

**Select Board Meeting
November 3, 2025, 7:00 PM
Sanford Hall, Town Hall
155 Village Street**

Present: Todd Alessandri, Chair; Dennis Crowley, Vice-Chair; Maryjane White, Clerk; Frank Rossi, Member; Glenn Trindade, Member.

Staff Present: Michael Boynton, Town Manager; Allison Potter, Assistant Town Manager; Peter Pelletier, Department of Public Works (DPW) Director; Nolan Lynch, Assistant DPW Director; Jon Ackley, Building Commissioner; Barbara Saint Andre, Director of Community and Economic Development; Stephanie Carlisle, Sustainability Coordinator.

Others Present: Andy Rodenhiser, Planning & Economic Development Board Chair; Gail Hachenberg, Medway Cultural Council Co-Chair; Fallon Maloney, Cultural Council Candidate.

At 7:01PM, Mr. Alessandri called the meeting to order

Public Comments

There were none.

Appointment Consideration: Cultural Council – Fallon Maloney

The Board reviewed the Candidate's Statements of Interest

Gail Hachenberg, Co-Chair of the Medway Cultural Council, introduced herself and spoke on Fallon Maloney's behalf. She explained that she met Ms. Maloney at the library, where she was impressed by her artistic talents and enthusiasm. Ms. Hachenberg noted that the Council had been seeking someone creative to join their group, and after meeting Ms. Maloney and seeing her involvement with the Diwali Festival, she felt she would be an excellent addition. She also stated that the Council had voted unanimously to recommend her appointment. Fallon Maloney shared that she recently graduated from college with a degree in English and expressed her excitement to contribute to the Cultural Council's work. Mr. Alessandri thanked her for volunteering and opened the floor for questions. Mr. Rossi asked Ms. Hachenberg about the current membership of the Cultural Council, noting that the website listed nine members, and she confirmed that Fallon would bring the total to ten voting members, along with one non-voting student member. She added that the Council can have up to fifteen members and that several members had recently rolled off after reaching the six-year term limit set by the Massachusetts Cultural Council. However, she mentioned that three of those members intend to return after their mandatory one-year break, and she also had a new potential volunteer in mind. Mr. Rossi commended Ms. Maloney for volunteering and acknowledged the Council's strong community programming. He asked Ms. Hachenberg to share some highlights of their recent events. She described several successful programs, including the Diwali Festival, which drew over 400 attendees, and the Pixie Festival, which had more than 200 participants. She also mentioned the High Tea event that reached full capacity with 35 guests. Ms. Hachenberg announced that the Council's next event would be a Town-wide cookie competition, designed as a fun community activity. She explained that it would feature both amateur and professional judging, including Ms. Maloney's mother, who is a caterer. The contest would have a two-tier format—first, participants would submit cookies and recipes for judging, and finalists would move on to a

“chopped-style” round with assigned ingredients. Mr. Rossi asked if the Council was also involved with PorchFest, and Ms. Hachenberg confirmed they had helped organize that event as well. He expressed his full support for Fallon’s appointment. She emphasized that the Council maintains a positive atmosphere and is always open to new ideas for community engagement. Mr. Crowley inquired about the location of the Diwali Festival, and Ms. Hachenberg responded that it was held outside the Medway Parks & Recreation Department on a beautiful evening with perfect weather. Ms. White expressed confidence that Ms. Maloney would be a great addition to the Council, noting that she knew Fallon’s parents and believed she would fit in well. Mr. Crowley asked Fallon whether she worked at the library, to which she replied that she did part-time. The Board thanked her for volunteering, appreciating her enthusiasm and fresh perspective.

Mr. Trindade moved that the Board appoint Fallon Maloney to the Cultural Council for a term expiring on June 30, 2028, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE: 5-0-0.

