at the financials, it makes more sense to run those turbines and — and hopefully the maintenance contract will hold up and we’re not going to get what I worry is major maintenance and repair costs that don’t get covered. But, if we believe in these numbers, these are going to produce profit. They’re not going to cost us. And right now, that’s the choice from a financial standpoint.

And I’m not going to talk about the other issues. But, financially, it makes sense to vote yes in this, and financially it makes sense to keep them running. And I wish you people would defend these things instead of just sitting up there.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. -- are you going to respond to the question? Okay. Okay, go ahead and then Mr. Potamis after. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I’d like to clarify what this article is
asking for. This is a response to an Operating
Budget that we put forward last year that was
expecting in the neighborhood of $200,000 in income
to be able to balance our budget. Due to the cease
and desist order put out by our Board of Appeals,
we know that we are not going to be making the
income that we need to be able to balance our
budget, and so we’re coming to Town Meeting to be
able to balance the budget by replacing the income
that we are not making with the $200,000 from Free
Cash.

Concerning the other figures about how
much money these turbines could make, we’ve seen
those figures for the past four or five years. On
this article we did not feel it was necessary to
make those presentations because all we’re talking
about is making sure that we’re replenishing funds
that we were expecting for income. That’s what
this article is about. It is not – this article
is not about running them, taking them down. It
is merely about making sure that we have a line
item to be able to make sure that we have a
balanced budget for this year.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Potamis.
MR. POTAMIS: Gerry Potamis, precinct 2 and also the Wastewater Superintendent.

I thank the Chairman for going over that this is a fiscal article. And this is a fiscal
decision. The other two articles we can debate,
but as one that has lived through a lot of this, I
can assume you all these things have been answered
and answered and answered.

As far as the efficiency of the turbines,
these are one of the most efficient turbines that
Vestus makes. This is not me speaking, this their
technical people. It doesn’t mean we’re making 33
percent of interest - or 38 percent. I remember
33 and I think the number could be 30 percent.
It’s how you measure energy and the energy of the
mechanical equipment, and I don’t want to get into
the physics because I’d probably not get it right.

As far as money, we don’t get a dime
until the courts, not the ZBA, until the courts
tell us to take it down. We’re hanging out there.
If we don’t try to deliver money -- and some people
may say, “It’s a waste of money”. I never thought
defending oneself in the court is a waste of money.

I’m also glad someone brought up about
the hearing in front of the ZBA. We should all be diplomats, not that I’m high on the list of being one. But I try, and I know when I fall short. Which is often. But one of the things I see with the hysterics from the attorneys is the fact that people don’t want to compromise. We spent a year in the wind turbine operations. No compromise. It came at a Zoning Board of Appeals meeting that the offer was made and counter-offered and one of the gentlemen in the litigation said, “I don’t want to take it.” His attorney in open meeting said, “That’s not true.” We have his client and we have the attorney. Who do you want to believe?

I would like to get back to what the chairman said. This is about fiscal responsibility. Legislators have fiscal responsibilities. We all have morals and we all have principles, and you can read the Bible if you want and you can get anything out of it you want. I daresay we’re all principled; no one wants to hurt our neighbors. But there’s no clear cut if we’re harming anybody. There’s differences of opinion.

The courts will settle it.
So I think let’s have the debate and hopefully I won’t have to get up, but let’s have the debate on the fiscal responsibility that the Town owes this money. You may not like it, but if you’re a businessman or you pay your bills, you pay your bills and then you try to resolve the issue. And the resolving of the issue is diplomacy and compromise. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lichtenstein.

Stand up so they know who you are.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: I had a letter in the Enterprise last week. We did vote, the Town, and two-thirds of the people voted they wanted to keep them up.

We have been trying to reach a compromise. I don’t think there’s a compromise here, Folks. And I think a lot of the people that voted might have voted differently if they knew that there wasn’t a compromise.

We really have two options. We can shut them down, or we can take the property by eminent domain, and remove the neighbors.

I’m all for green energy. I’ve been an environmentalist all my life. I’m a biology
teacher. I personally don’t think it’s fair for me to say, “Hi, neighbor, I’m beating you over the head 24 hours a day.” And you complain, and I say, “Okay, I’m only going to do it 12 hours a day. Now you should be happy.” I don’t think we can do that.

We have to take the responsibility, Folks, the whole town has to take the responsibility. If you are willing to vote to have the Town buy the properties, then we’ll keep the turbines running. If you’re not willing to buy the properties and move the neighbors out, then I think we have to turn them off. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Mr. Zweig.

MR. ZWEIG: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: And then we’re almost ready to do this.

Go ahead.

MR. ZWEIG: No, I was going to actually say what Mr. Smolowitz said, but the total over between 2015 and 2025, as calculated by the Town’s consultant, was close to $4 million dollars in net gain from the turbines over that period. I’ll be
discussing this and other points in the next article when it comes up.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Rhodes.

MR. RHODES: Scoba Rhodes, precinct 8.

I’ve been sitting in this audience a number of years, now, and we’re beating a dead horse. I - I suggest that we give me the opportunity now to call the question and let’s get on what we need for some answers.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question requires a two-thirds vote to close discussion. All those in favor of closing discussion 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 the two-thirds and I so declare. The question has been called. The question will now come on the main motion as recommended, to vote to appropriate and transfer the sum of $200,000 from Certified Free Cash into the Energy Receipts Reserved for...
Appropriations Account. This is a simple majority.

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 majority.

Yes, Mr. Oppenheim. Do we have a point of order or something?

MR. OPPENHEIM: I’m Jeff Oppenheim, precinct 2.

Before we enter into Article 2 I’d like to present a motion. The motion is to limit the debate to 90 minutes on Article 2 of the Special Town Meeting, with proponents and opponents given 15 minutes to present their initial positions, followed by alternating speakers for and against the article, not to exceed five minutes in duration each.

I don’t believe that’s open for discussion.

THE MODERATOR: So it’s 90 minutes total
and you said 15 opening. Fifteen minutes opening?
And five after that. So the 15 is the standard —
okay, you’ve got it in writing, good.

All right, the motion to limit debate
requires a two-thirds vote. This would do 90
minutes on the article, 15 for opening
presentation, one on each side, and each speaker
five minutes apiece. All those in favor of the
limitation of debate, signify by — yeah.

MR. LATIMER: [No mic:] I would agree
with this except —

THE MODERATOR: No, no, this is not a
debatable motion. Do you have a point of order?

MR. Latimer: Point of order.

THE MODERATOR: Yep.

MR. LATIMER: [No mic:] There’s two of
us who are the proponents of Article 2. And each
one speaks for seven and a half minutes.
[Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so, yeah, so your
presentation can be 15 total.

MR. LATIMER: Yes. [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Yes, we’ll do
that for 15, and then you guys split it in half.
Perfect.

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 third division, Mrs. Long.

MS. LONG: 52.

THE MODERATOR: 52.

In the first division, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: 47.

THE MODERATOR: 47.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: 68.

THE MODERATOR: 68.

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

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: First division.
MR. NETTO: 9.

THE MODERATOR: 9.

Third division.

MS. LONG: 2.

THE MODERATOR: 2.

Second division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 22.

THE MODERATOR: 22.

By a counted vote of 167 in favor and 33 opposed, the limitation will be placed on debate.

The chair would entertain a main motion from the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen on Article 2.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 2 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: If we can just hold a second, here, we’re making sure we have something that goes down to the second.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. No, because we have a minute clock up here. So, since we’re doing five minutes, we want to make sure we’re – excellent. There’s an app for that, great. Thank you. Ha, ha.
[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the main motion as printed, and who will be making the opening presentation?

Yes, Mr. Zweig.

MR. ZWEIG: Thank you, could you put up my slide.

Thank you, Mr. Moderator, for the opportunity to present in favor of positive vote on Article 2.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

MR. ZWEIG: Oh, oh. Thank you, Mr. Moderator, for the opportunity to present in favor of a positive vote on Article 2.

Good evening, I am Ron Zweig; I live in precinct one.

Slide.

The article reads as follows: to see if the Town will vote to support the Board of Selectmen’s efforts towards maximizing the benefits and thereby minimizing any financial burden to Falmouth citizens from operation of the Town’s municipal turbines at its Wastewater Treatment Facility at 154 Blacksmith Shop Road, West
Falmouth, Massachusetts.

The purpose of this article is to show our town’s support for the Board of Selectmen to maximize the benefits and operation of our municipal turbines.

There’s already been discussion this evening about the vote on May 21st, 2013 at a two to one margin not to finance removal of the turbines. One thing that has not been mentioned is that that vote even included a 54 percent majority in precinct 6, where the turbines are located, not to take them down, or not to finance their taking down. These citizens are the same as those who elected us to represent them.

The removal of the turbines at that time was estimated to be about $10 million for decommissioning and an additional $15 million loss by their offset of the purchase of electricity for municipal purposes generated by them. Yes, a whopping $25 million cost to taxpayers of Falmouth.

We are now again faced with the threat of the same burden of that crippling figure. From a fiscal standpoint alone, without considering environmental benefits, not to retain and operate
the turbines as planned will cause in real
financial terms an enormous hardship for our
townspeople and a certain reduction in services
they deserve: schools, public works, libraries,
police, fire and rescue, public safety, et cetera.
In fact, no reasonable plan has been put forward on
how to finance such an irresponsible action by the
proponents of turbine removal. How many town jobs
will be eliminated, families displaced and services
lost by such an action?

We also know issues have been raised via
the courts and Town boards by a handful of property
owners, eight of about 200 within one-half mile of
the turbines, or about 0.03 percent town-wide,
mainly over procedural technicalities and other
very questionable assertions over adverse impacts
by the turbines.

About 16 in total in that area have filed
written complaints with the Town in the past, eight
percent of the property owners, which amounts to
0.06 percent town-wide.

I do not have time this evening to delve
into all of the self-reported issues raised, but
will show the results of just a couple recent
scientific peer-reviewed analyses that challenge the validity of those claims, especially as they relate to health and real estate values. On health, there is consensus among experts that the perceived effects are specifically related to NOCEBO, or psychogenic factors. And on real estate values, as a direct indicator of well-being, home sales within one-half mile of the turbines are on par with sales across Falmouth and have overwhelmingly exceeded their assessed values since the turbines went up, with one sale 32 percent above that value.

All such studies find no evidence - find no adverse impacts on health and property values. Here are a few recent pertinent studies.

Slide.

This is an October 19th, 2015 letter to the Board of Selectmen and the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Falmouth Board of Health on one recent health study.

Slide.

What it says is this: “Dear Board Members, in a letter dated September 5th, 2013, the Board of Health recommended that the Board of
Selectmen consider changes to nighttime operation of the two wind turbines at West Falmouth Wastewater Treatment Plant based on concerns about sleep interruption impacting the neighbors. However, at that time, there was insufficient evidence in the peer-reviewed literature to support a health-based curtailment by the Board of Health. “A comprehensive study of health effects of the wind turbines has now been completed by Health Canada, and accepted for publication, entitled ‘Wind Turbine Noise and Health Study’. We encourage you to consider the conclusions in your deliberations concerning the fate of Falmouth’s two wind turbines, and note that regulatory findings based on health effects of wind turbines should be supported by peer reviewed scientific literature.” Signed by all the members of the Board of Health.

Slide.

The study included A-weighted, that is dB(A) low frequency and infrasound noise measurements from wind turbines with over more than 4,000 hours of wind turbine noise measurements, involving 1,238 households, most within 600 meters or 1,968 feet to large turbines like ours. The
following were not found to be associated with wind
turbine noise exposure: self-reported sleep/general
disturbance, use of sleep medication, diagnosed
sleep disorders, self-reported illnesses,
dizziness, tinnitus, prevalence of frequent
migraines and headaches and chronic health
conditions, heart disease, blood pressure and
diabetes, and self-reported perceived stress and
quality of life.

While some individuals reported some of
the health conditions above, their prevalence was
not found to change in relation to wind turbine
noise levels.

At the bottom there’s a tiny URL where
you can find this online at Falmouth BOH, and you
might take note of that because none of this has
been reported in the local media except on Falmouth
Patch.

Slide.

On real estate values, here’s the 2014
statistically valid relationship between wind
turbines and residential property values studied by
the University of Connecticut and Lawrence Berkeley
National Laboratory.
As can be seen, the study included 122,000 residential and real estate sales and evaluated a wide range of impacts, beneficial and adverse, on residential property values, including some near Falmouth’s wind turbines NRWWTF:

Landfills, like the one in the vicinity of our turbines; transmission lines; highways, such as the one near our turbines; prisons; open space; beaches; beachfront and operating wind turbines. As you can see, the impact of the wind turbines is negligible. Okay.

In the conclusion of the report is: weak evidence suggests that the announcement of the wind turbine facilities had a modest adverse impact on home prices, but those effects were no longer apparent after turbine construction and operation commenced. That’s what we’re seeing here.

Options to remedy the challenge before us should be as revenue beneficial as possible.

What’s most critical is not to throw away public funds and burden this town with debt in the short
term or possibly even for a generation. What’s probably well beyond our service to this body, with no benefit to taxpayers, the Town has taken several actions to try and resolve the matter, including many months of effort –

THE MODERATOR: We’re at 7:30, just so you know.

MR. ZWEIG: What?

THE MODERATOR: We’re at seven minutes, 30 seconds, just so you know.

MR. ZWEIG: Oh, okay, sorry.

All right. So we’ve already talked about the wind turbine analysis process that came to naught. And we already talked about the litigant who was offered – made an offer to, concerning a nuisance claim and rejected it. The litigant made a counter-offer, the Town accepted it, and then in court the litigant reneged on it.

Similarly, there was an –

MR. LATIMER: I’m going up.

MR. ZWEIG: Okay, I’m just about finished. Okay –

[Laughter.]

MR. ZWEIG: – just about finished.
Okay, most of us, if not all in this community, have compassion for those who claim to be adversely impacted. We have made important steps in this town through the leadership of the Boards of Selectmen in the past toward more sustainable renewable energy development and energy efficiency actions and we need to continue that.

This cannot be reversed. While we –

MR. LATIMER: Well, let me cut to the chase, here. Cut to the chase.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Ron has adequately described the doubts that many of us have about these adverse effects. It’s not a clear-cut case that these exist. But what this article does, it assumes, okay, these people have a grievance. We’re giving them that; there is a grievance there.

The question is: how do we address that grievance in a rational way, in a way that is fair to the taxpayers, in a way that is also fair to the people who claim to have the grievance. That is the issue, here.

Because what we are told is, and the reason Ron and I got involved in this, is we heard
that it was going to cost $15 million to tear the
turbines down. That’s $15 million taxpayer
dollars, whether it comes from us locally or
whether it comes from us as state taxpayers through
the state, it’s still $15 million. That is a
waste of money. Why? Because we spent $15

Now, who, who, who among us thinks that
is rational?

