

**Select Board Meeting  
June 7, 2021 – 7:00 PM  
Sanford Hall  
155 Village Street**

**Present:** Glenn Trindade, Chair; Maryjane White, Vice-Chair; Dennis Crowley, Member; John Foresto, Member; Frank Rossi, Member.

**Staff Present:** Michael Boynton, Town Manager; Carol Pratt, Finance Director; Sandy Johnston, Communications Director; Stephanie Carlisle, Compliance Coordinator, Department of Public Works; Dave D’Amico, DPW Director; Peter Pelletier, DPW Deputy Director.

**Others Present:** Planning and Economic Development Board (PEDB): Andy Rodenhiser, Chair, Bob Tucker, Vice-Chair, Matthew Hayes, Richard Di Iulio, Jessica Chabot; Thomas Gay, Planning and Economic Development Board candidate.

\*\*\*\*\*

At 7:00 PM Mr. Trindade called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Mr. Trindade stated that the Board needed to reorganize relative to the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Clerk positions.**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Ms. White as Chair. Mr. Rossi seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Mr. Crowley as Vice-Chair. Mr. Rossi seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Mr. Rossi as Clerk. Mr. Crowley seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Public Comments:** Mr. Liam McDermott of 39 Populatic Street reminded all that the 100 Club of Massachusetts fundraiser starts this Friday morning ending at the Esplanade. There are five members on his team who have raised a little over \$5,000 noting a family in Worcester will be a recipient. He thanked all for spreading word on this important fundraising event. Mr. Crowley asked if there was a fundraising goal. Mr. McDermott stated they do not have a monetary goal but want to raise awareness of the 100 Club and let families know they still care. He shared the details to access information on this club and its fundraising efforts as follows: (1) 100ClubMass.org/57 Club or (2) 57 for 100 on Facebook.

**Public Hearing (7PM): Discussion/Vote: Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Water and Sewer Rates**

*The Board reviewed the (1) Water and Sewer Advisory Board’s recommended FY22 Water and Sewer Rates memo from Dave D’Amico, and (2) 2022 Utility Study Results memo from Dave D’Amico.*

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board open the public hearing on the FY22 water and sewer rates. Mr. Crowley seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

Mr. Pelletier referenced the memo where the Water and Sewer Advisory Board recommends case 6 noting the methodology utilized included: (1) higher FY21 revenue, (2) use of a more

