

**ADVISORY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
March 9, 2016**

A meeting of the Advisory & Finance Committee was held on Wednesday, March 9, 2016. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Moody at 6:31PM and was conducted in the Mayflower II Meeting Room at the Plymouth Town Hall, 11 Lincoln Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

PRESENT **11 members of the committee were present:**

Kevin Canty, Betty Cavacco, Robert Cote, Harry Helm, Shelagh Joyce, Ethan Kusmin, Mike Lincoln, Patricia McPherson, John Moody, Patrick O'Brien, Marc Sirrico

ABSENT **4 members of the committee were absent:**

Marcus McGraw, Christopher Merrill, Harry Salerno, Scott Stephenson

Public Comment

- Steve Striar: He was going to request the committee to reconsider ATM Article 16F – Ship Pond Marsh, but he is awaiting new information. He also wanted to share that under Chapter 44B Section 12, regarding conservation restrictions, it is not a requirement for CPC to pay an outside organization to hold a conservation restriction for the town.
- Pat McCarthy: There are lots of questions in the community regarding the sewer repair and where the funding is going to come from. Selectman Provenzano said last night that he would like to see funding from a combination of tax payers and sewer users. She is wondering where are all the users, including numbers of individuals and businesses. The sewer is an issue for the community, businesses and tourism.
- Helen Hapgood: Those that were forced onto sewer should not be forced to pay for mistakes. If forced to pay for repairs, we may drive those that were forced onto sewer out of town. Like the schools and roads, this is a community-wide issue.

Agenda Items

➤ Town Meeting Articles

STM 8 - Sewer

Jonathan Beder, DPW Director, as well as staff from Environmental Partners, presented STM Article 8. Plymouth's sewer system pumps 1.5 million gallons each day. The system covers 4 ½ miles. The recent breaks are considered a catastrophic failure. The 1st break occurred on December 19th off Exit 5, 2nd break January 27th at Braley Road, and the 3rd break January 31st at Westerly Road. When a pipe is not full gases collect at the head space. These breaks occurred at high points in the line, where gases are exposed to more atmospheric pressure. Many hours have been put in cleaning up the break sites, inspecting the sewer line through pits and probes, and setting up a bypass. The temporary emergency bypass has been installed and a pump is pumping from the wet well into the bypass. The bypass is costing the town \$So far they have determined that 1 mile of pipe is no good. Cleaning and inspection is ongoing and an update will be given at Town Meeting on April 2.

There are six options for repair which are outlined on the next page:

PIPE REPAIR OPTIONS

	OPTION/COST/TIMELINE	PROS	CONS
1	Spot repairs at 4 locations include replacement of approximately 4,000 lf of the 30" pipe with new PVC or HDPE pipe. \$19,075,373 9 weeks	Fastest alternative Least expensive Least disruption	Leaves remaining pipe in its current condition Remaining 19,000 feet – inspection incomplete Ductile iron and cement lining left in place Extent of corrosion & abrasion not determined Future corrosion possible Lifespan uncertain
2	Slip line (using 24" pipe) approx. 12,000 lf of the existing pipe at various locations between Water Street and the WWTP, and replace the remainder with a new 24' pipe \$29,706,669 16 weeks	Suitable for first 12,000 feet Plastic preferred to DI Provides 21" internal diameter Higher velocity Lower retention time Cost effective Moderate disturbance, access pits	Grouting of annular space needs careful attention Minor loss of cross sectional capacity Short pipe segments are not cost effective Moderate disruption & traffic impacts.
3	Remove existing 30" pipe and replace with a new 24" HDPE or PVC pipe. \$30,596,544 24 weeks	Suitable for entire length Provides long term solution Improves velocity w/ smaller diameter Longest lifespan, 40-50 yrs	More disruptive than option 2 Highest restoration costs (paving, landscaping) Traffic impacts Highest cost for single pipe option
4	Spot repairs approx. 4,000 lf of the existing pipe and construct a 24" redundant line (HDPE or PVC) adjacent to the existing pipe. \$38,391,498 9 wks (repairs) & 30 wks (new pipe)	Provides immediate repair Redundant pipe Improves velocity & retention time	Leaves 19,000 feet of existing 30" pipe Restoration cost Permitting/coordination with Mass DOT Disturbance to downtown and residential areas
5	Slip line 12,000 of existing line, remove & replace remaining 12,000 & construct new 24" redundant pipe \$48,173,116 16 wks (slip line) & 30 wks (new pipe)	Can be applied to wide range of pipe Relatively rapid w/little disturbance Improves interior surface & reduces friction Most efficient w/long runs Provides redundant pipe	Most expensive pipe replacement/repair option High restoration costs Fair amount of disruption to downtown & residential areas Short pipe segments are often expensive
6	Spot repairs of 4 locations & new wastewater treatment plant closer to the Water Street pump station. \$19M + \$40,000,000* 3 yrs	Reduces length of force main Reduce long detention time New plant may be more cost effective than upgrading existing & new FM Address future treatment regulations	Suitable site needed Planning/permitting needed Public perception of plant location Duration: 3-5 years for permitting, design & construction