The only benefit that we get from this is
some feel-good political result where a handful,
less than one percent of the citizens of this town
are going to get their satisfaction. These are
the people that have had a scorched earth policy of
pushing this, pushing this. Like Ron said, one of
the people was offered money. He said, “No.” We
said, “Give us a counter demand.” He gave the
counter demand, the Town said yes, he back out.
Who’s driving that? Who – who – who got to him to
get him to back out of that?

There’s other interests here besides
those people.

We spent $15 million to tear the turbines
down. Now, there’s a Latin word, a Latin phase
called Cui bono. Who benefits from that? Well, sure, the small percentage of people who live near the turbines, they’re going to benefit. Who else? Well, the anti-wind industry out there.

Mr. Shearer was telling us about the people who came to his board talking about this. It wasn’t just the local there, it was the anti-wind industry. There are people out there making money. And who are they serving? Not necessarily neighbors and friends and neighbors in this town. They’re serving A, the fossil fuel industry; B, companies like Eversource; and C, the Koch brothers, yes. That’s who they’re serving. Those are the people that really benefit.

Mr. Shearer says those people, the opposition that he was getting in Bourne was, “Well, look at Falmouth, look at what’s happening in Falmouth.” Well, what do you think is going to happen to green energy if we spend $25 million to tear the turbines down? Never mind the money, the relatively small amount of money that we’re going to have to spend to do what this article proposes. And what this article proposes is simply to enable the Selectmen to authorize and direct them to
explore other alternatives. If we’re going to have to spend $15 million, there are smarter ways to spend it. We want the Selectmen to figure that out and come back and report to us what that might be.

Now, there’s this bugaboo out there: oh, it’s a takings article. Well, that’s the last resort. There are steps short of a takings that we can do. For example, we can negotiate settlements. Cash settlements where people can stay in their homes if they want to and they’re satisfied with a cash settlement. Or we can do voluntary buy-outs. That’s not a taking, that’s get them the place that they want and we get a release.

Now, this article doesn’t do any of that. At this point it’s just simply to authorize and ask the Selectmen to go and explore these avenues, find out what’s going to be the most cost effective way of dealing with this apart from just tearing it down and doing great service to the petroleum industry in this country, which is why we are promoting green energy in the first place, is to get off of our dependence on the petroleum
industry.

There’s a saying: act locally, but think globally. And for us to just spend $15 million as a handful of people want us to do to tear these turbines down is, in terms of global policy, insane and disastrous and ultimately it is fiscally irresponsible. What we would be asking the taxpayers to authorize us to spend $15 million to tear the turbines down when there would be other alternatives that we should be exploring. And that’s what this article is for and I would suggest that we say Yes to Article 2, ask the Selectmen to do their job, which they are willing to do, and come back to us. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: The Chair wants to be clear that the motion doesn’t include a reporting back requirement or anything. It’s really a non-binding resolution for them to maximize it. Okay.

MR. LATIMER: Yes –

THE MODERATOR: I just want to be clear that’s what –

MR. LATIMER: – it’s a non-binding resolution. It’s just simply asking the Selectmen to do this.
THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. ZWEIG: Do we have any more –

THE MODERATOR: You want to keep going, yeah.

MR. ZWEIG: I just think that that one

more thing that’s critical to realize –

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

MR. ZWEIG: Oh, just one more thing

that’s critical to realize is that, you know, we

have to look at what more can the Town do to

resolve this, basically. And what it comes down
to is that if we take them down, we’re going to

affect the financial well-being or threaten our

public employees livelihood. You can’t put faces

to those employees today, but as things progress,

if they were to be taken down, we’re going to be

displacing people, we’re going to be cutting back

on services. This is going to be a catastrophe

for the Town of Falmouth and for the people.

Many of those people may be sitting in

this room tonight, who may be losing their

livelihoods, so we have to look at a balance, here.

This is something that needs to be looked at and

resolved in a very fair manner that is reasonable
to all concerned.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, now who’s going to make the lead presentation opposed to this article?

Okay, yes, Ms. Fenwick.

MS. FENWICK: I’m Judy Fenwick, precinct 1. I don’t have a PowerPoint presentation this evening, and I will probably only speak for about five minutes.

I’m just going to get my text up in front of me, thank you.

So, what I want to talk about is finding alternatives for moving beyond wind to solar, in the context of this article as written, while we’re talking about minimizing financial burden to Falmouth and supporting the Selectmen’s efforts towards maximizing those benefits.

In December, I’ll attend the UN Climate Conference in Paris as a registered observer. The prospect is strong that, with this Climate Conference will come a global accord for gaining traction on this most critical issue. How do we bring that back to Falmouth?

Climate change, climactic disruption,
global warming, all of these issues have been a major concern of mine for decades in my professional and personal life. So in 2004, when Town management proposed renewable energy to run the Wastewater Treatment Plant and to produce additional electricity and income, I like many of you was enthusiastic in support of. As a Town Meeting member, a concerned citizen and a taxpayer, I was supportive.

Both solar power and wind power were discussed in those early stages, yet the Town pursued only wind. With insufficient background data, installation of industrial larger and more powerful – excuse me, installation of industrial-sized turbines without a permit, special or otherwise, that were far larger and more powerful than anticipated, and with no input for these changes from the community, including the neighbors, the project was flawed.

I, like many, was confused.

After several false starts to look closely and factually at the turbine problem and find a solution, the Board of Selectmen initiated the wind turbine option process in 2012. It was
conducted independently by the Consensus Building
Institute and paid for by the state of
Massachusetts Clean Energy Center. The WTOP
included all stakeholders: neighbors, wind
proponents and individuals who looked at all
perspectives to find a balanced solution to end the
conflict. I served as one of the two individuals
in that last role. And it also included Town
employees, citizens concerned with property rights
and values.

The WTOP submitted a report in 2013 with
recommendations to the Selectmen. I do believe
that recently the Town Manager stated that the WTOP
never came to any resolution. We were not charged
with coming to a resolution, only to make
recommendations to the Selectmen.

The one option contained in that report
that could satisfy all stakeholders in this case
was Section 5.3, and that was entitled, “Removal of
the Turbines and Replacement With a Photovoltaic
Array”. And that came complete with financial
analysis provided by Town and Mass. CEC
Consultants, showing the removal and solar
replacement could be accomplished for $3.9 million.
And I would like to make sure that the current 
Selectmen have all visited or re-visited that 
report and are very aware of that section. 

The Falmouth EDIC will put three articles 
before our Town Meeting that propose a 5.3 megawatt 
solar garden. And that would be on the capped 
landfill and could potentially save the Town 
$200,000 to $500,000 in reduced energy costs. This 
project will keep the Town moving ahead with its 
energy goals. And, when either by choice or by 
legal directive the turbines stop operating, the 
Town will already have in place a reliable 
renewable energy source. Maybe not producing 
quite as much energy as the turbines would if they 
were running 24/7, but to me this is a good 
compromise.

So, balancing global and local 
perspectives in energy consumption and low cost 
alternative energy development is almost an art 
form. With the upcoming closure of the Pilgrim 
nuclear plant, the push will be on to develop more 
alternative energy sources with low or no emissions 
in Massachusetts. We know in this state that 
land-based wind project development is static. We
know that natural gas projects with lower emissions and increased infrastructure will blossom. And we know more municipal solar projects will come online if the state lifts its current cap on net metering to allow for greater solar energy development.

The combination of technology development, scientific evidence, economic forces and political realities are all in play, here.

The hard political reality for Falmouth is that we need to get beyond wind, with all its messy moving parts, both literal and figurative, and on to solar.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the limitation motion asked for us to rotate speakers. So when you get my attention that you want to speak, raise your right hand if you’re going to speak in favor -

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: No, I’m serious, so I can keep track of this.

You raise your right hand if you’re going to speak in favor, and raise your left hand if you’re going to speak opposed when you get my attention to speak. Okay?

So, Mr. Putnam.
MR. PUTNAM: Sorry. I looked up that Canadian study to see what it said, and something jumped out at me. It said: "The results may not be generalized" – excuse me, Brent Putnam, precinct 9.

"The results may not be generalized to areas beyond the sample, as the wind turbine locations in this study were not randomly selected from all possible sites operating in Canada." And we can infer from that all possible sites operating in the world. In other words, the study is only applicable to what they studied, and everything else is sort of irrelevant.

It was already stated and I’ll state it again. The Board did try to negotiate; the Board failed. You all remember that straw poll we did last night about should we have the meeting here or should we have it at the high school. Everybody voted in favor of it. And then Mr. Vieira said, "Oh, by the way, Town Meeting rejected it years ago." It’s – the same thing applies to the myth of that 2013 vote, ladies and gentlemen, because yes, the Town voted two to one against it, but what
I heard after the vote were people saying, “I don’t want the turbines, but I don’t want to pay to take ‘em down.” I had people telling me, “Why don’t we just let them stay there and rust and then we don’t have to take them down, we don’t have to pay to take them down.”

There was a lot of misconceptions about that vote, ladies and gentlemen, so to use that as sort of a referendum to say that we need to keep the turbines up because that’s what the people said, it really doesn’t work very well like that.

And, to Mr. Hargraves’ point, we are elected to represent the people, not to parrot the people. Democracy, ladies and gentlemen, is flawed in that a direct Democracy is essentially mob rule, and it is up to us as representatives of the people to think through this carefully and weigh all the facts as they are presented to us, and not just take a straw poll and say, “What does everybody think about this?”

I really don’t know - I’m speaking, I guess, in opposition to this article, but the point is, is that it’s a straw poll that we’re talking here, ladies and gentlemen, and I don’t think it’s
going to help us.

In 2013, when the Board of Selectmen put that article here before Town Meeting and asked that we put it in front of the town, the Board looked down the road and saw what we’re seeing now, that it was not going to get any better, that it was going to continue to cost us money, and yeah, if we can operate the turbines 24 by 7, they will make money. But they haven’t been operated 24 by 7 in years, ladies and gentlemen, and they continue to lose money and the state continues to subsidize us. And we continue to debate it. And so we’re sitting out there bobbing in our boat. We’re still fishing, but we’re not pulling in any fish. And at some point we’ve got to come home and rest.

And I ask you all to vote this down, because somebody needs a straw poll somewhere, apparently, because, with all due respect to the Board, and I was up there and we made a decision, but I don’t see the Board making any decisions right now.

Please vote no, ladies and gentlemen.

Somebody needs guidance here.
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Patterson. Mr.

Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Sam Patterson, precinct 2. Speaking for myself, but of course I am a Selectman.

Like most of you, I have done a lot of soul-searching on this issue. As a physics teacher who also taught a course in environmental systems, I am well aware of the growing need to conserve coal, petroleum, and natural gas. Basically energy is what allows us to refine, modify, fabricate, construct and transport things. It's absolutely essential for us to have the kind of quality of life that we have.

At a Massachusetts Municipal Association's Selectmen's meeting this fall, Lieutenant Governor Karyn Polito indicated the concern the Baker administration has about the need for energy to sustain our vibrant Massachusetts economy and our high quality of life.

I will be attending a state briefing for municipal leaders December 3rd in Fall River which is being given to educate municipal leaders about the potential impacts of Entergy's de-commissioning
of two nuclear power plants. These power plants contribute a significant amount of electrical energy to the Southeastern Massachusetts load zone of the electrical grid. At this time, replacement of those sources of energy can only come from consuming more fossil fuels.

As most of you know, coal, natural gas and petroleum are finite resources. Along with India, China, Europe, we are depleting them at an ever-higher rate. Petroleum is also the raw material from which most plastics are made.

My grandmother was born in 1890. She was born into that what was then typically a middle-class farm house about 20 miles from Baltimore. The farm is now a suburban subdivision. She described her earlier years to me when I was about ten. Their home had no indoor electricity and no indoor plumbing. She rode to town and church weekly in a wagon pulled by mules. The same mules they used to plow fields and harvest crops. Their primary sources of energy were the food that was eaten by humans and animals and the firewood that they cut and split by hand 125 years ago. Not that long ago. Most of the food they grew themselves
in gardens and fields. My grandmother had six
children; four survived childhood. If we deplete
most of the fossil fuel resources on this planet in
four or five generations, where will the energy
come from to support the quality of life for
succeeding humans?

Our high quality of life is also only
possible through human civilization. Living and
working together in neighborhoods, villages, towns,
cities, nations requires cooperation, accommodation
and tolerance. People that live in urban
communities live with noise that far exceeds that
experienced by Falmouth residents. For 12 years my
wife and I lived within 200 yards of a major
commuter and freight rail line. Three tracks
leading into and out of Chicago. The noise from
that 24/7 activity of more than a thousand rail
cars a day dwarfs that made by our wind turbines
when you’re standing there at the Wastewater
Treatment Plant. But those trains provided food
and goods to more than 14 million people; that’s
the metropolitan area around Chicago.

On a windy day in March, Neil Anderson
invited the Selectmen to come to his house to
experience the noise he was experiencing. I honestly wanted to understand the nature of what was going on, what was bothering him and his wife and some of the other nearby residents. So I took him up on his invitation. In his driveway, I heard a periodic hiss that occurred about every second. It appeared to correlate with the wind turbine blades passing the supporting column that I saw through the trees. I heard the same kind of sound vibration but lower inside his foyer and his garage as he invited me in. I could not find any similarly - well, I won’t - when my fully enclosed attic fan came on this summer, I was immediately surprised by how much louder it was and how much more resonant hum it produced than the wind turbine sounds I heard at Mr. Anderson’s home.

I have a background in engineering. I worked for the Department of Defense in actually analyzing a secure communications system, and so detection and decoding of signals was an extremely important thing.

For us to have a conversation requires a minimum of 30 dB for you to understand me. You’re hearing me at significantly higher than 30 dB.
And the measurement on the wind turbines is something around 10 dB, sometimes poking above in the middle of the night when the ambient noise comes back, because it’s always a comparison to the background noise to the actual source of the noise –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Patterson, we’re at five minutes.

MR. PATTERSON: That’s it?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MR. PATTERSON: Okay, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Mark Finneran, precinct 6.

First off, Ron, I understand why you’re doing this. You’re a good friend of mine. I met you several years ago. We worked very hard together on the sewer project, against it. We had some numerous – we had numerous victories. If you happen to recall, they wanted to spend $650 million and sewer everything south of 28 in this town and that was the plan, forget it, that’s it. And we stopped that. And you should be proud.

But I can’t support you on this, Ron.
And first off, as far as the money and the information is concerned, the people on the pro-wind side, they always use the phrase, “Tear the things down”. “It’s going to cost 15 million, it’s going to cost 25 million.” Ten million of that number is electricity that it perhaps might have produced. You can’t count that.