conservative/lower water use level using 2019 levels, and (3) collection rates at 94%. He noted this translates to a quarterly increase for Tier 1 of \$18. Mr. Boynton noted that we sold a lot of water in the last year due to many residents working from home resulting in a large increase in usage and revenue. He noted that whether this will continue is yet to be seen. He further noted the significant increase in costs relative to the planned new water treatment facility, the Brentwood water main project continuation/completion, as well as the need to address the Lovering Street water tank in the next few years. He stated that we do not like rollercoaster rates so under case 6 using 2019 consumption, there will be an increase over the current rates for Tier 1 and 2 of \$2.04. He stated the driving factor is where we want to be for the rate payers. Ms. White noted the increase would be approximately \$80 per year. Mr. Foresto asked if costs are calculated using all capital costs and operational expenses in one bucket. Mr. Boynton confirmed noting this includes fixed costs and variable costs with the fixed costs including salaries, expenses, and projected debt. Mr. Foresto noted that with the heavy capital intensity over the next few years, we are making the higher usage user pay for that. Mr. Boynton stated he was not aware of a more equitable way of paying other than a user fee. Mr. Foresto stated a flat rate across all users for fixed costs would be a more equitable alternative. Ms. Pratt stated that was how this was done in the past. Mr. Trindade and Mr. D'Amico stated the seniors complained when the flat rate was in place. There was further discussion about the equitable alternative of charging across all tiers versus the higher usage tiers. Mr. Foresto asked if the capital costs for all new piping is included as well as the related street work. Mr. Boynton confirmed the piping was included but only a portion of the road costs. He stated there are additional mitigating factors including the 39 Main Street project that will add \$1 million to this budget, as well as the influx of COVID funds, potentially over \$3 million with very limited expenditure opportunities which include water, sewer, and broadband. He stated the ultimate variable long term will be the annual operating cost of the water treatment facility noting that he anticipates FY24 will be another changeable year. Mr. Crowley stated that generally he wants to build up reserves, but he is not in favor of option 6 and prefers option 5, which is a smaller increase at \$50 for next year. He explained his reasoning for his preference of option 5 including: (1) referring to the option 5 spreadsheet noting the reduction in revenue of \$185,000. Ms. Pratt noted that was an error of including that number. Mr. Crowley pointed out that number would then fall to the reserves increasing those reserves, (2) consumption based on 2019. We can't say in 2022 we are not going to use more water than in 2019. Those are two items that will increase the revenue, (3) carrying the bond rate of 2.9% is a bit high; Ms. Pratt stated we should be able to get 2% rate. Mr. Crowley noted that is substantially higher and we are being overly conservative, and lastly, (4) he asked if the Oakland Street portion of the project would really be done in FY22. Mr. D'Amico stated calendar 2022 not FY22. Mr. Crowley noted that we have the premium for that bond baked into FY22, in addition to that, we never borrowed \$672,000 in FY21 noting both these will fall to the reserves. He asked if both these costs are reflected in these calculations. Ms. Pratt stated those bonds were calculated into these numbers. **Mr. Crowley requested that she show him off-line where those are included. He stated that we have well over half a million that will fall to reserves so he would prefer to go with option 5.** He also stated we anticipate 550-600 new homes in town over the next few years, which adds a potential \$400,000 in additional revenue. He reiterated that he feels we could go with option 5. Mr. Trindade asked for the anticipated cost of the water treatment plant. Mr. Pelletier stated \$16 million. Mr. Trindade noted that construction costs historically go up quickly and his concern that if we go with option 5 we will get hit harder down the road. He also stated a lot of the new housing will be apartments so he does not think the usage will be what Mr. Crowley anticipates. Mr. Crowley stated the difference between option 5 and 6 is minimal. There was further discussion about the impact on future construction costs as well as option 5 versus option 6 and the impact of the revenue surplus on the ability to pay down principal on borrowings to decrease debt. **Mr. Crowley thinks we may end up putting twice as much in reserves, an additional half a million, which could be well over \$1million with option 6 but feels that residents would rather have the discount now.** Mr. Foresto stated that both engineering firms noted that we will not get this

year's prices next year for the water treatment facility due to the increasing costs of labor and materials. Mr. Crowley stated his concern that when this was last discussed, the cost was \$10 million and now we are up to \$18 million. Mr. Foresto stated that Medfield's low bid came in at \$9.1 and the high bid came in at \$10.2. He noted that our planned facility is much larger in size. Mr. Trindade stated we also added the potential to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). Mr. Crowley noted that we are building in capacity to deal with that problem noting the State cutoff is 20 parts per trillion while we at 10 parts per trillion. There was further discussion that we don't know what the Town's PFAS levels are as we have not been continually measuring it, as it fluctuates greatly. Mr. Rossi stated the difference between option 5 and 6 is a pay now or pay later scenario. Mr. D'Amico stated the water treatment facility is currently at a conceptual point so the cost estimate is dollars per square foot so there is a large range in fees. He reiterated that the Water and Sewer Advisory Board thought it was better to go conservative as it looks like we need to raise rates next year. Ms. White asked for any public comments. Mr. Rodenhiser stated that residents want clean water at any cost being judicious on how to do it. He reported that presently, his business gets weekly cost increases, and anything imported is very delayed.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board close the public hearing on the FY22 water and sewer rates. Mr. Foresto seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board approve the FY22 water rates case number 6 as discussed. Mr. Foresto seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 4-1-0. Mr. Crowley voted against.**

**Mr. Trindade moved to approve the Sewer rates with no change. Mr. Foresto seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Reconsideration/Approval of Minutes:**

