

**Wellesley Advisory Committee
Juliani Room, Town Hall
February 14, 2018, 7:00 PM**

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

Mike Hluchyj called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

7:00 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

7:00 p.m. Board of Public Works re: Warrant Article 18 (Grove Street reconstruction)

Paul Criswell, Board of Public Works; Mike Pakstis, Director, Department of Public Works (DPW); Dave Cohen, Assistant Director, DPW; and Dave Hickey, Town Engineer, DPW, were present.

- Will be reconstructing Grove Street from Spring Street to the Needham town line
- Requesting to borrow \$2 million
- Last resurfaced in 1993
- Have done a couple of short leveling courses in order to hold road together to get to reconstruction
- Some concerns about sidewalk and street elevation – currently at same elevation
- Will use “complete streets” method
- Design underway with current funding
- If approved, actual construction scheduled for summer 2018

There was a question as to what “complete streets” practices are: DPW looks at cars, pedestrians, bikes etc. – develops a design that addresses all of those.

- Starting at Needham end of project and moving towards Town
- Expected life of prior overlays is probably 1-2 years; band-aids until we could get to reconstruction
- Near Fuller Brook, cars are parking on the sidewalk; need to solve that problem; will be working with Dana Hall since it’s at one of their buildings

There was a comment/question that last summer there were tremendous tie-ups on Grove Street (all the way back to Benvenue) at the time that Ten Acre and Dana Hall camps were emptying out, so wondering how this project will interact with camps and schools: Probably will be additional backups, but will integrate project with schools; need to work closely with them.

There was a question as to whether Cliff Road has been completed yet: Will be starting that right after the Marathon; gas company just finished work in December. There was a follow-up question as to whether there will be a problem doing both projects simultaneously: No, there shouldn’t be; projects are located at opposite ends of Town. We have programmed out all our major streets for the next 10-15 years. Grove Street has been postponed for a number of years – got design funds for Grove last year.

There was a question about gas leaks: Try to meet National Grid every month; we’ve flagged this project for them; they say there’s nothing they need to do; but we’ll go back and check with them.

There was a follow-up question as to what caused the delays with Cliff Road: A lot of ledge; not sure National Grid is accustomed to that; entire relay of plastic piping on Cliff; that won't happen on Grove Street.

There was a question as to the different kinds of funds that can be used for street reconstruction: Inside the levy borrowing will be used for this one.

There was a question as to how long the Grove Street project will take from start to finish: Bulk will be done in 3-4 months and then punch list items after that.

There was a question whether any Ch. 90 funds (which come from the state gas tax via a formula; about \$860,000/year to Wellesley) will be used for this project: No, not anticipating using any; all will be inside the levy. There was a follow-up question as to where the \$860,000 in Ch. 90 funds will go: To the other category – street *resurfacing*, not reconstruction.

7:10 p.m. Board of Public Works re: Warrant Article 24 (Westgate Road easements)

The same individuals listed above were present.

This Article involves abandonment of an easement that has been in place since the subdivision was constructed. As best we can tell, it was put in place for future development; however, no plans for any future development. Homeowner requested abandonment of easement; approached Town Counsel; we agree that there isn't a need for this easement.

There was a question as why the easement was there in the first place: Sense that it was there in case it was needed for additional development; however, everything in that area is fully developed, and each street in area has its own water/sewer/drainage/electric/etc.

7:15 p.m. Discussion and voting on ATM Warrant Articles

Article 16 (Middle School feasibility study)

- All items to be included surfaced in the extensive 2014 SMMA study
- Projects will extend life of school for 25 years; take school to 2043, when building will be 90 years old
- \$125,000 for feasibility study on four items
 - HVAC equipment is original to construction
 - Kitchen equipment has exceeded service life
 - No known façade repairs have been undertaken since original construction
 - Doors/cabinetry

There was a question whether the School Committee has commented on this work in terms of its vision for the Middle School: Yes, they are partners in this and see this as necessary work; they would have preferred it to have been done a while ago, but they are on the same page as FMD.

There was a question about the scope of the HVAC and whether air-conditioning will be installed, as it seems like the usage and needs of building would warrant it: Will be installed in the auditorium and in the gyms (A & B). There was a follow-up comment that if we are doing a feasibility study, would be an option to get information about actual work, including air-conditioning.