Sliplining: One of the oldest trenchless options, relatively quick, least amount of disruption

Available pipe options for sliplining:

- Fusible PVC: 24" Fusible - C905 PVC DR 25 (OD = 25.8" ID = 23.61")
Bending radius: 450', Pressure Rating: 165 psi, Critical Buckling Pressure: 68 psi,
Weight per foot: 52.09, Proprietary pipe by Underground Solutions, Inc.
- HDPE: 24" Fusible - HDPE SDR 11 (OD = 25.8" ID = 20.82")
Bending radius: 215', Pressure Rating: 160 psi, Critical Buckling Pressure: 70 psi
Weight per foot: 75.78 pounds per foot

HDPE seems to be the best option to use for sliplining because it is more flexible and smaller pits can be used.

They are looking for a long term sustainable solution. Of the options outlined in the table, DPW and the engineers believe Option #5 is the best for Plymouth.

Approximately \$7 million has been spent so far. They would like to move quickly with the permanent repair because the temporary bypass is costing approximately \$300,000 per month.

FASTTRACK DISCUSSION

Option 5-\$48,173,116

16 Weeks to Slipline/Remove Bypass - Start April 2016

30 Weeks for new pipe line construction - Start Fall 2016

Contractors Solicitation:

Ongoing communications with 5 reputable Contractors

Meetings and discussions with PVC and HDPE technical representatives

Pricing from local Contractors and vendors

Project Bidding:

Fast track bidding restricted to 5 Contractors

Project Schedule:

Meeting with prospective Contractors: Ongoing

Plans and Specifications availability: March 31, 2016

Funds Availability: After Town Meeting

Open Bids: April 7, 2016

As far as funding sources, Spring Special Town Meeting is asked through this article to authorize the borrowing. The town will be applying through the state for SRF funding. *The Massachusetts State Revolving Fund (SRF) for water pollution abatement projects was established to provide a low-cost funding mechanism to assist municipalities in complying with federal and state water quality requirements. The SRF Program is jointly administered by the Division of Municipal Services of the Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and the Massachusetts Water Pollution Abatement Trust.* The standard borrowing rate is 2% for 20 years (2.4% for 30 years) but we will work on trying to apply for 0% (or possibly 1%). Once we receive approval from Town Meeting we can start the process with DEP. There will be an article at Fall Town Meeting regarding the specifics of where the funding to pay the debt will come from. There are options including the general fund, the sewer enterprise fund, and sewer fees (perhaps a combination of 2 or 3 of those). There is plenty of time to decide on the source(s) of funding.

