

**ADVISORY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 17, 2015**

A meeting of the Advisory & Finance Committee was held on Thursday, September 17, 2015. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Moody at 6:30PM and was conducted in the Mayflower II Meeting Room at the Plymouth Town Hall, 11 Lincoln Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

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

Belinda Brewster, Kevin Canty, Betty Cavacco, Richard Gladdys, Harry Helm, Ethan Kusmin, Marcus McGraw, John Moody, Patrick O'Brien, Harry Salerno, Marc Sirrico

**ABSENT**      **Three members of the committee were absent**

Shelagh Joyce, Patricia McPherson, Christopher Merrill

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

The Reserve Fund Transfer Request will be heard first, then Article 17, then Public Comment, then Articles 4C, 1, 16A and 16B.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**RESERVE FUND TRANSFER REQUEST**

Dinah O'Brien, Director of Community Resources, explained that the Library is requesting a Reserve Fund transfer in the amount of \$70,000 for mold remediation required in the non-fiction collection area. Mold was discovered in early September. At that time the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners was contacted in order to secure professional assistance. Polygon, on the state bid list and recommended by the MBLC was contacted. Polygon and the Library immediately instituted relative humidity monitoring of the lower level and have determined that the RH is running at an abnormally high level of approximately 76%. It was discovered that the new heating unit purchased for the Library several years ago did not contain a dehumidifier. The Library is working with DPW to determine the best method of lowering the humidity. There are 1,510 shelves in this section. The estimated remediation from Polygon is \$67,601 and the request is for \$70,000 to make sure costs are covered. All materials in the non-fiction section will be cleaned, shelves disinfected, and items will be placed back on shelves over a 15 day period.

**Questions:**

- Have you been in touch with the installer of the heat system? Is this their mistake? (E Kusmin) The installer is sure it is not their fault. Dennis Westgate, Assistant DPW Director, is taking care of communications with the installer.
- Are these books worth saving in comparison to the cost of replacing? (H Salerno) If there were a few shelves it may make more sense to replace. This is a collection of between 200,000-300,000 volumes, it is more cost effective to remediate than replace.
- How will you know if all the mold is gone? (B Brewster) It will be completely remediated and will not reoccur as long as we have the humidity under control. We will be sure to fix the humidity issue before we start mold remediation.
- What is the price for a new dehumidifier? (B Brewster) DPW is working on that.
- Are you confident that the mold is confined to the non-fiction section? (K Canty) Yes, we did an extensive search throughout the Library.
- Do we have insurance for this? (J Moody) This is considered a natural occurrence or act of God and is not covered by insurance.
- There is no other funding source? (J Moody) No, not that we are aware of.

**Harry Salerno made a motion to approve the Reserve Fund Transfer Request of \$70,000. Kevin Canty, second.**

Discussion:

Have to get rid of the mold but need to take care of humidity issue first.  
It is September 17<sup>th</sup> and we are spending over 50% of our Reserve Fund.

Dinah O'Brien thanked the Committee for their support over the past 22 years and explained that she is retiring in January. She was then thanked for her service.

**The motion to approve carries unanimously (9-0-0).**

TOWN MEETING ARTICLE:

**17: Precinct Chairs – Conflict of Interest**

Chris Pratt, Chair of the Committee of Precinct Chairs, presented Article 17. She shared that the Committee of Precinct Chairs voted 8-4-1 in support of this Article. This Article essentially provides the framework for a Town Meeting Member to challenge another Town Meeting Member if they feel that a conflict of interest exists. This must be done no later than 5 days prior to Town Meeting. The Member who is challenged has an opportunity to respond. A record of the challenges and responses will be available at Town Meeting and kept in the Town Clerk's office. After the 2014 Fall Town Meeting, a Conflict of Interest subcommittee was formed. It was made up of 9 members, including some residents and some Town Meeting Members. After significant research, they concluded that the current Charter provision regarding Conflict of Interest is legal, that municipalities could have more stringent policies and provisions locally. After that their next course of action was to formulate a proposal for a new bylaw or charter provision. Over the last few months they had a lot of discussion and compromise and Article 17 is the result of that work. It is important that Town Meeting Members periodically scrutinize their performance. This discussion and debate about Conflict of Interest belongs on Town Meeting floor. The vote at Town Meeting should be respected and abided by all.

