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

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

[Pause.]

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

[Pause.]

MR. NETTO: 43.

THE MODERATOR: First division 43.

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

MR. HAMPSON: 67.

THE MODERATOR: 67.

In the second division, Mr. Dufresne?
MR. DUFRESNE:  94.

THE MODERATOR:  94.

By a counted vote of 204, we have a quorum and I’ll call the Annual Town Meeting into session.

All present please rise for the presentation of the colors by the Brian Baru Pipe Band and Boys Scouts Troop 42.

[Colors presented.]

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

[Pledge of Allegiance taken.]

THE MODERATOR:  At this time, we’ll have the National Anthem by the Falmouth Town Band Brass Choir.

[National Anthem played.]

THE MODERATOR:  At this time, I’ll recognize Andrew Putnam for our invocation.

MR. PUTNAM:  Heavenly Father, may our meeting this evening be not only an exercise of care and concern for our community and its residents, but also an example of how a community can agree and disagree and still be a community. We ask you to watch over and protect our
families, our community, our nation and our
world. May your gift of peace become a reality
for all. Amen.

THE MODERATOR: At this time, the Brian
Baru Pipe Band will play Amazing Grace in honor
of our veterans, and also during this time if we
could pause to remember the tragedies – the
natural disaster that’s happened in the
Philippines.

[Amazing Grace played.]

[Moment of Silence.]

THE MODERATOR: Colors post.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Brian Baru
Pipe Band, Boy Scouts Troop 42 and the Falmouth
Town Band Brass Choir.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the first thing
we’re going to do tonight is swear in our new
Town Meeting Members. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK PALMER: The following people
please rise. David Bailey, Albert Fitzelle,
Paul Ketchum, Richard Latimer, Deborah Maguire,
David Martin, Jean McCluskey, Thomas Peterson,
Peter Waasdorp.
Wendi Buesseler, Anne Dewees, Robert Dugan, Lois Girard, Sia Karplus, Tracy Mincer, Brian Nickerson, Gerald Potamis, Tiffany Van Mooy.


Todd Bidwell, Paul Brodeur, Jared Goldstone, Donald Hoffer, Maureen O’Connell, Christopher Palmer, Barbara Schneider, Scott Thrasher, Wendy Vogel.

Ruth Brazier, Russell Ferreira, Lynn Grant Major, Michael Kasparian, Nicholas Lowell, Heidi Marotta, Kevin Murphy, Pam Polloni, Debra Rogers, Robert Young.


Mark Alliegro, Mary Ann Alliegro, Gary Anderson, Margaret Borden, Jeffrey Brodeur, Kathleen Driscoll, Thomas Gustin, Herbert Luther, Robert Medeiros, Richard Swain, Anthony
Tolentino, Stella Tolentino, Jacques Tompkins.

Linda Davis, Robert Dion, Austin Heath, Jason Hyatt, Leslie Lichtenstein, Alyssa Pohlman,
Laurie Robbins, David Salter, Edward Schmitt.

David DuBois, Richard Goulart, David Haddad, Peter Hargraves, Clayton Jones, Francis Keohane, Andrea Keohane, Adam Perry and Gregory Pinto.

Please all rise and repeat after me: I -

state your name -- do solemnly swear that I will faithfully perform the duties of Town Meeting Member according to the best of my abilities and agreeable to the Constitution and Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. So help me God.

Congratulations.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Welcome to our new Town Meeting Members. We did the orientation a few weeks ago and about half of the room were brand new Town Meeting Members who had actually never been to a town meeting before. So, welcome.

For those of you that might be interested in reviewing some of the procedures that we outlined at the orientation, it's now
available on the Town website. If you go to the Town Meeting page, you can actually play the video right on the Town website. Thanks to Channel 15 and FCTV for making that available to us.

This evening, we had the flags presented by Boy Scout Troop 42 and a number of the members of the troop are in the back right hand - to my right. They’re here tonight to work on their Citizenship and the Community merit badge. So I want to welcome the rest of the members of Troop 42 and hopefully you’ll enjoy this beginning of your merit badge and then I’ll be working with them over the next few months to complete their citizenship merit badge.

[Applause.]  

THE MODERATOR: We have two visitors here tonight from Houston, Texas. They see town meeting as an unexpected educational bonus to visiting New England and being here in Falmouth.

[Laughter.]  

THE MODERATOR: And they feel that learning how representative government works will help them get more connected, and I’d like to...
welcome Janice Hambrick [sp?]and Brent Grennier
[sp?] in our middle section of the back, welcome.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: We have Thanksgiving coming up right around the corner and I want to announce that the Falmouth Service Center the Sunday before Thanksgiving will be open from noon to 4:00. Accepting donations, particularly turkeys this year. They were telling me that that’s one of the things that they really need. Donations have been a little bit down in that area, so bringing in some fresh turkeys between noon and 4:00 the Sunday before Thanksgiving would be a big help.

At this time, I’d like to start with the dispensing of the reading of the Warrant.

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

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

THE MODERATOR: Okay, you’ve all heard the main motion to dispense with the reading of the warrant. All those in favor signify by
saying aye.

{Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

At this point, I’ll read the officer’s return of the warrant. By virtue of this warrant, I have this day notified and summoned the inhabitants of the Town of Falmouth qualified to vote on town affairs, as said warrant directs, by posting an attested copy thereof in Town Hall and in every precinct in the town. Signed by Constable Jim Crossen.

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

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

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

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR:  The ayes have it unanimous.

At this time, the Chair would entertain a motion for all Town employees who are not residents of the Town of Falmouth to have the right to speak on all issues before the 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.

Normally we’ll have a notification of public hearing by the Planning Board, but there are no planning articles.

And so, at this point I’d like to direct your attention to the last page of your warrant book, and we’ll briefly review some Rules for Town Meeting.
Speaking and Voting. Registered voters, residents and taxpayers of the town may speak on any article in the warrant. Persons who are not voters, residents or taxpayers of the town may address the Meeting only with the consent of a majority of those present.

Only Town Meeting members may vote.

Motions and Amendments. Motions and Amendments may be made only by Town Meeting Members.

Two amendments will be accepted on any article.

Long or complicated motions, and other motions which he shall so request, shall be presented to the Moderator in writing.

Reconsideration. Reconsideration will be allowed at any time during the meeting if the article does not involve the appropriation of money.

If the article involves the appropriation of money, notice of reconsideration must be given within 30 minutes of the vote on the article. Reconsideration may then be allowed at any future time.
The Moderator shall determine if the motion to reconsider is in order. Motions for reconsideration must be made on substantially new information not available to the Meeting at the time of the original debate. The motion to reconsider is not debatable.

Our Hours of Operation, the first night seven o’clock; subsequent nights will be seven o’clock, and we’ll close at 11:00 unless we get a two-thirds vote by Town Meeting to stay longer.

Now, normally we would start by doing a blanket vote, but tonight we have quite a few reports to do and I’m going to just jump right in with Article 1 and we’ll go through the warrant article by article.

So, at this time, Madame Chairman for a main motion on Article 1.

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

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Article 1 as printed, this is to hear reports. The first organization I have is the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PUTNAM: Good evening, Ladies
and Gentlemen. Brent Putnam, Chairman of the Falmouth Board of Selectmen. It’s always good to look back, see where you started, see what progress you’ve made or lack thereof.

Next slide, please. And we’ve come a long way. In 2010, I stood before you all and reported that our Town Manager had resigned, our Free Cash had been depleted, and our bond rating had slipped. And my, what a few years can make.

Financially speaking, we’re better off today than we were three years ago. We have millions in Free Cash and we’ll still have well over a million in Free Cash once we’re done this evening. We have a Stabilization Fund, a Capital Stabilization Fund, that is growing. A new financial system that is getting implemented and, not listed here but also worth noting is addressing the liabilities associated with the Post Employment Benefits that our retired Town employees have.

Next slide, please. But, while there’s cause for celebration, there’s still much work to do. The Committee Handbook, long discussed but also long shelved, has been reviewed, submitted
for feedback, and will soon be distributed to all the boards, committees and commissions. The Board has been working on making our hearings more consistent so that every applicant can expect the same process when appearing before us to get a license.

In order to address concerns about transparency, we’ve started a T.V. show on Falmouth Community Television, the government channel 15, called Behind The Board. It’s a monthly show -- maybe more frequently if we can pull it off -- and it delves into the details of Town government and gives the public the opportunity to call in and ask questions.

Early next year the Board will be holding a workshop on committee oversight and management, and one of the topics will be a discussion about merging if not disbanding some committees.

With several active and pending court cases, the fate and future of our wind turbines remains in doubt. In September, the Board voted to run the turbines 16 hours a day from 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. as a compromise between the state’s
desire that we run them more frequently and the
neighbor’s concerns about sleep deprivation.
There is a pending decision that we may discuss
tomorrow evening.

Next slide, please. In June, the
Capital Advisory Committee made a number of
recommendations, and we are exploring them. Last
week the Board approved a mooring rental pilot
program in West Falmouth Harbor which should be
able to generate revenue as well as increase
access to the water.

In a few weeks we’ll be meeting with the
Planning Board and one of the topics will be the
Committee’s recommendation to put parking meters
back in the Main Street area. And of course
tonight we’re recommending a management – energy
management services contract, an ESCO for short.
And, it’s interesting that the parking meters and
the ESCO have two things in common. One is that
they’re tools. Tools in our toolbox, if you
will. For funding capital projects. But of
course there’s also a resistance to both of them.

You see, one way or another, Folks, we
have to devote funds to the mid-sized capital
projects, and that was the mission of the Capital Advisory Committee. They’re projects that are too big to be funded through the Operating Budget and yet they’re too small to stand on their own, as overrides. This is what the Capital Stabilization Fund is for, but it needs these funding sources.

We have the Meals Tax; it’s been very successful. But it’s unfortunately not enough.

And that brings us to this evening’s warrant. The Charter requires that the Board recommend major courses of action to Town Meeting and we have a few this evening that we would like you to support and to vote in favor of.

Article 17, already mentioned, is the ESCO, and we are recommending that you approve this. It will allow us to fund some of those mid-sized capital projects by using the savings in energy costs. More importantly – most importantly, it would get the projects done without asking the taxpayers for a debt exclusion or a capital exclusion.

Article 16 includes a variety of capital projects. One of them, the municipal space
improvements, will likely create some discussion this evening. Town Manager Suso will give you some more details, but we’ve been trying to get the Veteran’s Services out of the basement and Town Counsel into Town Hall for some time, now, and so we ask that you support this request to make it happen.

Please note that there are additional pages in the back of your warrant book this evening. Each one has a specific capital request. You all asked for more detail and we’ve provided it.

Article 41 will add a flow neutral bylaw so that we are eligible for low interest or excuse me zero interest loans at the state level. Article 42 will allow us to extend betterments for as long as 30 years, making them more affordable to homeowners. Article 43 would exempt eco toilet installations from sewer betterments, encouraging homeowners to install them so we can test these alternative systems. And we recommend all of these, so that we can move forward with our wastewater plans.

So we’ve come forward, we’ve come a long
way. We still have a long way to go. We hope for your support this evening and tomorrow evening, if we go that far.

Mr. Moderator, that concludes my report.

I’d be happy to take any questions.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, thank you.

Any general questions for the Board of Selectmen? Okay, Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: My question to the Board of Selectmen. A number of years ago when the parking meters were removed from Main Street by a committee, the Finance Committee took great exception and spoke on Town Meeting floor that since the parking meters were placed by a Town Meeting vote in previous years that only Town Meeting had the right to remove the parking meters from Main Street.

Town Meeting upheld the Finance Committee’s decision at that particular time. I was probably one of the guest speakers on that particular issue and to this day the issue has never been brought back before Town Meeting for a legal removal of the meters placed by Town Meeting in I forget exactly what year.
So I would like the Board of Selectmen to take that under consideration in their deliberations on Main Street parking meters.

CHAIRMAN PUTNAM: We will.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else for the Board of Selectmen?

Okay, the Community Preservation Committee? No.

Okay. The Council on Aging. It’s supposed to be “COA”; I had “CPA”.

MS. BISHOP: Good evening. My name is Jill Irving Bishop and I am the director of the Council on Aging Senior Center.

At the April Town Meeting we announced that we would be moving forward with a needs assessment process. We contracted with the Umass Boston Gerontology Institute to coordinate this process with us. And they are here this evening to provide a brief overview of the process.

But first, I would like to take this opportunity to say thank you to all of you that participated in any one or multiple points of this needs assessment process.

We began in the spring with a community
forum, which we had a standing room only crowd
and some quite lively discussions. We also had a
fabulous response to our community detailed
survey and our community questionnaire. I would
also like to thank the Town officials, the local
residents and organizations who shared their
thoughts during our focus groups and our key
informant interviews.

I would now like to ask Town Meeting
through the Moderator to allow Jan Mutchler from
the U Mass Gerontology Institute to provide a
brief report on behalf of the Council on Aging.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, you’ve all heard
the main motion, to allow the consultant to
speak. All those in favor, signify by saying
aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

MS. BISHOP: Thank you.

MS. Mutchler: Good evening. I’m glad
to be here tonight to talk a little bit about the
needs assessment that we’ve conducted for the
Town of Falmouth Council on Aging Senior Center.

Our goal in conducting this needs assessment is to provide information that you can use when you’re making decisions about your community. Features of the community in which an older person lives actually makes a very big difference in the extent to which he or she is successful in achieving well-being in later life.

Thoughtful communities throughout the United States are seeking to design services, programs and amenities that will support the well-being of older residents. They’re asking questions like these: how can our community help seniors be economically secure throughout their retirement years? What can we do as a town to promote wellness throughout the life course? And how can we secure opportunities for seniors to participate in community activities and be engaged with life?

The Falmouth Council on Aging Senior Center takes significant responsibility for evaluating and responding to the needs of seniors in Falmouth by identifying and providing engaging activities for older residents, by providing
services that seniors need, by serving as a
source of information and referring seniors to
the programs for which they may be eligible, and
by providing leadership within the community
around senior issues.

So the Town of Falmouth Council on Aging
Senior Center Needs Assessment was conducted over
a period of six months, starting last May. In
our data collection we consulted stakeholders
across Falmouth, representatives of the people
who care about seniors and about Falmouth as a
community. Some of you here may have attended
the community forum that Jill just mentioned a
minute ago. Some of you may have participated in
the sample survey, which yielded a 30 percent
response rate, which was very good.

All of our findings are reported in a
document that will be released next month.

Now, this figure shows the clear
demographic imperative that justifies taking a
close look at the needs of seniors in Falmouth.
Simply put, the Falmouth population age 60 and
over has been rising steadily over the last few
decades, more than doubling since 1980. This
growth is due to the joint impact of long-term residents of Falmouth aging in place, staying here as they get older, and middle-aged residents choosing Falmouth as a place to retire.

In contrast, the population under age 60 has been declining in the last decade. And so when you put these two trends together, what you see is that currently seniors make up about one-third of the entire Falmouth population. And this is a higher percentage than in the State of Florida.

Tonight I’ll summarize broad themes of our data collection in terms of strengths, challenges and opportunities. In surveys in the forum and other venues we heard about Falmouth’s many strengths. Older residents are happy here and they want to stay here. They’re typically active and they’re engaged in the community.

Town offices and community organizations report strong support for seniors; they value their volunteer and their civic participation.

Seniors in Falmouth are typically in good health, and so with respect to those key quality of life indicators, the typical senior in
Falmouth is doing pretty well. Yet we heard about some challenges, as well. For example, most seniors in Falmouth are drivers, but many modify their driving in ways that reduce their ability to do some of the things that they want to do, such as get out at night. Many Falmouth residents are involved in caring for family members with physical or cognitive disabilities. This is very important work, but many care givers in Falmouth told us that their care giving activities make it hard to meet other family and work obligations. We heard quite a lot about emergency services during storms and some concerns about that. And although Falmouth residents are typically financially secure, we learned about pockets of insecurity. For example, one out of seven seniors don’t expect to have adequate financial resources in retirement.

As you all in Falmouth plan for a senior population that will continue to grow and evolve, you’re fortunate to be building on many existing strengths and resources. Moving ahead, you have the opportunity to transform Falmouth for the
next generation of seniors, while continuing to
strengthen Falmouth as a place for today’s older
adults to age in place.

Our study revealed a strong commitment
within the community to respond to the growing
older demographic while simultaneously enhancing
the livability of Falmouth for all residents.
This is both a challenge and an exciting
opportunity for the community.

As an additional component of our needs
assessment study, we learned about the programs
and services that are currently in place at the
Falmouth Council on Aging Senior Center and views
of the community about them. Based on the sample
survey, it’s clear that there’s strong support
for the activities and services that are offered
through the Senior Center. We found widespread
interest in participating in Senior Center
activities, either currently or in the future.

Yet some challenges were identified,
including information gaps. Many residents don’t
know what programs are available or they don’t
know how to access them. We heard many
statements that the center is too small, it’s too
old or it’s poorly configured. And our general sense is that the Senior Center is not having the impact on the community that it could, in part because of its physical features.

