

## ADVISORY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

### MEETING MINUTES

September 7, 2016

A meeting of the Advisory & Finance Committee was held on Wednesday, September 7, 2016. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Moody at 7:00PM and was conducted in the Mayflower II Meeting Room at the Plymouth Town Hall, 11 Lincoln Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

**PRESENT**      **13 members of the committee were present:**

Kevin Canty, Betty Cavacco, Robert Cote, Judith Fitzgerald, Harry Helm, Ethan Kusmin, Mike Lincoln, Christopher Merrill, John Moody, Patrick O'Brien, Sheila Sheridan, Marc Serrico, Scott Stephenson

**ABSENT**      **2 members of the committee were absent:**

Peter Mador, Harry Salerno

#### Announcements

Chair John Moody received a request from presenter Bill Keohan to change the order of the agenda so he could be placed at the end of the agenda because he had a meeting next door with ZBA. There were no objections to the agenda change.

#### Revolving Fund Spending Cap Request – Hedges Pond Revolving Fund

Anne Slusser, Recreation Director, requested an increase to the Hedges Pond Revolving Fund spending cap. They would like to increase it by \$12,500 from \$35,000 to \$47,500. Repair to the restroom building roof was requested during the FY2017 capital budget process but it was not approved. The roof has since deteriorated, is leaking and mold is now growing on an interior wall. Total cost of the roof repair is \$12,487, which can easily be covered by the Hedges Pond Revolving Fund. The current balance in this account is \$92,802. The Recreation Department fully anticipates FY2017 revenues to exceed expenses even with this unplanned project.

#### Questions:

- When will the repairs be made? (B Cavacco) As soon as possible, by the end of the month.
- What caused the roof damage? Will insurance cover the damage? (J Moody) Nothing specific happened to cause the hole it is just old and the shingles are all cracked.
- Is this the original roof from when we purchased the property? (J Moody) Yes, we purchased the property in 2007, and the roof has not been replaced or repaired since then.

**Betty Cavacco made a motion to approve the Hedge Pond Revolving Fund Spending Cap Increase Request. Patrick O'Brien, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

#### Fall Town Meeting Articles

- Article 27: West Plymouth Village Master Plan  
Robin Carver, Town Planner, and Russ Appleyard, Chair of the West Plymouth Steering Committee, presented Article 27. Article 27 asks Town Meeting to approve the "West Plymouth Village Center Master Plan Update," dated October 2016. There are 5 villages in Plymouth and each has its own master plan which is updated periodically. The village master plans support the overall Plymouth Strategic Plan. All of these plans can be found on the Planning & Development Department webpage. The West Plymouth Village Master Plan was last updated in 1993. Staff has worked with the West Plymouth Steering Committee to come up with this new plan. West Plymouth is Plymouth's largest and most expansive village with just over 10,000 people and 5,300 acres. The West Plymouth Master Plan Priority Checklist includes 11 items established within the 5 core goals that include policies and actions.

#### Priority Checklist:

- Community Identity: Brand & Trails
- Environmental: Expand open space network for passive recreation & protect aquifer & ground water resources

- Recreation & Public Spaces: Improve and expand existing parks, establish a community center
- Safety-Infrastructure Improvements: Improve Plympton Rd / Carver Rd intersection, improve Federal Furnace / South Meadow Rd intersection, improve Samoset St / Marc Dr intersection, provide a sidewalk along South Meadow Rd, continue the sidewalk along Plympton Rd

Five Core Goals:

- I. Community Identity – Sense of Place
- II. Economic Development
- III. Environmental Protection & Open Space
- IV. Infrastructure Maintenance, Improvements & Safety
- V. Recreation & Public Spaces

**Christopher Merrill made a motion to recommend Article 27 to Town Meeting. Kevin Canty, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

➤ Article 2A: Operating Budget Amendments

Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance, presented Article 2A. This article appears at every Fall Town Meeting and makes adjustments to the General Fund budget voted at the Spring Annual Town Meeting. The following adjustments are necessary:

<b>Article 2A - General Fund Budget Amendment:</b>	<b>Town Meeting Budget Line</b>	<b>FATM Adjustments Needed</b>
Medicare Part B Penalty	Member Benefits	(7,000)
Medicare Part B Premium	Member Benefits	82,000
Workers Comp	Member Benefits	242,000
Deferred Comp	Member Benefits	15,000
Employer Medicare	Member Benefits	(55,000)
Life Insurance	Member Benefits	(35,000)
Managed Blue	Member Benefits	437,500
	Member Benefits - Line 46	<b>679,500</b>
Veterans Benefits	Veterans Expenses - Line 14	<b>(150,000)</b>
All Town Insurance	All Town Insurance - Line 52	<b>(167,000)</b>
Moderator's Expense	Finance Exps - Line 10	<b>4,500</b>
Fuel & Utilities	Fuel & Utilities - Line 39	<b>(75,000)</b>
Legal Expense	Town Manager Exps - Line 2	<b>150,000</b>
Short-Term Interest	Non-Enterprise Debt - Line 53	<b>(194,800)</b>
	<b>General Fund Total</b>	<b>247,200</b>

Explanations for increases and (decreases) are as follows:

Member Benefits:

- Medicare Part B Penalty – Enrollment numbers are down even though penalty amounts have increased due to increased federal Medicare premium amounts.
- Medicare Part B Premium – Even though the town’s Medicare Reimbursement rate has decreased over the previous year the amount of eligible retirees increased over the amount that we had budgeted for. There were 20 more on the town side and 98 more on the school side.
- Workers Comp – the increase in premium is due to updated audited payrolls being used for the Fiscal 2017 year and an estimated increase that will be due when they complete the audit for Fiscal 2016.
- Deferred Comp – increase is based on current participants estimated out for the year. The new FIRE contract included a match that they did not have before.
- Employer Medicare – anticipating not needing as much as we had budgeted based on estimated payrolls and settled contracts.
- Life Insurance – budget was based on an increased life insurance benefit that has not gone into effect yet because all groups are not settled yet.
- Managed Blue – Increase due to the rise in number of retirees turning age 65; same as the reason above for the Medicare Part B premium.

Veterans Benefits - The number of veteran’s claims has decreased over the last two years; currently they are trending at spending approximately \$630,000 in FY17 based on current claims. This decrease will leave them with \$650,000 which the Veterans Agent is comfortable with.

All Town Insurance – we insure our property / casualty and workers comp with MIIA. Due to the large increase in our Workers Comp premium they “smoothed” out the overall increase in our total insurance products by not increasing the property / casualty by as much as we had anticipated.

Moderators Expense – the cost of the services we require at Plymouth’s town meetings merited an increase with the electronic voting vendor.

Fuel & Utilities – the trend in this line item has decreased over the last two years in addition to our 3<sup>rd</sup> contract for Solar coming online at the end of fiscal 2016.

Legal Expenses – the cost of pursuing the sewer litigation is reflected in this number.

Short-Term Interest – decrease is due to a combination of interest rates and a decrease in the overall amount that we ended up borrowing.

Also, as part of Article 2A, General Fund Budget amendment, the motion for funding the overall total needs to be modified to include the funding sources for the T-Wharf short term interest from Municipal Waterways, Town Hall short term interest from the Meals Tax Fund, and Plymouth South High School short term interest from Premium for Debt Exclusion; as shown in the following table:

Article 7A from Annual Town Meeting		April ATM Totals	FATM 10/15/2016 Art 2A	FATM Grand Totals
<b>Total General Fund Operating Budget</b>	(Item #1-54) \$	<b>197,522,205</b>	247,200.00	197,769,405.00
Title V - Betterment Program	\$	173,458		173,458.00
State Boat Ramp Revolving Fund	\$	10,360		10,360.00
Recreation Revolving Fund	\$	45,953		45,953.00
Memorial Hall Revolving Fund	\$	10,083		10,083.00
Plymouth Beach Revolving Fund	\$	9,866		9,866.00
Fire Safety & Prevention Revolving Fund	\$	7,731		7,731.00
Fire Alarm Master Box Services Revolving Fund	\$	9,856		9,856.00
Cemetery Perpetual Care	\$	23,863		23,863.00
Municipal Waterways	\$	130,000	23,464.00	153,464.00
Meals Tax Fund	\$	270,000	105,411.00	375,411.00
Premium for Debt Exclusion	\$	198,648	225,857.38	424,505.38
General Fund Free Cash for OPEB Fund	\$	500,000		500,000.00
Less Total Transfers	\$	1,389,818	354,732.38	1,744,550.38
To be raised by the 2017 Tax Levy (General Fund revenues & other sources)	\$	196,132,387	(107,532.38)	196,024,854.62