Update: Tri-County Construction and Financing

The Board reviewed the Project Update

Gibb Phenegar of 5 Causeway Street, Medway’s representative to the Tri-County School District, presented an update on the Tri-County building project. He began by noting that Dore + Whittier, serving as the Owner’s Project Manager (OPM), and Consigli Construction, the project’s builder, were both doing excellent work. Mr. Phenegar reported that the project remained on time and on budget and was about 25% complete, with an expected delivery in July 2027. Despite the impact of Canadian steel tariffs, he explained that the project avoided additional costs because all necessary steel had been purchased and delivered before the tariffs took effect. The steel structure and flooring were already completed, and crews were now working on the walls to make the building weather-tight by December so that interior work could continue through winter. He continued by highlighting that the main athletic field and track were completed ahead of schedule and would be ready for student use in the spring season, sparing the need to send students elsewhere for sports. Mr. Phenegar explained how the project is being financed: the State will reimburse approximately 50–56% of total costs, while the remaining portion will be covered by the 13 member towns. The total project cost approved by the towns represents the maximum allowed—if costs exceed that figure, the project team would need either to reduce scope or return to all 13 towns for additional funding. From his background in construction, Mr. Phenegar expressed confidence that the team was managing the project well and anticipated finishing slightly under budget. As of fall 2025, 95 Medway students were attending Tri-County, and he expected that number to rise once the new building opens in 2027. Mr. Phenegar invited the Board members to schedule tours of both the new and old school buildings, emphasizing that seeing the outdated existing facility helps illustrate why a new structure was needed. Mr. Trindade thanked Mr. Phenegar for his update and praised him for doing an outstanding job representing Medway at Tri-County, noting his focus on the school’s progress and accountability. Mr. Crowley then spoke, noting that since Mr. Phenegar had only been appointed three months prior, it might not be fair to expect detailed historical knowledge, but he wanted to explore the financial aspects further. He asked whether there could be a meeting arranged with Tri-County’s financial advisor to better understand the project’s bonding and expenses. Mr. Crowley recalled earlier figures indicating a \$285 million total project cost, with roughly \$80 million covered by the state and \$205 million bonded by the towns, but said he never received confirmation of the final bond amount. He also expressed concern that the documentation provided in the meeting packet referenced only \$191 million in construction costs, which seemed inconsistent with earlier numbers. Furthermore, he pointed out that OPM and architectural fees were not included in that figure and requested more detail on contingencies and overruns, wanting to know how these might affect Medway’s upcoming fiscal budget. Mr. Boynton responded, estimating that Medway currently had between 85 and 88 students enrolled, and promised a more precise update soon. Mr. Phenegar confirmed that number and offered to provide a five-to-ten-year enrollment table for

context. He also mentioned he would share a document link containing a 430-page project report that included full architectural details. Mr. Alessandri added that the link had already been circulated earlier in the day. Mr. Crowley shifted focus back to student enrollment costs, expressing concern that each Medway student at Tri-County costs about \$20,000 per year. With ten additional students, that could mean \$200,000 in new educational expenses. Mr. Boynton agreed, noting that the town should expect a significant increase in Tri-County's assessment for the next fiscal year. Mr. Boynton estimated that the student costs are now approaching \$25,000, meaning even small enrollment changes could have a major impact on the Town's budget.

Continuing the financial discussion, Mr. Crowley recalled that Medway anticipated paying roughly \$1 million annually in bond premiums, which could rise to \$1.1 million depending on student growth. He reminded everyone that while other towns passed tax overrides to cover their share, Medway instead used revenue from the battery storage facility on Route 109, allocating \$1 million of that income to Tri-County and \$1.2 million to Medway Public Schools. He also asked Mr. Phenegar for clarification about the vocational school lottery system, recently discussed at the state level. Mr. Phenegar explained that the state had passed lottery legislation for vocational school admissions, but adoption varied across districts. About one-third of the schools were pushing back against it, so clarity was expected within 30 days. Tri-County is likely to implement a lottery system in 2026, either straight or weighted, depending on local decision-making by the Tri-County School Committee. Mr. Crowley asked Mr. Phenegar to keep the Board informed of developments. Mr. Alessandri confirmed that the local Tri-County School Committee would decide which system to adopt. Mr. Phenegar elaborated that under a weighted lottery, applicants could receive multiple "tickets" based on various criteria, such as attendance and behavior. Mr. Rossi asked for more detail, and Gibb explained that every applicant automatically receives one ticket, and additional tickets are awarded for good attendance, positive conduct, and similar factors, with a maximum of four tickets per student. Mr. Crowley then raised another financial question: how the annual town assessments are calculated. He noted that Medway's current assessment is based on 95 students, but if that number rose to 110, the Town's cost could increase proportionally each year. Mr. Rossi confirmed that each September, Tri-County recalculates every town's percentage share based on enrollment, with Medway currently representing about 9.5% of total students. Mr. Phenegar responded that historically, each town's share has remained fairly consistent year to year. Mr. Boynton cautioned that if Tri-County implements an unweighted lottery, enrollment patterns could fluctuate significantly, potentially shifting spots between towns. This could cause unpredictable budget swings—benefiting or hurting towns depending on the year. Mr. Phenegar agreed that the issue is complex and recommended that Medway officials speak directly with Tri-County Superintendent for deeper insight into how the lottery system might affect town allocations under the state's vocational education regulations.