- **Reconsideration of May 3, 2021**
- **Approval of May 17, 2021**

*The Board reviewed the (1) proposed amendment excerpt of May 3, 2021 minutes, (2) e-mail request from Susan Dietrich to amend May 3, 2021 minutes, and (3) draft minutes of May 17, 2021.*

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board approved the minutes of May 3, 2021.** Mr. Boynton stated that School Committee Chair Dietrich requested to amend the May 3, 2021 minutes to reflect the correct date of the School Committee meeting of February 25, 2021. **Mr. Trindade rescinded this motion.** **Mr. Foresto moved that the Board approve to amend the minutes of May 3, 2021 as presented. Mr. Crowley seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Mr. Foresto moved that the Board approve the minutes of May 17, 2021. Mr. Trindade seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Appointment Considerations:**

- **Planning and Economic Development Board (PEDB) Associate Member – Thomas Gay**
- **Municipal Facility Study Committee – Mark Robinson**

*The Board reviewed (1) candidates' statements of interest, (2) PEDB's recommendation.*

Mr. Rodenhiser stated that the PEDB approved Mr. Gay's appointment at their last meeting.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Mr. Gay as an associate member of the PEDB for a term expiring on June 30, 2022. Mr. Foresto seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

Mr. Robinson explained his background and committee interest noting he has been in facilities management for over thirty years, strictly in healthcare, has a lot of knowledge of commercial building systems, and has been a Medway resident his entire life. Mr. Trindade stated he reviewed his resume noting it was stellar.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Mr. Robinson as to the Municipal Facility Study Committee for a term expiring upon completion of the final report. Mr. Crowley seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Authorization to Expend Grant Funds: MasseVIP Public Access Charging Grant Program - \$32,357 and Approval of Contract with Voltrek LLC for Installation of Two Electronic Vehicle Charging Stations - \$37,715**

*The Board reviewed the (1) memo from Stephanie Carlisle, (2) grant expenditure authorization form, (3) notice of grant award letter, and (4) Voltrek contract.*

Ms. Carlisle stated the plan is to install two charging stations, one at Choate Park and one at Oakland Park, noting the installation and equipment was funded through MasseVIP through MassDEP. She noted the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder for the network license to make them smart stations. Ms. White asked if we will be charging the same for these as for the others. Ms. Carlisle confirmed. Mr. Crowley noted that as of the last report, we were just breaking even and would like the Board to consider revisiting these charges after installation should there be a need to adjust these rates. Mr. Crowley noted there is a cost to the Town of \$5,300 and asked where this funding was coming from. Ms. Carlisle stated the DPW fleet account.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board authorize the expenditure of the MasseVIP Public Access Charging Grant Program grant and authorize the Chair to execute the contract with Voltrek LLC as presented. Mr. Crowley seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Approval of Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Enterprise Indirect Cost Allocations**

*The Board reviewed the proposed FY22 enterprise indirect cost allocations document.*

Mr. Boynton stated this agenda item will be moved to the next Select Board meeting.

**Presentation by KP Law: New Housing Choice Provisions—Need from Judith Cutler of KP**

*The Board reviewed the (1) e-update from KP Law, dated February 1, 2021, (2) guidance from Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development, and (3) Chapter 358 of the Acts of 2020, Sections 16-25, Amending the Zoning Act, G.L. c. 40A*

Mr. Boynton stated he requested a 30,000-foot view of what this new legislation means to Medway be presented to the Board as the new law has a major impact on communities. He noted that we did a lot of work to reach 10% in affordable housing to obtain Safe Harbor status and is interested in how this new law impacts 40Bs. He introduced Ms. Cutler who will address the direct impacts on Medway. Ms. Cutler stated the Housing Choice law is a lot of language that does not require towns to do much noting the intent of the law is to open doors for more housing and economic development and make it easier for certain types of developments to be implemented. She reported that the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) was tasked with developing guidelines for this law, and they have yet to begin on these guidelines, therefore, there is no need for any action at this time. She then described the four elements impacted by this new law including: (1) changes of the quantum of vote requirements lowered for certain types of zoning amendments and then explained the specific