Another thing that is counted is the cost to tear the things down. Why tear them down? Leave them there, as a monument to our mistake. Why spend the extra money?

But, whether you’re pro-wind or not, however you feel about global warming or not, there’s maybe another way you could look at this. Most people that read the newspaper or the advertisements for retail products, there’s sometimes a disclaimer printed: “Limited supply. Only two per store.” This comes from something in the early ‘70's, I believe it was, that was made illegal. Car companies used to sell one car for 19.95, you know? And they actually literally had one car for 19.95 and the rest of them were four grand, or whatever, back then. It was called bait and switch. It was made illegal. The people in
this town basically bought those windmills from Town management, the DPW, and it was a case of bait and switch. They told us we were getting 660's; they stuck us with these big things.

After the first one, they knew there were problems. As soon as they turned the switch on, my information is that they looked at each other and said, "Boy, these things are a lot louder than they told us they were going to be." Yet they went on and they put up another turbine.

We were given a letter by the manufacturer, telling us that these things were going to have - we were going to have these problems, and yet management insisted on going forward with it, anyway.

The sewer project that I referred to and the oyster work that you did, Ron, was fabulous. Everybody knows how much they work. We're not going to sewer $650 million in this Town - worth in this town.

And I hate to break it to you, Folks, but the sewer project is a revenue-producing instrument; that's why it was done. First and foremost. And it will produce some revenue, so we
do have some money coming in the future from that sewering project, and I don’t want you to forget that.

And in the future, perhaps we can apply some of this towards this giant mistake. This giant bait and switch that was perpetrated upon the people of this town. The only ones who really feel it are the Andersens and the people who live in the neighborhood. But, quite frankly, I believe them.

Another way you can look at it is allergies. Nuts, whatever it may be. A very small percentage of the people can be deathly allergic to one item or another, something that - I used to be able to rub poison ivy all over my face. You know, never bothered me. Crawl in it, work in it, didn’t bother me. Now I get near it, it’s brutal.

I believe these people. I believe we’re doing damage to them. And I believe this was just simply bait and switch and it’s against the law. You might not agree with me, but that’s how I look at it.

And as far as the tearing the things
down, I mean, that’s a canard. We don’t have to
tear them down, we don’t have to spend that money.
Give us an honest figure. I don’t believe we’re
ever going to get one. It took me three questions
last night to try to get an honest answer out of
management, and I didn’t get it. Somebody had to
follow-up the fourth time and we finally got it.

Um, I don’t have a lot of faith in the
management of this Town. Um, I believe they bait
and switched us and I believe at some point in time
we’re just going to have to put this behind us, and
I think that time should be now. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moran.

MS. MORAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
Moderator, thank you.

The – I want to just call Town Meeting’s
attention to the entire scope of the issue, and I
was not on the Board as Mr. Putnam was, when the
initial reviews were made and when all the public
notices went out and when all the meetings were
had. I only had the opportunity attend a couple
meetings and look though the Enterprise and try to
follow the news.

There – you know, certainly the Town
administrators were in the forefront of using wind energy to this extent, and I think a lot of people were excited about that; and fast-forward, where we are where we are.

There were many attempts made at mediation, at trying to find a mutually beneficial decision, and there are a few people for which that doesn’t work.

I, too, visited homes. I, too, understand. I’m, you know, as Mr. Patterson mentioned or someone, or Mark, maybe, I’m very sensitive to smells. That’s the – I was unable to perceive any of the effects whatsoever. I’ve read the research, so I’m assuming it’s something to that effect.

But the extent of the issue here, you know, there are lawsuits going on it as well as the matter being before the zoning Board of Appeals. And the, you know, the easy answer of, you know, this has gone on long enough. I wish it was over, I mean, I – I personally am very challenged and – and emotional about what it’s done to our community, and I think that that’s really, you know, an important thing to take pause and take
account of.

But, the other side of that is economic. And the lawsuits are very likely not going to be resolved by just taking the turbines down. The lawsuits will likely go on unless the proponents decide they don’t want to give up their nuisance claims for the health effects that they have alleged or their attorney’s fees or all of their additional claims. So that is part of the equation.

And with respect to leaving the turbines up, that’s not realistic. Certainly anyone can see that that could be a nuisance and a liability in and of itself, to leave, you know, that large a piece of equipment unattended.

You know, the other thing that we need to consider, if you fast-forward all of these real economic decisions, is we certainly will all need to make compromises. Whether, you know, some of the things that Ron mentioned, whether it’s trash pick-up or schools, these are real numbers.

And, you know, I just want to briefly comment in terms of what I know about the efforts the Town has made and about what this Board has
made.

We took seriously the mandate from the voters that was to leave the turbines running. And you know, it was, I’m sure, economically driven. And, so, you know, despite our personal feelings, that’s not why we’re elected. We are trying to do the best we can economically for the Town and we have asked the staff to try to be creative, to try to look for solutions.

You know, it’s constantly asked: have we gone back to mediation? Is there any, you know, break in the icebergs about all of the creative solutions that have been suggested? And it just hasn’t happened yet, and it’s very hard to have patience with that. But the lawsuits are these people’s right. And they will likely continue. And there’s no easy answer.

I mean, I am trained in conciliation. It’s often the most sensible resolution. Not everybody ends up happy. If there was a conciliated resolve, the Town would still have to pay something. You know, that would certainly be a part of the conciliation. If there isn’t a conciliated or mediated result, then a judge will -
THE MODERATOR: Ms. Moran, we’re at five minutes.

MS. MORAN: – make a decision.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Dick.

MR. DICK: Sorry for speaking twice. I know people are getting tired of this issue, but I have gotten really annoyed by a certain vote in 2013 in which a figure of $25 million was put up to the town to take down turbines that cost us about five. It was an outrageously inflated number.

Fifteen million dollars in lost revenue to the Town. Right now, we’re running a half-million dollar deficit. Let’s run that for 30 years. That’s $15 million negative, so we’ll split the difference. If we’re lucky, they’ll break even, but they won’t.

Stopping and starting, that’s putting a lot of wear on those windmills. They’re not going to produce anything like the revenue this was estimated there. That was phony.

But tonight I heard a guy say, “Hey, people in this room are going to lose their jobs if we take them down.” Ha, fear-mongering, ha.
That was really nice. I heard “catastrophe” if we take them down.

One of those windmills was put up with a loan; that could be forgiven. Now, Deval Patrick’s board wouldn’t forgive it. But we have a new governor. And that new governor is much more likely, when faced with the fact that it’s ended here, to approve the forgiveness of that loan.

So we have no real estimate of what it’s going to cost, but it isn’t going to cost $25 million and the Town of Falmouth did not vote two-thirds to keep them up, they voted two-thirds not to spend $25 million, which was outrageous. And it kind of upsets me to hear people citing that as the Town’s support for windmills. It was the Town’s opposition to spending $25 million to take them down. And I don’t want to hear anybody telling me that that was a vote to keep them up.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Dr. Clark, next on my list.

DR. CLARK: Good evening, I’m Peter Clark from precinct one.
I want, once again, to approach this issue, I approach it without demonizing neighbors for avarice, and without demonizing the Town government for manipulation.

I also approach it personally feeling that – and I think we all agree: if we had it to do all over again, we would do it in a different way. But that brings us, as Mr. Hargraves says, back to the point that we are where we are.

We have a complicated issue. I don’t believe that complex issues get solved by scapegoating. I don’t believe complex issues get solved accept through negotiating and through a messy process.

And I stand here today to say that I support Article 2 because I believe it keeps that process open for us to seek to find a negotiated settlement.

There is a morality about protecting your neighbors, and I feel that. There’s also a morality about representing the ballot, which I refuse to have wiped away. I mean, it’s the evidence we have, however you wish to re-interpret it now, it’s the evidence we have of how the town
voted.

There’s a morality in protecting against the costs in terms of other services.

And, there is a moral, although I think as Mr. Putnam has said it is kind of vague and out there, somewhere. There is the morality of worrying about what’s going to happen to huge numbers of people if we don’t get our fossil fuel burning under control. And I stand here from that moral position.

So, there’s morality to go around. And I don’t think anybody owns a moral position, necessarily.

So I stand here to say that I’m in favor of Article 2 because I believe it keeps the process open by which we can find what will be, I’m sure, a messy kind of process to solve this complicated issue.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I had the gentleman in the back right.

MR. GRANT WALKER: Hello, my name is Charles Grant Walker. I live on 71 Philadelphia
Street, precinct number 3.

I’d like to commend Mr. Hargraves for what he said earlier about the election and the Town Meeting in relationship to the voters of the Town.

I’m one of the voters in the Town. I voted with that 70 percent and I read about the issue. I understood, though, and do still think that I understood the issue. And I like the idea that we have democracy and that that vote counts. And in spite of what Mr. Putnam has said, I don’t think we should allow the comments of a few people who say they did not understand what they were voting for to now lead us to dismiss the results of the official Town vote. That’s what we have. That is our democracy, we voted. Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Potamis, Mr. Potamis.

MR. POTAMIS: Gerry Potamis, Wastewater Superintendent and Town Meeting representative.

I guess I agree with the last speaker, but I take deep and personal exception to anybody that says: “Democracy is mob rule. You guys are
the mob; so your decisions don’t count.” Tomorrow we’re celebrating Veteran’s Day, but Democracy is mob rule.

I think someone owes everybody an apology –

THE MODERATOR: Okay –

MR. POTAMIS: – especially at the Veteran’s breakfast tomorrow.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Potamis, I don’t want to get up on this side issue.

MR. POTAMIS: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: He talked about direct democracy, with no representation. We obviously have a Republic here in Falmouth. We don’t have a direct Democracy; they have that over in Bourne and Mashpee, but let’s not get into that.

[Laughter.]

MR. POTAMIS: All right. I apologize if I took the language literally, but I’m emotional.

[Laughter, applause.]

MR. POTAMIS: I can clearly say Vestus – – if that’s the letter someone was referring to – did not warn us. Because the letter came to me

Tinkham Reporting
(508) 759-9162
and I responded to the letter as a Town representative for the project. And after consulting with several people we simply told Vestus, "You are responsible for the performance of the turbine in accordance with the documents."
And part of that document was a sound power curve.
That’s what Vestus said. That’s what the documents say. So I think we should put that to bed.

And I agree with the other people: God help us if we take a vote and all of a sudden a few people say that vote didn’t count. That is mob rule. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Whitehead is next on my list.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I guess it’s on.
Lynn Whitehead, precinct one.
I have about eight points, if I can make them quite quickly. Even for the last one that Gerry just said.

First of all about health. I have more research than you can shake a stick at, as far as health effects of the wind turbines. I’ve been to conferences of the American Physical Society in
Baltimore. I sat there for a day. Even they, with the wind and the turbines that go around, the big blades, the infra sound that has erupted from those – you don’t have to hear – you don’t have to hear a wind turbine. You can feel a wind turbine.

I knew a little boy in fourth grade who looked sick, sick, sick, sick. I tried to send him to the nurse. Lo and behold, after four weeks, I pulled him out and he – I said, “You’re sick; I’m going to call your mom. You’ve got to go to the nurse.” “No, no, Mrs. Whitehead, I’m not sick. No, I’m not.” He’s talking about the glass vibrating - and he showed me. He said, “It’s not like this, it’s like that.” He said, “I tried to go to sleep, but you can – you can – you can feel it, you can hear it.” And the mattress was going not like this, but like this. But he couldn’t hear it, he could feel it.

He laid down on his floor, tried to sleep; couldn’t. Went down to the dining room, went to the living room, went to the kitchen, went to the den, and he’s been sleeping in the basement. Now, that’s – he didn’t hear it.

In fact, people said, “Well, I stood
under the turbine and I couldn’t hear anything.”

Well, you can’t hear anything under a turbine. You can’t feel it. You have to be in the right way, far away, even way far away, and you can feel it if the wind is a certain direction and if the topography is fine – is perfect for that area.

Another point is -- so, the health effects, back to that. There are many, many experts with peer-reviewed journals in the journals, even recently, that talked about all this.

Bob Frosch, who lives down in Woods Hole, talked about it. He’s an acoustic person. He was at NASA for nine years and he talks about the infra sound, not that you can hear it, the feeling of it, and what it does to the body. So I wish he would come and talk about that. He did try to go to the Selectmen, but he didn’t really get his point across; I know that.

It’s not a handful of people. There are 40 families. Everyone says a handful. It’s not a handful, it’s 40 families.

So if you want to take houses away, you just think about that part.
Let’s see. Mr. Potamis. I did see that letter that came from Vestus. And I think some of — I don’t know where I got it, but it’s on my — it’s on my email, and you signed it. And it was from Vestus saying that the Town needed to know about the risks, and they wanted to be relieved of the liability in case something happened. For instance, there were two risks.

One was stated that the ice throw was a big one. In case the ice throw — and I think with the ice throw came another one, and that was under the certain circumstances the ambient 40 – 40 ambient level was above that, it would go way above that. Maybe ten – ten above it. Under certain circumstances.

I have that letter. I wish I’d brought it. It said that the Town should be aware of that and they should know about it and it had to be signed, and you signed it.

The other thing is, I think the lawsuits would end. If these turbines came down, the lawsuits would end. I would hope they would end and I think they would end. I hope they will. If they come down, and people try to take them by
eminent domain, then they will be up again.

Certainly will. I’ll join them.

And I’d like to know how many public employees are going to be affected by this. How many of them. If --if they come down. How many employees does that actually affect? Never mind the houses that it would be - would - how many families would be affected by that.

I think we’re all for green energy. I think the solar would work, and I don’t think anyone wants to do any more fossil fuel. We know about all of the warming and everything else that’s going on in this world. So I don’t think that’s even a part of the question.

Now, the other thing, in Colorado, just very quickly. Just very, very quickly.

THE MODERATOR: No, we’re at five minutes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: So, next, Ms. Driscoll.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

MS. DRISCOLL: Thank you, Kathy Driscoll, precinct 7.

Thank you, everyone, for being here
tonight. I know that we’ve done this many times over many years. Each time, I believe I’ve spoken in support of the wind turbines. I have done a lot of research, a lot of background review, going back to old Town Meeting minutes and looking to see what was said.

I’ve gone back to 2009 Special Town Meeting for Wind II. It was very clearly spelled out in that meeting, with unanimous support going forward with Wind II, that it was a 1.65 megawatt turbine.

Going back to 2008 and 2007 for support and installation of Wind I, that it was stated it was a 1.65 megawatt turbine. There were Town Hall community meetings talking about the turbines sponsored by the Energy Committee, sponsored by the Board of Selectmen.

