

MINUTES
SHARON SELECT BOARD
December 20, 2022

The meeting of the Sharon Select Board was called to order at 7:00 pm by Select Board Chair Hanna Switekowski virtually by Zoom. Select Board members Emily Smith-Lee and Kiana Pierre-Louis were in attendance as were Town Administrator Frederic E. Turkington, Jr. and Assistant Town Administrator Lauren Barnes.

Public comment period

Ms. Janice Monat of 21 Jefferson Avenue commented that she received a link to the meeting. Ms. Switekowski mentioned that if Ms. Monat was here to listen to the early voting options, she will have the opportunity to comment as part of the public hearing.

Seeing no other comments, Ms. Switekowski moved on with the meeting.

Public Hearing – Early voting options

MOTION: To open the public hearing at 7:03 pm
(Pierre-Louis – Smith-Lee) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

At the last meeting, Mr. Hogan discussed with the updated the Select Board on the new voter law. It was determined that evening that a public hearing was needed. Mr. Hogan gave an update on the background on early voting options. The Select Board has the right to call for a hearing without his bringing this matter up. During discussions at the most recent Registrars meeting, a vote was taken to request opting out of vote by mail. Mr. Hogan explained that the Board of Registrars is not opposed to vote my mail, rather it was felt that there was there were issues in doing so for a Town Election.

He provided the law, Chapter 92 of the Acts of 2022, and explained the opt-in/opt-out options. The Board of Registrars can opt-in to in person voting for a Town Election and has vote to do so. Mr. Hogan went on to provide staff cost and data on vote-by-mail in the 2022 State Primary and State Election. Hi also discussed 2020, 2016, 2012, and 2008 Presidential data.

Ms. Smith-Lee thanked Mr. Hogan for the information and including responses to the Board's questions from the last meeting. She expressed that she wishes to protect enfranchisement in local elections which tend to have lower turnout, where it is more difficult to get people out to the polls. She prefers not to do anything that would make it harder for everyone to vote. The cost seems minimal for increased accessibility and is uncomfortable taking access away. She understands the concerns about waste, but feels this is an effort which can maximize participation.

Ms. Pierre-Louis also thanked Mr. Hogan for preparing the information. She feels like vote by mail makes it voting easier for people but feels better knowing that disabled qualify for an absentee ballot.

Ms. Switekowski agrees with Ms. Smith-Lee and Ms. Pierre-Louis and feels this promotes voter education and ease of access

Ms. Joanne Blatt from the League of Women voters stated that she is in favor of keeping as many options as possible for voting. She stated that there is only one date outside of working hours. She asked whether volunteers could help prepare mail-in ballots if cost is an issue. Mr. Hogan replied that volunteers do help but the State has a specific computer system and vote by mail generates 3 processing attempts at a State-specific computer.

Mr. Stuart Scharf of 38 Clark Street feels that calling this option “vote by mail” is a misnomer as it is not mailed back to the Town. He feels that the hours for in-person voting are not particularly convenient.

Mr. Ben Feinberg of 1863 Bay Road feels that the cost differential is not an important variable. Generally, he is in favor of improving options for voting but he understands the concerns Mr. Hogan is raising. He wonders if there is a path where, instead of taking away a voting option, is there an option to change the communication from the Town? Mr. Hogan responded that Sharon is getting into higher cost for cards the other three years. He explained that the postage cost to send the census every year is \$3520. The State cards may be double the postage. There is also a printing for the cards which is not a negligible cost.

Mr. Phillip King of 18 Ashcroft stated that there are other costs associated in-person voting such as heat and electricity.

Ms. Janice Monat 21 Jefferson Ave – relieved at Kiana’s comment regarding the immune-compromised. Mark clarified reasons for absentee ballot. Disability is not defined.

Mr. Sam Liao of 12 Turning Mill Road stated that he is in favor of opting-in for mail in voting and fees that receiving a ballot by mail perhaps may serve as a reminder to vote in the Town election.

