Fran Parks: I'm going to call the 30th of December, 2016, Prudential Committee of the Cotuit

Fire District to order. Could I please have introductions, starting on my right?

Michael Daley:

Michael Daley, treasurer.

Laurie Hadley: Laurie Hadley, Prudential Committee.

Stan Goldstein: Stan Goldstein, Prudential Committee.

Charlie Eager: Comment Eager, clerk.

Fran Parks: Fran Parks, Prudential Committee. Public comment? No public comment. The

first item on the agenda is a request to be able to do remote meeting

participation by the union negotiating committee with their attorney, which would allow them to consult with their attorney without Mr. Hoddnet driving all

the way down here for an hour and a half, which we pay for.

Laurie Hadley: This is the negotiating committee.

Fran Parks: This is the negotiating committee, but in order to do that, the Prudential

Committee or whoever is the chief of the public body has to have a remote participation policy in effect. This is the ... I've given you each the chapter and verse from the state. The most important thing is that, on this, is you can have remote participation for personal illness, personal disability, an emergency, military service, or geographic distance. The telephone can be used and internet or satellite enabled audio and video conferencing. The only is all members when any votes that are taken during the meeting must all be roll call votes. That's the

other requirement. Any questions?

Laurie Hadley: Yes, what was that part about the equipment that you can use?

Fran Parks: It's technology on the second page.

Laurie Hadley: Okay, so you could use a phone and we wouldn't have to buy any special

equipment.

Fran Parks: No, we don't have to buy any special equipment. We do have to buy ... I've

looked into getting speaker phones. We'll need a speaker phone for here and we

can get one for \$35.

Laurie Hadley: Sounds like a good idea.

Stan Goldstein: Speaker phone or the remote conference kind of thing? Not Skype. That's a video

but I mean there's a and I forget the word of it, something you set up right in the

middle of the table.

Fran Parks: Yes, it's like a pod.

Stan Goldstein: Yes, okay. Is that what you're referring to?

Fran Parks: No. I'm referring to a standard issue AT&T phone that has, you can have speaker

capabilities. The remote pod things cost two to three hundred dollars.

Stan Goldstein: The problem with the phones, the speaker, the phones, is they're pretty much

directional so it'll be difficult to hear all the participants if you put a telephone in

the middle of the table. That's my ...

Mike Daley: I tend to agree. I think those little multi-directional speakers that ... Do you have

a phone in this building?

Fran Parks: Yes. We have a phone.

Mike Daley: Do you have aluminum cables to get [inaudible 00:04:12]?

Fran Parks: I figured we'd just move the table up a little bit.

Mike Daley: At least you got a phone. That's my concern. Where you're going to be sitting

with the wire, you'd have to make sure that everybody [crosstalk 00:04:26] around it [inaudible 00:04:29] the speaker phone. You could try it. You'd just

have to [inaudible 00:04:32].

Fran Parks: We did it once in the chief's office and with just a plain old speaker phone and it

all seemed to work okay. If it's not suitable, then we can go for the more

expensive option, but that, I'm sure, would require some updating to our phone

because I don't think you just attach a wire to it.

Michael Daley: No, the pod is a phone. It's mounted and the speaker is omni-directional so

everybody can see and hear. That's what Stanley's talking about.

Stan Goldstein: Yes, remote conference calls.

Michael Daley: Sometimes when someone's speaking and someone speaks over them, you don't

pick up everything when you're listening on the other end is what he's talking about. It's true. Meeting phones they call them are a little bit more designed to

enable the sound to come and go.

Fran Parks: I can certainly look and see if I can find a less expensive one or I could talk to

Dan. Is that the assistant chief in West Barnstable? Our surplus person?

Michael Daley: That's David, but ...

Fran Parks: David, yes.

Michael Daley: There are definitely surpluses to be had.

Fran Perks: Okay.

Michael Daley: There may even be speaker phones out there.

Fran Parks: I'll see what I can do.

Charlie Eager: You need to vote your policy, regardless.

Fran Parks: Right, yes.

Stan Goldstein: You can get a cable, a telephone cable, 1,500 feet for just a few bucks, 10, 15

bucks.

Laurie Hadley: Tom's pretty good at telephone stuff.