Questions:

- Once the challenge is made, Town Meeting can proceed in a normal fashion and no Member can be prohibited from voting? (K Canty) Correct. The intent is to shine sunlight on a potential conflict as an incentive to abstain prior to Town Meeting. No one will be prohibited from voting.
- Does the Member who is challenged have a chance to respond and explain their reasoning? (K Canty) The original bylaw had the challenges declared by the Moderator but it does not belong on Town Meeting floor unless it is vetted.
- Won't the roll call vote by electronic vote solve issue since all votes will be visible, made public, and kept on file? (H Salerno) I do not think so. Not all constituents are familiar with Town Meeting Members' professions and affiliations. The challenge will detail that.
- Can a Town Meeting Member abstain from a vote but still speak on Town Meeting floor? (E Kusmin) Yes, they can still speak.
- Can challenges be filed by constituents or only Town Meeting Members? (B Brewster) Only Town Meeting Members.
- Why not include constituents? (B Brewster) It is something to be considered. It was thought that Town Meeting Members would be more informed if a conflict exists.
- Once notice is given to the Member in question, will they have a chance to explain? (B Brewster) Yes, they can explain their position and a challenge would or could be withdrawn.
- The list of challenges will be kept in the Town Clerk's office but not online? (B Brewster) Correct only available at Town Meeting and in the Town Clerk's office.
- Can residents see this list as well? (B Brewster) Theoretically, yes.
- Is there any way to get a list of employment of all Town Meeting Members? (B Brewster) Originally

the COI Committee thought about requiring disclosure of profession and employment of Town Meeting Members but the Committee of Precinct Chairs was not comfortable with this as it is a privacy issue.

- Is there a form or instructions on how to file a challenge? (H Helm) No.
- Are Town Meeting Members informed about Conflict of Interest? (H Helm) The Charter is clear.
- Will the Town Clerk be required to forward challenges to the subject of the challenge? The process is not explained. (H Helm) Yes, the Town Clerk will forward the challenge. The one that is challenged can respond. If challenge is not valid then it will be withdrawn and not kept on file.
- Will the Member filing the challenge be identified? (H Helm) Yes, the challenger and challenge will both be noted.
- Can a challenge stop Town Meeting Members from voting if it is a close vote? (B Cavacco) No. Members have a civic responsibility to do the right thing. The challenge will be vetted before Town Meeting. It is up to constituents to take action if a Town Meeting Member votes when he/she has a Conflict of Interest. *Marcus McGraw arrived to the meeting.*
- I am challenged by the wording in the bylaw. If a challenge can be withdrawn then why does the bylaw say the Town Clerk shall keep a record of all challenges and why doesn't it explain how to withdraw a challenge? (K Canty) The Committee did not feel it was warranted, they did not feel they had to go into that much detail.
- Why is this article being moved along now when the procedures need fine tuning? (J Moody) We do not want to put Conflict of Interest off any longer. It has been a very controversial and decisive topic over the past year and a half. It is time to take care of it.

John Moody said that this is a complex topic, he asked commenters to minimize emotion and be concise with their comments then he opened the meeting to Public Comment on Article 17.

Richard Serkey, member of the Committee of Precinct Chairs and Conflict of Interest Subcommittee, explained that at the 2014 Spring Town Meeting he believed several Town Meeting Members voted in conflict regarding the firefighter contract. It was because of that the COI subcommittee was formed to look at an enforcement component to the Charter provision. The existing Charter provision is valid but lacks an enforcement mechanism. This bylaw provides that one can defend him/herself and can still vote. It will cast sunlight on those that violate their oath of office. No one should vote if they have a financial interest.

Patricia McCarthy, Town Meeting Member, announced that she will be making a motion on Town Meeting floor to hear Article 18 before Article 17. Elected Town Meeting Members are excluded from Mass GL 268A and therefore can vote in the best interest of their constituents. Selectmen voted unanimously against this Article. By adding issues around challenges, Town Meeting can get chaotic. Where will the line be drawn? It is not fair for Town Meeting Members to have their name on this list when it is not valid. Most work for the good of the community.

