

PLYMOUTH BOARD OF SELECTMEN

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2010

TOWN HALL MAYFLOWER ROOM

The Selectmen held a meeting on Tuesday, February 23, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. at Town Hall in the Mayflower Room.

Present: Richard J. Quintal, Jr., Chairman
David F. Malaguti, Vice Chairman
Daniel "Butch" Machado, Jr.
John T. Mahoney, Jr.
William P. Hallisey, Jr.

Mark Stankiewicz, Town Manager
Melissa Arrighi, Assistant Town Manager

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Quintal called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

LICENSES

POOL TABLE (NEW)

❖ **Plymouth Memorial Post 1822, VFW** (22 Seven Hills Road) requested:

- One Pool Table (approved by Inspectional Services)

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve one pool table for Plymouth Memorial Post 1822, VFW. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

VEHICLE FOR HIRE OPERATOR (NEW)

❖ **For Habilitation Assistance** (434 Court Street):

- Michael McFadden, 6 Tideview Path, Plymouth, MA 02360

(Issuance of the above license is subject to the requisite CORI background check and review of driving record.)

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve a Vehicle for Hire Operator License to Michael McFadden to operate as a driver for Habilitation Assistance. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

❖ **For Mayflower Taxi** (166 Gunners Exchange Road):

- Michael Dube, 249 Jordan Road, Plymouth, MA 02360

(Issuance of the above license is subject to the requisite CORI background check and review of driving record.)

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve a Vehicle for Hire Operator License to Michael Dube to operate as a driver for Mayflower Taxi. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

ONE DAY WINE & MALT LICENSE

- ❖ **Plymouth Community Theatre, Inc.** (Robert Hollis, 110 Fairview Lane) requested six (6) One Day Wine & Malt licenses for plays to be held at the Plymouth Center for the Arts on North Street from 8:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on the following dates:

February 26, 27, and 28 and March 6, 7, and 8, 2010

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve six (6) One Day Wine & Malt licenses (as outlined above) for Plymouth Community Theatre, Inc. / Robert Hollis. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

- ❖ **Pilgrim Hall Museum** (Ann Young, 75 Court Street) requested a One Day Wine & Malt License for an exhibit opening to be held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on February 27, 2010. Liquor liability Insurance is in place and trained staff will serve the alcohol.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve a One Day Wine & Malt License (as outlined above) for Pilgrim Hall Museum / Ann Young. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

COMMON VICTUALLER (NEW)

- ❖ **Anzalone, Inc. d/b/a Anzalone Café** (186 Water Street), Tracy Anzalone, Manager, requested a Common Victualler License.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve a Common Victualler License for Anzalone, Inc. d/b/a Anzalone Café. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES

Meeting Minutes – On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2010 Selectmen’s meeting. Voted 4-0-1, approved, with an abstention from Selectman Hallisey, who did not attend the January 19th meeting.

Wild Animal Permit – The Board granted a Wild Animal Permit pursuant to Chapter 23, Article IV of the Town of Plymouth Bylaws to Cathy Rhear of 96 Sandy Beach Road for her male Staffordshire Terrier (1 year old).

Committee Appointment / Affordable Housing Trust – The Board appointed Nancy Muckle of 12 Barnswallow Lane to the affordable housing representative seat on the Affordable Housing Trust, for a term effective February 24, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

Committee Appointment / Affordable Housing Trust – The Board appointed Kenneth Gonye of 320 Court Street as the banker representative on the Affordable Housing Trust, for a term effective February 24, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

Committee Appointment / South Shore Community Action – The Board appointed Patrick O'Brien of 15 Indian Avenue as Plymouth's representative on the South Shore Community Action Council, for a term effective February 24, 2010 through June 30, 2012.

Committee Appointment / Energy Committee – The Board appointed Anne M. Lynch of 6 Grey Shale to a seat on the Energy Committee, for a term effective February 24, 2010 through June 30, 2010.

Committee Appointment / No Place for Hate – The Board appointed Bill Burke of 26 Fairview Lane to a seat on the No Place for Hate Committee. Terms on this committee are permanent until the member resigns or is removed for due cause.

Committee Appointment / Cultural Council – The Board appointed Dana Malcolm of 240 Sandwich Street to a seat on the Cultural Council, for a term effective February 24, 2010 through February 23, 2013.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dale Webber, Precinct 3 Town Meeting Representative, distributed copies to the Board of M.G.L. Chapter 44 Section 53F½ pertaining to the governance of municipal enterprise funds. Mr. Webber expressed his belief that the (aforementioned) section of the law allows the use of surplus money within enterprise funds to reduce user fees and charges. There is \$3 million in retained earnings within the Water Enterprise Fund, he said, and, thus, the Board should consider using this extra money to reduce charges and provide incentives to draw more customers onto the water and sewer systems.

Chairman Quintal noted that he would allow public comment on the Town Meeting articles scheduled for review during the meeting, upon request.

No further citizens came forth to address the Board during public comment.

ANNUAL AND SPECIAL TOWN MEETING ARTICLES

ARTICLE 5

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Classification and Compensation Plans and the Personnel By-Law and Collective Bargaining Agreements contained therein, or take any other action relative thereto

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Assistant Town Manager Melissa Arrighi presented Article 5 pertaining to the Personnel Bylaw, collective bargaining agreements, and classification/compensation plans for town employees. Ms. Arrighi stated that she is one of the 23 non-union personnel whose benefits fall under the Personnel Bylaw.

Ms. Arrighi explained that two of the Town's collective bargaining units are ready to ratify their next three-year contract with the Town: AFSCME Local 2824 – Library and AFSCME Local 2824 – Crossing Guards / Meter Enforcement Officers. Ms. Arrighi reviewed the highlighted changes within each contract, noting that both groups have agreed to a 2% wage increase effective July 1, 2011, equaling a 0-0-2% wage increase for each year of the three year contract (wage increases were not provided for July 1, 2009, nor will they be provided for July 1, 2010).

