

Shutesbury Select Board Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2021 Virtual Meeting Platform

Select Board members present: Melissa Makepeace-O'Neil/Chair, April Stein, and Rita Farrell
Staff present: Becky Torres/Town Administrator; Linda Avis Scott/Administrative Secretary
Other Town Officials present: Town Counsel Donna MacNicol, Fire Chief Walter Tibbetts, Catherine Hilton/Board of Health, Mary Anne Antonellis/Library Director, Kate Cell and Brad Foster/Board of Library Trustees, Town Moderator Paul Lyons

Guests: Andrew Chabot/Amp Energy, Susie Mosher, Leslie Cerier, Carlos Fontes, Michael Pill, Diane Jacoby, Ashleigh Pyecroft, Henry Geddes, Ken Holt, Jim Baron, Marina Gurman, Valerie Gilman, Michael DeChiara, Samuel Conrad, Lulu Fontes, Robert Price, Rebecca Edelson, Gabriel Fontes, David Leach, Remy Fernandez-O'Brien, Michael Vinskey, Ezzell Floranina, Lesley Smith, Edward Redonnet, Meg Sheehan, Jane Plaza, and Pastor Mark Ellis; many other individuals who did not speak also attended the virtual meeting.

At 5:30pm, Makepeace-O'Neil calls the meeting to order.

Discussion Topics:

1. DOER SMART Program and Amp Proposal/Town Counsel & Select Board Only:

Makepeace-O'Neil: the first hour of this agenda item is set aside for the Select Board and Town Counsel to review the proposal put forth by Amp Energy; this is the first opportunity the Select Board has had to discuss the matter; there will no public participation at this time; after the break, there will be an opportunity for public participation.

Makepeace-O'Neil: the Select Board wants to start by identifying our role in the process; in the normal course of events, the Select Board is responsible for negotiating the PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes) agreement with a solar developer; the proposal brought by Amp Energy has a new component which asks the Town to consider doing maintenance and operations for solar sites(s). Makepeace-O'Neil continues: there are no examples for us to look to; in the 3.24.21 meeting with DOER, we learned what is not acceptable in the arrangement proposed by Amp, i.e., hiring a subcontractor to fulfill maintenance and operations; we also learned that if the Town goes into an agreement with Amp that DOER signs off on, the developer may gain public entity status which would normally only go to a public entity.

Stein: to reduce confusion about statements made in emails received from residents, the Select Board does not do any permitting; the permitting process goes through the Planning Board who upholds the Town's Zoning Bylaw. Farrell: a point of clarification, the Select Board did receive a draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) from Amp for a public private partnership in which they talked about a first step toward an operations and management (O&M) contract. Farrell continues: at a prior Select Board meeting during which Town Counsel was present, it was determined that the Town would not move forward with the MOA as it was vague and unenforceable; no further documents have been received from Amp; since there is no proposed agreement with Amp, what are we talking about. It is noted that Farrell, representing the Select Board, Deacon Bonnar/Chair and Michael DeChiara represented the Planning Board and Town Administrator Torres attended the 3.24.21 virtual meeting with DOER. Stein: she has been

hearing from folks that Amp is “going to eat us alive”; we have more status than believed and such an agreement must benefit our town.

Makepeace-O’Neil: this is a conceptual conversation. Farrell: there is no formal proposal and the MOA has been dispensed with; DOER would be looking for a signed O&M contract in order to qualify Amp for public entity status. Farrell reinforces that the Select Board does not permit solar development; the Select Board would be considering whether an O&M, which we do not have, is appropriate.

Town Counsel Donna MacNicol: a MOA is not acceptable to DOER therefore there was no reason to entertain it; DEOR cannot ensure that a public private arrangement would meet the public entity criteria. MacNicol recommends the Select Board list their questions and the information needed so that if the Board is put in the position of signing a contract down the road, they will have the necessary information. MacNicol continues: at this point, we do not know what Amp is asking us for, i.e., how many solar fields, how many employees are needed to manage the site(s); is DOER even prepared to consider a public private entity arrangement; if not, then Amp’s projects would be permitted like any other project; if yes, what does it mean about where the applicant can build, such as in a sensitive area. MacNicol: would DOER consider a private entity on private land with public management; would this meet the public entity criteria; the Town needs something back from Amp; the Select Board’s first priority is to draft a letter to DOER.

