

DRAFT

**Truro Finance Committee
Wednesday, March 25, 2020
Conference Call Meeting – 4:00 p.m.**

Finance Committee Attending: Chair Robert Panessiti; Vice-chair Richard Wood, Jay Coburn, Lori Meads, Raphael Richter

Others Attending: Town Manager Rae Ann Palmer; Town Accountant Trudi Brazil; Select Board Member Susan Areson

Robert Panessiti: I will call the meeting to order. The main course of business here is the review the letter for the Warrant and also to review the Articles, the financial Articles. So, Rae Ann, do you want to walk us through the financial Articles. Let me just say that everyone's had a chance to look at them. Why don't we do questions on the individual Articles as they come up for a vote, so we'll approach it that way. [ping] Yes, go ahead.

Rae Ann Palmer: All right. Shall we start?

Robert Panessiti: So why don't you take it from here and walk us through. [ping] Richard, I assume that you just joined.

Richard Wood: Yes.

Robert Panessiti: All right. We are just starting. Start.

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 2 – Authorization to set the salary of the Select Board at \$3,000, and as a reminder the motion needs to be “motion to recommend,” and we're recording *Aye*'s to recommend, *Nay*'s to don't recommend. The vote will be taken by the *aye*'s and *nay*'s. Then we'll record it.

Jay Coburn: I move to recommend. This is Jay Coburn.

Robert Panessiti: Is there a second?

Richard Wood: Second. Rich Wood.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Richard Wood. All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Opposed or anyone abstaining? [silence] Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 3 – Authorization to set the salary of the Moderator at \$350

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any questions. [silence] If not, is there a motion?

Richard Wood: Motion to approve. Rich.

Jay Coburn: Actually, it needs to be “motion to recommend.”

Richard Wood: Okay. Motion to recommend.

Lori Mead: Second. It's Lori.

Robert Panessiti: All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Next is Article 4 – our amendments to our current Fiscal Year 2020 current Operating Budget funded by Free Cash, and I will just walk you through each of them. The first is Free Cash for the Cape Cod Regional Technical High School in the amount of \$80,182. That was not included in the 2020 Budget because we had not done the vote to do the debt exclusion, so we couldn't budget it. The next one is Transfer Station tipping fees in the amount of \$13,000. In the middle of the fiscal year, rather than extend our contract for another year, SEMASS decided to do a new contract and raise the fees by about \$30 a ton. Trudi, do I have that right?

Trudi Brazil: Correct.

Rae Ann Palmer: So, we have estimated at about \$13,000. The next one is for the Public building flooring project. It is to repair and refinish the sally port floor at the Public Safety Facility for \$12,000. We've done all of the floors over there, but we didn't have enough money to get the sally port, which consistently has water, so that's a safety issue. And, the last one for short-term interest borrowing for the Walsh Property for Fiscal Year 2020 is \$116,847.22, and again that purchase wasn't approved until Town Meeting, so we couldn't put that in, and when the Select Board approved using Dennis money, they only approved using it for last year, so we had always thought we would take it out of here.

Trudi Brazil: For next year. They approved using it for next year.

Rae Ann Palmer: Yeah, for next year.

Lori Meads: Is that just a typo in the first one, "to make a *potion*," instead of a *portion*?

Rae Ann Palmer: Thank you, Lori. We could make it a *potion*, I suppose. [laughter]

Lori Meads: We could. We could.

Richard Panessiti: Any questions for Rae Ann about cash movement?

Jay Coburn: I move to recommend. Jay Coburn.

Raphael Richter: Second. Raphael Richter

Robert Panessiti: All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Okay. Article 5 – Amendments to the Fiscal Year 2020 Operating Budget funded by the Capital Stabilization Fund. This is a request for the withdrawal of \$17,600 to fund hydration stations in the Community Center, Library and Public Safety Facility and to purchase an ice machine that we'll keep at the Public Safety Facility. If you've read the Warrant or watched, we're proposing a single-use plastic bottle ban for municipal use and purchase. It's for Beach attendants and Public Safety Facility folks and Town employees in the summer if they're outside. This equipment is being installed. That's what it's for.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Anyone make a motion?

Raphael Richter: I'll move to approve – to recommend. I'm Raphael.

Robert Panessiti: Is there a second? [silence] Is there a second?

Lori Meads: I'll second for discussion.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Motion made and seconded. Further discussion on the motion?

Richard Wood: Yeah. This is Richard. I looked at this, and, I said, it's a different world. When I was a 10-years old kid, we had thermos bottles and didn't need to have all that stuff.

I'm just saying, I'm going to oppose it. It's a minor thing, but . . .

Rae Ann Palmer: So, Rich, this is about the ice machine so that we can bring water around to people with their thermos bottles. There is no water at the beach.

Richard Wood: Yeah, I know. When I was a kid, we had the Thermos brand gallon things. We put ice into them, and we put liquids into them, and we went to the beach and drank out of them, and it was cold all day. So, I'm going to vote no on this. I think there's other ways to do it, and we're just spending more, and we're really nice, giving everything away, and I'm going to vote *no*. So, don't try to talk me out of it. It will pass, and that's all I'm going to say.

Rae Ann Palmer: We have an obligation as an employer to make sure we don't risk the health of our employees.

Richard Wood: Yeah. Did they have plastic bottles last year for water?

Rae Ann Palmer: We supplied water bottles.

Richard Wood: Okay. . . and was it refrigerated? Was there a refrigerator over there?

Rae Ann Palmer: Yeah, we kept it refrigerated at the Community Center.

Jay Coburn: I mean, I guess, I mean, I appreciate the need to watch out for the safety of the employees. . . and . . .but . . .ur. . .The employees can't bring their own frickin' water bottles?

Richard Wood: That's all I'm saying, Jay. No big deal, but . . .

Raphael Richter: I would just say that this is a small item in our budget and the numbers we're going to be looking at today. Certainly, I'm not going to put up a big argument in support of it, but I think this is a common thing being done throughout the country. I support it. If we're going to take bites out of the budget, we should try to do so in situations that are going to make a difference. This just seems like a worthy cause. I'm in support of this, and I'm sure people are going to bring their water, and there are plenty of good arguments. Things weren't the same as when some members of the community were kids. They weren't even the same when I was a kid, but I would encourage us to vote for this, and look at the other areas if we're in the mood to start cutting down more aspects of the budget that is in front of us and the Capital Budget.

Richard Wood: Okay. I'll just follow up on that if we're trying to not do an override. We're doing an override this year for an additional 2 ½% or 2.5.9999, a little bit over by \$140,000, so we're not going to like that. We are trying not to do an override. We've looked at the thing, so it's just down to a slice here and there, and this is just whatever – all we got to do - \$140,000? So, I'm just saying, sometimes you have to cut the little things, and, you know, I think it's nice and all. In my opinion, it's not a "must have."

Rae Ann Palmer: Mr. Chairman, If I may? The override is \$310,000, not \$143,000, and this is from the Capital Stabilization Fund, not in the existing budget and won't affect the tax. . .

Richard Wood: Um, that's what I said, Rae Ann, but somebody's got to pay for it.