Questions:

- Is \$7 million so far a pretty accurate number? The \$48 plus million, how large might the plus be? (M Sirrico) \$7 - \$7.2 is believed to be accurate based on the bills received and bills anticipated. As far as the \$48 plus million, the \$48.2 million estimate is conservative. We need it to be high because of the unknowns that we may run into like utilities downtown that may need to be moved, we need that flexibility. There is a 15-20% contingency built into that estimate.
- There were several questions about the premature failure of the forced main, maintenance contracts, and responsibility for that failure. The system is in year 16 of what was a 50 year expected life. The maintenance contract with Veolia expires in 2021. Once we figure out which option we are going with then we will sit down with Veolia and discuss any changes to the contract and work out the details with them. To the best of our knowledge, cleaning was never done to the forced main system. This subject is currently under litigation.
- There were several questions and comments regarding who was going to pay, any formulas, why people not on sewer would have to pay, and what effect borrowing \$48 million would have on the tax rate. Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance, answered those questions. There is no formula, they will be weighing all the options. The members of the Board of Selectmen are the Sewer Commissioners and they set rates for the Sewer Enterprise Fund. The Sewer Enterprise Fund will not be able to support the \$48 million so the General Fund will have to subsidize the project, not sure if that will be 100% of the project or a lesser amount. There is time to figure it out as this breakdown will be voted by Town Meeting in the Fall. Spring Town

Meeting will be authorizing the borrowing. As far as what the \$48 million borrow will look like on the tax rate assuming 100% is funded by the general fund, the first year including loan origination costs would be \$3.1 million so \$114 for the average tax payer (19 cents per thousand of value). That would be through the SRF with level debt. If we do level principal, the first year would be much larger. Melissa Arrighi, Town Manager, added that this sewer failure and accompanying price tag is a shock to all and that you have the assurance of the Town Manager, Director of Finance, and Board of Selectmen, that they will revisit the funding of this project every year when they set rates. There was some discussion about how those not on sewer will also be paying for the repair, the fairness of that, the existing Title V loan program for those not on sewer, how those with septic systems still use the treatment plant when their systems are pumped, and what "community" means.

- There were questions and discussion about the need for the redundant line and the timing of that line. We want redundancy/back up for when maintenance and cleaning need to be done and in the event of an issue. Even with a smaller pipe and increased flow, cleaning and maintenance will still be necessary. There will be an SOP, standard operating procedure, put in place that will include cleaning and maintenance procedures and timelines. As far as deferring the redundant line to a later time 2-5 years out, they would rather get it done this coming fall/winter. They would like that second line in place to start the maintenance program and have a back up when needed. If the redundant pipe installation is delayed they may need to go through restoration an additional time to the cost of \$1 - \$1.5 million. Plus the cost of construction will increase as time goes on and there is the risk that there may be an issue again, so getting the redundant pipe installed sooner is ideal.
- There were questions about the design regarding whether the high and low spots may be eliminated with the new system, whether 24" pipe is the right size based on usage, and the duration of the new line. They may be able to improve some of the elevations with the new pipe but they can not do that with the slip line into the existing pipe. The sewer system extends from North Plymouth to the Fire Station just south of downtown, and to the west to Home Depot and Commerce Way/Colony Place. There are 3,300 connections to the sewer system which include a mix of residences and businesses. Based on the usage, 24" pipe is the right size. The redundant pipe will be tested before it is put into full use. The new material should last at least 50 years.
- Is the \$6 million requested in ATM Article 9 for sewer projects still needed in addition to this \$48 million? (S Joyce) Yes it is. That is made up mostly of upgrades needed to the pump stations, which is an important part of the system.
- Is vandalism a concern with the bypass? (S Joyce) Yes it is. Since the bypass is above grade vandalism is a great concern. They do have the bypass lit and monitored.

Patrick O'Brien made a motion to recommend Option #5 of STM Article 8 to Town Meeting. Marc SIRRICO, second.