Farrell recalls that during the meeting with DOER’s three attorneys and staff members, they did not say a public private partnership could be done; “we will not know until we see it” and whether it could be approved until we (DOER) see the contract; DOER cannot provide legal assistance though is willing to look at an O&M agreement and provide feedback; there is no formal review by DOER until there is a contract. Farrell continues: DOER did not envision this kind of setup (public-private partnership); it was anticipated that solar installations would be built on public land and the municipality would benefit; this is on private land with a private developer and the Town performing O&M; this was not contemplated and there are no other examples in MA; DOER was were very cautious. MacNicol: her concern is that we cannot draft a contract without much more information; without subcontracting out, what does a town the size of Shutesbury need in order to manage solar projects; DOER will not commit without much more information; Amp needs to start the process. Stein asks if it is possible that there will be a solar array on public land in addition to those on private land. MacNicol: another concern is that with public entity status, the developer could build in sensitive areas; siting is a Planning Board decision; the O&M contract could state, for example, that if you build in sensitive areas, this contract is null and void. MacNicol continues: yes, the tax base could benefit though how can the Select Board entertain an O&M agreement because we cannot even hire an actuary to develop a spreadsheet without Amp submitting permit applications to the Planning Board, i.e., the size of the fields, the number of employees that may be needed. MacNicol to Stein: she is not convinced we have a move without something more concrete. Farrell: if in an applicant is in Category 1/fast track public entity status, the DOER regulations say Category 1 applicants do not have to comply with restrictions to building on land with at least 50% of its area categorized as Priority Habitat, Core Habitat and/or Critical Natural Landscape; DOER does not get involved in permitting; the SMART program is about financial incentives; it could be interpreted that obtaining Category 1 status does not give you a free ride regarding local permitting. MacNicol: the regulations say you get a pass on those things; do those regulations trump local law that objects to building in those

areas; is this something we give up or can capture in an O&M agreement; we need a much clearer understanding as to whether Amp could appeal if they are refused a permit to build in a sensitive area. Farrell: that is the first question for DOER.

MacNicol: this is a private developer and a private landowner trying to pull us in for their benefit; we need a great deal more information. Stein: without an O&M agreement, the applications can still go forward with the Planning Board. Makepeace-O'Neil: we are in consensus that more information is needed; we will start with a list of questions for DOER; when we have something more concrete, there can be further discussion.

Torres: this is an opportunity to be clear with the public that contracts for more than three years need to be voted on during a town meeting; the public will have an opportunity to weigh in on the relevant warrant article. Makepeace-O'Neil: along the way, there will be meetings with opportunities for public input. Torres: this is a publicly regulated process; at this point, there is a lot of vagueness about how the concept being presented can be rolled out. Makepeace-O'Neil: if the Select Board were to entertain such an agreement, we would be setting precedent. MacNicol: we do not have enough information to ask questions; the developer needs to become much more concrete with their proposal. Stein: the Town is in a strong negotiating position. MacNicol suggests the Select Board start making lists about what you would want covered in such an agreement. Stein: we do not even have room for the employees we have. Makepeace-O'Neil: we need to know the number of employees needed and what else? Stein: we cannot even ask questions at this point; to the public, this is an open process. Farrell: to MacNicol's point, we do not know what we would be operating and maintaining, in essence, there could be five mini power plants; beyond an actuary, we would need to know what exactly is involved in managing and the potential liability. Torres: a list of potential possibilities can be created; as we get more concrete information, there are models to protect the Town such as enterprise funds. MacNicol: one question is whether the Tort Act will protect the Town for a project on private land; it is a waste of funds to do research now. Makepeace-O'Neil agrees. MacNicol advises the Select Board to tell Amp that without many more specifics, the Town cannot move forward. Farrell: an application does not reflect what will be permitted. MacNicol: if permits are moving along, it may be worth the effort to start research; the Select Board should not sign anything until permits are issued. Stein: there is nothing before us to make any decision; if we did go forward, the residents would have an opportunity to weigh in; the town's best interest is what we have at heart. Makepeace-O'Neil and Farrell agree with Stein's statement.