Ms. Arrighi then reviewed proposed amendments to the Personnel Bylaw section of Article 5 (governing the benefits of the Town's non-union positions), which included (1) a 0-0-2% wage increase over three years (same as the collective bargaining agreements); (2) the clarification of language pertaining to step increases; (3) the elimination of call firefighters; (4) the addition of a floating personal holiday; (5) an increase in longevity pay; (6) an increase to the number of days that can be used from the Long Term Illness Account (LTIA) to care for a family member; (7) a change to the buy-back provision for time accrued in the LTIA; (8) the extension of reimbursement for professional development beyond academically-accredited courses; (9) an increase to the deferred compensation match for Department Heads; and (10) increases to employee health insurance co-payments.

Selectman Machado stated that he spoke individually with the other members of the Board—with the exception of Selectman Mahoney—about the proposed changes outlined within Article 5. While he expressed support for the ratification of the collective bargaining agreements, he affirmed his opposition to the changes proposed within the Personnel Bylaw for non-union employees. Selectman Machado alleged that non-union personnel already benefit from higher salary ranges and unmonitored use of vacation time. At a time when the Town has cut personnel and changed its hours of operation to save money, he said, the changes proposed for non-union employees would cost the taxpayers additional money. Selectman Machado advocated that the Board split its recommendation for Article 5 into two pieces, to approve the collective bargaining agreements but eliminate the proposed changes to the Personnel Bylaw for non-union employees.

Chairman Quintal seconded Selectman Machado's suggestion for discussion. Vice Chairman Malaguti refused to deny the entire set of amendments to the Personnel Bylaw on the basis that some of the items would bring non-union benefits to parity with union benefits.

Selectman Mahoney asked about the proposal to increase the Town's deferred compensation match for Department Heads.

Ms. Arrighi sought to clarify that the Town's 23 non-union positions range from the nine-member executive group (Department Heads) to the deputy fire chiefs to the administrative staff for the Town Manager's Office and Human Resources Department. In response to comments made by Selectman Machado about the salaries of non-union personnel, she noted that there are Division Heads (unionized positions) that make more than some of the Town's Department Heads. Ms. Arrighi explained that these employees are not allowed the collective bargaining process to bring forth requests for improved benefits. A group of non-union personnel submitted the proposed amendments to the Town Manager's Office to bring forth via the Personnel Bylaw in Article 5.

Chairman Quintal asked the Board to decide whether it wished to proceed with Selectman Machado's recommendation to accept the collective bargaining agreements but eliminate the proposed changes to the Personnel Bylaw. Vice Chairman Malaguti made the suggestion that the Board deliberate on the Personnel Bylaw, section-by-section. By consensus, the Board decided that it would approve the collective bargaining agreements and then discuss the proposed changes to the Personnel Bylaw, section-by-section.

Chairman Quintal read through the list of ten amendments to the Personnel Bylaw, one-by-one, and gave members of the Board the opportunity to object to each. No objections were made to amendments 1 (affirming the 0-0-2% wage increase over three years), 2 (the clarification of language pertaining to step increases), or 3 (the elimination of call firefighters).

In response to questions from Chairman Quintal pertaining to Amendment 4 (the addition of a floating personal holiday), Ms. Arrighi explained that the amendment would allow non-union personnel a floating holiday (in addition to the standard recognized holidays) to be used within the calendar year, as is afforded to the OPEIU and SEIU unions. Non-union personnel accrue earned time, she clarified, which is to be used for both vacation and sick time. This differs from the way time is earned and used by several of the union groups, she said, whose vacation and sick time are allocated separately. Ms. Arrighi provided information that demonstrated how holiday time—and the payment for holiday time—varies from bargaining unit to bargaining unit.

The Board moved on to Amendment 5 (the proposed increase to longevity pay). Selectman Machado cited what he believed to be the longevity pay amounts for the DPW union and made the statement that benefits for non-union personnel should be consistent with the union contracts. Ms. Arrighi noted that longevity pay for some of the other bargaining units, like the Teachers' union and Police union, is set higher and allocated differently than that of the DPW numbers cited by Selectman Machado.

Selectman Machado made a motion to keep longevity pay for non-union personnel at its current amount (thus rejecting Amendment 5). Vice Chairman Malaguti seconded the motion and the Board voted 3-2 in favor. Vice Chairman Malaguti and Selectman Mahoney cast the opposing votes.

Chairman Quintal made a motion to reject Amendment 4 (the addition of a floating personal holiday). Selectman Machado seconded the motion, and the Board voted 3-2 in favor. Vice Chairman Malaguti and Selectman Mahoney cast the opposing votes.

Pertaining to Amendment 6 (to increase the number of days, from five to seven, that non-union personnel can use from the Long Term Illness Account to care for a family member), Selectman Machado stated that the unions were only allowed five days. It is not fair, he said, to change this for the non-union group and not afford the same to all of the Town's bargaining units. Selectman Machado made a motion to reject Amendment 6 (thus leaving the numbers of days allowed for use from the LTIA account at five). Chairman Quintal seconded the motion, and the Board voted 5-0-0 in favor.

Referring to Amendment 7 (the proposal to change to the buy-back provision for time accrued in the Long term Illness Account), Chairman Quintal asked if the LTIA buy-back provision is the same for all groups. Selectman Machado noted that the contract with which he is most familiar allows employees to buy-back 100 days at \$25 per day, but the employee must have at least 200 days to initiate the buy-back. Ms. Arrighi noted that she would have to review the contracts of all of the Town's bargaining units to determine those that include this provision. Town Manager Mark Stankiewicz explained that the proposed amendment would leave the buy-back maximum unchanged while allowing non-union employees to reach buy-back eligibility more quickly. Selectman Machado said that, with the Town's other union groups, buy-back happens only in conjunction with retirement, not voluntary separation. He made a motion to approve Amendment 7 with the stipulation that the words "upon voluntary separation" be removed and replaced with "on retirement." Selectman Hallisey seconded the motion, and the Board voted 3-2 in favor. Vice Chairman Malaguti and Selectman Mahoney cast the opposing votes.

The Board discussed Amendment 8, the proposal to extend eligibility for reimbursement for professional development beyond academically-accredited courses. Ms. Arrighi explained that, with this proposal, the Town will reimburse non-union employees up to \$420 per fiscal year for job-specific seminars or workshops. Mr. Stankiewicz noted that department heads must budget for professional development expenses each year, and staff must seek approval from their respective department head prior to attending any accredited or non-accredited training. By show of hands upon Chairman Quintal's inquiry, the Board demonstrated its approval of Amendment 8 to the Personnel Bylaw.