MOTION: To close the public hearing at 7:53 pm
(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

MOTION: To adopt the Board of Registrars recommendation to opt-out of vote by mail for annual Town Election.
(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 0-3 **FAILS**

Switlekowski: NO
Pierre-Louis: NO
Smith-Lee: NO

Accept donation of land – parcel 102-149-003 R Ashcroft Road

Ms. Arguimbau of the Conservation Commission explained that the commission had been approached by the Striar Family who expressed their wish to donate a parcel on Ashcroft Road to the Town. This property abuts existing conservation land and the Massapoag Brook. For tax purposes, the Striars wish to have transaction completed before the end of the year.

The Board stated that they had no concerns and thanked the Striar Family for the donation.

MOTION: To accept the donation of parcel 102-149-003, R Ashcroft Road from Subon, Co.
(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

Community Center beach

Ms. Linda Berger, Recreation Director explained that over the past several years the Community Center beach has experienced consistently high levels of E. coli, causing several closings. The lake is flagged on the Massachusetts Department of Public Health's environmental toxicology program. Recreation Advisory met with the Conservation Agent, Health Department and Lake Massapoag Advisory Committee on November 17 to discuss the health of the lake and lake operations. Conservation and the Health Department have also been testing tributaries to help determine the source of the bacteria. At that the meeting on November 17, it was recommended the Community Center beach be closed to swimming for one year as a trial so all stakeholders can gather more information on the cause of the high levels of E. coli.

Julia Wood of 111 Maskwonicut Street asked whether there has been any discussion with Camp Wonderland and whether their beach will be kept open? Do their tests come back okay?

Ms. Leandra McLean of the Health Department advised that all E.coli testing results are returned to the Health Department. Camp Wonderland has had no problems. It is thought that Sucker Brook is the cause. Ms. McLean stated that all samples are collected and tested by same lab. This is a Department of Public Health monitored program and she is confident that all results are accurate.

MOTION: To close the Community Center beach for the 2023 beach season based on recommendations of the Recreation Advisory Committee as discussed this evening.

(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switekowski: AYE

Pierre-Louis: AYE

Smith-Lee: AYE

MOTION: To accept the annual beach fees as noted by Recreation Advisory.

(Pierre-Louis – Smith-Lee) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switekowski: AYE

Pierre-Louis: AYE

Smith-Lee: AYE

Drinking water treatment facility

Mr. Eirc Hooper, DPW Director and Mr. David Crosby, Chair of the Water Management Advisory Committee provided the Board an update on research of a possible connection to the WMRA system as an alternative to construction of a drinking water treatment facility. Mr. Hooper provided the following information.

In order to respond quickly to the presence of PFAS above Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) in Town drinking water wells, the Water Department was able to procure a trailer-mounted temporary treatment system that has allowed and will continue to allow the Water Department to provide PFAS free water to the residents of Sharon. However, operating the temporary treatment system is expensive and limited to only Well #4.

Just before the PFAS emergency, the Water Department started construction of an emergency pump station to access MWRA water. This pump station would be limited to 1 million gallons per day, about half of the peak day demand or about 90% of the average daily demand. Because the water would delivered via the Norwood distribution system, an inter-municipal agreement (IMA) with Norwood established conditions for use of the pump station and required a 10-year, annual contribution of \$150,000 to the Town of Norwood to cover costs incurred by Norwood to upgrade its distribution network.

However, neither the temporary treatment operation nor the emergency pump station meets the permanent needs of the Town. As a result, the Water Department has prepared a cost comparison of the two viable options for permanent water supply:

PFAS Treatment Annual Operating Budget Increase (assuming 440 million gallons)

Year 1

Capital Cost: \$790,000 = \$15.8M/20 years
 Operating Cost: \$220,000 = \$0.50 per 1000 gallons
 Total Cost: \$1,010,000 Initial Budget Increase

Year 21 (assuming 2.5% annual cost increase)

Capital Cost: \$0
 Operating Cost: \$330,000 (assuming 2.5% annual increase)
 Total Cost: \$330,000

MWRA Purchase Annual Operating Budget Increase (Assuming 440 million gallons)