Rae Ann Palmer: No. It's about money in the Capital Stabilization Fund, so it has no impact on the next year's tax rate

Richard Wood: So, if we ever wanted to increase the Capital Stabilization Fund to its current, amount, we would have to get that money from somewhere. The bottom line is we're spending money.

Rae Ann Palmer: I'm not arguing. I'm just clarifying. That's all I'm trying to say.

Richard Wood: Now, let me ask again, Rae Ann or Trudi, to see what you think about it. How much does the Budget increase from last year to this year?

Trudi Brazil: I'm going to give that to you as soon as I open up the file.

Jay Coburn: While Trudi's looking for that, Rae Ann, is this for the ice machine as well as the water stations?

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes, and the water bottle stations are going into public buildings in place of water fountains.

Jay Coburn: And, they accessible to everyone to use? The users in the public buildings?

Rae Ann Palmer: Correct.

Jay Coburn: And could you tell us how much of the amount is for the ice machine of the \$14,000?

Rae Ann Palmer: It's \$5,000, I'm quite sure. Let me say, these machines will also be useful to our public safety folks if they've fought a fire and need to be hydrated for that as well.

Trudi Brazil: Mr. Chair? The actual increase of the '21 projected budget over the actual '20 Budget is \$651,226. It represents a 3.19 % increase.

Richard Wood: Okay. Thank you. The amount that would represent is 2.5 increase or 2.4.9999, approximately \$140,000 less than that \$654,000. Correct?

Trudi Brazil: Yes.

Richard Wood: Okay. My point being if we were doing an override basically because of the overage of \$140,000, we're doing an override because it's \$650,000; we're doing an override of \$140,000.

Trudi Brazil: Actually, that's not accurate. . .

Ricard Wood: In my opinion, so that – go ahead, Trudi.

Trudi Brazil: That's not accurate. The specifics of the \$350,000 override are to fund positions that are not currently included in this budget, so, if you're saying that we need x-number of dollars more than we had last year, and what it should be without increasing taxes is \$140,000, I understand the logic, but I don't think it's appropriate to tie it to the term *override*. Semantics?

Richard Wood: Okay. So, "potato-potahto."

Rae Ann Palmer: Well, Trudi, don't we have revenue to offset - we are less than \$100,000 off balance before the proposed expenses and the revenue coming in. Obviously, we don't have a good idea of what the next couple of months are going to bring in. Um, what is part of why Town Meeting was delayed, but we're not doing an override because of the Budget. Right?

Richard Wood: Right.

Rae Ann Palmer: We don't yet know what the next work We're not doing the override because of the Budget. Right?

Trudi Brazil: Correct.

Rae Ann Palmer: We're able to fund the Budget within the Prop 2 ½.

Jay Coburn: We're doing the override because it's been our practice to not add new positions without doing an override.

Rae Ann Palmer: Correct.

Robert Panessiti: Any other discussion or questions on the Article?

Lori Meads: Can I just ask – Does Wellfleet have something like this? Or Provincetown? Is this just something that we're late to the party?

Rae Ann Palmer: I'm not sure about the hydration station, but we are late to the party on the plastic bottle ban - the municipal use bottle ban.

Susan Areson: Sue Areson here. I can clarify that. Both Wellfleet and Provincetown do have hydration stations, and Provincetown has the bottle ban. I'm not sure about Wellfleet

Rae Ann Palmer: Thank you, Sue.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any more questions or discussion? [silence] Okay. Why don't we move to a vote? All those in favor? Let's go individually just because of the phone issue. So, Rich?

Richard Wood: No.

Robert Panessiti: Raph?

Raphael Richter: Yes.

Robert Panessiti: Jay?

Jay Coburn: I support recommending. Yes.

Robert Panessiti: Lori?

Lori Meads: I guess I will support recommending. Yes.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. This is Bob.

I support. So that's four recommend, one opposed, no abstentions. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Next is the Budget. Trudi, would you like to walk us through this?

Trudi Brazil: Absolutely. The Raise through taxation is \$20,387,890. All of these figures should be in the versions you have online or in front of you in hard copy. Transfers from Transfer from Receipts Reserved for Appropriation – We have other separate figures within this that are reserved like \$10,000 from the Septic Betterment Fund, and – actually we’re all done with debt on the CPA – so that is the only other outside of General Funds activity included in this Budget. The Free Cash transfer of \$50,000 goes to a fund line in the Budget that goes to pay extraordinary or unforeseen departures of employees of whom we are required to buy out their accrued benefits. The only difference between this and the previous version you may have seen is that for reserve to the educational and governmental Access funding, and that is the funding we get and hold in reserve for use at Town Meeting to fund the following year’s cable TV’s activity, access, our recordings of meetings, our pay to LCAT for broadcasting our meetings, and . . . and I think that’s about it unless someone has a specific question.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn, and I move to recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any second? Second please?

Raphael Richter: I’ll second. Raphael.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any discussion?

Richard Wood: I’d just like a little clarification. Trudi, based on that “potato-potahto” thing, on Article 7 we’re voting to spend – I don’t know how much – I don’t know - whatever it says for the addition of four full-time firefighters?

Trudi Brazil: Correct.

Rae Ann Palmer: Can I answer that, Trudi?

Trudi Brazil: Sure. I don’t think it’s up me to answer

Rae Ann Palmer: That is the best information and course of action that the Select Board – Sue, I’m speaking for the Select Board – and . . .um. . .staff believes we have to do. Our understanding is that Provincetown Fire’s method of providing EMS service will change. We don’t know if it will incorporate Lower Cape or not, so we want to be sure that if someone calls in the middle of the night and needs an ambulance, or a fire. . .um . . . we’ve got people. So, it is our humble opinion that having four more firefighter/paramedics will provide us the capacity to respond should we lose Lower Cape, thinking Provincetown will change. We don’t know what that change will be. If we need to expand that to a four person, which we would need to do should we lose Lower Cape. If Provincetown goes off in its own direction, the number which we would need to make up with on top of the \$500,000 we pay them is another \$300,000 to \$500,000. So, we would move to three-person, and we want to have those folks on in case this change happens – you know – pretty quickly after next year. If we lost Lower Cape altogether, the offset from what we pay Lower Cape would cover the cost of four additional firefighters.

Richard Wood: Okay. So, if someone calls the ambulance, like we did – me did – a couple of days ago and got service . . .correct?

Rae Ann Palmer: Correct.

Richard Wood: But this doesn’t cover the whole year because the whole time because of the time thing? Potentially?

Rae Ann Palmer: Right. Right. And the other thing we could also apply for four paramedics from the Assistance to Firefighter grant, so . . .um . . . a little bit in flux until we go through the process with Provincetown and Lower Cape, and which the new Town Manager in Provincetown committed to do with us. We thought we were starting that conversation now. Obviously, other issues have taken precedence.

Richard Wood: Okay. Okay. So, this whole Article, which was just vote on those monies were not included at all for people within the Omnibus Budget appropriation numbers which we had previous discussion on.