instances, (2) changes to the quantum of vote requirements reduced for certain special permits and then explained the specific instances, (3) new zoning requirements for MBTA communities, of which Medway is one, where there must be a zoning ordinance or by-law that provides for at least one district of reasonable size in which multi-family housing is permitted as of right and explained the related specifics, and (4) new zoning terms expressly defined at the State level, noting these definitions may not be in concert with those of towns. She reiterated that there is no deadline for adoption but, until adopted, it will limit the Town's eligibility for certain grant funds. She stated now is the stage for planning the implementation and working with DHCD to confirm their concept as well as looking at those regulations relative to Smart Growth developments. She noted the type of growth this law is intended to incentivize is the town center kind of density nearby to public facilities with the need to look at where this density can be accommodated and in what circumstances. She noted that this does not compete with 40B in any way as there are no specific implementation requirements. This is an opportunity for towns to develop this the way they want noting all that would be needed is a simple majority vote for amendment to the by-law to allow multifamily housing and mixed-use development in an eligible location close to center of town. She noted that a lot of communities have mixed development, multifamily housing, and accessory use dwelling terms which are defined very differently in each town. There will be a need to match the Town's definition to the new law, as that is what impacts the change in quantum from 2/3 versus majority vote. Mr. Trindade asked if the Attorney General would determine if the State terminology superseded the Town's terminology. Ms. Cutler stated the State has a recommended process and the Town should be advised by both DHCD and Town Counsel to determine if this should be a 2/3 versus majority vote. She noted that the State guidance requires a petitioner to justify why this development requires a simple majority vote and that the PEDB, during a public hearing, would determine if this is a 2/3 or majority vote and make that recommendation at Town Meeting. She noted that most towns are being very careful in their analyses of this. She then reviewed the specific scenarios impacted by simple majority vote amendments including: (1) allowance of multifamily housing or mixed-use development in eligible locations by special permit, (2) an increase in the permissible density of population or intensity of a particular use in a multifamily or mixed-use development, (3) accessory dwelling units in a detached structure on the same lot or a reduction in the amount of parking required in a residential or mixed use development in order to allow more housing units, and (4) a zoning or by-law amendment that alters height, bulk, setbacks, parking, building coverage allowing for additional housing units beyond what could normally be allowed, all of which are based on terminology defined in this law. She then noted that for the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and PEDB this impacts special permits noting the law is very specific on which permits only require a majority vote including: (1) multifamily housing located within half a mile of a rail, bus, ferry station, (2) mixed-use development, and (3) in centers of commercial activity within the Town including town centers and other commercial districts. Mr. Boynton asked if these types of projects come before the PEDB is it their decision regarding the majority vote or is that determined by the new law. Ms. Cutler stated the Town zoning by-law defines mixed-use development in a certain way and if it does not match up significantly with the new State definition, there is no simple majority vote involved. The Town would have to show that the Town's definition is the same as the one defined in the Zoning Act. Mr. Boynton asked if the new law is allowing the Town through the PEDB to adjust the zoning by-law, the law does not change the quantum vote but provides the PEDB the ability to do so. Ms. Cutler confirmed. Mr. Boynton stated the portion that does affect Medway is relative to the requirement that an MBTA designated town must define a district for multifamily housing by right. Ms. Cutler confirmed. Mr. Rodenhiser stated it looks like there are two places where we currently have a situation where changes need to occur to zoning to make it match the statute and he is thinking potentially that would be Glen Brook and 39 Main Street as both have the density to address this. Mr. Crowley asked how that would benefit the Town. Mr. Rodenhiser said we would meet the statutory requirements, which would allow access to specific grant funding. Mr. Rodenhiser also stated we could

