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THE MODERATOR: Okay, all Town Meeting members present, please come forward. Make sure you’ve checked in and you have your electronic voting device so that we can establish a quorum for the Annual Town Meeting.

Last night, it appears that someone left a pair of glasses in the auditorium and a cell phone. It’s an iPhone. So, if anybody left your cellphone, here, tonight or – oh I’m told these are Mr. Alves’s glasses. Is he here tonight?

[Conference on dias off the record.]

THE MODERATOR: If you’re the owner of a Jeep Renegade, your lights are on, out in the parking lot. We don’t have the plate number, though. So, Jeep Renegade, lights are on in the parking lot.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, for those of you that may have reading glasses with you, if you hook them on your lanyard, make sure you take them off your lanyard before you put the lanyards
in the box tonight. Because we found some
glasses in the box, attached to lanyards, so.
And a necklace the first night, so - I don’t
think that was mine, but.
Okay. We’re going to cue up a slide,
here for the quorum count.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, quorum slide.
All Town Meeting Members present please press
one.

[Pause while electronic vote scrolling.]

THE MODERATOR: All Town Meeting
Members present please press one-A.

[Pause while electronic vote scrolling.]

THE MODERATOR: By a counted vote of
163 members, we have a quorum and I call the
Annual Town Meeting back into session.
Please rise for the Pledge of
Allegiance.

[Pledge of Allegiance taken.]

THE MODERATOR: At this time I’ll
recognize Dr. Antonucci for an invocation.

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

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

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we’re going to start on Article 26 tonight.

MS. VALIELA: Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Valiela.

MS. VALIELA: Mr. Moderator, I would like to ask for reconsideration of Article 15. This is the zoning article that extended accessory apartments to General Residence Districts that was last night.

Only two people were able to speak on that article before the question was called. There are many people who are concerned about it, particularly in Precinct 2 where most of the General Residence is, and I think there may be a conflict between the accessory bylaw and the – the stipulations that are in the General
Residence bylaw itself, which is already on the books.

So, for those reasons, I would like to ask you to consider letting Town Meeting vote on reconsideration.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So, when I first came in, Ms. Valiela mentioned this issue to me and, without having my fingers on or the time to look at the details of the existing zoning bylaw and the change to the zoning bylaw, I can’t make a really good determination if there is that inherent conflict in the documents.

So, therefore, it would be substantially new information which we can delve into if we reconsider the article, and so I’ll allow Town Meeting to take the vote to motion – the motion to reconsider Article 15.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it and we’ll
reconsider Article 15.

So I need a main motion from the Planning Board.

Let me get back to 15.

Yeah, main motion from the Planning Board, please.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Chairman, the motion of the Planning Board is as printed.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Valiela.

MS. VALIELA: Mary Barry of Precinct 2, as a Co-Captain of Precinct 2, had a prepared statement that she would like to present to Town Meeting.

MS. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Mary Barry, Precinct 2.

At spring Town Meeting, the Planning Board explained non-inclusion of G.R. Districts in the accessory apartment bylaw by saying that it was an oversight that needed to be corrected. On the contrary, I believe it was a conscious decision.

Secondly, in the explanation for this article, it says last spring we indefinitely postponed. It was voted down. It wasn’t
indefinitely postponed.

The current --

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Barry, just to clarify. When we take a no vote on an article, the force of that vote is an indefinite postponement.

MS. BARRY: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Just so that we don’t confuse Town Meeting Members. Okay.

MS. BARRY: Thank you for that.

The current G.R. bylaw allows greater density than any other Residential District in Falmouth. Up to three units are allowed; one of those must be affordable. If Article 15 is approved, it adds a fourth unit, and it would eliminate the requirement that it be affordable.

Affordable housing is clearly a critical need in Falmouth, and once there are four units on property, we are now opening up properties in G.R. zoning to be turned into condominiums.

Also keep in mind, adding one additional unit does not necessarily mean adding one person. The accessory apartment bylaw does not restrict the number of people that can reside in a unit.
If this law is passed, four units on a single property could equate to many more than four individuals.

The G.R. Districts already allow more housing options than any other Residential District in Falmouth. The G.R. Districts should not be required to shoulder more density on traditionally smaller lots.

The largest area of G.R. zoning is in the downtown area. One is just off of Main Street. It’s parallel to Main Street and it’s an area with very small lots. Greater density compared to other Residential areas and districts. This neighborhood is not sewered. This neighborhood is of old housing stock, and cesspools are common. The neighborhood is also in the Falmouth Inner Harbor Coastal Overlay area. These facts all suggest caution be used in any changes in zoning.

The Planning Board offered no evidence showing such a significant change would benefit the town’s housing needs. And no support showing that it will not cause an undue burden on G.R. homeowners and the environment. And a
point of fact is that this G.R. zoning is in six
districts. We did not have included in our
warrants maps of where these are even located.
It wasn’t part of what was addressed or brought
out by the Planning Board.

Because current G.R. zoning bylaws
already provide a lot of tremendous flexibility
for additional housing in these neighborhoods, I
get the distinct impression that Article 15 is
being brought forward to meet a very specific
want of particular individuals. And in fact, a
particular individual, as we learned last night.
It is not intended to meet the greater housing
needs of Falmouth.

Precinct 2 has the largest neighborhood
area zoned G.R. I have been contacted by a
large --

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Barry, we have hit
the time limit.

MS. BARRY: All right.

THE MODERATOR: Further discussion on
Article 15?

Ms. Johnson. With a microphone,
please. We don’t have mic carriers?
FROM THE FLOOR: No.

THE MODERATOR: Oh-oh. Maybe I’ll do it. I can walk around and run the meeting. Like theater in the round.

MS. JOHNSON: Patricia Johnson, Precinct 5.

I would like to have a map – a zoning map put up on the projector. I find it extremely difficult to read that map in – on the Town website because the yellow contrasts between the various yellow zoning districts is not very clear.

So I need a bigger map, maybe, and make sure that you – they point out the areas of G.R.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion?

Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Grant Walker, Precinct 3. I yield my time to a lady who was reading a prepared statement.

THE MODERATOR: We don’t have a practice of yielding time, but she could – she could get up for another two minutes as a second time speaking to it. We can do that.
So do you want to do that? Yes, do yours second?

MR. WALKER: [No mic:] Yes.

THE MODERATOR: This is why I was not a proponent, in the Rules Committee, of time limits. Because we haven’t shortened Town Meeting since we’ve had time limits. It’s like flying a 747 up here, trying to go back and forth between these two things, and we get caught like this.

So, go ahead, Ms. Barry.

MS. BARRY: Okay, I’ll try to talk faster.

So, Precinct 2 has the largest neighborhood areas that are zoned G.R. I’ve been contacted by a large number of residents voicing their adamant disapproval of this article. As a matter of fact, most them didn’t even know that this was going to take place and they live the G.R. District.

Their objections include: this would increase density over 25 percent and beyond what is reasonable to be handled. It would have an extremely negative impact on the environment.
Three, current zoning is more than adequate and flexible, and four, they don’t want condominium conversions.

In summary, G.R. zoning already meets the purpose stated in the accessory bylaws by providing three multi-family units for borders in a single family dwelling, and semi-detached and two family dwellings. G.R. Districts already provide a range of housing choice in Falmouth by increasing the number of small dwelling units. It encourages greater diversity in population, with particular attention to young adults and aging in place options for our seniors. And it provides currently affordable housing.

So I hope that you listened last evening and heard Mr. Ament say that his client – and he said this – has an illegal apartment. And he wants this passed on order to make it legal. The message here is: build an illegal apartment, hire a lawyer and propose an article that will make it legal.

Thank you for your time and I hope that you will vote no again.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lichtenstein.
MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Leslie Lichtenstein, Precinct 8.

Just as a point of information, I spoke on this article in the spring Town Meeting and I specifically asked for a map. I think maybe if people bring back an article and they’ve been asked for a map, maybe we shouldn’t think about it until they give us a map.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Faiman-Silva.


I’m just not terribly familiar with what the General Residence District provides, but can somebody give us some information about what in the accessory apartment bylaw would be lost if it were not applied to the General Residence District?

I like the idea – I live in a downtown. My lot is not small, it’s almost a half acre and it’s right downtown, and I like the idea of having an accessory apartment. Possibly to live in as I age. And for income generation. And I like the idea of a detached
accessory apartment. Are these all permitted in the General Residence District? And, if not, what would we lose, those of us who live in that district, if we were to vote no on this bylaw?

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, do you want to mention this?

MR. BOTT: Mr. Moderator, Town Meeting, I’m Tom Bott, I’m the Town Planner here in Falmouth, Mass. And, as you may know, I’ve been here since April and I’m not fully up to speed with our zoning bylaw, but I do have what is permitted in the General Residence Districts. Those are permitted by use. You come in to get a building permit from the Building Department. One family detached and semi-detached and two family dwellings. Interesting enough, a semi-detached dwelling is not something you can make a second dwelling for. A semi-detached dwelling is something you build originally as two structures. It’s very difficult for me to tell what the difference is between a semi-detached and a two family, but essentially you - a semi-detached is something that you built two units with a common firewall
Those other permitted uses in the General Residence Districts include church and schools, public libraries, parks, playgrounds. If you get a special permit or other permitted uses: agriculture, piers and multi-family where there is no more than three units, if one of those three units is an affordable.

And then, for a special permit, you can do these commercial accommodations, the conversion of an existing dwelling, hospitals, a sanatorium, private clubs, offices, roadside stands, garage spaces, home occupations, scientific research. And there are some other accessory uses, as well.