2. Input from Other Boards & the Public on the SMART Program & Amp:

Public participation begins at this point in the meeting. Because the first session required less time than anticipated, the Board agrees to allow 15 minutes for public comment and, after a short break, allow another 20 minutes. The rules for public comment are reviewed: name and address are to be stated, time allowed is 1-2 minutes per person, comments are directed to the Select Board, the Zoom raised hand function is to be used and those attending by phone will be asked if they wish to speak.

Andrew Chabot/Amp Energy: Chabot states he is present to answer questions and thanks the Board and MacNicol for their time; Amp did not send a focused O&M agreement to the Town as they were waiting to see if the Town is conceptually willing to move forward. If the Select Board is interested, we can provide more information. In order to learn what the town sees as appropriate, Chabot suggest a working group; to be as responsive as possible, we need to know

the roadblocks; a working group could move more quickly or could get drawn out; we need to know what the Town prefers going forward.

Susie Mosher/Cooleyville Road: understands that an informational session with Dr. Zara Dowling (Clean Energy Extension Research Fellow at UMass) will be held; it might be helpful for the town to have a moderated forum to express concerns; we are not at a deciding point but we may be in the future so obtaining information will allow an informed discussion.

Leslie Cerier/58 Schoolhouse: states she loves the forest and that she feels better that the Select Board needs to know more and thanks Town Counsel MacNicol. The solar bylaw has an acreage limit; the permitting process needs to go forward; the Town needs to weigh in; proposes a special town meeting because nothing happens until the Town gets a voice like we did when we voted the bylaws.

Torres: the forum with Dr. Zara Dowling will take place next Wednesday, 5.19.21, a notice will go out to the public; the forum will be moderated by Town Moderator Paul Lyons; there will be a 15 minute presentation followed by a question and answer session; questions will be submitted in advance.

Carlos Fontes/359 Montague Road: as we go forward, we need to expand our conversation's agenda; we need to talk about the wisdom of sacrificing the forest to build solar parks; there needs to be room for people to talk about how they feel about the forest and we need to bring this type of narrative to the conversation, i.e., the wisdom of clear cutting for a solar park.

Jim Baron/72 Baker: the key for him is to understand what the designation of public utility empowers the company to do then go forward from there.

Valerie Gilman/85 Baker: offers another voice for not doing the project; talking about management, is it okay to do in the first place; believes in solar though not to taking down the forest do so and the effect on animals.

Ken Holt/Montague Road: speaking as an abutter, his concern is home values; cites a study that shows that home values decrease with single arrays; these complex arrays could have a devastating effect on home values; we love our town; the article states "in many rural areas, there is an industrialization of the landscape and that could have a devastating effect on home values". Holt notes that he sent a letter to Town officials that he is willing to share with others.

Michael DeChiara/Pratt Corner Road: knowing that a town meeting vote is required is reassuring; asks MacNicol for the citation in Mass General Law that refers to this requirement for contracts over three years in length; an executive session for reason #10 may be needed; commends Farrell and MacNicol and recommends the Select Board tell Amp that we do not want to consider a contract right now and that if they want to have a substantive conversation, submit applications to the Planning Board.

Remy Fernandez-O'Brien 6 Old Egypt Road: has heard talk about there being an abbreviated environmental impact study however wants a full environmental impact study to be done.

Leslie Smith & Edward Redonnet/180 Montague Road: refers to Stein's statement about wanting to have the town in mind as we move forward and asks the Select Board what benefitting the town means, i.e., is it economics, is building things progress.

Marina Gurman/40 Leonard Road: in our culture, we overvalue the physical and under value emotional connection; we do not have a shared understanding of our past, our present and our future; there was a TED talk titled “Trees Talk” about underground communication; we need to make a conscious choice about whether we want to be more like trees or divide and concur.

