

COTUIT FIRE DISTRICT
PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE MEETING
FREEDOM HALL
COTUIT, MA 02635
December 4, 2024
Part A

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

The meeting was called to order by Mark Lynch on December 4, 2024 @6pm via Zoom.

Mark led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance via Zoom

Mark did a roll call of the members and the following members were present:

Mark Lynch

Seth Burdick

Fran Parks

Ray Pirrone

Charlie Yeager

Via Zoom is Janellvy Martinez, Consultant

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Carol Zais
 - Mrs. Zais asked if the Committee added people to the RFP bids
 - Mark replied that a decision has not been made yet but that the Cotuit School Property is the first thing on the agenda.

SCHOOL PROPERTY

- Receipt of proposals for the Demolition Renovation Study and discussion of next steps
 - This study was mandated by a vote at the Special District Meeting regarding the school property
 - This is a feasibility study that is meant to determine the cost of renovation, renovation/partial demolition, and full demolition of the Cotuit School Property under various scenarios
- An RFP was put together, with the assistance of Ad Hoc Committee members drafting it, and was put it out to the public and the response date was 12.04.2024.
 - One response was received and cannot be made public until Prudential Committee reviews it in Executive Session and make a finding on it.
 - Janellvy Martinez, a Procurement Officer in Lawrence, MA is the consultant and has advised the Prudential Committee that the process is for the Committee to review the proposal and there is criteria for the review which must be satisfied.
- Mark asked Janellvy if the next step is that Prudential Committee reviews the RFP
 - Janellvy answered the next steps:
 - Step 1: review the RFP individually and decide if then the next step would be to discuss and/or add any more members to evaluate if that is what the Committee chooses.
 - Step 2: In Executive Session, score the RFP (based on the sheet that was previously provided), and meet with Janellvy to discuss the proposal, open the cost proposal, and then decide if that is adequate for the committee and community then move forward with contracting
 - If an agreement is not reached, then other options can be discussed with them regarding what is available at that time.
- Mark wanted to clarify “other options” by which a government entity can secure assistance and also to review the steps including reviewing the “non-cost” proposal:
 - Non-Cost Proposal: has all the elements laid out in the RFP except for the price
- Mark also clarified that if the Committee decides to go through with the RFP, then the envelope is opened, that it has the projected price and, if the Committee wants to, they can interview the principal of the entity with the proposal
 - Janellvy answered Mark that yes, if the Committee has any outstanding questions or concerns and/or clarification regarding the proposal, they may elect to interview them
- Mark wanted to clarify that the contents of the RFP were to remain confidential
 - Janellvy answered that the context of the cost/non-cost of the Technical Proposal and the non-cost proposal shall remain private until a decision is rendered until the final decision regarding the next step
 - The only thing that is public is the name of the company

- Mark raised Mrs. Zais' question from earlier – the Prudential Committee, in its discretion, can include other members of the public citizens of the village to review the proposal (not have a voting opportunity) and advise
 - Janellvy answered that was a correct statement
- Mark raised the above question to the Prudential committee to discuss.
- Fran stated that there is not any price comparison from another bidder
- Mark stated that he believes that the Prudential Committee has bent over backwards to affirmatively get input from members of the public on this issue. The five-member Ad Hoc Committee assisted in the drafting of the RFP.
- Fran spoke (inaudible)
- Seth asked if the RFP could be posted again
- Janellvy answered that there is always a possibility to rebid
 - The original RFP would need to be looked at and perhaps add/delete or reach out to other firms and ask why they did not enter into a proposal
 - Timeline would be pushed back to after the holidays
 - In her experience, similar numbers/similar responses are received.
 - May or may not get more responses.
- Seith asked Janellvy if the way that it was worded may have created a limitation to the companies that may have bid on it? Is there any wording that perhaps stands out that may have deterred potential bidders?
 - Janellvy answered that the nature of a feasibility study is a lot of work for a company to put on and trending is more so companies are looking to do actual projects where they are engineering buildings. She also stated that the cost may inhibit interest. Additionally, geographically, the email went out to hundreds of firms but not necessarily limited to local ones. Lastly, the holiday timeframe could have been a hindrance.
 - This is a unique project (historical building, etc.) and there may not be enough firms well versed in this type of work
- Fran stated that she would like to go back to her original suggestion and put out feelers to architectural firms.
- Mark asked Janellvy if there are multiple paths to get assistance in this type of situation.
 - Janellvy answered that there are. Prudential Committee chose the RFP – which is the most in-depth. If the Committee chose to backtrack, they would need to put in less “scope” and just vendors to give resumes and choose from there.
 - Janellvy also stated that because engineering and architectural work is exempt from the Procurement Law of 30b in the process, the Committee can choose to pick a firm or call/email firms and do a smaller version of a Request for Qualification
 - Less transparent – no public involvement since there would be an exemption from the law being used