The final component of our study to be covered tonight involves a comparison of the Falmouth Senior Center with Senior Centers in some other communities on the Cape and the South Shore, and these are communities that are familiar to you.

There are many ways to evaluate a town’s services and amenities, and physical structures are only one aspect. With respect to senior services, it’s clear that the services and the programs form the core of what a town offers to seniors. Yet town structures do shape what services and programs can be made available.

When we look at comparison communities it’s clear that with respect to their physical amenities different communities respond to their growing populations in different ways. These towns have chosen to frame their senior services and activities as a community amenity.

Let me see the next one. Moving ahead,
the challenge for Falmouth is how best to respond
to the growing size and changing needs of its
older population. In this last slide – and you
have it on your handout as well. It’s kind of
busy – but the last slide pulls together
information on the profiled centers. The bars
illustrate the size of the Senior Centers in
square feet. The blue represents the number of
seniors living in each community. The blue bar
in the middle represents Falmouth.

The relative imbalance between the size
of the Senior Center and its senior population in
comparison to these other communities is clear.
So how best can Falmouth promote quality of life
for all members of the community, including older
adults? How should the special needs and
interests of seniors be factored into the Town’s
planning process? And what role can be played
by the Council on Aging Senior Center?

These are some of the questions that I
hope our report will help you answer as you move
forward in your planning process in the coming
years. Thank you.

MR. VIEIRA:  Good evening. Jim,
Vieira, Precinct 6 and Chairman of the Falmouth
Council on Aging.

Where do we go from here? We’ve
requested a spot on the Selectmen’s agenda to
present the final results of the study that Jan
just talked about. We’ll also ask that a working
group be formed to evaluate the options available
for a new Senior Center. A small group within
the Council on Aging has been working over the
past year to do just that. We would like to
formalize that process and widen participation.

An important part of this process is an
analysis of staffing impacts and expanded
volunteer opportunities. As a former Finance
Committee chairman, I am well aware of the
associated budgetary expenses that come along
with a new or expanded facility.

The group Friends of the Falmouth Senior
Center has funded the needs assessment Jan just
spoke about. They’ve also received a $20,000
grant from the Herb Willett Fund through the Cape
Cod Foundation. This is to be put towards a
site and feasibility study that would happen
after we have the results of the working group to
narrow the site alternatives.

With an organized and deliberate approach and the support of the administration and the Board of Selectmen, we can be ready in the spring of 2015 with an appropriation request for the design and construction of a new Senior Center.

Thank you for your attention tonight.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay, any questions for the Council on Aging?

Okay, next is the Community Athletic Complex Advisory Committee.

MS. BISSONNETTE:  Good evening, I’m Karen Bissonnette, Precinct 2, and Mike Duffany. And we just wanted to give you an update. We were here last year and we wanted to just give you an update of what’s going on with the community athletic complex.

Since we were here last I think we showed you this picture where the field would be sited. We have the engineers working on some plans now and we’ll have some numbers for you in April, but it is right behind the field house at the high school.
I just kind of wanted to show you the committee members. I think that you are familiar with them, but since we were here last, the School Committee voted us as an ad hoc advisory committee to the School Committee so that we have some sort of official status, but this is the hard working committee that has kept this project moving forward.

We also have a Building Committee, and that would be on the next slide. And so this is the Building Committee and so we have some town people involved with the project, and it’s been really wonderful working with them. And Mike Ward, who many of you don’t know, who is the new School Finance Director, is on our Committee, as well. So that’s been very helpful.

And Mike’s going to talk a little bit about what we’ve done since we became a Committee.


As Karen said, we’ve made a lot of progress since we spoke to you back in the spring, and we’re – as we prepared to give you
some final numbers on this complex before the
spring town meeting, we have engaged a firm to do
the design and so forth. We have sited the field
as Karen showed you. We have done a lot to try
to reduce the cost of this complex, try to get
the biggest bang as we can for, you know, for our
buck, here.

We’re going to utilize some of the
existing locker rooms that are in the field house
now. We have put together a donation account, if
you will, through Together We Can, with the
approval of the Selectmen. That was one of the
processes that we went through. So that when you
through – in the goodness of your hearts, you
know, give some funding to this facility, there
will be an account in place that the Selectmen
are comfortable with for that to flow through.

We have started the fund-raising
process. We’ve been out in the community
already, reaching out to folks to help us with
this. And as we go through our design process
we’ll further identify areas that people can
contribute to that won’t impact the contract or
the contractor doing their work.
As most of you know, we have received a $500,000 commitment from the Falmouth Road Race in order to help move this forward. They have already given $80,000 of that money towards the design. So that that has already taken place.

As I said, we did award the contract to CDM Smith. They’ve done a number of these fields here in communities both on and off the Cape, and they have a tremendous amount of experience in this. We feel very comfortable with so far where they’ve been very responsive to us – to our questions and our needs and so forth. And to the ability of us to be able to participate as a community, which is huge, that they’ve been very much a part of that.

We did, as Karen said, we did form – officially form these committees so that we are – we are doing it by all the right rules and procedures that are out there. It’s amazing how many of these there are; as you go along, you just keep finding them.

We have had unanimous support of the Recreation Committee. We have also applied for and have favorable recommendation from the CPC
for $250,000 which we hope that you will support us on this evening. And, again, that’ll help us to get a little bit closer to our goals. This is one of the - sort of the condition of some of the facilities that we have now. Just trying to make a little bit light of it if we can, but in reality this is - this is kind of what’s going on down at one of the fields, now.

So, and this is just a list of the folks that, again, and businesses that have stepped up.

I’ll turn this back over to Karen real quick, and as you know, Mr. Kalperis is with us, as well. He was actually the first person to donate to this, here. His family has already purchased the flag and the pole for the field.

MS. BISSONNETTE: You can go one more. These are just some of the people that have committed to us and I’m sure we’ll have a lot more before we get into this project.

But I just wanted to give you - just so you’re not surprised when we come to you next April, because hopefully we will be coming to you next April.

And you can go to the next one. And
this is - this is about the amount we think we
might be coming to the Town for. We’re hopefully
going to raise a million dollars. We don’t
exactly have the figures yet. And so I just kind
of wanted to give you, so peple weren’t surprised
and we want to be totally open about this, that
there aren’t any surprises.

But, if we were to borrow with a capital
exclusion, a one time capital exclusion and just
got hit on our taxes for one year, for a $400,000
house it would just be a little over $90. And I
just wanted people just to be thinking about that
so that you knew about what the numbers were
going to be.

And, you know, I know Brent talked about
all that Free Cash; if we wanted to use that,
that would be okay, too. But I think the reality
is we’ll have to borrow a little bit.

But I just wanted people just to see
that so that it wouldn’t be a surprise. And you
can just kind of chew on that until April when we
come back and see you.

But if you have any questions, please
feel free to catch me at the break, or Mike or
Mr. Kalperis or any of the other Committee members. Or, my number’s in the book; you can always call me at home if you have any questions. We would love your help in any way, if you think you can be helpful. I think this would be a great project for the community and we thank you for your time tonight.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any questions for the Committee?

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no. [None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 2. Article 2 is to pay unpaid bills from previous fiscal years.

Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I vote indefinite postponement of Article 2.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 3. Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN PUTNAM: Mr. Moderator, the Board recommends Article 3 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, as printed. This is to see if the Town will vote to petition the General Court in relation to the Historic District Commission around public notices.

Discussion on Article 3? Oh, and we have, in the main motion it says Chapter 654 of the Acts of 1978, and it should read 1975. So the main motion changes the date from ‘78 to 1975.

Any discussion on Article 3?

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 4. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PUTNAM: Mr. Moderator, the Board recommends Article 4 as printed, with the change of 1978 to 1975.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, this is again to petition the Court around the Historic District Commission around applications.

Any discussion on Article 4?

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.

Article 5, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI; Mr. Moderator, I
move Article 5 as printed. And I do have an overhead, I think.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so Article 5, the main motion is as printed. This is for the AFSCME local 1636 contract.

Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: During its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, November 4th, 2013, the Finance Committee received a copy of the Memorandum of Agreement ratified by the Board of Selectmen and the AFSCME local. The Finance Committee heard a complete presentation of the contract terms and fiscal impacts, discussed the agreement and voted to place a positive motion before this Town Meeting.

And I think that the Personnel Director is here to answer any questions that you may have.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on Article 5.

Any discussion?

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: And so there's no fiscal note on this. The article says to
appropriate a sum of money to execute this contract. The contractual terms do not call for an appropriation of funds.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Every year in the budget, Town Meeting votes a certain amount of money that’s placed in the Accountant’s budget to fund future contracts. And so we do not have to fund this contract.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Boyer.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: I have one more.

THE MODERATOR: Oh –

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: I forgot my second page.

MR. BOYER: Mr. Moderator -

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Boyer -

MR. BOYER: - Peter Boyer, Precinct 5.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Boyer, if you could hold one second. There is actually some more notes -

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Yes, yes.

THE MODERATOR: - that she needs to share with us. And then I’ll recognize -
MR. BOYER: Oh, this may solve the
problem. Am curious to what the terms are.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: May I finish, Mr.
Boyer, please?

THE MODERATOR: Yes. Go ahead, Madame
Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Thank you, sir.

The Memorandum of Understanding
represents two contracts spanning six years and
memorializes a sustainable wage package
consistent with the Town’s established pattern,
through Fiscal Year 2016.

The Finance Committee recognizes that
AFSCME employees have endured both reductions in
wages through furlough and no increase during
this period, and on behalf of the Finance
Committee, I would like to recognize the
contributions of our employees as the Town
endured and continues to recover from the
financial recession and for their ongoing support
for a healthy and resilient municipal economy.

The Town Management team is prepared to
answer questions and to present details as
requested.
THE MODERATOR: So, Mr. Boyer, did you have more specific details you were looking for?

Yes. And then we’ve got our Personnel --

MR. BOYER: More specifics.

MS. COLEMAN: More specifics. I’m Denise Coleman. I’m the Personnel Director for the Town of Falmouth, and I’m very pleased to be able to report that we’re able to settle two contracts. One for the outstanding years of FY ‘11 through ‘13, and then a new contract for FY ‘14 though ‘16.

What I’d like to do is just provide you with a brief overview of the terms and conditions and answer any questions.

Next slide, please.

The wages for the two contracts consist of, for the first contract, FY ‘11, a zero percent cost of living adjustment; as well as FY ‘12. And then in FY ‘13, a 1.5 percent cost of living adjustment.

For the second contract, we’d be looking at a 2.25 percent cost of living for FY ‘14, a one and a half percent for ‘15 and a one and a half percent for ‘16.
Next slide, please. In addition to those wages, I’d like to just briefly review some of the concessions on both sides that I think are very important. One would be the monthly accrual method of vacation and sick earning. What we will be doing now is be able to, with our new systems, financial systems, more accurately reflect and distribute the Town’s financial liability in the future. And our systems are capable of doing this, now. So, instead of getting a lump sum at the beginning of the year, employees will be able to accrue on a monthly basis.

We’re also going to – or we’ve also agreed to amend the job description language, the review of job description. So, instead of every five years, it’ll be every five years and as needed as the Town finds it’s warranted.

We also will be implementing bi-weekly payroll and direct deposit.

We will amend the probationary language in the contract. And, really, the purpose of that is so that, you know, if a manager believes more time is needed in order to evaluate an
employee, they’ll have the right to do that.

We also have amended the discipline and discharge language. And it just more clearly summarizes the progressive discipline process.

We’ve amended the grievance procedure language, just reflecting a consistent number of days in terms of responding to the grievances.

We’ve memorialized the non-discrimination language. New protected classes have legally come up over the last few years. So we were able to memorialize those protected classes. And also memorialize the leaves that we do offer, which would be the family medical leave; also the military leave and the maternity leave statute.

We also, in concession for all of these things, we adopted a sick leave bank for our employees in AFSCME. And what this does is it allows employees to contribute sick time into a sick leave bank, and in the event that an employee was, you know, seriously ill and was on an approved FMLA or medical leave, if they’ve exhausted all their time, they’re able to take the benefit through that sick leave bank.
And then there were also some general housekeeping language that we changed, and then we agreed to a wage re-opener for 2016. This is important to note that this is the first union to settle a contract for the outlying years of '15 and '16.

Next page, please. And last, I just wanted to review the financial impact. For FY '13, the one and a half percent cost of living adjustment is the 39,936. And then, for the new contract, FY '14 through '16, you’ll see the cost broken out by fiscal year, with a sub-total of 144,299. And, as I mentioned earlier, in recognition of this union being the first to settle a contract through FY '16, we did offer a $200 per employee one time bonus of $12,600. For a total of 156,899.

And, in closing, I just want to say again we’re very pleased to be able to settle these contracts and provide, you know, a sustainable salary schedule that both – for both the Town and also, you know, again, I want to really stress that we’re thrilled to be able to do this for our employees as well.
Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. I briefly want to recognize Town Counsel, just to make an explanation, because I don’t want Town Meeting Members to misperceive the vote that we’re taking here. Normally you would vote to appropriate funds for a contract, but you don’t ratify a contract.

So, Mr. Duffy, can you just explain that briefly so we don’t have any misconceptions on this motion?

MR. DUFFY: Okay, Mr. Moderator. Town Meeting does not approve or ratify labor contracts. That’s the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen. The traditional role of Town Meeting is to appropriate money to fund the contracts. In this particular case, the recommendation in the book is indefinite postponement because at the time we didn’t know there was going to be a contract.

Mrs. Magnani has recommended as printed. Now, it’s my understanding that the money to fund this contract is already in the budget. So what you’re doing by voting as printed, you’re
authorizing them to spend the money that's already in the budget for the purpose of funding this contract.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So, you know, we're always asking Town management to be forward with us and let us know what's going on, and so they wanted to put a positive motion here at Town Meeting so they could answer questions, they could make an explanation of what this contract is, but this body did already appropriate the funds necessary in the fiscal budget.

So, any further questions on Article 5?

Yes, Mr. Stetcher.

MR. STETCHER: Bernie Stetcher, Precinct 3. Just a quick question. On the sick leave and vacation, is there any limit to how many days an employee can accrue sick leave or vacation days?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Coleman.

MS. COLEMAN: So, the question is in terms of the vacation, the maximum allowed to carry over is depending on how many weeks you accrue. If you accrue two weeks, you're able to carry over one week, and if you accrue four
weeks, you’re able to accrue – carry over an
additional two weeks.

But during this first year that we’re
implementing this, we’re being a little more
flexible because we realized that people needed
to build up their balance, so we have removed
those caps for the first year.

For the sick leave, there is no maximum
carry over.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further
questions?

Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Leonard Johnson, Precinct
5. Over the years, I have been someone who has
asked questions about and requesting this type of
information. So now that we have it, I would
like to express my appreciation to the Finance
Department and the Finance Committee and the Town
administration for really giving us the kind of
detailed information that we need.

I would also like to point out that,
under the Article 2, we do not have any unpaid
bills. This is the first time in my
recollection that that’s been the case. It
suggests to me that we’re running a pretty tight ship. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay. Any further discussion on Article 5? Hearing none, then the question will come on the main motion as printed. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR:  All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR:  The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 6, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI:  Mr. Moderator, I recommend the Town vote to raise and appropriate $304,250, to be appropriated and distributed by the Town Accountant for the purposes of Article 6.

The Town received the arbitration panel award on Thursday, November 7th, 2013. The Board of Selectmen voted on the award this evening at their meeting. The Finance Committee recommends that Town Meeting vote the funds necessary to conclude the collective bargaining process, thereby allowing the Town to enter into contract
with the IAFF local. This award concludes four years of bargaining and is consistent with the across the board wages pattern established by the Town.

The Town’s management will answer questions and provide additional information.

Massachusetts General Law Chapter 589, Section 1 (11), quotes – I quote this: Any decision or determination resulting from the mechanism or procedures determined by the Committee, if supported by material and substantive evidence on the whole record, shall be subject to the approval by the legislative body of a funding request as set forward in this section. If the municipal legislative body votes not to approve the request or appropriation, the decision or determination shall cease to be binding on the parties and the matter shall be returned to the parties for further bargaining.

Any questions?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, questions on Article 6, either questions or discussion. This is $304,250 to raise and appropriate for the Firefighters Local 1397.
Yes, Mr. Boyer.

MR. BOYER: I’m not – Mr. Boyer.

Peter Boyer, Precinct 5. Mr. Moderator, I’m not clear on whether or not the contract length is the same pattern of three years in the past and three prospective.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Certainly, thank you, Mr. Moderator, Mr. Boyer. Julian Suso, Falmouth Town Manager. If I might, Mr. Moderator, just give a brief summary of the arbitration award, I think that will answer the question Mr. Boyer has raised and perhaps similar questions.

Can we move to the next slide? Okay.