The Board discussed the proposal in Amendment 9 to increase the Town's match of deferred compensation for Department Heads from 15% to 25%. Selectman Machado stated that the Town cannot afford such a measure, and he made a motion to reject Amendment 9 (and, thus, keep the deferred compensation match for Department Heads at 15%). Vice Chairman Malaguti seconded the motion for discussion but cautioned the Board against what appeared to be a decimation of the benefit requests from non-union personnel—a move, he said, that could encourage the group to organize.

Selectman Machado noted that the former Town Manager dissolved the Personnel Board that weighed and offered recommendations on requests for non-union personnel benefits.

Selectman Hallisey complimented the quality of the Town's non-union personnel and attributed his decision to deny some of the requested benefits to the economy and the strain it has placed on the Town's budget. Chairman Quintal echoed Selectman Hallisey's comments and added his belief that non-union benefits should be on par with union benefits. Mr. Stankiewicz advised the Board to consider how aligning non-union benefits with union benefits could affect the outcome of contracts or encourage non-union personnel to unionize.

The Board voted unanimously in favor of Selectman Machado's motion to reject Amendment 9 (and, thus, keep the deferred compensation match for Department Heads at 15%).

Chairman Quintal asked if the Board had any objections to Amendment 10 (increases to employee health insurance co-payments). No objections were made.

PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED CHANGES TO FEE SCHEDULES

Chairman Quintal opened a public hearing to consider proposed changes to several of the Town's fees and rates for services.

DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONAL SERVICES

Paul McAuliffe, Director of Inspectional Services, presented the Board with a list of proposed changes to the fee schedule for plumbing, gas, and electrical inspection fees. Mr. McAuliffe referred the Board to the list and comparison sheet of current fees and proposed changes. These fees, he said, have not been changed since 1999, and he characterized the proposed increases as reasonable and comparable to other communities.

Mr. McAuliffe responded to questions from the Board regarding specific increases and the latest trends on the number of permits filed. While the number of permits for new construction has decreased, he said, the number of permits for remodeling and other miscellaneous work has remained consistent. Mr. McAuliffe noted that the cost to travel to distant areas of town has increased dramatically since 1999, and these new fees, he said, will help his department to break even on expenses. In response to a question from Chairman Quintal about the new hours at Town Hall, Mr. McAuliffe noted that residents appear to find the new hours more convenient for scheduling inspections. If necessary, he said, his department will schedule additional hours for inspections on Friday mornings to accommodate any significant increase in permit requests.

Chairman Quintal asked Mr. McAuliffe if his department could manage if the Board were to reduce the proposed fee increases in half this year and approve the other half in 2011 (i.e., if a \$20 increase to a fee was proposed, the Board would approve only a \$10 increase in 2010 and the other \$10 in 2011). Mr. McAuliffe noted that any deficiency in his department's budget that is not covered by fees must be subsidized by the General Fund.

Chairman Quintal opened the hearing to public comment. No citizens came forth. Chairman Quintal then made a motion to (a) approve the proposed fee increases presented by the

Director of Inspectional Services at a 50% reduction, now, and (b) approve the remaining 50% balance of the proposed increases for the following year [see fee schedule, pages 8-9]. Selectman Machado seconded the motion, and the Board voted 5-0-0 in favor.

INSPECTIONAL FEES – PLUMBING, GAS, & WIRING			
	Current	Proposed	Approved 2010
RESIDENTIAL PLUMBING & GAS			
RESIDENTIAL PLUMBING			
Permit (<i>includes first fixture</i>)	\$35.00	\$50.00	\$43.00
Additional	5.00	10.00	8.00
Septic tank or water service combo – Pinehills Exempt	35.00	50.00	43.00
Tank-less or hot water heater	35.00	35.00	35.00
Water heater / gas boiler / backflow combo	40.00	70.00	55.00
RESIDENTIAL GAS			
Permit (<i>includes first fixture</i>)	35.00	50.00	43.00
Additional	5.00	10.00	8.00
Water heater – Combo of Plumbing & Gas (<i>if taken by the same installer and permit filed at same time</i>)	35.00	35.00	35.00
Re-Inspection Fee	40.00	40.00	40.00
COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PLUMBING & GAS			
COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL – PLUMBING			
Permit (<i>includes first fixture</i>)	70.00	100.00	85.00
Additional	10.00	15.00	13.00
Septic tank or water service combo – Pinehills Exempt	50.00	50.00	50.00
Tank-less or hot water heater	60.00	60.00	60.00
COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL – GAS			
Permit (<i>includes first appliance</i>)	70.00	100.00	85.00
Additional	10.00	15.00	13.00
Water heater – Combo of Plumbing & Gas (<i>if taken by the same installer and permit filed at same time</i>)	60.00	60.00	60.00
Re-Inspection Fee	40.00	40.00	40.00
RESIDENTIAL ELECTRICAL/WIRING			
Dwelling Unit Complete (<i>service, security, fire alarm, and communications included if completed by same installer</i>)	150.00	175.00	163.00
Additions, Renovations (<i>including garages, etc.</i>)	50.00	75.00	63.00
Temporary Service	25.00	40.00	33.00
Permanent Service	25.00	45.00	35.00
Security, Fire Alarm, or Combination	40.00	55.00	48.00
Power Limited (<i>communication or low voltage wiring</i>)	40.00	55.00	48.00
Swimming Pool	50.00	75.00	63.00
Solar P/V Systems	50.00	125.00	88.00
Single Inspection Fee	25.00	40.00	33.00
After-Hours Inspection (<i>minimum 2 hours</i>)	N/A	62.50	33.00
Re-Inspection Fee	20.00	20.00	20.00