Mr. Trindade summarized the issue plainly: "If enrollment goes over 95, we have a problem." Mr. Crowley agreed, emphasizing that the Town's budget was built on 85 students and could be strained if that number continues to rise. Mr. Alessandri added a broader economic perspective, noting that as the job market for college graduates weakens, demand for trade education will likely increase. With unemployment projections for degree-holders nearing 20%, more students may seek vocational paths, as trade careers are becoming more stable and lucrative. Mr. Phenegar responded that he did not foresee a dramatic enrollment surge, since Tri-County's new building is designed for 1,000 students and current enrollment already stands at 998. Ms. White thanked him for clarifying this point, saying she had assumed the population would remain static but was now aware of the possibility for slight increases. Gibb reiterated that while the lottery system might sound transformative, its practical effect will likely be minimal because the weighted and unweighted models produce similar results. Mr. Rossi closed by noting that he had reviewed the Consigli project report linked earlier, which included 436 pages of data, email correspondence, and budgets. He asked if such detail was typical for municipal construction projects and it was confirmed that it was, explaining that public projects must maintain extensive documentation and that the report's \$2.983 million contingency referred only to construction costs, not

the full \$47 million contingency that existed at the project’s start. Mr. Rossi also asked about another vocational school project—Whittier Tech in Haverhill—that had recently failed in a district vote. Mr. Trindade explained that Whittier’s proposal was rejected because all towns, regardless of student enrollment, would have paid equal shares, prompting smaller towns to vote no. Mr. Alessandri added that Old Colony Vocational School would soon face a similar vote, and Mr. Boynton mentioned that Keefe Tech in Framingham was also beginning the process to seek project funding. The discussion concluded with the Board thanking Mr. Phenegar for his thorough update and ongoing representation of Medway at Tri-County.

Fall Town Meeting Warrant - Vote Recommendations: Articles 10,11,12 &13

The Board reviewed the Fall Town Meeting Warrant

FTM Article 10: Zoning Amendment- Battery Energy Storage Systems

Barbara Saint Andre, Director of Community and Economic Development, provided an overview of Article 10, which concerns an amendment related to battery energy storage systems. She explained that the Planning Board had discussed and voted on proposed changes to the article, following input from the Building Commissioner. The Commissioner recommended replacing the term “certificate of occupancy” with “start of commercial operation,” since there is no certificate of occupancy applicable to battery energy storage facilities. Additionally, Ms. Saint Andre noted that the Planning Board had an extensive discussion regarding who should handle the certification of compliance. The revised language now clarifies that a third-party consultant must be hired to submit the certification, which must also be signed by the facility owner.

Mr. Rossi moved the Board to approve Article 10 with a motion at Town Meeting to include the new language, seconded by Ms. Trindade. VOTE 5-0-0.

Mr. Crowley raised a question regarding the battery energy storage facility, asking what would happen if, after the required end-of-year testing, the operator installed a new software package several months later. He wondered whether such a change would require retesting and if it could affect previously granted UL approvals. Planning Board Chair Andy Rodenhiser explained that any operating software must comply with NFPA (National Fire Protection Association) standards at all times, and operators are required to certify annually that their systems meet current codes and safety standards. Mr. Crowley continued to express concern about whether changes made after certification would trigger retesting or notification to the Town. Mr. Rodenhiser replied that operators must remain compliant, but the Town would likely only learn of an issue if an incident occurred. Mr. Trindade, drawing on his professional experience in the field, elaborated that companies like UL or Intertek certify battery systems based on specific components, including software. If an operator changes any element on the “critical components list,” such as software, they must return to the certifying body to verify that the new version still meets safety standards. Without that updated certification, the system would lose its compliance status. Mr. Rodenhiser added that NFPA standards require all electrical equipment to be UL listed or meet equivalent standards. Mr. Crowley pressed further, questioning whether the Town would be notified if a new software version required recertification. Mr. Trindade responded that the key was to verify the existence of a valid certification, comparing it to the UL label found on appliances. If a manufacturer changes a component without retesting, it would lose the right to display the certification mark. Mr. Boynton added that the most immediate public concerns are noise and safety. He cited the example of Exelon, which must regularly submit reports on operating standards and emissions as part of its permit conditions, noting that a similar reporting approach could apply to future battery facilities.