Rae Ann Palmer: Right. And the cost to the taxpayer with a house assessed at \$50,000 is – I think – between \$35 and \$40. Is that correct, Trudi?

Trudi Brazil: I believe it is \$38 and change.

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes.

Richard Wood: That's for the Article 7 for the Fire Department?

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes. Right.

Richard Wood: So just, um, so the Omnibus Budget about \$100,000 to \$140,000 beyond 2 ½% does not impact this Article whatsoever? That's my discussion on Article 6.

Rae Ann Palmer: Correct. I forgot. You haven't voted on Article 6 yet.

Richard Wood: Sorry. Sorry!

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any further questions or discussion? Okay. I'm a bit distracted. Did we have a motion and second on this? We did?

Richard Wood: I think someone did second it.

Jay Coburn: I moved it, and, I believe, Raphael seconded it.

Raphael Richter: Yeah. I did.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any further discussion? [silence] Okay. All those in favor?

Jay Coburn, Lori Meads, Robert Panessiti, Raphael Richter: Aye.

Richard Wood: I'm going to vote *no*, Bob.

Robert Panessiti: Any abstentions? [silence] Okay. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: I think I've already explained it. It's the General Override for the four firefighters, and it includes their salary, um, gear and, um, equipment, and then health benefits in that also.

Robert Panessiti: So, let's get a motion and a second.

Richard Wood: I recommend Article 7.

Robert Panessiti: Is there a second?

Lori Meads: Second. Lori.

Robert Panessiti: Lori, thanks. Let's open it up for discussion or the override question.

Jay Coburn: So, this is Jay Coburn. The one – I am hopefully going to support this recommending Fire/EMS – that we are moving to, or not. But my concern is, um, that I feel strongly that this additional expense, basically the gradual professionalization of the Fire and EMS Department that we are moving forward on that a significant reason for that has been the fact that our community is no longer a community in which working people can no longer afford to live, and we are unable to maintain a volunteer Fire/EMS Department, and, so, we're now asking the entire, uh, property owner tax base to finance this, and I feel strongly that the Select Board ought to increase the residential property tax exemption to lessen the impact on the property taxes on year-round residents of the town since the additional dynamic of increasing part-time home ownership. That's one of the key factors in driving the Town in having the Town have to take on this expense, and so, Sue, I kind of say this for your benefit, and maybe we want to make a recommendation to the Select Board that, um, at the tax classification hearing this fall, that the residential property tax exemption rate be increased, but I just didn't want to let this go and approve this without having this discussion.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Sue, I don't know whether you want to respond at all?

Susan Areson: No, I hear what Jay's saying, and I think the tax classification hearing is the appropriate place to bring that up, and, if you want to, come as board – that's up to you folks to do that and make that recommendation - or individually as well.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Fair enough. Any other questions or discussion? [silence] I'll go to the vote then. All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Is anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Nope. Okay. Let's go to the next Article.

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 8. It's \$100,000 of Free Cash to the Capital Stabilization Fund.

Ricard Wood: Did you say a hundred or one million?

Rae Ann Palmer: I said a hundred.

Trudi Brazil: It's a million.

Rae Ann Palmer: It's a million dollars. Oh! You know, I'm in Section 3. Section 1 is one million to Stabilization from Free Cash.

Richard Wood: I recommend it. Rich.

Robert Panessiti: Do I have a second? Lori, did I hear you second?

Lori Meads: I'll second.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Discussion on this one? [silence] Okay. All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay. Section 2 - Rae Ann?

Rae Ann Palmer: OPEB Trust is the transfer of \$400,000 to the Other Post-Employment Benefits Trust Fund, and I don't know if, Bob or Trudi, do you want to talk about the trust fund and where it's at?

Robert Panessiti: I think the people need an update on it. The OPEB Trust is, obviously, funding the future liability of the benefits of the retired employees. We did engage Rockland Trust to invest the funds in full, even regardless the decline in the Market right now. The fund investment might be down a little bit, but the way it's looked at, the capital market returns on the portfolio over a market cycle, so this way it won't negatively impact our liability when the auditors come in and do the numbers, and, in fact, being invested releases the liability we had last year because we are using capital market assumptions vs. mainly cash. So, I think our funding is to be paid in full by 2040, I believe, and we're moving towards schedule, at least now to make contributions every year, and this is our annual allotment. So, that's the overview. Any - Is there a motion? - and then I'll answer any questions.

Richard Wood: I'll make a motion to recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Is there a second?

Lori Meads: I'll second. Lori.

Robert Panessiti: Thank you, Lori.

Lori Meads: How much closer are we to funding this? This is Lori

Trudi Brazil: We took our liability from a little over a million dollars, down to 6.3 million, just by having it be handled by a trust with a financial institution. So how close are we? It, quite honestly, depends on markets, and, at this rate, the plan is we are fully funded by 2040. Once we are fully funded, we then use the proceeds from the interest, if you will, to actually pay the annual cost of operation. So, an aggressive schedule helps us in the long run even if it's difficult in the short run.

Richard Wood: So, these, quote-unquote, requirements, in that we use Rockland for this, is around 6.3, and, with this four hundred, we'll be halfway?

Trudi Brazil: Yes.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any other questions? [silence] All right. Motion made and seconded. All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Well, moving on . . .

Rae Ann Palmer: Section 3 is \$100,000 to the Capital Expenditure Stabilization Fund. Which is our annual amount, keeping in mind that we haven't touched the money we started out with from the older fund which was transferred into this. We're still on target with our funds like for our public radio replacement.

Jay Coburn: this is Jay Coburn. I move to recommend.

Richard Wood: I second.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone have any further questions on this one? [silence] Okay. If not, all in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay, Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Section 4 is a transfer of \$100,000 to our Stabilization Fund, which will get us closer to the recommended 5 % of the operating budget. We're at about one million, ten thousand dollars right now.

Richard Wood: I recommend.

Jay Coburn: Second.

Richard Panessiti: All right. Any discussion? [silence] All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Richard Panessiti: Anyone opposed? [silence] Abstaining? [silence] Okay. Next one?

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 9 is the Council on Aging Revolving Fund. It basically sets our ability to spend the money in the fund. We set the cap at \$40,000. I'm guessing we don't spend that. Is that correct, Trudi?

Trudi Brazil: That is correct.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone recommend?

Raphael Richter: I recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Thanks. Any second?

Jay Coburn: Jay, second.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any further discussion? [silence] Okay. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Any one opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay. Next one?

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 10 is our arrangement to expend funds in anticipation of reimbursement for state highway assistance aid or Chapter 90. The amount is we've got for '21 is \$170,187, and we're using it to repave roads.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn, and I move to recommend.

Richard Wood: Second.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Rich. Thanks. Any discussion on this Article? [silence] Okay. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 11 is an authorization for the Select Board to lease land for the two cellular towers in town. They're both expiring so we need to be able to go out to RFP, and the Select Board needs to be able to negotiate a contract. I don't anticipate any significant change in

who is managing the towers now, but I do anticipate we're going to be able to get some new terms, but those remain to be seen. Right now, this is just an authorization to let the Select Board do those negotiations, probably at some point in the fall.