But, essentially, the requirements of the newly adopted accessory housing bylaw is that it has to have a minimum of 7500 square feet. So, any lot that is in the General Residence District that is not 7500 square feet would not be available to create an attached dwelling unit. And in addition you have to have setbacks from the property, so the smaller the property the more difficult it is to sit those
things on place.

   So that is what’s allowed in the General Residence Districts. There is a limitation on the lot size, so if your lot is smaller than 7500 square feet – and many of the lots in the downtown areas are smaller than those – then they would not under the current bylaw be allowed to apply for an accessory housing unit.

   Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, Precinct 9.

   I just want to say one thing. I’m very disappointed in the Planning Board. They brought to us an article, asked us to vote on it as printed and come back a second night and ask us to re-vote this. That’s very disappointing.

THE MODERATOR: No, no, Town Meeting moved reconsideration. The Planning Board didn’t ask for that.

MS. PUTNAM: Well, we have a Planning Board member up speaking against the article that was asked to be as printed.

FROM THE FLOOR: No, no.
MS. PUTNAM: She’s asking us to vote it down after we passed it.

THE MODERATOR: Who are you referring to on the Planning Board?

MS. PUTNAM: Is she not Planning Board?

THE MODERATOR: No.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MS. PUTNAM: I thought she was on the Planning Board.

THE MODERATOR: No.

MS. PUTNAM: I apologize, then. I apologize.

If the fact that, you know, this has been brought to us, Planning Board vetted it, Planning Board actually went through and created this accessory bylaw, would they not have thought that a General Residence would have been a bad place to put this, in effect?

You know, whether we have an extra unit does not mean that somebody is not going to necessarily rent it to somebody who needs an affordable rental. People can only afford what they can afford to rent in this town. So just because someone builds something and would like
to add an extra unit, out of three, and add a fourth unit, that might just go to somebody who is in workforce who could walk to work downtown.

The other issue, too, is, you know, we’re hearing statements of well, it’s in a coastal overlay district. Well, if anyone is very familiar with that, coastal overlay districts only allow you so many bedrooms per square footage of lot coverage. So, they would either have to upgrade their septic system, because they’re going to have to get a building permit, and in order to get a building permit, you have to go through the Board of Health. And the Board of Health has to approve whatever system is there.

So, I would say that we really need to keep it as we voted it last night.

And, I apologize, I’m having trouble hearing because I have vertigo, as well.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, yeah, center section. Do we have a - oh, he’s doing the mics?

Thanks, Peter. Yeah, right here in the center.
MS. HARRIS: Charlotte Harris, Precinct 5 and the Planning Board.

It could be that the person who rose to give the prepared statement is correct and the Town Meeting will decide that. But I would like to answer the question that Sandy asked: what would the General Residence District people lose if you reverse the vote. They would lose the opportunity to propose one of these units, is what you would lose. And it really gives me an opportunity to put in a pitch for the accessory apartment bylaw.

The accessory apartment bylaw is new; we’re all getting used to it. It’s long, it takes a while to figure out all of its pieces, but a very important piece of it is that it requires a design review. You’re going to have a site plan review. And the site plan review isn’t an answer, it’s a process. As Mrs. Lowell had said the first night that we met. And the process involves, for those of you who might not have been through it, is it has to go through all of the departments that are involved in building any kind of a structure.
So, it goes to the Health Department, it goes to the Safety Department, it goes to the Wastewater Department. Everyone who might have a concern about any kind of new piece of construction, they have to check off, and the Planning Board receives a check list to say, “Yes, this is okay by us”, or “Oops, issues!”, so that we’re alerted to that.

At that point, the Planning Board’s role is to call a public hearing, so that the issues that were brought forward that may be true for some, even many of the pieces of land in General Residence, would come to light during that public hearing process. So that the individuals who feel they’d be adversely affected have been notified, the abutters are notified, people have a chance to speak on it.

So that it may or may not, then, go forward with the blessing of the Planning Department. Even then, it can be appealed to Zoning. So it’s really an opportunity lost, but it’s not anyone -- if you were to decide to keep the General Residence open for accessory apartments, that’s the first step for someone in
General Residency having one. It is not a by-right thing that they acquire.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, let’s see, next on the list is Ms. Lowell.

MS. LOWELL: Thank you, Vicki Lowell, Precinct one.

Right now, in 2012, the Town Meeting voted to allow an accessory apartment in General Residence, it would be a third unit if it was affordable. Now, by giving the ability to have a third unit on General Residence, there’s now no guarantee that it’ll be affordable. It could be affordable; it has to be a relatively small unit, but it won’t be tied to affordability. Whereas now, if someone put in a third unit and it was affordable, it would count toward the Town’s affordable housing inventory.

So, that that’s the difference. And now they’re both going to be on the books. They’re both going to be by right. So, I just - I think we should put - I’m not sure which one would take precedence, but we did have the commitment to try to - if we were going to have the greater density in General Residence, that it
would be affordable. Now we’re, by voting for
Article 15, we’ve taken away that requirement
that the third unit be affordable.

[The Moderator and Mr. Duffy confer off the record.]

[The Moderator and Mr. Bott confer off the record, and
then with the Assistant Town Manager, also.]

THE MODERATOR: I haven’t read the
entire Chapter 240, either, so I’m trying to get
some clarification, here. So thank you, Mr.
Bott, for that clarity.

My next speaker is Mr. Turkington.

MR. TURKINGTON: Eric Turkington,
Precinct one.

I have a process problem with this
article. It came to us by petition of Kevin
Klauer, the attorney, and presented by Bob Ament,
the attorney, on behalf of a client who has a
problem. We never found out who the client was
or exactly what his problem was, but they want to
change the Town bylaw for everybody who owns
property in General Residence. That is not the
way to do business.

We’ve heard from the people in Precinct
two where most of the General Residence is, and
they don’t like this change; I think we should
support them.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Thorrold. Ms.
Thorrold? All set.

Okay, in the center, back, yeah.

MR. LEMAY: Joe Lemay, Precinct 9.
Member of the Affordable Housing Committee.
The affordable housing, maybe an
accessory dwelling unit bylaw, allows you to add
an accessory apartment to a single family house.
It does not let you add a third apartment to
something that already has two units. So your
issue there --

FROM THE FLOOR: [No mic: inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Whoa, whoa, whoa.
Let’s do microphones and be recognized, please.

MR. LEMAY: General Residence today can
have three units, or it can have one unit.
Okay? You can’t have a single family house and
a detached accessory apartment in a General
Residence. Okay? That’s as much clear as I
can get that.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lowell, do you want
to?
MS. LOWELL: Vicki Lowell, Precinct one.

Under Section 240, 26C, the language is, and this is Permitted Uses By Right: multifamily use of - this is for General Residence Districts - Multifamily use of no more than three units if at least one unit is affordable as defined. And that was voted in April, 2012 Town Meeting.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, anyone else on this article?

Yes, Mr. Donald.

MR. DONALD: Malcolm Donald, Precinct six.

I, too, was contacted by a resident of this General Residence District, Leslie McDonald, and she’s concerned about the water mains being able to handle the possibly increased density.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Fenwick.

Then Mr. Buesseler, after.

MS. FENWICK: I’m hoping we can take the big picture. Let’s take Precinct two, where we’re told that the majority of General Residence is. Approximately how many units of affordable
housing would we lose if we vote Article 15?
Can anybody come up with -- quantify some number?
Because that’s what is at the crux of this, is if
you vote Article 15, we lose the possibility for
a lot of affordable housing stock.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. It would be
hard to project what everyone in that district
wants to do with their private property. So,
it’s hard to come up with a hard number on it.

Any other discussion?

Yes, Mr. Buesseler. And then Mr.

Callahan.

MR. BUESSELER: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator. Ken Buesseler, precinct two.

I’m pleased we’ve been able to have this
discussion. I felt yesterday and today, I’m
still a bit confused by the impact of this single
petition article, maybe motivated by one case, on
the rest of the town.

There were no maps. They’ve been
flashed by. There’s one of them, my
understanding, there’s like six areas where we
have this zoning. So, questions I would like to
know, really before I vote, and I don’t think I’m
going to get them, is just how many lots are in these districts? How many are in coastal overlay zones of those lots? How many are in Historic Districts? I don’t know where those maps lies.

So, what other restrictions do we have? And this last question, you know, what happens to our stock of affordable housing? It sounds like we’ll just have more density in some areas that already have higher density allowed, and the people in those areas aren’t very happy with this.

So, I kind of agree with some of the other ones that we don’t have a lot of information, and it sounds like this is not the way forward for this one lot, one case that’s being put forward under this general petition article.

So, I can’t vote for it until I have answers to those.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Callahan.

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you. Jim Callahan, Precinct 5.

I’m just curious: how is this in this
particular instance, someone just went ahead and
built an accessory or built a building, and we
hear about all the processes and the going to the
Health Department and the Building Department and
the permits, et cetera, et cetera, how did this
happen in an area where you’ve got neighbors and
no one seemed to be watching or paying attention?
I’m just curious: how – we have a process and it
obviously was not done for this particular
illegal structure.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jones.

SELECTMAN JONES: Doug Jones, Precinct one.

Particularly in Precinct 2 there are
quite a few lots where there are two domiciles on
the lot that were built before the bylaw was put
in effect, saying you could only have one house
per lot. And so this is an attempt to try to
get some of those to be made into legally usable
houses, where you do have two houses that have
been put on one lot and trying to make them both
legal.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further
discussion?
Ms. Lichtenstein.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Clarification. If we pass a bylaw, is that retroactive? I didn’t think we could make something illegal that was already existing and legal?

SELECTMAN JONES: [No mic:] It wasn’t illegal [inaudible.]

[General talking off the record.]

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Lichtenstein and then Ms. Faiman-Silva. Oh, no, you just spoke. I didn’t check you – I’m sorry. I didn’t --

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: [No mic:] If I can have an answer.