Comments/Discussion:

- Disappointed to hear discussion at the Board of Selectmen's meeting last night, it is disconcerting when you hear certain areas of town being singled out, we need to remember that we are a community. (M SIRRICO)
- We all benefit from sewer system upgrades, the environmental impact is huge, we have the largest aquifer in the state with 365 lakes and ponds in Plymouth. Option #5 makes the most sense. (P O'Brien)
- It is a fair question to ask how this will be paid. We are the Finance Committee and are here in an advisory role. Option #5 makes sense, it is the most logical and, yes, the numbers are huge and frightening. (H Helm)
- Let's get the sewer fixed once and fixed right. I support Option #5. We are all in it together

and should all pay for it together. This has been a big topic of discussion, it is a lesson in civics, it is a community-wide matter and should be paid equitably by spreading it out to all. (M Lincoln)

- It is appropriate to ask about funding and important to understand the funding. Communities share the cost of things. In support of Option #5. It goes farther than the other options and will last 50-75 years. Would like to adjust the culture in Plymouth to take better care of what we have so it lasts longer. (K Canty)

The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).

ATM 27 – Ground Mounted Solar

Patrick Farah, Planning Technician and Energy Officer, said that the Energy Committee and the Planning Board voted unanimously in support of ATM Article 27 which inserts sections 205-3 and 205-77, a ground mounted solar voltaic section, to the Bylaws. Town Counsel has also given the bylaw a stamp of approval.

Lee Burns, Chairman of the Energy Committee, presented the article. Massachusetts General Laws (Chapter 40A §3) states that “No zoning by-law shall prohibit or unreasonably regulate the installation of solar energy systems or the building of structures that facilitate the collection of solar energy, except where necessary to protect the public health, safety or welfare.” Therefore, the Town cannot prohibit the construction of solar energy systems but can establish reasonable regulations.

Recently, the Town has permitted a growing number of commercial-scale, ground-mounted solar facilities but currently we have no standards covering the proper installations of such facilities. They have been handled on a case by case basis. The intent of this bylaw is to promote, by-right, subject to Site Plan Review, in all Districts, the generation of solar energy while preserving the natural environment and supporting reduction of Plymouth’s carbon footprint. This amendment establishes reasonable standards and protections for neighboring residential areas and the Town as a whole.

The amendment includes provisions that:

- Only apply to ground mounted facilities
- Require site plan review by the Planning Board
- Prohibit large scale commercial solar facilities (over forty acres)
- Establishes natural vegetated buffers and screening measures
- Requires security controls to limit unauthorized access
- Establishes removal and decommissioning provisions
- Includes stormwater standards

The following solar facilities are exempt from this amendment:

- Rooftop systems
- Ground mounted system under 1,500 square feet in size
- Systems located on agricultural land & used for energy generation for the agricultural use
- Systems located on already disturbed area in commercial and industrial districts

By establishing standards including size limitations, buffers, and set backs, it will be easier for these projects to go through the process. These standards came from gathering data from other towns. The committee originally had residential and commercial bylaws but ended up merging the two together. The committee removed stipulations about trees but may add language to the bylaw.

Questions:

- Last night the Board of Selectmen tabled the discussion to wait on further information about surety. Is there new information available? (M Sirrico) Yes, staff has added language this morning, as an addendum regarding Page 3 section 4C for those greater than 2 MW, “in the form of cash bond” and also added an adjustment for inflation over the usable life cycle. This can be provided to the Advisory & Finance Committee.
- What about the status of the language relating to trees? (J Moody) Of the bylaws reviewed from 9 other towns, only 2 have sentences protecting trees. The Energy Committee can not add language to the bylaw now but can bring an addendum up on Town Meeting floor. We may ask on Town Meeting floor to insert a sentence, similar to that from Fairhaven, protecting trees.
- I thought the Planning Board said that trees cut would need to be replaced with 6-8’ trees? (S Joyce) The Planning Board can offer suggestions to the Building Commissioner. There was a comment that maybe the trees could be replaced with shrubs but that is ultimately up to the Building Commissioner. The Town does recommend shielding view of the solar equipment from neighbors.
- So the issue that happened a year or two ago where one was installed on Warren Ave and later was required to be removed, could happen with this new bylaw as long as it is less than 30’x50’? (E Kusmin) As long as it had the proper boundaries around it and shielding, yes. The projects that are exempt from site plan review still need to go through zoning though.
- Less than 2 MW there is no site review but over 2 MW there is site review required? A lot as small as 1 acre could have a .65 MW solar array? (H Helm) Right now ground mounted solar is an allowed use as long as it meets set back requirements through zoning. This bylaw creates standards where there is more control and requirements that need to be met.
- With the 40 acre cap, are those already built just above that size grandfathered in? (K Canty) Yes, they will be grandfathered. We did not want to limit the size unnecessarily.
- When panels need replacing, do they need to go through this process again? (K Canty) The panels can be swapped out without an issue. Only if the footprint changes, they will need to restart the process.