Yes, originally, in 2004, 2005, 2006, the 660 kilowatt turbine was what was out there and available to see. It was not decided upon.

There was discussion.

But, if you go back, do the research. If you want to go into the minutes, they’re all available on the Town website. I’ve looked
through them again, and looking through what a lot
of people have said and their positions. It was
not a bait and switch.

A lot of – a couple of the issues that we
are facing here with this article is to continue to
support the Board of Selectmen in their endeavors
in this issue to come to a solution, a resolution,
an answer for our community. Not just the
neighbors that are up around the turbines, not for
the people that are just in support of the wind
turbines, but for everyone. It means a little bit
more compromise, a little bit more consensus,
something along those lines, to come up with
something that would be fair for all of the
taxpayers.

When this discussion began back in 2006–
2007, and in one of the presentations by Mrs.
Harper is that Wind I was a revenue bond. No
taxes were raised by any of residents or businesses
in Falmouth to install Wind I. No taxes have gone
towards that installation. Okay?

In ensuing operation, some of our tax
dollars, through appropriations, through votes,
because of minimized operation, have gone towards
other bills’ debt service. And that’s actually where we’re at right now. That started in about 2014. Not prior to that. Our taxes have not been raised or been turned into the operation of either wind turbine.

With that revenue bond, that means that the turbine needs to operate to pay its bills.

With Wind II it was done, in 2009, it was done through a grant for about $4 million. The condition to have that grant is for the operation of the wind turbine. If the wind turbine does not operate, then the bond must be paid back.

Those two values of debt, with Wind I and Wind II, are approximately eight to ten million dollars. That does not include the dismantling. That does not include the lost electricity.

We’d have to come up with money to pay for the electricity at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. We are expanding operations at the Little Pond sewer process that I know anybody who’s driven through Falmouth Heights this summer probably did a lot of swearing, and with detours, but the electricity is going to increase. We have been told, when we voted on that project, that
electricity was going to increase. Having those
two wind turbines there are supposed to help offset
the increased capacity and operation at the
Wastewater Treatment Plant.

We need to look at this in a much broader
scope than how we are viewing it. I'm not saying
that we don't listen to what our neighbors are
saying; we have done that. There have been many
processes. We are continuing to listen. We're
not saying that we're not going to listen to them.

THE MODERATOR: Okay we're at five -

MS. DRISCOLL: It may not be what
everyone wants to hear. But please vote yes,

thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Dufresne.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: [No mic:] Mr. Moderator,

if it's the will of Town Meeting, I'd like to move
the question.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can't hear you.

THE MODERATOR: Andy was trying to - Mr.

Dufresne is trying to move the question. We have

a limit on debate already.
FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Say again? We have a limit on debate already. The motion is in order, but we do have an overall limit on the article. So Mr. Dufresne is moving to close discussion. This requires a two-thirds vote.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it by the two-thirds and the question is called.

The question will now come on the main motion as printed.

All those in favor, signify by saying – Yeah.

MR. MORIARTY: [No mic:] Don’t we have 90 minutes to debate?

THE MODERATOR: You did until a motion to close discussion passed by a two-thirds.

MR. MORIARTY: [No mic:] You didn’t mention that.
THE MODERATOR: He doesn’t have to mention that. That’s parliamentary procedure. And if you’d attend my training, you’d know it.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Article 2 is the main motion as printed. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

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

[Pause.]
and the tellers will return a count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Third division.

MS. LONG: 27.

THE MODERATOR: First division.

MR. NETTO: 22.

THE MODERATOR: 22.

Third division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 36.

THE MODERATOR: 36.

By a counted vote of 118 in favor and 63 opposed, the article passes.

I’m sorry.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: No, no. Hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on. 22 plus 36, plus 27. Yeah, it’s 85. I punched something in wrong. It’s 85. It’s 118 in favor and 85 opposed.

Yes, Mister – do you have a point of order?

FROM THE FLOOR: No, I just left a pen up there.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, okay. That was
important, okay.

Mr. Chairman, Article 3.

The result was 118 in favor and 85 opposed, okay.

Mr. Chairman, Article 3.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Our recommendation is indefinite postponement.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the recommendation of the Planning Board is indefinite postponement.

Mr. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, the Board of Selectmen placed this article on the warrant over two months ago in an effort to ensure that all of the potential options are available to the Town to secure appropriate authority to responsibly operate the Town of Falmouth’s wind turbines. The zoning changes put forth in Special Town Meeting Article 3 represented one potential pathway available to the Town to resolve regulatory challenges.

We recognize and appreciate that the short time frame associated with this request placed a burden on the Planning Board to hear and consider this matter without time for the
significant community outreach and deliberation on
the decision that they are accustomed to use.

We respect the decision of the Planning
Board and agree that action on this issue is
premature.

The Town of Falmouth is presently before
the Board of Appeals seeking a special permit for
Wind I and we anticipate a thorough, reasoned and
objective review by our Zoning Board of Appeals.
We remain optimistic that this process will result
in permitted operations consistent with the Board’s
continued goal to respond to and address the
concerns of neighbors and to fulfill the will of
the Town to continue renewable energy production
through the operations of the Town’s wind turbines.

We appreciate the thoughtful comments and
concerns we have received and we ask that Town
Meeting continue with patience as the Town works
diligently to bring all these matters to closure.

On behalf of the Board of Selectmen,
voting unanimously, I move that the Town refer
Article 3 to the Planning Board for further review.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so the main motion
on the floor is to refer Article 3 back to the
Planning Board. All those in favor of referring signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the Chair is that the ayes have it by a majority and the article will be referred.

The chair will entertain a motion to dissolve the Town Meeting.

FROM THE FLOOR: Moved.

THE MODERATOR: So moved.

All those in favor of dissolving the Special Town Meeting, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

We’re dissolved.

Let’s take a break and come back in 15 minutes for the Annual.

[Whereupon, a recess was held.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, here we go. We’re going to take a quorum call and then we’re going to
reconvene the Annual Town Meeting. And at the Annual Town Meeting we were in the Capitol Budget, Article 9, so we’re going to go back there.

Okay, let’s go, Folks, come on forward. [Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: I would be remiss if I did not read this email that I just got from a young man from Falmouth who is actually at Georgetown University and he’s watching Town Meeting live. And his grandma is in the room. And so Thomas just sent me a little email. It says, “Rep, I’m watching online from D.C. As always you’re doing a great job navigating the strong turbine feelings of the room. I hope the FHS mic carriers are as speedy as their predecessor. Leave it to a Republican to remind the Town that Falmouth is a Republic.” [Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Thomas, glad you’re watching and keep up the good work down there at Georgetown.

Okay, all those present please stand for the establishment of the quorum and the tellers will return a count.
THE MODERATOR: When Thomas got his Eagle Scout, I actually gave him a copy of Town Meeting Time and told him I couldn’t sit in this chair forever, so he’s – he’s watching to make sure he’s ready.

THE MODERATOR: In the third division.

First division.

MR. NETTO: 51.

THE MODERATOR: 51.

And in the second division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 90.

THE MODERATOR: Nine-zero?

MR. DUFRESNE: Nine zero.

THE MODERATOR: Nine-zero, 90.

By a counted vote of 197, we have a quorum and we’re back in session of the Annual Town Meeting.

So the motion on the floor was the motion to zero out the line item for the Facilities Improvement Consolidated Dispatch Center of...
$578,500, and which list is it?

Mr. Crocker was next on my list, but I think you were going to make the motion to go after 11:00, right? Did you want to speak on this, Mr. Crocker?

MR. CROCKER: [No mic:] No, I didn’t.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Bob Donahue, precinct 3.

Folks, why? Why did we have a vote last spring -- a unanimous, three-quarter vote; how often does that happen here – and we said, “We want you to go to the Fire Department.” That’s what we said. It was simple, plain.

So, do we get the one finger salute from the Selectmen and the Town Manager for this vote? Is that what it is?

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. DONAHUE: No? That’s what they said in the Enterprise.

Could it be? Because, if you look upon the government circles, a feather in the cap of the Fire Department has always been a sore for years with Selectmen and Town Managers. In contracts they will go to the arbitration before they settle.
And usually they win more than they lose. So it makes these guys look bad. And it’s been going on for years. That’s why they don’t want it at the firehouse. In my opinion. I’m sorry, it’s my opinion, Folks.

Mr. Murphy said it was right, we needed a call center in Falmouth. I agree with him. We need a call center in Falmouth because the state – one more incident with Police Departments in this state and all policemen will have to have cameras, both in the cruisers and on their bodies. And if that is the case, then we’re going to have to have a center to filter this stuff. And who’s going to be the manager of the filter? The Town Manager, the Fire Chief and the Police Chief.

Who has the vested interest in the communications? The Police Department. They are the ones that deal with the most sensitive of sensitive issues in this town. So the Chief of Police is going to be the manager of this Department.

Now, we don’t have any other structure. There’s no structure like a regular Town department where you have a manager, assistant manager,
citizen secretaries. No, you have it all run by a triumvirate.

So I say we vote to eliminate this Town item. We can pick it up again further on when we’re talking about the Police Department Headquarters, further on in the articles. And let’s get some answers and some truth.

Why do we need – why did they go out and behind our backs, kind of, and go to another consultant? Because they don’t want it in the Fire Department, Folks. They just don’t want it.

If they had come back to us and said, “We’re going to put it anywhere in Falmouth. And we’ve got a contract with somebody that owns a building and we’re going to go into that building,” I would be 100 percent in favor of that. But no, they want it in the basement of the Fire – of the Police Department, excuse me. And that is in a flood zone.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. DONAHUE: It is. Look at the map.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. DONAHUE: But still, why do you need it? Have you looked at the layout for it? The
Communication Center is a very small area but they’ve put a gym in for the Police Department.
Come on. We don’t need this in the Police Department.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Jones.

CHAIRMAN JONES: I have to take a minute to respond to Mr. Donahue. Mr. Donahue has asked for facts.
The first fact I will give you is the Police station is not in the flood zone. You may check the FEMA maps.

Second fact is the Board of Selectmen and the Town Manager have not chosen the Police station in any kind of retribution to the Fire Department and the firemen, and to suggest that is offensive and inappropriate. And to put that forward, if you want a fact, I can guarantee you that is not anything to do with a discussion.

As I stated last night, this body suggested the Fire Department and the Board of Selectmen responded to that, saying a neutral site was not important to this body; the fire station was acceptable. Once you stated that, we opened our eyes to saying, “Well, we can consider other
non-neutral sites.”

To just have our consultant look into the fire station without numbers to compare did not make sense. So we asked the consultant, and they said the Police station would be less expensive and more efficient. That was the basis of our recommendation.

What this body did vote in the spring was money to go towards the fire station, and that money is there. The Board of Selectmen feels very strongly the consolidated dispatch is the correct way to go. If more money is available from the town to go to the fire station, I’m sure that we would be willing to do that, but we have made our recommendation on what we think is the most efficient and most cost effective.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: I apologize last night for being the last person in Falmouth who does not have a smart phone and I didn’t have any way to show what I was trying to talk about.

I am a biologist. I don’t really do planning. I did happen to attend a very good conference on coastal zone planning.
That is a map from the Cape Cod Commission. The yellow – well, it’s actually, if you go to their website it’s the whole Cape. You can type in any address and what it does is it’s actually a sea level rise program. But it has on it the FEMA firm flood plain areas. And that, the yellow there, they are correct, that is the FEMA flood plain that you have to pay insurance for.

However, the National Weather Service has produced a large program which is used by FEMA in their environmental emergency management planning. If you go to the NOAA website you will see that this program is used as overlays on the entire coast of the United States. It is a process –

Could you please click on the SLOSH, now?

It is something called SLOSH. Which is a weird acronym; it stands for Sea Lake Overland Surge from a Hurricane. This is not a flood plain, but they said if you have a hurricane this is what the winds will do with the water from Falmouth Harbor. The water from Falmouth Harbor will come up, it will go all the way up to the Police station, beyond the Police station, all the way up to Dillingham Avenue.
And this fascinated me. It was like,

“Oh, okay. Wow, look at that. We’ve got water coming all the way up from Falmouth Harbor and going all the way up there.”

Town Meeting, our job is to watch the budget and see that money is spent wisely. After I went to this meeting and I saw that water would be all around that area in a surge if we had a hurricane – now, it’s true, I hope we don’t have a hurricane. I really hope we don’t have a hurricane. But if we do, there is a potential for this. The federal government uses these SLOSH maps to predict what will happen in a hurricane. Okay?

I looked at it and I said we’re asked to appropriate money all the time. And our job is to make sure that we spend the money wisely for the citizens of Falmouth. We just appropriated at a prior Town Meeting three-quarters of a million dollars for new combined service emergency communications center. I’m all for that; don’t get me wrong. I think that’s good. I think we should do that.

I don’t think we should be rushed into
doing it right away because, oh, the federal
government or the county or the state or something
will do something to us if we don’t. It’s not in
that imminent danger of failing, Folks.

We want to do it, but we want to do it in
the right place.

I’m a biologist, but I don’t think
spending half a million dollars to renovate a
basement and then put three-quarters of a million
dollars worth of new electronic equipment into that
basement if that building is in line with surge
that you might get from a hurricane. I just can’t
see that that’s a possible way to do.

It really surprised me. I’m sorry if I
misled anybody and said it was a flood plain last
night. I don’t know all the terms. But I do
know that it is in a surge area for a potential
hurricane. I do know that our Selectmen and our
Town Manager had never heard of this SLOSH.

Now, considering its use by FEMA and its
use all around the country, it’s just something to
think about. Maybe we don’t want to consider it.
Maybe we think we won’t get a hurricane, we can
save $120,000. But it’s just something that I
felt as a Town Meeting member I had an obligation
to bring to you and let you know about, because
nobody had told us about it.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, precinct 9.

I’d like to start out that I sent some of
you an email with some information. And I was
told when I walked in here that I sent out some
wrong information. I forwarded the map that
Leslie sent me. So that’s the map that you saw on
the screen. And I am in 101 percent concurrence
with her thinking.

That’s correct. Are you going to spend
a half a million dollars in your basement on Cape
Cod when you find out it’s there when your choice
is -- no offense to the third floor, but I’m even
beginning to wonder how much of a consolidated
dispatch center we need, and I’ll get to that.

Last night during the -- and when I stood
up to speak somewhat against this article, it was
the location of the Rec center, twice, and you
supported that, that we didn’t build the Rec center
for a communications center. Okay. I didn’t pay
too much attention to the Consolidated Dispatch concept. And I’ve started spending more time.

And last night, when I was listening to the speakers, I was feeling that the term Consolidated Dispatch means that when you pick up the phone like we did years ago, you talked to someone in the Falmouth Fire Department or the Falmouth police station. Well, 9-1-1 changed all that. And the cellphone changed all that. So let’s start — clear some things up.