Thank you. As noted on the slide, the wage award is per the past town pattern already established. There is an EMT and Medic stipend, which has been awarded by the arbitration panel based upon regional comparability. A vacation request brought to the arbitrators was not awarded. Personal leave adjustment was also not awarded. The existing sick leave buyback had no change.

Bi-weekly pay and direct deposit was awarded similar to what was noted in the AFSCME.
contract just described. It is our hope to apply
this to all Town employees uniformly for savings
in administrative costs and related costs to
taxpayers.

Request for a change in sick leave use
was not changed. Seniority language was not
changed. Call back language was not changed.
And a request for a change in longevity was not
awarded by the arbitration panel.

Mr. Moderator, maybe I should also
summarize that.

This arbitration process is available to
police and firefighters. Under state statute
this similar process is not available to other
unions in the Commonwealth. It is in recognition
of the public safety – critical public safety
role of police and firefighters.

Shortly after my arriving as Town
Manager, the firefighter’s union served notice
that they were going to binding arbitration. So
it has been a two year wait, a hearing process
and a lengthy deliberation by the arbitration
panel with the JLMC, a state-wide Joint Labor
Management Committee, which reviews these. And
they are the ones who made the determination
about this award after considerable testimony and
filings by the Town administration as well as the
firefighter’s union.

And that summarizes that award.

It is through Fiscal Year ‘13. Fiscal year ‘14, which as Town Meeting is aware, we are
currently in the midst of, about halfway through.
We do not have a contract with firefighters for
FY ‘14 going forward. The Town pattern is as
shown above and has been recounted for the AFSCME
settlement. We hope to continue that and
anticipate, if we’re successful, to continue that
same pattern with all collective bargaining units
in the town.

Don’t know if there is any other - a
slide with any other information.

I guess I’ll read this for completeness.

The panel decision and award achieved regional
comparability by increasing stipends for our
EMT’s and paramedics over the three year period
noted through FY ‘13. And then, rolling these
stipends into base pay, that was a major item of
request and review. This will impact both base
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payroll and overtime and training costs in perpetuity. The overall annual impact of this decision approaches $500,000. Again, I underscore annual.

Cost of living adjustments were budgeted already, limiting the funds needed to $304,250. We are requesting Town Meeting’s authorization and set-aside for this additional appropriation to fund the financial aspects of this award. For the years to come, including FY ‘15, we’ll be bringing you budget proposals which will include the anticipated annual impact approaching $500,000 as well.

Happy to answer any other questions Members may have, Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further questions or discussion? Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Mr. Moderator, no questions or discussions. I would just like to make note that last Monday when these contract negotiations were conducted, Selectmen again, and I repeat again, improperly posted the meeting. Therefore the public was not properly informed as mandated by state law, and I would just like to
ask them to redouble their efforts to keep the
public informed. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further
discussion on Article 6? Hearing none, then the
question will come on the main motion. This is
$304,250 to raise and appropriate. 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 7, Madame Chairman for the main
motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Chairman, I vote
indefinite postponement of Article 7.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Article 7 is
another contract. Police Federation. The main
motion is indefinite postponement.

All those in favor, signify by saying
aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]
THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 8, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I vote indefinite postponement of Article 8.

THE MODERATOR: Article 8, this is the Superior Officers' Association contract; it's not completed.

All those in favor of indefinite postponement, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Madame Chairman, Article 9.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Chairman, I vote indefinite postponement of Article 9.

THE MODERATOR: Article 9, this is Lieutenants Local 165, no contract; 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.
Mr. Wilber?
MR. WILBER: [Inaudible - no mic.]
THE MODERATOR: No, let’s just grab a mic.
MR. WILBER: Jude Wilber, Precinct 8. Is there any update on these last three articles as comparable to the first two? Any news, views?
THE MODERATOR: In progress.
MR. WILBER: Progress?
THE MODERATOR: In progress.
MR. WILBER: In progress, okay.
THE MODERATOR: In progress. And hopefully next Town Meeting we’ll have some updates.
Article 10, Madame Chairman of the Finance Committee for the main motion.
CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move Article 10 as recommended.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, as recommended.
This is to combine two vacate part-time police
dispatcher positions into one 36 hour police
dispatcher position. And the Grade 6.

Discussion on Article 10?

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it

unanimous.

Article 11, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I

move Article 11 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: As printed. Article

11 is to create a new Grade 3A on the Town Salary
Classification Plan. Any discussion on Article

11?

Yes. Microphone to my left, please.

MR. MARSHALL: Joe Marshall, Precinct

9. My question and also comment is we’re using
this TAM system of grading, but I feel that we’re

going to be opening up a can of worms and
possibly setting precedents that possibly next
year, or the year after, you’ll be coming to ask
for a 4A or a 3B or something on those lines.

I know it’s going to directly affect the
next article, but I feel that systems are in
place to be followed. Thank you.


MS. HARPER: Thank you for the
question. Can you hear me?

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible].

MS. HARPER: Is that better?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

MS. HARPER: Thank you for the
question. This is a unique circumstance. These
two positions were part of the AFSCME collective
bargaining process. That union, one of the
reasons it took us so long to get back to you
with that settlement agreement is that the Town
and the union agreed to separate that unit into
two separate units, an A group and a B group.
That went to the Division of Labor Services and
took over a year for that separation to occur.

We received notice from the DLR on June
24th that that was awarded, and one of the
components of that was removing the two public
safety administrative assistants in the Police
Department and the Fire Department from that
union, thereby creating a new job. Those
positions did not have job descriptions. They
required – it was necessary to create new job
descriptions in the unclassified technical
administrative and management system and, through
a full evaluation done by the Personnel Director,
both internal and external comparables for
employees conducting that type of classified and
personnel work. The Grade 3 simply wasn’t
competitive and the 3A is recommended as in the
best interests of the employees and the Town.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further
discussion on Article 11?
Hearing – yes, Ms. Allegro.

Microphone in the center section,
please.

Ms. Allegro.

MS. ALLEGRO: Mary Ann Allegro,
Precinct 7. Yes, just a question. If the three
wasn’t a competitive level, why not just raise
the position to a 4?

MS. HARPER:   Ms. Coleman’s going to answer that question.

THE MODERATOR:   Ms. Coleman.

MS. COLEMAN:   So the question is why not classify the position to a Grade 4. And the reason is there’s a 15 percent differential between the Grade 3 and the Grade 4, and it just seemed pretty substantial to move it up to that grade. And by creating that 3A, it really more properly and precisely puts that position in our salary schedule, as well as externally, it makes it more equitable.

So it just didn’t seem right to either go 15 percent below or 15 percent higher, so that 3A really seemed to address the issue.

THE MODERATOR:   Okay, further discussion?

Mr. Shearer.

MR. SHEARER:   I’m just curious. Dan Shearer, Precinct 6. What really is the difference in the job? Why is there an increase in pay? I don’t understand. You’re changing a title but I don’t know what the job entails.

MS. HARPER:  The key feature determining the removal of those position from the collective bargaining unit really relates to the confidential nature of the work that those two employees do for the police chief and the fire chief. And I know that they are both here this evening and would be more than happy to talk about the very specific details about the growth, over the last decades, and the responsibilities associated with those positions that really relates to the confidential nature of the work related to both personnel actions - personnel actions, and in any way related to all the employees in both of those departments. They are highly confidential and work on the highest levels of work in the department.

THE MODERATOR:  Okay, any further discussion on Article 11?

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR:  All those opposed no.
[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it unanimous.

Article 12, Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I recommend that the Town vote Article 12 as printed, and I will be making a correction in that written recommendation.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The correction.

So, yeah, in your warrant book it says Article 11; this is Article 12.

So, the main motion as printed. This is deleting the G-8's and making them the M-3A's.

Any discussion on Article 12?

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.

Madame Chairman.
CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I recommend Article 13 as printed.

THE MODERATOR: As printed, this is to amend the Town’s Classification Plan to delete the Community Preservation Planner and insert a Community Development Planner.

Discussion? Ms. Haney.

MS. HANEY: The CPC has been talking to the Town about this position for several weeks now.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

Can’t hear.

MS. HANEY: Oh, sorry.

The CPC has been talking to the Town about this position for several weeks, now. This is downgrading the position by a whole grade, when this staff person is - the new job description would assign them to be staffed to four committees instead of one, and somehow work for the CPC 80 percent of the time.

It seems hard to believe that that’s possible to do, and we have been working with the Town. We’ve gotten some informal agreements with them on the way the time will be spent. But,
despite the strong efforts to come to an agreement with the Town management, the Community Preservation Committee has regretfully voted not to support this article.

Members feel that it’s critical for a committee that makes recommendations on millions of dollars a year should have a top level staff person dedicated to helping them make those decisions and to make those projects better for the Town. We’re recommending the spending of Town money and we’ve been told we’re a bunch of volunteers, and that’s true. We need and want a professional to work with us pretty much 80 percent of the time.

I know there’s other committee members that have comments. They’ll be speaking for themselves.

THE MODERATOR: Further discussion.

Ms. Hayward, Mr. Herbst, I’ll add you to the list.

MS. HAYWARD: Nancy Hayward, Precinct 5. I agree with Ms. Haney’s comment but I have somewhat further comment to make about this. Because I went to the personnel office to get the
description of the job when it was for a Community – for the Community – the Assistant Town Planner Community Preservation person. And when I got the description for the Town of Falmouth Community Development Planner, it says that this person is to assist the Town to implement Community Development goals, and then under the supervisor’s section, it says they work under the direction of the Town Planner and the employee functions independently, consulting with the Town Planner when clarification or interpretation of procedures, tasks or policies is required.

And then I found from an Historic – I am a member of the Historical Commission. And I found an Historical Commission minutes from the meeting of October 17th, 2012, discussion about merging the Historic District Commission and the Historical Commission, a statement which I guess was made by Chairman Heidi Waltz that the merger may be part of a trend toward creating a growth department, which would encompass Planning, Conservation, Historic Districts and Zoning, and I had noticed in the appendix section of our
warrant book - of our warrant book, on the third page of the things in the appendix, that there's this placeholder for - for the development person. And so, this looks very odd and I think what I and what the CPC are interested in is having the administrative assistants as it was given to them when Jessica Erickson was hired and filled that position.

So, I would say do not vote Article 13 for the Community Development Planner. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Herbst.

MR. HERBST: Ralph Herbst - excuse me - Precinct 8. For those new Town Meeting Members tonight who may not know who I am, I’ve been on the Planning Board for 12 years. I’ve been on the Community Preservation Committee for eight and a half years, and I’m one of the three original members still serving on the Community Preservation Committee.

I’m going to give you five reasons why you should not vote for Article 13. I will not have a musical accompaniment to this.

[Laughter.]
MR. HERBST: The first reason. This is a classic example of top down management. An archaic style that does not seek adequate input from those who have to work with the policy. The Selectmen voted to endorse this downgraded position without reviewing the job description. I gave a copy to one member and asked if others had received a copy prior to their vote. The answer was no. Even though the job description includes serving as staff for the Economic Development Committee, the chairman of that committee was not consulted or even made aware of the proposal. How do I know this? Because I asked him.

Number two: if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. The CPC has operated with its own staff for the majority of its existence. We need four days of work dedicated to our responsibilities. We did everything ourselves without a staff person for the first year. We realized the fiduciary responsibility of managing millions of dollars and making responsible recommendations to Town Meeting - that’s you - required professional assistance for the nine volunteers on the
committee.

Number three. This proposal creates more and varied work with less pay. The job description not only adds considerable responsibilities, it creates the role as a staff person – staff person – for the Affordable Housing Committee, which was created and appointed by the Selectmen and reports to them – not to us – the Historical Commission, and the Economic Development Corporation which I referenced earlier. Only one day a week is provided to carry out these responsibilities. Keep in mind that these government bodies meet monthly and as the staff person he or she would be responsible for posting agendas, overseeing minutes, making site visits, doing research and drafting articles.

In addition, the job description introduces these duties by saying, quote: “Including but not limited to”, which means they could add more to this person’s responsibilities.

How much more could a person do?

It’s clear that it will be impossible for one person to do all of this in just one day.
per week.

It would also jeopardize the time required to support the CPC in carrying out its duties. So if the person got overwhelmed by these additional duties, then, for that one day, they might be using some of the time dedicated to the CPC, which is four days.

It is important to note that the CPC has its own administrative funds to pay for the four days of work. By law, we cannot fund other work.

Four. The job description indicates that this staff person will be supervised by the Town Planner, yet this person will work four days for the CPC. The person in this position has always reported to and worked with the Chairman of the CPC and there is no reason for this to change.

Number five. The job description is in direct conflict with the intent of the process outlined by the Community Preservation Act, which is the law that establishes the Community Preservation Committee. This proposal directs the staff person to, quote - I’m talking about a quote out of the job description, now - quote:
“Draft agreements for funding for review by Town
management”, unquote.

The CPC law mandates that, quote: “The
CPC shall make recommendations to the legislative
body, Town Meeting” – that’s you – “for open
space, recreation, community housing, and
historical resources” unquote. The act was
obviously written to exempt the process from
political and outside influence, and to give the
final decisions to Town Meeting, that’s you.

Not to Town government and management. This is
how the CPC has operated for the last seven
years, and has solicited a positive endorsement
of over 75 proposals worth millions of dollars
from you, Town Meeting.

What should we do? Vote the article
down. Six out of seven CPC members tonight voted
not to support this article at a meeting held at
six o’clock this evening.

Secondly, revert to the previous job
description so that we can continue to function.

And, lastly, give Town Meeting – that’s
you, because the administration is coming to you
to create a new position – give Town Meeting –
that’s you – time to consider another, more well-constructed proposal from Town’s management with major input from the CPC itself.

If that doesn’t convince you to turn down Article 13, I don’t know what will. Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Donahue. Okay.

Let’s go, folks.

Mr. Donahue in the center. Microphone in the center section, please.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Moderator, fellow Members, I am rising against this motion also. The reason I’m against it is that there are I believe four to six people that work for the Town that are in this Planning Department. And what we’re basically saying from my point of view on this is that one person in a different department was making a dollar and 54 cents more than the other, so we have to bring that six down to a five to keep harmony in the group. Rather than bringing the five up to the six. And for other reasons it’s – and, in going further on, talking about other articles like this tonight, folks, if
you look at the numbers, it makes us look like
we’re pikers. And I’ll speak later on on some
of the other issues. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Latimer.

MR. LATIMER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I’m Richard Latimer from Precinct 1. I’m a
member of the Planning Board but I’m not speaking
as such. I’m not a member of the CPC.

I agree with everything that’s been said
against this article so far. I thoroughly agree
with everything.

But I’m going to point out something
very fundamental, a very fundamental flaw with
this that struck me right off the bat. And you
are changing not just the pay level, which might
be a trivial thing and could possibly be
justified if we were in a position of extreme
financial distress, I could see maybe demoting a
position, but the more fundamental problem I have
with this: we’re going from a Preservation
Planner to a Development Planner.

Now, preservation and development are
two opposite ideas. They’re two opposite
concepts. So, if you’re going to have a person
who is for development, we’re going to create
conflicts with people who are interested in
preservation. This is just a badly conceived
idea. I would fully support an article that kept
the Community Preservation Planner as is and then
added another position if it was necessary, a
Community Development Planner. That would be
rational. But this is just irrational. Thank
you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, Precinct 9. I
think Mr. Herbst summed this up and gave you more
than enough reason to vote this article down as
printed.

There are some things when we heard this
at Precinct 9 and when I got my warrant book, you
know, that disturbed me and I’ll speak about pay
raises in a future article. But, when you look
at it, this person, again to reiterate, worked
four days a week for one boss. And there’s a
new plan now they’re going to work four days a
week for that one boss and then on the next day,
the fifth day, work for somebody else.

One person cannot serve two masters. We
at Town Meeting constantly ask, as Mr. Herbst said, for information. There's millions of dollars tied up, tax money, that we take out of our tax bills to fund the Community Preservation Act. Again, Mr. Herbst said, if it isn't broken, don't fix it.

And I - but the last, to me, what bothers me even more, is that we're asking this person to work 20 percent more and we're going to ask that position to take a pay decrease. In my 30 some-odd years of standing here in Town Meeting, and we have other articles to do this, we have never voted pay decreases and I am not going to start now. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: I too, am against this article. But I'd like to go a little further. This article represents what we've seen happening in the past few months. It started with the explanation that there were too many direct reports to the Town Manager, so they were going to cast some of this off. Basically it's, in my opinion, it's a sort of a consolidation of power to the favorite lieutenants. And it just puts
another layer between the people that are trying
to get something done and the Town management,
which may have a problem getting things done, if
they’re switching this thing as much as they are
and changing it around, and I just don’t like it.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, does anyone want
to speak in favor of this article?

Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adrien Dufresne,
Precinct 2, and I’d like to call the question
because I think we’re ready to – for –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, yeah --

MR. DUFRESNE: – to do this vote.

THE MODERATOR: -- we’re going to do
that without a vote. I’m going to call the
question because – unless anybody wants to speak
in favor. Because no one’s spoken in favor.