Jay Coburn: Jay Coburn. I move to recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Second? Is there a second?

Lori Mead: Second. ["Lori" with second voice heard.]

Robert Panessiti: I'll give that one to Lori. She got there first. Any questions?

Richard Wood: The only question I have, being familiar somewhat, with these cellular leases. Has the company that's leasing it from us – have they come to town in the past three to five years to ask if we have been interested in extending these leases? Because, you know. . .

Rae Ann Palmer: We can't. The leases are written so that they've already been extended, I believe. I don't know the number off the top of my head, but they've been extended to the maximum the original lease allows, so they have to have a new lease.

Trudi Brazil: That is correct. They've both extended once and again in 2010. They've each extended with five-year continuances.

Richard Wood: Oh. Okay. Okay.

Rae Ann Palmer: What we've done is a short-term extension with both vendors, which Town Counsel has reviewed and approved.

Richard Wood: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any other questions? [silence] Okay. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Any opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay. Motion passes - recommends passing rather. Any other... next Article, please?

Rae Ann Palmer: Article 12 Authorization to transfer Town property to the Truro Conservation Trust. This is a thin parcel of land, less than an acre, at One Pond Village Ave. and add it adjoins the existing Twinefield property, so we would transfer it to the Trust for a nominal amount, if any finances. [background cross talk "tax title". . .]

Richard Wood: I recommend [with second voice]

Raphael Richter: I second.

Robert Panessiti: Who seconded?

Raphael Richter: I did.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Rich - motion. Raphael seconded. Is there any discussion on this? Any in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Is there anyone objecting or abstaining? [silence] Next?

Rae Ann Palmer: All right. The next Article is the amendment of the personnel bylaw, that would take the half day holiday at New Year's Eve and Christmas Eve days and move them from half-day to full-day holidays, so that it's going to better facilitate scheduling in our Public Safety and Public Service Departments.

Richard Wood: I'll recommend.

Raphael Richter: I'll second. Raphael.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn. Just a question. Um. . . This, in essence, would be giving an additional day of paid day of leave to Town employees because immediately you have two halves and you put them together and you get a whole.

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes. Yes.

Richard Wood: You get one whole day. You're right.

Jay Coburn: And, uh, when does the collective bargaining agreement come for renegotiations?

Rae Ann Palmer: We have one year left on it.

Jay Coburn: I just wonder if we want to wait a year and add that to the bargaining chip or bring that to the table when bargaining comes up.

Rae Ann Palmer: Um. Well. . .

Jay Coburn: Otherwise, I would move to recommend.

Richard Wood: If we vote on it, Rae Ann, does it become part of the contract, *per se*, right now?

Rae Ann Palmer: Uh, Yes. If it gets voted on, it won't become part of the contract, but it's part of the bargaining chip to say, "Okay. We gave you this. We're going to take something else in between." So, I think it will play into the bargaining no matter what.

Richard Wood: Right.

Rae Ann Palmer: I will talk to Town Counsel because, in fact, I could implement this for the non-union folks and then bargain it – or whoever replaces me- could bargain it as a part of the contract negotiations, rather than just giving it to them, which is frankly not a bad strategy.

Jay Coburn: Hmmm. No one will replace you, Rae Ann.

Rae Ann Palmer: Thank you, Jay. That was very nice. Not sure everyone agrees with you, but that would be okay.

Jay Coburn: That would be not a new experience.

Rae Ann Palmer: No. [laughs]

Robert Panessiti: Any further discussion on the Article?

Jay Coburn: I've moved it. Need a second.

Robert Panessiti: I thought we had one. Okay. Rich – second. Any further discussion?
[silence] All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? [silence] Okay. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: . . . is the Capital Exclusion request for the heavy-duty tractor truck replacement. This is a truck that was used to move our big heavy pieces of equipment and also to take the compacted trailers to SEMASS to dispose of trash, and it's pretty much that the one we've been using is in pretty bad shape, so it's \$170,000 and it's a about \$18 to \$20 a year on a \$500,000 house. Correct, Trudi?

Trudi Brazil: I believe that's true.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn. I move to recommend.

Raphael Richter: I'll second.

Robert Panessiti: Any questions? All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed or abstaining? Okay. Next Article?

Rae Ann Palmer: Next Article is a borrowing authorization for an ambulance, which will be an all-wheel drive or a four-wheel drive vehicle, in the amount of \$350,000. Um, this has been in our Capital Plan for multiple years but has been pushed out. We have one very old ambulance that we end up with whether it's our own response/ambulance service ore we're looking to work with Lower Cape, we need to replace one of our two ambulances, and this is a debt exclusion so it will be about \$30 impact to tax rate on a \$500,000 house or probably three years. Trudi, you think?

Trudi Brazil: More than likely five years, paying \$70,000 for each year and understanding that the assessed total value of the town increases each year. The tax impact will decrease each year.

Rae Ann Palmer: Thank you.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay. I move to recommend.

Richard Wood: Second. [Silence] Bob, are you awake?

Robert Panessiti: Oh! Yeah. Sorry. Yeah. I just. . .

Lori Meads: I just have a question. It's Lori. Excuse my ignorance. If we replace an ambulance, and we don't have two, and then if we don't have Lower Cape anymore, would we then have to get another ambulance . . .

Rae Ann Palmer: No.

Lori Meads: . . . or would the town then operate with two?

Rae Ann Palmer: We could operate with two. We could probably, like we do now, depend on mutual aid. We generally use Lower Cape and the station, and if then they respond, and then if we need to, we respond with one of our ambulances. If we're going to go to a 4-man shift, we're only going to be able to use two ambulances anyway.

Lori Meads: So then, if we don't use Lower Cape, you just go to Wellfleet or Provincetown for mutual aid.

Rae Ann Palmer: Right. Right.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any other questions? [silence] Made and seconded. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Any objections or abstentions? [silence] Okay. Next Article.

Rae Ann Palmer: Oh, we need to do Preservation Act Articles. [inaudible talk overs] Section 1 is administrative support \$31,732, and that pays for their staff person who manages all of their paper – excuse me – paperwork they have to do, and . . . Trudi, do you want to take over and do Preservation Act Articles?

Trudi Brazil: I'll be thrilled to. Absolutely. So, as Rae Ann mentioned, the first one is \$31,732 for the administration support of the committee itself. It represents 5% of the projected revenue for use in the fiscal year.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn, and I move to recommend.

Raphael Richter: Raphael. Second.

Robert Panessiti: Uh, questions? [silence] Okay. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Any opposed or abstaining? [silence] Section 2?

Trudi Brazil: Section 2 is a contribution to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund in the amount of \$150,000 from projected Community Preservation Act revenue.

Jay Coburn: This is Jay Coburn. I'm recusing myself from this for a potential conflict of interest in that CDP may be involved in managing the Cloverleaf Property, and the funds will probably be needed for the Cloverleaf Property.

Richard Wood: I move to recommend.

Raphael Richter: I'll be abstaining as well.

Trudi Brazil: Raphael, are you recusing or abstaining?

