

**COTUIT FIRE DISTRICT  
PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE MEETING  
FREEDOM HALL  
COTUIT, MA 02635  
August 26, 2024**

**Present: Mark Lynch, Seth Burdick, Fran Parks and Ray Pirrone**

The meeting was called to order at 6pm by Mark Lynch on August 26, 2024, at Freedom Hall and available by ZOOM.

Mark Lynch did a roll call of the members present.

**Public Comment:**

- Lally Lloyd, appointed to the district's policy advisory committee, asked to know who the other people are that have been appointed as representatives of the Prudential Committee.
- Seth answered a few names and Ms. Lloyd said she would follow up with him

**Treasurer's Report**

**FY24**

- June cash has been reconciled
- Departmental encumbrances have been finalized
- Ray stated he will start the closing entry
- Ray spoke about paychecks
  - Paychecks identified the Pension as a 401 tax agency and not a 401H tax agency
  - Ray stated that he has engaged in conversations with three (3) separate individuals to try to get this resolved as there are tax extension deadlines approaching

**FY25**

- First month of the year shows revenue almost exactly on budget
- Tax revenues were slightly below the target of 8% in July
- Ambulance collections were at 6%
- Regarding the other categories – ahead of the target due to the high interest rate
- Cash balance is strong
- Will go over with the Collector and then the Auditors
- Ray spoke with the Chair at the Water Department regarding claims/refunds
- Any and all expenditures needed will be figured out.
- Discussion about two systems not showing the same results regarding refunds
  - Seth asked if the difference could be because of the abatement status and offered to follow up
  - Ray stated he will continue to pursue this with the auditor
- Ray stated that the insurance premium was due in August and up 5.6% from last year
- Ray stated that he spoke with District Council regarding umbrella coverage

## **ANNUAL REPORT – REDLINING STATUS**

- Finished and waiting on confirmation from Water Dept.

## **COTUIT SCHOOL PROPERTY**

- Ms. Martinez was going to join the discussion but she did not join
- Ad Hoc Cotuit School sub committee had six (6) meetings and came up with a five (5) page document for the Prudential Committee to assist in the drafting of the request for the proposal for the study that was mandated at the Special District Meeting
  - Fran stated that she read the document and it appeared to be one that was for a Community Center and there were items that were not appropriate
    - One is a “Use Analysis” which wants to know the water usage and wastewater general usage
    - Water quality improvement options should not be in the document because the Water Department tests the wells once/month
    - Museum / Artist / Studio / Recreation
    - Request to do a traffic study (costing between \$3k-\$15k+)
      - Fran stated that she does not feel that an Environmental Engineering Analysis options to mitigate potential degradation to Cotuit Fire District or parking lot analysis were not part of what the Prudential Committee was asked to do
    - Fran explained why the playground was in the park and not on the Federated Church property – because of liability
    - Fran mentioned the Habib Report
    - Fran stated that the decision to be made is will the building be demolished or keep for the Community Center (all or a part of it)
      - Fran stated that she did not think it was the Prudential Committee’s responsibility to address all of the above issues.
      - Fran stated that this was a study to determine whether the building should or should not be demolished
  - Fran stated that she feels the AdHoc’s proposal in the document is taking advantage of the taxpayer's of the village
  - Seth disagreed with what Fran stated above
  - Mark stated that the study needed to be done
  - Fran stated that the first thing that needs to be done is to decide on the architectural firms and look at least three (3)
  - The other committee members disagree
    - Mark stated that the study needs to be done then the study is proposed to the different architectural firms
    - Seth stated that he thought that was the reason to have Ms. Martinez, as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party consultant, be at the meeting
  - Fran suggested speaking with Kevin Conley at CFD regarding what the process was that the CFD went through

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Penny Levert asked where is the money coming from to do any of the work that the AdHoc Committee proposed
  - Mark answered that at the SDM, there was a lot of discussion regarding a warrant that allocated funds to determine how much all of the different scenarios would be
    - The money that was allocated to determining how much all of the different scenarios would be has not been spent
  - Fran also answered that some of the money is being used to board up broken windows
- David Churbuck Board of Water Commissioners asked to see a copy of the AdHoc Committee report
- There was discussion about Cotuit Kettleers and parking issues
- Patty Daley from AdHoc Committee offers support in the Prudential Committee bringing a 3<sup>rd</sup> party. She also stated that the water quality language was meant for drinking water and infrastructure.
- Carol Zais from AdHoc Committee stated that the AdHoc Committee finished the project ahead of schedule
  - Asked the Prudential Committee to meet more frequently to get this done as the AdHoc Committee rose to the occasion and hopes that the Prudential committee will do as well
  - Stated that the Civic Association held a meeting to give an update by representatives from the Community Center nonprofit. Questions from that meeting may interest the Prudential Committee. This meeting was recorded and posted.
- Lally Lloyd stated that the voters of the district would deeply appreciate having this level of research so that when it comes time to make a vote to demolish or not demolish – and if not demolish then what – then everyone has access to the same high quality information
  - This was the intent of the AdHoc Committee and the work that it has done and she appreciated the Prudential Committee's willingness to support that direction

Motion to Adjourn – all in favor