Charlie Eager: Well, I guess I would ...

Laurie Hadley: If we need somebody to hook things up.

Laurie Hadley: I guess I would make a motion that we set up to have a remote meeting for

participation for our meeting. I don't know if it is set for a specific meeting or any

type of meeting.

Fran Parks: It's a blanket policy. It'd be a blanket policy for all the committees.

Mike Daley: If you're away on vacation or ill they can remote participate?

Stan Goldstein: Let me try to rephrase that. I move that we purchase equipment to enable us to

do remote meeting participation for the various boards in the Cotuit Fire District.

Laurie Hadley: And adopt the policy.

Fran Parks: Adopt the policy as written.

Laurie Hadley: And adopt the policy as written.

Fran Parks: Is there a second?

Laurie Hadley: Second.

Fran Parks: All those in favor.

Group: Aye.

Stan Goldstein: Isn't this a part of the open meeting law?

Fran Parks: Yes, it is. The next item is the trees overhanging our building on the north side of

the building. I've had three arborists look at it. I had Not Your Average Tree, Tree Fellers, and Bartlett. Not Your Average Tree for clearing over our building all the trees, four trees on the side, and thinning out the tree in front, the maple in front, was \$2,250. Tree Fellers was \$2,000. Bartlett was \$1,100. I spoke to Mr. Ceratani about it, because Bartlett would need to use his roadway. He's still recovering from his hip surgery, so he said it's fine. You can use it any time. My

recommendation is that we go with Bartlett.

Stan Goldstein: Are we cutting down trees on the ...

Fran Parks: No, just ...

Laurie Hadley: Just thinning or trimming.

Fran Parks: Because they're overhanging our building, so we're just thinning them.

Laurie Hadley: I make a motion that we accept the proposal from Bartlett.

Fran Parks: For \$1,100.

Stan Goldstein: Second.

Fran Parks: All those in favor.

Group: Aye.

Fran Parks: The treasurer's search report, the committee has come up with three candidates

that we're planning to interview and everyone on this board is available January 4th, which is a Wednesday. I will let the chief in West Barnstable know that. I

believe they're going to start at 7:00 pm.

Stan Goldstein: All three candidates will be here?

Fran Parks: No, we're meeting at West Barnstable.

Mike Foldsterin: We're meeting between the two boards at the West Barnstable fire station. All

three candidates are going to be interviewing.

Stan Goldstein: They'll be up there. They're on 149, is it? Over the ...

Laurie Hadley: You can't miss it, yes.

Stan Goldstein: Just go over the hill, on the right. Go by the church

Fran Perks: Just over the hill after the ... Yes. Okay.

Stan Goldstein: Can I make an assumption that, I mean you pretty much qualified these people

as far as their firefighting capability and it's other things that we're interested in because I frankly wouldn't know what to ask them how you're going to put out a

fire.

Fran Parks: Treasurer.

Stan Goldstein: Why am I thinking six months ahead?

Mike Daley: Do you use a pencil? Do you use a pen?

Stan Goldstein: I'll have to put on my thinking cap.

Laurie Hadley: We're not going to have a joint fire chief.

Mike Daley: I don't think those guys would be happy.

Fran Parks: I would take Joe, though, in a nanosecond.

Laurie Hadley: Oh yes, yes.

Stan Goldsterin: Okay, 4:00 pm Wednesday, 7:00 pm, 4th of January, at West Barnstable. I'll get it

right yet. I'll be there.

Fran Perks: I have their resumes and I'll copy them and get them to you.

Stan Foldsterinr: Yes, that would be nice.

Fran Perks: USDA loan.

Michael Daley:

This one's going sideways on us again. I think you're all up to speed that there was some document issues. The district's attorney did not meet certain delivery dates with certain documents. As of today the federal agent has pretty much committed to not meeting our needs on January 18th proceeds from our loan. I've spent a day trying to put together a numbered note sale [inaudible to hold us. The fed's thinking it'll take another 30 days beyond our current target of the 18th of January. We agreed to put a note out, a note sale next week. You could call the meeting on the 9th, the notes, sign them, get them up to the DOR, and get them back to the banks. Then we'll try to do it all over again once the two million from the feds. I haven't spoken to Mark, but the feds can print. His deadline was December the 5th to deliver about five or six documents. As of today he still hasn't delivered them. He has contacted them since I contacted them to find out where the money was.