Year 1

Wholesale Price for MWRA 2023: \$1,930,280 = \$4.387/1000 gallons
 Pump Station Operating Cost: \$44,000 = \$0.1/1000 gallons
 Avoided Operating Cost: -\$836,000 = \$1.90/1000 gallons
 Total Cost: \$1,138,280 Budget Increase

Year 21 (assuming 2.5% annual cost increase)

Wholesale Price for MWRA 2043: \$2,985,420 = 6.5805/1000 gallons
 Pump Station Operating Cost: \$66,000
 Avoided Operating Cost: -\$1,254,000
 Total Cost: \$1,707,420 Budget Increase

The above cost estimate for the first year show relatively little difference between the cost of constructing a treatment vs purchase of water from the MWRA in year 1 of the 20-year period. However, two main differences make the cost difference significant and in favor of PFAS Treatment:

1. The cost of MWRA water has historically increased by roughly 2.5% each year. Consequently, the cost difference between the two options will increase.
2. Unlike the borrowing cost for the treatment plant, this incremental cost of purchasing water from the MWRA will not be retired and remain an annual cost.

Present Water Supply

The Water Department presently operates six groundwater wells dating from the 1930's to the 1970's. Several efforts to identify and permit additional well locations either came up short because of capacity or quality concerns or blocked due to perceived environmental impact. This left the Town with the original six wells.

Well	Location	Permitted Capacity	Watershed Basin	Comments
2	Moose Hill Parkway	0.47 MGD	Neponset	Iron, Manganese, Nitrate above secondary contaminant level (nuisance), PFAS above MCL. Well currently offline
3	Farnham Road	0.38 MGD	Neponset	PFAS above detection levels but below MCL
4	Tree Lane	1 MGD	Neponset	PFAS above MCL. Well currently treated.

5	Gavins Pond Road	0.47 MGD	Taunton	Operational capacity limited to half of permitted capacity.
6	Wolomlopoag Street	0.35 MGD	Taunton	Iron and Manganese above secondary contaminant level (nuisance), PFAS above detection levels but below MCL.
7	Gavins Pond Road	0.45 MGD	Taunton	PFAS above detection level but below MCL

Emergency Response:

- Short duration localized (hours – week) emergency needs hours: tank storage, hydrant to hydrant with adjacent Towns,
- Intermediate duration Town-wide emergency needs (month – 2 years): Norwood emergency pump station limited to 1 MGD, MWRA Operating Policy 5, Uncontaminated (PFAS) wells (5, 6, 7) capacity – 1 MGD,
- Permanent replacement or treatment.

With the construction of the pump station, short and intermediate emergency have been addressed.

The Water Department currently operates under a Water Management Act permit that places daily limits on individual wells, an annual limit on the overall system and because Sharon is located in two watershed basins, annual limits on what can be withdrawn from each basin. It is very important to note that no permit limit is approached either at any individual well, within each basin or town-wide. Both maximum summer withdrawals and total annual withdrawals at worst reach about 2/3 of our permit limit. These limits were established by Commonwealth Environmental Regulatory agencies based on good environmental stewardship.

The purpose of complying with our withdrawal permit is to demonstrate that we are operating in a way that the Commonwealth regulatory agencies consider proper environmental stewardship. **Exceeding** what the state considers to be proper environmental stewardship is actually what is being debated when reducing withdrawal below permitted values or eliminating withdrawals altogether, i.e., connection to the MWRA, is presented by environmental advocates as proper environmental stewardship. The withdrawal limit that is included in our Water Management Act permit does consider environmental impact and under the revised WMA conditions resulting from the Sustainable Water Management Initiative actually gives more weight to environmental concerns than to the other, previously equal considerations. Further, any environmental impact that we are causing via our withdrawal would be mirrored by the environmental impact due to groundwater surcharge caused by import of water and recharge via septic systems.

For the past year, the Water Department has relied primarily on essentially untreated water from Wells #3, #5 and #7 and treated water from Well #4. Well #6 was used only during the summer to meet peak demand because Well #4 capacity was constrained by about a half due to treatment vessel pressure issues since resolved. Well #3 use was temporarily discontinued for the winter. While below MCL concentration for PFAS, because of reduced demand during the winter, there is no need for this well.