**Funding Sources:**

The \$23,464 reflects the debt service specifically for the T Wharf Project so that will be paid from the Municipal Waterways Fund. Money was borrowed sooner than anticipated for the Town Hall Project so the \$105,411 will be paid from the Meals Tax Fund. We borrowed in May for the Plymouth South High School project so \$225,857.38 will be paid from the Premium for Debt Exclusion. That leaves a reduction of \$107,532.38 in the amount being funded by the FY2017 General Fund, bringing it from \$196,132,387 to \$196,024,854.62.

**Questions:**

- Is the \$150,000 increase to legal expenses just for the sewer lawsuit? (B Cavacco) Yes.
- Is the town still looking to recover those fees as part of the sewer lawsuit? (H Salerno) Yes.
- Regarding the use of the Meals Tax, is the project more expensive or is it just moving at a faster rate than anticipated? (E Kusmin) It is moving at a faster rate so the cash flow statement that we receive from the Owners Project Manager has been update with all of the contractors and sub-contractors.

We originally anticipated borrowing \$15 million in FY2017 and we ended up borrowing \$20 million.

- Regarding the Medicare Part B Premium budget increase, do we anticipate the same happening next year? (C Merrill) It is difficult to estimate both the number of retirees each year as well as the number of new employees coming on every year. Employees do not always provide generous notice for their retirements. We run reports showing ages of those nearing retirement age but still have no idea if they actually plan to retire any time soon.
- Regarding the Managed Blue increase, more opted in to the option than planned? (H Helm) Yes, at age 65 retirees sign up for Medicare A & B and then are given two supplemental plans options: Medex (a more expensive PPO type plan) or Managed Blue (a less expensive premium based plan). More are choosing the Managed Blue than we had anticipated. We left the other side of this equation, Member Benefits, alone because the net was only \$37,000 and on a \$32 million dollar budget, we left it there.
- What is the total Managed Blue budget? (J Moody) the FY2017 total is increasing to \$1.5 million.
- Will we see a significant Managed Blue premium increase in the future? (J Moody) No because history has shown that premiums decrease with increased enrollment.
- The Health Insurance Trust Fund is \$32 million, \$1.5 million would be a small portion of that total. (J Moody) With this product, we can not self insure so we would have to look at other products.

**Kevin Canty made a motion to recommend Article 2A to Town Meeting. Patrick O'Brien, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

➤ Article 2B: Enterprise Budget Amendments

Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance, presented Article 2B. This article appears at every Fall Town Meeting and makes adjustments to the Enterprise budgets voted at the Spring Annual Town Meeting. The following adjustments are necessary:

<b>ARTICLE 7B: WATER ENTERPRISE FUND</b>		<b>April ATM Totals</b>	<b>FATM 10/15/2016</b>	<b>FATM Grand Totals</b>
Personal Services	(Item #62)	\$ 1,123,375		1,123,375.00
All Other Expenses	(Item #63)	\$ 1,246,458		1,246,458.00
Debt Service	(Item #64)	\$ 1,139,917	(93,906.00)	1,046,011.00
<b>Appropriated for Direct Costs</b>		<b>\$ 3,509,750</b>	<b>(93,906.00)</b>	<b>3,415,844.00</b>
Indirect Costs - Charged to Enterprise Fund from General Fund	(Item #65)	\$ 1,293,076		1,293,076.00
<b>Total Cost – Water</b>		<b>\$ 4,802,826</b>	<b>(93,906.00)</b>	<b>4,708,920.00</b>
<b>ARTICLE 7C: SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND</b>		<b>April ATM Totals</b>	<b>FATM 10/15/2016</b>	<b>FATM Grand Totals</b>
Personal Services	(Item #58)	\$ 346,165		346,165
All Other Expenses	(Item #59)	\$ 2,024,311		2,024,311
Debt Service	(Item #60)	\$ 2,128,923	(8,982)	2,119,941
<b>Appropriated for Direct Costs</b>		<b>\$ 4,499,399</b>	<b>(8,982)</b>	<b>4,490,417</b>
Indirect Costs - Charged to Enterprise Fund from General Fund	(Item #61)	\$ 293,124		293,124
<b>Total Cost – Sewer</b>		<b>\$ 4,792,523</b>	<b>(8,982)</b>	<b>4,783,541</b>
<b>ARTICLE 7E: AIRPORT ENTERPRISE FUND</b>		<b>April ATM Totals</b>	<b>FATM 10/15/2016</b>	<b>FATM Grand Totals</b>
Personal Services	(Item #55)	\$ 509,431		509,431
All Other Expenses	(Item #56)	\$ 2,099,215	(3,114)	2,096,101
<b>Appropriated for Direct Costs</b>		<b>\$ 2,608,646</b>	<b>(3,114)</b>	<b>2,605,532</b>
Indirect Costs - Charged to Enterprise Fund from General Fund	(Item #57)	\$ 194,979		194,979
<b>Total Cost – Airport</b>		<b>\$ 2,803,625</b>	<b>(3,114)</b>	<b>2,800,511</b>