I haven't spoken to Mark. I just know that we're to an edge again, so we are good through February. It's going to cost us another four or five grand, but there's not much we can do about it.

Stan Goldstein: How far out do we want to roll them?

Michael Daley: 30 days.

Stan Goldstein: What's the increase in cost if we go out for 60 days and give ourselves a little

breathing room?

Michael Daley: Well, it's probably going to be about a percentage point. The rates, the last time

we saw them were, I think, 90 basis points so it's not a lot of money. I hope, and there's always the possibility with feds of delivering the two million dollars by the 18th when our note is scheduled to be paid. As soon as I get the two million, I'm going to be investing that while I'm paying the interest on the two million I've borrowed because I had to wait for those notes. I'll offset some of the cost with some investment income. The thing is when is Mark going to get me my money and I assume that the fed is confident that they're close. Mark has indicated that the papers are all worked up and he was chasing a few concerns as of late last week and then he's this week. We're going to assume that he may even get it in time to get it done by the 18th, but we just can't take that risk because I can't call the bank on the 17th and say, "I'm missing a couple of million bucks."

Stan Goldstein: Yes, let them give and take ...

Michael Daley: It doesn't do much for our credit rating. I'm going out 30 days because I think

that's the prudent thing to do. If it were me, I'd probably be cutting it to 15, but I don't think we want to spend another month's worth of interest, 60 days. I think we can get it done by 30 days. As it was, I budgeted a note to be paid in November because the contract was supposed to be done and deliver a tank

back to us in August. We couldn't close in November because they hadn't finished building the bloody thing. This is the second time we've been knocked off of our schedule by external forces. I'm not going to let a third one happen. I'll get Mark to get the papers in time and I'll get the money.

Stan Goldstein: Do we need to build a fire? You talking about Mark Bodreau?

Fran Parks: Yes.

Stan Goldstein: Do we need to build a fire under him?

Laurie Hadley: I think we just let Mike deal with Mark.

Michael Daley: Come next week if I have an indication from the feds that things are cooking

along again, I will contact Mark. He knows that we know, let's put it that way. I don't think we need to build a fire. I think he lost control and something slick got

us. I think we need to think about how good and efficient the return is.

Laurie Hadley: I suspect it's not the type of thing that Mark deals with on a daily basis.

Michael Daley: Marks's a real estate guy.

Fran Parks: Yes, right.

Michael Daley: I'm not going to argue that. I would think that you're aware of the problem.

We're going to deal with it. It's a pain in the butt but there isn't a lot of recourse

unless you're willing to be a real risk that it all works out in the end.

Laurie Hadley: No, we can't take risks. I can but we can't.

Michael Daley: There you go. We'll go ahead and proceed to do a note sale and if we can

schedule a meeting for that, I think January the 9th, we'll sign notes, seal them, pack them all up, and send them off to Boston for signature, and get them back

down to the bank for closing the 17th.

Laurie Hadley: Okay, do we need a motion to authorize Mike to do all that that he just said?

Mike Daley: We just need to schedule a meeting.

Fran Parks: We just need to schedule a meeting.

Laurie Hadley: You said the 9th?

Fran Perks: The 9th, yes.

Michael Daley: It's a Monday afternoon.

Laurie Hadley: That's fine.

Michael Daley: 5:00.

Fran Parks: 5:00 is okay? Okay, I'll do 5:00. Okay, so I do have an item that was not

reasonably anticipated. The construction project next door, I have spent more time than I care to trying to chase people out of our parking lot. They're just, everybody's using it for access. We've had the pool guys and just regular old pool trucks couldn't seem to go down the driveway, but they were parked in this parking lot while they did the stuff for the pool. Then, let's see, the next thing was when they dug the hole. They used the biggest trucks they had to take the sand away, so of course they used our parking lot to go back and forth. I was here yesterday, two days ago, and the foundation people were here in trucks that would easily fit down the road over there, but they were using this parking lot and parking halfway on it. The general contractor is using this parking lot to come and go. I spent 40 minutes on the phone with him the other day explaining that we agreed to limited use for just things like the concrete delivery or maybe

the lumber delivery.