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.

[No.]
THE MODERATOR: It is the opinion of the Chair that the no’s have it.

Article 14. Article 14, Madame Chairman for the main motion.

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

THE MODERATOR: As printed. This is to delete the Police Captain M-9 and add Police Captain M-10.

Discussion on Article 14. Hearing none, then the question will come on the main motion as printed. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

Article 15. Madame Chairman for the main motion.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Would you please turn to page eight in your warrant booklet.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

THE MODERATOR: You’ve got to go just a
little closer to the mic, there.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: I’m sorry. I am
moving this Article 15 as recommended. And I
know it’s confusing with the two, but if you just
look at the recommendation, this is what the
Finance Committee is recommending.

I need to make a correction on the Grade
9 position. The Assistant Superintendent, the
maximum would be - the minimum would be 16.02 and
the maximum is to be $18.73.

THE MODERATOR: That’s on page 8 of the
regular book?

Okay, did everybody get that page? On
page 8 of your warrant booklet, down towards the
bottom, the change in the recommendation is for
that Assistant Superintendent of Beaches. So,
it’s as recommended, with that change.

Discussion on the main motion. Yes. I
see a hand in the back; I’m having a little glare
here, tonight.

MS. VACON: Janet Vacon, Precinct 3.

In the explanation, it says, “Seasonal salary
schedules have not been adjusted in over ten
years and Falmouth is notably under market,
compared to local communities.” But when you
look at the adds and deletes, if I’m looking at
it correctly, it looks like the top steps in each
of these – well, except for the one that was just
corrected and one or two others – the top step is
actually being decreased. And, if I’m correct –
and I don’t know what happens in the
intermediate steps, but if that is correct, that
the top step is being decreased by the adds and
deletes of these, are any employees actually
seeing a pay decrease?

And it goes on – what about the
incentive for anybody in the middle ranges to
move up?

First, I guess the question is: am I
right, is that being decreased in the top step?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Coleman.

MS. COLEMAN: So, I can answer that
question. And also go over a complete review of
my findings and recommendations regarding this
article.

You can switch the –.

So, what occurred is I was asked by the
Town Manager to review the salary schedule for
our seasonal employees. And my findings
indicated that the seasonal schedule has not been
adjusted in over ten years, as you just
commented.

Additionally, as you commented, it is
ture that the salaries market surveys that we
conducted within the Cape communities indicates
that we are under market, and as a result I am
proposing a fair and consistent pay practice.

Next screen, please. So, first I’d
like you to take a look at the current salary
schedule. This is very busy, but I hope it can
clearly display what our current plan looks like.
So, you’ll see that the current step is listed,
and then there’s a four percent differential in
between each one of those steps. There’s five
steps in total. So a four percent increase
within the steps.

What’s important to note is not only has
this seasonal salary schedule not been adjusted,
almost 90 percent of the employees have not
received a step increase since they were hired.
So many of them are still at the first step.

Next slide, please. I’m now going to
give you a quick overview of the external comparability. Again, a lot of information on here. I compared the minimums and the maximums of Falmouth compared to other Cape communities, and if you look on the far right column, you’ll see the percentages that are listed there.

So, in other words, six – the Cape communities pay approximately 16 percent more than we do for a parking attendant, and on it goes, endless.

Next slide, please. So, what I’m proposing is a way to accomplish a few things. It’s to, first, be able to start a fair and consistent pay practice that has not occurred over the last ten years. So we’ll start off by increasing the first step by four percent. This addresses the recruitment, you know, efforts that we’ve had issues with lifeguards and not being able to recruit qualified lifeguards because of the rate. So we’re going to increase the first step by four percent.

Then, what we would do is apply a three percent increase between step two and three. That means that we’re dropping step four and
five, but what is important to note is that the majority of the employees are not at step four and five; they’ve never received increases.

Next slide, please. So I color coded this for you because I would like you to really be able to take a look at what’s happening here. Because if you look at the article, it’s clear, it looks as though we are taking away money. And that is not the intent. The intent is to be able to reward people, which we’ve been unable to do because that salary schedule of 16 percent over a five year period for a seasonal employee is unsustainable.

So Town management instructed everyone not to give the increases. This is to replace that and start rewarding our employees.

So let’s take a look at the first step. Step one. I’m proposing currently it’s at 8.21; I’m proposing 8.54.

Next step. Currently it’s at 8.57; I’m proposing that it go to 8.79. Again, an increase.

Step three, you do see a decline: 8.94 to 9.06. And then we’re dropping step four and
five.

So, next slide, please. So ultimately what this proposal does is it positions ourselves so that we can improve our external marketability. We can attract new hires.

It also requires a fair and consistent pay practice. Like I mentioned, there are some employees that did receive step increases prior to - you know, I can’t give you the explanation why, but there was an inconsistent pay practice over the last 13 years. This corrects it.

Employees should be getting a step increase every year for their first three years. The average years of service for a lifeguard or a seasonal employee does really vary, but we feel those first three years up front, you know, would address that retention.

So, again, we’d be recognizing those employees that have been here for years and years and have not gotten those step increases. And equally important is that this is a fiscally sustainable salary schedule. The one we had did not work. People were not getting the increases. We’re proposing that they do, now.
Next slide. So, in closing, I’d like to remind everyone that no employee will receive a decrease in pay. Eighty-nine percent of the employees will receive a four percent increase. Others who have received an increase that’s inconsistent with the majority may receive less because of the fact that they’ve already been granted a step increase.

So this is the first step in correcting an external pay inequity – and an internal one. This group of individuals did not get cost of living adjustments or step increases. And annually we will consider them as we would anyone else for cost of living adjustments, we would consider it.

The financial impact for this article is between $27,761 and $30,683.

And before I close, if you don’t mind going back to the previous screen. The one before that, please.

I want to also point out that there were two positions – and again, this salary schedule is not created by the individual; it’s created by the position and it’s there to reward people. I
do need to recognize that there are two positions, the Assistant Superintendent of Beaches and the Superintendent of Beaches, who are here well beyond 12 weeks a year and have provided a huge commitment to their positions beyond what one would consider a typical seasonal employee. So, when we talk about the salary maximums, here, you’re going to see that theirs actually increased under step three compared to the others. There’s more marked increase between those positions which are a grade 9 and a grade 11. We added another four percent onto the current max, and that is simply because these people are here year after year well beyond the 12 weeks and, again, the theme of this is to recognize employees and still be sustainable.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, Precinct 9.

When this warrant book came out I had two of these employees under this pay schedule come to see me and they were very upset that they were getting a pay decrease. And then when I opened up the warrant book like the rest of you and look
at this, obviously I assumed they were getting a pay decrease because both individuals had worked for the Town as the Personnel officer just said, for many, many years. And I figured that they were on the top step. Ten years, one person—well, many years, because. And anyhow.

And these—was somewhat appalled. As someone who’s been in labor contract negotiations for over 35 years, I said, What do you mean? We have—as a Town Meeting Member, we have a minimum and a maximum and there are pay increases that we, as Town Meeting Members, have voted in. We gave management the fiscal means to give these people a pay raise. And, as you saw on the slide, 89 percent of these people in ten years have not been given a raise. That’s not our problem, that’s not our fault. That’s management’s.

We have to okay every penny spent. Did Town management ever come to us and ask us to appropriate more money so that we can give these people who are non-union, who work seasonal, a pay increase? We gave them the physical structure to do it and it was never implemented.
I complement the Personnel officer now.

She’s new here and we seem to have a new wind blowing the sails. So – because one of my questions has been answered. Because when I worked, the pay increase – the step increase, excuse me, after you returned for that year of service, was automatic.

So, I’m correct in thinking that if we vote this in, Denise, that that is going to be automatic now? Okay. So that’s -- that’s good. Because, see, these people have no representation. They’re all individuals.

Now, they’re not all kids. They’re not all parking lot attendants. And I don’t want to get into particulars, here. But many of them are retired. Many of them have a great deal of certification for the job that they’re doing. And some of these jobs, if you look at them, are handling expensive equipment and technical expertise.

And I think enough time has been spent. I would just like to offer one amendment and I don’t – it’s very simple. And the amendment is to delete the added maximums and to keep the
current maximums that are in place. It’s sustainable if we, Town Meeting, vote the funds. To say it was unsustainable in the past is a misnomer.

I’d like to you to look at this warrant book that we just did. Look at Article 10. We kept the pay the same. Article 12, look back at it, you voted an increase. Okay? Article 14, you voted an increase. You defeated a previous article that was going to take money away from a position. You did it for, as Mr. Herbst said, five good reasons.

I just think it’s fair and for once we have the salary shown on the board, but my amendment is not to delete the last step, except, I guess, obviously we have given a raise – and it’s convenient and there was a good explanation – a raise to step 9 and step 11. Step 9 got the raise because the person was obviously went in and saw what happened on paper, and that happened last Monday. So that wasn’t a typo. That happened because that individual went in and negotiated a raise.

What about the other eight positions?
Well, I’d like to represent them and the only point of being, again, the amendment, Mr. Moderator, is to delete the current – to delete the Current add, which deletes the last step. Except for nine and ten –

THE MODERATOR: You want to delete the Proposed Maximums?

MR. NETTO: Right, delete the Proposed Maximum and keep them the same the way they are. Raise the minimums and delete the Proposed maximums, which is a decrease in the step. Which nobody is at yet. So there is no funding necessary.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so discussion on the amendment.

MR. NETTO: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, back right.

MR. NETTO: [No mic. Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Excluding nine and eleven? Okay, so striking the Maximum category, excluding nine and eleven.

Go ahead.

MR. MEDEIROS: Robert Medeiros,

Precinct 7. If we were to maintain the current
maximums, how would that work in the three step system?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Coleman.

MS. COLEMAN: So if I’m understanding correctly, what we would do is drop the first step, so that would be a four percent increase for all – if I’m understanding correct. And then there’d be five steps. Is that correct?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: No, it’s the pay rate for the last step, the maximum step. Your pay rate would decrease the – for what we have in front of us.

Don’t forget now, folks, we don’t have this information. This was all new and it was new to you and it was new to me. I’m going by what’s printed in the warrant book, that those employees that came to me, you know, when they showed me their pay raise.

And now you’ve shown us something here again. And again, this is our argument that we have in presentations getting last minute information. And if – how long have you had this chart? if I may ask.
THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

MR. NETTO: Through the Moderator, I'm sorry.

THE MODERATOR: Sure.

MS. COLEMAN: I've been working on this salary structure for quite a lot of time and have put a lot - invested a lot. In terms of this actual schedule, I mean, I've been working on it and I don't think that any article has the level of detail that a presentation would have, so we gave you a summary.

MR. NETTO: It's -

THE MODERATOR: Okay, let's - Joe, let's focus on the decision. You want to drop the maximums, which in essence is going to keep the existing schedule except for your number one is going to go up the four percent, is what he's talking about.

Any discussion on this amendment? Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. Peter Clark, Precinct 1. I would urge you not to vote for the amendment. I think there's been careful study done, and a systematic set of steps
developed. I think it solves a number of problems.

I think the problem that still remains is two years out, when you want to keep someone who’s done a great job for three years and you’ve hit a max that’s below other communities.

So, I think the issue is not to impose the old maximums. I think the issue is for us to be cognizant of the fact that we’re helping our seasonal employees. We’re going to be able to hire them against competition. We’re going to give them raises. The issue will be what happens in three years when that lifeguard can go someplace else. Great experience, knows our people, knows our beaches.

So, that’s a future problem. I think we ought to vote the amendment down and vote for this article.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Latimer, on the amendment.

MR. LATIMER: Thank you. I need a little clarification, because I’m not certain at all I heard Mr. Netto mention nine and eleven as if they were steps. Those are grades. So, I
need some clarification if he’s talking about all
grades, one through eleven, or if he’s just
talking about altering the steps for grades nine
and eleven. I’m not clear on that, and I can’t
vote one way or another on the amendment until
that is clarified.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so he wants to
take the maximum proposal here, that’s in the
recommendation, and strike all of those proposed
changes except for the changes that were proposed
for the assistant Superintendent of Beaches and
the Superintendent of Beaches, Grade 9 and 11.

Okay. Any further discussion on the
amendment? The question will come on the
amendment. All those in favor signify by saying
aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the
Chair that the no’s have it by a majority and
we’re back to the main motion.

Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adriene Dufresne,
Precinct 2. I was on the Beach Committee about 40 years ago and tried to establish some reasonable salaries to keep our people.

Mr. Netto and I had long conversations on this and unfortunately that’s just been voted.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

MR. DUFRESNE: You cannot hear me?

THE MODERATOR: You’ve got to speak directly into the mic. A little closer.

MR. DUFRESNE: Okay. Mr. Netto and I had a long discussion on this and I did concur with the Personnel Officer and she explained it to me and I accepted it.

But one other item that came to my mind is DELETE 6, with is the Operator of equipment, and I’d like a clarification from the Beach Superintendent of what equipment is included in this particular category. Is he –

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Hoffer.

MR. DUFRESNE: - is Mr. Hoffer here?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, he’s right here.

MR. HOFFER: Don Hoffer, I’m the Beach Superintendent. Also Town Meeting Member,

Precinct 4. The equipment Mr. Dufresne refers to
is the Beach Screener, which requires a hydraulic license and is used during the summer. And that came about, my assistant used to run that. And when he became the assistant, he just kept running it, so to speak. And he runs it, he’s run it to this day.

So, at the present time, our equipment operator is part of our Assistant Superintendent job. Does that satisfy you?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, and Mr. Hoffer, you actually had your hand up to speak, as well?

Oh, Andy, are you done, or?

MR. DUFRESNE: Not yet.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. DUFRESNE: I believe his explanation is okay. I’ve known Mr. Mogado when I hired him 40 years ago. He does a hell of a job. He’s been operating that equipment as a Level 9. Now, it’s a very important position on the beaches because it involves the grading and the cleaning and removal of seaweed and whatnot.

The beaches are a primary asset of the Town of Falmouth. It brought in I believe – and I’m going to get a rough estimate of a half a
million dollars more than the cost of running the
beaches. And I have no problem with paying the
employees in order to retain the employees.

But one of my concerns is, years ago,
when we hired a lifeguard, we always asked for a
commitment of the season. The season being a ten
week beach season. Do we give them the automatic
step increases if they give us seven weeks, or
eight weeks, which a lot of them do because
they’re college students and they want to go back
to college?

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

THE MODERATOR: You gotta keep talking
into the mic, Andy. They can’t hear you.

MR. Dufresne: Well, let’s just pass
the article.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Hoffer.

MR. HOFER: I didn’t hear that last,
but –

THE MODERATOR: He said let’s just pass
the article, so.

MR. HOFER: Very briefly, I just
wanted to clear up a couple of things that might
be on your mind. As to - I’m going to speak for the beaches, only. I can’t speak for the other seasonal employees.

As to why the beach people never got step increases over all these years is because, if you recall, the Town was pretty hard up financially. And it just so happens that the beaches have the most employees. We have 90 employees. So if I give a lifeguard a step, times 55, it impacts the Town finances. And I’ve been - without going into detail, I’ve been turned down several years on that particular score.

The other thing, contrary to what you’ve heard tonight - I told you, I have 90 employees. Eighty of them are between 16 and 22, and they bring in the money, and they’re responsible.

Integrity is very important, to handle that much money. A lot of money.

These parking attendants that we’re getting, you were - just think of yourself in your job in the year 2000, and you were making X dollars in the year 2000. Here we are in 2013; that kid is making X dollars. There’s been no -
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maybe one raise to some people. But that’s the way it is and I think Denise did a very – I had other things, but she did a very good job, I think, in explaining this thing. And it is complicated but she did do comparables and I’ll tell you, this year – every other year I’ve done this -- this is my 13th year. Every other year, I was able to give lifeguards to other towns, Mashpee, Sandwich, because I’d have excess when we had our lifeguard training.

This year, I had to get lifeguards from other places. And you know, I like to think that our parking attendants who are interviewed – every one of them are interviewed. People say, “For 8.21, you’re going to interview these kids?” When a tourist comes from out of town and goes to our beach, they don’t see me. They see that parking attendant, and that’s what – I want somebody to greet them properly. And I just have lost my train of thought a little bit.

But they – making 8.21 an hour is kind of – kind of tough for these kids. So, I’d appreciate if you’d vote this up.

I know Denise has done a lot of work,
and it's a work in progress, also. And I was assured that - and, again, speaking for the beaches, now, I was assured no employee would get less money this year as a result of this. You know. So, thank you.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority and we will stand in a 15 minute recess.

[Whereupon, a recess was taken.]

THE MODERATOR: We just completed Article 15 before the break.

Okay, here we go. We need to re-establish the quorum. All Town Meeting Members please come forward, take your seats.

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

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: In the first division.

MR. NETTO: 42.
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THE MODERATOR: 42 - yeah. 44. Okay,
Mr. Netto, you’re counting this group as well?
Okay.

MR. NETTO: 44.