THE MODERATOR: Frank, do you want to clarify the fact that these things were built before this bylaw?

MR. DUFFY: The suggestion was made by the gentleman over there that perhaps these buildings may have been built without permits recently, but they’re probably very old and were built before the zoning bylaw, so that’s not really the question.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: [No mic:] That isn’t the answer. The answer is if we passed --

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: If we pass a bylaw, does that retroactively make things which were legal, illegal?

MR. DUFFY: No.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN: Okay. So, if they were legal before the bylaw, that means after the bylaw passes they’re not illegal because of that bylaw?

MR. DUFFY: It’s that they’re trying to control the use of the property, not the legality of it.

THE MODERATOR: So, so when you add this to the bylaw, folks in these districts that don’t have an accessory apartment on a lot, could potentially go through the process to build an accessory apartment on the lot. But those accessory apartments that already exist on a lot and existed prior to the other zoning bifurcation, were technically illegal but they’re pre-existing non-conforming.

So, you pass this, they’re legal, and it allows General Residence Districts to have this
section within the bylaw going forward. Okay, so it doesn’t make them illegal. They are now pre-existing non-conforming.

Ms. Faiman-Silva.


I just wanted to make a couple of points. One is that our discussion last evening or in the first night about the accessory apartment bylaw seemed to emphasize that this would allow middle income and working people to have access to more housing, and it would also allows for elders who maybe cannot afford to keep a single family dwelling to have added income, thereby contributing to affordable housing. Even though it’s not officially under the umbrella of affordable housing permitting, these would be affordable dwellings.

Second, in this district downtown, if we had an accessory apartment that we wanted to have permitted, we would upgrade our septic system, which would contribute a positive affect with respect to the problem of sewage. And I think that both of these are beneficial effects.
I do not feel that it’s appropriate for us to deny access to the affordable housing – to the accessory apartments in this downtown district. I think that you’re misrepresenting many of the parts of these – of this district downtown.

MS. VALIELA: Thank you.

MS. FAIMAN-SILVA: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Mr. Brown.

SELECTMAN BROWN: Hi, Douglas Brown.

I was formerly on the Planning Board when this was developed. I believe this was developed for single family residence on – one house on a lot. And now to apply it to a place where there’s more than one residence, I don’t think the bylaw’s crafted for that.

So I think if we were to let 15 stand, we would have to add some language that would clarify that it would be only allowed on a property that has only one residence at the time. So maybe – I don’t know if I – I don’t think I want to make an amendment, but I think if it were to pass it would need something like that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, so other sections
of the bylaw are not subject to the amendment because they were not posted. So, we can only talk about this section.

Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: Peter Hargraves, Precinct 9. And I’m just speaking to balance the input, because there’s been a lot said in favor of reversing what we voted last night.

But, listening to the arguments, I think the reconsideration is good in affirming the reason we passed this. And when you consider the greater good of the town, having the availability of accessory apartments and the purpose and conditions, to control them seems like it’s an adequate protection.

I would suggest that, as in anything like this, some of the western precincts may have a parochial interest in controlling their neighborhoods, but passing this is in the best interests of the whole town of Falmouth.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: Hello, Peter Clark, Precinct one.

This is about I think the third or
fourth instance in our Town Meeting right now, over the last three nights, when something has come up in which we are saying, “It’s okay, but we – it would be better if”, or “It might have this problem”, or “it might” or “it might” or “it might”. And I, in those instances, find myself in favor of moving assertively and making the correction afterward, rather than moving negatively and holding everything up and waiting for someone to go back again and make a correction and bring it back.

And, and so here, in this instance, as in some others, I would favor staying with what we voted. And if there are bad side effects, give the Planning Board time to come back the next, and say, “Here’s some corrections we need to make.” So, I tend to stand prepared with my vote last night.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. I see a hand behind Ms. Asendorf. You’re literally right behind her. I can’t see who’s there. [Laughs.] I just see a hand. There we go.

MS. POLLONI: Pam Polloni, Precinct 5.
I’m afraid that people who have just spoken are confused. We did pass Article 14, the accessory apartment bylaw. And what we’re reconsidering is Article 15, which – and they’re confusing the two articles. Fourteen is the one that provides the affordable housing and it’s not going to be taken away by voting on Article 15.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Article 15 is dealing with the General Residence Districts and accessory apartments.

Mr. Hargraves.

MR. HARGRAVES: For the record, I would like to correct that I was commenting on Article 15, which would allow the accessory apartment bylaw to be applied to General Residence District. I am not confused, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Shepard.

MS. SHEPARD: Susan Shepard, Precinct one.

I think Doug Brown made a very good point, and I think there’s enough confusion about this article and what’s allowed there by right and what isn’t that we ought to define that and bring it back through the Planning Board, not as
a petition article on behalf of a single individual.

Thank you.

Vote no.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Peterson.

MS. PETERSON: Laura Peterson, Precinct 3.

I just want to say that I’m not confused. And I wasn’t confused last night. And, to me, what this is is it makes it all more consistent. And the only new information I’ve heard is that “There’s one person who’s going to do something that I don’t want in my neighborhood”, and to me that’s not new information. And that’s why I moved the question last night and that’s why I’m standing up to speak right now, because I’m not confused. I have the information that I need and – and we – I can’t. I already said what I had to say.

[Laughs.]

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, are we ready for the question?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.
THE MODERATOR: Yes, one more, yes.

MS. LONG: Sarah Long, Precinct 7.

I encourage everybody to actually read the article and I don’t know your name, sir, far left, who just spoke.

SELECTMAN BROWN: Doug Brown.

MS. LONG: Selectman Brown. You’re right. There’s a lot of restrictions here. And we voted a very restrictive Article 14 last night. It had a lot of checks and balances.

If you read this, it will add accessory apartments subject to the same definitions, requirements and design standards of the one we changed last night. In other words, it would be single residence houses. If you read it.

So, read – I just encourage everybody to read it. If it’s the same definition, then go back and read 14; 14 says a single residence. I don’t think this is Armageddon. Or the apocalypse. I think it’s actually going to be pretty restrictive and isn’t going to let anybody do much at all in those General Residence Districts.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Vogel.
MS. VOGEL: My concern with this article is that it seems to me that we are adding an accessory apartment right to a zone that already has three family right. So, if that means four, which I think is what Mr. Ament was proposing, he was going to make the existing house the accessory apartment and do three units behind. That what this article might actually be doing is making it possible for there to be four units. And, if that’s the case, then I would be very much opposed to it.

And it would not be a consistency across the town, because it seems like General Residency with a three family already sort of has an accessory apartment by right, because they can have a three family. It makes sense.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moran.

CHAIRMAN MORAN: I just want to get back to something Dr. Clark said, and I – the fact that, you know, things don’t have to be perfect, we can pass them as an idea and then tweak them later.

My – I take a different view, because I think that there can be unintended consequences
that hurt people when that happens. And, in this Town Meeting in particular, I feel that we have, you know, many issues that still have a lot of questions on Town Meeting floor. And that makes me very uncomfortable, because I think Town Meeting Members have worked very hard to learn the issues and that it’s the obligation of the proponents, of the staff, of the Selectmen, of the Boards, to be sure the questions are answered the best they can.

Not perfectly, no guarantees, but I’m really seeing a trend that more homework needs to be done, and this is one of those articles that I think more homework needs to be done.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: After three nights of Planning Board articles and discussion, I’d like to move this question, please.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: We have a motion to close discussion. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.
THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the ayes have it by the two-thirds and I so declare.

The question now comes on the main motion, Article 15 as printed. 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 nos have it by a majority and there’s no two-thirds.

All right. Article 26. This is a petitioner’s article.

Mr. Shearer.

MR. SHEARER: I would ask for reconsideration of Article 23.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. SHEARER: It is only two words and it’ll take us just a second. I think it would save some time in the future.

THE MODERATOR: Which number was it, Dan?
MR. SHEARER: 23.


So, Mr. Shearer, right as I was coming up, asked me about reconsideration. We didn’t have time to talk about it in detail, but he brought up the point that the bylaw the way it’s written bans these float devices that moorings are made out of, because some of them are made with these products. And insulation that construction firms use in houses.

So, based on that information, he wanted to see if Town Meeting wanted to reconsider this article to make in the exemptions section an exemption for the marine and construction industries.

So, the question will come on whether or not to open up for reconsideration Article 23. All those in favor of reconsideration, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those – what?

MR. DONALD: [No mic:] It doesn’t ban construction materials.

THE MODERATOR: Show me where the
exemption is. What section? Yeah, let’s get
him a microphone. Because a series of attorneys
looked at it today and says it does, so.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: There’s an exemption
section, and I don’t see it listed there.

[Pause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I’m going to go
with the word of the attorney that it’s not
banned.

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: Oh, boy. Let’s do a
slide.

So, here’s the question on
reconsideration. One is to open up to
reconsider it, and two is to not reconsider it.

Yeah, yeah.

FROM THE FLOOR: [No mic:] Can you just
repeat the interpretation you got?

THE MODERATOR: For the question?
FROM THE FLOOR: [No mic:] Yes. Is it banned or not?

THE MODERATOR: So, the way it is written, according to counsel, if you have a Styrofoam float out in the mooring fields, in the marine trades, that would be banned if it’s made with this product.

FROM THE FLOOR: No, no. No, it’s not.

THE MODERATOR: Wait a minute.

[Confers with counsel.]

THE MODERATOR: You know, this is what happens [laughs] when we try to do these things on the fly, we get four page bylaws on the floor of Town Meeting the night of Town Meeting.