Break

Ashleigh Pyecroft/109 Baker Road: thanks the Select Board, Planning Board, and Town Administrator; this is a huge decision; when the Select Board is thinking about a contract, what about retirement benefits; she is concerned about affordability; what does the public input look like; would it be us, as a town, having input into what a contract looks like; asks Amp what they will get out of a contract.

Meg Sheehan: states she belongs to a community land group and has written a report about the impacts of land based solar; these are statewide issues; refers to “save the pine barrens.org”.

Henry Geddes/Baker Road: referring to the Wheelock solar project, urges the Select Board to rely on environmental experts to address site management; offers to send his list of issues that need to be addressed for the record; science should be the guide.

Samuel Conrad/38 Weatherwood: all decisions should be for the best benefit of the town; we are discussing solar because of climate change; private corporations’ profit is not in the public interest; do what is best for towns.

Lulu Fontes: notes that she is currently not a resident and asks if the Select Board will have a full environmental impact study done and wants more information about this.

Robert Price & Rebecca Edelson/386 West Pelham: are opposed to solar farms; it is counter productive to cut down forests; they are against the town taking on business interests in solar; there is probably a good reason other towns have not done so.

Ezzell Floranina/Wendell Road: the town would be involved in maintenance; we do not have cleared space for a solar farm; is concerned about the forest; what does the town stand to gain from the development; why would we do this for a project that has a 20year life span; we will be gone, then it will need to be taken down by someone else.

Jane Plaza/314 Wendell: her family has lived in town for generations; folks move to Shutesbury for the quiet and nature; this will change what the town means for so many; what would it do to the perception of our town; it would really change us.

Gabriel Fontes: refers to the large clearcutting done in Williamsburg (for a large scale solar development) that permanently damaged the water shed and resulted in a suit by the Attorney General’s office; concern about erosion and the need to keep in mind what the slope is and the effect on the water supply; does the town have the capacity to deal with that externality.

Makepeace-O’Neil asks if anyone on the phone wants to make a comment; there is no response.

David Leach/25 Stowell Road: thanks the Select Board as he found this meeting helpful; echoes comments about the need for a full environmental impact study and that this is the purview of the Planning Board and Conservation Commission; refers to the ANRADs (Abbreviated Notice for Resource Area Delineation) as being abbreviated impact studies.

Makepeace-O'Neil thanks those who have made public comment.

3. 32 Leverett Road/Access to Town Well: Torres explains that the parsonage at 32 Leverett Road sold about 3-4 months ago; the person who originally bought the parcel sold it to Eric Benton who is remodeling the home and has asked about access to the Town well on the Fire Department site that is hooked up to the residence; the question is, are there any steps to be taken to request the old well be tested or to require a new well to be dug; currently, the Fire Department and a home are on the well in use.

Walter Tibbetts/Fire Chief explains the history of the wells: the hand dug well was replaced with a drilled well in 1960; the hand dug well is not connected to anything though is used to fill fire trucks. Tibbetts: the drilled well, that is several hundred feet deep, was deemed contaminated about the same time the DeLesdernier property, west of the Fire Station and now the Bowen/Valentine property, was having trouble with contamination from the salt shed. Tibbetts: a new well was dug in 1976 (in the back field adjacent to the parsonage) and connected to DeLesdernier property; it is estimated that it was sometime in the 1980's that the well was connected to the parsonage; the only documentation is a letter from William Randall to Michael Pill stating the history of situation; there is no other documentation, only a gentlemen's agreement, that the parsonage was connected to the well dug in 1976. Tibbetts to MacNicol's question: yes, the well connected to the Fire Department and the Bowen/Valentine residence is connected to the parsonage; the parsonage has been vacant for several years though the well was used in the past. Torres: currently, there is no plumbing in the house to test the well water. Tibbetts: the Fire Department well water has been tested; no one knows where the old well is that was deemed contaminated; when the new well was drilled at the Fire Department, the parsonage was connected between 35-45 years ago and is still connected but there is no water into the parsonage now and it has not been tested for several years.