What happened to Mrs. Putnam is correct; that’s what happens. You have a cellphone; you get the state police because your cellphone tells them exactly where you are. You know, you go to Google Maps, the blue dot. So that part is true; we’re not going to change that.

So now, the system that we have in place when you place a call, it goes to County. And some of you know, I’ve done this, had this happen: County says, “What town?” You tell them Falmouth. And then they say, “What’s your emergency?” “Choking, fire, someone’s breaking into my house.” Then County sends it to Fire and Police.

Now, if you need medical assistance,
there's a very good plus to that. And this has all been verified by the Chiefs. I'm not standing here making this up. I've spent time talking to them.

County, if it's medical, the dispatcher at County is trained if someone is choking or you have to perform CPR - and I'm not a medical person. While the Fire dispatcher is sending out the ambulance or the fire truck and then having to call in the backup for the minimum manning, because that's what that dispatcher does, the person at County is trained to give you instruction over the phone. I think that's a great thing.

And then of course the fire or ambulance or police get sent to help you out.

Now, when we do a consolidated dispatch, guess what? Nothing's going to change. Nothing is going to change. It's the same system.

So then, as I looked at this, I said, "You know, there's somebody missing from this argument. Matter of fact, there's two people missing from this argument." And that's what some times where -- and I don't mean to point the finger so to speak, but this change, as Mr. Jones, the
Chairman of the Board of Selectmen has said, is policy driven from the administration.

When you bump into the Fire Chief and the Police Chief as you walk around town, are they pulling you aside and saying, "Joe, we really need your vote on this," "I would like your support for this consolidated"? And I don’t mean to put them on the spot, but let’s - we want to spend money based on facts.

Mr. McNamara, when this first came up stood up, if I’m not mistaken, and said, "You know what? If it’s not broken, why are we going to fix it?" And I’m beginning now to change my mind that if I want to call the Fire Department because I have a fire, then let me deal directly with them through County. And if I need a police, deal directly through them.

Oh, but California has only four of these. Wow, aren’t you impressed? Let’s all pick up and move to California. And you could list towns that have gone to this and have changed. I’m not going to do that now.

But I do have a question for Mr. Jones. Because we based this on money, a Chairman of the
Board of Selectmen.

   And the figures that came in, because now
we're being prudent, it's $578,500 to get this up
and operating at the police station, correct?

   CHAIRMAN JONES: [Nods.]

   MR. NETTO: Okay.

   Now, there's a call box downstairs in
this school. There are call boxes on streets,
metal boxes which you pull the handle down that
there's a fire in this building, that there's a
fire at this location. Those call boxes, I don't
know whether they're a hundred mil, whatever the
term that they use for those, are all wired to the
fire station. So the minute that handle is
pulled.

   In the $578,500 for the police station
location, has a price of moving the wiring from the
fire station to another building included?

   CHAIRMAN JONES: That is part of the
telecommunications budget, yes.

   MR. NETTO: Well, then, we have a
difference of opinion of that. Because I've been
told no, it hasn't.

   It's been included, Mr. Suso? Because
you gave him the answer. Excuse me, I mean, obviously.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Absolutely. It’s included.

MR. NETTO: Okay, its’ included. All right. Then I was told wrong today, I guess, because that’s –

But we’re into the same argument with the flood plain maps, but that price has been included. All right, so let’s look quickly at the figures. It’s 729 for the Fire station and it’s 578 for the Police. The difference is 151,000. But it’s not really 151 because we voted 75,000 last year that’s earmarked for the Fire station. So really, the true difference is $75,000 out of this year’s tax rate, correct?

CHAIRMAN JONES: [Nods.]

MR. NETTO: Okay, I just want to make sure I’m correct, thank you. So that’s the money you’re looking at. Now, what do you gain from that? All right, when you have a hurricane, where does your – I can’t use the right vernacular, the acronym, but when you have a disaster, the Emergency Management
team is in the fire station. And the dispatch is
going to be in the police station? Does this make
sense? Forget money, forget - does that make
common sense? That at least those two should be
there. And that’s what I think when you come to
$75,000 difference. I think we get what we pay
for. And I don’t want to get into the semantics
of Fire and Police and this and that. But I -

And what was missing -- this article,
this article started out on the wrong foot and it’s
never been right.

When we did something like this in the
past, I don’t see the people who have to make this
work involved in the creation. And now I’m
talking to the Board of Selectmen. What happened
to our old working groups?

What happened to going to get some of the
- talking to the dispatchers at the Police and the
Fire, and visiting? When I talked to them, they
said you folks haven’t talked to them. This is an
upper level management decision with the people
that make it work not involved.

I don’t think that’s the right way to do
it. That’s my opinion. Thank you very much.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moran.

MS. MORAN: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

The question Police or Fire Department, I mean, if one has a surge possibility, another one might have a wind possibility. That’s something that insurance will be reviewed to deal with.

But I want to really just speak against Andy’s motion to zero out the line. And I disagree with Andy with great hesitation, from my last - my past experience. But while I am making the point, it -- particularly where he was recently recognized for service as a veteran by the National Graduate School. But, moving on to the point.

The - you know, Ms. Putnam brought up the point we can’t continue to tempt fate and we need a decision moving forward, here. She did - she described a very scary experience. I’ve had a similar experience with a person in this room, just trying to call 9-1-1 for someone that was gravely ill and there was quite a delay.

But I want to make clear the point that Mr. Netto just brought up, that the consolidated dispatch does not route ambulances. That’s not directly relevant to the point that we’re talking
about today.

The emergency services in the Town do have to be made a priority here. And as the chair mentioned, everything is a balance of the needs and the funds. The Selectmen took a look at the project because it was directed by Town Meeting: Go sharpen your pencil. We don’t want it in the Rec center for any number of reasons. And that’s exactly what we did.

I think there’s a slide on both of the Police and Fire together. Do we have that? Do we?

Okay, so, in any event, while that’s being found. The decision was made very specifically on the logistics of the space and the cost. So, if you look at the logistics, on the right is the police station; on the left is the fire Department.

On the right side, it’s you know your basic, you know, parallel functions straight across from each other. In the top left, you see the console area. It’s sort of a circle of organization, very friendly toward communication.

If you look at the left, you can just see that,
because of the layout of the space, the communication area has to be separated. It doesn’t as easily facilitate quick and discernable communication.

Possible likelihood of mistakes or errors, and that’s where I think Rebecca Putnam made a very good point. When you’re in an emergency situation, you want it to be as quick and efficient and lifesaving as possible. So we really just looked at the efficiency when we looked at the spaces.

The other thing we looked at. As you all know, there is $150,000 difference, give or take. And I know that just before yesterday’s meeting the Town Manager was saying to me, because it’s been a topic that we’ve discussed earlier, “We’ve got to take a look at the West Falmouth Fire Station situation.” I mean, that’s something that we’ve got to talk to the Village Association about what’s needed there. That that’s, you know, it’s a recent situation that just came up that’s somewhere where that $150,000 could go. Just as an example.

So that’s, you know, the Board’s decision
was, you know, we’ve – we have sharpened our pencil
to try to effect the desire of Town Meeting.

And, just as part of my conclusion, here,
I’d like to call, if the Moderator would allow, the
Fire Chief and the Police Chief.

THE MODERATOR: For what? To speak?
MS. MORAN: To the podium, yes, sir.
THE MODERATOR: Yes, sure. If they
want to speak.

MS. MORAN: Thank you.
THE MODERATOR: I don’t know.
CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Netto had asked
for some input from the Police Chief and Fire
Chief, and suggested that we had not communicated
with the dispatchers or with these two departments
about their feeling about consolidating the
dispatch.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Would either of
the chiefs like to speak?
CHAIRMAN JONES: And this is not about
the location.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: All right.
THE MODERATOR: Well, this is up to you
guys. You guys are the chiefs. If you’d like to
speak, you can have the floor; if not, you don’t
need to.

CHAIRMAN JONES: This is not about the
location. Mr. Netto was questioning whether
consolidated was the right way to go, and that’s
the specific question I’m hoping they can address.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: Yeah, hi, Mark
Sullivan, Fire Chief.

I’m going to say what I said a year ago
on the floor, is that if I had my way and money and
training wasn’t an issue, that I would leave the
dispatch centers the way they are, because they are
two different functions.

If we can save money for the community
and get a better service, then I would go with the
consolidation.

So, I leave that up to you.

CHIEF DUNN: As far as whether the
dispatchers in the Police Department have been
involved in this, they’ve been involved in this.
They’ve spoken to the consultants; I’ve had
conversations with them and everything else.

As far as the Police are concerned, the
consolidation is the right way to go. We’re going
to free up police officers that I can give you a
proactive Police Department and not a reactive
Police Department which we are right now.

CHIEF SULLIVAN: Just, right now we were
also short a fire engine, as the Town Meeting is
aware of. And if we can save $150,000 by putting
it in the Police station and maybe use those funds
towards funding our fire station, or a fire engine,
which we need very, very quickly, then I would vote
on it again.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Mustafa.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Mustafa is next.

MR. MUSTAFA: Mr. Moderator, I’m not a
mathematician nor a politician, but I’m looking at
what you have up there, and if you take a close
look at it, the size of the doors at the Police
station and the size of the doors on the other one:
the scale is completely wrong, here. If you’re
gong to put something up there like that, keep them
both the same scale.

All I want are the facts, and that’s the
way I’m looking at it.
Personally, right now we have a very good Fire Department, we have a very good Police Department. We have qualified people in both areas.

What I would say is we can save a lot of money by buying both of the departments new equipment. Not buy, excuse me, let me take that back. Lease radios for the Fire Department and for the Police Department. That way there, as the technology changes weekly, they can get new equipment without having to pay any more; the lease would continue on.

But if you buy it, you own it and that’s why they’re in trouble now, because the stuff was bought and it’s out of date.

So all I’m saying is this: right now, let’s buy — let’s lease the radios for the Police and the Fire and let them work it through. And, please, don’t – don’t try to snowball the thing by coming up with false facts. If you – if you don’t like us making decisions, then why don’t we just stay home and you people make the decisions and just call us up and say, “This is what we’re going to do.” This is not right.
[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Let’s – I had a
gentleman in the center middle aisle.

I’m going to let you reply, and then I’m
going to call the question, because people know
what they want to do with this. Go ahead. Make
a reply and we’re going to go.

MS. MORAN: Only to –

THE MODERATOR: Because we’ve been
doing this one article for about an hour between
last night and tonight - this one line item, excuse
me.

MS. MORAN: The slide is not anything
other than trying to fit it on one screen. That’s
it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question is
going to come on the amendment to remove this. 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 is that the no’s have it and the amendment
doesn’t pass.
And we’ll go on to Town Hall Archives, $95,000.

Bike path design, Community Preservation Committee match, $53,000. Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: [No mic:] I never heard the call for the vote.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so we’ll vote again because some folks didn’t know that we just voted.

So, 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 again.

MR. LATIMER: [No mic:] What is the motion?

THE MODERATOR: What is the motion, are you kidding me? Are you kidding me, Richard? The motion that we’ve been debating is whether or not to remove the consolidated dispatch line item from the Capitol Improvement Plan.

MR. LATIMER: [No mic:] Thank you, all
FROM THE FLOOR:  [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR:  Okay?  That’s the motion that was on last night; that’s the motion I placed back on at the beginning of the meeting. That’s the one that we just –

MR. LATIMER:  [No mic:]  The motion to zero it out.

THE MODERATOR:  To zero it out, to remove it from the plan.

Is it – did a lot of folks not realize that that’s what we just voted on?

FROM THE FLOOR:  [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR:  Okay.  It’s going to go the same way, but I’m going to take a vote one more time so I don’t get accused in the newspaper tomorrow of voting when people didn’t know what they were voting on.

All those – not your newspaper.  All those – [laughing] they’re waiving back there.  All those in favor of removing the line item for the Consolidated Dispatch, say aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR:  All those opposed, say
THE MODERATOR: And the no's have it again.

[Laughter.]


MR. FINNERAN: Just curious on the Town Hall archives: is that part of the construction at Town Hall, shall we call it?

THE MODERATOR: The Town Hall archives.

MR. FINNERAN: And what does that entail? It's moving the stuff that's in the basement now, but where are you moving it to? And wouldn't that be part of the $300,000 or $4.6 million project that we discussed last night?

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. FINNERAN: I just want an explanation. It seems like it's all part of the same thing.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: All right, I will do a very brief presentation, which I hadn't anticipated,
but.

Good evening. I’m Heather Harper; I’m the Assistant Town Manager.

Very briefly this project is very long needed to address the storage of Town archive files. That is the lower level of Town Hall. That is space that’s finished space, or it could be finished to accommodate office uses in the lower level of Town Hall. We’ve talked a lot about the flood zone. That is in the flood zone. Those need to be removed and placed in a location where they can be appropriately preserved and filed and maintained.

Next slide, please.

We also have significant files in the lower level of Town Counsel’s facility, which is a leased space. And I believe that’s also in a flood-prone environment. But that’s space that we don’t own and those are Town files and they need to be archived.

So the project is to place the files — and you can go to the last slide.

Which shows you the type of — well, this talks about what the project will do, which will
take all of those files back to a facility, create a complete archiving program, and then make them available hopefully much more conveniently both for our departments and for the public in retrieval of documents.

The project includes providing a scanner. It's a very compact solution. It will accommodate over 2600 boxes, which is what we've identified the need, based on the evaluation of the Town archives as well as those in Town Counsel.

And I believe this is a project that you can vote for regardless of how you feel about whether Town Hall should be moved to another location, whether you think it should be renovated and improved, or whether it should stay as it is. These files need to be made much more accessible, and ultimately the files will be electronically archived as we move in the future towards an electronic archival program. So I ask for your support of this project.

MR. FINNERAN: Just one more question.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: My original question: where are they going to? Where are you going to
archive them? What is this $95,000 to move them
to where?

MS. HARPER: Oh, I’m sorry, I didn’t
hear that part of the question. We’re talking
about locating it within the Gus Canty Community
Center.

THE MODERATOR: I hope it’s not on the
stage.

MR. FINNERAN: Have you talked to them?

[Laughter.]

MS. HARPER: We have attended a meeting
of the Falmouth Recreation Committee; we had a very
warm welcome and reception. We did a tour of the
facility with the Rec Committee and we’ll have
ongoing communication with them about where in the
building makes the most sense for the recreational
program and for the archive use.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Cuny.

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

We have met with our Town Manager, but my
question to her is if this passed, would they be
able to just move the archives to wherever they
want? Because the Recreation Committee did not
vote on where they should go. And we were looking at the different rooms, but the fact that they would take one and it would be a permanent taking, we, you know, we questioned which of the rooms that they wanted, because it has to be a certain size. And the one that was off the Teen Center was one that we really didn’t want to part with.

