

**Wellesley Advisory Committee  
Juliani Room, Town Hall  
January 31, 2018, 7:00 PM**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Rose Mary Donahue, Tom Fitzgibbons, Mary Gard, Mike Hluchyj, Mark Kaplan, Paul Merry, Lina Musayev, Alena Poirier, Betsy Roberti, Tom Skelly, Ria Stolle and Andrea Ward.

Mike Hluchyj called the public hearing to order at 7:02 p.m.

**7:02 p.m. Public Hearing on the 2018 Warrant for Annual Town Meeting**

Mike Hluchyj opened the hearing with an introduction:

- Thanks to Town boards and committees who have come to Advisory to present budgets and warrant articles
- Advisory continuing to receive input on matters before Annual Town Meeting (ATM), which will begin on Monday evening, March 26, 2018 at Wellesley Middle School
- Brief explanation of Advisory Committee composition and function:
  - 15 citizens appointed by Town Moderator for 3-year terms
  - Serve as advisers to/ “work for” Town Meeting
  - Perform functions that finance committees do in many other towns
  - Scope of Advisory Committee in Wellesley broader than finance: extends to anything that will come before Town Meeting, including zoning bylaw changes
  - Advisory previews all issues, examines budget, asks questions that a Town Meeting member might ask, requests supporting documentation, meets with proponents and opponents
  - Goal is to make sound recommendations to Town Meeting; sometimes Advisory Committee’s work leads to revised proposals or decisions not to bring a proposal forward
  - Publish Advisory Report for Town Meeting
- Tonight’s public hearing is part of process of listening to all perspectives – important part of info-gathering stage of our deliberations. Advisory doesn’t set priorities; rigor of its analysis determines its power. Only committee that balances different needs of Town.

Process for hearing:

- Will go through each article on ATM warrant in order
- Anyone who wants to speak, come up and sign in
- Advisory role is to listen and take input; no formal response by Advisory to any comments, although may ask a question for clarification

This hearing is not the only opportunity to share comments. Advisory email address is [advisorycommittee@wellesleyma.gov](mailto:advisorycommittee@wellesleyma.gov). Advisory will be deliberating on articles over next month or so – will make a recommendation on every article; meeting agendas are posted each week; can watch meetings online; minutes are posted on the website.

A summary of each article on the warrant was then read, in numerical order, and the public was offered the opportunity to comment on each one in turn. There were no speakers to any of the articles on the warrant. The public hearing was then concluded.

**7:20 p.m. Citizen Speak**

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

**7:20 p.m. Planning Board re: Zoning Articles for 2018 ATM and FY19 Budget Update**

Deborah Carpenter, Chair; Catherine Johnson, Vice Chair; and Michael Zehner, Planning Director, were present.

FY19 Updated Operating Budget

- FY19 request is \$324,208
- Entire variance compared to FY18 (\$19,897, or 6.54%) is in personal services
- Approximately \$5,519 of the variance is merit pay and the remaining approximately \$14,378 is associated with FY18 increase in salary to Planning Director and hiring of replacement Planner at just below midpoint of range (prior Planner had been at very low end of range)

There was a question on whether the funds for the FY18 salary increases came from Human Resources (HR): No, made up with existing Planning Department FY18 funds available due to the vacancy.

There was a question whether, given high turnover in the Planner position, the increased salary might result in greater longevity: Hope so; Planning Department hires great people who want to be challenged and have opportunities for advancement; working for Wellesley is attractive to other employers. There was a follow-up question as to whether, after the increase, the salary for the Planner position reflects current market rate: The salary is quite a bit higher than that of the prior individual; Planning Director considers parity among employees and relative experience; salary matches new employee's talents and background.

There was a question whether there had been any discussions with the HR Board regarding using that Board's discretionary fund to pay for the FY18 salary increase: Not that Planning Director is aware of; works with HR to write ad and set hiring range; HR confirmed that rate was acceptable; never occurred to Planning Director to ask for discretionary funds from HR.

There was a comment that the variance is 6.54%; recognize that it is over guidelines, but also due to unique circumstances.