look at our central business district but would need to assess what we currently have in place compared to the current law. Mr. Boynton stated if we rezone either Glen Brook or 39 Main Street we need to ensure that we do not run afoul of any spot zoning issue. There was further discussion about the impact of not addressing this zoning or addressing it in a way that could potentially negatively impact the Town. Mr. Trindade asked if the Town's mixed-use definition of the central business district is close to what is in the statute. Mr. Gay stated the PEDB has yet to review these new definitions. Mr. Rodenhiser stated the PEDB must compare the Town's current definitions to this new law. Ms. Cutler stated that there is no requirement that Towns change their zoning by-laws to match the State and this only impacts MBTA communities. Mr. Rodenhiser stated our current process is a special permit for a multifamily development and to look at that area for density. He further stated that he feels the PEDB has been progressive noting the State is talking about raw density and trying to drive up that type of housing. Ms. Cutler clarified that the State wants a by right multifamily housing within half a mile of an MBTA station if at all possible/practical. There was further discussion on the potential eligible locations and possibility of requesting an added MBTA stop. Mr. Di Iulio asked about the possibility of creating an overlay district in the Glen Brook and 39 Main Street area that is larger than those parcels. Mr. Rodenhiser stated he believes that achieves same thing. Mr. Tucker stated the need of the PEDB to look at the statute and have further discussion noting that both of those areas are two good options to further investigate. Mr. Trindade then explained the specifics of both projects. There was further discussion regarding rezoning the 39 Main Street project and the efficacy of this meeting the new statutory requirements. Ms. Saint Andre stated her belief that a development like 39 Main Street would fulfill the statutory requirement. Mr. Hayes asked what the affordable housing requirement is under new statute. Ms. Cutler stated the multifamily development would require 10% of the units as affordable housing at the 80% median income level along with an affordable restriction put on them for thirty years. Ms. Chabot stated the requirement is 15 units per acre but asked if the PEDB can still set other requirements like minimal parcel sizes, height restrict, etc. Ms. Cutler confirmed noting it is just a by right and not a special permit. Mr. Gay asked if once the central business district is maxed at a commercial level, which was the original plan, could we then build onto it with this designation. Ms. Cutler confirmed as long as the multifamily is treated as by right. Mr. Crowley asked if we anticipate a lot of PEDB articles coming up in November caused by this. Mr. Rodenhiser stated a least a couple. Ms. Saint Andre reminded all that we now have mixed-use development, our own version, can just keep them, do not have to change them based on this statute, and can wait until we have the DHCD guidelines, which are not out yet. Mr. Rodenhiser stated his preference to wait for the DHCD guidelines. Ms. Cutler agreed stating the only issue to be addressed is one multifamily type. She stated there is one bizarre change, which is the definition of a lot, which is different in every town and was never defined before. She noted that the applicable definition would default to the State. She stated that the PEDB should look at this definition as well. Ms. Chabot asked what the penalty would be should the PEDB decide not to comply. Ms. Cutler stated if an applicant comes into Town to use this definition, they could go to court to force the Town to adopt the zoning.

### **Annual Appointments**

*The Board reviewed the (1) list of incumbents who have requested reappointment, and (2) Fiscal Year 2021 attendance records for the Affordable Housing Committee, Affordable Housing Trust, Agricultural Committee, Board of Assessors, Capital Improvement Planning Committee, Community Preservation Committee, Conservation Commission, Council on Aging, Historical Commission, Medway Cultural Council, Medway Pride Day Committee, Memorial Committee, and Zoning Board of Appeals.*

Mr. Boynton stated Ms. Langley compiled the reappointment list along with the Board and Committee attendance.

**Mr. Foresto moved that the Board appoint the incumbent board and committee members as listed on the meeting agenda. Mr. Trindade seconded. No Discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Discussion: Select Board Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Meeting Schedule**

*The Board reviewed the proposed FY22 meeting schedule.*

**Mr. Foresto moved that the Board approve the FY2022 Select Board meeting schedule as presented with the change of June 20, 2022 to June 21, 2022. Mr. Trindade seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Discussion: Select Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Board Liaison Positions**

*The Board reviewed the proposed Select Board Liaison Positions.*

Mr. Rossi requested to liaison with the Finance Committee instead of the Parks Commission. Mr. Crowley made this switch with Mr. Rossi.