So, we haven’t gotten all the figures of where they want to put it. We didn’t close the door on the idea, but we certainly haven’t voted, and I would like to think that before their move to the Recreation building that you would re-assure that the Recreation Department and the Committee would have a formal vote on this.


MS. HARPER: I think we -- we would have no objection to that. The Board of Selectmen I believe ultimately has the authority over space use in town. I mean, I know that it’s clear that they’re looking for your input on what the best use of the Gus Canty Center is.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Yeah, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: I’m sorry, but it seems
like we’re putting the cart before the horse, here.

We’re giving you money to move something and you
don’t even know where you’re moving it to. And
you’re already sitting on 225 that you didn’t want
to tell us about last night.

I propose we zero this one out, too.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we have an
amendment to remove the Town Hall archives for
$95,000.

Discussion on the amendment.

Mr. Latimer.

So this amendment is to strike out the
Town Hall archives line.

MR. LATIMER: In addition to the concern
of not knowing where this money would be spent, I’m
concerned about almost - assuming that the rec
building - the community building could be used for
any other purpose for which it’s convenient to dump
something. I mean, I think that that is a
valuable facility that should be used for what it
was designed to be used for.

Are there no other publicly owned
buildings that could be used for either the Police
or - excuse me, either the dispatch center or this
storage that would be available to the Town? Are we saying there are no other buildings? Doesn’t the Town own other properties that could be perhaps rehabbed for these purposes?


MS. HARPER: Mr. Moderator, there are three locations in the Gus Canty Center that we reviewed with the Recreation Committee. In fact, we asked them where they think the most reasonable location would be. And I can’t speak for the Committee and neither can Ms. Cuny, I don’t think, but the reception was very warm. It wasn’t at all an adversarial conversation.

They – we are measuring all three of the locations. There are multiple issues. The height of the room -- two of them we know are feasible and we’re waiting for a report on the third location.

But I’m confident that, working with the Recreation Committee, that there will be a space in the Community Center that makes sense for this important community use. These are important files. They will be available to the public and there are locations in the facility that are currently not actively used.
In terms of other municipal buildings, we did explore many, many locations. Again, I worked closely with the Human Resources Director Denise Coleman. We explored every municipal facility. There’s currently nothing available now that would be appropriate for this use.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Hayward.

MS. HAYWARD: Nancy Hayward, precinct 5. Off the Historical Commission due to term limits.

I have one comment to make. I don’t know where you can put these. Please don’t put them in a basement. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Palmer.

CLERK PALMER: Can everyone hear me? In 2001, a report was done by I believe her name was Nancy Kugis [sp?], which made recommendations for the archival of our historic documents in Town and documents we use to do business.

Nothing has been done since 2001. We have woefully underspent on archiving of our public records. We need to move forward with some kind of system wherever it may be. I’m not saying it should be at the Rec building, but wherever it may be, to preserve the historical documents of this
If anybody has ever tried to put in a public request for documents, it is very difficult when you go into the basement of Town Hall and the pictures there, to see what the pictures look like of how these things are stored. It takes time to look through these documents to find what people are looking for.

We have been spending – and I have a saying, we spend on buying a Volkswagen bug where we need to be spending to buy a Cadillac. We have not spent any money in 15 years on archiving of documents. We need to do something and, wherever it is going to be in Town, we need to put some money into the archiving of documents and preserve the history -- the documental history of the Town.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adriene Dufresne, precinct 2.

The security of the Community Building for these archives -- did I understand that the Town records are under the control of Mr. Duffy; they’re also in a basement. A few years ago, when I was on the Finance Committee, I was witness to
some of the records that are in the basement of his
building. Are those records also going to be
placed in the Community Building under a secure
area?

CHAIRMAN JONES: [Nods.]

MR. DUFRESNE: Okay.

His records, of course, are very
important, the security of those records. That’s
the legal records of all the Town. And right now,
they’re sitting next to a furnace in the basement
of the building that he leases.

Some form of security would have to be
placed in whatever location all of these records
are going to be placed. And I don’t understand:
we close the Community Building usually every night
and I’m wondering about the liability. I think
that’s what’s on my mind, is, knowing both
locations, these archives have to be preserved and
they really have to be moved, but the security
portion is what I don’t understand.


MS. HARPER: It will be a secure
location. It will be locked and secured and
likely will have a swipe card system associated
MR. DUFRESNE: With an alarm?

MS. HARPER: I don’t know.

MR. DUFRESNE: I mean, it’s right next to the Police Station –

MS. HARPER: Yeah.

MR. DUFRESNE: I would suggest every bit of security necessary –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, all right.

Let’s go. I don’t want to get into the question of where that’s going to go. That’s the – the Selectmen are going to make that decision. Either you want to give them the 95,000 to go forward with this, or not, okay?

We don’t have the authority to set the site, here. They’re going to make that decision. I think they hear the concerns of Town Meeting members. So, if there’s anything new related to the 95,000.

MR. DUFRESNE: I would like to move that we keep the funds in place and remove it to a safer place.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Young?

Nothing new, okay.
Mr. Hargraves, anything new?

Mr. Hargraves: Peter Hargraves, precinct 9.

This is new in the sense that I’m kind of losing perspective on what we’re doing here. I thought we were allocating Free Cash to capital spending, and it seems to me that we’re assaulting volunteers, elected officials and paid administrators of the Town who are presenting us with their best thinking and I think we owe them a level of trust – or else it ought to come out at a different forum of performance reviews or some other venue. But I think assaulting the people who are up there trying to serve us is not the way to get this done. And micro-managing their job can only de-motivate them in giving their best creative effort. And so I would encourage us to think about what we’re trying to accomplish here.

And I know that they don’t need any defense from me, but I’d like to make a comment that I didn’t get a chance to make on the last item, which is: some people thought that we were directing Town management to look at one location. Personally, I’m glad that people have the passion...
in their job to deliver the best value to the taxpayers, and I thank Town management for looking at all the options and delivering that. That’s what I expect. And so, instead of not meeting expectations, I would say that’s exceeding expectations.

I would certainly consider the other things that have been brought up here: the SLOSH factor and can we lease equipment, but you know, attacking the people on the stage is not the way to get this done.

THE MODERATOR: Okay –

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: – the question will come on removing the $95,000 –

[Applause continuing.]

THE MODERATOR: The question is to remove the $95,000 for the Town Hall archives. 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 no’s have it by a majority.

Bike Path Design (CPC Match), 53,000.
Golf Equipment, 56,356.
Senior Center Owner’s Project Manager, $50,000. Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adriene Dufresne, precinct 2.

How about a slight explanation on is this a brand new position?

THE MODERATOR: The OPM for the Senior Center, Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: Just very quickly, the Owner’s Project Manager is a requirement of Chapter 149, which is the construction bid laws, and you’re required to have an Owner’s Project Manager on board prior to selecting an architect. We heard the report on the Senior Center the other night; our thought was to engage the Owner’s Project Manager for a short period of time to assist the Town in whatever is needed as soon as any additional vote is required related to an architect. So this is just making the next appropriate step in the decision-making relative to the Senior Center.
It’s not a staff position, it’s a contract.

MR. DUFRESNE: [Inaudible.]

MS. HARPER: It’s a contract.

MR. DUFRESNE: It’s a contract?

MS. HARPER: Correct, with a professional –

MR. DUFRESNE: A contract position.

And I’d probably have no problem with it, except that we’ve not really voted on a location for the Senior Center, of which I understand there’s been some discussion in the last couple of nights. And I question if this is not a premature appropriation, but that’s a personal opinion.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jones.

CHAIRMAN JONES: If I heard you correctly, Mr. Dufresne, there has been a vote taken on the location on Brick Kiln Road at the high school.

MR. DUFRESNE: It has been voted?

CHAIRMAN JONES: Yes, it has.

MR. DUFRESNE: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Phase 1, Portable Radios, $240,465.
Police Vehicle Radios, $112,000.

Mr. Donahue. Yes, with a microphone,

Mr. Donahue.

Is it on, or are you --

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: I don’t think it’s on.

Maybe the batteries died.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Mine are gettin’ a

little low.

[Laughter.]

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Chairman, through you
to our Finance Director.

I bring this up every time. Shouldn’t
these two items be in the Police Department budget?

Don’t they – all police vehicles need radios and
don’t all policemen need portable radios?

I keep asking every time this comes up.

I believe this should be in the Police budget.

It’s a normal thing. It’s nothing unusual. If
you – you know, the Fire Department, we’re going to
need a fire truck; that’s unusual. We don’t need
a fire truck every year, or even every ten years.

Why can’t we get these things so we can reflect the
Police budget and other budgets in a proper accounting manner?

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Go ahead, Ms. Petit.

MS. PETIT: This is a Capital item.

It’s not an operating expense item, so you wouldn’t see it in the Operating Budget, if that’s what the question is. We’re not using re-occurring revenues to buy this. This is the first phase of replacing all of our radios, so it’s not something that we would put in the budget in April every year.

MR. DONAHUE: But my point is, is that all equipment that’s used by a department, standard equipment, should be in their budget, not in a Capital budget. It should all be –

THE MODERATOR: Whoa, whoa, whoa, Mr. Donahue –

MR. DONAHUE: – so we reflect –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Donahue, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Go into your warrant booklet and look at the Working Group’s definition
of Capital, okay?

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah.

THE MODERATOR: And we don’t upgrade our entire portable radio system on a regular basis. It’s not like buying the police cruisers every three years, re-occurring expense, re-occurring. This clearly meets the definition that the Working Group that Mr. Anderson put together defined to lead us into a paradigm of what is capital and what is operating.

MR. DONAHUE: But we bought these a few years ago, as well.

What I’m saying is that, anything that’s standard equipment, whether it’s stationery or radios, if it belongs in that department, it should be bought under that budget so we know what the total cost of that department is.

I’m just looking for what the total cost is. You don’t – and in the spring, you won’t come down and say the police budget was $2.50 plus $5.00 for radios and give us a – do you follow what I’m saying? I just think that –

THE MODERATOR: No, I don’t, actually, and I’m losing my patience with it.
MR. DONAHUE: I'm sorry.

THE MODERATOR: Because this is – could I have the Chief explain the upgrade to this system? Because, clearly, the background of why we're doing this radio system is not known by anyone.

So, could we talk about the upgrade of the platform, here, and that this isn't a re-occurring expense; that we're actually –

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Job shift.

CHIEF DUNN: He's going to help me, because he understands.

These portable radios that the Police Department are using are from 1996 Olympics. There are no parts for 'em. We are scavenging the ones that are good to repair 'em.

Our cruiser radios are also from 1996. Motorola, if you talk to Motorola, the young techs at Motorola now have never even heard of our radios.

[Laughter.]

CHIEF DUNN: And, like I said, they are failing and if you come into the Police station,
I’ll show you the box that we have that we’re scavenging parts just to keep them running for now. So, we don’t buy new radios every year.


FPI Vehicle. Fire Prevention Inspection vehicle, yes, Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, precinct 9. And, I’m sorry, I just wanted to go back to the Ford F-250. For what department is this vehicle for? I think we should at least know is this for Police, Fire, DPW? Who is it going to?

THE MODERATOR: Yeah. If we go in the back, it’s in there. There’s a sheet for each one. Does anybody got it off the top of their head?

MS. PETIT: It’s for the Police Department.

THE MODERATOR: Police Department.

Okay?

Fire Prevention Officer Vehicle.

EMS Supervisor Vehicle.

Marina Building Roof.
Let's see, and then we've got the DPW.

This is the DPW Garage Windows. That was the change in the main motion from the fire station to DPW garage windows.

Rec Center Exterior Wallboard.

Two Emergency Generators.

Road Maintenance/Construction/Sidewalks.

Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: Peter Hargraves, precinct 9.

I notice that in the back this is requested at $850,000, and it's consistently in the out years requested at that amount. We spent $200,000 last year and the statement, if I'm recalling it correctly, is the 200,000 is kind of the minimum to cover crack filling and striping.

So, my question to all of us and to Ray Jack if he's here: should we increase this amount, considering we saved 300,000 in one of the line items and 121,500 in another. So, we have $421,500; should we be putting more money into road maintenance? I see a lot of road projects and they always seem to get it done, but so I don't really know if this is smart, to increase this.
I’m looking for some help and guidance on this.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Harper or Ms. Petit.

MS. PETIT: Yes, this question came up last year because it’s consistently requested in the Capital Plan of about $800,000. The issue is that the DPW, if we appropriate $200,000, they still have money from previous years on the books. So you can appropriate more money, but they won’t spend it in the next year.

We want to -- you know, in the next year we’ll probably be able to increase it a little bit knowing that they will get to the projects for the roads and actually spend it. But they have more than the 200 that you’re going to appropriate already on the books and that’s why we only recommended the $200,000.

MR. HARGRAVES: Thank you.

Could I just ask a clarifying question on what you just said, Jennifer?

MS. PETIT: Sure.

MR. HARGRAVES: Is that because there isn’t the need, or because they don’t have the capability to manage that many projects?

MS. PETIT: Well, I definitely think
there's a need. It's just, you know, in the last couple years, I think with staffing and things of that nature, they just haven't been able to get to those projects.

And also, I want to remind everybody that they do have use of Chapter 90 funds, and they've been using that as well. They just haven't been getting to the money too much of what we've been appropriating. So we want to let them catch up a little bit, but you'll probably see an increase next year.


MR. MCCONARTY: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Peter McConarty, Deputy Director of Public Works, Town Engineer.

It is correct, we do have Chapter 90 funds that we use on an annual basis. The Chapter 90 funds that we do use is basically what we use for our road maintenance. This $200,000 was appropriated.

It is correct, the statement. It basically covers line striping, crack sealing and minor repairs that we do to the roadways. It does
not take care of any of the larger areas that we’re working on the roadways.

So, we will be working this year to reduce the budgets for the roadway, but what we don’t want to do is start depending on Chapter 90 funds, as what we have been doing.

You’ve been seeing a lot of construction going around town. You’ve been seeing it on Acapesket Road. You’ve been seeing it on Old Barnstable Road. That is our Chapter 90 funds and it’s not to be confused with the funds that we have for local. We don’t want to be relying on our Chapter 90 funds. We are looking to increase our local funds for the roadway maintenance.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else on that one?

All right, let’s see. A Dump Truck with Plow, 190.

Sweeper, 260,000.

Roadside Mower, 100,000.

Sewer Cleaning Truck Rehab, 45,000.

Chipper, 70,000.

Pickup Truck F350, 50,000.
Mower and Blower, 43,217.

Replace Van with F350 Truck, 50,000.