Petitioners, in the future, as you have been advised multiple times when you speak to me and others, get this stuff together at least a couple of weeks in advance so that Town Meeting Members can read it, we can find if these exemptions exist, and we don’t end up with four pages when we walk in the back door; we vote that night, and all these questions arise on Night 3 of Town Meeting.
The question will merely come on whether or not to reconsider it, and then we’ll discuss it if the reconsideration passes.

All those in favor of reconsideration, signify by pressing 1A.

FROM THE FLOOR: [No mic. Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: This motion is on reconsideration.

All in favor of reconsidering it, press one. All those opposed to reconsidering it, press 2.

[Pause while electronic vote scrolling.]

THE MODERATOR: On a counted vote of 74 in favor and 100 opposed, the motion to reconsider fails and we go to Article 26.

**Article 26** is a petitioner’s article.

The recommendation by the Board of Selectmen is indefinite postponement.

Will the petitioner make a main motion.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Hi, there. The Solid Waste Advisory Committee asks the Town to create a Solid Waste Division.

FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Just, Linda Davis.
CHAIRMAN DAVIS: I’m sorry.

THE MODERATOR: Could you introduce,
sorry.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Moderator and Town Meeting Members and Town officials. My name is Linda Davis, I am from Precinct 8 and I am Chairman of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

And we have a proposal before you tonight. We are asking the Town to create a Solid Waste Division within the Department of Public Works, headed by a Solid Waste manager superintendent.

My presentation will be brief and to the point.

Everybody take a breath. We’ve been through a lot in the last hour, so just relax and listen and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee will make its point.

First of all, I want to briefly refresh your memory on the proposal to create a Solid Waste Division within the Department of Public Works headed by a Solid Waste Manager. The Solid Waste Advisory Committee has advocated for
a Solid Waste Manager since 1989. In 2007, the Matrix Consulting Group studied the operational, organization and management of the Department of Public Works. It recommended that Solid Waste should be centralized and placed at a higher level in the organization.

In the spring of 2012, Town Meeting voted to recommend the creation of a Solid Waste Division within the Department of Public Works headed by a Solid Waste Manager. Leadership over there and management listened, and in November of 2012, Town Meeting voted Article 29 to amend the Town’s Salary Administration that created and funded the very needed position of Deputy Director to the Department of Public Works.

In satisfying that need for a second in command, the position also carried with it some Solid Waste responsibilities.

In 2015, the position was filled. This was clearly, clearly a step in the right direction. However, a close look at the job descriptions of three Department of Public Works personnel, the Director of Public Works, the Deputy Director of Public Works, and the Highway...
Superintendent, shows that the responsibilities for municipal solid waste management are allocated across the present management lines, with no leadership in one position.

And these positions carry with them major responsibilities in other areas, as well, with new challenges being added all the time, such as continuing coastal erosion, infrastructure repair, recovery from unexpected storms, to name a few. Not to mention the stress that comes from seeing the population triple during the summer season.

Management of solid waste is not a priority in the structural setup.

Now, let me make this very, very clear. The Solid Waste Advisory Committee has no issue, no issue with the personnel in charge. In fact, working with Mr. Peter McConarty, Deputy Director of the Department of Public Works, and Mr. Jim Grady, Superintendent of the Highway Department, has been very positive, and an-eye opener as to how very dedicated and hard-working these men are at their jobs.

But it has also revealed the difficulty
in management and in making waste management a priority under the present decentralized structure. The Town needs to take the next step.

The changing face of trash and recycling worldwide, its impact on the United States, Massachusetts and Falmouth, clearly calls for leadership and direction that is consolidated in the position of Solid Waste Manager who heads a separate solid waste division within the Department of Public Works.

That being said, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee is fully aware that this article before you is advisory only. Town Meeting cannot create a position. Only a recommendation from Town management, with a four-fifths vote of the Board of Selectmen can make this happen.

Your vote to either support or reject this article will have no immediate affect, but will continue the conversation for the need to have a Solid Waste Division headed by a Solid Waste Manager.

In closing, you need to know the Solid
Waste Advisory Committee would not be doing its job if it did not continue to advocate for this as one of its goals in working toward an effective and efficient integrated waste management system for this Town.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Netto.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, Precinct 9.

Mr. Moderator, I’d like to ask you a question, because it has to deal with the Charter, and I had a problem in reading the explanation given for Article 26 and Article 29, and I think we should – and I think Ms. Davis kind of alluded to it, that under the powers given to each branch of our Town government under the Charter, when I read it under the creation of new jobs, we have the four-fifths vote by the Board of Selectmen. I don’t know exactly what comes first, you know, the chicken or the egg, here, but the Board of Selectmen on a new position have to vote at least four positive votes for that position.

And then, if I’m not mistaken – and
maybe you could help me, Mr. Moderator – under
the Charter I think our role – or would Mr. Duffy
answer the question, okay, Mr. Duffy, I’m sorry.
Mr. Duffy, isn’t our role to okay the funds so we
have to have a vote for the – any time a new
position is created? Is that the mechanics of
how it works, under the Charter?

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Netto, that’s the way I
understand it, too. Town Meeting funds the
position after it’s been created, and it takes a
four-fifths vote of the Board of Selectmen to do
so.

MR. NETTO: Thank you. I hope all
Town Meeting Members remember that.

So I have to ask you: how come we got
left out of the explanation? And pay attention
to new positions that are being created in the
Town of Falmouth.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further
discussion on the article?

MR. SUSO: Mr. Moderator.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Suso.

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

I do want to clarify: when the position of Deputy Director of Public Works was created, it was during my tenure as Town Manager. It was a position which we had reviewed at some length, deliberated upon, brought to the Board of Selectmen, as has been described by the process pursuant to the Falmouth Town Charter. The Board of Selectmen voted unanimously to approve that position, as well as the detailed job description for the Deputy Director of Public works.

That was then subsequently brought to Town Meeting with the subsequent budget and we requested Town Meeting’s support to provide the funding to allow us to fund that full time position.

We also provided information on the job description for the position approved by the Board of Selectmen and recommended by me as Town Manager. And it clearly stated that among the responsibilities of the Deputy Director of Public Works is all oversight of the Solid Waste management function. It’s clear-cut. There’s
no question.  It’s not decentralized.  And our
very able Deputy Public Works Director Peter
McConarty, who’s been with us here every evening
and is steadfast and diligent in his work,
oversees that function and does an excellent job.

So, I wanted to clarify that for Town
Meeting Members.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR:  Mr. Patterson.

SELECTMAN PATTERSON:  I just want to
mention that the solid waste issue is not
something that the Selectmen are blind to.  Part
of our strategic plan includes a long-range plan
for handling the disposal of our solid waste,
because when the Bourne landfill is capped off,
we have to go somewhere else.  And so we
actually have it in our strategic plan to start
dealing with these kinds of problems.

So, I would ask you not to jump the gun
here and try to insert a position like that, but
allow us to handle it as an administrative
function that we’re watching to make sure that
it’s being dealt with.

Thank you.
MS. DAVIS: May I comment?

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Braga and then Ms. Davis. Ms. Braga and then Ms. Davis.

SELECTWOMAN BRAGA: Thank you. Just to follow up a little bit on what Sam was mentioning.

I think that the points raised by Linda and the work that Solid Waste has been doing, it’s as Linda noted: there’s no slight to the members of the Department of Public Works. I think it’s, you know, just a recognition of the reality of issues around solid waste and how they’re growing and they’re complex.

The economy around recycling has changed drastically all over the world and it’s impacting us and we have to be able to be really proactive as we think about ways to, number one, do what we need to do with our waste so that our town remains beautiful and the services that we all really appreciate and that are very rare -- they’re, you know, curbside pickup is pretty rare, and it’s becoming more rare as time goes on and it’s, you know, a wonderful service that the Town is able to provide.
But the other piece is, you know, the economic piece of it. Saving money, making sure that we’re getting the best for the money that we as taxpayers put into it.

The one issue that I think the Board has with articles like this, and again it’s not—it’s a recognition that the need is there. But it’s similar to some of the other articles that we’ll see tonight. And I think it’s related to the idea when we talk about sort of spot zoning, these spot, you know, hirings. And I know that Linda noted it was just advisory.

But, you know, hiring personnel isn’t something that we just enter into, you know, willy-nilly. It’s very expensive; it’s not just their salary, it’s all of the benefits. And it has to be looked at in a full structure of what the entire budget is for the Town.

And the process, you know, certainly involves this board, it involves Town Meeting, it involves, very importantly, Finance Committee, who reviews those budget requests each year, you know, from even department, when they ask for additional staff.
So I think the message is - is heard from Solid Waste Advisory by this Board. And as to sort of the other issues around hiring and personnel, we hear that, too. But it really has to be looked at as an entire picture because those are big investments that the Town makes in personnel. It’s really our most important investment, because it’s the people that get the jobs done.

The capital is important, but the folks that are actually running the machinery and running the departments, you know, that’s really our biggest investment and we have to look at - at it in it’s totality.

And, again, get the input from Finance Committee, from our Finance Director and have that kind of whole evaluation.

So, I just - I want Solid Waste Advisory and for this body to understand that we, as Sam said, we hear this. This is - it’s part of our strategic plan. This is a priority for the Town, for the Board to really do better and to be forward-looking around the issues of solid waste. But we just - we didn’t support it for the, you
know, the description and explanation is that we have to look at hiring in the bigger picture.

So, I just want to thank Solid Waste for doing exactly what Linda said, which is their job, in pushing these issues forward.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Davis.

CHAIRWOMAN DAVIS: May I comment?

Yes, you know, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee does certainly understand what’s involved in creating a position, all that goes with it, the benefits, the retirement and so forth.