THE MODERATOR: 44. Okay.

Third division.

MR. HAMPSOH: 59.

THE MODERATOR: 59.

The second division.

MR. DUFRESNE: 93.

THE MODERATOR: 93.

By a counted vote of 196, we have a quorum and we’re back in session.

Okay, we had just completed Article 15, and during the break we noticed that there was one position that was missing from the printed motion, the printed recommendation. It was in the article but it wasn’t in the motion.

So, at this point, I’m going to entertain a motion to reconsider the article so that we can get the motion to place the position back in. So, so moved.

All those in favor of reconsideration, signify by saying aye.
[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR:   Opposed, no.

[None opposed.]

THE MODERATOR:   The ayes have it unanimous.   Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI:   Mr. Moderator, I move that we add Grade 3 – it says delete Sailing Instructor. We are adding Sailing Instructor. $10.67 is the minimum, and 11.32 is the maximum. And I so move.

THE MODERATOR:   Okay, so we’re just putting the Sailing Instructor back in there.

Any discussion?   Hearing none, then the question will come on the 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.

Okay.   Now, Article 16 is the capital improvement plan, but based on the decision of Town Meeting on Article 17, it will affect what the Finance Committee is going to recommend be in
our Capital Improvement Plan. So, because of that interrelatedness, by a call of the Chair I’m going to take Article 17 first. And after Town Meeting expresses it’s will, then the Finance Committee will be prepared to make its motion for Article 16.

So, on Article 17, Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I move that the sum of $2,500,000 be appropriated to fund an Emergency Management Service Contract under – I’m sorry – Energy Management Service Contract under Massachusetts General Law Chapter 25A, Section 11I, and that to meet the appropriation, the Treasurer, with the approval of the Board of Selectmen, is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to Chapter 44, Section 7 of the General Laws, or pursuant to any other enabling authority, and to issue bonds and notes of the Town therefore.

And may I make a statement?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

There’s the main motion.

Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: There was an
extensive presentation a year ago in Article 55 in the November 2012 Town Meeting. At that time, Town Meeting was informed that the Trane Company was selected – had been selected as the performance company. We were informed that the School Department had done a similar project and it had been successful.

This is not a new concept. We are not on the cutting edge. We don’t anticipate any free stuff. We are attempting to address how to control our energy costs and update our buildings to best operate in an efficient manner.

At the present time, we react to emergency projects. If a generator or boiler does not work, we’re forced to replace it quickly and probably not always in the most financially sound way. The project gives the Town an avenue to correct the situation by using energy savings to offset the cost of updates. The Town Manager’s ESCO Advisory Team will remain in place and the Finance Committee has a member on that team.

The Finance Committee is charged with studying each article and recommending to Town
Meeting. We concentrate on how best to spend the taxpayer’s money and we believe that this does present an opportunity.

The Finance Committee would like to see the funding for ten years instead of 20. And it’s a very difficult situation. We cannot tie the hands yet because the funding will not start until 2017. We have no idea what the interest costs will be at that time, and whatever costs there are, the Finance Director will definitely do what is best for the Town.

We have removed the – in the request, there was to do the roof at the Morse Pond School and the windows here at the Lawrence School. We have taken those out. This is a smaller project. We would like to do it, see how it works, and then perhaps go for larger projects in the future.

And I would like to ask the chairman who is our resident expert on this article to speak. Vice-chairman, excuse me.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Lowell.

MR. LOWELL: My name is Nick Lowell. I’m Precinct 5. I’m the Vice-Chairman of the
Finance Committee. Yeah, we have been working on this article very hard for quite a while and we’ve come up to this what is amounting to being a compromise plan on the ESCO project.

As many of you know, the original project was for a four and a half million dollar plan. It included many of the Town’s facilities. I think Heather perhaps will have a complete list for you or some kind of a list later, in just a moment. But we’ve boiled that list down to a two and a half million dollar plan.

Now, the project itself is complex, and it has a lot of different things that need to be understood, and it’s difficult to explain that in a couple minutes, but the nuts and the bolts of this type of energy savings contract are that you are attempting to fund projects that will upgrade your energy efficiency, and then you’re paying for that by using the energy savings that you have achieved by upgrading the efficiency of your projects.

So you can then -- because in future years your budget will not have to be as high because you’re not going to be paying as much for
electricity, for gas, for oil; you can use those savings to pay off the bonding on the projects that you put forward.

So, it’s a complex process where you have a lot of variables, and we’ve done our best, now, to look at these variables and make sure we understand how they work and what the impact would be.

Now, that said, I’ve been looking at this very hard myself, but I’ve been extremely skeptical, at times, as to whether this project made sense, but I have come around. And I would like to just sort of outline how that’s happened.

The main sources of concern that I had were that at this time we do not have a complete project list. I cannot tell you exactly what projects we’re going to work on at this time. We have a draft list, but we do not have a complete list. The only thing that we have agreed to, now, is that the roof at Morse Pond and the windows at Lawrence School are not going to be included in this project.

The reason those two projects were taken out was because they’re quite expensive and they
have – it’s very little energy savings potential. Don’t get me wrong: these are important projects and we’re going to have to deal with them as a Town, but they have very poor return. So, using our rough numbers that we have, it’s about two million dollars worth of projects; they save about $4,000 worth of energy every year. In terms of payback, that’s about a 500 year payback for those two projects. But, taking them out, the remaining projects have a payback that roughly breaks even. So, in other words, the amount of money that we’re going to have to pay for the bonding is going to be equal to the offsets that we’re making in the electricity. It’s not exact. We don’t have exact numbers yet because our investment grade audit isn’t complete, which is one part of this process, but it’s about in – in about in equality.

So, the reasons I that I was concerned: we don’t have a complete list, we don’t completely understand what our maintenance costs are, we don’t know the exact amount of savings and we don’t know the exact bonding plan. And we don’t have experience working with Trane, except
for the point that we’ve been working with them for a while, but we haven’t completed a project with Trane. All things that have made me nervous.

But, as I’ve researched this project and as I have talked with more people, as I’ve talked with – as I’ve read the documentation, I’ve become more comfortable with it.

So, in Massachusetts, there have been over 300 ESCO projects that have been completed. Not all with Trane. There are several suppliers. But 300 municipal and school projects have been completed. We’re not the first ones to do this. It’s generally accepted that this is a good way to upgrade your energy infrastructure, upgrade your capital items.

Second of all, Falmouth Schools have done this. A number of years back the public schools worked with Honeywell on a project and they had a favorable experience from that.

Third, Trane, who’s our chosen supplier, has a very good reputation in Massachusetts. They’ve done this before. We’re not breaking any new ground with them. So I feel comfortable
that they’re a good supplier for us.

We also, by taking this project on, many of the projects that are going to be on the list are things like HVAC systems, building controls, lighting controls, energy management systems. These are things that are fairly complicated and unfortunately in the Town we don’t have all of the expertise that we need to do these things. So, putting in a building automation system is something that’s just beyond the capability of most of the – of our Town employees. We don’t have resident experts in these areas. Trane does have those resident experts. By having them working on the project, they are going to help make sure that we get the right equipment and do it right the first time.

There also are the energy savings. So the energy savings are not theoretical. The energy savings are guaranteed. Trane does a – they’re doing, they’re in the process of completing an investment grade audit with us right now. They figure out how much energy we’re using. They figure out how much energy we’re going to save by completing these projects.
So, you have some confidence that the energy that they say you’re going to save, you’re actually going to save. So there’s a reduced risk that it’s – that somehow that they’re made up numbers. It’s made me more comfortable with the project.

Another very important thing is that, by approving this type of project, we get a whole bunch of projects done and started essentially simultaneously. Normally if we wanted to do these projects, we’d have to bid them out individually. It’d be a lot of work; it’d be a long process. We get to lump somewhere on the order of 25, 30 projects and we get them all started at the same time so we’d start making the energy savings – collecting the energy savings on a much more timely manner than we would by doing them one by one.

So, and finally, by scaling this project down to a two and a half million dollar project instead of the original four and a half million dollar project, we have a very manageable project. It’s not the down sides – if everything that went wrong with my original thinking, you
know, if all my nightmares came true, it’s still not going to break the budget. We are going to still be in a sound fiscal position.

But, on the other hand, on the upside, if we do these things, if we realize the energy savings, we get new equipment, we help avoid catastrophic emergency failures, we start saving energy and hopefully – and money immediately, and it’s something that just starts to make more and more sense.

So, on the balance, I personally have come from being skeptical to being supportive of this. I hope that you will also be supportive of it.

If things go really well, we can look at doing a Phase 2 and including more projects, and if we decide that in a couple years that we aren’t liking it, well we don’t have to do anymore but we didn’t risk a lot by doing it.

So, it’s a new way of doing something and I hope that you’ll support it. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on the article.

Mr. Alliegro.
MR. ALLIEGRO: Mark Alliegro from 7th Precinct. So, unless I misunderstood, we don’t know the exact cost, we don’t know what the exact savings are, we don’t know what the projects are that are going to be involved, we don’t know what the bonding is going to be, we don’t have resident experts to evaluate what we’re being suggested to do, so we’re going to take the salesman’s word on this that they’re going to do a good job.

For two and a half million dollars in Phase One.

It seems to me a project like this would really beg to have a consultant with no direct interest in the project itself. A consultant that we would pay for a one year contract to come in and evaluate and stand to gain nothing directly from the project. That’s if I’m understanding this correctly.

And if I am, I’ve never heard a proposal like this before. So, unless – I hope that I’m misunderstanding and I could be corrected on some of these points, because otherwise I could never vote for a proposal like this.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Lowell. Or, Ms. Harper.

MR. LOWELL: [No mic: inaudible.]


MS. HARPER: First of all, thank you for the questions, and I want to thank Mr. Lowell for his very rigorous review of the project. Going back to late August and September, he spent a tremendous amount of time both familiarizing himself with the process, the contracts, as well as the very specific projects. And we do have a very detailed scoping assessment of the projects that the Finance Committee has reviewed in some detail, leading to the elimination of the two larger projects, the windows and the roof project.

In addition, at the last Town Meeting, I think it was a year ago, this Town Meeting appropriated the funds for us to obtain a third party consultant. He is here this evening, Mr. Ward is here. He has reviewed the scoping assessment. He’s reviewed the contract and provided that high level of service that you would expect from the Town. He’s had an
opportunity to present to the Finance Committee
and answer all of their questions, and I think if
you asked any of them, they would share my
respect for his work and diligence that he’s
offered to this point and we would expect
throughout the project, both through the final
recommendations of the full project scope and for
the year beyond, when we’re ensuring that the
energy savings is what Trane is committing to.

And I’d like to just do a brief
presentation. I won’t hang on the slides too
long.

So the ESCO really is a tool available
to the Town to make projects more affordable by
reducing the cost and the time associated with
the design-bid-build process. This project
would require no additional taxation. It’s
proposed within planned budget growth policies.
It’s consistent with our fiscal policies and
funds planned capital needs.

It allows access to federal subsidies on
interest and will include rebates and incentives
through utilities.

The projects include, and these are just
the types of projects that will be included, and this represents projects throughout 17 facilities: replacement of HVAC systems, variable frequency drives, lighting, aging boiler and furnace replacements, kitchen equipment and cooler controls, building envelope improvements, energy management systems, lighting replacement, new windows – not at the Lawrence School – and others.

Projects originally proposed in the capital plan, if you look in the back of your book, you will find all of these listed. And Fiscal '14, the facilities coordinator is looking for $175,000 for the Rec Center HVAC system. In '15, $250,000 for the Town Hall. In '16, $50,000 for the Police Department. In '17, Public Works controls. In Fiscal '19, she has a very general item for building maintenance equipment upgrades; a portion of that would be anticipated to be covered by this ESCO.

Additionally, the school has annual maintenance and capital offset that would result from improvements in the school systems.

With an approved ESCO, the energy
conservation projects would begin simultaneously as one project in all of these facilities. I will not read them to you, but there are about 17 there.

Next slide. The Town ESCO project, and I want to report that it’s been approved at this level at a meeting of the School Committee this evening, as well as at a meeting of the Board of Selectmen. Both those boards concur with the Finance Committee’s recommendation.

The Capital cost is $2.5 million. The annual estimated savings, which has been reviewed by our third party consultant based on a very specific detailed list of projects, is $172,000 is the estimate. Now, you can consider where we are at this phase is at about 75 percent design. There’s still another 25 percent to go in the full review of the investment grade audit.

And I just want to use the term investment grade audit one more time. Our expectation is that we will have a financial instrument, an audit, that we could take to a bonding authority so it will have the level of detail illuminating every project and every cost
savings that is associated with that project, and
that will be reviewed in detail by Mr. Ward.

The avoided costs from the capital
improvement plan we just reviewed is
approximately $550,000. The savings will equal
the debt payments in year ten. That’s really
good news. Any additional savings through an
interest subsidy would reduce that cost, and it
may be feasible that a ten year bond is possible
with this project, and that is something that
we’ll look at as we move to the permanent
financing and we know more about what the
potential for those subsidies may be.

The estimated fiscal impacts would be
effective in 2017, and the debt service is
estimated to be about $232,000 a year. The
annual savings projected is approximately
$172,000 a year, leaving a total annual cost to
the Town of $60,000 a year. This is based on a
20 year note, estimating four percent interest
and declining thereafter.

Next slide. The Town and the schools
first embarked on the exploration of energy
services contracting several years ago, as a
financial tool to assist the Town in meeting our unmet capital needs without seeking additional dollars from taxpayers.

And that is it. If you have any questions, I’d be happy to answer them.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Further discussion? Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: George Hampson, Precinct 5. This is for either Nick Lowell or Heather.

You said this is very, very specialized contracting, and I can appreciate that. But is there any a time – which is an important question – that you use local contractors that can do the work that isn’t so specialized. Thank you.


MS. HARPER: That is a good question. We’ve asked Trane that very question. They have very clear specifications for their contractors, based on the means and methods that they require because Trane is going to guarantee the performance of the equipment that they install.

They will accept references from local contractors and if those local contractors meet their specifications, it’s possible they could be
hired, but that’s solely at Trane’s discretion.

We do not have a role in that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening, I’m Gary Anderson from Precinct 7. First, I’d like to state that for the record my past history would probably show that I’m very much in favor of saving money. That’s the kind of thing that pegs my jovial meter, I might add.

Now, as many of you also know, when it comes to spending money, that’s a wee bit harder for me. So let me point out my issues with this Article 17, the ESCO project. One of the gentlemen from our Precinct 7 earlier made some comments which I would agree with.

Information of the quantitative type seems to have been slow in coming. The Finance Committee didn’t have enough information to make a recommendation until late last week, and as a matter of fact I think it may have been as late as earlier this evening. This is a proposal for nearly three million, two and a half million dollars in spending which would not be subject to approval by the voters. A project of this cost
and complexity merits more than a cursory
overview.

I become very leery of no competitive
bid contracts, which is what this is in essence,
or it appears to be. I understand that the state
allows no bid contract under these ESCO things,
but that doesn’t necessarily make it a wise
decision.

Here’s my brief analysis, at a very,
very high level, of some of the key issues. It
appears that the appeal of this ESCO project is,
Number one, it doesn’t require voter approval.
And, as I said, that’s not necessarily a good
thing.

Number two, there is a guarantee of a
certain level of savings in energy by the ESCO
provider, and I’m going to get back to that in a
minute. I understand that there is also the
possibility of a federal rebate or grant to
reduce the interest cost of the bonds. Something
which isn’t known today and which isn’t
guaranteed.

Number four. It’s also a way to lump
several projects together for bonding purposes,
some of which have a payback which may be beyond
the useful life of the project.

Now here are some of my issues which I believe should be addressed before approving this article. First, how is the guarantee of these savings determined? In other words, will the threshold be set so low or with so many qualitative conditions that the only way to have the ESCO provider make good on a guarantee is to litigate?

Number two. This begs the question of what is the value of the guarantee. This is critical because this element poses some level of risk for ESCO, the provider. The only way to reduce this risk is to charge additional money, a risk premium, or reduce the likelihood of having to perform on the guarantee. Which gets into the standards.

Which is being done here? And what is the cost? And, by the way, that cost is being borne by the taxpayers.

Next, the federal rebate isn’t guaranteed. We don’t really know - or at least I don’t, and I’m sure many of you do not know what
the conditions and likelihood are of receiving that. What is it’s value? It ought to be quantified to our taxpayers.

Fourth, if a bond is issued, for example ten, as the Finance Committee proposed, or 20 years as was alluded to by the Assistant Town Manager, how wise is it to pay interest, even at a reduced rate, for several years beyond the useful life of a project?

What I would like to see is a side by side comparison of an ESCO bid by project which includes the guarantee, and a set of competitive bids with the same criteria. Excluding the guarantee. This will give us some idea of the cost of that guarantee and from that we can estimate the value.