There was a question as to how much time the Planning Department spends on 40B developments, as it seems like that would be a huge addition to Department's workload: This has hit Department pretty hard since May or June; has accounted for approximately 13%<sup>1</sup> of Director's time since he began keeping track (beginning of August). Planning does a lot on the front end of a 40B proposal, but less so when it gets to Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Front end consists of public engagement; educating people; steering concerns in productive ways. There was a comment that these are very important contributions to the Town at a key moment in the life of the Town: Has also added to work in that it encouraged the creation of the Housing Production Plan, the request to CPC for feasibility studies. There was a follow-up comment that perhaps the Department needs even more staff.

There was a question whether the Board could be more specific about extraordinary circumstances that warrant going outside the guidelines: The Director's salary was significantly inconsistent with those of his peers in other communities as well as other director-level staff in the Town. The Board felt that this was the year to rectify that discrepancy; worked with HR director to come up with appropriate salary range; moved Planning Director into the middle of the range now. The other factor that leads to budget being over guidelines was hiring someone (Planner) at higher rate than FY18 budget was based on.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figure provided by Planning Director to Advisory Committee via email on February 1.

There was a comment by an Advisory member that this is not a Planning Board/Department issue; it's how the Town deals with salary increases to compensate its best people and how it deals with a new hire who comes in at a higher salary. Right now, the Advisory member continued, it's handled by saying (to the Department), figure it out within your FY18 budget; that's confusing when you get to FY19; Advisory has to explain the FY19 increase to Town Meeting (Advisory will vote separately on Planning budget as part of new policy for departments that are over guidelines); something doesn't feel right in the way the Town handles this; funds should come from HR and it should be added to Department's FY18 budget so the increase for FY19 won't look so high. The HR board has committed to come back to Advisory and hopefully explain/discuss this further.

There was a comment by another Advisory member that this is a systemic problem; if you look at salaries in annual report you can see how different positions are compensated; need to think about ways to manage salary process differently: There is a wide variety of skill sets you need in Planning, but no such mechanism as "steps and lanes" where you can move people along.

There was a question whether Planning had significant turnbacks in past few years: Yes, mostly because the Department didn't use its "other professional services" fund.

#### Workload

Only change from previous presentation to Advisory: since August 15, there have been 48 applications and five meetings under demolition review bylaw. Revenue under the bylaw updated: \$26,500 in fees have been collected since August 15. Clear that the Town will recoup all the funds associated with the new part-time planner position (\$27,500) within current fiscal year.

#### Capital budget request

\$25,000 request for sub-area land use study and plan (with matching \$25,000 from CPC); will have better idea as ATM approaches of what area to focus on

There was a question as to what areas the Department has in mind for further study: State Street area; certain areas along Route 9; certain areas in our villages where there are underdeveloped areas and properties; want to nail down what the Unified Plan is considering and what consultants come up with in Housing Production Plan; possibly Cedar Street and Barton Road.

There was a follow-up question as to whether the North 40 was a possibility: That's a question for the Board of Selectmen (BOS), whether they would be open to that; they've committed to a study.

Planning Department is currently managing existing capital budget funds for Unified Plan and for Design Review Board guidelines.

There was a question as to whether the fees from the demolition delay applications were intended to offset the cost of the additional half-time Planner, and whether in fact that had been reached: Yes, fees have just about covered the full cost of that new position already this year. Planning is committed to work with the Historical Commission to evaluate their fees and see if Planning's time is being adequately compensated. There may be a way to shift fees; the waiver process is especially time-consuming.

#### ATM Warrant Article 29 (Rezoning of NRC properties)

- Third and final phase of rezoning NRC properties into Parks, Recreation, and Conservation District
- Planning Board is co-sponsor, along with NRC, of this article
- Phase 1 (2016) involved 28 parcels; Phase 2 (2017) involved 17 parcels; current Phase is 18 parcels
  - 7 other parcels were originally to be included in this phase, but have been removed