Wastewater System upgrade, 125,000.

New fire safety improvements and paging system, 163,460. Ms. Mace.

MS. MACE: Okay, just making sure it works.

Rose Mace, precinct 3.

This is through you, Mr. Moderator, to Mrs. Harper. In my precinct meeting we went over the replacement of mini van. If you look in the back of your Articles of the Warrant, they want to replace this mini van with an F-350. And their explanation for it is that the mini van has 103,000 miles on it and that it was beyond its life cycle. And you said the other reason was because they needed the F-350 for a piece of equipment they need to put in the back of it, you believed. And I was wondering if you got that information.


MS. HARPER: I did raise your inquiry with the Facilities Coordinator and the Finance Director and I know Shardell is prepared to answer that question for you.
THE MODERATOR:   Ms. Newton.

MS. NEWTON:   Shardell Newton, Facilities Manager.

What we’re doing is we have a van that was a hand-me-down from the Water Department, which many of our vehicles usually are hand-me-downs. We have a half ton, very small half ton Chevrolet pickup truck that our town carpenter drives. That vehicle originally belonged to me. It was purchased for the Facilities Manager; it wasn’t purchased to do heavy jobs or push snow around.

Since the hiring of the carpenter, we’ve taken that truck and we gave it to him. And as you’ve all seen, I’m sure you’ve seen him around town, lugging wood around. That half ton just can’t push snow for us. And we’re the first ones out in the morning. What we try to do is help the DPW by plowing the smaller buildings, like the Senior Center, the Rec area, the Police station. We just can’t push snow around with that half ton pickup.

So we’re taking the oldest vehicle of the fleet, which is a two wheel drive van; that’s driven by the overnight person. We have a person
that works 11:00 to 7:00 at night. So that person in a snowstorm is driving around in a two wheel drive van that has a rotted floor in it, and it’s just not really that safe. So we’re going to get rid of that vehicle. We’re going to give the four wheel drive half ton pickup to the custodians that work at night, and the new one ton pickup will be driven by the Town Carpenter.

Those guys start work at six o’clock in the morning; they coordinate with Mr. Souza on who’s going to plow what and where we’re going to go.

So we really help the DPW out to keep some of the bigger trucks on the roads where they belong and we’ll take the one ton pick-ups and try to get the Town buildings cleared so we can keep these buildings open for the snow storms.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on the Capital Budget?

Hearing none, the question will come on the main motion – the amendments – as amended. So, your amendments included removing the Town Hall renovation, and that was the only amendment.

So the new total amount is $3,582,003.
All those in favor of the Capital Budget, signify
by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it
unanimous.

Article 10, Madame Chairman for the main
motion.

CHAIRMAN VOGEL: Mr. Moderator, I move
article 10 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This
is non-Capital projects, to transfer from Certified
Free Cash $403,860.

Mr. Hargraves held this.

MR. HARGRAVES: [No mic:] No.

[inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Well, I had you for ten
and eleven.

MR. HARGRAVES: [No mic:] Okay, I did
have one question. Thanks for correcting me.

[With mic:] The only – Peter Hargraves,
precinct 9.

There’s one item under Water, Update
Water and Sewer Rate Study, and I was wondering the nature and purpose of that work. It seemed like something that somebody who has a job in DPW would be doing, and I don’t know if this is a consultant, and for what purpose that we would be paying $30,000 for this study.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Potamis, Mr. Rafferty, who’s - let’s give Mr. Rafferty a shot.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: He gave us a great tour a couple weeks ago with the Municipal Citizen’s Academy.

MR. RAFFERTY: The Town every few years takes a look at what revenue is raised by the Water Department and the Sewer Department, to make sure the revenue that’s being raised covers the cost of those departments. Those costs are the cost of the labor, the cost of the materials, as well as the cost to recover some of the capital in the project of fixing the pipes.

We haven’t done it for a number of years. The new Water Treatment Plant is going to cost us some more money to run. We’re going to get a lot
more sewer users. Both of those factors will affect what the rates are.

I believe the question was can it be done internally. I suppose it could be, however we’ve used a consultant in the past who has got a vast knowledge of what rates are charged across the state, and he’ll help us in comparison to what we’re doing to other communities, and help us with the economics of how much and how fast we should try to take on certain projects and the fairness of the rates that we’re going to establish.

The state’s got several rules around water quality management and water resource management and we’re going to have to make sure that our rates fit into those rules. There is some complexity to that and we want it done right.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Hargraves.

With a microphone, please.

MR. HARGRAVES: Your answer was excellent, as usual, and it pinged on the purpose of my question.

So, in doing the rate study are we planning to look at making the Water Department and Sewer Department paying for itself, or creating a
revenue generator based on equitable rates in other communities? Because I would hope the former. I’m concerned that, you know, we have low water rates and a lot of people enjoy that, and some people are feeling that—whether it’s folklore or truth—that the Water Department is a money-maker now. And I know we’ve had informal kind of banter on this point, but I would hope the purpose is to just establish a fair rate based on the cost of delivering services in Falmouth. But I don’t know; I’m asking you that.

MR. RAFFERTY: I think you stated it rather well. The intent is for the Water and Sewer rates to cover the actual full costs of the Water and Sewer Departments.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further discussion on Article 10, the non-capital items? 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, that was Mr. Hargraves wanted to release his hold.

What, Mr. Finneran? A point of order.

MR. FINNERAN: Yeah.

I know we voted on it, and would it be possible to go back to number 10 and my question is: we just saved $300,000 from the Town Hall funds. Would it be possible in any way to take that 300,000 and earmark it towards the fire engine that we definitely need? And try to address that safety issue?

THE MODERATOR: The article, this is a non-capital article and it’s – we’ve already taken a vote on it, so it’s closed.

MR. FINNERAN: Well.

THE MODERATOR: We’ll have to come back at a future Town Meeting if we’re going to buy a fire truck.

Article 11 was held and he wants to release the hold, by Mr. Hargraves. So the chair would entertain a motion from the Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Jim Fox, Chairman of the Planning Board.
We recommend indefinite postponement.

THE MODERATOR: 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.

The next one, we’re going to go to Article 14. By a call of the chair, we’re going to take that one out of order because we have to decide if we’re going to rezone the land before we can give them authority to do stuff on the land.

So, Article 14 is to see if the Town will vote to amend the official zoning map of the Town of Falmouth so as to rezone from Public Use to Light Industrial C a portion of the former Town landfill.

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

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moderator, we recommend the article as printed.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, as printed.

And I think we have a presentation that
will address this and sort of be an overview of all these three articles and then we can have a little debate and then we can go article to article.

Mr. Galasso.

MR. GALASSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Good evening, Town Meeting members. My name is Michael Galasso. I'm the Chairman of the Falmouth Economic Development and Industrial Corporation, also known as the Falmouth EDIC.

With me tonight is Board member Jim Fox, our consultant Mike Richards with Weston and Sampson, and our Attorney Laura Moynihan.

We have a short PowerPoint presentation this evening on the proposal to rezone a portion of the closed landfill on Thomas Landers Road from Public Use to Light Industrial C; it's Article 14.

And to ask for your approval for the EDIC to enter into a land lease with the Town, that's Article 12; to develop a solar array at the landfill which could generate up to 5 megawatts of electricity and save the Town between 250 to 500,000 dollars a year in electrical cost.

These three articles, if approved by you this evening, again will save the Town between 250
and 500,000 a year at no cost to the Town. This
is a different way to produce renewable energy for
our community.

Let’s see how we propose to do that.

First slide, please.

Just a quick background on the EDIC. It
was formed in 1981 by vote of Town Meeting, and on
the screen are some of the projects that were –
some of the ones that have been already completed.
And the one that we’re currently working on is the
Falmouth Station. If you recall from our
presentation in the spring, we entered into a long-
term, 99 year lease with Mass. DOT to renovate the
Falmouth Station, and we were also able to secure a
grant from the Mass. DOT for 1.4 million to go
towards renovation of that project.

The current capped landfill and the
surrounding development.

Next slide, please.

The nearest residential home to the
capped landfill is 600 feet away. That’s shown on
the right in that little square box. Sorry it’s
not a little bit bigger. It’s 714 Blacksmith Shop
Road. 617 feet away.
Let me give you a little bit of background if I could. In 2012, the EDIC entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Town to study at our cost, the EDIC’s cost, all the potential re-uses that could reasonably be accomplished at the closed and capped landfill. We hired and paid for a consultant, Weston and Sampson, who has extensive experience in studying land use and market alternatives for closed landfills, to study all the potential re-uses that our landfill could support.

We held a number of open public meetings and information forums between 2012 and 2015 to solicit input into the study and the proposed plans, including meeting with the Board of Selectmen, the Planning Board, and noticing the residents and property owners within 1,000 feet of the site. We individually invited all the property owners within 1,000 feet to come and join us at those meetings to discuss the highest and best use.

If you recall, we presented an update to you at the Spring Town Meeting, where we mentioned we would be before you this evening.
The study by Western & Sampson looked into and evaluated a variety of potential re-uses ranging from recreational, agricultural, industrial -- such as contractors’ yards and boat storage -- to parking. A copy of the re-use study has been posted on the EDIC website for a number of months.

The conclusion of that study, taking into account public input, was to develop the solar array which could generate up to 5 megawatts of electricity to be used at Town-owned facilities and reduce the Town’s cost of electricity.

In addition to the study, the EDIC has also paid for the interconnection study we needed to submit to Eversource to determine if the grid could accept the proposed power that the landfill could generate, and what would be the cost which the solar developer would pay to upgrade the grid. The result of that study that was approved by Eversource was that: yes, the grid could accept the power we would generate at the landfill.

Next slide, please. Next slide.

This is the area of the landfill we are asking to be rezoned from PU, Public Utility, to Light Industrial C. The Waste Management Facility
which is located up in the upper left-hand corner, is not a part of our rezoning request. The total area of the Landfill is approximately 53 acres, and the area to be rezoned is in the shaded area; it is approximately 48 acres.

There is a map with more detail in your warrant book.

Next slide, please.

So, again, here is the evaluation criteria that Western & Sampson used in ranking each of the potential re-uses. What was legally possible, physically permissible and financially feasible, that was the criteria in looking at all the potential re-uses that our landfill could be put to.

Again, the full report, which we reported on in the Spring, is on our website.

Next slide, please.

So the zoning district that permits ground-mounted solar panels in our community, by right, is Light Industrial C. It is the only zoning in town that permits ground-mounted solar arrays.

If you agree to the rezoning tonight,
Article 12 would authorize the Selectmen to enter
in negotiations with the EDIC for a ground lease of
the area being rezoned, and Article 13 would
generate – would grant easements over Town-owned
land that would allow us to connect the power – the
solar power into the grid.

There’s a telephone pole on the left-hand
side as you enter the landfill; that’s the
connection point. That’s not a part of the area
that we’re going to be leasing; it’ll remain Town-
owned and we need an easement to get to that power
pole. And that’s Article 13.

So, once the EDIC enters into a lease
with the Town, it would then enter into a sub-lease
with the selected solar developer.

Next slide, please.

So the solar array will be developed,
financed, maintained and, at the termination of the
lease they would remove the panels – if we want
them to be removed – by the selected solar
developer. And to ensure that the solar developer
who’s selected to build the array meets all their
obligations to both the EDIC and the Town, we will
require that the developer post a bond or a letter
of credit.

The Town will not borrow any money, provide any grants, nor have any financial obligation in the development of the solar array at the landfill. So, let me repeat that so we all understand: the Town will not borrow any money, provide any grants. It will have no financial obligation in the development of the solar array at the landfill.

The EDIC will be responsible for selecting the solar developer and entering into agreements for the development with the selected developer. The Town will receive the benefit of reduced, green, renewable energy at a cost lower than what it currently pays Eversource.

The Town will enter into what is called a Power Purchase Agreement, known as a PPA, to purchase the power generated at the landfill from the solar developer at a rate below what we currently pay Eversource for electricity.

In addition, we have the right to fix our cost of electricity over the 20 year period.

Next slide, please.

Okay. There is some urgency in moving
forward tonight. One of the financial incentives
to developing solar projects, whether it’s on your
home roof or projects like we’re proposing at the
landfill, is a 30 percent federal tax credit, which
is available to solar developers or to a homeowner
if you purchase the solar system and place it on
your roof.

The Town, since we do not pay federal
taxes, cannot take advantage of the credit. The
credit is due to be reduced to ten percent at the
end of 2016. The potential impact is that if we
are not in operation by the end of 12 – by
12/31/16, the end of 2016, the credit expires and
reverts to a ten percent credit. The cost of
developing the solar array will increase and the
savings to the Town would decrease. We would still
derive a savings; it just won’t be as large.

All indications are if we obtain your
approval tonight for all the three articles, we can
meet the end of the year deadline. It’s the end
of 2016.

I’m going to ask my fellow board member
Jim Fox – Jim wears a lot of different hats, but
he’s been a long-term board member of the EDIC –
THE MODERATOR: Mr. Galasso, before you do that --

Can we just have a motion, Mrs. Long?

MS. LONG: Mr. Moderator, may we have a motion to continue after eleven o’clock to finish these three articles.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, to continue after eleven o’clock for this package of articles. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a two-thirds majority and I so declare.

Mr. Galasso.

MR. GALASSO: Thank you.

So Jim is going to take you through some of the preliminary cash flow projections so you get an idea how we’re coming up with the potential savings to the Town.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Can I have the next slide, please. Ooh, that’s so small.

Basically what we have here is three different categories. We’re looking at getting a
20 percent discount, a 30 percent discount or a 40.
Which, the 14 cents as you see it in the second
column, that’s what the electric bills are. The
actual numbers, the actual credit now is that’s
closer to 17. These numbers are a year old.
The estimated dollars that we thought we
would get from a credit you can see goes from
either 11 or as low as 8. We got the bids today,
and the bids are at 6, and they’re fixed for 20
years. If you changed those two numbers, one to
the 17, which is the current bid rate, the electric
rate, and the other one to six, that 500,000 – that
400 becomes an almost $800,000.
We have seven bids in from some of the
major companies in the country like this, with all
great credit and this project’s looking really
good. We’re just going through the bids right now,
but they look absolutely fantastic. Almost double
our expectation on the revenue. So it’s good
news.
Next slide, please.
This shows how the Town flow goes. The
Town leases the site to the EDIC, and it collects
rent from the EDIC and it gets payment in lieu of
taxes. And it also saves on the discounted electricity through what we call a Power Purchase Agreement. The EDIC leases it from the Town and subleases it from the developer. We just wanted an intermediate role because we’ve been working on it for three years and studying it and we’re the ones that took the initiative.