There is a decrease to Debt Service to the Water, Sewer, and Airport Enterprise Funds because we are borrowing less. That is the only change to these three budgets.

Also, based on updated estimated enrollments and the costs associated with providing those services, the following updates to the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund are needed:

ARTICLE 7D: SOLID WASTE ENTERPRISE FUND		April ATM Totals	FATM 10/15/2016	FATM Grand Totals
Personal Services	(Item #66)	\$ 314,354	(20,000)	294,354
All Other Expenses	(Item #67)	\$ 1,890,770	38,500	1,929,270
<b>Appropriated for Direct Costs</b>		<b>\$ 2,205,124</b>	<b>18,500</b>	<b>2,223,624</b>
Indirect Costs - Charged to Enterprise Fund from General Fund	(Item #68)	\$ 294,914		294,914
Total Cost – Solid Waste		\$ 2,500,038	18,500	2,518,538

The Solid Waste Enterprise Fund Budget will also require amendment to the funding sources due to the rates set back in May by the Board of Selectmen. An \$111,000 transfer is required from the Special Purpose Stabilization Fund for Solid Waste and the Solid Waste Retained Earnings.

To review the timeline for the FY2017 Solid Waste budget, in October 2015 enrollments are estimated for curbside and transfer station, then rates are set in May, sign ups are mid May through June, July and into August, fines go out in August for those using the transfer station that have not signed up, also ABC calls curbside non-renewals to ask them to pay or the barrels will be picked up and service discontinued.

Transfer station enrollment was estimated to be 3,600 and we are currently at 3,300. A rate of \$196 was recommended by staff to the Selectmen and they voted \$168.

Curbside enrollment was estimated at 5,600. There is an adjustment to the ABC contract, an increase of \$53,805, plus an increase in tipping fees of \$12,300 plus an increase to bags of \$2,369, which total \$58,500. Then there are decreases to overtime by \$20,000 and vehicle fuel of \$20,000, which total \$40,000. The net of increases and decreases total \$18,500.

Questions:

- What is the balance in the Special Purpose Stabilization Fund for Solid Waste? (J Moody) The current balance is \$102,147.94.
- This transfer will drain the entire reserve and the remaining approximately \$9,000 will come from Solid Waste Retained Earnings? (J Moody) Correct.
- The \$111,000 shortfall is due to the recommend rates not being approved by the Board of Selectmen? (J Moody) Correct.
- Why are we completely draining this stabilization fund? (H Helm) In 2013 this stabilization fund was created as the town converted to the Pay As You Throw program. At that time \$300,000 was transferred from Transfer Station operations for this conversion process. If this stabilization fund is not used to fund the shortfall, the options are to place the shortfall on the tax rate or cut the budget.
- What about next year, will the shortfall end up on our tax rate? (H Helm) Possibly, if the number of enrollees and the rate they pay do not cover the costs, there has to be changes made to the operations or to the services we provide there. We have been looking at options for the hard to manage program. The priority is that users fund the transfer station and that it not hit the tax rate.
- Staff gave the recommended rate to the Selectmen and then they reduced that rate. How can we change that? (S Sheridan) That is a good question. The Selectmen are aware of the issue.
- How many municipalities have the same system as Plymouth? (C Merrill) Can't answer that because Solid Waste is handled differently in every town. Many towns offer curbside and then a transfer station only for items not accepted curbside. Not many towns offer both a curbside and a transfer station option for trash.
- It sounds like we are going to have to cut the cord on the transfer station at some point. (C Merrill)