Long-Term Municipal Water Supply

Two viable options exist for long-term operational response to the presence of PFAS at Well #4:

Option	Primary	Backup Supply
1	Existing wells	MWRA
2	MWRA @ Norwood	Existing wells

Regardless of the option, nearly all system capital expenses (water distribution main and storage tank maintenance and replacement, meter replacement) remain as required under both scenarios. Some new capital expenses would be required to upgrade the recently completed emergency pump station to permanent use

while some operating cost savings would be realized under Option 2 (well maintenance). However, some of these savings would be offset by greater pump lift requirement. Finally, under Option 2, the inter-municipal agreement with Norwood would have to be re-negotiated.

Constraints:

For cost comparison purposes, some minimum system requirements and constraints are assumed:

- Primary source must meet maximum demand 2 MGD,
- Backup supply must meet average demand 1 MGD,
- Supply (Primary and Intermediate Emergency Backup) must meet expected PFAS Maximum Contaminant Limit (MCL) of 4 ng/l,
- Iron and Manganese (Fe/Mn) concentration (Primary and Emergency Backup) must meet secondary contaminant MCL via either treatment or blending,
- MWRA cost is based on recent average consumption of 440 million gallons per year split among 5,500 Water (Residential, Commercial/Industrial/Other, Irrigation) accounts.

Option 1 Summary

New Cost: PFAS Treatment Facility Capital construction cost,
PFAS Treatment Facility Operating cost (including media disposal).

Advantage: Backup supply already in place
Retained control,
Lower cost per gallon.

Disadvantage: Greater operating responsibility and operating cost.

Option 2 Summary

New Cost: Expanded present pump station to meet peak demand (additional 1 MGD pump),
Disinfection (chemical feed and chloramine storage)
Renegotiated IMA with Norwood,
MWRA Operating Policy 10 (Op10) for permanent connection,
Interbasin Transfer Act permit
MWRA cost/gallon,
Additional pumping cost (lift from lower hydraulic gradeline at Norwood).

Advantage: MWRA responsibility for change of law/additional required treatment – cost would be spread among all system users,
Environmental impact of water withdrawal shifted from Sharon to Western Massachusetts (Quabban Reservoir).

Disadvantage: Loss of control,
MWRA per gallon cost (permanent cost),
Present Town wells that meet PFAS MCL without treatment are not sufficient to meet demand requirement, emergency conditions would require use of current temporary treatment system.
PFAS treatment of MWRA water (if required – potentially significant cost).
Benefit of shifting withdrawal impact to Western Massachusetts would be offset by mounding and stream flooding caused by infiltration of consumed water (assuming same magnitude of hydrologic response as resulting from pumping.)

Option 1: Primary Supply via Treated Production Wells

Two sources of funding are currently available for PFAS treatment: \$15.8 million via 0% State Revolving Fund loans and \$5.2 million via outright grants through the **American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA)**.

Current estimated construction cost for a PFAS treatment facility is \$15.8 million. However, this cost estimate was determined in the fall of 2021, so already a year old. Cost to construct a treatment facility does not include using \$5.2 million of available ARPA grant funding to reduce SRF borrowing and offset cost. As a result, the treatment plant construction plus operating cost will initially add approximately \$145/year including increased operating cost to the average account. The capital cost from borrowing will be eliminated after 20 years as the debt service will end.

Annual Operating Budget Increase (assuming 440 million gallons)

Capital Cost:	\$15.8M/20 years = \$790,000
Operating Cost:	\$0.50 per 1000 gallons = \$220,000
Total:	\$1,010,000 Annual Budget Increase

Average Bill increase Treatment: \$185/year

Capital Cost:	\$15.8M/20 years/5500 accounts = \$145/year
Operating Cost:	\$0.50 per 1000 gallons per account = \$40/year

PFAS Treatment Construction Cost:	\$15.8M 20-year borrowing via SRF funding at 0% + \$5.2M via ARPA grant funding.
-----------------------------------	--

Option 2 Primary Supply via MWRA Connection

The Water Department undertook the MWRA pump station project assuming that the station would meet the Town's demand in the event of an emergency that would last for 3 months to 2 years, given that after two years, the MWRA would likely require joining with permanent connection. If the Town would turn to the MWRA as a permanent connection, our IMA agreement with the Town of Norwood is for emergency use only and includes an annual payment of \$150,000 for 10 years to cover the cost of upgrading the distribution network in Norwood plus the cost of water used. This agreement would likely have to be reopened in the event the connection is used on a permanent basis and an interbasin transfer permit would be required. Further, this approach would leave the Town without a secondary connection in the event of a distribution system problem in Norwood, putting the Town in the same predicament that led the Department to undertake the emergency connection in the first place.