Raphael Richter: I'm sorry. I meant to say *recuse*. My apologies.

Trudi Brazil: That's okay. Thank you.

Robert Panessiti: So, Rich, you've made the motion. Lori, do you want to second it?

Lori Meads: I'll second it for discussion.

Robert Panessiti: So, moved and seconded. Further discussion? So, it will just be the three of us discussing. Lori, do you have a question.

Lori Meads: Yeah. My question is – and if I’m allowed to ask this – What was the opposition from the two members on the committee if I’m reading this correctly?

Trudi Brazil: To be honest, Lori, I wasn’t at the meeting.

Lori Meads: It wasn’t . . . hmmm

Trudi Brazil: I honestly can’t answer it.

Richard Wood: Is Peter Herridge on the CPA?

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes.

Robert Panessiti: He is. So . . . [other inaudible voice overs]

Rae Ann Palmer: As is Bonnie Sollog.

Richard Wood: Yeah. There you go.

Lori Meads: Okay. . . Okay. So noted. Thanks. So noted.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any further discussion? [silence] So we’re looking for a vote on Section 2 of Article 16.

Lori Meads, Richard Wood, Robert Panessiti: Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: That’s three in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

Trudi Brazil: Noted.

Robert Panessiti: Section 3?

Trudi Brazil: Section 3 is - I’m assume, Jay, you are staying recused at this point.

Jay Coburn: Yes. I’m assuming Raphael will as well.

Raphael Richter: Yeah, I will recuse as well.

Trudi Brazil: Section 3 is support of the Lower Cape Housing Institute, which is run by the Community Development Partnership, and it is a request for \$15,000 to continue this program.

Richard Wood: I move to recommend Article 16, Section 3.

Robert Panessiti: All right. Second.

Lori Meads: I guess this is my question to Jay – This doesn’t affect anything because I’m on the Advisory Council. Should I abstain as well?

Jay Coburn: You know. . .

Lori Meads: Just as an abundance of caution.

Jay Coburn: Yeah, as an “abundance of caution.” Rae Ann, do you have any guidance for Lori?

Rae Ann Palmer: I think she should recuse herself, but now you have. . .

Lori Meads: Now we don’t have enough people.

Raphael Richter: I think you can just abstain because the Advisory Board is . . .

Lori Meads: Oh. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So, I’m not voting, I guess so I will abstain then.

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes.

Richard Wood: And not recuse, but abstain?

Rae Ann Palmer: Um, I would recuse, but then we could note that three members recused because of potential conflict, which is better than doing that as abstentions.

Lori Meads: Okay. So, I’ll recuse as well.

Trudi Brazil: If I may, can I just jump back to the previous section. Lori, should we do that this way as well?

Lori Meads: Yeah. I should do that because there is – like Jay said – a potential conflict of interest if the CDP ends up. . .

Trudi Brazil: Adjustment to the previous section is going to be two vote *for*, no opposed, no abstentions, but footnoting that there are three people recusing due to a potential lack of – not “lack of” – sorry – “conflict” of interest. [laughter]

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any further discussion on this or should we just go to the vote?

Richard Wood: Yeah.

Robert Panessiti: Okay.

Richard Panessiti: Okay. Basically, that's Richard and I – Richard and *me*. So, we have two in favor, three abstentions – *recusals* rather – and no one opposed.

Trudi Brazil: Got it. Section 4 – Phase 5 restoration of the Highland House Museum. This is purported to be the final stage. [someone laughs] It will provide funding in the amount of \$144,471 of surcharge revenue to replace the roof with red cedar shingles, wooden trim and copper flashing.

Richard Wood: I move.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Richard has moved. Is there a second?

Lori Meads: Second. Lori.

Robert Panessiti: Well, this is Raphael. I, I'm just looking at Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, which are for historic preservation, some completely, looking for spending of - or we are asked to spend \$590,000, on those Articles, and though recused from the discussion of Sections 2 and 3, I'm speaking of funding money I find to be low – a little bit low and a little bit behind what is going on in our community, on the ground, and what people need. I recognize that there are multiple positions on this, but I take a strong position on this that families need homes to live in, and people need places to live and I think the amount of money for this is out of whack with that, so I will not be voting no on all the remaining sections, except for Section 8, which seems like a reasonable request for the Recreation Department for a very small amount, and I hope that others on the Committee will consider joining me in sending a message about where our priorities lie because all aspects of government certainly affect the finances of the future.

Robert Panessiti: Raphael, if I could just jump in for a minute. I don't philosophically disagree with you, where you're coming from. I think you'll find it is an issue that needs some clarification, and Trudi and Rae Ann maybe you could explain there are some limits in CPA funds. YOU have to spend allocations in three of five categories. You can't give 97% to one and 2 or 3% in the others. Is that right?

Trudi Brazil: That is correct.

Robert Panessiti: So, Bob. . .

Jay Coburn: Only 10% of approximately \$300,000 has to be spent per category, and you don't actually have to spend it.

Robert Panessiti: Right.

Jay Coburn: You can hold it in reserve for future spending.

Richard Wood: I do believe . . . I think Provincetown, actually a few years ago, voted to set a new minimum for Affordable Housing.

Jay Coburn: You are correct.

Richard Wood: There are actions that can be taken, and, Raphael, I agree with you a thousand percent. This has been going on for a couple of years, and I think the people in power in this town should, uh, kind of exert that power. Exert their position in the government and have a good talk with them and provide strong direction to the CPC.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. I just wanted to make sure we had the information. Is there anything else anyone needs to know about CPC allocations that would provide some clarity and people's feelings about for Section 4? I think we've got it.

Susan Areson: If I may just add here, I understand what all of you are saying, and I don't disagree. The CPC is separate. The Board of Selectmen has no authority to direct the CPC. The

law was written in such a way that they are an independent board. We were told – before I was on the Board, and I went to a meeting – the Chairman said very succinctly, “Look, we have nothing to do with this.” They are organized alone. It’s not the Select Board’s role to chastise the CPC. [voices talking over each other]

Jay Coburn: You have the power to appoint the at-large CPC.

Susan Areson: We do.

Richard Wood: You don’t have the authority to tell them exactly what to do, but you have a great degree of persuasion as to what this town needs and wants.

Susan Areson: I understand that – and this is off on a tangent, and I don’t mean to sound offensive in anyway - but I believe that the Board has said that these are our priorities and in many different forums. I’m not sure that message was embraced by some members of the CPC.

Jay Coburn: The Select Board has yet to take a position on Sections 4 and 5?

Susan Areson: Actually, we just did that yesterday.

Jay Coburn: You did. And what was the position of the Select Board on those Articles?

Susan Areson: On four, five and seven? Let’s see. On four. . .

Jay Coburn: On four, five, six and seven?

Susan Areson: Okay. On four, “five voted to recommend.” On five, “two voted in favor, three against.” Six, “four against, one abstention.” On seven, “five against,” and on Puma Park, Section 8, “five in favor.”

Raphael Richter: We’re happy to hear that.

Richard Wood: Five against?