We have collected a lot of information about solid waste managers in other areas. We’ve spoken to some of them who are very willing to share how their towns created that position. There’s a lot of information that could be helpful that we would like to pass on to – not tonight. This is not the forum for it. But we have it. And it may be helpful to you to look at it, and to consider how not just necessarily the position, but how are we going to meet – meet the demands of a changing waste environment? I mean, that’s what we’re talking about.
And it’s not just maintaining what we have or looking at what we have to make it work more effectively, but we’re looking at being current, we’re looking at connecting with the state, other communities on the Cape who are trying to come together to deal with some of these issues. But also, somebody who can think out of the box and look at what the options are for the future and be ready to handle them.

And that’s why we want this.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: Mark Finneran, Precinct six. Also on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

Just a little piece of information. In the article I’m about to present next, I called towns all over the state and I Googled up or used the search engine looking for the D.P.W. If the number came up straight in the search, I just called the D.P.W. Most of the time I had to go onto the Town’s website, all of them which were different than our website; many of them which were the same, the set up, format, whatever.
But I was surprised to see in almost every town or city that I looked in, going down through the departments, they all—and I think it was all—had a Solid Waste Division, and we don’t.

That’s why we’re bringing this article.

I mean, it’s a necessity. And anybody who’s familiar with it can see that we’re really going backwards. And we’re just trying to do our job and move this thing forward.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Dufresne.

And then Mr. Smolowitz.

MR. DUFRESNE: I’d like to commend the Committee for all of their efforts, but I’d like to move the question.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

MR. DUFRESNE: Adriene Dufresne.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can’t hear you.

THE MODERATOR: He wants to move the question.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.
THE MODERATOR: The opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it by a two-thirds.
The question comes on Article 26 to ask the Town to create the Solid Waste Division.
All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: Let’s do a slide.
All those in favor of Article 26 as printed, signify by pressing 1A. All those opposed, 2B.

[Pause while electronic vote scrolling.]

THE MODERATOR: By a counted vote of 97 in favor and 77 opposed, the article passes.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Article 27 is another petitioner article. The Board of Selectmen’s recommendation is indefinite postponement.

Mr. Finneran for a positive motion.

MR. FINNERAN: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Marc Finneran, Precinct six.
I’d like to put a positive motion on the floor for this article and I’d like to go through it as quick as possible.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, as printed?
MR. FINNERAN: As printed, yes.
THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.
MR. FINNERAN: Cue it up.

This is Article 27: shall Town Meeting vote to authorize the use of a second water meter at properties in the sewer service areas for irrigation and other outside uses. The second meter would be paid for by the property owner, installed by the Town and billed at the non-sewer rate. Or take any other action on this matter.

Next slide, please.

Our water is billed in units. One unit equals a hundred cubic feet, or 748 gallons. If you live in a non-sewered area, you pay $3.30 for a unit of water. If you live in a sewered area, you pay $6.70 for a unit of water. More than double.

Next slide, please.

There’s a term for these meters. They’re used all over the country, all over the
world, all over this state and on Cape Cod, as well. They’re called exclusion meters. It basically excludes the water that you use for outside uses. Irrigation, for the most part. That’s what we’re looking for.

Next slide.

First thing I did was contact the towns on the Cape that have sewer, which are Barnstable, Chatham, and Provincetown. Barnstable uses a second meter. Chatham uses a second meter. And Provincetown does not allow irrigation with Town water and, as I found out afterwards, actually Provincetown doesn’t have a lot of their own water; they buy it from Truro. And I’m sure that’s why they don’t allow it; only with wells.

Okay. I had a friend who told me that he lived in Lynn and they allowed for second meters. I had someone also that lived in Lexington tell me that they allowed second meters, there. I had numerous people, Town Meeting Members, tell me they lived in Florida and their houses had second meters.

So I called all these towns. You can
see: out of the towns that were there, Lawrence
Lee, Lenox, Lexington, all use a second meter.
Littleton has no sewer. Longmeadow has a sewer
charge limit and they use a formula that they
charge anyone who uses irrigation so they don’t
pay the full sewered rate.

    Lowell uses a second meter. Lunenburg
uses a second meter. Lynn uses a second meter.
Lynnfield has no sewer;therefor it’s not a
question. That’s just the L’s in Massachusetts.

[Laughter.]

    MR. FINNERAN: But you can see there:
it’s overwhelming. And it’s just not fair.

    Next slide, please.

    And that’s the question, really. Is it
fair to charge different prices for the same
product depending on where you live in town? I
say we’re all the same, we’re all equal. Why
should somebody literally across the street from
you pay half what you pay to irrigate their
property? It just - it makes no sense to me.

I see that it’s not fair, and you can see how the
towns that I’ve showed you all agree.

    I also personally think that it’s
possibly against the law. I mean, it’s not equal treatment of all. I mean, it’s – it’s – it’s inequitable. And that’s all I have. I understand the Department of Public Works has a counter-presentation, and I’ll reserve my time to counter that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion?

Ms. Lowell.

MS. LOWELL: Hi, I’m Amy Lowell, the Town’s Wastewater Superintendent.

I entirely understand why this article was presented. I understand the question. Unfortunately – there is one slide here on this article. A second meter is not as good as it sounds. It’s not going to do what the proponents hope it will do.

I just have a few points to make about that.

Installing a second meter would not be as cheap or as simple as one might imagine. The Town would require a second service to the property, a second water service to the property and a meter pit and a meter in that pit. The
cost for that would vary, but it would be more
than $2,000.

In addition, a second meter would only
benefit people who use a lot of water for
irrigation. One thing that might not be clear
is, if you install a second meter, you would have
a minimum charge every semi-annual billing period
for that second meter, just like you have for
your existing meter. So, unless you use more
than the allowance for the period of water to
water your lawn, you will actually be paying more
for that second meter than you would be saving.

In fact, second meters ultimately would
redistribute the sewer cost among the sewer
customers. If high irrigation water users - if
high water users who use their water for
irrigation put in second meters, that would
decrease the sewer revenue. Sewer revenue has
to pay for the sewer division costs. Sewer
division costs are not going to go down if people
put in second meters. So, unfortunately, if you
do the math, what that means is you would have to
increase the sewer rate to make up for the lost
revenue, and so that would redistribute the sewer
system cost among the sewer system users.

So the result would be that it would -
this change, the allowing a second meter, would
reduce sewer costs for the people who use the
most water for irrigation, but would increase
costs for the majority of sewer customers.

Lastly, if one does use a fair amount of
water for irrigation, an irrigation well is a
much better option. A well does have
installation costs of about $3,500 but, once you
install that well, you do not pay the sewer cost
or the water cost for the water that goes on the
lawn. So, that’s a very significant difference.
You’d have zero cost for your irrigation water
with a well.

The Health Department, in recognizing
the benefits of using well water for irrigation,
recently reduced the setback requirements for
irrigation wells within the sewer service area.
The setback, I don’t know, used to be 50, a
hundred feet, something like that. It’s now ten
feet. So, almost any property would have enough
space on their lot to put an irrigation well in.

The Town just built a $40 million
drinking water plant, and it is worth thinking about whether it would be better to water grass with water that comes out of the ground rather than directly out of the ground, rather than our highly treated drinking water.

Lastly, a benefit of irrigation wells is that they would reduce peak demand on the water system. You may have heard, if you were watching the Selectmen’s meetings or reading the newspaper over the summer, that the peak demand for the water system is in the summer, when not only does our population triple, but also everyone has their irrigation systems programmed to come on at — at — in the early morning. If the more people switched to wells, the higher water users switched to wells, the less we — the less demand that is during that peak time.

So, in conclusion, I understand the concept, here. What happened was the Little Pond Sewer Service area customers connected to the sewer and they got that first bill, and it’s a shock. The sewer rate is twice the water rate, and when you connect to the sewer, your water and sewer bill then triples. And that’s —
that’s a big impact. But I don’t believe that this proposal would have the desired impact.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Netto. And then Mr. Dynan.

MR. NETTO: Joe Netto, Precinct 9.

How many Town Meeting Members here are connected to the sewer? Would you just raise your hand quickly? I don’t know if some of you have any idea what the sewer rates are -- and I voted and spoke for the sewer, and I believe in it. I’m not going to speak for this article.

But, all of this talk of irrigation. I have a tenant in a house in the sewer area with absolutely no irrigation, two people, cooking, showering. Just think, all of you got a water bill, what, two weeks ago? How would you like to get four and five hundred dollar sewer water bills? Absolutely no irrigation.

They’re not watering the lawn, it’s my property. I know what my bill is, and I have an extensive garden. You know, it’s like $87 and I water that all summer.

There’s a great inequity, here. You
know, speak to the Board of Selectmen. We have to look at these sewer rates.

I mean, Ms. Lowell spoke about irrigation as the second. But how many times do you wash your car? Just stop and think of it. I mean, you know. These rates in the sewer area for water, and I don’t know how we differentiate, are astronomical.

And you may say, well, Joe, I know, and it’s only six months, twice a year. But think what you paid for your water. And the neighbors on Alma Road that I talked to, all have the same bill. They stopped irrigating their lawn. “Joe, I can’t afford it.” I think that’s the issue that we want to look for.

And I know in speaking to Ms. Petit two years ago, when we raised the rates -- because we raised the rates when we passed the sewer bill. We passed an article here at Town Meeting to raise the rates so that we could get more revenue. Now, there was a goal to that. I’m not going to ask her that question tonight. But, in the presentation for that article, there was a goal put out of a figure or X amount of
dollars, and I said I’m going to come in a couple years from now and if we’ve met that goal, or have we exceeded that goal?

So I think this is something. I’m not rising in support of the article. It is expensive. But just the question of the rates. In the explanation, it was always given as these people irrigating their lawn. No, they’re not. They’re bathing, cooking. I just want you to understand that.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Potamis.