Mr. Boynton also clarified that Article 10, even if adopted, would not apply to the existing Milford Street battery facility, as it was permitted by the state rather than the Town. The new zoning requirements would only govern future, locally permitted projects. He assured the Board that the Town would be proactive

with any new vendors, such as the Medway Energy Center, to ensure they adhere to all local standards. If any issues arose—such as excessive noise—Medway could request or conduct its own testing. Mr. Crowley suggested that future agreements for new facilities, such as one potentially planned for West Street, include specific language addressing software updates made between certification periods. Mr. Boynton explained that while the Town cannot renegotiate the existing host community agreement, the planning process for any new project would provide opportunities to address those concerns. He also noted that because the proposed facility would span both Medway and Bellingham, coordination between the two towns and oversight by the state’s Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB) would be crucial. If the developer failed to cooperate with local permitting, Medway could revisit its host community agreement and consult special counsel regarding its legal rights and intervener status with the EFSB. Finally, Mr. Alessandri clarified for the record that the preceding discussion was not about the specific language in Article 10 itself but rather about potential procedural and compliance issues that could arise with future battery storage developments. Mr. Boynton reiterated that Article 10 does not apply to the existing Medway Grid facility on Milford Street.

FTM Article 11: Zoning Amendments – Housekeeping

Ms. Barbara Saint Andre explained that the first proposed housekeeping amendment involves deleting several unnecessary definitions from the zoning bylaw. Since the term “ski area” was removed from the bylaw last year, its definition also needs to be deleted. While reviewing that section, staff decided to remove other redundant definitions, such as “retail bakery” and “movie or cinema,” because these terms are commonly understood and can simply be referenced by their standard dictionary meanings. She noted that eliminating these unnecessary definitions helps streamline the bylaw and reduce clutter. Ms. Saint Andre continued her presentation by reviewing a series of proposed zoning bylaw amendments. She began by explaining that under the current zoning bylaw and Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40A, there are two enforcement methods: a non-criminal ticket and court action seeking fines or injunctions. The Building Commissioner requested that the Town clarify the enforcement language within the bylaw. To address this, the proposed amendment adopts the exact wording from Chapter 40A, ensuring that the local bylaw aligns precisely with state law and removes any ambiguity. She then discussed several additional clarifications and updates. She noted that while the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) is appointed by the Select Board for three-year terms, this term length is not explicitly stated in the bylaw. The proposed change formally adds that language for clarity. Next, she addressed amendments regarding “exempt uses,” such as religious and educational properties. These uses are subject only to limited site plan review under state law, but the Town’s bylaw language was somewhat unclear. The new section would specify that exempt uses can only undergo minor site plan or administrative review, never major site plan review, ensuring compliance with state regulations. Continuing, Ms. Saint Andre explained that several of the proposed changes are intended to correct inconsistencies and align references throughout the bylaw. For instance, one amendment corrects the designation of the special permit granting authority, which had been updated in one section but not another. Similarly, adjustments to the schedule of uses section are meant to ensure consistency across the document. Next, she reviewed proposed changes related to off-street parking and loading requirements. Currently, multifamily dwellings that use tandem parking—defined as one vehicle parked behind another—require a special permit. Since most multifamily units and townhouses in town already follow this design, she noted that it seems unnecessary to require a second special permit. The amendment would therefore allow tandem parking by right if all bylaw criteria are met. When Mr. Alessandri sought clarification that “tandem” did not refer to tractor-trailers, Ms. Saint Andre confirmed that it applied only to standard residential parking arrangements. She then mentioned a housekeeping update regarding a lengthy section title—“special permits for electric vehicle charging station digital advertising”—which will be shortened for readability in the table of contents. Lastly, she described the amendment concerning accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Under the new state statute,

municipalities may not require a special permit for ADUs, even when attached to preexisting, nonconforming homes. The proposed local amendment ensures compliance by allowing such homeowners to seek a simple majority vote from the Zoning Board, rather than a special permit, when adding an ADU as an extension of a nonconforming structure. She confirmed that the proposed language had been reviewed and approved by Town Counsel to ensure full legal compliance.