COMMERCIAL ELECTRICAL/WIRING			
	Current	Proposed	Approved 2010
Temporary / Permanent Service	75.00	100.00	88.00
New Building, Addition, or Renovation up to \$100,000 in building value (service, security, fire alarm, and communications included if completed by same installer)	150.00	175.00	163.00
Each additional \$20,000 in building value, or fraction thereof	30.00	45.00	38.00
Building Shell Only: 10,000 sq. ft. or less	150.00	175.00	163.00
Building Shell Only: 10,001 – 20,000 sq. ft.	175.00	200.00	188.00
Building Shell Only: 20,001 – 50,000 sq. ft.	225.00	250.00	238.00
Building Shell Only: over 50,001 sq. ft.	350.00	400.00	375.00
Solar P/V Systems	N/A	200.00	100.00
Security, Fire Alarm, Communications, Power Limited	100.00	125.00	113.00
Yearly Maintenance Permit	500.00	550.00	525.00
Carnivals	50.00	75.00	63.00
Swimming Pool	150.00	175.00	163.00
Single Inspection Fee	75.00	100.00	88.00
After-Hours Inspection (<i>minimum 2 hours</i>)	N/A	115.00	58.00
Re-Inspection Fee	20.00	20.00	20.00

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Deputy Chief Donald Brown presented the list of proposed increases to the Fire Department’s Fire Prevention & Code Compliance fees, which, he said, will standardize all of the department’s fees. He responded to a question from Selectman Machado regarding the newly-proposed fee to pump out flooded basements, noting that this is a safety-related service that the Fire Department can provide, but at a cost.

The Board discussed this new service and its related fee. Fire Chief G. Edward Bradley explained that flooded basements pose an electrical hazard and, therefore, a fire hazard; while the Fire Department cannot spare on-duty staff to perform pumping services, he said, it can call in off-duty personnel to respond to requests for this kind of safety-related service.

Seeing no further inquiries from the Board on the Fire Code & Compliance Fees, Chairman Quintal opened the presentation to public comment. No citizens came forth.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Mahoney, the Board voted 5-0-0 to approve the proposed fee increases pertaining to Fire Prevention & Code Compliance, as presented by the Fire Department [*see fee schedule listed on pages 10-11*].

Chief Bradley then presented new fees for the use of the Cedarville Community Room within the Cedarville Fire Station which, he said, will help the Town cover the cost to clean and maintain the space and supply expendables associated with the use of the room. These new fees, he explained, will apply to private groups—much like the use of rooms at the Library—while Town boards and committees that conduct Town-related business, like the Cedarville Steering Committee, will be exempt from the fee.

Seeing no further inquiries from the Board, Chairman Quintal opened the hearing to public comment. No citizens came forth.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted 5-0-0 to approve the new fees for the use of the Cedarville Community Room, as presented by the Fire Department [see fee schedule listed below, spanning pages 10-11].

FIRE PREVENTION, CODE COMPLIANCE, & MISC. FIRE DEPARTMENT FEES			
	Expiration / Renewal	Permit Fee	Inspection / Detail Fee
Items in bold with * = New or Modified Fee			
Smoke & Carbon Monoxide (<i>Note: \$50 per unit up to \$500.00 per building</i>)	60 days from issue	\$50.00	
Plan Review Drop-Off – Commercial Building Plan Review		100.00	
Plan Review Drop-Off – Residential Building Plan Review (<i>1-2 family</i>)		50.00	
Plan Review Drop-Off – Residential Multi-Family Plan Review (<i>3+ units</i>)		100.00	
Fire Alarm Systems – Residential (<i>1-2 family; per unit</i>)	6 months	50.00	50.00
Fire Alarm Systems – Residential (<i>multi-family; per unit</i>)	6-12 months	50.00	50.00
Fire Alarm Systems – Commercial (<i>new or major renovation</i>)	12 months	*50.00	*Sq. ft. x 0.05
Fire Alarm Systems – Modification of Existing System	6 months	50.00	50.00 +\$3 per device
Fire Sprinkler Systems – Residential (<i>1-2 family; per unit</i>)	6 months	50.00	50.00
Fire Sprinkler Systems – Residential (<i>multi-family; per unit</i>)	6-12 months	50.00	50.00
Fire Alarm Systems – Commercial (<i>new or major renovation</i>)	12 months	*50.00	*Sq. ft. x 0.05
Fire Alarm Systems – Modification of Existing System	6 months	50.00	50.00 +\$3 per device
Hood Suppression Systems	6 months	50.00	50.00
Fuel Storage	1 year	50.00	Inclusive
Oil Burner Installation		50.00	Inclusive
Tank Installation (<i>per tank</i>)	Project Specific	50.00	Inclusive
Tank Removal	Project Specific	50.00	50.00
Storage Tank Registration Reports	Annual	*50.00	Inclusive
Permit to Maintain Storage Facility	Annual	50.00	Inclusive
Application for License	Project Specific	*50.00	Inclusive
Certificate of Registration	Annual	*50.00	Inclusive
Cutting/Welding Operations	Project Specific	50.00	Detail required
Fuel Transfer Tank (<i>119 gallons max.; per vehicle</i>)	Biannual (even years)	50.00	Inclusive
Marine Fueling Application / Permit	Annual	50.00	Inclusive
Fireworks	Event Specific	50.00	Detail required
Un-vented Gas-fired Space Heater		50.00	Inclusive
Storage of Black Powder, Smokeless Powder, Ammunition & Primers	1 year	*50.00	Inclusive
Propane Cylinders for Exchange (<i>per location</i>)	Annual	50.00	Inclusive
Demolition of a Structure	Project Specific	*50.00	Inclusive
Cannon / Mortar Firing	Annual	*50.00	Inclusive
Blasting	Project Specific	50.00	Detail required
Bonfires & Christmas Trees	One Day Only	100.00	Inclusive
Burning Permit – Residential		25.00	Inclusive
Burning Permit – Agricultural		100.00	Inclusive
Burning Permit Violations (<i>first offense</i>)		100.00	
Dumpster Permit	Annual	*50.00	Inclusive
Waste Oil Tanks	Annual	50.00	Inclusive
Retail Display and Sale of Flammable / Combustibles	Annual	50.00	Inclusive
Re-Inspection Fee		100.00	