MR. POTAMIS: Gerry Potamis, Precinct two. I hope I’m not the kiss of death in this. But I recommend voting against this.

Ms. Lowell is completely right. I installed the sewer system. $5,000. My landscaping cost was $10,000. 2000 for irrigation. Who knows what you’re going to pay for landscaping. And you have to connect up. The internal plumbing cost? I think they’re going to be expensive.

It has some internal plumbing and I think you might see a thousand to $2,000,
minimally, if you want to relocate your plumbing.
Because the meter has to go on probably the
irrigation spigot, or wherever it fits the
irrigation. Not your outdoor shower or not how
you water your car. You could do that, but the
costs have gone up.

And finally, this is something that’s
been discussed for wastewater for a long, long
time: irrigation wells. Actually, we’re
bringing up water with nitrogen. Even people in
the sewer area, you’re getting nitrogen coming
down from the legacy north of us, okay? You
might actually be helping with nitrogen reduction
by putting in an irrigation well, because the
water comes up, and it goes back down through
your lot.

That’s a secondary thing but I really
think--

I also have a sprinkler system, and I
use it a lot. And my rate wasn’t that much
more. I’ve had neighbors that: 1700, 2000. I
say, “I’ll take a look at it, but you have to
call to see if you have a broken meter or not.”
I don’t know why these costs are so high. I
have a relatively new house, the meter’s good, so
 I’m getting billed pretty much for what I use.
 And my sewer and water costs are not that high.

 I expected the sewer cost; it was in line with what the Water Quality Committee and I think I even had some estimates on it.

 So, I vote – I recommend you to vote no because, as Amy said, it’s probably not worthwhile to install it and they’re going to redistribute the costs, anyways. So, my wastewater bill will go down, but I’ll pick on my good friend John Waterbury. But he may be spending a little bit more or other people may be spending a little bit more on wastewater or water if we don’t have enough operational maintenance cost to fund those departments.

 Thank you.

 And I hope I wasn’t the kiss of death.

 [Laughter.]

 THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Dynan.

 MR. DYNAN: Bill Dynan, Precinct 5.

 New Silver Beach at 210 homes that have sewerage. And we paid $28,000 a home to have it installed. Without the hook-up, another three
grand. That was nine years ago.

I have an irrigation system. I use it.
I have a garden, I use that, too, to water it.
I checked on the price of a well and I got a
quote between 13 and 15,000 for the well.
Which I didn’t do.

When this was designed, the plant was
designed, my question is: was a hundred percent
of this water going to be recovered for the
station, to go back to? They showed us a
consideration there that only a certain
percentage was going to be used outdoors and the
rest of it was going to go back as far as the
plant for recovery. I don’t know if anybody can
answer that.

But I think it’s an inequity that should
be addressed and I don’t think there’s going to
be a big split, here, let’s say of second meters
put on and the water’s going to drop and your
rates are going to go up. I don’t think it’s
going to be that bad. I think the rates are way
out of whack with 100 percent for the people with
sewerage, and that has to be addressed.

Can I get an answer on the
consideration, Amy? When this was designed, was
it a hundred percent recovery?

MS. LOWELL: I don’t understand the
question, I’m sorry.

THE MODERATOR: When you set the rates,
did you figure a hundred percent of the water was
going back, or not?

MS. LOWELL: We – we set – so, we bill
for sewer based on water use, so we set the sewer
rate knowing what our costs are, and we divide
that by the number of water units used in a year.
I mean, that’s an oversimplification. There’s –
we did a detailed rate-setting process. But
that’s --

THE MODERATOR: I think the question’s
very simple.

MS. LOWELL: – basic --

THE MODERATOR: Is there any exception
for any water that wasn’t returning to the
wastewater treatment plant? Yes or no? I
mean, that’s --

MS. LOWELL: No.

THE MODERATOR: – a pretty simple
question. No. So, there’s your answer: no.
MS. LOWELL: But, we know the water doesn’t — that it all doesn’t come back to the plant, but we don’t make an accommodation for that, the way you’re — and I guess that’s your question.

MR. DYNAN: Right.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah. And that was the answer.

So, Ms. Putnam.

Let’s go, Folks, they’re calling out the sanders already.

[Laughter.]

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam —

THE MODERATOR: I’m serious. They’re calling out the sanders.

Let’s go, Ms. Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Rebecca Putnam, Precinct 9.

I manage a property that is going to be hooked up in the next year into the sewer, the new sewer plant. And we have apartments that we actually rent below what is the state guideline for affordable units. Affordable two bedrooms is 1400; we rent at 1200 a unit. So we are
saving people 200, which is $2400 a year. Each
person. So that they can work and stay in
Falmouth.

Now, our actual water rate went from
being $500 twice a year to, I’m figuring when I
just got this bill, we’re going to be a little
over maybe 2000. Now, the usage hasn’t changed.
The same tenants have been there for, you know,
five, six, seven years.

Now, I’m going to have to turn around
and tell my property owner, “You’re going to have
to increase these people’s rents.” I think that
what really needs to be done is that we need to
actually have maybe an article that addresses it
as having an actual meter that reads what goes
out of the buildings.

MR. FINNERAN: They don’t make them.

MS. PUTNAM: Which would help – which
would help people. Because if you’re not using
– if you’re using irrigation, it’s gonna only
meter what comes in for water usage and then
metering what goes out into the actual treatment
plant. And I think that that’s really what we
should be looking and addressing, because that
would actually be fair to the people on the
actual sewer system.

MR. FINNERAN: Can I answer that?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Williams, and
then we'll come back, yeah.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Cheryl Williams, Precinct 3 and I'm
also co-president of the Teaticket Civic
Association.

I am in the Little Pond Sewer Area, and
I would just like to remind everybody: when we
were going through the whole process of being
sewered in the Little Pond area, there was major,
major concern because of the socioeconomic
condition in the area, and there are loans
available, et cetera. I guess my point being:
when you take a look at the rates that are being
charged right now - and we are getting numerous
emails from our membership in Teaticket, people
just so overwhelmed with - with their sewer and
water bills. Bottom line: water coming in
through a meter is read and ultimately the
assumption is that it’s going back through the
sewer. If you wash your car or you water your
garden, that ain’t necessarily what is really going on.

So, what Marc is saying is true. You know, there’s an in equity.

I would suggest is, Rebecca just said we really need to take a look at this. I don’t necessarily agree with the second meter. I don’t necessarily agree with wells. Because of the money involved with – with either of those alternatives. But there has to be another hard look taken at this because of the situation and the amounts of the bills.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Finneran.

MR. FINNERAN: First off, when I was making these calls, I did ask five or six people when I was having discussion, I asked lots of things. And the ones I asked how much their water was, their water rate was, we have the highest, by far. I was kinda surprised.

Also, we were told that you would need a second service. I mean, I discussed it with the people. All you do is split the line where it’s coming in, you put in a T, you put your second meter in. It’s not necessary to have a second
And Amy said it would only benefit people who irrigate. Well, they have the choice. If they’re spending enough money on irrigation and they want to pay for the second meter, they can. If you don’t, you don’t have to buy it.

I mean, it’s done all over the state.

As far as the sewer costs, I mean – and Rebecca said you need to measure what’s coming out. Those – you can’t measure sewage going out of a building. So that, that’s not possible. Otherwise, I mean, we would know and there would be a differentiation and – and I’m sure that there would be a credit for it. But it’s just not possible.

And – and you’re charging someone for a service that they’re not even using. It’s – it’s just not fair.

These people are paying 16,000 in betterment, maybe $5,000 to hitch up, and you want them to spend another $5,000 for a well? I mean, that sounds simple, but a lot of people just don’t have the money.
But, as I said, I mean, it’s up to you. Are we all the same? Should we all be treated the same? Should everyone pay the same price for water? I think yes. And, I mean, it’s up to you, you know. Think of your neighbors, though. And, in many cases, it’s literally the person across the street is paying twice as much as you to do, for the same thing.

Again, I ask you: how fair is that?

THE MODERATOR: Okay, Mr. Crocker.

MR. CROCKER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Moderator.

I was a Town Meeting Member here for 55 years, sitting in this place where you are right now. I look around at some of the people when I first started, when I was 25 years old. I look down the corner where Andy Dufresne sits, and there was – there was gentlemen that were there for years, and they’ve gone. Mr. Nickerson, Woods Hole, and quite a few others that I remember.

I sat here for 55 years and I listened to all the Town affairs and I always thought the best for the Town of Falmouth. I am five
generations here. A lot of you people know me by being a professional entertainer traveling all over the country. But I’m here tonight to say this: I lived in this town, I grew in this town and I worked my can off in this town to support the town and the taxes.

Sure, we’re here tonight, we say, “Oh, well, we’re gonna do the cost, the money, and everything else.” How about the people in the sewer area that are being charged like myself, a native, and I’m trying to hold onto the house and paying my taxes and a double water bill with the sewer?

Now, in respect to all the Committees that work so hard, I feel that we should go to the drawing board, find out how we can help the people in the area with the cost of the water and the sewer. The people in the other areas are not affected as of this time, but they will be affected in the future. So we have to set a precedence.

Every time we come to this Town Meeting, I hear the bickering back and forth, and over 55 years we’ve had some knock-downs, fights and
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hollering, but I will tell you one thing: 

Falmouth is a wonderful town, it’s a great town, and let’s keep it a great town by helping the people in the area. And remember one thing: we are for the people, not for our self. We want to help the people out there that are listening on television right now, are listening to us. And they are waiting for the results.

I’ve had calls and calls. People saying, “Harold, would you please voice your opinion at Town Meeting?” Which I have for 55 years.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Rafferty.

MR. RAFFERTY: Steven Rafferty, Precinct two, Water Superintendent.