Susan Areson: Yes, and that was largely, uh, because we wanted more information, and, unfortunately, we were not able to get it – more information – about what the agreement is between Castle Hill and the Conservation Trust. There was a strong belief that we should support the Conservation Trust acquiring this property, but we weren’t sure what the lease or long term arrangement was for this cottage and what the public access was to that area when the cottage is occupied. That is if I got it correctly.

Richard Wood: Hmm! Okay.

Rae Ann Palmer: Madam – excuse me – Mr. Chairman, if I may pop in for a minute.

Richard Panessiti: You may.

Rae Ann Palmer: So, I wanted to add to what Sue said that there was some conversation when you’ve talked about the Corn Hill project particularly. It could be more strongly supported if it were leased to a town resident or a seasonal employee, and in the Highland House piece, I just want to remind everyone that the museum houses parts of the Town of Truro’s historic collection as well as their own, so that’s been the reason for supporting them throughout the rehab.

Raphael Richter: May I ask, how much money have the additional four phases received from funds? What amount?

Trudi Brazil: Oh, you had to ask that!

Rae Ann Palmer: [laughs]

Raphael Richter: I’m sorry.

Trudi Brazil: I will have to . . .

Raphael Richter: It could be an approximate number for the four phases previous. I would also be curious to know what they received for the first phase.

Richard Wood: I think that the total of the phases was well above three hundred

Lori Meads: I know last year it was really big because of the elevator.

Jay Coburn: I would remind everyone, this is a building we lease from the National Park Service. We don't own it.

Robert Panessiti: This is contingent on a long-term lease. Right?

Richard Wood: Which they went out and go.

Robert Panessiti: Trudi, are you still rooting for the data?

Trudi Brazil: [inaudible comment]

Richard Richter: Just chime in with that information when you get it, but it would be great to know the amount they received. It would be helpful to know what was put into the Affordable Housing Trust at the same period of time.

Trudi Brazil: Okay.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Then we can vote on Section. . .

Raphael Richter: Four.

Robert Panessiti: Four, yeah. Anyone have any more questions on Section 4? [silence] Okay. I'll ask it this way, anyone in favor of Section 4? [No immediate response]

Richard Wood: Well, you know what. . . I'm going to vote in favor of it only because we're "a little bit pregnant." [General laughter] I don't. . . you. . . um . . . just like in the other one down the street on Rte. 6. We started a project, and, even though it's not guaranteed year after year, it's a foregone conclusion that CPC is going to pay three or four years on this thing, and it is the final phase. Well, okay. You know. . . let's get it done. . . and move on, put the spike into the ground for certain things like this. So, I'll vote yes on this.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. I'm voting in favor on this. I kind of agree with what Richard is saying, and, I think, you know, I agree with the whole issue about Community Housing, and I've been as big an advocate as anyone on the need for everyone to get together and do their part. I do appreciate that there are a couple of members of the CPC that are adamantly against Housing, and that's just wrong, but I also think that the message has been delivered strongly enough to the group. I would hate to see some of these organizations get the rug pulled out from under them especially when they're counting on the money year after year and money to finish the project. So, I'll vote in favor. So, that's two in favor, and then. . .

Jay Coburn: Jay Coburn. Oppose.

Robert Panessiti: And, Raphael, you oppose? [silence] Raph?

Raphael Richter: I'm sorry. I had it on mute. Yes, I oppose.

Robert Panessiti: And, Lori, where are you at?

Lori Meads: I oppose.

Robert Panessiti: So, two in favor, three oppose, no abstentions.

Trudi Brazil: And I will search for that information and get it to you when we are done with this exercise. Section 5 – again in Historic Preservation - requesting \$47,550 to the Historical Commission who seek, as a project, to locate and inventory historic properties, and this would be an update of a project that was completed in 2020.

Richard Wood: I'll move only to start.

Lori Meads: This sounds like a project that was a former Finance Committee member's issue.

Robert Panessiti: Lori, you just seconded. I'm not sure I understood your question.

Lori Meads: Sure. I was just commenting that we used to have a former member of the Finance Committee who was heavily into having this happen.

Robert Panessiti: Bertie?

Jay Coburn: Oh, no. She just wanted an inventory of Town property. She didn't care whether it was historic or not.

Lori Meads: I'm sorry . . .

Robert Panessiti: She wanted an inventory of everything, computers, desks, , ,

Rae Ann Palmer: If I may?

Robert Panessiti: Yes.

Rae Ann Palmer: The Historical Commission reviews all permits for property demolition before they can be issued, and the historic housing inventory is a place for our building inspector to start looking to see if potentially there's going to be a problem. It's also good for homeowners. So, um, you know, I'm not aware of whether you need to update it, but, I know for a fact, that it's a tool we need to have.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Any questions for Rae Ann? [silence] Okay. Any further discussion on Section 5? Okay. Move to a vote. All in favor? Let's go down the line again. Do it that way again.

Richard Wood: Can I just ask Rae Ann for clarification on this 'cause it looked like we were going to be spending forty grand or fifty grand every ten years to do this, but Rae Ann said this is kind of needed, and I sometimes respect what she says, so I just need clarification on what she said.

Rae Ann Palmer: So, my – from my perspective – and, if you know a certain family in town who have to wait a year for demo of the structure before they can build their permanent home, they need clarification and any solid information that, yes, it is on the list and that will help them and our staff to try and prevent unnecessary delays, short of just replacing our whole Historical Commission bylaw with something more flexible, this tool helps us – helps people – to a) protect historic properties but also manage the properties they own. I was trying to be tactful, but I don't know if it worked. [laughter in the background]

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Everyone understand what she's saying? Are we ready for the vote? So, we have a motion and a second for Section 6.

Trudi Brazil: Five!

Rae Ann Palmer: Five.

Robert Panessiti: Section Five. Okay. Let's go down the line again. Jay?

Jay Coburn: I oppose. I don't recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Raphael?

Raphael Richter: I do not recommend.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Lori?

Lori Meads: Um, could I just ask – Did the Select Board vote on this yesterday?

Trudi Brazil: Yes.

Susan Areson: Yes, we did. Two in favor, three opposed.

Lori Meads: Okay. Yeah. I'm opposed.

Robert Panessiti: Rich?

Richard Wood: I'm opposed too.

Robert Panessiti: Yeah.

Richard Wood: Yeah.

Robert Panessiti: I'm opposed too. So, we have zero for, no abstentions, five against.

Trudi Brazil: Section 6 is the preservation and restoration of Building T-5. This is a request from the Payomet Center for Performing Arts. The request is for \$165,000 to rehab and make space available for a long – excuse me – for year-round use for a building art the former base, Air Base.

Robert Panessiti: Um, hmm. . .

Rae Ann Palmer: A building that does not have a long-term lease yet. They have a letter from the Seashore on intent to lease.

Lori Meads: Does this building have asbestos issues?

Rae Ann Palmer: Of course.

Trudi Brazil: I should note that when Town Counsel reviewed this, in came the requirement that the long-term lease be executed prior to any funding leaving the Town.

Richard Wood: Do you know if they're going to put their circus aerial equipment within this building?

Trudi Brazil: I'm not aware of that.