**Discussion/Vote: Policy on Continuation of Remote Participation**

*The Board reviewed the (1) e-mail from Town Counsel, Mark Reich, (2) March 10, 2020 Governor's Order Suspending Certain Provisions of Open Meeting Law, and (3) May 28, 2021 Governor's Order Terminating March 10, 2020 Order.*

Mr. Boynton stated we will have reached the end of the State of Emergency as of June 15<sup>th</sup> and the law reverts to pre-Covid status as far as remote participation of meetings. The legislature is taking up the topic to allow this to continue but this has not been finalized. Some Boards and Committees have requested to still continue with Zoom. He noted that as of June 15<sup>th</sup>, the majority of a Board or Committee must attend in person stating Zoom created a lot of work for Medway Cable and others. The Board agreed that in-person discussions/meetings should resume effective June 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Boynton stated we will advise all appointed Boards and Committees that the Select Board policy is that all are expected to have in-person meetings effective June 15<sup>th</sup>. He noted that the PEDB and Board of Health are elected Boards. He reminded all that after June 15<sup>th</sup>, the law requires a quorum in person unless the legislature extends the allowance of remote participation.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board vote to advise all Boards and Committees to return to in-person meetings as of June 15<sup>th</sup> as discussed. Mr. Foresto seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**Vote: Rescind Select Board Emergency Declaration of March 16, 2020**

*The Board reviewed the emergency declaration of March 15, 2020.*

Mr. Boynton stated the need to rescind the emergency declaration of March 16, 2020.

**Mr. Crowley moved that the Board rescind the emergency declaration of March 16, 2020, as discussed. Mr. Trindade seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

**One-Day Liquor License Applications:**

- **Stephanie McMullin – Thayer Homestead – 6/12/2021**
- **Kristen Rice – Thayer Homestead – 6/17/2021**
- **Mary Weafer – Thayer Homestead – 6/25/2021**
- **Stephanie Martins – Thayer Homestead – 6/27/2021**
- **Lorraine Hall – Thayer Homestead – 7/9/2021**

- **Nancy Newman – Thayer Homestead – 7/25/2021**
- **Lauren Alessi – Thayer Homestead – 7/30/2021**
- **Sean Peplinski – Thayer Homestead – 7/31/2021**

*The Board reviewed the Police Lieutenant's recommendations for Stephanie McMullin, Kristen Rice, Mary Weafer, Stephanie Martins, Lorraine Hall, Nancy Newman, Lauren Alessi, and Sean Peplinski.*

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board approve the one-day liquor applications as presented subject to the Police Lieutenant's recommendations and proof of appropriate insurance coverage. Mr. Foresto seconded. No discussion. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

#### **Action Items from Previous Meeting**

*The Board reviewed the (1) action items dated May 17, 2021, and (2) Water Treatment Facility updated project timeline.*

This agenda item was not addressed.

#### **Town Manager's Report**

*There were no items for the Board to review.*

#### **COVID Update:**

- Funding - Mr. Boynton stated we are still watching for a new level of funding. He noted that we have received 50% of the \$1.4 million and in 6 months the second 50% is planned to be distributed. There is a second sum due from Norfolk County which is still investigating how/what will be passed along to each of the towns including should they send the funds to the State who would then disburse to the towns or disburse directly to the towns. He stated that we have no plan to expend any of these funds. He commended Ms. Pratt on her phenomenal job identifying appropriate expenditures as well as seeking reimbursements. He noted that our COVID expenditures are far less now noting the need for a more global plan before planning on expending any further funds. Mr. Crowley stated that he thought saw that Norfolk County has \$3-\$3.5 million for reimbursing to Medway and asked about the breakdown of the \$3.8 million total to Medway that was previously discussed. Mr. Boynton stated \$1.4 million from the CARES Act plus the amount anticipated from Norfolk County would equal the \$3.8 million. Mr. Crowley stated that Norfolk County received \$187 million.