Mr. Trindade moved the Board to approve Article 11, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE 5-0-0.

FTM Article 12: Zoning Amendments – Signs

Andy Rodenhiser, Chair of the Planning and Economic Development Board, discussed Article 12, which concerns proposed changes to the Town’s sign bylaw. He explained that the Planning Board collaborated closely with the Building Commissioner and the Design Review Committee to address enforcement issues the Building Commissioner had been encountering. For example, there were cases where business owners would place signage directly on a window, making it noncompliant, and then move it slightly behind the glass to circumvent enforcement. The goal of the amendments, he said, was to make the bylaw simpler and more practical for both businesses and Town officials to follow and enforce. While the current revisions represent progress, he noted that the issue remains complex and will likely require further refinement in the spring, with additional input from the Building Commissioner, Design Review Committee, and Planning Board. When asked by Mr. Alessandri whether there had been any public comments during the hearing on the article, Mr. Rodenhiser replied that there had been none. Mr. Rossi raised a question regarding the removal of language about festive or Christmas lighting. Ms. Saint Andre clarified that the provision was being deleted from the sign bylaw because it is already included, verbatim, in the Town’s outdoor lighting bylaw, where it is more appropriately addressed. She added that several other duplicated provisions were also being cleaned up for consistency. Ms. Saint Andre further explained that the Planning Board’s recommendation to the Select Board covered only items one through six of Article 12. Item seven, related to window signage, was not being recommended because it still required additional review and refinement. Mr. Rodenhiser confirmed that the Planning Board had formally excluded item seven from its vote.

Mr. Trindade moved the Board to approve Article 12, items 1-6 only, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE 5-0-0.

FTM Article 13: Zoning Amendments – Multi-Family Housing

Ms. Saint Andre explained that Article 13 concerns multifamily housing and the clarification of zoning districts following the adoption of the new MBTA community multifamily housing bylaw. She noted that the Town already had an existing multifamily housing overlay district, which caused some confusion since there were now two distinct districts with different zoning rules. To differentiate them, the proposal renames the original district—covering much of the village areas along Village Street and parts of Main Street—as the “Villages Multifamily Housing District.” She emphasized that this change is simply to distinguish between the two and not related to any outside references. Additionally, the article updates language regarding planning board regulations, clarifying that while the board may adopt additional rules for these housing areas, it is not required to do so, as existing site plan review regulations are already comprehensive.

Mr. Trindade moved the Board to approve Article 13, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE 5-0-0.

FTM Article 14: Citizen’s Petition

Dorothy Robinson of 25 Pond Street spoke as the Citizen Petitioner for Article 14, which seeks to revert the name of Indigenous Peoples Day back to Columbus Day on the second Monday in October. She explained that her reasoning stemmed from the fact that Native Americans are already recognized with a

heritage day in November and a month dedicated to Native American heritage. Ms. Robinson felt that while many cultural groups have holidays that honor their heritage, the Italian-American community lost its traditional day of celebration when Columbus Day was changed. She shared that, as an Italian-American, the holiday had great meaning to her grandparents who immigrated in 1909 and saw it as a symbol of pride and cultural celebration. Several board members responded with differing perspectives. Mr. Rossi expressed understanding and empathy for Robinson's viewpoint as it was an important holiday in his Italian family, while Mr. Alessandri, also Italian, disagreed, saying his family never regarded Columbus Day as an Italian holiday and that continually revisiting the issue would create division. Mr. Crowley acknowledged both sides, noting the historical injustices against Indigenous people and the cultural pride Italians associate with Columbus Day. He proposed that the Select Board not take a position and allow the citizens at Town Meeting to decide independently, as it was a citizens petition. A discussion followed over whether the Board should make a recommendation. Mr. Alessandri argued that as elected leaders, they had a responsibility to provide guidance, as they had done on similar matters in the past. Mr. Crowley countered that previous board action had caused controversy and that it was better to stay neutral and let the citizens decide. Mr. Trindade, sharing that he is married to an Italian-American, said he understood both perspectives but opposed reopening the issue, warning it would only lead to repeated debates at future meetings. Further clarification was provided regarding the state and federal designations—federally, it remains Columbus Day, though many Massachusetts communities observe Indigenous Peoples Day locally. When asked whether a permanent decision could be made to avoid future changes, Mr. Boynton explained that such a change could only be done through a bylaw, which would still be subject to future amendments.