FIRE DEPARTMENT FEES, CONTINUED	Expiration / Renewal	Permit Fee	Inspection / Detail Fee
Fire Watch Details (<i>3 hour minimum</i>)			Hourly rate x 1.5 +10% admin. fee
Records Search (<i>pro-rated based on employee hourly rates</i>)			25.00
Copies of Records / Reports			\$0.20 per page
Statutory Quarterly Inspections – innholders, theaters, nursing facilities, etc.			50.00
Statutory Health Care Facility Inspections – hospitals, clinics, outpatient, etc.			50.00
Statutory Annual Inspections – gas stations, correctional facilities, etc.			50.00
Statutory Annual Liquor License Establishment Safety Inspections			50.00
Fire Alarm Master Box Fee (<i>systems connected to Town Fire Alarm System</i>)	Annual		300.00
Fire Alarm Master Box Short Term Disconnection – Class 1: 1 Technician			50.00
Fire Alarm Master Box Short Term Disconnection – Class 2: 5 Tech’s or Less			100.00
Fire Alarm Master Box Short Term Disconnection – Class 3: 6+ Tech’s			150.00
Pump Jobs for Flooded Basements			*150.00 +\$40/hr.
Cedarville Community Room			\$45/hr for first three consecutive hours; \$10/hr each additional consecutive hour

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – OFF ROAD VEHICLE STICKER FEE

David Gould, DPW Environmental Manager, presented a proposal to increase the price of the Off-Road Vehicle (“ORV”) Sticker from \$35 to \$40 (senior rate from \$12 to \$20) for the 2010 season. In 2007, he noted, the Board approved the DPW’s request to make incremental increases to the ORV price from \$25 to \$40 in \$5 installments over a three-year span. In 2009, Mr. Gould explained, the Board did not implement the final \$5 increase to the ORV sticker, but with the anticipated costs of the seawall repair and legal fees associated with defending the Beach Management Plan, the \$5 increase for 4x4 beach access is needed. Even at \$40, he said, Plymouth’s ORV fee will be the lowest on the South Shore and Cape Cod.

The Board posed questions to Mr. Gould regarding the effect that the heightened restrictions on 4x4 access enacted early in the 2009 season may have had on sticker sales. Mr. Gould explained that, although the nesting issue (of endangered shorebirds) that was expected to close access to the vehicle crossover last summer did not fully materialize, the sale of stickers was affected. Much of the nesting activity takes place in early to mid-June each year, he noted, requiring varying restrictions on vehicle access until late July.

The Board discussed the proposed increase to the ORV sticker. Selectman Hallisey expressed hesitation to increase the fee due to what he described as increasing limits on access to Long Beach. Vice Chairman Malaguti cited the Board’s 2007 vote to implement incremental increases to the ORV fee, which, he said, is consistent with the Board’s recent discussions on making gradual—rather than dramatic—increases to Town fees. Vice Chairman Malaguti also noted the cost required to defend the appeals of the Town’s Beach Management Plan, which is vitally important to the Town’s ability to keep the beach open to the public.

Mr. Gould noted that all coastal communities face issues with beach access due to the annual nesting of endangered shorebirds. Two appeals of the Town’s Beach Management Plan were filed since the last increase to the ORV sticker in 2008, he said, requiring the Town to expend funds for legal defense of the plan. Mr. Gould stated his belief that, for the most part,

Plymouth citizens are aware of the limits placed on access to Long Beach. The cost of the ORV sticker remains reasonable, he said, and sales remain fairly consistent each year.

Chairman Quintal opened the hearing to public comment. No citizens came forth.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Mahoney, the Board voted to approve an increase to the Off-Road Vehicle Sticker, as presented by the Environmental Management Division (new fees: \$40 – general rate, \$20 – senior rate). Voted 3-2, approved. Selectman Machado and Selectman Hallisey cast the opposing votes.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – SOLID WASTE / TRANSFER STATION FEE

Hector Castro, Director of Public Works, addressed the Board to discuss proposed increases to the Town's solid waste fee (a.k.a. Transfer Station Pass). Mr. Castro requested that the Board allow him some additional time to review new information and projected figures related to the solid waste fee and related enterprise fund.

The Board made no objections to the request.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – WATER & SEWER RATES

Mr. Castro provided a presentation on the proposed rates for water & sewer service for FY2011. The Town, he noted, again engaged the services of Pioneer Consulting to perform a sufficiency study on the water and sewer enterprise funds, which revealed that water revenues continue to meet the cost of providing water service and related capital improvements. On the other hand, he explained, the year will end with only a small balance remaining in the Sewer Enterprise Fund, even after continued subsidization from the General and Stabilization funds. Mr. Castro recommended a 3% rate increase as part of phased approach to bringing the Sewer Enterprise Fund to solvency, which, he predicted, will amount to a \$17 increase to the average sewer bill over the course of the year.

Mr. Castro responded to questions from the Selectmen regarding plans to expand the Town's sewer infrastructure, noting that it will take him at least three months to research and formulate an expansion plan. In reference to the information provided by Mr. Webber during public comment, Mr. Castro explained that surplus revenues within the Water Enterprise Fund should first be applied to the much-needed replacement of 3.5 miles of aging jacketed water mains before being used toward rate reductions.

Paul Wohler, Utilities Superintendent, noted that all residences / establishments in proximity of the Town's water and sewer infrastructure are connected. Sewer mains are much more expensive than water mains, he explained, as they require more extensive installation measures and pumping equipment. Mr. Wohler reported that the feasibility studies conducted on the extension of sewer service along Samoset Street and Warren Avenue indicated the need for major capital expense to accomplish such undertakings.

Mr. Stankiewicz explained that there are three ways the Town could fund sewer expansion: (1) through the increase of sewer rates, which would put the burden squarely on those currently connected to the system; (2) through a betterment and mandatory connection process; and (3) through an override (allowed by State provision) for capital water and sewer projects, which would be subject to approval by the voters, not all of whom would benefit from the expansion.

Chairman Quintal opened the hearing to public comment.

Roger Silva advised the Board to give ample notice of any plans to mandate sewer connections, so that homeowners / property owners can plan the necessary maintenance or replacement of their septic systems accordingly.

Chairman Quintal and Selectman Hallisey both described the sewer fees and rates as “discouraging” to new connections. Chairman Quintal noted that he would ask the Chamber of Commerce to offer feedback and ideas on ways to make connection to the system more attractive to new business.

No further citizens came before the Board to offer public comment.

Mr. Castro responded to further questions from Chairman Quintal and Selectman Machado regarding any other measures that would help the Town to avoid the proposed sewer rate increase for FY2011. Without raising fees, Mr. Castro explained, any revenue shortfall within the Sewer Enterprise Fund would require subsidy from the General Fund. He reiterated his recommendation that the Board approve a 3% increase to the sewer rates this year, rather than a more significant increase next year.