**Patrick O'Brien made a motion to recommend Article 2B to Town Meeting. Harry Helm, second.**

Comments/Discussion:

We are going down a slippery slope where we are throwing money at a problem and this happens all the time. This is eventually going to end up on the tax rate if we do not solve the problem, which is unacceptable. (S Stephenson)

**The motion carries (11-1-0). Scott Stephenson, opposed.**

➤ Article 13: PILOT Agreements

Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance, asked the Advisory & Finance Committee to consider postponing Article 13 because not all Agreements have been settled at this time.

Chair John Moody expressed his frustration that the article had to be postponed and asked that materials be received no later than the Monday before the meeting.

**Patrick O'Brien made a motion to postpone Article 13 to Thursday, September 15. Judith Fitzgerald, second.**

Discussion/Comments:

The committee requested that they receive more detail on the PILOT agreements not only regarding the rates negotiated but also the totals to be paid over 20 years, what monies are going into the Environmental Fund voted at Spring Town Meeting, projected profits, the payback as a percentage of the projected profit, etc. Lynne Barrett said that she will provide as much detail as she is able but that 38D requests are confidential under state law. The Assessor, Anne Dunn, does a great job looking at all information, including the income to expense ratios, and calculating what the taxes would be through typical personal property tax then looks at what the rate of the PILOT should be knowing that it will be 20 years of steady payments with a 2 ½% escalation each year.

**Motion to Postpone hearing Article 13 to September 15 carries (11-1-0). Kevin Canty, opposed.**

Old/New/Other Business

➤ Reconsideration of Article 26: Solar Bylaw:

Lee Hartmann thanked the Advisory & Finance for reconsidering Article 26. The Energy Committee listened to the recommendations that were made when they presented the article to Advisory & Finance and made changes to the Bylaw as a result. Parking lots and power line utility easements were added as locations not requiring site plan review but require a 200 foot buffer along each lot line that abuts a residential district. The maximum size allowed decreased from 30 acres to 15 acres. Residential zones were further defined. Screening was added to the standards. Notification of abutters within 300 feet was added as a requirement. The Planning Board approved the changes. Lee Hartmann reminded the committee that there are 2 appeals currently in court and that both litigation fees and staff time will continue to add up to tens of thousands of dollars or more each year if we do not get a solar bylaw on the books. If we had this bylaw on the books 1/3 of the solar fields approved to date would not have met this bylaw.

Questions:

- Were solar bylaws of other towns looked at? Carver currently has a large conflict over solar fields. (J Fitzgerald) Yes, we looked at solar bylaws of all local towns. This bylaw adds protections where we currently have none. New required buffers will go a long way.
- Sand and gravel operations are considered previously disturbed land, correct? (S Sheridan) Property owners can turn a wooded area into a field provided it is not a natural heritage area or wetlands. If they want to create a field first and then apply for a solar permit, they have to wait 5 years. To run a gravel operation it is a completely different permit process.
- Why were parking lots added? (S Sheridan) The Planning Board encourages developers to put solar in developments and parking lots are a great spot, like REI has done in their parking lot.
- What about use of power utilities for solar fields? We heard an article last week that pertained to this. (S Sheridan) That particular lot has rare and endangered species so they would have a hard time getting permits to build a solar field. In that case usually 70% is set aside and the state may allow up to 30% be developed. If a solar field is built in a power easement and the lot abuts residential lots, screening and setback requirements would have to be met. Planning would perform a site plan review. This is better than what we have today, which is nothing.

- Why has the abutter notification been batted back to us? (H Helm) Lee Burns, Energy Committee Chair, said the Energy Committee is welcoming suggestions from Advisory & Finance as far as the specifics of the abutter notification in hopes that they will look at the bylaw more favorably.