Mr. Crowley moved the Board to not make a recommendation on Article number 14 the Citizen's Petition. VOTE: 2-3-0. (Mr. Alessandri, Mr. Trindade & Mr. Rossi opposed)

Mr. Rossi moved the Board to approve Article 14, Ms. White seconded. VOTE: 2-2-1 (Mr. Alessandri & Mr. Trindade opposed, and Mr. Crowley abstained)

Update: 120 Main Street Property – Environmental Clean-Up Financial Update and Next Steps

The Board reviewed the Memo & Budget Forcast

Mr. Boynton provided an update on the 120 Main Street environmental cleanup, financial status, and next steps. He explained that the Town had previously appropriated \$1.25 million at the Spring Town Meeting for the project, with approximately \$388,000 spent to date, leaving a remaining balance of about \$861,000. The remaining cleanup is estimated to cost \$318,000. He also outlined several funding requests, including \$50,000 for demolition of the front building, which no longer serves a purpose, \$20,853 for additional asbestos abatement monitoring by Tetra Tech, and \$5,000 to extend fencing to secure the site once demolition is complete. Mr. Lynch added that the asbestos presence is minimal, limited mostly to windows and a small portion of the roof. Mr. Boynton noted that if all proceeds as planned, approximately \$400,000 to \$442,000 could later be transferred into the facility stabilization account in the spring. Mr. Lynch confirmed that utility cuts are underway and the abatement bid package will be issued soon, with demolition expected to follow shortly thereafter. Mr. Boynton emphasized that completing this work now would be more cost-effective than leaving it for future architectural contractors. The Board agreed that the project update was thorough and appreciated the clarity of the financial and progress summary.

Approval: Contract with Strategic Environmental Services for Site Soil Remediation and Disposal at 120 Main St. - \$318,235

The Board reviewed the Memo & Strategic Environmental Services Contract

Mr. Lynch explained that this contract covers the long-planned soil remediation work, noting that Strategic Environmental Services was the lowest responsible bidder. Tetra Tech, the Town's oversight engineering firm, has worked successfully with them in the past and provided a strong recommendation. The company is prepared to begin immediately, having already completed bonding and performance paperwork, and their work can proceed concurrently with the demolition phase. Mr. Pelletier added that the \$318,035 represents the minimum cleanup estimate, with the possibility of cost increases if additional contaminated soil is discovered or if wet soil conditions require extra dewatering. Mr. Boynton emphasized that the project was timed to minimize weather-related expenses and that the goal is not only to complete the cleanup but also to finalize the process under the state's Mass Contingency Plan, ensuring the site is fully clean and certified by the Department of Environmental Protection.

Mr. Rossi moved that the Board approve the Strategic Environmental Services for Site Soil Remediation and Disposal at 120 Main St. in the amount of \$318,235 and authorize the Chair to execute it, seconded by Mr. Trindade. VOTE: 5-0-0.

Approval: Task Order Proposal with Tetra Tech, Inc. for Asbestos Abatement Design and Monitoring Services at 120 Main St. - \$20,853

The Board reviewed the Memo & Tetra Tech Task Proposal

Mr. Crowley asked for clarification regarding the scope of work. Mr. Trindade explained that the proposal covers the asbestos removal oversight, while Mr. Pelletier confirmed it includes the monitoring portion of the project. Mr. Crowley sought further details about the cost breakdown, noting that the estimated \$25,000 for asbestos removal seemed close to the \$20,000 cost for engineering oversight. Mr. Lynch clarified that the original hazardous materials estimate was approximately \$19,000, with the \$25,000 figure reflecting a slight inflation to cover contractor work. He further explained that Tetra Tech's fee includes designing the bid documents and overseeing the abatement process. Although the oversight and removal costs are comparable, both were considered necessary to ensure compliance and proper environmental management.