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 16, as proposed by the BOS, to see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate, transfer from available funds, or borrow the sum of \$125,000.00 (ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS), to be

expended under the direction of the Facilities Management Department to obtain one or more feasibility studies for four Middle School projects which include: (1) exterior façade repairs, (2) replacement of the HVAC system, (3) replacement of interior doors and (4) replacement of kitchen equipment; and for any other services in connection therewith and, for the purpose of meeting such appropriation, to authorize the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Board of Selectmen, to borrow said sum in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 7(1) of the Massachusetts General Laws, or any other enabling authority and to issue bonds or notes of the Town therefor, and that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of the issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the Massachusetts General Laws, thereby reducing the amount to be borrowed to pay such cost by a like amount; or to take any other action in relation thereto. The motion was approved unanimously (12-0).

Article 21 (Middle School piping project)

There was a comment by an Advisory member who is very concerned about the breadth of this project; feels that Town should be looking at other pipes (i.e., steam pipes in addition to return pipes), and that appropriation should be larger to more fully investigate the steam pipes and any other necessary work.

Another Advisory member commented that the steam pipes were done in 2006-08 but that this segment (return pipes) was left out of 2006-08 project due to cost reductions; that Advisory member is comfortable that the broader overview has been done and that this work will get us through next 25 years.

The first Advisory member stated his recollection that the steam pipes are original to the building.

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 21, as proposed by the School Committee, to see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate, transfer from available funds, or borrow the sum of \$391,575.00 (THREE HUNDRED NINETY ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS), to be expended under the direction of the Permanent Building Committee, for architectural and engineering designs, plans and other specifications and any associated costs related to the replacement of the Middle School Steam Pipe system, and for any other services in connection therewith and, for the purpose of meeting such appropriation, to authorize the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Board of Selectmen, to borrow said sum in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 7(1) of the Massachusetts General Laws, or any other enabling authority and to issue bonds or notes of the Town therefor, and that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of the issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the Massachusetts General Laws, thereby reducing the amount to be borrowed to pay such cost by a like amount; or to take any other action in relation thereto. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

7:35 p.m. Warrant Article 36 (Citizen petition to rezone 170-184 Worcester Street and 7 Burke Lane)

Dennis DeSchino, President, Equity Partners, Inc., spoke on behalf of the petition. Mr. DeSchino has been involved in property management and leasing at the site for 25 years.

- 7 Burke Lane is a 19,000 square foot lot currently in the Single Residence 15 district; proposal to rezone property to Single Residence A district
- Property owners want to make 7 Burke Lane a parking lot for the neighboring 170-184 Worcester Street commercial properties
 - Single Residence A allows for parking lot
 - Will increase parking to close to 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet

- Desperately need parking; state took a significant portion of land out front on Worcester Street
- Will enable building owners to eliminate some parking in front of 170-184 Worcester Street and replace with landscaping
- On Burke Lane side, will eliminate parking there, as well; will make wide sidewalk (5 feet) to allow access around building, introduce landscaping to improve curb appeal
- One abutter came to first Planning Board hearing and spoke in favor; at second Planning Board meeting, there was a question from a residential abutter at 3 Burke Lane, where we will put in landscaping and fencing to create a buffer
- Rezoning will not allow expansion of the commercial building; will not allow any further encroachment of commercial into residential neighborhood
- Currently no house on the 7 Burke Lane property; torn down a little over a year ago
- No runoff; will retain stormwater on the site

There was a question whether that would involve installation of catch basins: Probably dry wells. There was a follow-up question as to the distance from the property line to the next residential structure: Not sure, probably not twenty feet setback; that is where fencing and landscaping will go.

- Per Planning Department, will be removing some split zoning on both pieces of property/cleaning up of zoning line.

There was a question as to what feedback had been received from abutters: Met with direct abutter, who just wants fencing and screening.

There was a question as to what types of permits are required: Mostly engineering. There was a follow-up question as to the intended lighting for the parking lot: Probably will be similar to Church Square; keep lighting low; no spillover into residential areas; maybe 10 feet pole height.

There was a question as to whether the zoning bylaws provide any guidance as to how many parking spaces are permitted: Usually works the opposite way; you need minimum number of spaces to cover floor area of the building. Parking ratios in Wellesley can be as low as 3.2 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Tenants at 170-184 Worcester will include a dance studio, medical offices, restaurant; we'll have 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Will be nice to have the extra spaces from a leasing perspective and to have a place to put snow. In the past, there was parking spillover onto Burke Lane and residents didn't like that.

There was a question whether there are any additional leasing changes that might increase traffic, in addition to the dance studio mentioned: No. Some medical space is currently vacant; has been difficult to lease because of insufficient parking.

There was a question as to what kind of feedback the proposal had received from the Planning Board/Department: Favorable. There was a follow-up question as to whether the Planning Board had voted yet: No, will do so at Feb. 26 meeting.