- Do not expect these to return
- One was Town Hall; other 6 are questionable in terms of whether they are large enough to account for developmental potential
- Rezoning these properties into Parks, Recreation, and Conservation District is a goal outlined in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Open Space and Recreation Plan
  - Also comports with “best practices,” as zoning of properties should be consistent with actual and/or intended use
- The eighteen properties to be addressed in Article 29 are as follows:
  - a. Problem Rock, 215 Grove St. (a.k.a. Puddingstone Rock)
  - b. Morses Pond Beach, 99 Turner Road
  - c. Sinoff Gift, 16 R Brookdale Road (landlocked parcel)
  - d. Bird Island Sanctuary, 5 R Dale Street
  - e. Pine Point, 47 R Russell Road
  - f. Morses Pond, 1000 Worcester Street (Morses Pond is currently zoned single family housing – probably good practice to rezone)
  - g. Schofield Tennis Courts, 9 R Cedar Street (active recreational uses clarified at last ATM as being within Parks, Recreation, and Conservation District)
  - h. Warren Park, 94 Washington Street
  - i. Sawyer Park, Forest Street/Wellesley Avenue/Sawyer Park Road
  - j. Yotz Meadow, 41 Hillside Road
  - k. The Waterway, 30 The Waterway
  - l. Peabody Park South, Abbott Road/Livermore Road
  - m. Indian Springs Park, Croton Street/Squirrel Road
  - n. Farms Station Pond, Glen Road/Croton Street
  - o. Farms Station Pond South, 60 Croton Street
  - p. Ware Park, 212 Washington Street
  - q. Hunnewell Field, 55 Rice Street
  - r. Devil’s Slide, 10 Greenwood Road

There was a question about the parcel of land behind Pine Point and Bird Island Sanctuary: That is Pickle Point, owned by Conservation Council, a private corporation. Town probably should look at conservation-owned land next.

There was a question whether rezoning affects who takes care of the land: No, the ownership remains the same. There was a follow-up question as to what exactly does change: Current zoning is single family residential, but that’s not the intended use of the properties, so Town is re-zoning to intended and actual use of properties.

There was a question as to whether Planning might be able to address a problem on Hundreds Road of people waiting to pick up and drop off passengers at the Wellesley Farms train station: Subject for conversation with BOS; sounds like a public safety issue.

There was a question whether “Hunnewell Field” in item “q” is where the softball fields are located: No, the football field.

There was a question as to the process by which Planning decides which properties to rezone: These are all owned by the NRC; this process began at 2016 TM; this is third and final phase. Basic zoning map tells the use of different types of properties; overlays on many of our properties allow for single family development. Town discovered when North 40 came up for purchase that it was zoned single family residential and could have supported a huge number of homes; as that process developed, Planning looked at other properties in Town and saw that many of the NRC properties had this single family overlay. Unlikely that these properties would be used as such, but felt it was better to be sure they could not.

There was a question as to why Town Hall was removed from this year's list of proposed rezonings: There were a number of questions surrounding that parcel and didn't want to bog down rezoning process for the other properties. Questions include whether there is a permit for the use of Town Hall for municipal purposes (in the Planning Director's view, it is a pre-existing non-conforming use). Should there be expansion of Town Hall (parking lot, etc.), may need to get a permit.

#### ATM Warrant Article 30 (Phase 2 of zoning map corrections)

- Phase 1 (2017) corrected 9 areas; this second phase includes 14 areas, as well as some other related changes
- Zoning map converted from physical to digital format in 2002-03 and digital map adopted by Town Meeting 2003
- Discrepancies in current zoning map discovered in 2014; zoning map is a legal document and can only be amended by TM
- Town has been directed by Land Court in a particular case that even if map shows something is an error, still have to revert back and interpret as TM intended
- In some of Phase 1 changes, Planning noted TM original intent but ultimately recommended something different – there are more of those situations here, which is why they were saved for second phase
- 4 grounds in warrant article for rezoning:
  - formally adopt and accept the inadvertent errors on the map – memorialize what map currently shows (items “a” through “l” on article list)
  - rezone from current (erroneous) designation to match intent last designated by TM (items “m” through “u” on article list)
  - accept *neither* current erroneous designation nor last designated TM intent – do something different (2 instances, items “v” and “w”)
  - for some parcels that are being addressed in one of the first three categories above, correct another aspect of the parcel that has an additional issue, e.g., correct split zoning (property might straddle a 10,000 square foot zone and a 15,000 SFZ, so makes sense to zone entire property into one) (items “x” through “ff”)
- A lot of judgment and research has gone into this process

There was a question as to what communication the Department has had with property owners and whether there had been any objections: For all zoning map corrections, letters are sent to affected owners. For all rezonings, postcards are mailed to property owners within 300 yards of affected property, although not required to do so. Staff have fielded a lot of calls. No objections to NRC rezonings (one individual has questions and will come to Planning Board public hearing on 2/5/18). There are one or two property owners affected under this article who may have additional questions: (1) Sisters of Charity and (2) property on Pleasant Street; otherwise not aware of any objections.