**Community Farm Lease – Authorization for Solar – Grant Application:** Mr. Boynton stated they are applying for a grant to allow solar to be placed on farm. Since the property is under the control of the Select Board, the Board would need to approve and support that grant process. Mr. Crowley requested that we confirm that they would comply with the newest zoning just past at Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Boynton confirmed noting that ground mounted solar is granted through the PEDB via a special permit.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board grant the Community Farm the approval to proceed with the solar project. Mr. Rossi seconded. VOTE 5-0-0.**

#### **BESS Review Process:**

- Funding Source – Exelon
- Special Legal Counsel – BCK Law
- Financial Mechanisms Review – Sansoucy (Glenn Walker)



Mr. Boynton stated that he would like to use the same consultants for this project that were used for Exelon relative to the Host Community Agreement (HCA) and Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT). Specifically, Jeff Bernstein of BCK Law for the HCA and Glenn Walker of Sansoucy, LLC for the PILOT. He would like to not exceed \$12,000 for the PILOT analysis noting that Jeff Bernstein would charge time and materials for the HCA as he did with the Exelon project. He stated that the technology energy funds from Exelon of \$70,000 are available for the costs associated with both these endeavors. He is requesting authorization to engage Sansoucy, LLC at \$12,000 for the energy piece up front.

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board vote to retain Jeff Bernstein of BCK Law as special counsel for the battery energy storage system (BESS). Mr. Rossi seconded. VOTE-5-0-0**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board authorize the Town Manager to retain Glenn Walker of Sansoucy, LLC for the purpose of PILOT investigation in an amount not to exceed \$12,000. Mr. Rossi seconded. Vote-5-0-0.**

**Mr. Trindade moved that the Board authorize the use of Exelon funds for the purposes just voted. Mr. Rossi seconded. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

DPW Leadership Changes: Mr. Boynton congratulated Dave D'Amico on his successful career as DPW Director noting that we will retain his expertise for a few hours weekly over the next year. He then congratulated and presented Pete Pelletier as the new DPW Director. He stated the new DPW Deputy Director, Sean Harrington, is from Needham and will be starting on July 1<sup>st</sup>. He then wished Rich Kearnan all the best on his retirement and announced Nolan Lynch as the new highway superintendent. He commended Mr. Pelletier in his role as Deputy Director. He then thanked Steve Carew and Julie Harrington for getting the splash pad up and running prior to this heatwave.

Town Manager Out of the Office: Mr. Boynton stated he will be out of the office as follows:

- June 14 – June 25<sup>th</sup> - Vacation

NEXT Regular Select Board Meeting – Monday, June 21, 2021.

### **Select Board's Reports**

*There were no items for the Board to review.*

Mr. Foresto stated there was a lot of discussion at the last meeting of the Water Treatment Facility Committee regarding how to fund the project. They are putting a list together of funding opportunities.

Mr. Crowley stated there were 154 Medway High School seniors who graduated this weekend and congratulated them, Superintendent Pires, as well as his staff on the event. He asked if we have had a response from the attorney of the bottle cap lots. Mr. Boynton stated we have not. He asked if we have received the federal census numbers back. Mr. Boynton stated no, and he does not know when they will be provided. Mr. Crowley reminded all that the affordable housing applications for Glen Brook close on June 18<sup>th</sup>. Seventy percent of these units are set aside for Medway residents and they have only received 20 resident applications to date. He noted there was confusion on the cost stating that a 1 bedroom allows a yearly income of under \$52,000. Mr. Crowley commended Mr. Trindade in his role of Select Board Chair noting it was a tough year and he worked very hard this past year. He thanked him for all his time and effort, as well as his efforts outside of the Board.

Mr. Trindade stated there have been 350 applications for Glenn Brook noting most are non-residents. He spoke with Superintendent Pires requesting this information be disseminated via the schools. Ms. Johnston stated there is a video that was done that she will continue to release to the public.

Mr. Rossi stated he is very happy to be seated at the table.

Ms. White commended Crossing Guard Cheryl Goodspeed on her efforts at the Medway Middle School each day.

**At 9:06 PM, Mr. Trindade moved to adjourn. Mr. Foresto seconded. VOTE: 5-0-0.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Liz Langley  
Executive Assistant  
Town Manager's Office