MWRA provides wholesale water to the point to entry through a metered connection. The cost of water this FY is \$4,387.28 per million gallons (\$4.387/1000 gallons). This rate includes both system capital and operating costs. Sharon may also need to construct a backup pump station for the same reasons that the Norwood connection and pump station was constructed: in the event of a long-term (in excess of 1 month) disruption in service from the MWRA at Norwood, a second firm connection would need to be put on line. For comparison, the cost of the Norwood connection at \$4 million could also be added to the cost of turning to the MWRA for both primary and backup supply.

Under the MWRA supply scenario, Sharon would pay for what it uses. However, Sharon would continue to manage and maintain its own distribution system, i.e., staff salary, operating cost and capital cost for infrastructure maintenance and replacement, which today represents approximately 75-90 percent of the annual budget, would remain.

The MWRA has historically had an entrance fee based on the expected use, payable over 20 years, but the MWRA Advisory Board is in the process of examining whether that fee should be eliminated or not. The MWRA Advisory Board Executive Director did propose at MWRA's Advisory Board meeting on Thursday, April 21 to suspend the entrance fee for the next five years if the community has water quality or quantity issues (this would apply to Sharon).

At this point, it appears likely that the one-time buy in fee would be waived for Sharon. MWRA believes they have sufficient excess capacity to supply water, but no excess capacity for wastewater. Assuming that the capital buy-in fee is waived, a change over to MWRA as the primary supply would add approximately \$2.55/per 1000 gallons used or an increase of approximately \$185 per year for the average account. An additional \$40 per account per year could be added for 20 years to cover the cost of the backup pump station bringing the all-in cost increase to \$225 per year.

If the suspension is not granted, the current entrance fee is approximately \$4.3 million per million gallons per day (MGD) interest free, payable over 25 years, with a three-year grace period. This means that the added cost would be roughly \$50 per year per account for 20 years if the ask was an average of 1.25 million gallons per day (rough historical average for the past 5 years).

MWRA does provide a variety of water quality services including free total chlorine residual (TCR) sampling, and all the other regulatory sampling of our water. If Sharon continues to maintain and operate our local sources, we would still be responsible for operating expenses and doing whatever treatment and sampling is required.

One significant benefit is that MWRA would be responsible for compliance with any changing water quality regulations, and has protected their sources well (both legislatively and physically) resulting in a lower likelihood of needing additional treatment. Particularly as it relates to PFAS, there is real uncertainty that any treatment built now will be fully capable of handling future regulations. The clear fear is that PFAS regulations will get broader and more stringent, and that the cost and difficulty of treating and then disposing of media will increase over time.

Again, even if Sharon connected to MWRA's system, the Town would be responsible for the cost of connecting to MWRA's system and maintaining its distribution system and other town assets (tanks, water mains, water meters, and the pumping station). In short, most of the cost currently contained in the Water Department budget would remain. The only exceptions would be treatment chemicals and well maintenance (assuming our current wells would be abandoned, roughly \$150,000/year) and the anticipated cost of PFAS treatment.