Michael Pill: moved to Shutesbury in 1982 at which time there was a family living in the parsonage; it may help to narrow the timeline in that there was no excavation at the parsonage from 1982 on, so the well connection was made before 1982. Pill continues: the Fire Station cleanup was all to the west; the well on his forest land showed very slight traces; this raises the concern that the parsonage is close to his house at 37 Leverett Road and the house at 29 Leverett Road; if there is testing done on the water to the parsonage, will he need to do more testing. Pill: after pastors' families moved out, the church rented the house and he never heard about any problem with the house running out of water; there is the benefit of having the house back on the tax rolls; the new owners could ask the Town for an easement; if there is testing, he requests his properties be included.

MacNicol: this is not about soil testing; if there is a well on the parsonage property, we will want to see if the water is potable; without any kind of past agreement, the Town needs to see if there is water on the property. Makepeace-O'Neil: if there is an existing well on the parsonage site, it would be tested by the buyer. Farrell agrees with Makepeace-O'Neil. Pill to Stein: there is not a functioning septic system on the parsonage site; there is a long line that goes out to the back therefore it is safe to assume a new system will be needed. MacNicol: during site plan work for a new septic system, the old well will need to be located, identified and tested; the owner can provide results to Town then next steps can be determined.

Tibbetts: the agreement between the DeLesderniers and the Town, noted in the relevant annual town report and the Registry of Deeds, there is a clause stating that if the property does now have potable water, the town is relieved of its responsibility to provide water; if providing water to the parsonage is what is decided, a similar agreement is needed.

Torres: the Select Board agrees with MacNicol's recommendation to ask Benton to search for a well on his property and to test the water as he starts development work on the site.

- Farrell moves that a letter be written to Eric Benton directing him that the Select Board will not take further action until the well is located and the well water tested. Stein seconds the motion. No public comment is offered. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

4. Shutesbury Community Church Handicap Access Request: Torres: the Community Church would like to build a handicap access out the back of the building; per Town Counsel, use of the town common is restricted however MacNicol has worked out a process. Makepeace-O'Neil: the church does not own the land around the building situated on the common. MacNicol: the church sits on its footprint; under Mass law, the common is a park and is controlled by related statute; to use the common for another purpose requires a town meeting and a two-thirds vote of the Legislature for a parkland easement; because it is for a handicap ramp, religious use of parkland does not seem to be a conflict. MacNicol to Pastor Ellis' question: the relevant statute in Article 97 of the State Constitution; parkland is owned by the town and the people of the Commonwealth which the reason why the Legislature needs to convey a change in use; other laws are liberal about handicap access. Pastor Mark Ellis/Shutesbury Community: we are anxious to have handicap access; the back stairs were removed about one hundred years ago; the fire escape and front steps did not need to go through the Legislature so he does not know why it is necessary to do so now; we are seeking a structure that would jut out from the church about five feet and be less prominent than the fire escape. Ellis to Farrell's question: we are proposing an 18'x20' ramp straight out the back of the church toward Town Common Road or it could go sideways which would require some access from Town Common Road to the ramp; three handicap parking spaces will also need to be carved out of the common. Makepeace-O'Neil confirms that Ellis is asking for a ramp, access from Town Common Road and three parking spaces. MacNicol asks Ellis to provide accurate dimensions for the area to be used. Ellis: it is our intention to file a building permit application that would require dimensions. MacNicol: you cannot file a building permit on land that is not yours; you will need provide the Select Board details so we can start to make sense of the project; a special town meeting could be held see if the Town would authorize the use of the common for a ramp, access to Town Common Road and three parking spaces on the town common.

Farrell: if the church is sold, would the easement go with the next use? Ellis: the church building is owned by the church; the parsonage was deeded to the American Baptist Churches of Massachusetts in 1885; the church was never conveyed to them. Makepeace-O'Neil requests Ellis to provide drawings and dimensions to assist the Select Board in deciding on next steps. Ellis agrees and states that the church has financing for the project; there are members who have been unable to attend due to the steps; the church has offered community opportunities and is eager to do more; we are working on policies

for renting the church to groups. Makepeace-O'Neil: the item will be on the agenda after Select Board receipt of the requested information.