This isn't a big surprise, working out well. We now have all kinds of oil all over the parking lot from somebody's dripping truck. I've been contacted by several people in the village that aren't happy that they're using the parking lot. I'm going to be calling Mr. LaPoint. I'm done talking to Mr. Cataldo who's just is not listening to me on it, basically. I tend to agree with one of the people that commented that we ought to just rent one of those fences and put it up at the end of our parking lot and they can figure out how to get the stuff done.

Laurie Hadley: They'd probably figure out how to take the fence down.

Mike Daley: It took them a long time to put a [inaudible 00:18:47], come on the property,

move the [inaudible 00:18:52].

Fran Parks: Probably.

Mike Daley: If they did, that would be a brave move on their part [inaudible 00:19:01].

Laurie Hadley: Has there been, other than the oil stains, any real damage to the parking lot?

Fran Perks: No, but there are a lot of oil stains out there. That's only part of the point. The

point is that we sat here and they agreed to X number of trips.

Laurie Hadley: Seeing if there was damage we could really throw at them.

Fran Parks: They're not living up to their part of the bargain. I'm just going to ...

Stan Goldstein: Do we get the water department? Talking about the saw horse, and I know they

use their vehicles all the time, but they may have a day when this truck's not being used or a day when the other truck's not being used. They could just park the truck there. That's a real hassle for them, but we'd get the point across when

there's a truck parked.

Mike Daley: Between the fire department and the water department, we must have a couple

of saw horses or something. Just put them out there and ...

Laurie Hadley: That's a thought.

Mike Daley: I don't know if they'll want to sacrifice it, but they'd be less likely to move that

and get the message. That may be your alternative to parking on it. If they

continue, then they'll be [crosstalk 00:20:16]

Laurie Hadley: We will in some way block the parking lot, yes.

Stan Goldstein: We will escalate.

Fran Parks: This guy over here has started doing work on his property. All right, any concerns

or ...

Stan Goldstein: Yes, one. The supervisor that passed, the water supervisor that passed away that

was looking for survivor benefits. I was wondering, because we ...

Michael Daley: Question, that's another Mark question or Charlie. I sent that email. Have we

ever voted the proper section of 32B for the beneficiaries of a deceased retiree?

Charlie Eager: Not since I've been here.

Michael Daley: I don't think we have.

Laurie Hadley: I don't recall it back 20 years ago.

Michael Daley: I don't see anything in the by-laws. There's no evidence that we took the vote. I'll

just let the woman know that. You may want to think about putting that on an

annual meeting for future issues.

Stan Goldsteinr: What would that mean? Other than them obviously them putting order, what

would it mean financially?

Michael Daley: Well, it's all actuarial. You have a very limited number of these situations, but as

we live longer and retire younger, there will be definitely spouses that will be looking for benefits. This particular retiree didn't choose to provided financial security in cash to his surviving spouse either. Just because they choose a benefit

that ends upon their death ...

Stan Goldstein: Single life, yes.

Michael Daley: ... the surviving spouse doesn't get benefit from the district health insurance just

because the retirement system isn't distributed in cash. They make a payment to the board pension check. I'm guessing. I give you a schedule every year. I don't have it all locked down in my head but I'm guessing we've probably got 10, maybe, retirees and probably six or seven of them are married. You're looking at the potential of pre-deceased men and women, well men, most of them are men. There's one couple that's married that are both retirees. It's going to cost something someday. If we can leave it alone and avoid that, that's part of your plan. That's why I've said before I think the district needs a plan document so that people understand what they're getting and what they're not getting. If they want to buy up, that's negotiable. Every time somebody gets a free bene and we don't negotiate, we end up spending more on salaries because that's all they pay. It would have a cost. You could have it actuarially calculated, what it would

cost. We could if we need to, but it would you something.

Stan Goldstein: You're talking about a retirement benefit, effectively?

Michael Daley: It's a retirement benefit. It's a surviving spouse annuity payment until their

death.

Laurie Hadley: I have that coverage.

Michael Daley: Good for you.

Laurie Hadley: From the military.