The issue of not having to go to the voters is actually moot. Because if you can do this project under ESCO and not have to go to the voters because the energy savings are going to pay for it, what’s the difference? If you do it on a competitive basis, you’re going to have the same energy savings; those energy savings would pay for it on the basis of a competitive bid.
Last, there is no agreement, at least to my understanding, on how the savings will be captured. As we all know from recent events on a national scene, the devil is in the details. Until we have a better understanding of ESCO, I would suggest that we hold off approving this one. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue is next on the list.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Moderator, I feel that I’m against this right now. I think it should be an indefinite postponement. I think it needs more research and more information to come back to us to vote on this.

Number two, when you’re saying savings — and maybe Heather can answer this question — for example, if we have an oil bill for this building and it’s let’s say $100,000 for the cost of the oil, if we put a new burner in, that was one of the line items, and the oil bill goes down to $85,000 or whatever the number is that’s going to give us the savings to pay for it, how do we do that in government? Because, in government, there’s a budget. It’s not like you’re going to
take the $100,000 that we’re paying today and
next year we’re going to get the hundred – the
difference and put it somehow into another
budget? Maybe I’m not making myself clear, but
it just seems like you can’t do that.

You have a bill for X amount of dollars,
you have to pay it. You can’t say the difference
between last year and this year, we’re going to
put into Fund X. Or maybe you can, I don’t know.
I’m not – this government financing is always a
very tricky thing for me to understand. But if
you’re paying with savings and how can we assure
that the next Town government will not take those
savings and spend it on something else?

I mean, is there something that locks
further Town Meetings into – into something that
we wouldn’t like.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Harper, can
you address those savings?

MS. HARPER: That’s a very good
question. I’m going to answer part of it and I
would like Mr. Ward to talk in some detail about
the process of establishing savings, because it
is not an unknown. It is a known. And Mr. Ward
will do a much better job of describing it than I will.

But, in terms of the budget, the savings are established based on the cubic unit of energy, and there will be a very thorough study of each piece of equipment or improvement that’s made to determine what the cubic energy savings are going to be based on whatever the building consumes. And that will be translated into a dollar figure and those budgets will be reduced. Those budgets will be reduced, those energy budgets will be reduced and the debt budget will be increased. And that’s the method that will be used over time.

And, I would — if it’s okay with Town Meeting and I’d ask for your consent to have Mr. Ward talk a little bit more about how energy savings is determined.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we’re going to take a procedural vote to allow Mr. Ward to present. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All opposed no.

[None opposed.]
THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

Mr. Ward.

MR. WARD: Thank you, Mr. Moderator and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the town.

My name's Dave Ward. I'm a Registered Professional Engineer in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I own my own consulting firm. I've been in business for about ten years. I've been involved in performance contracting for about 20 years, at all levels: federal, state, municipal, private.

So, one of the key elements is the savings, the guarantee of the savings. Verification is critical because the guarantee is only as good as what can be proven. And so there are protocols in place. They've been in place for a number of years, 15 years or so. I helped develop these protocols when I was doing work with the federal government that describe how savings should be calculated. There's various steps and types, without going into the detail. So, that's one of the things that I will do for the Town to look at how the savings
are calculated.

And furthermore, prior to becoming a professional engineer, I worked installing heating and air conditioning equipment for ten years. So not only do I ensure that the savings are calculated correctly, I ensure that the piece of equipment can generate those savings. Calculations are only calculations. If a piece of equipment is not capable of doing something that the contractor says it can do, then, you know, the calculations don’t mean much.

So I will be very thorough and diligent about determining if the savings can be generated by the piece of equipment installed as the contractor says, and that the calculations that they use to determine savings are accurate and valid, and then the final piece is the verification methodology will be clear and simple such that you don’t need to hire me every year to come back and inspect that. You’re welcome to if you like. But the Town should be able to look at a very clear and simple document that demonstrates what these savings are.

So that, every year, every quarter --
and we will determine this along with all of the other few details that remain as far as the scope and the other elements of the project will be determined during the development of the investment grade audit.

One of the final pieces of that is coming up with the measurement and verification protocol for each one of the measures. And that will be worked out with the Town so that it will be a very rigorous, where it needs to be, and yet very low cost. Because you can do, as an example: rather than calculate energy savings from a new boiler, I would just look at the combustion efficiency. Which should be tested every year on a new boiler -- on any boiler, anyway. So that, if the guarantee is for a 95 percent efficient boiler, the combustion efficiency report, done by an independent, should show 95 percent efficient. If it doesn’t, Trane will have to make it say 95 percent efficient. It’s very easy. It’s very clear and very simple and very direct.

So that, they can do whatever they want to make it say 95 percent, be that replace the
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boiler, tune up the boiler, but if 95 percent efficient boiler is what the Town is purchasing, then that will be the requirement on the measurement and verification. No calculations needed. A piece of paper, a test that shows that efficiency.

So those are the kinds of things that we will go through on every measure prior to the Town signing up to the project.

THE MODERATOR: Okay –

MR. WARD: Is that sufficient?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Shephard.

Oh, are you all set, Mr. Ward?

MR. WARD: Yes, sir.


MS. SHEPHARD: Susan Shephard, Precinct 1. I was asked by someone in the precinct to ask whether street lighting is part of this.


MS. HARPER: We have a contract with the County to replace all of our municipal street lights this year. Those will be done separately at no cost to the town.

MS. SHEPHARD: And so any opportunity
to have input on the color of those lights is -

THE MODERATOR: Is beyond the scope of this article.

MS. SHEPHARD: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

[Laughter.]

MS. SHEPHARD: But you’ve answered my question, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. O’Connell. And then Mr. Murphy.

MS. O’CONNELL: Mr. Moderator, Maureen O’Connell, Precinct 4. Our former chair of the Finance Committee hit on what I was concerned about and am concerned about. I wonder how Trane was chosen over any other contractor or business to perform these services. As was mentioned, Honeywell had been used in the past in the schools.

And also I really agree that the way that we would make a decision based on some kind of fact would be as was previously proposed: to have different providers of this service propose what the savings would be and contrast those savings side by side.
Can somebody please tell me how Trane
was chosen, and this was not a bidding process,
am I correct?


MS. HARPER: So this was a public
procurement process that’s established by the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It was a request
for proposals issued in 2012. There are
multiple bidders that submitted proposals. They
were all interviewed and a full comparative
analysis was done of each one of those firms and
Trane was identified as the most responsive and
responsible bidder and was selected following
that process.

MS. O’CONNELL: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Moderator. Kevin
Murphy, Precinct 5, member of the Board of
Selectmen but I also happen to be on the ESCO
Review Committee as a representative for the
Board of Selectmen.

The Board of Selectmen, along with the
Town Manager’s Office, have worked diligently
over the last four years to maintain a fiscal
discipline approach. The $4 million that we have this evening in Free Cash didn’t just fall out of the skies. It came from discipline, Folks, a commitment from our Town employees who helped us bridge the gap during the tough financial times.

This Board has been able to, if you remember right, Town Meeting had before it a proposal to do an override for roughly $2 million to be able to pay for capital costs. This year we’re looking at once again having a surplus of $4 million. The reason, because we are trying to do things and consolidate things to save you and the taxpayers money.

This project will be done and we’ll be able to clear some of those capital items that have been on the list that were delayed because of the tough fiscal times. We have a backlog of capital projects that we now can see the light at the end of the tunnel and be able to go forward with a disciplined approach. This puts another tool in our toolbox.

These funds will be paid for out of the Operating Budget. We will have to make some cuts or it will be within the Board of
Selectmen’s Budget Statement in the year 2017

because that in fact is when this will end.

So, we worked collectively with the
Finance Committee and the School Department to
come up with something that was a little bit more
manageable and to take the fear out of the
process.

Two point five million dollars without
the subsidy, without the subsidy of the interest
from the federal government. And, again, like
my friend Mr. Anderson, I don’t like doing
wishing and hoping, but if we got that subsidy,
the $60,000 a year could possibly be zero dollars
a year to put the debt service. That’s with the
payback in the energy cost.

You know, Folks, this is an opportunity
for us to try something that doesn’t have a lot
of risk.

One of the other things that I want to
say to you is we continue to talk about the
potential for bidding these as a separate stand-
alone item. I can tell you that when it comes
to technology - and a lot of this is in fact
technology. One of the reasons we backed off
the roof and the windows is because that’s not
technology. But we saw what happened with some
of our other bidding projects, i.e. one of the
school - the high school. We also saw what
happened to the insulation at Town Hall, because
we didn’t have the necessary qualified people to
bid these projects.

Trane is a professional in this field.
It provides and they’re going to guarantee the
savings to the Town of Falmouth. Along with our
consultant, we’ll be able to qualify and quantify
what those savings are.

I hope you vote for this because I think
this will move us forward as a great tool in our
toolbox.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Thank you. Lesley
Lichtenstein, Precinct 8.

I only have one question, and that is
because we are relying on a guarantee from Trane,
is there some sort of a bond that they will be
there? A few years ago I bought a car that had
- I paid extra for Rusty Jones so it wouldn’t
rust out. When the car started to rust, guess
what? That company wasn’t there.

What kind of a guarantee do we have? I mean, I’m all for free things, but I’m worried about a free puppy here.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: So this is enabled by a statute, a general law. And the General Law set forth a program of the ESCO, and we would enter into a contract with Trane that would lay out all the terms and conditions. So it isn’t as though we are requiring a bond. It’s a contract that requires them to participate with the Town over the life of the project, which under a 20 year note would be 20 years.

I think that answers your question.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: But what if they weren’t there?

MS. HARPER: One of the reasons Trane was selected was that they are a very longstanding, large firm that’s been around for a very long time and we expect them to be around for a long time.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM: I’d like to address a few
things that Mr. Anderson or a few issues that Mr. Anderson raised and I’d also like to thank Mr. Anderson for his insight and his questions because it’s — you know, making decisions, especially amongst a body such as this, is easier when we get alternate points of view and different perspectives.

But there are a few things that he said that I think need some clarification. One of them, he said this is not subject to approval by the voters. And I’d like you to look one article before this, to Article 16. There’s $3 million in projects there, ladies and gentlemen, not subject to approval by the voters. This body, on a biannual basis, approves millions upon millions of dollars of projects that are not subject to approval by the voters. We are elected in order to make these decisions.

So, his thoughtful questions, and yours, are appreciated here because obviously you’re doing your job. But don’t get hung up on that.

He mentioned litigation and the enforcement of contracts, but I’d refer you again back to the fact that 300 ESCO projects have been
done across the state of Massachusetts; Trane has
done dozens.

We talk about the longevity of companies. Before this, how many of you have
ever heard of Trane? You see ads on T.V. They’re a very widely known company. They do a
lot of business across the country, around the world.

Now, how many of you can remember the name of the high school building contractor? I
certainly can’t. Not Gilbane, but the actual contractor. Yeah, there’s a few folks.

The point is, is that – and – and Mr. Anderson mentioned it. He talked about doing
this out in bidding. Well, there are dozens of projects that are going to be done under the
umbrella of the ESCO. So if we do dozens of projects, that means we have to go through the
bidding process. That’s a lot of work for the Town Manager’s Office. It’s a lot of work for
the Energy Committee. It’s a lot of work for every Town department that has to put together
the proposals needed in order to get the bids for dozens of projects.
Is there a premium here? Yes. We’re going to pay a little premium. That’s a guaranteed, because Trane has to get their money out of this. They’re not a non-profit, Folks, they’re going to be doing this for money. But we’re getting a service for that premium and that service is to allow them to save us the time. They’re going to do that process with the bidding and make sure – and it’s a guaranteed contract. And again, I go back to 300 successful ESCO projects done across the state. It’s a process that is guaranteed in a contract. Trane has not only their money on the line, literally, because they have to guarantee this, their reputation is on the line.

And, as noted, there was a panel of individuals in this town: Energy Committee, Board of Selectmen, Town Manager’s Office, put together to review the various bidders and they came up with Trane. So Trane’s reputation is on the line, their name is on the line. This is not something they’re going to take lightly.

Are there some fuzzy details still? Yes, there are. There are always going to be
fuzzy details. There are always going to be some questions that remain unanswered. But we have done our due diligence here, Folks. And this is not a question mark. We know what we’re doing. I suppose easy for me to say; I’m standing here talking about it. But the reality is is there’s been a lot of due diligence done.

There’s a lot of experience across the state with these projects and we wouldn’t be entering into this if we didn’t think it was going to be a win-win for the Town.

We ask that you support this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Flynn.

I’ve got an extremely long, growing list. So if we can ask questions or make new points about why you do or don’t want to do this, because this list is really getting long, longer than what you’ve already heard speak.

Ms. Flynn.

MS. FLYNN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Moderator. Pat Flynn, Precinct 6.

I think the legislature did a really good thing when it passed this bill to allow communities to be able to meet their energy needs
through a piece of legislation like this.

If you really think about the long lists
that we have had over the years for capital
projects and infrastructure projects, they aren’t
even as long as they could be, because oftentimes
department heads don’t put everything on the list
because they know it can’t possibly happen
anyway.

If you look in the appendix, even, of
the warrant, you will see a long list of capital
needs that still have to be met. My point is
this: the legislature gave us a vehicle where we
can take energy related infrastructure and
equipment and be able to purchase it and install
it, implement it, in a way that does not affect
the way we usually buy our capital equipment,
through the regular RFP’s, the regular bonding,
the Town Meeting votes and all of that.

So what it does is it takes all of those
items out of the Capital Plan and it shortens the
list. So it helps us get our capital needs done
faster and more efficiently and – and the way
they should be done.

So, that’s really the whole point of
this. And I think all the comments that have been made are very, very important. The considerations that have been raised really need to be looked at. But, in the end, what this is, is another way of being able to acquire these - this kind of equipment, these kinds of capital needs, outside of the usual process so we can move our other needs forward and we don't end up year after year with a list that we never get to the bottom.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Mustafa.

MR. MUSTAFA: Ahmed Mustafa, Precinct 4. My question is the way things are, $250,000 for the Trane Company to do this review, do we - is there any stopgap measure in there to prevent cost overruns? This needs to be done here and this needs to be done there. Is that the final figure, the 250, or is this just the beginning? Because I know we've been burnt a couple times on a starting figure and then we end up paying two or three times more than what the starting figure was. That's my question.


MS. HARPER: Thank you for that
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The request to Town Meeting is a $2.5 million ESCO, not to exceed $2.5 million. We won’t come back to you for more to complete this scope of work.

And the way the pricing works, and I’m going to have Mr. Ward answer this again, is it’s fixed, firm pricing. So they will give you a fixed price and that is the price. And the reason we have Mr. Ward is to review each and every one of the specifications, the equipment specified, as well as the energy savings on them to insure that we are getting good, solid industry prices on those.

I don’t know if you have anything more to comment on.

MR. WARD: Just briefly, thank you. Yes, as far as the pricing goes, it’s an open book, then closed book, firm, fixed price.

So that the Town, the Energy Committee, with my help, will scrutinize all of the pricing of everything. And if something looks out of whack, then we’ll go back and augur into it deeper. But the pricing will be scrutinized and
matched up with - I’ve done maybe 50 projects just like this, so I have a good idea of what pricing should be for each of these things and the scope of work should be for each of these things.

So if the scope seems to be out of whack or the price seems to be out of whack, then we’re going to augur into it more. And if it can’t be brought into line, that piece can be dropped from the project and replaced by something else. This is why the project is not cast in stone yet, because there’s still a little bit of tweaking that has to be done as we get all these final numbers in. So it will be scrutinized.

Once the project is selected, it’s a firm, fixed price, so they must do that work for that price. And we will be scrutinizing them throughout.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Newton.

MS. NEWTON: Chardell Newton, I’m the Facilities Manager for the Town of Falmouth. I actually went with Paul Gentile, our Energy Coordinator, to visit these other towns and cities who had already either had an ESCO done or
they were in the middle of having one done. And we met with the facilities managers. We met with the actual plumbers and the custodians and the Maintenance Department who followed out the project from start to finish. And we had extremely positive notes.

We actually met with the Financial Director in the City of Somerville to discuss how the ESCO payback was and how much money they were saving. And I don’t think – and Paul, correct me if I’m wrong – that we actually found anything negative about any of the ESCOs.

The employees liked it. They said the training was phenomenal. And the one thing about doing the low bidding, as everybody seems to be worried about the bidding process, oftentimes when you’re low bidding, you get a piece of equipment that is a low bid, and in the end the Town pays a lot of money to have it repaired over and over and over again.

I can assure you of one thing: I’ve been the Facilities Manager for 22 years, and Trane makes an extremely good product. Most of the Trane equipment that we have, we have very, very
little problems with it.

But I do want you to know that we did actually go to these cities and towns to speak to them about their experience, and it was a very positive experience that they told us that they had.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Fenwick.

MS. FENWICK: Good evening, I’m Judy Fenwick, Precinct 1, and also Chairman of the Falmouth School Committee. And I want to use this opportunity this evening to introduce Dr. Bonnie Gifford who’s our new Superintendent of Schools.

[Applause.]

