

COMMITTEE OF PRECINCT CHAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES  
THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2023 7:00 p.m.  
GREAT ROOM, TOWN HALL/HYBRID

7:00 p.m. Kathryn Holmes, COPC Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

GUESTS PRESENT: Peter Neville, TMM - remote  
Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance  
Harry Helm, Select Board  
Derek Brindisi, Town Manager  
Bill Abbott, Chair, Charter Commission  
Al DiNardo, TMM - remote  
Pat McCarthy - TMM  
Randy Parker - Chair of Conservation - remote  
Steve Bolotin - Master Plan Chairperson  
Kelly McElreath - Town Clerk

Those present participated in the Pledge of Allegiance

INTRODUCTION OF PRECINCT CHAIRS:

Precinct 1	Sarah Sibley - remote
Precinct 2	Thomas Pinto - remote
Precinct 3	Jerry Sirrico
Precinct 4	Clare Montanari, Clerk
Precinct 5	Kevin Lynch
Precinct 6	Bill Arienti
Precinct 7	David Golden
Precinct 8	Don Williams
Precinct 9	Kathryn Holmes, Chair
Precinct 10	Alan Costello
Precinct 11	Frank O'Brien - remote
Precinct 12	Pat Adelman
Precinct 13	Susan Wentworth
Precinct 14	Kristopher Houle - remote
Precinct 15	Wrestling Brewster
Precinct 16	Pompey Delafield
Precinct 17	Joe Hutchinson
Precinct 18	Alyse Bruneau - remote

7:10 p.m. Town Meeting Feedback: Mr. Arienti commended all involved with the Town Meeting; it went very well and noted that two members of his Precinct could not come in person and were able to attend virtually. Mr. Williams commented that the meeting dealt with planning issues which were in favor; he noted how the budget passed quickly and pointed out that it is hard to find information for every budget item in one place, there should be more debate on the budgets, a 1/4 of a billion dollars gets approved too quickly. Mr. Golden commented that the Moderator deserves special commendation for this hybrid meeting. Ms. Sibley commented that it was a well conducted Town Meeting, the Moderator did a phenomenal job; she said the hybrid increased accessibility, she needed to attend virtually. Peter Neville, TMM, commented that he

raised a question for Steve Bolotin to address which was the article that was brought to the floor by Precinct 3, the article suggests that any precinct could come to Town Meeting and ask for money for a feasibility study, he was surprised that the Town Manager and Lee Hartmann didn't have anything to say. Mr. Serrico thanked everyone who supported the Precinct 3 article; he said several years ago the Town sponsored an article to rehab the monument on the "green", the amount was \$20,000., part of the article was that the Town would do it if Precinct 3 could raise \$10,000. with town contributing \$10,000.; Precinct 3 raised the \$10,000. Ms. Adelman commended the Town Moderator and the Assistant Town Moderator, who had to step in at the last minute. Mr. Neville asked how the Precinct 3 proposal fits in with the Master Plan and he expected Mr. Bolotin who is Chair of that committee to comment. Ms. Holmes noted that Cedarville has done its own traffic study and anyone can come forward and propose articles. Mr. Serrico noted that the article proposed by Precinct 3 was the result of many people over several years complaining about the problems. It was noted that the Plymouth Center Master Plan of 1989 noted issues; he said there are a lot of problems in his precinct, people were asking for street changes, so Precinct 3 proposed this article.

7:20 p.m. Charter Costs: Ms. Holmes said at a previous COPC meeting there was discussion about placing the Charter on the agenda and there was discussion about the changes. She received several phone calls and emails asking about the costs, and two reports were sent out to the COPC: 1) New Costs of the Proposed Charter, agreed to and supported by Ms. Barrett, Mr. Brindisi, elected officials, (Mr. Helm, SB is present to discuss the costs), and 2) Alternative Costs Projections for the New Charter, Ms. Holmes noted she received 4 different spread sheets on the costs and they are not all the same. She said this is not for a debate but an opportunity for the Town to come and talk about the costs. She noted that some members of the COPC expressed an opinion that the COPC should not be discussing the Charter. Ms. Holmes noted she reached out to the League of Women Voters to see if they would moderate a debate and she was told that forums are planned to educate the public.