Mr. Rossi move that the Board approve the Task Order Proposal with Tetra Tech, Inc. for Asbestos Abatement Design and Monitoring Services at 120 Main St. in the amount of \$20,853 and authorize the Town Manager to sign it, seconded by Mr. Trindade. VOTE: 5-0-0.

Approval: Change Order with S&R Corp. for Environmental Cleanup Project at 120 Main St.- \$50,000

The Board reviewed the Memo & S&R Corporation Change Order

Mr. Lynch introduced the final item, a change order under the existing open contract with S&R Corp for the 120 Main Street environmental cleanup project. Mr. Crowley confirmed that S&R had handled the original demolition work and noted that the contract remained open due to pending state filing documents, which allowed the change order to be added without issue.

Mr. Rossi moved that the Board approve the Change Order with S&R Corp. for the Environmental Cleanup Project at 120 Main St. in the amount of \$50,000 and authorize the Chair to execute it, seconded by Mr. Trindade. VOTE 5-0-0.

Approval: Contract with Kimley-Horn & Assoc. for Milford Street Improvement Project - \$1,516,350

The Board reviewed the Memo, Bid List & Kimley-Horn & Assoc. Contract

Mr. Pelletier explained that the Town has been working with Kimley-Horn for about a year on designing and improving Milford Street, including upgrades to intersections and sidewalks. The Town received \$250,000 from Senator Spilka's office to begin the effort, and is now moving forward with a \$1.45 million MassWorks grant to continue the project. Since the total contract cost exceeds the grant amount, Chapter 90 funds will be used to cover the remaining balance. The project will be split into two phases—east and west—based on MassDOT's recommendation, with the long-term goal of extending sidewalks from Milford and Summer Streets to the Milford town line. Mr. Boynton added that the project addresses longstanding safety, drainage, and environmental issues, particularly near Gray Squirrel and West Street where a culvert replacement is needed. He noted additional funding from the Medway Grid host community agreement, totaling around \$250,000 to \$300,000, will also support the project. Mr. Crowley expressed concern about project costs, noting that \$66,000 will need to be reallocated from the Town's roads and sidewalks schedule and estimating the total project cost at approximately \$15 million. He cautioned that while the Town is investing in design now, construction could take eight to ten years through the state's TIP program. Mr. Boynton acknowledged that despite potential costs and delays, the improvements are necessary given recurring flooding and multiple fatal accidents along Milford Street. Mr. Rossi concluded by urging continued advocacy for the project, encouraging the Town to stay proactive "behind the scenes" to move it forward.

Mr. Trindade moved that the Board approve the Kimley-Horn & Assoc. for the Milford Street Improvement Project in the amount of \$1,516,350 and authorize the Chair to execute it, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE: 5-0-0.

Discussion/Vote: Water & Sewer Fees

The Board reviewed the Memo, 2021 Water Sewer Fees and Proposed 2025 Water Sewer Fees

Mr. Boynton began by noting that it had been a long time since the Town's water and sewer fees were last updated. Mr. Lynch explained that the updates were necessary because the Town had been losing money due to rising material costs. He clarified that the intent was not to increase revenue but to ensure fees reflected current expenses and kept operations cost-neutral. The new structure also includes a mechanism to automatically adjust with inflation or material cost changes, avoiding the need for repeated approvals. He added that a 10% surcharge was included to account for handling, shipping, and delivery costs that the Town typically absorbs as a middleman. Mr. Alessandri asked if there were any questions regarding the proposed service and material fees. Mr. Crowley confirmed that the Water and Sewer Commission had already voted on the changes. Mr. Rossi inquired whether the violation fees had changed, and Mr. Lynch confirmed they remained the same—\$100 for the first offense and \$300 for the third. Mr. Rossi also pointed out a new fee for a fire service without a meter, which Mr. Lynch confirmed was recently added, set at \$2,000 per inch of tap size. Mr. Lynch explained that the new fee reflects the strain that increased development places on the Town's water infrastructure. Mr. Crowley asked whether the new rates would apply to projects already in the planning stages. Mr. Boynton clarified that any developments already in the permitting process would be grandfathered under the current rates, while new projects—such as the Mehan project—would be subject to the updated fees. Mr. Lynch noted that water and sewer entrance fees remain unchanged, with only the fire entrance fees being revised. Finally, Mr. Rossi asked how often the Town encounters after-hours service calls, such as water turn-ons or shut-offs. Mr. Pelletier responded

that such calls are infrequent but explained that a new flat fee had been introduced to replace overtime billing, ensuring costs are covered fairly without the need for hourly overtime charges.