Steve Lydon, Town Meeting Member, does not support this Article. It is very confusing. Follow State law. The process is not fair and is very decisive.

Karen Buechs, Town Meeting Member, explained that she is not happy with how both sides have conducted themselves on this issue, they have become nasty. Town Meeting Members are not elected officials, they are elected but are not officials. If you have a conflict remember it is your credibility on the line. Lets get back to doing the right thing for people in our community.

Jerry Sirrico, Town Meeting Member, agrees with Steve Lydon. This has been a two way fight with lots of division. This is a moral issue and you have to be very careful when you try to legislate morals.

Bill Abbott, Town Meeting Member, said that the Charter provision is legal. He shared a copy of a letter from the Attorney General's Office to the 1999 Charter Commission stating that the Charter amendments, including the Conflict of Interest provision, "...do not conflict with Constitutional Laws of the Commonwealth."

Mark Donahue, Town Meeting Member, does not like this bylaw. It does not address how to reverse a challenge or what the shelf life of the record is. He does not want this bylaw but thinks it should at least include a deadline for how long these challenges will be maintained on the list.

Betsy Hall, Town Meeting Member, supports this concept but thinks it is a "tempest in a teapot." She does not believe Town Meeting has a problem but in an attempt to fix the perceived problem has actually created huge problems. There are lots of people that have acted inappropriately through this process.

Paul Hapgood, Town Meeting Member, has attended every Conflict of Interest meeting and is disgusted. The schools agree that anyone elected, even with a financial interest, can still vote on the bottom line.

At 7:42 a five minute recess was called. The meeting was called back to order at 7:47PM.

There were a few more questions regarding the process of challenging, defending, keeping records on file, etc. It was clear that the bylaws did not include detailed procedures. It was asked if the procedures would be clarified. In order to do that, the revised bylaw would have to be presented at a future Town Meeting for approval.

**Ethan Kusmin made a motion to recommend Article 17 to Town Meeting. Belinda Brewster, second.**

Discussion:

- Can't support this.
- Understands both sides and importance of sunlight.
- As a procedure, this is full of holes and is a recipe for anger and recrimination.
- This sunlight is blocked by a dark cloud.
- I can not support this.
- I am in support of this.
- It is a tame approach and not intended to punish just acknowledge.
- It is good to shed some light.
- Not in support.
- Supposed to be procedures but full of holes.
- It is vaguely written to the point of being dangerous.
- Also, actions of the past were called out distastefully tonight.
- This will change the tenor and tone of Town Meeting, it is accusatory.
- Not supporting this article.
- Support keeping the original provision in the Charter but with the Roll Call vote there will be evidence of how every Town Meeting Member votes on every article, issue of anonymity is solved.
- Be wary of unintended consequences.
- I do not vote in favor of procedures that have not been flushed out.
- Worry about unintended consequences.
- "The road to hell is paved with good intentions."
- "There is no such thing as un-ringing the bell." Peoples' reputations and honor are on the line.
- This is divisive.
- Feel strongly for this Town and this government and moving towards 2020.
- Not supporting this article, there is too much gray area.

- I support this article.
- I understand that electronic voting helps the situation but the firefighter contract vote was a roll call vote. Hope that the holes in the procedures can be filled.
- Town Meeting Members need to read the Charter and educate themselves.
- We can't legislate honesty.
- Don't understand the exemption.
- Tired of seeing people vote in their own interest, lots of people are tired of it.
- This bylaw is a good faith effort, sorry it was compromised to the point of uselessness.
- It did not pass Selectmen, it is not passing tonight, it will be interesting to see what happens with it at Town Meeting.