Mr. Helms, SB, said he created this cost projection and it represents just his analysis, he feels that all residents should have all information available, it is not an attack on the proposed charter, it is about information. However, it has become ammo to one side and an embodiment of nefarious to the other. He noted that the process began at the PACTV program two weeks ago and a presentation of costs that would be incurred, they were presented by our Town Manager and Finance Director to answer questions PACTV posed "how would the new Charter impact you or your department"? He said he asked for and received the excel spread sheet they were referencing; he took it upon himself to compare to what was on that spread sheet to what was in the proposed charter, paying attention to new committees, new responsibilities, new initiatives and new workloads it would create. He noted concepts in the charter that are listed as "may" but in the new charter are listed as "shall". He noted the potential legal costs should be factored in and spoke with legal counsel regarding additional costs, he also spoke with an attorney not employed by the Town and the Town Manager and created his estimate based on our FY22 legal expenses. He has served 8 years on the Advisory & Finance Board and 2 on the Select Board. He is aware that another resident has created an Alternative Cost Projection and it allows for a discussion; he is asking for the COPC or an organization of their choosing to coordinate a civil debate or discussion between him and a representative or the creator of the alternative cost projections, it should be public and televised. Mr. Costello noted that Mr. Helm has taken ownership of his document, he asked who has taken ownership of the alternative document? Ms. Holmes said we are not debating. Mr. Costello said he is asking if the other document is credible. Ms. Holmes noted that if we are to compare one to the other we need to do that in a different forum. Ms. Holmes said it was her intent tonight to take the Town's position and go through the costs; she said she is trying to get a debate that will not be sponsored by the COPC. Mr. Brewster thanked Mr. Helm for his comments and taking ownership of this

document, however, the other party who created the other document should also be public to give validity. He noted that Mr. Helm is asking for facts, and he, Mr. Brewster, is distressed at the level of social media and he would like to be able to compare with assurance that the other document is valid; he said this is not the place to debate but we are only given the presentation of one document. Mr. Hutchinson asked Mr. Brindisi if the cost of the positions to be hired is over the next 5 years, and Mr. Brindisi said "yes". Ms. Holmes said she has received many spread sheets from many people. Mr. Hutchinson said the topic demands a debate or discussion. Mr. Sirrico noted Mr. Helm's idea of carrying this in another session is important. Mr. Costello asked if the second document received today has credibility and asked who created the second document. Ms. Holmes noted that the COPC needs to discuss financial costs that are related. Mr. Golden said he did ask for a financial impact statement at the COPC meeting in January and he has received no response from the Charter Commission.