During the discussion, Chairman Quintal, Vice Chairman Malaguti, and Selectman Machado expressed concerns as to whether the Town’s wastewater treatment facility is being operated and maintained properly. Selectman Machado suggested that the Town conduct an annual inspection. Mr. Castro noted that he would investigate the Board’s concerns and provide a follow-up report.

In response to an inquiry from Selectman Machado pertaining to Mr. Webber’s earlier comments regarding the use of the surplus in the Water Enterprise Fund to offset rate increases, Mr. Castro and Mr. Wohler both reiterated the importance of using Water Enterprise Funds for the replacement of the Town’s aging water system. Mr. Stankiewicz advised the Board to avoid lowering rates with surplus funds, as surplus funds will eventually become depleted, thus forcing the Board to enact dramatic increases in the future.

Selectman Mahoney made a motion to approve a 3% increase to the sewer rates for FY2011, as proposed by the Department of Public Works [*see fee schedule listed on page 14*]. Vice Chairman Malaguti seconded the motion, and the Board voted 4-1-0 in favor. Selectman Machado cast the opposing vote.

WATER RATES & FEES	Current	Proposed	Approved FY2011
Minimum Charge (no consumption in minimum)	\$25.00	No change	\$25.00
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 1 st Step: 0-3,000 cf	1.16 per 100 cf	No change	1.16 per 100 cf
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 2 nd Step: 3,001-9,000 cf	1.64 per 100 cf	No change	1.64 per 100 cf
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 3 rd Step: over 9,000 cf	1.96 per 100 cf	No change	1.96 per 100 cf
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 3”	60.00	No change	60.00
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 4”	90.00	No change	90.00
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 6”	180.00	No change	180.00
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 8”	420.00	No change	420.00
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 10”	700.00	No change	700.00
Private Fire Protection – Annual Charge: 12”	900.00	No change	900.00
Cross Connection Testing	50.00	No change	50.00
Connection Fee – 1” service	650.00	No change	650.00
Connection Fee – 1.5” service	850.00	No change	850.00
Connection Fee – 2” service	950.00	No change	950.00
Meter Fee	250.00	No change	250.00
System Development – Residential, per lot	250.00	No change	250.00
System Development – Commercial, per 1,000 sq. ft.	150.00	No change	150.00
Meter Pit	300.00	No change	300.00
Non-Emergency Turn On / Shut Off	60.00	No change	60.00
Seasonal Turn On / Shut Off	25.00	No change	25.00
Final Reads	25.00	No change	25.00
SEWER RATES	Current	Proposed	Approved FY2011
Minimum Charge (no consumption in minimum)	\$85.00	No change	\$85.00
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 1 st Step: 0-3,000 cf	3.98 per 100 cf	3% increase	4.10 per 100 cf
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 2 nd Step: 3,001-9,000 cf	5.39 per 100 cf	3% increase	5.55 per 100 cf
Metered charges per 100 cubic feet – 3 rd Step: over 9,000 cf	6.34 per 100 cf	3% increase	6.53 per 100 cf

Chairman Quintal closed the hearing on fee increases and called for a five minute recess at approximately 9:00 p.m. to prepare for the next presentation.

ARTICLE 30 – SEMASS CONTRACT

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Town Manager, pursuant to General Laws Chapter 30B, Section 12(f), to enter into an extension of the Waste Acquisition Agreement with SEMASS Partnership for the disposal of the Town’s solid waste at the SEMASS Facility located in Rochester, Ma., for a term not to exceed twenty years; or to take any other action relative thereto.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Chairman Quintal reconvened the meeting at 9:05 p.m. and asked if the Board wished to take agenda items out of order to hear the SEMASS article (Spring Annual Town Meeting Article 30) while representatives from Covanta / SEMASS were present during the meeting. Seeing no requests for a presentation from his fellow Selectmen, Chairman Quintal asked if the Board felt comfortable going forth with approval of the article without a presentation. No objections were offered, and, thus, by consensus, the Board recommended Article 30 of the 2010 Annual Town Meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: RESPONSIBLE CONTRACTOR BYLAW

ARTICLE 25

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Town Bylaws, Chapter 140, Responsible Contractor Bylaw, Section 140-1, by deleting the section entitled “PREVAILING RATE” and adding the following sentence under “TRAINING:” “This obligation may be waived by the Town if it is determined to be in the Town’s best interest,” or any other changes relative thereto.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Chairman Quintal opened a hearing to discuss proposed changes to the Town’s Responsible Contractor Bylaw (2010 Annual Town Meeting Article 25).

Ms. Arrighi explained that an internal committee comprised of Town staff and a member of the Board of Selectmen was formed to review the Town’s Responsible Contractor Bylaw. Following evaluation of the bylaw, Ms. Arrighi reported, the committee—Pam Hagler (the Town’s Procurement Officer), David Gould (the former Acting Director of Public Works), Arthur Montrond (the School Department’s Facilities Manager), and Vice Chairman Malaguti—put together some changes that it felt would improve the bylaw, specifically the section pertaining to prevailing wage and training/apprenticeship programs.

Vice Chairman Malaguti noted that the Procurement Division has received many letters from local contractors who communicated that the training/apprenticeship requirement causes a hardship and prevents them from bidding on Town projects. By altering the language of the bylaw (as noted in the warrant article), he said, the Town would have more flexibility to waive the training requirement and, thus, open more jobs to local contractors who are likely to employ local residents.

Pam Hagler, Procurement Officer, briefly discussed the regulations of the Town’s Responsible Contractor Bylaw that are triggered by projects that exceed \$750,000 (or \$200,000 for projects defined by M.G.L. Chapter 30, Section 39M). The committee, she noted, identified two changes that would improve the effectiveness of the bylaw: (1) the removal of redundant language pertaining to prevailing wage and (2) the provision of flexibility with regards to the requirement of contractor-sponsored training/apprenticeship programs. With regards to the removal of the section on prevailing wage, Ms. Hagler noted that State law already requires municipalities to pay prevailing wage for any of its construction projects. Pertaining to the requirement of contractor-sponsored training/apprenticeship programs, Ms. Hagler reported that local contractors repeatedly contact her office to explain that they cannot comply with the training provision, despite the intent of Town Meeting to put local contractors and their employees to work when it originally adopted the bylaw. By giving the Town some flexibility to waive the training requirement, she said, the committee felt that it could eliminate any unintended consequences that might prevent local competitors from bidding on Town projects.