**The motion to recommend Article 17 to Town Meeting fails (2-7-1). Ethan Kusmin and Belinda Brewster, in favor. Marcus McGraw, abstain.**

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Peter Conner, Zoning Board of Appeals Chair, sent a letter to Advisory & Finance after the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting when they heard Article 24, about electing ZBA members. He has been on the ZBA for 15 years. He believes in turnover but has stayed on the ZBA because of the lack of people requesting appointment. Thinks there will be even less interest if positions are elected and not appointed. Current system works. Alternates are given time to learn before joining the Board as regulars. They are an official board governed by state law and town bylaws, they have to separate personal feelings from issues. ZBA members who are also Town Meeting Members have done a good job separating their thoughts at Town Meeting and voting in the best interest of their constituents. That is where this Article started. One person feels that ZBA members should not be Town Meeting Members and by switching ZBA to elected, they will no longer be allowed to hold both positions. The ZBA did not know anything about this article until after it was added to the warrant.

David Peck, ZBA Vice Chair, agrees keeping the ZBA as appointed makes the most sense. By appointing they can make sure the board is balanced in different areas of expertise. They currently have an architect, builders, attorney, contractors, and a real estate agent. This is an advantage. They can ask informed questions and review drawings and challenge developers. If the ZBA is changed to elected they can not maintain this balance. It may allow special interest groups to fund candidates to vote in their interest. There is a cost to run so many qualified citizens may not be interested in running and financing a campaign. It makes more sense to leave the Charter the way it is with ZBA appointed.

Karen Keane, Charter Review Committee Clerk, said that she did reach out to all ZBA members by email regarding this topic coming before the Charter Review Committee and she only heard back from one ZBA member that said he was unable to attend. In addition to the personal invitations, the meeting and agenda were posted publicly.

Bill Keohan, ZBA Clerk, has been on the ZBA for 10 years. This will impact the town in that it will create the opportunity for special interest groups to permeate the ZBA. Selectmen run for office and express the votes they take, they should continue to appoint who they see fit and maintain the balance that is important to keep the ZBA functioning well.

Buster Main, ZBA Member, explained that the ZBA is a quasi-judicial, court appointed authority and

only the Superior Court can overturn a ZBA decision. He shared a bit of the history of the ZBA. Being a ZBA Member is not easy. They have to look at the application and at the law and make a determination. With elections unintended consequences can be worse. Do you really want a guy that can raise a lot of money? You have to trust your elected officials to make decisions and appoint the best candidates to the ZBA.

Russ Appleyard, Town Meeting Member, says that this is too important a topic not to be subject to election. 4 ZBA members voted on the height overlay article at Spring Town Meeting and one spoke in support of the article.

Jim Simpson, ZBA Alternate, said that the Town needs to maintain the professional skills they have on the ZBA and the only way to do that is by appointment by the Board of Selectmen.

Steve Lydon, Town Meeting Member, respects the ZBA and says their integrity is not in question. ZBA members should be accountable to the citizens, not only the Board of Selectmen.

Bill Keohan, ZBA Clerk, pointed out that the Planning Board is elected so the public has input on the permitting process through those elected officials. ZBA should continue to be appointed.

John Moody, Advisory & Finance Committee Chairman, thanked the ZBA members for attending the meeting and sharing their views. He said that if the Advisory & Finance Committee decides to take action it will be done under Old/New/Other Business later in the agenda.

TOWN MEETING ARTICLES:

#### **4C: Corrosion Repair Engines**

Ed Bradley, Fire Chief, presented Article 4C. Three of the Town's pumping engines are showing advanced stages of exterior corrosion. The corrosion, around door handles, window openings, capped corners, door edges, lights, and hinges, was more noticeable after the harsh winter. The apparatus spent long periods of time responding during the extreme weather on roadways. The chemicals that DPW uses to treat the roadways contribute to the body corrosion issues. These apparatus have aluminum bodies which have held up satisfactorily over the years, much better than the steel bodies used years ago and equally satisfactorily as the stainless steel bodies which add significant weight and cost to the vehicle. The apparatus, Engine 2 and Engine 5, which went into service in October 2008, and Engine 1, which went in service November 2011, are in need of corrosion repairs and repainting. The total for all three is \$50,935 before warranty work, \$30,532 after warranty reimbursement.