Rae Ann Palmer: No, I don't think one can. . . [inaudible cross talk]

Jay Coburn: Jay Coburn. Sue, can you share the Select Board's recommendation on Section 6?

Susan Areson: Sure. Yes, um, we had four opposed and one abstention. I'm sorry. I lost you guys for a minute. Yeah, "Four opposed, one abstention."

Jay Coburn: Can you shed some light on their reasons for the . . .

Susan Areson: Mainly because the. . .uh, um. . .Payomet is a private, non-profit. We were wondering if this building is turned into a year-round facility, would there be opportunities for the Town or members of the public to use it if the Town approved grant money for the restoration. And, again, we don't have a lot of information on when it would be used, what it would be used for, whether the public would be allowed access, so . . .

Jay Coburn: Can I also just. . .can I also just chime in? I just have a concern about the Town of Truro paying to preserve buildings that are owned by the Federal government. That just seems really wrong to me.

Richard Wood: Yeah. I can't disagree there!

Robert Panessiti: Did anybody move this?

Jay Coburn: Yeah. For purpose of debate, I'll move to recommend.

Richard Wood: I'll second.

Richard Panessiti: I thought we already did. Trudi, do we not have them. I thought we had a move and a second.

Trudi Brazil: I did not note them.

Robert Panessiti: So, Jay and Rich. Sorry about that. We'll continue the discussion. Any other questions?

Richard Wood: The only. . . Sue, did the CPC ever come to the Board of Selectmen this year and go over all these things to educate you as to the in's and out's of them?

Susan Areson: No, and that was one of the reviews Rae Ann had recommended at the last meeting that we actually had face-to-face. She said, "Maybe we can get the CPC to come in," and then corona happened, so we were missing a lot of information that we weren't able to get prior to voting.

Richard Wood: Yeah. Yeah. . . and just so you know from the last – I don't know – three or four years, we have annually said to them that same thing as far as coming to the Finance Board so we could be better informed on voting these things. And, I believe one, out of the four years, their note taker – who is a very nice person – updated us as best she could but . . . Anyway, that's all I have to say.

Robert Panessiti: Message received. Thank you. [laughter] Okay. Any further discussion on Section 6? [silence] All right. Let me move to a vote then. I'm ready there. I'm starting to see all those opposed. Is anyone in favor of Section 6? [silence] Okay. Those who are opposed

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Trudi Brazil: Zero-five-zero. Section 7 – Acquisition of 42 Corn Hill Rd. This is a request from the Truro Conservation Trust for \$192,000 for – I’m sorry. I take that back. – for \$145,000 to be repurposed from a prior appropriation of \$192,000 that originally was going to be given to the acquisition of 2 Kill Devil Rd. Those plans fell through. They are now asking that \$145,000 of that be repurposed to acquire 42 Corn Hill Rd., the property and the structure there.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Is there a motion so we can go to discussion?

Richard Wood: Yean. I’ll motion. I’ll move for discussion.

Robert Panessiti: Second? Is there a second? Raph?

Raphael Richter: I don’t plan to support this Article.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Is there someone else who will second it so we can discuss?

Jay Coburn: I’ll second it for discussion.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Are there any questions on it, or anyone want to make a statement?

Richard Wood: Well, I think. . . I thank Sue for being at this meeting, first of all. I think her description of what the Board of Selectmen’s thought process to come up with an overall negative vote was very good, and especially as far as, maybe, having a Town employee or somebody else like that live in the cottage year-round vs. having some visiting artist in there, is a valid point. Here’s a place where we could have some affordable housing or some moderate level housing. So that’s my take on it.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Anybody else? [silence] All right. Move to a vote. Um, anyone in favor of this Article – section of the Article, I should say? [silence] Okay. Anyone abstaining? [silence] And those opposed, signify by saying *Nay*.

All: *Nay. Nay. Nay. Nay. Nay.*

Robert Panessiti: Okay. That’s for recording purposes. So, five votes opposed.

Trudi Brazil: And Section 8 is a request for a reappropriation of prior funding. The Recreation Department – Commission, rather – had an appropriation of \$26,500 for work to be done at Snow’s Park to make it accessible. That request is now being made by the Truro Commission on Disabilities to repurpose those funds to add inter-generational facilities to Puma Park. The request is for \$26,500.

Lori Meads: Move to recommend.

Richard Wood: Second.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Move to discussion.

Richard Wood: Trudi, what word was that? Something-generational?

Trudi Brazil: *Inter-generational*. So that. . .

Richard Wood: You mean like “old people”? [laughter]

Trudi Brazil: And “young-uns.”

Rae Ann Palmer: Exercise equipment for old people that will go along the outside of the park.

Richard Wood: Thank you. The only thing I can say, really again, is that – more directed at Bob – when we originally voted against the use of the funds at Snow’s Park, after three years . . .

Lori Meads: Yup! I agree.

Richard Wood: . . . finally, at least the money will come around and go to something that’s right. I agree with this 100%.

Robert Panessiti: All right. Then. . . for which generation?

Richard Wood: Bob, you won’t get there for a while. [laughter]

Rae Ann Palmer: You’re not far behind there, Mr. Panessiti.

Lori Meads: No comment. No comment! [laughter]

Robert Panessiti: All right. Any further discussion on the Article? [silence] So, Section 8 – All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Anyone opposed? [silence] Anyone abstaining? [silence] Okay.

Trudi Brazil: Five-zero-zero. That completes Article 7 – I'm sorry – Article 16, and, I believe, completes the requirements of votes by the Finance Committee.

Rae Ann Palmer: Nope. There's one more Article

Rae Ann Palmer & Robert Panessiti: Article 20.

Trudi Brazil: Oh! My bad.

Rae Ann Palmer: Amend General Bylaws Chapter 2, Section 2-1-1, renting or leasing of buildings. Currently, um, we have a rental registration program for people that are going to rent their house for any period of 120 or fewer days. As it stands, if any cottage colony or condo association was licensed by the Health Board, they did not have to register. This would remove that protection for condos or anyone who rents for 120 days or fewer would have to do a rental registration with the Town, and the amount is \$200 that we charge, I believe. Is that right, Trudi?

Trudi Brazil: Yes, it is two hundred dollars.

Susan Areson: Mr. Chairman, can I just jump in her please, and say this was recommended to the Select Board by Rich Wood. And, I think it was a really important recommendation. We all voted in favor of it. It could be a significant revenue generator for the Town, so thank you for suggesting, Rich.

Richard Wood: You're welcome, Sue.

Richard Wood: Rae Ann, I don't know when this was. It might have been a Board of Selectmen meeting, and elderly woman who is always speaking up – I don't know her name – about her rental and what the state law was, whereas if you rented at less than x-number of weeks, you did not have to register. Wasn't that made part of this, or was there any discussion of this?

Rae Ann Palmer: Well, first of all, you have to register whether you rent it for two weeks or less. That's a requirement of the state of Massachusetts. Um. . .Second of all, when we were constructed this, honestly, how would we manage that exception?

Richard Wood: Yeah. Yeah.