There was a question as to whether there is a danger that someone will try to exploit one of these incorrectly zoned parcels: Danger is misinformation and miscommunication; people may rely upon incorrect information in a sale or purchase and make flawed decision; don't want to produce a zoning map with disclaimers—that makes it pointless and worthless. If Town did nothing, knowing errors exist, it would still be obligated to interpret map as TM intended, which doesn't always make a lot of sense. Hope to continue to work with town counsel up to ATM to make motion language clearer.

There was a question as to whether someone goes out and surveys properties: Yes and no; parcels are described by shapes. Polygons that are being corrected are made up of parcels that were added over time.

There was a question on items k, l, u and ff (Hollis/Westerly area), as to why proposed rezoning left some split zoning at the bottom of the map: Because that's Delanson Circle (site of proposed 40B development) and didn't want to do anything.

There was a question as to whether any of the uses of the DPW property on Municipal Way (item "m") – e.g., filling station, etc. – are of concern under rezoning to Single Residence District 15: No, those uses are municipal uses allowed under current permit. Benefit to neighbors of rezoning entirely into SR15 (vs. entirely into business) because, under SR15, neighbors are noticed any time there are changes to DPW operations.

Items "p" and "z" – Sisters of Charity property on Oakland Street – will be rezoned from single residence to educational district. Owners had questions as to how this would affect their use of property; religious uses are allowed in both; will not affect their use.

Items "q," "w," "bb" and "cc," affecting the Oak Street/Linden Square area, will be rezoned from industrial to business. There was a comment that it is great to see this cleared up, and perhaps the south side of Linden Street should be tackled, as well.

There was a question as to how much more zoning map correction work there is to do: Don't believe there is anything additional; had originally included 17 Abbott Street, but there is a question as to whether it's in historic district, so pulled off warrant. There was a follow-up question as to whether split-zoned properties pointed out through discussion tonight have to be corrected: Planning did an analysis of how many properties are split-zoned; there are always instances where we may wish to change zoning (e.g., Woodlawn Cemetery is single family residential).

#### ATM Article 31 (Outdoor lighting bylaw)

Intent of proposed bylaw:

- enhance public safety
- protect community character
- promote energy conservation
- protect resident privacy
- minimize sky glow

Existing Town approval processes touch on lighting but there is no single, specific bylaw.

Goals of proposed bylaw:

- codify current permitting practices within zoning bylaw
- provide technical standards for permitting (definitions, measurements, general regulations, requirements for height of wall and ground-mounted fixtures)
- create consistency among projects
- sharpen tool in Town's tool box

There was a question whether the Town has instruments to measure light: Rely on manufacturers of actual light fixtures or the engineering reports that come from proponents; science has evolved a lot; specifications of light fixtures are very detailed; as long as Town can confirm that lighting specified is lighting installed, that's 90% of the question; issue of light trespass of one foot candle may come up—if there were ever a complaint, could rely on property owner to confirm; Town can pursue getting a light meter.

Town requires photometric plans. Terms include: "lumen" (intensity of light at light fixture, usually measured at border of property or distance from the fixture; goal is zero trespass at border), "lux"

(intensity on ground, measured in meters) and “foot candle” (same as lux, applied to feet instead of meters). In past few years, industry transitioning from foot candles to lux – we have both in the bylaw, as recommended to Town.

There was a question whether the existing permitting requirements that are described as being codified in the new bylaw are requirements that are included in all permits: Lighting comes up in large house review, but difficulty determining appropriate standard due to subjectivity; for larger projects (with parking lots, subject to ZBA), there is standard in off-street parking bylaw (lights shall be shielded and no spillover), but varying application of that standard.

The bylaw does impose new lighting requirements on projects that don’t already have a lighting requirement to them. Three applications for bylaw:

1. *Major or Minor Construction Projects* – as defined by “XVIA. Project Approval,” includes projects of significant impact (PSI) (e.g., Bel Claire, Tolles Parsons Center (TPC)) – a lot of work that you want to do to make buildings of these sizes consistent

There was a question as to what an example of a “minor construction project” would be: Any non-single family or two-family project where owner needs a permit because he is making changes to exterior of building (e.g., renovation of Citizens Bank at intersection of Washington St./Forest St.; door or window changes; definition included in zoning bylaw).