**Scott Stephenson made a motion to recommend Article 26 to Town Meeting contingent upon an abutter clause being added to the bylaw language. Harry Helm, second.**

Discussion:

- 30 days notice prior to construction is short notice to coordinate with neighbors, boards, legal counsel, etc. Longer notification would be preferable. (K Canty)
- What are the other timing options in the cycle? (J Moody) 30 days prior to site plan review (possibly 45 – 60 days) but that does not include all projects. Some projects go only to the Building Commissioner. 60 days would work for all projects.
- I have concerns about the solar on power utility easements. When is enough enough for solar farms on residential land. I can not support this. (S Sheridan)

**Kevin Canty made a Motion to Amend to require abutter notification a minimum of 60 days before construction begins. Chris Merrill, second if 60 “business” days. Motion to Amend to require abutter notification a minimum of 60 business days prior to the start of construction passes (9-3-0). Sheila Sheridan, Betty Cavacco, and Judith Fitzgerald, opposed.**

Discussion/Comments - returning to main motion as amended:

- There is lots of opposition to solar. Currently the town has no protection. While I prefer bylaws to be tight, right now a 70% solution is better than no solution. We need to help Plymouth residents by recommending this to Town Meeting, I urge you to vote yes. (M Lincoln)
- I would like to see solar fields eliminated from residential properties completely. (S Sheridan)
- If we allowed solar fields on only commercial property then the 5% of land in Plymouth that is commercial may be covered by solar farms preventing buildings from being built. (J Moody)
- That state has more power and they say we can not unreasonably regulate solar fields. Concerns should be addressed at Beacon Hill. For now this bylaw addresses many concerns and gives some regulation where there is virtually none now. (K Canty)

**The main motion to recommend Article 26 as amended to Town Meeting carries (10-2-0). Sheila Sheridan and Judith Fitzgerald, opposed.**

Lee Hartmann said he will let the Planning Board know about the motion to add abutter notification.

- Article 28 update: A red-lined copy of the Plastic Ban Bylaw has been received from legal counsel. Please review it and contact Chairman Moody if you feel the article needs to be reconsidered or if we need an affirmation vote.

### Fall Town Meeting Articles

- Article 9A: CPC – 1820 Paydown  
Bill Keohan, Chair of the Community Preservation Committee, presented Article 9A. Article 9 asks Town Meeting to reduce the borrowing authorization for the 1820 Court House by up to \$750,000. The Community Preservation Committee reduced the original \$5 million borrowing authority at the Fall 2014 Town Meeting, Spring 2015 Annual Town Meeting, and Spring 2016 Annual Town Meeting by \$500,000 each time. Reducing borrowing is a strategy of CPC to build up a reserve fund to avoid borrowing. This strategy will allow the CPC to avoid interest by paying for construction activities on the 1820 Court House with cash on hand. We are not sure of the exact amount right now which is why we are saying up to \$750,000. The Finance Director would like a buffer in case the revenues do not come in as expected.  
**Christopher Merrill made a motion to recommend Article 9A to Town Meeting. Scott Stephenson, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

➤ Article 9B: CPC – Steinway Library

Bill Keohan, Chair of the Community Preservation Committee, and Donna Curtin, Executive Director of Pilgrim Hall Museum, presented Article 9B. Article 9B asks Town Meeting to appropriate \$125,000 for the preservation rehabilitation and restoration of the Steinway Library at the Pilgrim Hall Museum. This would be contingent upon an agreement to allow free access to Town residents for 5 years and use of the Library by the Town for community meetings from time to time subject to availability. Pilgrim Hall Museum is the oldest museum in North American and is Plymouth's greatest repository of historical collections and archives. The restoration will help expand the potential and vitality of a nationally visible anchor institution, and will create new economic and educational benefits for the upcoming 2020 celebrations. The Library is a unique gathering space for public programs, presentations, meetings and events. The total project cost is \$210,000 for repair to the tile ceiling, flooring, UV, plaster, windows, equipment and technology. Under that space is a vault and archives and they are also in need of updates which will be considered later as a Phase II, estimated at another \$200,000. We would like to leverage the success of Phase I to raise additional funds for Phase II.

Questions:

- Will this project have to go through the same procurement process as town projects? (C Merrill) Procurement law does not apply but we did receive 3 quotes so we're comfortable with the estimate.
- Have you looked at cultural facility grant funding through the state? (C Merrill) We have not looked at that option. We are looking into federal grants now. Will look at state of MA Historical Commission which does require a public bidding process.