There was a question as to what permitting is required on the site and how to be sure that the intended actions spoken of today will come to fruition: Will have to present to the Engineering Department and address all the drainage and do a hardscape/landscape/lighting plan in order to get approval for the parking lot. There was a follow-up question/comment that the petitioner and the Advisory liaison will clarify the permitting sequence going forward and report back to Advisory, with the idea that Advisory will have sufficient information to vote on Article 36 at its Feb. 28 meeting.

There was a comment that the Planning Board has been very concerned about eliminating split zoning on properties. This Advisory member expects that these two lots would be combined in the future into one lot with a different kind of split zoning (e.g., Business and Residential A); thinks that is an appropriate use of split zoning and would like record to reflect that; perfect example of Residential A allowing parking in transitional area between a business and residential district; applauds actions in the Article.

7:50 p.m. Warrant Article 37 (Citizen petition re: electronic voting at Town Meeting)

Pete Jones, Town Meeting Member, Precinct B, spoke on behalf of the petition.

- Interested in introducing electronic voting at Town Meeting
- Connected with group of town moderators and town clerks who have been using electronic voting for a number of years
- Believes this might be a way to increase productivity of Town Meeting; make sure that all votes count; voice votes are “who can yell the loudest”
- Wants Town to put some funds forward to do a proper evaluation and perhaps a demonstration at Town Meeting
- Worked with Town Counsel and Executive Director to draft actual motion
- Town Counsel raised a few concerns about electronic voting being in conflict with existing Town bylaws

There was a question whether the petitioner had considered simply studying the subject in Year 1, reporting back to TM, and then implementing in Year 2: Would like to try it out next year (2019 ATM) and see if we like it rather than losing another year.

There was a question whether, as part of his evaluation, petitioner had looked at possible software concerns, e.g., what issues have there been in other towns and what steps can one take to prevent them: Spreadsheet shows comments/experiences of other towns; hard to tell how new the other towns’ systems are.

There was a question as to what the Town Clerk and Town Moderator think of electronic voting: New individuals will be assuming both positions; petitioner met with both candidates for Town Clerk, who seemed excited about possibility.

- System can be used in combination with current voice voting system; expected to save 30 minutes to 80 minutes of time vs. typical voting
- Every Town Meeting member vote is recorded; tool is not dependent on audio volume of a voice vote
- Up to moderator to decide how votes are displayed on screen at Town Meeting, if at all (e.g., by precinct, etc.)
- All voting data is then available for Moderator and Town Clerk instantaneously
- Town moderators and town clerks in towns surveyed were very positive; lots of videos where you can watch the systems perform
- Different acquisition models – owning v. leasing

There was a comment that perhaps the study committee could do a more rigorous analysis and consider factors such as the number of years to payoff, etc.

There was a comment that an Advisory member had heard about electronic voting from friends in Lexington and Arlington who think it’s terrific; agrees with need to study it, but hopes we could move it along quickly.

There was a question/comment that the committee should be given funds sufficient to do a dry run the first year; otherwise, will lose a year.

There was a comment that this will allow the creation of voting records for Town Meeting members; right now all that is captured is attendance; there was a further comment that electronic voting would save time in so-called standing votes.

There was a question as to whether Town Counsel has concerns: Yes, he did have concerns regarding Sections 8.20-8.22 of the Town Bylaws.

There was a comment that it might be worthwhile for Advisory to hear from Town Counsel.

There was a comment that some people are discouraged from running for Town Meeting because of time demands; electronic voting might make participation more palatable.

8:25 p.m. Playing Fields Task Force re: Warrant Article 17 (Wellesley High School field improvements)

Michael D'Ortenzio, Jr., Chair, School Committee, and Member, Playing Fields Task Force (PFTF) and Andy Wrobel, Chair, Recreation Commission, and Chair, PFTF, were present.

- Not a lot of changes since presentation last fall
- Master site plan includes restrooms and a building with two team rooms
- Original cost estimate was \$1.5 million; actual cost will be significantly lower (requesting \$525,000)
- Funding model is the 1/3 Town, 1/3 CPC, 1/3 PFTF model previously used
- Walkers and field users need restrooms
- Team rooms necessary because new High School has less locker space and more athletes than prior school
- Working with Cricket Vlass at DPW to identify route into State Street for utilities without taking out trees
- Received BOS support on Monday
- RFP for the team room and park restroom (approved at 2017 ATM) will be going out this week
- Expect park restroom and team rooms to be done in the fall

There was a question whether installation of the park restroom (by the tennis courts) approved at last year's ATM had been delayed to better coordinate with this project: DPW had been moving forward on that restroom, but saw options they preferred while on site visits for this project; that's how the projects became dovetailed.