I’m going to back Amy up a little bit here on what she said. We have another slide that’s got a math slide that I want to put up there to help you walk through this.

I’m not going to tell you that what you’re paying for your water or what you’re paying for your sewer is a good deal or a bad deal. I will tell you that when we go through
the rate process, we’ve determined what it costs to operate the Water Department and what it costs to operate the Sewer Department, and then we divide it by what we expect the water will be used for all the water users and all those people that are on the sewer.

The current water rate is $3.30. The current sewer rate is $6.70. If you’re only getting water, you pay $3.30 per unit. If you’re in the sewer area, you’re paying $10.00 per unit: $3.30 for the water, $6.70 for the sewer portion.

I took and looked at the 1,324 homes that are on sewer and how much water each one of those individuals used over the last year. 54% of the people do not use the minimum amount of water in a year. If you’re only on the water system, you’ll pay $116 a year if you’re in that 54%. If you’re in the sewer service area, you’ll pay $384 a year.

32% of the people use roughly twice the allocation. Their sewer bill and water bill combined, when they’re in that sewer service area, is now running between 750 and a thousand
dollars. And then there’s 13% of the users who use a lot of water. Some of them are commercial establishments, some of them are people that irrigate. And their bills run anywhere from 3,000 going on up, depending upon how big a unit they are.

So I ran the numbers. I don’t know whether or not the proposal is that it’s an elected — it’s up to you to choose whether or not you want to put a second meter in, or rather the intent is to put a second meter into everybody’s home. But when I went through and did the analysis, I said, “If you take that 13 percent and you presume that they go and put their own meter in, and then you decide that, you know, 30 percent of the water they’re using is irrigation or is not going back to the sewer, what does that mean?”

Well, for 54% of the people, it doesn’t mean an awful lot, because they’re already using less than the minimum. For those 32% that were using roughly twice the minimum, by the time we come back to our equation, here, where we put the operational costs for the Water Department and
now we’re using a smaller number on the bottom of that equation, there’s less water usage being used, quote, unquote, because we now have water that’s being used for irrigation and not part of the equation. When we reduce the denominator and the rate will increase and those folks that were paying $750 to $1,000 a year will now be paying $900 to $12,000 a year. But that 13% that’s paying $3,000 and on up, those lucky individuals save between $200 and $600 a year on their overall bill. And those are the numbers and that’s the math, and that’s all I’m going to say.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Anything else? And then we’ll take a vote.

MR. FINNERAN: Again, it’s simple: it’s elective, as it was indicated. If you irrigate a lot and you want to pay for the meter, that’s your option if you vote for this.

But you’re still charging people for a service that they’re not using. You’re — in your calculations, you chose to charge people for water that you knew wasn’t going into the sewer. And, as you can see, I showed you before, almost
every town seems to give the option, and why we wouldn’t, I don’t understand. And if we don’t do this, I won’t understand.

We’re no different than any other town.

We’re all the same.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion. All those in favor of Article 27 as printed, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the chair that the nos have it by a majority and the article does not pass.

**Article 28.** Article 28 is a petitioner Article for the ALICE training between the schools and the Police Department. The Finance Committee’s recommendation is indefinite postponement.

Would the petitioner like to make a positive motion?

MR. HEYLIN: May I move the amendment – I amend the motion.

THE MODERATOR: No, you’re just going
to move what --

MR. HEYLIN: Move --

THE MODERATOR: I emailed you this morning.

MR. HEYLIN: Yes, please.

THE MODERATOR: So, read it off. “I move --

MR. HEYLIN: I’ve got to pull it up.

Doo, doo, doo, doo, doo, doo.

My name is Michael Heylin, and I move the Town votes to transfer a sum of 11,900 from Certified Free Cash for ALICE training and peripheral equipment and supplies within the Falmouth Public Schools, to be expended under the jurisdiction of the Police Chief and School Committee.

And I’m going to keep this nice and brief. As we all know, school shootings across the country are on the rise, and what we’re looking for here -- and I know that the police and several teachers have been ALICE trained -- we are looking for some equipment. If a school goes into lock-down, you have children in kindergarten, elementary school who are locked in
a room, and what we’re looking for is equipment, pretty much porta johns, first aid kits, these kind of things. Some of these lock-downs are for hours. $11,900 is short money to, you know, keep our kids as safe as possible.

And that’s it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, discussion on Article 28.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can we see it?

THE MODERATOR: Can you see what?

It’s what – yeah, what’s printed in there. It’s $11,900, but the difference here is that it talks about peripheral equipment supplies and it’s under the jurisdiction of the Police Chief and School Committee.

MR. HEYLIN: And these are some of the peripheral supplies we talk about. That’s a bathroom for kids who are in a school lock-down, right there. First aid kits, door locks, these kind of things.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any discussion?

Ms. Medeiros.

MS. MEDEIROS: Hi, Terri Medeiros, Precinct six and Chairman of the School
Committee.

First, we would like to thank Mr. Heylin and everybody who considers the safety of our students. We have been proactive in doing ALICE training. We – our first two meetings of this year were dealing with safety issues, and we’ve – even before school began in September, we sent out administrators who have been to conferences and trying to find how to implement ALICE.

Some of the ALICE things have buckets in their suggested materials to keep on hand.

But, at any rate, we are handling our training and the – we didn’t – right now, we’re not sure what equipment we need, so we don’t think that this article should be considered because we just don’t have the amounts that – I’m not quite sure where Mr. Heylin got the amounts for this. But we will have a budget soon, a budget where we will – and we will take the information we’ve gotten from the various workshops we have gone to, working with Chief Dunne.

Chief Dunne is also going to talk about this issue, a little bit.
Right now, we’re handling quite well our need for sending our administrators, our teachers. We’ve had parents, we’ve had students who’ve been involved in activities. And we certainly wouldn’t want to turn down any money. But right now, we’re just not in a place where we know exactly what funds we would need. Okay? So, that’s the financial part of it, which the School Committee has been considering.

Again, thank you. We know if we came back and we needed money, that you would certainly help us on this issue.

Okay. And now, Chief Dunne will talk about some of the safety parts of it.

THE MODERATOR: Chief Dunne.

CHIEF DUNNE: I’m just looking for an email for one second. I have some numbers.

Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Edward Dunne, Police Chief.

We’ve been working with the school through the summer. I had a conversation with the new superintendent, Lori Duerr, about ALICE training and she elected that she wanted to go to the ALICE model. And for those of you that
might not be familiar with what ALICE is, it’s an acronym for Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, and Evacuate. We’ve been doing school lock-downs probably going back into the early 2000's, and I can assure you the staff and the students have always done a wonderful job. And — and we keep them safe.

Going to this new model of ALICE, I have three police officers that I sent off to be trained as instructors. So, it doesn’t cost the Town any money. I’ve already paid for those, and they are instructors. One is an SRO, the other two are detectives and who have been working with the schools.

I’m not going to tell you exactly how many people in each school is trained, I’m just going to tell you the schools we’ve addressed and the number of people that have been trained.

So far, we’ve trained: the school administration, Teaticket School, North Falmouth, Lawrence, Morse Pond, High School, Mullen Hall, School Administration heads, and that totals 492 people have been trained.

We have four more trainings coming up in
November and December, and that’s going to be: the remainder of the school administration, East Falmouth School, a private school in town. And, the School Committee, we’re going to give them an overview exactly what ALICE is about, and that’s coming up.

So, I mean, I believe it’s well in hand. Some of the new lock-down drills that we have, we’ve already experienced the evacuate part of it. We’re doing it piecemeal, and it’s been – it’s been embraced and it’s – the Police Department and the School Department have always had a great working relationship, and it continues.

So, I can assure you that we’re doing all we can to keep your students and children safe.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further discussion on Article 28?

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

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed.
THE MODERATOR: It’s the opinion of the Chair that the nos have it by a majority.

Article 29, the recommendation of the Board of Selectmen is indefinite postponement. This was also a petitioner article.

Mr. Heylin.

MR. HEYLIN: Once again, nice and short. First of all, these positions are not new police positions. They are existing unfunded, vacant positions that have been unfunded and vacant for the better part of a decade.

I’m only going to read the amendment to the article: I move the Town vote to advise the -

MR. LOWELL: [No mic:] Point of order. It’s not an amendment to the article, it’s a main motion.

THE MODERATOR: That’s correct.

MR. LOWELL: It’s the main motion --

THE MODERATOR: That’s correct.

You’re right.

MR. HEYLIN: I apologize.
THE MODERATOR: You’re making the main motion.

MR. HEYLIN: The main motion --

THE MODERATOR: The same thing. The email that I sent you yesterday.

MR. HEYLIN: I move the town vote to advise the Board of Selectmen to bring the staffing level within the Falmouth Police Department to a fully staffed 66 police officers within the next few years, beginning July 1st, 2019.

THE MODERATOR: Do you have a printed copy for the clerk?

MR. HEYLIN: [No mic:] No [inaudible.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we’ll get – all right, we’ll get it. It’s up there.

So, this is an advisory opinion to the Board of Selectmen, staffing over the next few years.

The presentation, let’s go.

MR. HEYLIN: And that’s it. I’d just like the body, here, to advise the Selectmen that we support the Police and we want full staffing over the next couple of years. Simple.
THE MODERATOR: Yes, Chief.

CHIEF DUNNE: Again, Edward Dunne, Police Chief.

First of all, I just want to thank Mr. Heylin for, you know, and the community for the support that they have for the Police Department. You know, over the last several months it’s been very difficult and we really do appreciate first of all the Board of Selectmen support that we’ve received since the incident on July 27th where Officer DeMiranda and Officer Moore were shot.