There was a question as to whether the bylaw would require parking lot lighting that turns on when it senses cars in area: Nothing in the proposed bylaw that would restrict or require it. One of permitting entities is ZBA; they frequently cut sign to dark when building not operational; bylaw not addressing at this time.

2. *Large House Review (LHR)* – only time proposed bylaw touches residential properties – exterior lighting as need to accomplish “safety and design objectives” – permitting done by Planning Board

There was a question as to whether the outdoor light fixture shown on LHR slide is allowed: Owners would need a special permit because that one is not shielded, although you can purchase some like that that are shielded. There was a follow-up question as to whether the Town is going too far: These are large houses; need to think of neighbors. There was a further follow-up question as to whether the Town instead should say, “turn your lights off”: That’s a harder reach; enforcement problems. Sometimes applicants come to LHR with a proposal for hundreds of exterior lights. There was a comment that it seems a little unfair that neighbor without a large house can have the fixture shown in slide, but large house can’t.

There was a question whether there are measurement units for skyglow: Not that aware of.

There was a question as to whether, if the focus of the bylaw is on lights staying on all night long, perhaps concern of NRC that animals can become confused by light, etc., the Town should instead take a stand on how long people can leave lights on: That hasn’t been principal concern expressed; instead, it’s the overall light pollution – uplighting, etc. There was a follow-up question as to whether Town could regulate when people turn off landscape lights: Partly an enforcement issue; enforced by building inspector, who goes home at 5 p.m.; then becomes a neighbor requesting enforcement, which sets up a whole dynamic. Planning Board instead chose an iterative approach, starting with major/minor projects and PSI; felt that if it could take care of big pieces in Town, there would be a chance later on to see what else could be done.

There was a comment that the slide showing the prohibited front door fixture, perhaps containing a couple of 40 watt candles and located under a roof, doesn't seem like a big problem, in contrast to problem with hundreds of uplighting fixtures on a property.

There was a question (1) whether there is an example of something that is fully shielded (and allowed) that Planning could show Advisory and (2) what happened to tree lights: Only fully shielded lights are allowed; uplighting prohibited without a special permit.

There was a comment that the Planning Board should make the uplighting prohibition clear in its presentation to Town Meeting. There was an additional comment that if everyone put just five uplights in their yard, that would cause additional usage of electricity that residents pay for; our rates increase based on usage. There was a follow-up comment that electricity usage from LEDs is not extensive.

There are approximately eight to fifteen LHR applications per year to which the proposed bylaw would apply. Another step that perhaps could be taken in the future is to apply light cutoff or timing cutoff for all new construction permits. Not prudent to do so at this time; need to see how this bylaw works and what reaction to it is.

There was a question whether the opposition/concerns expressed last year by the colleges still remain with respect to current version of bylaw: No, their concerns have been resolved. There was a follow-up comment that, for Town Meeting presentation, Planning Board should think about examples to make the concerns/issues underlying the bylaw more real, since many people don't perceive/understand the problem; could also have an educational component, too.

There was a question whether the bylaw applies to Town properties as well: Yes (e.g., TPC, were the project to have come forward after bylaw enacted); can't have different rules for different groups of citizens.

There was a question as to what caused the educational institutions to accept the current version of the bylaw: Primarily the changes to the recreational/athletic field maximum illuminance; standard now in bylaw was taken from NCAA standards – allows the maximum needed for any outdoor sport. Prior concerns about interior lighting on campus addressed through 1,000-foot exemption and other provisions.

3. *Externally Illuminated Signs*: third area of application; needs DRB review or special permit.

Bylaw does not apply to (1) ordinary maintenance, repair and replacement of lights not approved as part of one or more applications; (2) installation of new lights on properties NOT subject to an application (e.g., residential properties not subject to LHR)

There was a question as to what exactly had changed from last year's proposed bylaw:

- changed some definitions (e.g., foot candle, illuminance, luminance, light trespass, lumen, lux, skyglow)
- under "administration," clarified what type of information needs to be submitted
- added general regulations for single family residential uses, limit for correlated color temp
- added allowance of standards for outdoor recreation and sports facilities
- added exemption for "seasonal lighting of a temporary nature" (e.g., holiday lights)
- added prohibition on searchlights for commercial purposes

49 towns in Commonwealth have an outdoor lighting bylaw, including some peer towns (Brookline, Lexington, Concord).