- Responses will be reviewed; modular company will build and bring to site; DPW managing installation
- Maintenance is still an open item, e.g., how much will be required, how often, who will perform it); DPW currently maintains park restroom, but probably doesn't make sense given FMD's role/mission

There was a question as to who will clean the team rooms this year: Not sure; working on that; hope to have answer soon.

There was a comment that there are two questions relative to maintenance: first, the long-term cost to the Town beyond the construction of the building—usually there is an estimate of that over the life of the facility; second, relative to FY19, does anyone have maintenance in their budget or will there need to be another source of funding: We are having those conversations right now.

There was a question whether this project is so small that it doesn't need to go through the Permanent Building Committee (PBC): Yes, it is below the PBC threshold. Also, buildings will not be "built" on site; they are built off site and then set onto our site; different model than we have seen with PBC projects; all the prep work/utility work/pad work will be done by DPW.

There was a request for clarification on the construction costs: The team room will be approximately \$90,000; each of two restrooms is \$65,000-\$80,000; add in installation + pad + footings + utilities; so overall closer to \$400,000 but asking for \$525,000, including contingencies and plantings (compared to original \$1.5 million estimate); whatever funds are not used will be returned to each group proportionate to their pieces; Team Room will be paid for by PFTF; restrooms will be funded half by CPC and half by Town.

There was a question whether the proponents are satisfied that the modular structures will have sufficient longevity/warranties: Yes; they have a 30 or 40 year life span, but who knows how the Town is going to want to be using those areas in the future; not bad to have a decision point down the road.

There was a question whether the Design Review Board will be involved: Yes, and NRC has some views on color as well.

There was a question regarding security features at the new facilities: The team rooms will be locked with limited access to HS Athletic Director; expect 2 of 3 bathrooms to be locked most of the time, except for major events/games; bathroom that will be open most of the time will probably have a keypad, with code posted online or shared around town; open to feedback on that latter point; still considering.

There was a question where the Town expenditure of \$175,000 is coming from: BOS has indicated that it will be inside the levy borrowing.

8:50 p.m. Human Resources Board re: Warrant Article 5 (Reserve fund for mid-year salary adjustments)

John Hussey, Chair, Human Resources Board, and Scott Szczebak, Director, Human Resources Department, were present.

- Here tonight as follow-up to earlier discussion with Advisory around the Human Resources (HR) Board Reserve Fund for mid-year salary adjustments (Article 5, motion 3)
- The question that came up was, can we find a way to improve transparency of these adjustments; i.e., should unbudgeted salary actions in the current fiscal year be funded through the Reserve Fund
- Planning Department budget brought this question to light:
 - Personal Services budget up 7.6% from FY18 to FY19, but hard to tell where the change is coming from
 - In this case, Director received a standing in range increase that was substantial and unplanned, AND in "other professionals" line, there was a vacancy for a while but then new person hired at higher rate
 - FY18 figures shown in FY19 budget shift the funds to the line item where they were used (from "other professionals" to "director"), so not possible from viewing that budget to understand what occurred; not an ideal situation

- Were you to leave the FY18 funds in the “other professionals” line, instead of moving it to the “director” line, you could say this is more transparent – director salary shows an increase of 11% instead of 2% -- but still hard to tell that that increase happened in FY18

There was a question as to what the budget would look like if the Reserve Fund were used to finance the adjustments: That is the third slide in the presentation; however, the line items simply go up from FY17 to FY18 in each of the “director” and “other professionals” lines and there’s no transparency as to what happened there; no one beyond the relevant Board and HR/BOS would know what happened. There was a follow-up comment that the transparency could occur by listing under Article 5, Motion 3 exactly how those funds were used (e.g., “Planning Director increase from \$x to \$x”).

HR examined all salary actions from July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2017. Actions included:

- Hires above job grade mid-point (budgeted amount)
- Un-budgeted promotion
- Reclassification – job changed or re-analyzed and moved to higher job grade
- Standing-in-Range adjustment – job grade doesn’t change but employee responsibilities or competitive/internal review indicate compensation inequities
- Recognition Award (one time – no long term implications)
- Total average \$100,000/year over 2.5 years

There was a question whether, if total salary actions per year are \$100,000 but only \$15,000 per year in Reserve Fund, then \$85,000 coming from unfilled positions in department budgets: Yes.

45% of total salary adjustment funds went to new hires above the mid-point. Most new hires are replacements (4/6 in 2017); budget impact uncertain. 85% of new hires are in DPW, FMD, Police.