Mr. Brindisi noted that prior to the PACTV forum, he and Ms. Barrett, Mr. Hartmann, Ms. McElreath and Mr. Brothers met to discuss what costs would be associated with this Charter; this action is no different from what they do for a Town Meeting preparation, and they do this with the Select Board, indicating if a policy decision is executed there is a cost associated with it. He said it would be irresponsible for them not to do this in advance of May 20; the administration is trying to produce good information so people can make a good choice, and on May 22 the Town will execute what the voters decide. He said he and Mr. Helm sat down to formulate this document, refined it, had consultation with counsel, figures were "ballparked" at \$90,000. for legal expenses. He said they now have a part time GIS analyst, and based upon the new charter they would expect to increase the part time GIS analysts to full time; he noted that all of the costs have built in benefits associated with it, the costs are with the benefits included. (GIS is Geographic Information Systems) He noted the next item is communications but there is a cost associated with this, a minimum of 1.5 (FTE) full time employee. He noted having a second assistant Town Manager, which is already being discussed, to help manage the day to day operations to allow him to work with the SB on policy directives, some directives are back to the 1980s, a second assistant Town Manager will be needed very soon. Ms. Wentworth asked if the Charter doesn't go through would you still be looking for the positions, so there would be the proposed costs whether or not the Charter is approved. Mr. Brindisi said he would like to have a person focused on communications; the Charter would mandate this. Mr. Brindisi said communications is very important for a community of this size, and he would hope in the future to have one individual focus on communications. Regarding Master Plan revisions and redistricting, he said he thought they might hold off on that for a time. The charter would provide for the Town to hire an assistant Town Manager. Ms. Wentworth asked if there are line items, whether or not the Charter gets approved, that the Town would expect to implement. Mr. Brindisi said there is nothing that hasn't been covered that the Town would be advancing if the Charter did not pass, example two FTEs for the Planning Department to ensure all requirements are meeting the definitions of the Master Plan; Master Plan is at \$500,000. Ms. Holmes noted that regardless another assistant Town Manager is needed; Mr. Brindisi noted that in 2015 there was talk of bringing in a second assistant Town Manager. Ms. Holmes said many items in the Charter are things the Town should be doing, some of the costs should help our Town function better, the legal fees are Charter related but some resources covered are not necessarily connected to the new Charter. Mr. Brindisi said in 2022, if this Charter had passed a year ago the Town would already have a communications director; this was not done in our last budget cycle because the Town had to unfund 9 FTEs. The Charter will mandate. Mr. Williams, noting things out of the 1980s which need to be changed, asked if discussion should be focused on the rationale for doing these things rather than the costs and asked if the discussion be focused on these things being important rather than the costs being justified? Mr. Brindisi noted it is not his position to weigh in on what form of government our community has, that is the voters' decision, and it is not his role or the staff's role to determine what are the important components

in this Charter. Mr. Williams noted that all things being discussed are changes in the government, discussion is about getting things done more efficiently, more open communications. Mr. Brindisi said he, Mr. Hartmann, Ms. Barrett attended Charter Commission meetings and gave opinions and recommendations. Mr. Williams said some of these are going to cost money which is only one component and it is getting too much attention rather than the importance of these things which he, Mr. Brindisi, has already discussed. Mr. Neville, noted the \$500,000. of the Master Plan update, that figure is just to get it done, no approval involved. Mr. Neville asked why doesn't the Town have a Master Plan that is current, it is not the proposed Charter mandate; it is not a number to be assigned to the proposed Charter when it is a cost that should have been incurred historically. Mr. Delafield noted the important of the Charter, the Town is growing fast, is complicated and the costs being discussed are costs because of the growth, when you just put the costs in front of people they think only in terms of the cost, he said we cannot afford not to incur the costs regardless of the Charter and asked how that issue gets resolved. Mr. Brindisi said the community is growing and is super complicated, 104 square miles, coastline and action is taken daily to see what the Town can afford yet maintain taxes, there is no staffing to provide the services that we need. Mr. Golden asked if it is fair to say this is something that you will have to address at the Fall Town Meeting, if the Charter passes? Mr. Brindisi said some items he would like to get started on right away, the Town would need to set up a transition if the Charter passes putting the personnel in place. The Master Plan the Town would go to Town Meeting and would require assistance and have 1 FTE on day one. Mr. Golden asked if the Charter passes all this would be implemented right away versus if it doesn't pass some of these items might come to us but would be in the future. Mr. Brindisi said you would see some of them within the next 5 years, but not all of them over the next 5 years. Mr. Brindisi noted the COPC Oversight Legislative Support, COPC must have staff which is a cost. He said they would need 1 FTE employee to support Advisory & Finance because an article & budget review process would be on-going, 1 FT budget analyst and one half time to support COPC. Ms. Holmes said the COPC has been trying to get Legislative Oversight for many years, it was attempted by Mr. Costello when he was Chair, it is critical for the COPC to know where the Articles voted on are at, are we over or under budget, whether or not the Charter passes this is a requirement. Mr. Brindisi said any decision made prior to March, 2022, is before he was here, but if there is a need we will talk; COPC is a very important body and needs support. Mr. Houle said there needs to be a comparison between the costs of implementing the existing Charter and the proposed; some costs are not necessarily new costs, and asked if that can be prepared? Mr. Abbott was asked if there is any analysis done to the existing Charter on how it costs to implement that versus the new Charter.