Chairman Quintal opened the hearing to public comment.

Scott Gustafson of Cedarville voiced his opposition to the changes proposed for the Responsible Contractor Bylaw. Since the inception of the bylaw, Mr. Gustafson said, many projects have been awarded to non-union contractors. He touted the benefits of a professionally trained construction workforce and insisted that there is a direct cost savings on projects when contractors use apprenticeship training. Mr. Gustafson stated his belief that the proposed amendments to the bylaw are not legal, and he questioned whether the committee presented any data to demonstrate what cost savings the Town might achieve if the amendment is approved. Mr. Gustafson advocated for changes that would strengthen the bylaw, not weaken it.

Chairman Quintal asked Mr. Gustafson if he could put together some suggestions as to how the Town might be able to appease smaller construction companies and add clauses to the bylaw that will require the use of local employees on Town projects. Mr. Gustafson responded that he would be happy to provide input on the Town's Responsible Contractor Bylaw, but noted the legal complications associated with placing residency restrictions on construction projects.

Members of the Board posed questions to Mr. Gustafson and Ms. Hagler. Ms. Hagler again reiterated her concern that the training/apprenticeship requirement has prevented local contractors from bidding on Town projects, including, for example, the recent Eel River Headwaters Restoration undertaking. Any road construction project over \$200,000 and any building construction project over \$600,000 will trigger the regulations of the Responsible Contractor Bylaw, Ms. Hagler explained, and most of the Town's major roadway and facility construction projects will typically surpass these thresholds.

Ms. Arrighi noted that the committee was formed to review the bylaw because it appeared that it was not working completely as it was intended. The majority of local contractors capable of handling projects of this magnitude have stated that this portion of the bylaw has prevented them from bidding on Town projects, she added.

Some brief final comments were shared by Ms. Hagler and Mr. Gustafson prior to Chairman Quintal's call for any further public comment.

Larry Fava offered his opinion that, while there are some worthy facets to the Responsible Contractor Bylaw, he is aware that it has prevented local contractors from bidding. He offered his support for the changes proposed to the bylaw via Article 25.

Dennis Lassige discussed the importance of education and training within the construction field and, thus, expressed concern that the Town would consider watering-down the training / apprenticeship component within the bylaw.

No further citizens came forward to offer public comment.

A brief discussion ensued between members of the Board and Ms. Arrighi regarding the concerns raised during public comment and how the Town might alleviate those concerns while addressing the barriers that local contractors are encountering in the bidding process.

Consensus among the Board appeared to form around tabling Article 25 to Fall Town Meeting to allow time for gathering further information and working on alternative solutions.

In response to the apparent consensus of the Board, Ms. Arrighi noted that the Town Manager's Office would withdraw Article 25 from the 2010 Annual Town Meeting warrant on behalf of the Board.

ANNUAL & SPECIAL TOWN MEETING ARTICLES

SPECIAL ARTICLE 10

To see if the Town will vote to transfer a parcel of land containing .170 acres more or less, shown on Assessor's Map 57, Lot 60A-8, identified as 217 Roxy Cahoon Road, from the Town Treasurer for the purpose of sale to the Board of Selectmen for the purpose of conveyance, and further to authorize the Board of Selectmen convey said parcel of land to the Plymouth Redevelopment Authority for the development of affordable housing thereon, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into all agreements and execute any and all instruments as may be necessary or convenient on behalf of the Town of Plymouth to affect said conveyance, subject to such terms and conditions as the Board of Selectmen may determine appropriate, including the payment of nominal consideration, or take any other action relative thereto.

REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Laura Schaefer, Director for the Plymouth Redevelopment Authority ("PRA"), presented the PRA's request for property at 217 Roxy Cahoon Road for the development of a single family home, to be deed-restricted as affordable housing. Ms. Schaefer referred to four similar affordable housing projects undertaken by the PRA as examples of how the project at Roxy Cahoon Road would be conducted.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to recommend Article 10 of the 2010 Special Town Meeting. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

ARTICLE 27

To see if the Town will vote to adopt General Town Bylaw, Chapter 77, "Graffiti and Litter", as on file with the Town Clerk's Office, or take any other action relative thereto.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Gerry Sirrico, Precinct 3 Town Meeting Representative and chairman of the Graffiti & Litter Bylaw Subcommittee, presented the most recent draft of a bylaw proposed to assist the Town with the removal of graffiti from buildings throughout town. Mr. Sirrico discussed the main changes made to the bylaw (listed below) from the previous draft that was presented to the Selectmen on February 2, 2010.

- The bylaw now focuses solely on graffiti; the litter component has been removed
- The bylaw now addresses graffiti on both private and public property
- The Office of Community Development will facilitate removal of the graffiti by a third-party contractor at no cost to the property owner

Mr. Sirrico outlined the process by which the Office of Community Development will facilitate the removal of graffiti, from the first report of vandalism to removal by a third party contractor. These changes, he explained, were culled from input offered by the Selectmen, Advisory & Finance Committee, and the public.

Selectman Machado questioned who would define and determine what is or is not graffiti. While graffiti should be removed immediately from public property, he said, the Town should not involve itself with telling owners of private property what they can and cannot display.

Richard Serkey, Precinct 2 Town Meeting Member and member of the Graffiti & Litter Bylaw Subcommittee, emphasized the use of the word “unauthorized” within the definition of graffiti, which clearly distinguishes the authorized display of artwork on private property from unwanted graffiti. He referred to the unsightly graffiti that currently exists on the rear facades of privately owned buildings that face historic Burial Hill which, he said, will remain there until the Town has the ability to mandate its removal. With financial assistance from the Office of Community Development, Mr. Serkey noted, the financial burden of graffiti clean-up is taken off the property owner.

Selectman Hallisey expressed support for the bylaw and encouraged the Bylaw Subcommittee to address the issue of litter at some point, as well.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Hallisey, the Board voted to recommend Article 27 of the 2010 Spring Annual Town Meeting. Voted 4-1-0, approved. Selectman Machado cast the opposing vote.