Mr. Trindade moved that the Board approve the 2025 Water and Sewer Fees as presented, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE 5-0-0.

Approval of Minutes: October 20, 2025

The Board reviewed the October 20, 2025 Minutes

Mr. Rossi requested one change on page 7, line 324 – change the vote from 5-0-0 to 4-0-0.

Mr. Trindade moved to approve the minutes from October 20, 2025, as amended, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE 5-0-0.

Action Items from Previous Meeting

The Board reviewed the October 6, 2025, Action Item List

It was requested to change item seven on the list from Trotter Drive to “Milford Street Project.”

Town Manager’s Report

There were no back up materials for the Board to review.

Mr. Boynton stated he had no major updates but took a moment to commend the fire department for assisting the Town of Milford, which was experiencing a major fire that evening. Mr. Boynton added that Medway had sent an engine with a four-person crew to assist and concluded by reminding everyone that Town Hall and other town offices would be closed on Tuesday in observance of Veterans Day, with a ceremony scheduled at the Parks & Recreation Building at 11 a.m.

This time is being reserved for topics that the Chair did not reasonably anticipate would be discussed.

There were no back up materials for the Board to review.

Ms. White raised concerns about ongoing fire alarm issues at 39 Main Street, noting that the Fire Department has repeatedly responded there for alarms and maintenance problems. She asked whether the property was being fined for these recurring incidents. Mr. Boynton explained that fines were not being issued, as many of the incidents were not technically fineable, though the department was working through the challenges and had recently installed additional alarm systems. Mr. Crowley then brought up a resident inquiry about crosswalks on Oakland Street, asking whether the Town had followed up with the resident to explain whether the request could be accommodated. Mr. Boynton acknowledged the question and said follow-up was needed. Mr. Crowley also requested that at a future meeting, the Board receive a brief update from Mr. Pelletier on the Recycle Center, including the status of the consultant’s work and next steps regarding the landfill. Mr. Boynton suggested scheduling that update for the first meeting in December, since the next meeting would be limited in time due to the building committee’s design review session.

Select Board Reports

There were no back up materials for the Board to review.

Mr. Alessandri opened the Select Board reports by turning first to Mr. Trindade, who praised Parks and Recreation for an outstanding Halloween night event that drew well over a thousand people. He also commended the recent Hanlon field reopening and asked Mr. Boynton to consider doing an update to clarify public concerns about the Mobile station's relocation and misinformation circulating online about future development, particularly rumors about an auto dealership. Mr. Boynton agreed, noting that discussions related to a development agreement were underway and that he would provide a clear update soon. Mr. Crowley then highlighted the upcoming Medway football game featuring Ms. White's grandson, congratulated the varsity cheerleaders for winning first place in the Tri-Valley competition, and reminded residents of the upcoming Town meeting. Ms. White noted the progress at the Jacob Ide House, praising the Building Commissioner Jon Ackley's role. Mr. Rossi added reflections on the well-attended pumpkin walk and invited audience members to speak; Arthur Coleman introduced himself and raised concerns about Japanese knotweed growth while expressing interest in becoming more involved civically. Several board members encouraged him, noting that openings exist on various committees. Mr. Alessandri reiterated appreciation for the Hanlon Field rededication and reminded residents that attending Town meeting is essential. Mr. Boynton answered questions about clickers—confirming the town still has 500—and said he was unsure whether babysitting would be available. Mr. Trindade suggested contacting the National Honor Society, whose volunteers had recently helped at events. The Board encouraged residents to arrive early to avoid entry delays, and they concluded by planning to meet at 6:30 p.m. before the Town meeting for a brief discussion.

At 8:46pm Mr. Trindade motioned to adjourn, seconded by Ms. White. VOTE: 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Natalie Lennon
Executive Assistant
Town Manager's Office