Harry Helm made a motion to recommend ATM Article 27 as written to Town Meeting. Patricia McPherson, second. The motion fails unanimously (0-10-0).

ATM 21 – Alarm Systems

The Advisory & Finance Committee previously voted to not recommend ATM Article 21 to Town Meeting. Since then, the article has been withdrawn.

Kevin Canty made a motion to recommend No Motion No Action on ATM Article 21. Betty Cavacco, second.

Discussion:

- I do not like that the smaller projects are excluded from the standards. Is it possible to add wording to the bylaw? (E Kusmin)
- There is always a risk when we approve with the assumption that verbage is going to change. It is taking a leap of faith. We can not add to the bylaw. You could choose to not approve the article. (J Moody)
- Smaller projects could be regulated but this bylaw chooses not to. (K Canty)
- Not exactly sure what we are voting on. Is it as written in the document we were supplied with? (M Lincoln) Yes, we are voting on exactly what we have in front of us. We can not vote on the topics of surety and trees that may be brought up on Town Meeting floor. (J Moody)
- If something is not ready we should not act as if it is ready. This bylaw is a good start but it is not ready. For that reason, we should not recommend this article now. (K Canty)
- This Committee can vote to not recommend it to Town Meeting. Town Meeting has the ability to approve it regardless of our recommendation. This Committee can also vote yes to recommend it to Town Meeting and let them do what it will. (J Moody)

The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).

➤ Town Meeting Schedule

Caucus Scheduling

John Moody is scheduling Advisory & Finance Committee members to represent the committee at precinct caucus meetings. Most caucuses have been scheduled. He is looking to pair a new committee member with an experienced committee member at each caucus. He will email an updated schedule and reach out to individuals that have not responded with their availability.

Presentation Forum

The Committee of Precinct Chairs has scheduled the Presentation Forum for Thursday, March 17. John Moody is looking for 2 more committee members to volunteer to represent the Advisory & Finance Committee at the Forum. He will be presenting the FY2017 budget at the Forum.

Motions Meeting

The Chair, 1st Vice Chair and 2nd Vice Chair are invited to attend the Motions Meeting on Wednesday, March 23rd at 8AM.

Town Meeting Preview

Everyone is invited to attend the Town Meeting Preview on Thursday March 24 at 7PM. This is hosted by Moderator, Steven Triffletti, and is basically a dress rehearsal for Town Meeting. It will be televised.

Town Meeting

Town Meeting is Saturday, April 2nd at 8AM in the Plymouth North High School Performing Arts Center. The Advisory & Finance Committee will be meeting at 7:30AM before Town Meeting.

Old/New/Other Business

- Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance, reported that there are some changes that need to be

made to the budget. There are some reductions to debt in the Sewer Enterprise, Water Enterprise and General Fund budgets. These are all items through the SRF Clean Water Trust where the original amount was entered and it should have been the amount after the subsidy. These reductions add up to over \$1 million.

- John Moody reported that the school recognized the need to step up and the School Committee voted Monday night to cut \$155,660 from its budget.
- John Moody also reported that the Board of Selectmen indicated at last night's meeting that they were interested in the budget savings but maybe not the budget expansions. They will be reviewing the revised budget numbers at next Tuesday's meeting.
- The Advisory & Finance Committee will be scheduling another meeting to review and vote on budget revisions.

ADJOURNMENT

Patrick O'Brien made a motion to adjourn. Ethan Kusmin, second.

The motion for adjournment carries unanimously (10-0-0).

The meeting adjourned at 9:07PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kere Gillette