The developer actually spends all the money. This third party alternative is what we – the decision we made that makes it different from any other projects. We’re not – the Town is not investing anything. The simple way to put this is we’re renting the dump out for about $800,000 a year. It’s a really good deal.

The developer is going to build the photovoltaic array on it at their own costs. They’re going to pay the EDIC rent. They’re going to make payment in lieu of taxes to the Town, and they’re going to sell the Town electricity at around six cents a Kilowatt, with the current price being 17. And that six cents is fixed for the entire term of the 25 year agreement, because we own – the Town owns the land. That’s the deal. And we’re letting them come in and build. They own
the equipment, we own the land.

And the reason why this works is, as Mike mentioned first, this is over a ten million dollar project we’re doing here, so this 30 percent tax credit, they’re getting $3 million back right off the top if we get it done in the first couple year – in the first – before the end of next year.

And on top of that, the state gives out a tremendous amount of SRECs, or Solar Recoverable Energy Credits that only third parties can use, only for-profit companies can use; the Town can’t use it. So they are selling those. They syndicate them, they re-sell them, and that’s where they’re getting all their money from, basically from two incentives.

One, they get the money from selling the electrons to the Town. We actually do some electricity, here. But the more than two-thirds of the money comes in the form of these SRECs and credits, and that’s where – that’s how this thing is all coming together.

Next screen, please.

Now, in the zoning. At some of the meetings, you know, people brought up their usual
thing, they say “spot zoning”. Okay? As you can see, we have – this is the area of the town that the Planning Board’s been working on and the Local Comprehensive Plan has been considering for the past three or four years.

We first create the Light Industrial C district before it’s assigned anywhere. That’s the way zoning works. First you create the district, and you have a vision where you’d like to assign it. And, as far as the Planning Board goes, we’ve been looking at this area of town because it has major truck routes coming in and out Blacksmith Shop Road; not far from Sandwich Road, Thomas Landers and 28. That’s where your industrial land is.

So this has been part of a long-term comprehensive plan. We have a letter from the Attorney General verifying that this is not spot zoning, this is something that – part of our long-term plan and it is included in our Local Comprehensive Plan.

You can see the one little dark area there is an area that we first assigned to Light Industrial C a couple meetings ago, and in our view
we’d like to encourage more property owners in this whole area if they want to, because Light Industrial C was brought to us by our town — people working in our town. They needed to have a place for their contractors yards.

Can I have the next slide, please.

These are the by-right uses in Light Industrial C. Contractors yards, wholesale to the trades, warehouse and ground-mounted solar array. These are all by-right uses. And the most important thing in here is there is no residential use.

One of the things we had with our Light Industrial A and our Light Industrial B over the last 20 years, it was all eaten up with condominium developments. So we used up all our land, because that was a permitted right they could build eight units per acre, and off Carlson road and Treetops and many of those areas in town, were all developed over the last 20 years and they ate up our Industrial land and so our contractors were moving out of town. So they came to the Planning Board, pleaded with us, and we created Light Industrial C and we’re — part of the long-term plan is to apply
it to this area. So it’s been something we’ve been working on for years.

Next slide, please.

This is what some of the other – this is what other areas look like, that have done it. These are landfills that are capped.

Next slide.

This is what the equipment looks like on grade. It actually sets right – it’s not buried in the ground. It sets right on top of the landfill. It sits on concrete blocks and it’s pretty much plug and play. They snap the panels down and put the conduits in and –

Next slide, please.

And then they – that’s the frame before they put it on it.

And one more.

And it’s – the cool thing about the Cape, we have some of the best environment – our summer environment, with the cooler weather, actually produces more electricity than any other areas of the country, because if it gets too hot, they don’t work that well. So the Cape is uniquely seated or suited for this.
The next slide.

These are the inverters. The solar arrays can make DC power, direct power, and it has to be converted to AC to go into the grid, so we have about ten of these that’ll be going on site. And those again are just sitting on those concrete pads. They’re not buried in the ground. They can be lifted up and taken away.

Next slide.

These are all the towns that have already done this on Cape Cod. We’re about four or five years behind the curve, here. This has been going on for a long time and all these have been done, with the exception of Mashpee and Dennis, by Cape & Vineyard Electric Cooperative. So, as you can see, they’ve been going on and they’re generating an awful lot of power. So it’s not some new idea.

Next slide.

Some of you, I hope you got letters from - emails from us if you wanted to see the background. These are some of the other information that you could get. You could click on these links and you can get these background information if you needed it.
Next slide.

And this is the credits for the project.

It’s done by the EDIC, myself, Dave Eldredge and John. The other board of directors is Sue Moran, Jay Zavalas, Brooks Bartlett and Chris Langlais. Weston & Sampson, Mike Richards has been working with us for years on this project and we have the Law Offices of Laura Moynihan; she’s been working on the zoning aspect of it and helping us with the Power Purchase Agreement.

We’ve been lucky enough to get the Power Purchase Agreement and the lease from Mashpee, so we already can take a look at. We’re not reinventing the wheel, here. We’re have – we’re copying the documents. I myself actually went down and visited some of these sites and through the Freedom of Information Act got copies of the bids from the other towns.

So we’ve been studying this for a long time. We’re really well prepared. And the numbers are fantastic. They’re almost double our expectation and we’re pretty sure that the Selectmen will be real happy to – I think they have a place to put that money.
FROM THE FLOOR: Vote it in.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Putnam.

FROM THE FLOOR: Vote, vote.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Putnam.

We’ve got a zoning article; we can’t just vote it in. We gotta –

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca –

MR. GALASSO: I just wanted to – excuse me, Mr. Moderator, I just wanted to conclude, if I could, by –

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. GALASSO: – saying that we’re available to answer any questions that you have this evening. We’ve made presentations to all the precinct meetings. Anyone who has a question, both Jim and myself are available and our consultants, too.


MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, precinct 9. I am very much in favor of the solar.

It’s, you know, less obtrusive to neighbors, even if there were neighbors.

But I have an issue with zoning a Light Industrial C. Because Public Use allows a lot
more usage there if these solar panels end up, you know, when the lease ends or if we don’t use them and some other technology comes out 30, 40, 50 years from now, because that’s what happens, technology changes.

Through you, Mr. Moderator, I’d like to ask the Town Planner or the Zoning Board of Appeals why we would not be able to do a special permit for the life of the lease for these solar panels instead so that we don’t rezone, and still be able to use the land for solar panels.

CHAIRMAN FOX: I would just like to make one comment. We have been looking at this area to rezone Light Industrial C as part of the Local Comprehensive Plan we put together, as part of the - and brought to this board and approved, for a long time. So this is part of a plan the Town’s been working on and thinking about for a long time.

MS. PUTNAM: But that was not my question.

CHAIRMAN FOX: I know. I just wanted to -

MS. PUTNAM: My question was can we, instead of rezoning, do a special permit so that if
we need this section of land for a public use, that it does not fall under a Light Industrial C; we would still be able to utilize it.

MR. CURRY: The short answer is no. Would you like the longer answer?

The Light Industrial C has a category in there, the photovoltaic array, as a matter of right. Public Use district is silent. It has no by right or special permit use that lists the photovoltaic array. So you’re sort of stuck with the LIC zone at this point, for the longer answer.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Hargraves.

Then I got back there, yeah.

MR. HARGRAVES: Peter Hargraves, precinct 9.

I’m aligned with Ms. Putnam on this. I’d like to read a brief section from Massachusetts General Law Part one, Title 5, Chapter 40A on zoning, Section 3: subjects which zoning may not regulate, exemptions, public hearings, temporary manufactured home residences. And mercifully there’s only one sentence that applies to this discussion.

It says: No zoning ordinance or bylaw
shall prohibit or unreasonably regulate the
installation of solar energy systems or the
building of structures that facilitate the
collection of solar energy, except where necessary
to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

Which means that we could put – and I’m
in favor of this solar project and I congratulate
the proponents on their financial wizardry and
cleverness in putting it altogether. But I object
to this zoning change. I don’t think it’s
necessary. In fact, I had an email exchange with
Mr. Fox, and part of the answer I got was
reinforcing and underlining my concerns. If you
heard at the beginning of the presentation, it was
said that the nearest home is 600 feet away, which
is closer than some of the turbine objectors’ homes
where they’re having issues.

And if you look at what’s allowed by
Light Industrial C, I think – and, at the same
time, turbine objectors – I’m sorry to use that
shorthand, but I’m trying to save time at eleven
o’clock – were very willing to accept solar and
it’s not as intrusive.

So I would say some of the Light
Industrial C uses would be more offensive and intrusive and objectionable to residents, and in fact the – one of the – the part that relevant in the answer I got to my email was “rent will be negotiated as well as a payment in lieu of taxes based on any additional investments on the site”. And my question was really regarding who would have control over remaining land after the solar panels were put in, and who would control the use, and who would actually be responsible for the performance of those other people leasing the property.

I’m just concerned this is a Trojan horse and we’re –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, let’s get an answer. Yes, go ahead.

MS. MOYNIHAN: I’m Laura Moynihan, the attorney for the EDIC just to respond, Mr. Hargraves. The section that you quote from the Mass. General Laws, we’re aware of that section, but we do feel that the zoning bylaw has to specifically authorize the use. It can’t -- while it may not prohibit it by way of certain regulations, here you have a very complicated RFP process, where you have developers coming in to bid
on this solar. We want specific authorization
within the zone to allow this particular use.

The zoning bylaw was amended to allow
this use in the Light Industrial C District and
that’s why the rezoning is being requested, so that
it is very crystal clear and there’s no ambiguity
that the use is allowed. That’s important to the
process as a whole.

Also, as far as the rezoning goes, we
have to keep in mind that the town owns this land,
so this isn’t a private landowner or petitioner’s
article coming in, asking you to rezone the land
Light Industrial C and opening it up to the various
uses in the bylaw. Because the Town owns this
land, in essence, Town Meeting has a say and has a
level of control over what goes on on this land.

If for some reason this project did not
materialize and there was some other use that the
Town boards wanted to make of this land, in
response to Ms. Putnam’s suggestion, then we would
have a new rezoning article perhaps back before
you, to rezone that land back to Public Use or some
other zoning that would specifically address the
presentation before you for the land use.
So, in a way, there’s a built-in regulation of what goes on on this land, which is a good thing.

In terms of other uses for the property, obviously those things would have to go through the Town board and the Town would have control over them.

So, that is the difference here. It’s important to keep in mind. It is a large parcel of land. It is an unusual type of rezoning article because it is the Town itself coming to you and asking you for it, but we do believe that the specific authorization for the use is important to the project. It is authorized by the bylaw in this district and that’s why we’re asking for the LIC.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the center section, yes, right there.

Yes, with a microphone, please.

FROM THE FLOOR: Is this equipment going to be made in America?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Galasso.

MR. GALASSO: Two things that we have
requested in the Request for Proposals from the
developers are that they - we prefer that the
panels be made in America and that they hire local
contractors for the installation.

So we can’t guarantee that, but we have
asked for that to be part of the RFP.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Long. Mrs.
Long.

MS. LONG: [No mic: inaudible.]


You’re on the list, yeah. Ms. Moran.

MS. MORAN: Okay, Susan Moran. As you
saw, I’m also a member of the EDIC.

And I just want to emphasize a point that
Attorney Moynihan made. I’m also an attorney.

I’ve worked for a long time with developers,
contractors, financers. And, as we saw with the
Marriott, that developers are - put a great weight
upon not having to go through the cost and the time
of - and the uncertainty of special permits. And
it adds to the value of the development.

And it also, in this case, with the
credits being a very short window and development
time being, you know, of the utmost importance as
it always is with developers, that that’s why it’s requested as part of this project.

I just wanted to just highlight that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Siegel, and then Mr. Latimer.

MS. SIEGEL: Mr. Moderator, I’d like to call the vote – move the question.

And I’m also wondering, since we’ve been discussing all three articles here, if I can possibly move all three questions.

THE MODERATOR: No, you – we can’t do that, but we have to do them one at a time.

MS. SIEGEL: Didn’t think so, but it was worth a try.

THE MODERATOR: Good try, though.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Good try.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: So the question will come on closing discussion. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[None opposed.]
THE MODERATOR: Opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it unanimously.

The question will now come on Article 14.

This requires a two-thirds majority. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous and I declare the two-thirds majority.

Do we want to try to do the other two related ones?

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The chair would recognize the chair of the Board of Selectmen for a main motion on Article 12.

CHAIRMAN FOX: The Planning Board recommends Article 12 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I got Board of Selectmen written in my book, here.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator --

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JONES: - the Board of Selectmen also recommends Article 12 as printed.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, but you’re making the main motion, right? The Board of Selectmen’s making the main motion as printed, is the recommendation.

Any discussion?

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

Oh, there is one? Okay, yes, Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Gary Anderson, precinct 7.

To avoid any issues such as we’ve had with the wind turbines, is there any known or possible deleterious effects on neighbors or aircraft, such as reflections or noise, from these sort of photovoltaic solar arrays?

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Galasso.

MR. GALASSO: We certainly did a report – it was done by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center. That was sent out to many Town Meeting members. And, as far as them creating any noise, the inverters that were pictured before
make a humming noise that is similar to the transmitters that are on poles. But I will tell you that, from our experience in going and seeing these, they make less noise than the seagulls that used to live at the dump.

And also, though many of the seagulls are now gone, there is quite a bit of industrial operation that occurs out in that area. There is land mining that goes on, there is heavy truck traffic on both the roads, the site is pretty well screened by trees. The nearest home is over 600 feet away and, based upon our experience in visiting other locations, within 50 feet any noise from those inverters dissipates and you don’t hear them.

MR. ANDERSON: [No mic:] Reflections?

THE MODERATOR: Reflections?

MR. GALASSO: Solar panels are built to absorb sunlight and not reflect them. So they do not reflect and cause any – there hasn’t been any instances of solar glare causing any problems with air traffic control.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Richard Latimer, precinct
We’ve been told that this is the highest optimal use of this land that we owned, for which nothing else can be used. Who’s going to develop on a landfill, a capped landfill?

This is no brainer. I move the question.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, then let’s just vote on it.

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 12. Mr. Chairman for the main motion – 13, sorry. I’m writing my notes on 12 and trying to get to 13.

So, 13, Mr. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen.

CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 13 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: As printed. This is
to authorize the Board of Selectmen to grant,
transfer and convey any leases or easements, excuse
me, necessary.

Any discussion?
Hearing none, then the question will come
on the main motion. All those in favor, signify
by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it
unanimous.

And we will come back on -

MR. GALASSO: Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: -- Thursday at seven
o’clock.

Don’t forget tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. we’ll
have the Veteran’s Day Ceremony at Falmouth High
School auditorium.

[11:25 p.m., whereupon, this matter adjourned for the
night.]
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