John Moody, Advisory & Finance Committee Chair, shared that he visited Engine 5 and saw the corrosion which is not as visible in the photographs. He said that there are bubbles under the paint which in time will peel and turn into a rust spot.

Questions:

- Does the warranty coverage count the time the issue is reported or the time we seek repair? (H Salerno) The manufacturer already sent a team out to inspect the vehicles. We just have to get on the list to get done. We have to get on the list before November to be covered under the warranty.
- This seems to be an ongoing problem. Can it be incorporated into the Fire Department's budget? (B Brewster) It is not an annual expense so it can not be incorporated into the budget.
- The staff said the engines are hosed down when they return to the station. Would pressure washing be helpful? (J Moody) The manufacturer does not recommend that with the decals and tags and reflective paint on the engines. We do rinse off the engines but that even might be contributing to the problem. We hose down, pull into the building where there is the greenhouse effect, then go back out and the water on the surfaces freeze on the body, we think that is better

than the salt and magnesium chloride remaining on the surfaces though.

- What is the price difference with the stainless steel engines? (K Canty) When the Department replaced a cab with a stainless steel cab it added 6,800 pounds to the vehicle and cost an additional \$4,000. For a full engine, it would add at least \$10,000 to the price and a lot more weight. A new engine today costs about \$560,000.

**Patrick O'Brien made a motion to recommend Article 4C to Town Meeting. Harry Helm, second. The motion to recommend Article 4C to Town Meeting carries unanimously (10-0-0).**

### **1: Personnel Bylaw – Misc D – Revised**

Cindy DePinda, Director of Human Resources, presented Article 1. She previously presented this Article to the Advisory & Finance Committee on September 2, 2015 but the list of Miscellaneous D rates has changed a bit. She originally was going to wait until Spring to add some positions but decided to add them now to take care of all of the rates through 2017. The additions are Sport Official, Sport Clinic Director, and Warden. A few of the positions on the original list were already voted on at the Spring Town Meeting so those were removed from this revised list. These include Life Guard and Head Life Guard.

Questions:

- Do we need to reopen the Article? (M Sirrico) John Moody said that it would be valuable to have a clear understanding of the changes and reconfirm the vote on the revised Miscellaneous D rates.
- We dealt with this last fall and again in the Spring. How do we know these are right this time? (J Moody) I, and my staff, have looked at them and confirmed they are right.

**Betty Cavacco made a motion to recommend Article 1, substituting this new list of Miscellaneous D rates for the previous list, to Town Meeting. Patrick O'Brien, second. The motion to recommend Article 1 to Town Meeting carries unanimously (9-0-1). Marc Sirrico, abstained.**

### **16A: CPC – Simes House**

Bill Keohan, Community Preservation Committee (CPC) Chair, presented Article 16A. Article 16A asks Town Meeting to appropriate \$3,420,477 of CPC funds to complete the Simes House project located at 29 Manomet Point Road. This is a unique opportunity in that it incorporates all three categories of CPC funding: historic preservation, affordable housing, and open space/recreation. The project includes preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of the historical building, creation of two affordable rental units, and the creation and preservation of open space for recreation for use as the Manomet Village Green. The first floor will be renovated to create three multi-purpose public meeting rooms with a commercial kitchen so it can generate revenue with event rentals. The second floor will be renovated to create two office spaces, also to generate revenue. The third floor will be renovated to create two one-bedroom affordable rental apartments, also generating revenue. Upon completion of the project the Town Manager and Board of Selectmen, in consultation with the Community Preservation Committee and Antiquarian Society, will consider entering into a lease agreement with a qualified organization to operate, care, maintain and make improvements to the Simes House. The organization would operate the property with a business plan to generate income through the rental units, and rental fees of the multi-purpose space. Town sanctioned committees would not be charged a fee to meet or hold events at the Simes House, subject to availability. The CPC voted unanimously in favor of this article. The Selectmen voted 2-1 in support of this article.