MS. FENWICK: I just want to make a few statements on behalf of the School Committee. At our meeting this evening prior to Town Meeting, the School Committee reconsidered a vote we had taken last week, which was to follow the recommendation of the Finance Committee, which was last week for indefinite postponement.

There’s been a lot of scrambling and requests for more information. And, although you – Mr. Alliegro, you talked about things being
fuzzy and wanting more information. We also were
right there with you, but we’ve gotten the
information that we want to satisfy us.

The School Committee feels that going
forward with a slightly reduced project really
plays into economies of scale, which is something
as a Town we need to do. And I see this as a
proactive approach and also a creative approach
to financing projects, as Ms. Flynn said that
have been begging to be done.

So, the School Committee is firmly in
support of going forward with this reduced
project for $2.5 million.

And if you’d like to address anything to
this?

MS. GIFFORD: I don’t think I can.

Can I?

MS. FENWICK: All right, yes, you can.

MS. GIFFORD: I can?

MS. FENWICK: Yeah.

MS. GIFFORD: Okay. Just to echo
what Ms. Fenwick just said. We’ve had many,
many, many meetings.

I am just really thrilled to be able to
work with all of the Town boards, here, and look
at that as a collaborative effort, that if this
is something that we can do for the benefit of
the taxpayers as well as getting some of these
projects off of our list and moving on to get
some others addressed, as we said, we have voted
to support this.

So, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Nidositko.

MR. NIDOSITKO: Jim Nidositko, Precinct
2.

I may have missed something, but I don’t
believe the word – the acronym TRANE is mentioned
in the article. And if I’m correct, I’d like to
know why. And I’d like to know what the term,
the acronym, TRANE stands for and where the firm
is located in the event someone wanted to Google
it and get some more information about them.


MS. HARPER: I do not know and I’m not
sure that there’s anyone here that does know.

Trane is a very large, multi-national firm. If
you look up Trane, Google Trane, you’re going to
get a lot of information about them. Trane is
the name of the firm. T-R-A-N-E.


All right, let’s see, I had Mr. Lowell.

MR. LOWELL: Nick Lowell, Precinct 5, and I did want to just clarify a couple things that I said that didn’t maybe come out exactly the way I intended.

The project list is not nailed down exactly because the investment grade audit has not been completed. So the numbers that we’ve been working off of to date are based on a quick walk-through type of review of the facilities. It’s difficult from a walk-through to be sure of exactly what you’re looking for to be able to guarantee the energy savings to identify the lighting that the – the exact equipment and to know exactly how you’re going to replace it.

So, when I say the project list is not nailed down, what I mean is that until you’ve done a very detailed review, you can’t nail it down. And the reason that the way that this whole process works is by first, in this case, contracting with Trane, is because they need to have some assurance that they’re going to get the
job to do the level of detailed work to
determine, you know, what equipment needs to be
replaced, how you’re going to replace it and what
the savings will be.

It’s not reasonable to expect that to be
something that you could bid out on a normal
process.

The second thing, when I said that the
costs aren’t nailed down, we – the numbers work
even if we get no federal rebate; even if there
are no other rebates. But what we don’t know
yet is we probably will get some money back. It
may be an interest subsidy from the feds. We
probably will qualify for lighting incentives,
perhaps from Cape Light Compact. We’ll probably
qualify for incentives from the gas utilities for
upgrading boilers. But until we know exactly
what light fixture we’re replacing with a
different type of light fixture, you won’t know
what those pay backs are going to be, what the
incentives will be for those.

So, without accounting for those, we
still feel comfortable doing the recommendation.

Sure, I’d love to know exactly how much
we’re going to get back from those types of things, but we don’t know them now but it doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t go ahead with it.

The one thing that’s certain: if we don’t do the project, we won’t save the energy from doing it. We’ll continue to be wasting our electricity by running lights. We’ll continue by heating the outdoors in the winter and cooling the outdoors in the summer. We’ll continue to have problems with equipment malfunctioning or breaking down entirely unexpectedly.

So this is just a way for us to ensure that some of those things don’t happen. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Pinto.

MR. PINTO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Greg Pinto, Precinct 9. I move that we suspend debate.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, move the previous question. The question will come on closing discussion on the main motion. 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 a two-thirds

majority and the question will come on the main

motion.

This main motion includes borrowing

language, so this will require a two-thirds vote.

All those in favor of Article 17, the main

motion, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It is the opinion of

the Chair that the ayes have it by a two-thirds

and I so declare. Is there a challenge to the

Chair?

Hearing none, I declare the two-thirds

majority.

Now we will go back to Article 16,

Madame Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MAGNANI: Mr. Moderator, I

move that the Town vote to appropriate $3,068,325

for the purpose of Article 16, and to meet this
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appropriation the Town transfer the sum of $3,018,325 from Certified Free Cash and transfer $50,000 from the Waterways Improvement Account. Said funds to be expended under the jurisdiction of the Town Manager.

And the reason this is changed is that we had – the Finance committee voted to put $60,000 more in the Capital Improvement Plan and this – and that’s – it’s for replacement windows in the Lawrence School. Originally this was in the capital, and then it was taken out because it was going to be under the ESCO project. Now we are not doing the windows at the Lawrence School and what is needed is a study to get this in – get it planned and get it designed and the School Committee believes that this is something that we need to attend to now.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’m going to start by any general questions and then we’ll actually go through this by line items. And we actually have an opening presentation first.

MS. PETIT: Good evening. I’m Jennifer Petit, the Director of Finance. I just want to give a brief overview on the Capital Plan and how
we made some decisions and recommendations.

First slide, please. As you know, the Capital Plan has been underfunded in the past several years. We are continuing to make progress in funding current capital plan requests and we are continuing to increase our capital in the Operating Budget as additional revenues allow.

If you remember last April we actually put around 400,000 back into the operating budget of capital police cruisers, things of that nature. And in FY ‘15, the Selectmen’s budget policy will continue to fund the Capital Stabilization Fund.

Next slide, please. Last year, the Capital Advisory Committee met weekly and they looked at some work a previous committee had completed and the came up with three categories. Category one are transitional items, falling below the 25,000 and five year life limits.

Category two are expenditures between 25,000 and one million dollars with a life expectancy of greater than five years. And category three are large expenditures exceeding
one million dollars with a life expectancy
greater than ten years.

Next slide, please. This capital plan that
you’ll be reviewing tonight focuses on category
two primarily expenditures in the plan and
revenue generation to fund at least three million
in capital per year.

Our Free Cash was certified this year at
approximately 4.9 million, and we are
recommending about three million in capital.
When the Capital Advisory Committee met and they
reviewed these thresholds, they did focus on
revenue generation, and they also came to a
conclusion that if we could fund around three
million a year we could probably keep up with
some of the capital needs. Although, if you look
at the capital plan, there are always a lot more
requests than what we can fund. But at least
we’d be able to make some headway towards that.
And they made a report to the Board of Selectmen
on their findings.

So the process. As I stated, we
generated enough in Free Cash to fund
approximately three million. The department
heads submitted a ten year capital plan. It was reviewed by myself, the Town Manager and the Assistant Town Manager. And recommendations were made on current year requests. So all your information in the back of your warrant booklet, when you get those individual sheets, you’ll get sheets for what has been requested in the capital plan.

And the Finance Subcommittee members met with all the department heads and they made actually some additional recommendations as well.

Next slide, please. So, in conclusion, that’s really how we came about the ten year capital plan and everything is in the back of your warrant booklet. And if you have any questions, we have the department heads here to answer specific questions you may have.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, thank you.

Any general questions before we actually go to the line items? Okay.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, Bob Young, Precinct 5.

I’d like to ask Ms. Petit if maintenance, painting and training belong in the
Capital Expense budget. I see this eight different times, but rather it should be Operating Expenses and belong in the Operating Budget. I brought it up in other years and it seems that these things slip in because there’s no other way to pay for them and I’m sure the department heads need these things done, but they’re not true capital expenses and don’t belong in this article.

MS. PETIT: Thank you for the question. Some of the items, as I stated, we are trying to put back into the Capital – into the Operating Budget, so you’ll see us doing that. Training, yes, you could make the argument that it really isn’t a true capital expenditure, but instead of putting it in as a separate warrant article, it was a request that was made through the process, so we added it into this. And there is – this is certain training for not just your re-occurring training. But that’s why you might see some items that might not actually meet that threshold in the budget, but we will be incorporating that into the Operating Budget.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else
general before we go to line items?

Okay. General Government — oh, yeah,

right up front, here.

MR. HARGRAVES: Hello, Peter

Hargraves, Precinct 9.

So, building on the question that was

just asked by my colleague, and I’m burdened by

my business experience and so I’m here to be

educated on how the treatment of this budget item

impacts Town finances. But certainly in a

business a capital item is depreciated and it

affects profits, and taxes due, and so there’s a

legal aspect, and the government and statutory

requirement on what can be called a capital item

and how long it can be depreciated, and I’m not

sure how the naming of something as a capital

item impacts our Town finances and how Falmouth

looks to the outer world that might be examining

our finances. Because, in spite of the comments

about systems and training and other things that

were put in here, I did some investigating in the

Massachusetts Department of Revenue Finance

Handbook, and even in the back of our own

handbook, here, capital items are, you know,
defined as depreciable assets and they’re
classified according to statute and they don’t
include things like system training, IT
networking, GIS flyovers, bridge maintenance,
coastal structural repair, and even tuckpointing
bricks on the fire station.

I understand that these are all
important items but, on the other hand, when this
is all allocated to Free Cash, as a former
business manager I understand when there’s free
cash around everyone lines up at the trough, and
I wonder if this is really the highest and best
use of Free Cash when we have unresolved
contracts and unfunded pensions and other
financial needs in town.

So, it seems to me that maybe I’m making
a comment on a need for a more disciplined
budgeting process rather than how to spend the
Free Cash and calling it capital expenses.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Petit.

MS. PETIT: Thank you. Two issues.

One is the deprecating of assets. When we –
every year when the auditors come in, we go
through a review of a list of assets and we do
deprecate them. And just because it was in one article, stating the Capital Plan, we wouldn’t depreciate it. You wouldn’t depreciate training. So we go through a different exercise to identify our assets and depreciate them, according to Mass. General Laws, and it is – and the auditors do go over that when they come in and do their review.

The Certified Free Cash really comes down – back to a budget policy, and the fundamental policy would be one time revenue for one expense and reoccurring revenue for reoccurring expenses. Free Cash is a one time funding source. So we try to use that – so we use that for capital items, one time capital items. We wouldn’t want to use Free Cash to fund the budget or reoccurring expenses. It’s not a good fiscal policy. Bond rating agencies do not look favorably upon that. So that’s why we use Free Cash to fund our capital.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the first section under General Government.

Police Department. Fire/Rescue Department. In the center section. If you
could stand there in the center.

FROM THE FLOOR: Unless there’s some additional information, in the precinct meeting the Traffic Radar had no amount of money beside it in the warrant. That came up. Somebody could clarify that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, good point. There is no Traffic Radar in the Capital Budget, so the title should have been taken out. Their number was taken out. So, you can strike the language Traffic Radar.

Mr. Boyer.

MR. BOYER: Peter Boyer, Precinct 5. I think I know the answer, but I think I want this on record. The capital replacement of the ambulance is a replacement, I believe. We did learn at the last acquisition of a new ambulance the rationale by the Fire Chief was, “Well, but we’re also going to keep the old ambulance because then it will spread the usage over five pieces instead of four.”

How many ambulances will we have once this purchase is concluded?

THE MODERATOR: Chief.
CHIEF SULLIVAN: Hi, I'm Mark Sullivan, Fire Chief. We'll have five. We have five now and we'll be trading one in or selling it, whatever works out best for the community. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Mr. Dufresne, did you have your hand up earlier?

MR. Dufresne: I had raised my hand on General Government and you didn't recognize me.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, okay, go ahead. We'll go back to it.

MR. Dufresne: Is it possible to go back to it?

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. DUFRESNE: On the second - Adrien Dufresne, representative of Precinct 2. Under General Government, the second line, which is Municipal Space Improvements at a cost of $250,000. In this tough economic times, I think some type of an explanation to this body as to what the expenses will be that would take up $250,000.

Most of these excess funds available to
us tonight have been brought about by increasing fees on some of our working people that generate the – the money goes into the General Fund. One of them that really tore at my innards was when I read in the paper that we increased the fees for teaching kids how to swim. Here we are surrounded by water and we now raise a fee which affects people who have the least amount of monies to afford this.

But anyway, if we’re going to improve the space – municipal space, shouldn’t we not have some type of explanation as to how we’re going to spend a quarter of a million dollars?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Suso, do you want to address that.

MR. SUSO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

We have a slide on that.

As you can see, $250,000 is request in furtherance of the Board of Selectmen directive to relocate all Town departments from rented Town-owned space, which represents currently $50,000 a year, plus additional utilities beyond that, and I think Town Meeting has been aware of the discussion and the directive in that regard.
These funds will advance significant adjustments as follows. This is a brief summary of an analysis of space which has been underway and which will be presented in a more detailed form to the Board of Selectmen in the near future. But, in brief, that will effect the relocation of the Town Counsel Offices to Town Hall, Human Services functions offices to the Edward Marks building.

It will remove file storage from the Falmouth Town Hall, where there is considerable amount of storage now, in spite of the fact that it’s using critically important and highly valued office space. It will create central records in the Gus Canty Recreation Center. It will accommodate a relocation of all the permitting, planning and preservation functions, as I refer to them, to the ground floor space of Town Hall, which is the largest single floor footprint in Town Hall for convenience and better service to the public.

It will coordinate, as far as possible, with ESCO Improvements for HVAC systems, as well. Regarding the Edward Marks Building, there will
be a needed upgrade for the Human Services
relocation there; some structural repairs, as
well, and the – furthermore, the exploration of
potential second floor use for the consolidation
of the public safety dispatch. We’ve had some
discussion of that at the Selectmen level.

Again, this is all in furtherance of the
directive the Board has given me as Town Manager
to seek to consolidate reasonable functions
within the Town of Falmouth to more efficiently
manage office services and combine operations to
utilize taxpayers’ funds more efficiently and
more effectively and to better service all of you
and all our residents who are customers. The
consolidation of Public Safety Dispatch is
another step in that direction.

All of these items I’ve mentioned have a
time frame of some significance. Some involve
required impact bargaining with public sector
unions. All of these represent initiatives that
are underway in various stages. The $250,000
requested as noted is in furtherance of important
first step improvements for upgrades to physical
structures and some modest renovations. As I
think all of you are aware, when you relocate offices and move them from structure to structure, you can’t just drop a desk in the middle of a space and figure that everything’s going to work just fine. So some dollars are needed.

I’ve been discussing this with the Finance Committee and others over the last several weeks and this process is one that will continue to unfold. This is step one.

And thank you for the opportunity to address that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion?

MR. DUFRESNE: Not a question - not mentioned is the relocation of the Veteran’s Services Department.


THE MODERATOR: There’s a question about Veteran’s Services relocation.

MR. SUSO: That question about Veteran’s Services. As I noted, this is not all inclusive. This was merely a summary. We will
be talking about this at much greater -
significantly greater length in a presentation to
the Board of Selectmen, but I have already
announced to department heads and the affected
departments that, for instance, I envision
Veterans Services coming under the - becoming
affiliated with the Personnel function and in all
likelihood being relocated to the second floor of
Town Hall offices as a result.

But again, this is conceptual only. We
don’t have a plan about where everybody’s desk is
going to go and where they’re going to plug their
lamps in. This is yet to unfold and more work
to come and this is a work in progress.

MR. DUFRESNE: Fellow Town Meeting
Members, I just wanted for the record the last
comments made by the Town Manager. The present
offices which are part of this municipal space
improvements is cold and damp in the winter and
hot and humid in the summer, and has threatened
the health and welfare of the employees in that
section of the building. It has been a
disservice to those two employees and has been a
serious concern of the Veteran’s Counsel over the
last two years.

When we first approached the Town Manager and the Board of Selectmen on an air quality problem in that section of the building and were dismissed and ignored by both the Board of Selectmen and the Town Manager as to what was taking place. I just wanted for the record this Town body – we’re looking at $250,000 of improvements for a building that’s been functional for the Town of Falmouth since 1964.

And, anyway, thank you, Mr. Moderator, for allowing me service.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Hampson.

MR. HAMPSON: Point of order, Mr. Moderator. I’d like to make a motion to extend this meeting past eleven o’clock to finish this article.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The motion to go after 11:00 just for this article. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by the
two-thirds and we'll finish this article.

Ms. Hayward. Microphone for Ms. Hayward, please. Microphone, please.

MS. HAYWARD: Nancy Hayward, Precinct 5. Vice-chairman of the Falmouth Historical Commission.

The Eddie Marks Office Building was mentioned and I spoke to Kip St. Germaine from the Retirement Board and he told me this evening that Retirement has moved out of the Eddie Marks Office Building. However, there is an issue which I would like to bring forth at this very public meeting.