8:05 p.m. Mr. Abbott said the Charter Commission was conscious with the financial aspects the entire time, trying to save the Town money, everything proposed does not have a dollar sign on it because they did not mandate a position to be added to the Town's finances. After the forum on March 13 he said he was surprised to see these numbers for the first time; the Commission had the Finance Director attend their meetings many times during the last two years and never once did a question come up about costs associated with implementing the Charter. He said we are comparing our new Charter with our existing Charter. He noted that the mention of the word "shall" which means you do the best you can, there is no big distinction between the word "shall" and "may". He said the figures were put out there with no backup at the time, produced at the last minute by Town staff, and it was done to have an impact on the voters; it was introducing the "fear factor". Mr. Abbott further noted the distinctions of the red color: if it is in red it is new, black it is already in the Charter. He noted a part of the Charter which stated the Planning Board "shall" develop and maintain a comprehensive Master Plan, in 3-12-2 it uses the word "shall" have specific duties, etc. This has been in the Charter for 20 years. Mr. Golden said we should not be debating. Mr. Abbott said he is not debating, these are the numbers we were invited to comment on; regarding the alternative numbers, which he did not produce, simply

shows that there are discrepancies with the numbers. Mr. Abbott noted the Legislative Oversight and Warrant Article Support at \$150,000. All the Charter is saying is when Town Meeting passes an article there will be an over-sight, it is essential. The item for enforcement of the Charter, given a \$47,000. estimate; he said the Commission followed the example of Falmouth; complaint and response which doesn't take much time, and will not be \$47,000. The Communications item: The Charter says nothing on this item. Item 7-1-1 which has a figure of \$172,000.; it says the Town will communicate with its citizens, there is no requirement to do anything under "communications" and now there is a figure.

Mr. Arienti made a motion that the COPC meet at least a week prior to May 20 and ask the Charter Commission at that meeting to present a cross analysis of their proposed charter, motion seconded by Mr. Golden. Mr. Arienti said any group or individual who would like to present their own cross analysis should do so by presenting it to the Charter Commission to be verified and included in their analysis or rejected. Mr. Abbott said he would approve anything that gets the facts out. Discussion: Mr. Houle noting that the analysis came from the Finance Department and asked if a comparable analysis be prepared for implementing the existing Charter. Mr. Brindisi said what is before the group are the changes, the "delta" are the changes. Mr. Houle is asking what is the cost of the existing Charter; he noted there are costs with the existing Charter, ie. Legal costs, the Master Plan is mandated by our existing Charter so they are not new costs; he would like to see what the Town paid over the last two years under the existing Charter versus the new costs, the Town Moderator cost of \$4000. is not a new cost. Mr. Brindisi said the Charter talks about the DPW, the Finance Department, having a Planning Department and costing all that out would be basically going through the operating budget. Mr. Brindisi said what we are talking about is the delta. Ms. Holmes acknowledged that Mr. Houle's question was not answered. Motion on the floor discussion. Mr. Hutchinson said an analysis from Mr. Brindisi of on-going costs of the Charter we have at this time, the delta would be implied in the proposed charter; some costs are tangible, some intangible and has to do with the compacity of Town Hall, and over-lay that with the costs of the Charter. Mr. Brindisi noted that Mr Hutchinson is asking to look at existing capacity, project where we will be in five years and how that is different with the Charter. He said a cost analysis of the existing Charter is looking at all the functions that go into the Charter; he said Mr. Hutchinson is recommending that in a five year projection, what is the Charter indicating. Mr. Brewster noted discussion earlier indicated costs, in changing government, cost in staying the same, the Charter is mandating things we should be doing; The Town staff is directed to come up with numbers; he said let's get away from accusations; this will cost money, there are things the Town will be doing in five years and would be great if we did do them sooner; it will cost money, but we have to deal in facts and reality; he said he is a member of the Charter Commission but we need to get away from all this visceral language. Ms. Adelman would like a debate on the finance and most importantly the substance of the Charter and only would agree to a debate if it was all inclusive. Mr. Arienti said he did not propose a debate, he proposed that the Charter Commission give us their cost analysis. Mr. Abbott said he was in agreement. Mr. Golden asked Mr. Abbott to account for the distinction between the words "shall" and "may"; he read a decision of the Supreme Judicial Court of 12/1/1947 which outlined the distinction. Mr. Abbott indicated that the word "shall" is in both Charters. Mr. Costello asked if there is a time frame; response was at least a week before the vote, by the 13th of May. Mr. Abbott asked who is doing the analysis; Ms. Holmes replied that it is the Charter Commission; Mr. Abbott asked who will provide the financial resources? Mr. Abbott said the Charter Commission won't be dissolved until May 20. Mr. Arienti noted that the Commission came in under budget should have resources to pay for a cost analysis; Mr. Abbott said they do not because they turned them over to the Select Board; they have \$1500. remaining in the budget for final expenses. Mr. Abbott noted that the alternative numbers provided illustrate that the Town's analysis is not correct. Mr. Costello, noting the forum of March 13, the Vice Chair of the Charter Commission said that this proposed Charter will be less