5. Board of Health/Opt-out of Mosquito Spraying for EEE: Catherine Hilton/Board of Health: during the Board of Health 5.5.21 meeting, the Board voted unanimously to opt out of mandatory spraying for mosquitoes by the SRMCB (State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board). Hilton continues: if the Select Board opts out, an alternative mosquito control management plan application will need to be submitted. Hilton: during the 5.5.21 meeting, members of the public attended and spoke against spraying for health and water quality reasons; there are PFAS in the spray's inert ingredients and in the storage barrels. Hilton continues: this is a one year exemption; the Town is not giving up any options; this is about local control; the formal steps are a public meeting, public comment, and consultation with the Board of Health then putting the alternative plan together; the Board of Health has essentially met all the minimum requirements for this plan: public information is provided ever year, i.e., sent out in town mailings and posted on the Board's web site, as well as the annual town meeting vote to join the Mosquito Control District which does testing in Town that provides an early warning. Per Hilton, residents are advised to clear up standing water; the Highway Department is clearing culverts and, if necessary, BTI dunks could be used in standing water; it is unlikely there will be arbovirus in this part of the State due to the three year cycle; the arbovirus occurs mostly in the southeastern part of the State; the State would have to certify that the extent of the problem is necessary in order to override the opt out option; the probability is low. Stein attended the 5.5.21 Board of Health meeting and was impressed by the number of residents present and being listened to by the Board of Health. Hilton: resident concerns were eloquently expressed.

- Farrell appreciates the Board of Health's preparation and willingness to prepare the alternative mosquito management plan. Farrell moves the Select Board opt out of aerial spraying; Stein seconds the motion. The public is provided an opportunity to comment; no comment is offered. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

Hilton will prepare the necessary application for signing by the Select Board.

6. Shutesbury Athletic Club License (SAC) Applications: Scott reports the ABCC approved the Shutesbury Athletic Club's "change of manager" application; the SAC is applying for two licenses: Live Entertainment and Operate a Pool Table; the SAC is planning a live music event this coming weekend during which no alcohol will be served; per Mark Olszewski/SAC President, the SAC met with the Board of Health during their most recent meeting; the SAC wishes to have the license to Operate a Pool Table in place prior to their full reopening. No SAC Board of Director officers are present. Per Scott, prior to reopening, the SAC will need to provide the Select Board with evidence that their liquor liability and workers compensation insurances are in place.
- Stein moves the Select Board approve the Shutesbury Athletic Club applications for Live Entertainment, per MGL Chapter 140 Section 183A and to Operate a Pool Table, per MGL Chapter 140 Section 202. Farrell seconds the motion. No public comment is asked for. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries. Select Board members will sign the

licenses and Scott will prepare them for SAC President Mark Olszewski to pick up prior to the upcoming SAC event.

Break

7. MBLC Small Library Pilot Grant Program: Mary Anne Antonellis/Library Director: the Mass Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) has been considering how to make their program easier for small towns; the Small Library Pilot Grant program is a competitive process resulting in the selection of one library; the MBLC has budgeted \$3,000,000 and will provide support for planning, design and construction and up to 75% for the costs with some exceptions, i.e., landscaping and furniture; in the regular grant rounds, they offer 60%; this is a one-time streamlined application; the Pilot experience will provide the MBLC with guidance for the regular 2026 grant round. Per Antonellis, we have almost \$500,000 saved toward a new library building: \$227,000 in Town funds and \$259,000 in privately raised funds. Antonellis: she and the Library Board of Trustees want to apply for the Pilot Grant; we need a new library now more than ever; social distancing is not possible, there is only room for one staff person and there is no running water; our inadequate library is dangerously inadequate now; this is an amazing gift that the State is offering to a town and it has to be for new construction. Antonelli: the first step, is an annual town meeting warrant article asking for permission to apply; this is standard practice. Antonellis asks the Town Administrator and a volunteer from the Select Board to meet with her to look at the application and develop a game plan to put forward the best application. Antonellis screenshares the proposed warrant article which is edited to include the name of the grant program “Massachusetts Public Library Construction Program (MPLC) Small Library Pilot”.
 - Stein moves the Select Board request the Town apply for funding from the Massachusetts Public Library Construction Program (MPLC) Small Library Pilot through an annual town meeting warrant. Farrell seconds the motion. Antonellis to Mosher’s question: the warrant grants the appropriation; if the Town receives a grant, the article grants permission to use the funds. Brad Foster/Library Trustee clarifies that some of the funds are in a Town account and some in the Friends of the M.N. Spear Library account. Kate Cell/Library Trustee: the warrant provides permission to apply for the grant; the fact that the Town has set aside funds plus the private support demonstrates that the Town is well prepared to apply for the grant. Antonellis to Mike Vinskey’s question: the warrant article is standard language used by towns across the state; we are applying for a grant from the MBLC which will defray the cost of design, construction, and furnishing of the library. Farrell clarifies that the article states “authorize to apply”. For further clarity, the “such funds” in the last line is changed to “MPLCP funds”. Torres explains that language “to accept and to expend” is necessary. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O’Neil: aye; the motion carries. Stein volunteers to meet with Torres and Antonellis.
8. Annual Town Meeting Review/FinCom Schedule: Torres expects the FinCom will finalize the budget during their 5.12.21 meeting; the plan is for the Select Board to review the warrant and budget on 5.18.21. Torres: the town meeting setup will be a rerun of last year; the Board of Health has reviewed the plans which will be abbreviated from