I also want to thank, you know, the Town Manager and the Assistant Town Manager for all their support. I want to thank all of you for all your support, and the community at large. Enough can’t be said for the amount of support that we’ve had in the Police Department.

I just want to give you a quick history. Some people might want to know where this 66 number comes from. And, like I said, we want 80, but 66 is the number that’s being out there.

I work hand in hand with the Town Manager and the Finance Director Jennifer Petit on my budget for next year. Last year, we came before
you looking for a position for one detective so I could increase the Detective Division.

We were at 66 in 2008. I have to go back in a little history. I’ll make it real short, because it is snowing.

We were at 66 in 2008. That’s what we’re allowed by this body in civil service to have for a maximum in the Police Department. We all know 2008 was a good year. 2009, 2010, the economy tanked. When the economy tanked, we had officers that left this Department and transferred to other departments because of the Education Incentive Bill. We then had officers that had some disciplinary problems and were fired. We then had some officers that left. During that time that they left, the Town was in need of funding and took funding back from all departments, the library, the Fire Department, the Police Department, the Department of Public Works, because in order to run the town.

So, then we got down to 58, and that was under the guidance of Chief Riello. But you also remember, this body, we had to give money back - cruisers. We didn’t have cruisers for
three years. We didn’t have drug money to do drug investigations.

Over time, once we got through all that, we came back, working with the Town Manager, working with the financial people, we started to increase money into our vehicle budget so we could buy new vehicles. We increased money into my budget so we could do drug investigations. And, as I just said, last year this body voted money so that we could hire a new position, which took us from 58 sworn – which is what we got down to – we are now 49 sworn people.

MR. HEYLIN: 59.

CHIEF DUNNE: I mean, excuse me, 59.

MR. HEYLIN: Or 49. That sounds better to me.

[Laughter.]

CHIEF DUNNE: Yeah, no. Three nights, I’m tired.

I’m sorry, 59 is what we have right now. I actually have two in the Police Academy as we speak.

I prepared my budget for next year and I’ve asked for four positions. It has been
nothing but positive, dealing with the Town Manager and Jennifer Petit. I believe I’ll get those four positions, which we’ll bring before you in the Spring Town Meeting for the budgets. Next year, I plan on asking for three. That will bring me up to the 66.

If this body or the Board said tonight that they would give me money for all seven positions, I couldn’t fill it for two years or three years. There’s a hiring process. The hiring process takes a year to get a police officer into place. I also have one or possibly two retirements coming up, so it’s always a catch-up.

So, I appreciate the support that Mr. Heylin has brought forward. I appreciate the support out from the community, because I’ve heard from several people, several groups. That support’s important as we move forward in the spring to fund these positions.

But, again, I thank you all, and again I thank you all for all your support during our troubling time in the Police Department.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, further
discussion on Article 29?

Hearing none, the question will come on
the - oh. In the back right.

MS. WEBBER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator,
Gina Webber, Precinct 9.

I just wanted to make sure that I understood. Is Chief Dunne saying, then, that he expects that these positions that Mr. Heylin is requesting will be funded in the near future?

THE MODERATOR: Chief.

CHIEF DUNNE: Yes, I do. As I said, I’ve had nothing but positive meetings with the Town Manager and Jennifer Petit.

THE MODERATOR: Can we keep the motion slide up there, please, since it’s different than what’s on the warrant booklet.

MR. HEYLIN: No. Go back one, I’m sorry.

THE MODERATOR: Yeah, right there.

MR. HEYLIN: So this is just as a body for us to advise the Selectmen and women to vote, you know, to push this forward and then we’ll see this again in April where we can vote it again budgetarily.
THE MODERATOR: Okay, Ms. Moran.

CHAIRMAN MORAN: Thank you very much.

I don’t think there’s anyone in this room that is not appreciative and very supportive of the Police Department. And particularly, as the Chief said, this Board of Selectmen and the Town staff.

I think the Town Meeting’s role is basically to, you know, pass the Spring finances and to look at initiatives. With respect to articles that would involve planning ahead, such as the Chief has discussed, I think the most efficient way to bring these articles is to come to the Selectmen. Come to staff. Do the, you know -- put the idea into the – into Town Hall so that these concepts and initiatives, maybe they’re already in the works, as the Chief said. Maybe, you know, it’s something that there can be great agreement on.

But I’m not sure that Town Meeting is the place to advise Selectmen with respect to Chief staffing. I mean, again, I don’t think anyone disagrees with it. But in terms of process, please email the Selectmen, come and see
us, talk with Town staff.

This Board is very active and we’ve done communication outreach. We want to hear from you. We want you to have your initiatives forwarded in the most efficient way possible, and we want to make sure that everyone’s idea has a 360 view and gets input from all sides.

So, thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question will come on the main motion, which is the slide as presented above. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

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

**Article 30** is a Community Preservation Committee. Community Preservation Committee for the main motion.

MS. CUNY: Sandy Cuny, Precinct 2. Vice Chair of the Community Preservation Committee. I move Article 30 as recommended.

THE MODERATOR: As recommended. This
is to appropriate the sum of $260,270 from Fiscal 2019 Community Preservation Revenues to construct a pedestrian bridge and wetland walkway at Swifts Crossing Coonamessett Greenway Heritage Park and Gateway – Heritage Trail and Gateway Park.

Who held this article? Yeah, did you – do you have a question, or? Yeah, with a microphone, please.

MR. LEMAY: Joe LeMay, Precinct 9.

I just want to see what I’m buying.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. LEMAY: I want to see a picture of the bridge, what’s the design work they did on it. If --

MS. CUNY: Next slide.

MR. LEMAY: - they have anything like that. Thank you. That’s what I want.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. So, a presentation, Ms. Cuny.

MS. CUNY: This is a picture.

[Laughter.]

MS. CUNY: This is the loop.

And I have Betsy is here, tonight. So, do you want to give him just a little overview?
Through you, Mr. Moderator.

MS. GLADFELTER: Yes, thank you.

Betsy Gladfelter, Precinct 6.

So, for those of you who have been out to the river to the restored lower part of the river, you might have seen Dexter’s Mill Crossing. And I had actually given the Committee a picture of the bridge to show you so that you could see what the wetland walkway looks like. But we don’t have that.

We do have another picture for you in a second, though.

But, the middle dam will be taken down, shortly, in a few months, and so in place of that middle dam will be another wetland walkway. And this entire loop will be about a little less than a mile and it’ll all be wheelchair accessible. And we’d like to have this finished before Middle Dam comes down, so people will have a walkway while the upper part of the river is being restored.

So, could we have the next picture, too?

And this is – so, this was the picture that Community Preservation Committee decided to
put in. This is some of the Teaticket second
graders and those are herring flags that they’re
showing us what the herring do when they’re in
the sea. The herring schools in the sea. This
was a field trip last spring.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. I saw a hand
somewhere in the middle. Yeah.

MR. JONES: Clayton Jones, Precinct 9.

Just a quick question through you, Mr.
Moderator, to Betsy. It is not presently
handicap accessible because those granite blocks
that are positioned in front of the bridges are
not stroller accessible. Do those get shifted
out and moved slightly?

MS. GLADFELTER: Absolutely. They’re
going to be shifted — I actually had it designed
for — for those of you who have hiked and you’re
up —

MR. JONES: Yeah.

MS. GLADFELTER: — there’s Kissing
Gates.

MR. JONES: Right.

MS. GLADFELTER: But that’s a moveable
part.
MR. JONES:   Yeah.

MS. GLADFELTER:   But what we’re going
to do is shift those blocks, so that they will be
disable accessible.

MR. JONES:   Thank you.

THE MODERATOR:   They’re almost not
pedestrian accessible, in some cases.   I tripped
over one. [Laughs.]

MS. GLADFELTER:   We’re working –

THE MODERATOR:   No, I know, I know.

MS. GLADFELTER:   A few months, in a few
months, the whole thing will be.

THE MODERATOR:   We talked about it,
yeah.   And maybe we’ll get you some money from
the state in a few weeks on that, too.

MS. GLADFELTER:   Okay, great.

THE MODERATOR:   Go ahead.   Mr. Brown.

SELECTMAN BROWN:   Hi, Douglas Brown.

Betsy, in the request, it doesn’t mention the
amphitheater, but in the explanation it does.
Are we still - is the amphitheater included in
this or is this just the walkway?

MS. GLADFELTER:   No, the amphitheater
is not included in this.
SELECTMAN BROWN: Okay.

MS. GLADFELTER: This is just for 
Swift’s Crossing.

SELECTMAN BROWN: Okay.

MS. GLADFELTER: And we’ll – we’ll – 
SELECTMAN BROWN: You’ll be back.

MS. GLADFELTER: We’ll be back.

SELECTMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any further 
discussion?

Yes, Ms. Shepard.

MS. SHEPARD: I just want to say this 
before you release us all. I actually read 
every word I receive in my warrant booklet and 
all of the other things, and I would hope that in 
future Town Meetings we do a better job of having 
wording printed in the warrant books as it’s 
supposed to be, and also on the petitioners’ 
articles.

It’s been a very confusing meeting.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The question 
will come on the main motion, Article 30 as
All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

[Aye.]

THE MODERATOR: All those opposed no.

[No.]

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it by a majority.

Mr. Chairman of the Finance Committee, can you let us know how much money we spent at this meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEGEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Mr. Moderator.

This body has spent $19,257,769.28.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

Madame Chairman of the Board of Selectmen for the notification of the next Annual Town Meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN MORAN: I hereby give notice the next Annual Town Meeting will be April 8, 2019.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, April 8th, 2019.

The chair will entertain a motion to dissolve the meeting.
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, we’re adjourned. And good luck getting that snow off your cars.

[9:05 p.m., Whereupon the meeting adjourned.]
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