There was a question as to how those towns' bylaws compare to proposed bylaw: Some are not standalone bylaws, but some are; they're all fairly consistent in terms of amount of lighting and trespass allowed; goal is to have zero trespass on the property lines.

There was a comment that it would be good to address issue of neighbor putting up spotlight that shines in someone's window: Hope to do that in the future.

### **9:30 p.m. Approval of Minutes/Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters**

Andrea Ward made and Mike Hluchyj seconded a motion to approve the January 17 and January 24 minutes; the motion was approved unanimously.

#### Schools (Tom F.)

- State funding gods are smiling on us
- Circuit breaker reimbursement rate had been 73% for last two or so years; this year was only 65%, as pot was thinner this year; but projection is 70% for next year; Superintendent felt very positive that there was upside
- Schools carry over circuit breaker reimbursement surplus into next year
- Complicated but headed in right direction

#### Jane (HHU)

- A lot is churning; desire to get feasibility study funding before the summer; moving towards a late April/early May STM
- SBC met last week; they said to make headway, need to get architects onto the committee and get technical stuff going; need to work on both projects together at least initially, and get master plan and then legally decouple
- We need TM vote to move from phase 1 to phase 2 eligibility – fund feasibility and schematic design
- Specific process MSBA follows – average timing to completion is 5-7 years
- With Hunnewell, there is a lot of concern about cost escalation – we've been assuming 3.5% cost escalation per year but may be more like 5 or 6%; lot of concern about delaying Hunnewell for 5 years at those rates; may be worth it to renovate St. Paul's at a cost of \$5 million to save \$10 million in cost escalation
- SBC approved use of \$9,500 in funds from MPC phase to engage SMMA to review St. Paul's at a high level; study will take about 4 weeks; will give a little more sense of the cost and timing of that project

There was a question whether the thinking is to do the two schools at the same time, or one ahead of the other: All options are on the table.

#### Health Insurance (Mike)

- BOS made proposal to unions; BOS has the right to go ahead, and did, with alternative proposal (can be rescinded if Town reaches agreement with unions)
- Nothing to do with ongoing GIC health insurance issues in the news
- In both cases (proposal and alternative) there are about \$3m in savings to the town over current costs (don't yet know rates for coming year)

#### Municipal Light Board (Mark)

- Streetlight conversion process (funding voted at last year's ATM) – 3,000 streetlights – on schedule to be completed by end of March or early April

- When conversion process completed, result will be:
  - Better lighting from LEDs with reduced emissions
  - Savings of \$115,000 to \$125,000 per year on Town's electric bill
  - Town eligible for State reimbursement of 50% of \$400,000 spent on materials
- MLB also completed 5-year financial forecast:
  - Projecting that 5% rate increase that went into effect should provide enough revenues to carry MLP rates through FY22 without further increase
  - Anticipate that forward capacity charges will be leveling off in next few years so available cash will be going back up – protects Aaa rating for borrowing
  - One of areas MLB is looking into is whether to offer internet service to some of large users (businesses, educational, etc.) – potential revenue generator
  - MLB spends a lot of time dealing with environmental issues
    - Greenhouse Gas committee has been up and running
    - Public forum scheduled for 2/13 in Great Hall
    - Literature included in electric bill concerning voluntary renewable energy program
      - In the past, people say they want to do it until they see the cost
      - Working with marketing consultant to try to get a better result
      - Working with National Grid on individual energy audit

Board of Health (Mary)

- Still working on budget; has come down a bit after meeting with Blythe/Lenny/Marcia
- Board of Health meeting tomorrow; will come back to us with update

**10:02 p.m. Adjourn**

Mike and Tom seconded a motion to adjourn; the motion was approved unanimously.

**Items Reviewed During Meeting**

- Planning Department FY19 Operating Budget Request
- Planning Department FY19-FY23 Capital Budget Request
- *Planning Board & Department FY19 Budget & 2018 ATM Presentation to Advisory Committee, January 31, 2018*