Michael Daley: This would be their health insurance would be paid beyond the death of the

retiree. If the spouse pre-deceased the retiree, you wouldn't have a question. It's a game of which spouses are younger and more robust and which spouses are the retirees. I'd say you've got about six or eight retirees out there and maybe

they have coverage or don't.

Stan Goldstein: The union stuff is separate.

Michael Daley: This would be a union item. Also, water employees have the same thing, but they

don't even bargain. They just get raises. I'm not thrilled with the way you handle your labor negotiations here. Never have been, but clearly this is an expensive

benefit that if you just give it and there's no quid pro quo for it, people will line up and vote it, I'm sure. You need to think about ...

Fran Parks: Negotiate it beforehand.

Laurie Hadley: No, I do have that kind of coverage until I'm part of his retirement pay.

Michael Daley: Correct.

Laurie Hadley: For a period of years. Then we reached the point where we didn't have to pay in.

Now you guys are paying for it.

Michael Daley: There's a whole table to select from. It defines whether you can receive 50%

employer contribution or not. I think there's two votes on the survivor. You've already voted to allow above the 50%, so you at a minimum have to vote to provide health insurance for surviving spouses except that section which. I think that's all you have to do, and the actuary can tell you what it would cost you.

Stan Goldstein: We probably ought to look at that anyway.

Michael Daley: Yes. The woman had just called yesterday and Tony asked me this morning.

Obviously I need to advise her that the benefit does exist and just add it to your

list of considerations for negotiations.

Stan Goldstein: I have something else for you. I was just wondering if the last meeting, reading

the minutes, we did talk about, or at least I talked about, getting Mark Bodreau to send a letter off to the responsible state department to get any legal reading on whether we need just an executive summary minutes or we could use the

transcript. Can we ask Mark to do that or did we ask Mark to do that?

Fran Parks: No, I haven't asked him. I just haven't gotten to it. I can do that. I think the

problem is when we started using the transcripts, the fire commissioners had

someone contact the secretary of state office and who's actually ...

Laurie Hadley: Yes, Mark called me, too. Yes.

Fran Parks: Who's actually in charge of minutes. They said it was not clean and dry, clean and

fast, that it was murky. We took it to understand that at that point in time,

transcripts could be used. You called the AG's office.

Laurie Hadley: Yes, if you're publishing a transcript you don't need minutes. We were publishing

a transcript and a recording.

Stan Goldstein: I would like to see something in writing from the state saying you can or you

can't. The other thing that has to do with this, one of the things I'm going to be

bringing up at the policy advisory committee, we already had one meeting, we didn't talk about this, is I became aware of the fact that Jen in the water department, she sits right down after the meeting and does the minutes, does the minutes and maybe even a transcript. I'm not sure if she does both.

Laurie Hadley: She's an employee. The Prudential committee doesn't have an employee.

Stan Goldstein: That's what I'm going to. We should look at cross-utilization of the district's

employees because they work for the district and not for the water department, not for the fire department. We're paying them. There may be issues there. They may need an extra hour or two that week or something or whatever. There may be other things, but we should look at cross-utilizing those people. First let's find out if we can get, have Mark Bodreau get us a letter from somebody that's in

charge and whether we can use a transcript or minutes.

Fran Parks: I'm going to ask him to speak with people both in the AG's office and at the

secretary of state's office.

Stan Goldstein: Send a letter to both of them and see if they agree.

Fran Parks: Well, AG now controls it because of the OML

Michael Daley: The Secretary of State had control, but I think the AG needs to play a deal at the

moment.

Fran Parks: All right. Anything else?

Laurie Hadley: No audience.

Fran Perks: No audience.

Stan Goldstein: Do we have minutes?

Fran Perks: Yeah, we have minutes from ...

Joey Eager: Two sets now.

Fran Perks: Two sets, November 15th and December 14th. Any concerns about those

minutes?

Laurie Hadley: None.

Stan Goldstein: No. I've read the minutes and I would move that we accept both the minutes as

written.

Laurie Hadley: Second.

Fran Parks: All those in favor.

Group: Aye.

Fran Parks: I would accept a motion to adjourn.

Laurie Hadley: So moved.

Stan Goldstein: Second.

Fran Parks: All in favor.

Group: Aye.