**Christopher Merrill made a motion to recommend Article 9B to Town Meeting. Sheila Sheridan, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

➤ Article 9C: CPC – Mount Pleasant

Bill Keohan, Chair of the CPC, presented Article 9C. Article 9C asks Town Meeting to appropriate \$1,028,000 to fund a grant to the Plymouth Housing Authority for the construction and/or renovation of Mount Pleasant School for senior affordable housing. This would be contingent on 4 things: a) the transfer of the property to the Plymouth Housing Authority for no consideration, b) any alterations to the façade must be approved by the Plymouth Historical Commission, and c) preservation of access to the park known as the "Hollow" containing 2 acres and to the children's play area, both areas to be permanently accessible to the public through an easement and d) Plymouth Housing Authority to grant the town a permanent affordable housing restriction dedicating the property to senior affordable housing. The school just vacated the building in August. The town should look at all options including selling or affordable housing. The Town had a similar Senior Affordable housing agreement with the Plymouth Housing Authority with the successful Cherry Hill II project. This money is being set aside so the Housing Authority can leverage it and raise more funding to see if this is a viable project. The project will be handled completely by the Housing Authority and not by the Building Committee or Procurement.

Questions:

- How does this project compare with the Slmes House? (H Helm) It doesn't. The Housing Authority would have complete responsibility for the project, not the town. The Housing Authority has proven success in raising funds and completing building projects within the budget.
- What is the rush? (P O'Brien) There is another article on the Town Meeting warrant to transfer the property from the School to the Board of Selectmen. The CPC wants people to know that affordable housing is an option for that building, before the Board of Selectmen sell the building.
- How many affordable housing units would fit into the 14,724 square feet? (J Moody) Senior units must meet state requirements. Housing Authority architects saw the space and think that 8 units would work best, six 1-bedroom units and two 2-bedroom units.
- Any idea of the total cost it would take to complete the project making 8 affordable senior housing units? (J Moody) The architects estimated \$1.4 million plus a \$200,000 contingency bringing the total to \$1.6 million including an elevator, so on average \$200,000 per unit.

- When was the building built? (J Moody) 1904 but it has been kept up to date as far as heating, windows, ventilation and some asbestos abatement.
- Would the units be rentals or purchased? (J Moody) Rentals.
- The Housing Authority wouldn't have direct access to these funds, correct? (J Moody) Correct, CPA funds are completely controlled by the Town, expenses are signed off by CPC and Finance Dept.
- Project cost is \$1.6 million, that leaves only \$572,000 for the Housing Authority to raise? (J Moody) Yes and the Housing Authority may or may not move forward after further studies.
- Have you received quotes on the cost to rehab the park? (P O'Brien) No, we are not proposing to do anything with that now. That would be a discussion later for the town to decide what to do with it.

Public Comment:

- Steve Striar believes it is too early for this article to move forward. The other article is not to sell the property but to shift the care and custody from the school to the Board of Selectmen. The \$1,028,000 has been accumulating for 4 years. It should remain in the Affordable Housing reserve fund and add 10% of approximately \$700,000 each year. We are being asked to pre-fund a project with very little detail. This is an attempt to move the process in the direction of affordable housing instead of letting the Board of Selectmen consider all of the options. They may decide to sell the building to a developer and add significant dollars to the tax base. He urged the committee to not recommend this article to Town Meeting.
- Everett Malaguti, Precinct 1 Town Meeting Member, said that this article is far from complete and he knows that Advisory & Finance likes complete packages. The article is based on opinion and not numerical figures. We should keep Mount Pleasant in the hands of the Selectmen. Senior housing is needed but this is not the best bang for the buck. He urged the committee to not support this article.
- Donna Curtin, Precinct 3 Town Meeting Member, said that this topic has had lively discussion in her precinct. The neighborhood is densely populated and she would like neighbors to be consulted for their feel on the topic. This article is offering an option, an opportunity for discussion, it is not unreasonable to put this on the table, the building could maybe continue to be a part of town history.
- Bill Keohan reiterated that the money was going to be placed in an account to allow the community to have a discussion.

Question:

If this opportunity does not work out will the money return to the CPC Affordable Housing reserve fund? (S Sheridan) Yes.