There was a time when the Falmouth Historical Commission was for three years active—well, actively present in the Eddie Marks Office Building and I would like to say that the Falmouth historical Commission has records in the Eddie Marks Office Building. They have a secure closet with documents in it, some of which are required to be, by the Mass. Historical Commission, to be under locks.

We have other records which are in there. We have had very little space in Town
Hall and there was mention and I’m sorry, I lost track, somebody – some – oh, maybe it’s Veterans Services, which is going to go up on the second floor in Town Hall. There are groups of people up there, I don’t know where all. Perhaps this is simply what looks to me like perhaps the eradication of the Falmouth Historical Commission.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, let’s –

MS. HAYWARD: There’s only one desk in there and there are some file cabinets and we’re talking about –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Hayward, let’s weigh in with the Selectmen when they review the plan for moving around. Right now is whether or not we want to fund the plan, the details of which will be determined at a Board of Selectmen meeting, so –

MS. HAYWARD: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Fire/Rescue Department.

Yes, Ms. Marotta. Down here. Microphone down here to the right, please.

MS. MAROTTA: Heidi Marotta, Precinct 5. I’m actually going to go back because I’d
like an explanation of the GIS Aerial
Photography. I appreciate all the level of
detail in here, but it says See Attached
Documents and I’d really like some explanation
about what this is and how it’s used in town,
especially given superior Google aerial
photography.

So I’d like to know what this is.


MS. HARPER: I’m not sure if you want
to coax Mr. Shea away from the machine, but Bob
Shea is our singular GIS expert, extremely
valuable employee who runs the GIS system, which
is the support to our Public Safety operations,
including our computer aided dispatch, as well as
providing the infrastructure detail that’s
necessary for us to implement projects like the
Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan.

The flyover that you see online does not
meet the specifications to work with those
systems that we have in town. We’ve conducted a
flyover regularly in this town since 1950, I
learned this morning. And this is a regular
update of that process, and it includes both a
flyover as well as the processes to put that into planometric form.

And I do have a little bit more information to offer Town Meeting, as well. We will be working with Barnstable County on a county-wide effort that would possibly reduce the value of these services. And we’ll have a little bit more information about that in the coming weeks, but we expect the cost of this to come down and we will alert town Meeting to what that ultimate cost is in April.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else on the General Government?

Okay. Let’s go back to Fire/Rescue.

Marine and Environmental Services.

Facilities. Yes, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: I’d like to know this 65,000 to paint Town Hall; did that go out to bid? That seems a little bit high, to me.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Newton.

MS. NEWTON: I did put out a request for painting for the Main Street Fire Station, and that’s actually the lesser of the two. The other proposal came in at 72,000.
THE MODERATOR: We're talking about Town Hall. The question was Town Hall.

MS. NEWTON: Town - oh, I'm sorry, yes, Town Hall. The same painter did both buildings. So we requested from two different painters to get a budget number. It's not a bid that was actually put out, but it's a budgeted number to see what it would cost to paint Town Hall, and that was what the price came in at, and it was the lower of the two.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the gentleman in the back, there.

MR. PETERSON: Tom Peterson, Precinct 1. I'm a painting contractor. I think I'm the last one that painted Town Hall, about 20 years ago, and I agree with Mark, I think that's a really pretty pricey chunk of money for those two buildings. I don't know, does that include some carpentry repairs or is that strictly the painting?

MS. NEWTON: No, that's repairs, too. But it's also prevailing wage rate. Prevailing wage rate is really high.

MR. PETERSON: What is that rate?
MS. NEWTON: It’s around $43 an hour.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: I might put a bid in.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, back in the right.

MR. MEDEIROS: Rob Medeiros, Precinct 7. I’d also like to point out with the Town Hall painting, that strikes me as more of a regular maintenance issue. So, it’s – and I work in maintenance.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else in the Facilities?

Highway Department. Yeah, in the back left, there. Is that Ms. Murphy.

MS. MURPHY: Hi, thank you, Mr. Moderator. Carol Murphy, Precinct 9. I’m going to go down to Vehicles and Equipment, if that’s okay.

THE MODERATOR: Anybody for Highway Department? I’ve got a couple of Highway Departments first.

So it’s – yeah, to the right, someone over there, I saw a hand.
MS. HARLOW-HAWKS: Maureen Harlow-Hawks, Precinct 6. I just had a question on the solar compactors. In the back, it says 30,000, but in this it says 15. Are they $15,000 apiece, or are we buying two? Or are we getting a half a one?

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: Yeah.

MS. HARLOW-HAWKS: And, also, $15,000 for a rubbish can and we have 157 of them in town. I’m wondering what the payback is on these.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Mr. Suso.

MR. SUSO: Certainly, Mr. Moderator.

The reason the sheet in the back says $30,000 is that as Town Manager my recommendation was that solar compactors be funded at the amount of $30,000 and the Finance Committee reduced that to $15,000. The Energy Committee and others had made that recommendation and, based on our experience with those units, I feel that an expansion of them is a good way to go.

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: How much are they?
MR. SUSO: They’re $15,000 each. This would have bought two, now we’ve purchased one.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. I saw a hand somewhere on my left. Who – there was somebody in the back, here. Yeah. On this article, the Highway Department. No.

Mr. Finneran.

I’m going to ask town Meeting Members if you could stand when you want to speak, because I’m having trouble seeing the hands. We’ve got a new set of lights on the – up on the balcony tonight and when you get midway down there, I’m having trouble seeing you all. So if you could stand.

Yes, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Hello. $15,000 for a garbage can? What’s the payback on that? Must be about 5,000 years.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else on Highway Department? Mr. Dufresne.

MR. DUFRESNE: Just a quick question on the solar panels. The one on Main Street, do we have a facility to clean these things? The one on Main Street, I sit there quite often and it’s
probably the most repulsive thing that you’ll
ever put your trash in. Do we have a system for
cleaning these solar systems?

THE MODERATOR: Who’s got this one?

Yeah, Ms. Harper.

MS. HARPER: We have our assistant
superintendent is here who can answer that
question.

I just want to make one comment before
he comes down to answer the method for cleaning
the solar compactors, is that John Lyons has been
very happy with the performance of those
compactors. They are placed in strategic
locations in town. They’ve had the effect of
reducing the amount of mileage and employee time
that we have to contribute to removing trash from
specific facilities and, while we haven’t done a
full payback on them, there is an annual
reduction in the amount of time, equipment and
gas that we have to contribute to maintaining
public facilities.

I don’t know how we clean them.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Somebody got the
cleaning the compactor answer?
MR. SOUZA: Good evening. Mike Souza, Assistant Superintendent of the Highway Department. We do have a pressure wash trailer that we do bring down Main Street and we do, we pressure wash all the garbage barrels and the solar compactors on a maybe every three months. We’ll do it late at night and we have a couple of laborers that come in and take care of everything.

MR. DUFRESNE: My only comment on that is the summer season is quite active on Main Street and I would ask the Department of Public Works to do it quicker than three months.

MR. SOUZA: That’s no problem. It’s just, it’s a funding -- It’s a funding issue, but we can definitely take care of that.

[Laughter.]

MR. SOUZA: [Laughs.]

THE MODERATOR: He’ll be back in April, Andy.

[Laughter.]

THE MODERATOR: All right, anything else with the Highway Department?

Okay, Ms. Murphy, the Vehicles and
MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Under the Dump Truck with a plow, the 36,000 Gross Vehicle Weight at $140,000, and in the appendix in the back it says that the vehicle request is to replace a Water Department vehicle that was destroyed due to an electrical fire. There was no insurance coverage at the time to cover a replacement. And it was deemed a total loss.

I'm confused. We don't have insurance on these vehicles?


MS. HARPER: So that is not the Town's finest hour. If you recall - if you recall, there were very significant budget cuts that this Town Meeting approved. Those included some reductions in the coverage that we apply to our vehicles, and while there was the basic comp and collision that's required on the vehicle, the replacement value was not on that vehicle at that time. Those coverages have been fully restored and all our vehicles are back on that policy. But at that time, that is accurate.
MS. MURPHY: So if there would be another loss of a $140,000 vehicle, that would be covered totally?

MS. HARPER: Based on the replacement value in the policy, yes.

MS. MURPHY: Yes, okay. Thank you.

And how many plows are there? How many trucks with sanders and plows are there in the town?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Souza. Can you share the mic, there, just so we can - okay.

MR. SOUZA: Michael Souza, Assistant Superintendent of Highways. We have 22 one ton vehicles with nine foot plows, and we have eight large 36 GVW trucks with sanders.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Alliegro. Mike, can you stay down here just in case we have any more questions.

[Laughter.]

MR. ALLIEGRO: So we’re spending $15,000 on a trash compactor that we can’t afford to clean but once every three months and we don’t have insurance on vehicles that burn? Aren’t there better uses for that $15,000, or $30,000 than putting a fleet of trash compactors that we
can’t afford to clean, while we don’t pay for
insurance? I just don’t understand it.

THE MODERATOR: Well, we didn’t pay for
insurance in previous fiscals years. We have
increased the coverage.

MR. ALLIEGRO: Yeah, but money is
tight. I mean, we’re spending 15,000 bucks on a
trash compactor and by this gentleman’s own
admission we can’t clean that but once every
three months; it was a budgetary issue.

So if we can’t clean them, why are we
buying them?

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Further
discussion on the Vehicles and Equipment? Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: Joe Marshall, Precinct
9. My question is in the back of the appendix,
and I do understand that vehicles and equipment
is purchased through state contract pricing, how
come we don’t see a reflection of trade-in
allowance?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Petit.

MS. PETIT: It wasn’t – it was just
information that we didn’t put in on the sheet,
but we can put that in in the future.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, so it’s information we do have, but it just wasn’t on that particular sheet.

Any further discussion on the Vehicles/Equipment?

Ms. Driscoll.

MS. DRISCOLL: Kathy Driscoll, Precinct 7. Just a quick statement on the big belly solar trash compactors. Just a quick clarification. They’re probably less than $5,000 each. So I just want to get a clarification on that number per unit, if you could. I know that we have purchased them at Mass. Maritime and we have the dual system, which one side is a trash compactor, the other side is a recycling unit.

It doesn’t – the recycling side does not have compaction in it; the trash side does. It holds five times as much trash in it. It requires less –

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Hoffer, can you answer the question, what do they cost?

MR. HOFFER: [No mic:] I think we have three in the Town. I believe they were about 4500 [inaudible].
MS. DRISCOLL: 4500, yeah. And the more you buy at once, the lower the price is, especially under state contract with the company. They are made here in Massachusetts. So I think that number is much lower and they also will reduce a lot of the routine maintenance of what is needed for them in terms of cleaning. They do come with a mechanism in which they can signal out to the DPW or to someone through a software program. We have it as well. It just shows you a light as you’re going by or it can actually return back into the DPW to tell you it needs to be emptied.

It’s very, very efficient. The company itself does have maintenance programs with them to keep them up and running. They are a great system. They have been reducing costs across municipalities in municipalities across the country.

So, don’t let that number kind of jump out at you in that manner. It is a very efficient and effective system.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Water. Mr. Donahue.
MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Moderator, Bob Donahue, Precinct 3. We’re paying $15,000 for one and this lady just said we can buy them -

THE MODERATOR: No. So - no, that actually would be more than one, up to $15,000. They’re about $4500 apiece.

Right, is that what you said, 45?

MR. SOUZA: [No mic:] Yeah.

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah, she said 4500 each.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, so you’re going to buy more than one and you can’t -

MR. DONAHUE: No, no, Mr. Suso said we were only going to pay -

THE MODERATOR: Yes, and we corrected that error. They’re $4500 apiece, and if Town Meeting votes $15,000, that’s the cap on what they can spend to buy these things.

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

MR. DONAHUE: It says 30 in the - yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso, or Ms. Harper, could somebody clarify how many of these compactors we’re going to buy. I still don’t have a motion to amend this at all.

MR. SUSO: Mr. Moderator, I mis-spoke.
My apologies. It would appear that this would purchase up to three solar compactors, as opposed to six, which $30,000 would buy.

MR. ALLIEGRO: [No mic:] Motion made.

THE MODERATOR: To strike it?

MR. ALLIEGRO: [No mic: inaudible].

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we have a motion to strike the solar compactors. To remove the 15,000 from the budget. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the Chair that the no’s have it and we do not strike the solar compactors.

Water. Ms. Alliegro.

FROM THE FLOOR: [No mic:] Can we have clarification, Mr. Moderator?

THE MODERATOR: Well, get the mic first. We have a point of order.

FROM THE FLOOR: All right, point of clarification, please. Just for the record, so shall I amend the appendix on the solar...
compactors to read 15 –

THE MODERATOR: No, because it doesn’t mean anything. It was supporting documentation.

FROM THE FLOOR: Oh.

THE MODERATOR: You had the motion on the floor to spend up to $15,000 for solar compactors.

FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you very much.


Ms. Alliegro.

MS. ALLIEGRO: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Mary Ann Allegro, Precinct 7. I just have a question. What is Water Meter replacement? What does that entail? It is quite a lot of money.

THE MODERATOR: Can we get somebody from the Water Department.

MS. WISER: Good evening. Mary Beth Wiser, Water Superintendent. The 125 that’s up for the capital improvement is for replacing the stop meters. We have – the age meters we have are over 70 years or 30 years, and that’s what generates the money for the Town. So, if we
don’t keep our meters functioning with the stop meters, we’re not going to generate the revenue.

So that’s what the money’s for.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Donahue. Microphone for Mr. Donahue, please.

MR. DONAHUE: You know, this is just like trash compactors. If you put down how many you were buying, we could figure it out. How many meters do you buy for 125,000, and you know, are you changing them all?

MS. WISER: No, we’re not changing them all. That buys about 600 meters.

MR. DONAHUE: 600 meters. How many meters do we have in the town?

MS. WISER: We have about 23,000 accounts.

MR. DONAHUE: And we do about 600 a year? Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anything else under Water?

Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Tell me if I’m wrong, but it’s my understanding those meters are made out of bronze and they’re rebuildable

Tinkham Reporting
indefinitely. Why are so many missing?

MS. WISER: I’m sorry, did you say how many are missing?

MR. FINNERAN: [No mic:] Why are so many missing? Why do we need so many if you can rebuild them forever?

MS. WISER: The meters aren’t missing.

I –

THE MODERATOR: The replacement is because they’re not operating correctly, right? Yeah.

MR. FINNERAN: [No mic: inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: So they can be rebuilt, was the question.

MS. WISER: We can replace the meter heads on the meters, but some of the meters that we have, they are 30 years old, and as time goes by, they lose their efficiency. So we might not be capturing all of the usage that’s out there. And, under the AWW standards, we are supposed to be changing out meters every ten years to 20 years.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else under Water?
Engineering. Yeah, in the back. And then we’ll come down front. Mike, right there, there’s a mic right there.

MR. MCGRATH: Michael McGrath, Precinct 6. I hope this is for the West Falmouth dock, because the West Falmouth dock is a disgrace. The northwest side is collapsed. It’s been collapsed for three or four years. There’s – it’s a particularly harsh safety risk, so I sure hope we’re about to fix the West Falmouth dock. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McConarty.

MR. MCCONARTY: Good evening, Peter McConarty, Town Engineer. This cost is not for the West Falmouth dock, but I will report that we had meetings as recent as this morning on the West Falmouth dock, to go through for doing the design. The design for West Falmouth dock has been approved on the last meeting in November. So that process is underway for design.

It will be designed and then permitted and then once it’s designed and permitted we’ll be back at Town Meeting. Probably early next year, November or April or November for
construction funding.

What this funding is for, we have several projects in town that are coastal erosions. Most what happened last year with Hurricane Sandy - Tropical Storm Sandy and the winter storm Nemo. We have one project on Great Bay Road, we have another project at the end of Surf Drive. So this funding is for those projects. And it's listed in the back of the book.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, center section on the right, here. Yes.

MR. MCCAFFREY: Charles McCaffrey, Precinct 5. Peter, the projects you have, will they reflect recommendations and be consistent with what the Coastal Resources Working Group recommended? I mean, we understand that as storms occur and sea level is rising, we need to have a better understanding of the coastal processes that are affected by coastal structures.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McConarty.

MR. MCCONARTY: Yes. I just want - do want to make one comment, Mr. Moderator, you are
right. You’re almost blind looking at these new lights in the second floor. Makes you squinting down.

Yes, this will go along with those projects. We’ll be going through full permitting, we’ll be going through the Conservation Commission, we’ll be going through all the – so it will be a full budget. And we’ll be coming back to Town Meeting for funding for the construction.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: [No mic:] He answered it.

THE MODERATOR: He answered the question, okay.

Okay, anything else under Engineering? Parks. School. And the final addition that the Finance Committee made in the main motion is the Window Study for the Lawrence School.

Okay, the question will come on the main motion as presented by the Finance Committee. 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 stand adjourned until seven o’clock tomorrow.

[11:25 p.m. Whereupon, meeting adjourned.]
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