In 2010 the Town obtained this property through tax title. Some Town Meeting Members approached the Town about partnering with CPC to find an organization to take on the Simes House as a project and to raise \$2 million to fund the renovations needed at the Simes House. The Simes House Foundation was formed and Town Meeting took a leap of faith and turned the property over to the Foundation. They

were able to complete Phase I which was to renovate the exterior of the building. They were not able to raise the additional funds needed to complete the project. The project has now come back to the Town in an emergency and requires the Town's expertise to complete. CPC recognizes that this was unfair to ask the Foundation to raise so much money. They now have a policy to not send articles to Town Meeting without full funding.

Manomet is the third largest village in Plymouth. CPC has not spent as much in this village as it has in other areas of Plymouth. The village has adopted this town green and has quite a few activities there each year. CPC wants to complete this project for Manomet and for the whole town.

Donna Curtain, Plymouth Antiquarian Society President, agreed that this is perfect "trifecta of CPC funding." This helps CPC to achieve greater geographic parity and show that Manomet matters. She then shared the history of the Simes House and that it is eligible for National Registry because it is of architectural, historical and biographical interest.

Bill Keohan explained that this project will not raise the tax rate. The money is already allocated to the CPC. They have funded a lot of projects downtown and now they would like to focus on funding projects in the villages to help improve them. This project can be done without compromising any upcoming projects.

#### Questions:

- The total spend on this project is \$4,920,477: \$1.5 million originally approved and then the \$3,420,477 in this article, correct? (H Helm) Correct. Only \$750,000 of the original \$1.5 million has been spent to date.
- The revenue chart indicates a cash flow of \$34,000 a year back to the CPC. So it would take 142+ years to earn that money back? (H Helm) All revenues would go back into the Simes House. The revenue estimates are conservative and they do not include events that may be held on the lawn. Revenues could easily come in higher than those estimated in the chart.
- Estimate for completing the work seems very high? (E Kusmin) CPC hired an outside firm to put together the estimate to complete the work. The hope is that construction will be less expensive than the estimate. Part of the article is asking for special legislation to exempt the project from prevailing wage law which would save \$600,000-\$700,000. Grant writing also has the potential for \$500,000 in funding. CPC hopes to not use the entire appropriation. The Building Committee is helping to review the quote to see where savings could be made.
- How likely is it that the special legislation will pass? (P O'Brien) It has been discussed with various representatives in the trades and they were interested in supporting this legislation. They recognize that the Town controls the property because of tax title, it is an emergency situation, and they plan to lease it back to a non-profit, so it is a good cause for exemption.
- What happens to the Simes House if this article is not approved at Town Meeting? (P O'Brien) CPC would have to look at trying to complete the project in other ways, maybe all affordable housing. Hope they do not have to sell it because money would be lost. Hope they do not have to deal with that prospect and hope that Town Meeting supports this great project.
- It could not be sold for \$750,000 which has been spent on the project already? (B Brewster) No, it is a shell of a building really. The interior is 1865 and is unfinished so it needs all new electrical and plumbing and needs to be finished. Maybe it would sell for \$350,000 at this point but that is just a guess.
- What is the acreage? Remember the article for \$1.5 million but never heard that they may have to come back for more funding? (B Brewster) The lot is approximately 1 acre. It was hoped the Foundation would be able to raise the funds to complete the project. In retrospect, it was not fair put that on the back of the Simes House Foundation.

- Is it an option to walk away and take that hit? To maybe build a new community center elsewhere in Manomet instead? (E Kusmin) We are relying on professionals to guide us in the right direction and this project makes the most sense. A new community center can not be built for this amount of money.

#### Public Comment

Randy Parker, Town Meeting Member, rented the Simes House lawn for his son's wedding which was fantastic. He says there is great potential to raise a lot more revenue than the \$34,000 annually in the projection. This is such a unique building for the region and is so important to Manomet. This is CPC's number one priority, he is grateful and comforted that this project is back in the hands of the Town. Please support this article and send it to Town Meeting.

Steve Lydon, Town Meeting Member, opposes this article. He supported it in 2010 but never would have voted for it if he knew it was going to cost almost \$5 million, it is too much money.