efficient and more expensive and asked what that comment was based on? Mr. Abbott said the only thing we should be talking about is what is the difference in cost between the two Charters; the costs involved with the existing Charter should be subtracted from the Town's analysis. Mr. Houle asked if Mr. Abbott could issue a response formally to the Town's analysis, indicating only the new costs. Mr. Abbott responded that this could be done. Mr. Arienti withdrew his motion, Mr. Golden withdrew his second.

Mr. Delafield asked Mr. Brindisi if there are things in the present Charter and not implemented, and are some of those costs reflected as additional costs? Mr. Brindisi said the analysis the Town conducted involved the red line changes. The only item that could be debated is the \$500,000. which is a one time cost. Mr. DiNardo expressed his concern that this has become political, only 4 weeks to go; suggested a yes group representative and a no group representative and a chair of each group needs to debate this. His concern is that this issue creates no animosity. Ms. McCarthy noted that the mail in ballots will be issued soon, there are many questions, there are forums scheduled and questions can be answered. She said issues made tonight are reflecting back in the cuts made last year, also in "red line" it indicates that every 10 years the Master Plan shall be done, the fact that the Master Plan is in the proposed Charter in "red" brings attention to that. She noted the League of Women's Voter Forum is April 27 and others are scheduled; she noted that the LWV is non-partisan. Mr. Sirrico noted that the COPC is not authorized to talk about issues not going to Town Meeting. Ms. Holmes said it will be going to Town Meeting because the costs will be before Town Meeting; Mr. Sirrico said that the costs would be after if the Charter gets approved; he suggested we go onto the next subject.

Mr. Hutchinson said we should ask the Town Manager to provide the base line tonight. He suggested that the Town give the analysis; that Mr. Brindisi said he could do an overlay with the years the Town has been on the current charter. Mr. Brindisi said there is no value in doing an analysis of the existing Charter unless you want to know what the departments' costs incur which is already known when you vote the budget; if you are looking for an analysis of the Town's proposed Charter costs versus what the projected costs would be with or without the Charter, then you would have a delta and compare those two bottom lines, this could be done; he said he sees no value in doing an analysis of the existing Charter.

8:45 p.m. Legislative Oversight Sub-Committee Re-establishment: Mr. Costello noted that several years ago, Chris Pratt was COPC chair and this Committee was started. He said a procedure was adopted that if the COPC voted that if they wanted to see an article, or have discussion about an article already voted on, or constructed, the Committee could ask the sponsor of the article to come before the COPC with an update. He said that was accomplished initially. He noted at times it was a "highlight" of this Committee, but at times it was not. Mr. Costello, said it did continue to grown, Karen Keane was instrumental in keeping a record of all projects and project sponsors; however, this was not sustained. Ms. Holmes noted that at the time they struggled to get information. Mr. Costello said they would ask department heads, chair of the CPC, etc. to come before the COPC or give a verbal over the phone. Ms. Holmes noted it was a struggle to get costs in the budgeting; she said she would like to put that group back together; asked if there should be a sub-committee or the entire COPC; she noted it is in the new Charter. Mr. Costello noted that Mr. Keohan placed it in the new Charter, Mr. Costello said the COPC could do this today, and we should, whether the Charter is approved or not approved. Ms. Holmes said she initially invited department heads to come to the COPC meetings and there was a debate over "over-time"; she said she spoke to Mr. Brindisi this morning and there is full support; guide lines need to be clear. Mr. Sirrico said this started when Ms. Pratt was chair of the COPC, there were discussions on Burke's Law (money that was not spent), and it grew when the Stephen's Field plan was initiated and it worked well, it was much more productive to have the individuals responsible come before to update.