Rae Ann Palmer: . . .and could find a way through it, so went ahead with it the way this is read.

Richard Wood: Okay. Thank you.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Rich, moved. Is there a second?

Lori Meads: Second.

Robert Panessiti: Any further discussion on it? [silence] Okay. All in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Any opposed or abstaining? Motion – or rather recommendation - carries. So, that's all the financial Articles?

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Moving onto the letter. Any questions? Rich, I'm sorry I had to send you a quick e-mail this morning, a reminder, just one-on one for scheduling a meeting, and even that has to be kept according the Open Meeting Laws. So, Rich had asked and Lori, also had chimed in, that we should perhaps make a statement about Lower Cape or something here. Has anyone else taken a whack at the letter? Something you want us to add in a line here or there about it? We could say something along the lines that we support the budget with the 2 ½

override, that the Committee recognizes that this is about affording public safety, and we'll be making a comment at the meeting – Town Meeting. We can do something as simple as that, or, if someone has something more involved that you want to put in there. You know, now is the time.

Richard Wood: Well, I think, now that you've brought it up, I've looked around more, and I think maybe just a sentence on it, acknowledging that we know why this whole thing is happening because, I'm sure, it's a whole separate line actually, that someone from the Board is going to step up and kind of explain everything to everybody, the rationale and why all that, for what is going to happen. The other half of my thought process was, "Hey, we're doing an override, and I thought 'potato-potahto'." But, there's things in the budget that caused us to go above the 2 ½%, and, um, you know, I keep going back to the fact we're going to Town Meeting. People want to vote on the whole budget – two minutes and then we'll be done with it. You know, we could keep on adding and adding and adding. So, I just thought potentially, either Bob from the Finance Committee or someone from – maybe Jan is the head of the Board of Selectmen or Select Board – is going to get up and say, "Hey, we're covering additional costs in these areas, and that's why we have to do the 2 ½% override. So, just to summarize on the letter, I think we should add a sentence or two, as Bob stating, that certain things had happened, especially in the public safety, so that's why we're doing it. But, I just hope that the Select Board will get up and really talk from the financial angle as well.

Susan Areson: If I may comment on that? I think, of course, there will be an explanation. It also helps that Steve Roderick is now a Truro resident, and he did an excellent job going through the figures and so on when this was being presented to the financial Budget Task Force meeting, but, the other thing, and this is something from feedback last year, was the effort to approve the Budget in two minutes. Two years ago, as you know, someone got up, moved the Article and, low and behold, it went through. Last year, that same person made the same attempt, and it was denied, so I think that was a good thing. I think it's up to all of us who care about the town and really care about the spiraling budget to try and keep it down, but attempts like that and having people to get up for further discussion with vetoes on the floor. We've done the best job we can with a lot of help from Rae Ann and Trudi and the department heads to compile a budget that we think is reasonable, and we want people to understand the reason for it. So, I agree. We want to hear what people think, and we want to hear challenges, explanations and what are people's priorities.

Richard Wood: Yeah. It's hard to have to try to do something for years. You're right, Susan.

Richard Panessiti: Okay. Anybody else?

Lori: Can I just say one thing? I think it's kind of frustrating when the Finance Committee holds its kind of Pre-Town Meeting, open Question & Answer meeting, you know, and nobody shows up. Then everyone shows up at Town Meeting like they're seeing it for the first time and drags out the meeting. I'm hoping that the Task Force videos are helping, but maybe not. But, I kind of put it back on some of the residents. If you're not going to come to these open meetings that are offered to clarify exactly what you're going to question, Town Meeting is not the place to bring it up initially.

Jay Coburn: Sue, I appreciate what you're trying to say. On the other hand, the whole Town Meeting form of government is not friendly at all to people – young people and people who work full time. I think that motion to consider the Budget in its totality was offered in the spirit of frustration of the way Town Meeting is run and the whole slow process, and not necessarily just trying to [inaudible word] the Budget.

Susan Areson: I have said that, but I don't believe that's the case for one night of the year. I share Lori's and Bob's frustration about people not showing up at meetings and then pretending like they haven't heard anything about most of the stuff that's on the Warrant, but then you get it's our job to educate the people the best as we can, and then live with the results.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. I guess then. . . Trudi, I didn't send you the letter. Most of its content is the same as last year. I just need you to plug in the numbers on the bottom like you usually do for us.

Trudi Brazil: Sure.

Robert Panessiti: So, I will do that, and then, if everyone agrees, I'll just add a line in after the part, "We support the budget that will provide an override". . .um. . .The override is presented due to . . um. . .I guess, fortifying. . . Just say it is due to the need to fortify public safety. a change in the demographics in town, and we will be making a comment at Town Meeting along with the Select Board. Sound good? Thoughts from anybody?

Lori Meads: Sure.

Richard Wood: Sounds good.

Robert Panessiti: Okay. Motion to approve the letter?

Lori Meads: So moved.

Richard Wood: Second.

Robert Panessiti: Rich – second. All those in favor?

All: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Robert Panessiti: Okay, and then with the inclusion of the numbers and this paragraph, so approved. Five, approved. No abstentions. No against. Okay. All right. I guess we just need a motion to adjourn.

Lori Meads: I just have a question. Is there some consideration being given to possibly moving Town Meeting . . .

Rae Ann Palmer: Yes.

Lori Meads: . . . or are we not allowed to?

Susan Areson: We voted yesterday to postpone Town Meeting, but we don't have a date certain.

Lori Meads: Oh. Okay.

Susan Areson: Rae Ann can explain better. The Warrant will not change. She wanted to get this through so we would have it ready to print. Rae Ann, you can explain more.

Rae Ann Palmer: Sure, um. . .Mass General Law allows us, Mass General Law Chapter 39, Section 9, allows the Select Board to postpone Town Meeting, if the Warrant hasn't been posted, to a date to be determined, and, I think, our feeling all along has been that what's happening around us is changing every day and very quickly, so by doing it this way and having the Warrant prepared. We could be prepared to set a date, and the only thing we have to worry about Town Meeting and the Warrant is we have to have it posted for 14 days prior to Town Meeting. So, that's the premise that we're working on. Then the election still needs to be determined in terms whether and when that would be delayed to.

Lori Meads: Okay. Thank you.

Susan Areson: And, I believe we're voting on deferring the Elections– next week – or is it two weeks from now?

Rae Ann Palmer: April 7th.

Susan Areson: April 7th. Two weeks from now. I'm going to sign off now, folks, but thank you for your time, and I appreciate allowing me to participate. Stay safe.

Voices: Thanks, Sue!

Robert Panessiti: Okay. I think we're pretty much done. Is there a motion to adjourn, or do we need anything else?

Richard Wood: Do we need a motion?

Robert Panessiti: So moved. We're all set then. So, I'm sending off that letter with additions about override, fortifying public safety, change of demographics in town, the Select Board and Finance Committee will make comments at Town Meeting, then I'll send it out to Trudi for the numbers. Then we should be all set.

Trudi Brazil: Thank you.

Without any objections, the tape and the meeting ended at 5:33 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Mary Rogers

DRAFT