Annual Operating Budget Increase (Assuming 440 million gallons)

Wholesale Price for MWRA:	\$4.387/1000 gallons = \$1,930,280
Pump Station Operating Cost:	\$0.1/1000 gallons = \$44,000
Avoided Operating Cost:	\$1.90/1000 gallons = -\$836,000
Total Cost:	\$1,138,280

Average Annual Bill Increase - MWRA

Current Operating cost to produce water: \$1.90/1000 gallons (avoided operational cost)

Wholesale price for MWRA:	\$4.387/1000 gallons (incurred operational cost)
Additional operational cost:	\$0.1/1000 gallons (incurred operational cost)

Backup pump station **\$40/account/year (incurred capital cost not included)**

Annual water use per account: 58 gallons per person per day (GPCD), 3.4 person household (72,000 gallons per account per year)

Total Cost Increase: $[58\text{GPCD} \times 3.4 \text{ persons per account} \times 365 \text{ days}] \times [(\$4.387/1000 \text{ gallons} + \$0.10/1000 \text{ gallons} - \$1.90/1000 \text{ gallons})] + \$40/\text{account/year (backup pump station)}$
= **\$225/year**

Buy-in Cost: $\$4.3\text{M} / \text{MGD} \times 1.25 \text{ MGD}/20 \text{ years}/5250 \text{ accounts} = \underline{\$50/\text{year}}$ (not included)

Conclusion:

The above cost estimate for the first year show relatively little difference between the cost of constructing a treatment vs purchase of water from the MWRA in year 1 of the 20 year period. However, two main differences make the cost difference significant:

3. The cost of MWRA water has historically increased by roughly 2.5% each year. Consequently, the cost difference between the two options will increase.
4. Unlike the borrowing cost for the treatment plant, this incremental cost of purchasing water from the MWRA will not be retired and remain an annual cost.

The Water Management Advisory Committee reviewed the November 30, 2022 memorandum from Eric Hooper to the Select Board and following discussion among the Committee members took the position on a 5-0 with 2 absences vote to support continuation with design intended for construction of a drinking water treatment facility with the capacity to treat the permitted capacity of Wells 2 and 4 with an option for treatment of the permitted capacity of Well 3 at a future point and to not pursue a permanent connection to the MWRA at this time.

Last spring town Meeting voters approved construction and design of a treatment facility. The Water Management Advisory Committee has done due diligence in researching alternatives.

MOTION: To support the position of the Water Management Advisory Committee to proceed with the design and construction of a water treatment facility.

(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE

Pierre-Louis: AYE

Smith-Lee: AYE

Bicycle grant project update

Mr. Hooper advised that Maria de la Fuente has left the department as she has accepted a position in the Town of Norton. He is picking up where she left off with this project. A grant was secured to purchase electric bicycles. It is planned that some bikes will be available at the commuter rail and some at community center. He explained that this pilot program is not a blue bike program. The intent is to have them available for folks to come to Sharon and use them to go to larger recreation facilities in town such as the lake, Crescent Ridge, Wards Berry Farm, and the Audubon property. Rec Advisory suggested that helmets required. Participants will be responsible for bikes by charge card.

Communication strategy

Ms. Melissa Frank provided the Board with her plans for The Massapoag Press, a new local newspaper. She updated the Board briefly on her background and the features she expects as part of the paper.

The Board expressed their gratitude to Ms. Frank for her update and also their excitement at the news as the lack of a local paper has been missed deeply by the community.

Select Board representative to Sharon Standing Building Committee Selection Committee

MOTION: To appoint William Heitin as the Select Board's designee to the Sharon Standing Building Selection Committee.