- Lastly, Janellvy also stated that there was one additional option, a State Contract Option
 - State Contract is put out by the Operational Services Division and is used by all of Comm. of MA
 - Prudential Committee can solicit vendors from there where there will be a list of maybe five (5) to ten (10) and committee members can call/email them and let them know what it is they are looking for and vendors would respond with whether they thought they could do the work and what the cost would be
- Mark and Seth discussed the current RFP – parts were inaudible
- Seth asked Janellvy about sharing the RFP information.
 - Janellvy stated that if the committee chose add members, then Janellvy would like to speak with them privately (according to the memo that she has already provided) and the new member would be trusted in good faith that whomever joins the committee would follow the process as stated and they would be allowed to evaluate, score the sheet and be involved in Executive Session – not having a vote but an opinion
 - Seth stated that he does not have a problem with that scenario
 - Mark stated that as long as that person/persons understand that they do not have a vote
 - Mark and Seth had a discussion (inaudible)
 - Fran stated that it should just be the three committee members
 - Fran and Seth had a discussion about adding an additional member (most of the discussion is inaudible)

Minutes from previous meeting

- Not discussed

Public Comment:

- Patty Daly
 - Ms. Daly suggested Stephen O'Connor, who has done these before and has come at this with an open mind and would be an excellent suggestion

Mark made a motion to add Patty Daly and (inaudible) to those reviewing the RFP that the Prudential Committee has received in a non-voting capacity – assuming that they do it this week. All in favor – Seth-aye, Mark-aye, Fran (inaudible)

Mark and Fran had a discussion (inaudible)

TREASURER REPORT

- Ray stated that he circulated, with mixed results, the Revenue Collections, starting with taxes
 - Short of the target, with the October cut-off
 - Short in October but it appears that when the books are closed in November, we will have caught up and on target for tax collections
 - \$57,000.00 refunds were not recorded last year – they were recorded this year because there was not any budget to record that last year
 - Also included in Tax Collection is -\$57,000.00 for last year's refunds. Refund notice was not received until July 17th, which was beyond the two-week window for putting things in the prior year.
 - Water Department collections are under budget by \$73,000.00
 - There was a drought and a drop in pump age
 - Anticipate that the recorded revenue in January for the first half of the year will be down from last year
 - Fire Department collections are strong and up by around \$13,000.00 from the target
 - Federal and State Grants are \$58,000.00
- Collections are short by \$165,000.00
- Overall expenditures are under budget by (inaudible)
 - Fire Department is underspent primarily due to low operation expenditures and somewhat less salary expenditures
 - Water Department is under target due to low operational expenditures
 - Freedom Hall under target due to low operational expenditures
 - Streetlights are well under target (seasonal) and lack of any maintenance that have not occurred so far
 - Library on target
 - Debt Service Payment made in October and distorted YTD figure
 - Benefits are up – distorted by retirement
 - Taking into account one-time expenditures, we are relatively under budget YTD
- Accounts are reconciled
- Status for all funds were presented (through end of October) and where the funds are “housed.”

Meeting continued in Part B due to technical difficulties.

COTUIT FIRE DISTRICT
PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE MEETING
FREEDOM HALL
COTUIT, MA 02635
December 4, 2024
Part B

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

(Part B is a continuation of Part A of 12.04.2024 Prudential Committee Meeting Minutes as there was technical difficulties at the end of Part A).

The following members were present:

Mark Lynch

Seth Burdick

Fran Parks

Ray Pirrone

Charlie Yeager

Continued with Treasurer Report

Appropriations handled at the ADM including \$260,000 Fire Department increase in salary category. Some of the reserve needed to be used to cover the salaries.

Budget for FY25 is addressing this and it is the increase in appropriation

Also, \$80,000.00 increase in health benefits:

- Increase in number of participants in medical options from last year to this year
- General increase by Cape Cod Municipal Health Group of 8%, which accounted for the balance

Mark stated that there was a technical glitch for about 3.5 minutes.

Mark moved to reduce Clerk's compensation by \$750 annually in recognition of that he will no longer be doing meeting minutes. Fran seconded the motion. All in favor.

Freedom Hall

- Fran spoke (inaudible)
- Mark asked if meeting minutes were legally required to be posted outside of the building.
- Fran stated that the meeting agendas were to be posted in the post office
- Mark spoke about the acoustics in Freedom Hall and possibly hiring a company

Streetlights

- Fran stated that there was a duct taped streetlights and replacement cost was \$400
- Fran stated that (inaudible) Service Company (inaudible) is coming up for streetlights
- Seth, Fran, and Mark spoke (inaudible)

Meeting Minutes

- No specific date(s) was/were approved, various comments regarding receiving and reviewing past minutes were made.

Public Comment

- No public comment

Mark stated that he would accept a Motion to Adjourn / Seth seconded – all in favor