SPECIAL ARTICLE 9

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate, transfer from available funds or borrow a sum of money for the purpose of preparing road layout or improvements to unaccepted roads and conducting studies associated therewith; and further, to authorize the Board of Selectmen to seek special legislation for the purpose of implementing a road improvement program for unaccepted roads, provided, however, that the General Court to make clerical or editorial changes of form only to the bill, unless the Board of Selectmen approves amendments to the Bill before enactment by the General Court, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to approve amendments which shall be within the scope of the general public's objectives of this petition, or take any other action relative thereto.

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tim Grandy, chairman of the Roads Advisory Committee (“RAC”), provided a PowerPoint presentation on his committee’s proposal (via Article 9) to give the Town the ability to expend funds for the preparation of layout or improvements to unaccepted roads. There are currently 200 miles of unaccepted roads for which Chapter 90 funding cannot be used, he explained, and over half of Plymouth’s taxpayers live on these private roads. Mr. Grandy reported that the RAC has met regularly over the past three years and, from those meetings, recognized that the Town needs a formal, long-term road acceptance policy to meet the needs of taxpaying property owners on unaccepted roads who want the same services as those on publicly-accepted roads.

Vice Chairman Malaguti noted that, for better or worse, the opinion from Town Counsel—backed up by case law—has indicated that it is illegal to spend public funds on private ways. Just as the Town had to enact special legislation to perform snow and ice removal on private roads, he said, the Town will need to request special legislation (via Article 9) to review and devise improvement plans for private / unaccepted roads.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to recommend Article 9 of the 2010 Special Town Meeting. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

ARTICLES 32 AND 33

ARTICLE 32: To see if the Town will vote to revoke its acceptance of the Community Preservation Act, Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44B, Section 3 through 7 inclusive, which was authorized by Town Meeting on October 25, 2001, and by ballot question of May 11, 2002, or take any other action relative thereto.

ARTICLE 33: To see if the Town will vote to amend its participation in the Community Preservation Act, Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44B, Section 3 through 7 inclusive, authorized by Town Meeting on October 25, 2001, and ballot question of May 11, 2002, by reducing the surcharge to the minimum of .25%, or take any other action relative thereto.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Chairman Quintal opened Articles 32 and 33 to public comment.

Paul Withington of the Community Preservation Committee (“CPC”) discussed the accomplishments made possible through the Community Preservation Act (“CPA”) and spoke against any attempts to eliminate or reduce the CPA surcharge. Plymouth, he said, has been able to use the CPA to leverage grant funding—in addition to the State’s CPA match—to acquire acres of open space, fund historic preservation projects, and provide affordable housing, noting that the net cost to the Town for \$20,717,000 in projects was only \$7 million. In some cases, Mr. Withington said, the sellers of those properties acquired with CPA funds were willing to sell to the Town at a lower price because they recognized the value and availability of CPA dollars. He pointed to the Town’s acquisition of the Center Hill Road beach-front parcel (formerly the Joslyn Center property) as an important example of the ways in which the CPA has improved the quality of life for Plymouth’s citizens. Open space protects and preserves the Town’s aquifer from the effects of sprawling development, Mr. Withington added.

Larry Fava acknowledged the work done by Mr. Withington and the members of the CPC but spoke in favor of allowing citizens to vote on whether they wish to eliminate or reduce the CPA. The CPA is a tax on a tax, he said, and as it was established by vote of the citizens, the citizens should decide its future. Mr. Fava argued that the public purchase of open space not only removes property from the tax rolls but drives up the cost of remaining developable property and costs taxpayer dollars for liability and maintenance. The advocates for the adoption of the CPA, he claimed, misled voters with an inaccurate portrayal of the effect of development on school enrollment, and they now appear to want to deny citizens the right to vote on whether to maintain the CPA surcharge.

Steve Lydon spoke on the importance of preserving open space.

Ginny Davis, Precinct 4 Town Meeting Representative, noted that she has not received any calls from constituents who wish to eliminate or reduce the CPA. If voters wish to do so, she advised them to contact their Town Meeting Representatives so that they can act accordingly on their behalf.

John Hammond, Precinct 4 Town Meeting Representative, noted that open space is important to residents and visitors alike.

Andrew Kusmin, president of Plymouth Guild, Inc. for the Arts, discussed how the CPA enabled the Town and his organization to preserve the historic Russell Library and Lindens buildings for the establishment of a community arts center. The benefits of this CPA-funded project, he said, have radiated out to other community organizations and local businesses by generating interest, foot-traffic, and tourism in the downtown area.

Chairman Quintal closed public comment and brought the matter back before the Board. He expressed his belief that the intent of the Board was to present these articles to Town Meeting without a recommendation for or against. The economic climate has changed, Chairman Quintal said, and the intent is to allow citizens the ability to decide whether they wish to continue paying the CPA surcharge.

Selectman Mahoney asked to postpone any decision on Article 32 and 33 until the following week to allow for more discussion. Chairman Quintal noted that he closed discussion to adhere to the Board's policy that all committees conclude night meetings by 10:00 p.m.

Selectman Hallisey made a motion to send Articles 32 and 33 to Town Meeting, with no indication of favor or opposition. Selectman Machado seconded the motion, and the Board voted 4-1-0 in favor. Selectman Mahoney cast the opposing vote.

ARTICLE 6

To see what action the Town will take pursuant to G.L. c.41, §108 with regard to fixing the salaries of elected Town Officials, or take any other action relative thereto.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

The Board held no discussion nor posed any questions on the annual article to set the salaries of elected officials.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Malaguti, seconded by Selectman Machado, the Board voted to recommend Article 6 [*see salary schedule, below*] of the 2010 Spring Annual Town Meeting. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

Chairman, Board of Selectmen	\$2,000
Selectman, Other (each)	\$1,000
Moderator	\$ 300

OLD BUSINESS / LETTERS / NEW BUSINESS

Members of the Board did not offer any comment on old business, letters, or new business.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

On a motion by Selectman Machado, seconded by Selectman Mahoney, the Board voted to adjourn its meeting at approximately 10:40 p.m. Voted 5-0-0, approved.

Tiffany Park, Clerk to the Board of Selectmen