(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE

Pierre-Louis: AYE

Smith-Lee: AYE

Consent Calendar

- I. Vote to approve the following minutes
 - a. November 15, 2022 – Executive session
 - b. December 6, 2022 – Open session
- II. Vote to accept the following donation
 - a. \$7,044 from Rita Rabb for lights at pickleball courts
- III. Vote to approve the following Common Victualler's Licenses from *January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023*
 - a. Shaw's Supermarkets, Inc. d/b/a Starbucks Kiosk, 780 So. Main St. – Application form
- IV. Vote to approve the following Alcohol License renewals from January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023 contingent upon receipt of an inspection certificate before December 30, 2022
 - a. The Cape Club at Sharon – Retail License Renewal form**
 - b. Saphire Manor and Inn – Retail License Renewal form
 - c. The Savory Spread – Retail License Renewal form**
 - d. Simcha – Retail License Renewal form**
 - e. VFW Arthur I Boyden Post #7238 – Retail License Renewal form
- V. Vote to make the following Board/Committee appointments through *December 31, 2025*
 - a. Mena Mesiha, Board of Health
 - b. Lois Diamond, Commission on Disabilities
 - c. Susan Friedman, Commission on Disabilities
 - d. Jonathan Wasserman, Conservation Commission
 - e. Ruth Palan Lopez, Council on Aging Board
 - f. Neil Grossman, Council on Aging Board
 - g. Rita Edelston, Council on Aging Board
 - h. Eli Hauser, Economic Development Committee
 - i. Alan Lury, Economic Development Committee
 - j. Mike Sherman, Energy Advisory Committee
 - k. Robert Hutton, Historical and Historic District Commissions Alternate
 - l. Gordon Hughes, Historical and Historic District Commissions
 - m. Shirley Schofield, Historical and Historic District Commissions
 - n. Gary Bluestein, Recreation Advisory Committee
 - o. Cheryl Whiting, Recreation Advisory Committee
 - p. Chris Pimental, Water Management Advisory Committee
- VI. Vote to make the following annual appointments through December 31, 2023
 - a. Animal Control Officer, Rachel Oles
 - b. Animal Inspector, Edwin Little
 - c. Building Inspector, Dana Hinthorne
 - d. Civil Defense Director, Michael Polimer
 - e. Electrical inspector, Mark Fisher
 - f. Fence viewer, William Heitin
 - g. Finance Director, Krishan Gupta
 - h. Norfolk County Advisory Board Representative, Edwin Little
 - i. Parking officer, Shaun Strobel
 - j. Parking clerk, Kevin Weber
 - k. Parking clerk, Elizabeth Curley
 - l. Plumbing & Gas Inspector
 - m. Sealer of Weights & Measures, Mark Coyne
 - n. Town Counsel, Richard Gelerman
 - o. Veteran's Agent, Paul Bergeron
 - p. Crossing guards
 - i. Andrea Sullivan
 - ii. Karen McDougal
 - iii. Leah Stella
 - iv. Valeriy Tsinman
 - v. Mario Raynor
 - vi. Diane Dobie

- vii. Gale Simpson (fill-in)
- q. Special Police
 - i. John Ford
 - ii. Matthew McDonald
 - iii. Philip McEnany
 - iv. Neil McGrath
 - v. John McGrath
 - vi. Jenna Shulsk
 - vii. Donald Williams

MOTION: To approve the consent calendar
(Pierre-Louis – Smith-Lee) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

Town Administrator's report

Mr. Turkington provided the following update.

We received / exchanged approximately 20 pieces of correspondence between Friday, December 2 and 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 14. Topics included:

- Two submissions related to consideration of appointment to Town boards and committees;
- Email concerning oversight of library legal counsel expenses;
- Emails from and response concerning status of tractor-trailer ban on South Walpole Street;
- Emails and response regarding hunting regulations;
- Email from Fire Chief concerning house fire on December 9 on Moose Hill Parkway;
- Email from and response regarding excessive noise from leaf-blowing equipment and late delivery activity; and,
- Email from and response regarding the status of \$400K water mitigation funds required by the MOU with the owners of Sharon Gallery.

Topics not anticipated within 48 hours of posting

MOTION: Vote to approve and sign the Confirmatory Proposed Final Order of Taking for 700 South Main Street
(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

Adjourn

MOTION: Enter into Executive Session at 10:00 pm for the purposes of discussing strategy with respect to contract negotiations with non-union personnel and the Town Administrator. The Board will adjourn for the evening at the conclusion.

DISCUSSION OF THESE ITEMS IN OPEN SESSION MAY HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON THE BARGAINING POSITION OF THE TOWN
(Smith-Lee – Pierre-Louis) 3-0 **PASSES**

Switlekowski: AYE
Pierre-Louis: AYE
Smith-Lee: AYE

List of Documents

- Hearing notice
- Deed
- Map
- Approval and acceptance forms
- Memos (3)
- Letters of support (4)
- Proposal
- Meet the Massapoag Press
- Correspondence
- Minutes
- Common Victualler application
- Alcohol license renewal applications (5)
- Report