Mr. Brewster made a motion to re-activate the Legislative Oversight Sub-Committee, motion seconded by Mr. Golden. Discussion: Mr. Golden noted a number of Chairs are not present who may be interested; he suggested establishing the committee tonight and ask who would like to participate. Ms. Holmes said she wants to establish from the people attending tonight those who want to be on the sub-committee, extend the invitation to the Chairs and the Vice Chairs who are not present and once the committee forms the officers would be declared. Ms. Montanari noted that Chairs and Vice Chairs could change with the re-organization that takes place after May 20 and asked if we should wait until June to do this. Ms. Holmes felt we need to go ahead and organize now. Mr. Lynch suggested we do not restrict it to Chairs and Vice Chairs and open it up to any Town Meeting member. Ms. Holmes noted that the subcommittee can make that decision. Mr. Golden asked about forming a sub-committee to define the parameters of what is suppose to be done. Ms. Holmes responded that everyone is able to define within the sub-committee exactly how it is going to be run. Mr. Golden said he is still motioning to form the sub-committee. Mr. Sirrico said you do not need a sub-committee, the COPC is the committee. He noted that when this was first discussed, they decided to get more information regarding the status of the Stephen's Field plan and Bill Keohan came before the COPC and gave a report; he was the first. Motion repeated by Mr. Golden is: to form a sub-committee for Legislative Over-sight, motion seconded by Mr. Brewster. Vote was 16-2-0.

Ms. Holmes asked for nominees for the sub-committee: Alan Costello, David Golden, Pat Adelman, Kathryn Holmes. Ms. Holmes said to open it up to the Precincts and see if more people would like to volunteer. She asked for the sub-committee to report what the guidelines are.

9:00 p.m. Public Comment: Pat McCarthy, Project Arts, noted the fund raiser for Mike Landers was a huge success, one of Mike's grandsons played with the band and during the night Mike was able to zoom in and see everyone. Mike is now home. The projected amount raised is \$30,000. just on ticket sales. She said anyone wishing to donate can go to "[ProjectArts.com](http://ProjectArts.com)". She noted there are 10 Project Arts concerts this summer.

Bill Arienti addressed the assembly: He read a prepared statement - "The freedoms that we know as defined in the blessings of liberty are under assault." He cited the incident which occurred on Thursday, April 26, 2023 when the members of the Tennessee legislature made plain that they have no respect for the first amendment or the electoral democratic process. He ended his statement by saying: "I stand here tonight to ask every member of Congress, all the State legislatures, each and every City Council, Town Council, Select Board, Board of Alderman and Town Meeting members to do what is right, to stand up, stand together and denounce this act of the Tennessee Legislature which violates every basis of democracy." There was applause from those present.

9:10 p.m. MEETING MINUTES: Ms. Montanari noted minutes of the March 16, 2023 were sent out Tuesday. Motion to approve made by Mr. Brewster, seconded by Ms. Holmes. Minutes were approved by vote of 12-0-6.