those of 2020; the Board of Health will be active during the meeting; folks will be encouraged to view town meeting documents online and to bring their devices and/or printed documents; printed materials will not be available unless doing so is okayed by the Board of Health; there will be one large tent and smaller ones for staff and one porta-potty; the Broadband Committee will boost the internet signal. Paul Lyons/Town Moderator: we need to allow enough time to plan the details needing attention and ensure townspeople are kept in the loop, as much as possible, and understand procedures; we need to get information out as soon as available. Torres to Lyons: no citizen petitions have been received to date. Lyons will want to talk with any petitioners in advance; suggests ordering and grouping warrant articles as was done last year.

9. Personnel Board Resignation:

- Stein moves the Select Board accept Ralph Armstrong's resignation from the Personnel Board; Farrell seconds the motion and thanks Armstrong for his service. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

10. Town Administrator Updates: Potential contractors for the elementary school roof project had their official walkthrough; bids are due 5.26.21; the bid documents for the Locks Pond Road culvert replacement project will go out this week.

- Stein moves and Farrell seconds a motion to appoint Melody Chartier as the Personnel Board representative to the Police Study Group. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

Unanticipated Items:

1. MSBA Letter of Interest: The Select Board has reviewed the resolution to authorize the Superintendent to submit a Statement of Interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority for the Shutesbury Elementary School for which an application may be submitted for replacement of the school roof.
 - Stein moves the Select Board sign the letter to the Massachusetts School Building Authority authorizing submission of the Statement of Interest Form. Farrell seconds the motion. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.
2. Planning Board Amendment: Stein moves the Select Board accept the amended Planning Board amendment to Section 10.4A "Associate Members" of the Town of Shutesbury Zoning Bylaw; Farrell seconds the motion. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries. Stein moves and Farrell seconds a motion to the proposed amendment back to the Planning Board. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

Administrative Actions:

1. Select Board members will sign vendor warrants totaling \$80,122.99.
2. Select Board members will sign payroll warrants totaling \$99,137.11.

At 8:44pm, Farrell moves and Stein seconds a motion to adjourn the meeting. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

Documents and Other Items Used at the Meeting:

1. 5.11.21 email from Henry Geddes: “Comments for SB meeting 5/11/2021”
2. 5.10.21 email from Fire Chief Walter Tibbetts: “Re: Pill/Randall letter” and attachments
3. 5.7.21 email from Catherine Hilton/Board of Health: “Report of the Board of Health on Spraying Opt-Out” and 5.10.21 Board of Health email: “For your discussion May 11”
4. Shutesbury Athletic Club license applications (see file)
5. Draft Library Trustees warrant article regarding the MPLCP Small Library Pilot
6. 4.27.21 “Personnel Board Resignation” from Ralph Armstrong
7. Statement of Interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority
8. Planning Board amendment to Section 10.4.A “Associate Members”

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Avis Scott
Administrative Secretary