**Sheila Sheridan made a motion to recommend Article 9C to Town Meeting. Robert Cote, second.**

Discussion/Comments:

- I do not like the idea of giving clearance to over \$1 million to get the ball rolling. Why not \$200,000? Why 65% of the total project cost at this point? (E Kusmin)
- I feel the project is going to cost a lot more than \$1.6 million. The park being overgrown is an extreme understatement. I can't support this as this article asks us to go down a road we have gone down before. (H Helm)
- Once invested, if a new expense comes up, we will have incentive to throw more money at the project to protect the investment already made. There are too many unanswered questions so I do not support this article. (K Canty)
- They are asking to use funds to leverage discussion. This will help the elderly in town. There is a huge need for affordable housing in this town. The Housing Authority has a successful track record. I support this article to let Town Meeting have the discussion. (M Sirrico)
- They are asking for this article to be on the table simultaneously with the other Mount Pleasant article transferring care to the Board of Selectmen. (S Sheridan)

**The motion fails (4-7-1). Sheila Sheridan, Robert Cote, Betty Cavacco, and Marc Sirrico, in favor. Judith Fitzgerald, abstained.**

➤ Article 9D: CPC – Savery Pond II

Bill Keohan, Chair of the Community Preservation Committee, presented Article 9D. Article 9D asks Town Meeting to appropriate \$250,000 to purchase approximately 11.5 acres off Old Sandwich Road and State Road for open space and recreational purposes. The property was appraised at \$285,000. The land will be held under the care, custody and control of the Conservation Commission. Purchase of this property will help restore the water quality in Savery Pond, which is a major freshwater contributor to Ellisville Harbor. The property contains a 6.5 acre active cranberry bog that is within the Pool A Ocean Spray Cooperative. The bog would be taken out of production and the Pool A rights sold off for approximately \$45,000. Also, the bog equipment can be utilized at our Center Hill bog location. Closure of this bog would improve the water quality in the area. This property is located within an area of approximately 375 acres of CPA land just across Savery Pond. It is almost entirely within a Commonwealth of MA designated “Interim Wellhead Protection Area,” and is directly adjacent to a “Zone I Wellhead Protection Area”. It directly abuts an area identified as “Sand Plain Natural Community Systems Grassland”, an uncommon habitat type in the state.

Paula Marcou, Director of the Friends of Ellisville Marsh, said that the Friends group supports this article. They will formulate an official statement at their upcoming meeting. Savery Pond has seen persistent closings over the past six years because of poor water quality. Compared with 38 ponds in Plymouth, it rated “impaired” with the highest levels of pollution of all ponds studied (data is available at ellisvillemarsh.org). Purchasing this land is an essential first step to repairing the pond.

Public Comment:

Steven Striar said that while he does not like the CPC, he commends them on this project. The town should acquire this property.

**Patrick O’Brien made a motion to recommend Article 9D to Town Meeting. Betty Cavacco, second. The motion carries unanimously (11-0-0).**

*Harry Helm had stepped out of the room.*

➤ Article 9E: CPC – Beaver Dam

Bill Keohan, Chair of the Community Preservation Committee, presented Article 9E. Article 9E asks Town Meeting to appropriate \$599,000 to acquire 127.8 acres off Beaver Dam Road, known as Tidmarsh Farms West, for open space and recreational purposes. The intention of this purchase is to preserve the waters of Beaver Brook and surrounding areas. It is an area of critical environmental concern. The water from this property runs along Beaver Brook to Bartlett Pond and to White Horse Beach. The Department of Marine and Environmental Affairs is working diligently on this project and has provided a letter of support for this article. The land is comprised of cranberry bog upland woodlands, extensive frontage on Beaver Dam Road, and the “Church Lot” which sits at over 300 feet in elevation and is part of the highest elevated landscape on the eastern seaboard south of Acadia National Park. The land will be held in the care, custody and control of the Conservation Commission. The Massachusetts Audubon Society is purchasing approximately 190 acres of land to the east and is planning to build a Nature Visitor Center.

Questions:

- The application was dated December 2014, why has it taken so long? (S Sheridan) It takes time to negotiate acquisitions and get the appraisals done, once terms are agreed upon and funding is identified, it can move forward to Town Meeting.
- It was assessed in 2014? (S Sheridan) It was and it has since been reassessed.

**Patrick O’Brien made a motion to recommend Article 9E to Town Meeting. Scott Stephenson, second. The motion carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Patrick O’Brien made a motion to adjourn. Mike Lincoln, second.**

**The motion for adjournment carries unanimously (12-0-0).**

The meeting adjourned at 10:18PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kere Gillette