9:15 p.m. Don Williams addressed the group regarding water and phosphorus; the greatest source of phosphorus is septic, sediment from cranberry bogs and runoff. He is involved with the Herring Pond Water Association, there are issues with Cyanobacteria blooms. Phosphorus comes from fertilizers, septic tanks, iron will bind phosphorus and keep it moving very slowly, however, during the building boom the iron in the soil was saturated so phosphorus moves into the water more quickly, and with this happening we will have more cyanobacteria and algae blooms which are toxic. Plymouth has a sole source aquifer and if contaminated there is no

water to drink, etc.; all ponds are directly linked to that aquifer. He said it is unknown how much time will occur before the watershed is compromised. He said the Town should start planning for sewers, it can be staged but it is very expensive. He cautioned that there should be no "clear cut", residents should conserve water, and a stop should be implemented in mining sand and gravel. He said the aquifer is not far below the surface and the more soil taken away makes it easier for contaminants to enter the aquifer. He stressed assembling knowledge. He said there should be monitoring of watersheds and people who are violating Bylaws, and Bylaws need to be enforced. He said Randy Parker attended the meeting Monday night; suggestions from that meeting were sending letters to landscapers who are cutting down trees, setting fines, ensuring compliance, mandating a planting of two trees for every one taken down. Mr. Parker was asked about the "clear cutting" issue; Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Parker if he agreed with the suggestions made and if he will be active taking steps necessary to enforce the Bylaws. Mr. Parker said he did a summary as a result of the meeting held on April 17; part of the problem with enforcement is additional staff for monitoring and enforceability by the DMEA, additional staff means more tax dollars. He said DMEA (Department of Marine and Environment Affairs) will show up at a site to exercise enforcement, but they had guns and want Conservation staff to go to the site as well and that is a problem for staff. He said he went to a site last week and took staff, he said he agrees with Mr. Williams that there is nothing more important than water. He said with respect to Conservation's charge, it is the surface runoff. Mr. Parker said there is another enforcement, if not the DMEA, and whether it is fair to send staff out without guns, he does not care for guns, he suggested that a Police escort be used. He wants people to work together. Ms. Holmes said enforcement used to be handled by the DMEA, Mr. Gould's group, and to continued the enforcement with weapons they would have to move under the Chief of Police; an amicable decision was made between Mr. Gould and the Chief of Police; Mr. Gould elected to turn over their weapons and Mr. Gould's office is not under the Police Department. Ms. Holmes commented that the Police escort is a good solution. Mr. Costello said Mr. Williams previously that there was clear cutting taking place on public land, he said why is there confusion as to enforcement if it is on public land, and now we hear that a lot is on private land; Mr. Williams said it is happening on both. Mr. Williams said the Town has jurisdiction because the Bylaw says that nobody can clear cut and that taking down one or two trees is "clear cutting" because of the leaves being taken down. Mr. Williams said there is confusion about who is responsible. Ms. Holmes said she talked to Mr. Brindisi this morning, it is no longer Mr. Gould's responsibility for enforcement, it is the Conservation Commission's responsibility. Mr. Parker suggested reviewing the summary of the Herring Pond Watershed meeting. Mr. Parker said he and Mr. Williams are not adversaries. Mr. Hutchinson questioned if there is a clear Bylaw on clear cutting and if so, why is it so difficult to enforce?

New/Old Business: Master Plan agenda was sent out, meeting moved to April 27. Mr. Bolotin will conduct and the Town Meeting will vote on this in the Fall. Mr. Bolotin noted the Master Plan has not been updated for 20 years: there will be an article at the Fall Town Meeting at a cost of \$500,000.

Ms. Holmes noted that with the issues COPC needs to address she would like to be able to call an extra COPC meeting on the first Monday of a month if needed, motion to approve was made by Mr. Brewster, seconded by Mr. Delafield: vote was unanimous.

9:45 p.m. Kelly McElreath, Town Clerk, addressed those assembled regarding the upcoming Town election, May 20, noting the various ways voting can occur prior to the actual date. She noted that the new Town website has been installed and will be going live on April 24; the Town Meeting Handbook and other information can be obtained through the website. She noted she can prepare an excel sheet for each precinct with every registered voter on it.



Ms. Holmes noted that the Town Meeting handbook needs to be updated; she will send it out; she will need a subcommittee to update the new handbook.

Having no further business, Mr. Brewster made a motion to adjourn, motion seconded by Mr. Arienti, vote unanimous: meeting adjourned 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Clare Montanari, Clerk  
Precinct 4 Chair