**Kevin Canty made a motion to extend the meeting beyond 10PM. Richard Gladdys, second. The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).**

Karen Keane, Town Meeting Member, is in support of this project. She is passionate about the Simes House. The fact this project hits all 3 categories for CPC funding proves it is a worthwhile investment. If we do not protect our own history, we can never bring it back. If we turn our backs now, it may be gone forever.

**Richard Gladdys made a motion to recommend Article 16A to Town Meeting. Ethan Kusmin, second.**

#### Discussion:

- The people of Manomet deserve this and the village of Manomet needs this.
- Costs are high but maybe they can bring the costs down.
- This house is one of a kind, encourage you to support this article.
- This is an investment in the future.
- This is a unique historical building that speaks to the character of Manomet.
- Would like to see the Town work the numbers down.
- The estimate is high and knows costs can be cut considerably.
- Will vote in support.
- Originally flipped over \$5 million but after listening here, have to believe CPC would not spend this if it did not look at all of the benefits.
- It is unfortunate that the Town is in this position, but supports article and hopes costs can be brought down.
- \$5 million for one house on one acre is way too much money.
- Have to prioritize funds and can't vote in hopes costs will come down.
- What if grants don't come through?
- Does not like the mentality that you do not like Manomet if you do not support this project.
- Believe we can create a park and village center for a lot less money.
- It is time to close the book on this dream and move on.
- Support this article but would now support it if the funding were not already put aside.
- Manomet is a unique village and it deserves something like this.
- This house is not something that can be replicated.
- History is Plymouth's greatest asset.
- Future generations will be appreciative that we did this.
- I struggle with this decision because it is a lot of money, but Manomet does need a

village/community center.

**The motion to recommend Article 16A to Town Meeting carries (8-2-0). Belinda Brewster and Patrick O'Brien, opposed.**

**16B: Open Space**

Bill Keohan, Community Preservation Committee (CPC) Chair, presented Article 16B. This article will appropriate \$400,000 of Community Preservation funds to acquire 43.6 acres off Little Herring Pond Road. This property abuts the west side of Little Herring Pond. The purpose for the purchase is passive recreational use, protection of priority habitats of rare species, and the protection of water quality of Little Herring, Carters Brook, Great Herring, Pickerel Pond and the herring run accessing the Cape Cod Canal. Acquisition of this property will enhance the land conservation and water protection in the great Herring Pond water shed. The property provides extensive frontage on and extensive views of two ponds, Little Herring Pond and Triangle Pond, a county road layout accessible from Carters Bridge Road. It also abuts existing opens space at Pickerel Pond Preserve that is situated to the west. The property possesses considerable natural resource values. It is partially within several areas designated by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program as important wildlife habitat (Eastern Box Turtle, Eastern Pondmussel, Tidewater Mucket, and Bridle Shiner). It has extensive frontage on Little Herring Pond, a body of water containing "Anadromous Fish Presence" and known to support one of the region's premier herring runs. The property was appraised at \$830,000. They asked for \$600,000 then added another parcel. We agreed to a purchase price of \$525,000. An individual, who wishes to remain anonymous, offered \$125,000 to the town to help with this acquisition.

Public Comment:

Steve Lydon, Town Meeting Member, supports this article as this property is critical as it has potential for tremendous environmental impact.

**Patrick O'Brien made a motion to recommend Article 16B to Town Meeting. Harry Salerno, second. The motion to recommend Article 16B to Town Meeting carries unanimously (10-0-0).**

**Old/New/Other Business**

There was no motion or discussion to reconsider the Article 24 – Elect ZBA.

**Meeting Minutes**

- September 2, 2015: **Patrick O'Brien made a motion to approve the 9/2/15 meeting minutes as amended. Harry Salerno, second. The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).**
- September 3, 2015: **Patrick O'Brien made a motion to approve the 9/3/15 meeting minutes as amended. Harry Salerno, second. The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).**
- September 9, 2015: **Harry Salerno made a motion to approve the 9/9/15 meeting minutes as amended. Richard Gladdys, second. The motion carries unanimously (10-0-0).**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Harry Salerno made a motion to adjourn. Patrick O'Brien, second. The motion for adjournment carries unanimously (10-0-0).**

The meeting adjourned at 10:34PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kere Gillette