For existing employees, HR Reserve Fund was used for 1/3 of total of \$120,000 -- smaller departments with little budget flexibility; 2/3 were in smaller departments; 55% of smaller department changes funded by departments.

There was a question whether a department can move funds from expenses to personal service: No (only schools can). There was a follow-up comment that the only way a department has extra money for these kinds of adjustments is by having a vacancy/gap in hiring.

Financial Principles per HR Board

- Departments should be accountable for their budgets
- Budget process should be as transparent as possible

Considerations per HR Board

- Budget process compares current FY budget to plan FY budget
- Adjustments in current FY can drive budget FY over guideline
- Budget and presentation should demonstrate real increase
- Lack of run rate or projection impedes understanding of budget FY increases
- Question about transparency for current FY vs. budget FY
- How to explain current FY changes whether money comes from within budget or from HR Reserve Fund
- HR funding increases turnback when increases are affordable within department budget
- HR should not be check and balance for budget or be driving department budgets
- HR should maintain record of unbudgeted salary actions and evaluate on a regular basis

There was a comment that, regardless of where the funds come from, it is all Town money: Yes, but HR board doesn't want to get into business of driving budgets.

- HR funding may influence departments to be unnecessarily aggressive in new salary offers or standing-in-range increases since retention or hiring risk will be lowered and supporting funds will come from outside the department and will be permanent
- Process should be the same for new hires and existing employees
- HR funding of unbudgeted increases would require HR one-time budget increase of \$85,000 with no corresponding decrease
- Majority of current FY budget changes don't create budget FY challenges

Lot of discussion – no silver bullet answer – but conclusion of HR Board was that (1) departments should fund changes wherever possible, as has been occurring; and (2) at same time, budget information should show changes in current FY and plan FY increase from current projection/run rate.

There was a question as to the one-time increase of \$85,000 in the Reserve Fund: You would increase from \$15,000 to \$100,000 the first year, then would remain at \$100,000 thereafter.

There was a question whether, in the ideal situation, if an employee leaves and there are excess personal services funds, those should go back to the Town; then if a replacement is hired, the funding would come out of the Reserve Fund: Right now we can achieve better transparency by being specific in article write-ups. In the end, the HR Board felt that there is turnover in departments, and that gives them enough flexibility to do what they want to do; problem not significant enough to justify adding new funding flows into the system. There will be specific cases, like the Planning Board, that will be difficult to explain.

There was a question/comment that roughly 85% of increases during the year are coming from sources other than the \$15,000 Reserve Fund; that is a hidden budget creep that Town Meeting members can't see; really not healthy in terms of transparency: Don't see that as budget creep. There was a follow-up comment that a position gets upgraded because another one is unfilled, then the position gets filled, and the budget goes forward at that higher rate: Those changes can be explained in the departmental budget. There was a further comment that the problem is, when Town Meeting votes for the mid-year adjustment Reserve Fund, that's where they think these changes are taking place, but in fact a much higher volume of such changes occurs because they are hidden in the department budgets and Town Meeting doesn't know.

There was a comment that departments could be prohibited from moving funds within personal services; if they find themselves with a surplus they would have to turn it back to the Town, and would need to go to HR when they find a new hire.

There was a comment that it might be worth having a discussion with Finance re: different approaches to this issue; would be better to operate off the run rate of where we are now, not off of the prior year budget. Perhaps Finance/Advisory/HR could get together after Town Meeting. There was a follow-up comment that it would be helpful to have specific information concerning any salary changes made in the past 18 months.

9:40 p.m. Discussion and voting on ATM warrant articles (continued from earlier)

Article 4: Amend Job Classification Plan

Motion 1

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 4, Motion 1, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, to see if the Town will vote to amend the Classification Plan established at the 1950 ATM as amended, by striking Schedule A, "Job Classification by Groups"

and inserting a new Schedule A as described in the Motion, which was distributed to Advisory members. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

Article 5: Amend Salary Plan – Pay Schedule

Motion 1

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 1, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, to see if the Town will vote to amend Schedule B of Article 31 of the Town Bylaws (entitled “Salary Plan – Pay Schedules”) for the Series 40 employees as indicated in the Motion, which was distributed to Advisory members. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

Motion 2

Andrea Ward made and Paul Merry seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 2, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, to see if the Town will vote to amend Schedule B of Article 31 of the Town Bylaws (entitled “Salary Plan – Pay Schedules”) for the Series 50 and 60 employees as indicated in the motion, which was distributed to Advisory members. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

Motion 3

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 3, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, to see if the Town will vote to appropriate the sum of \$170,000 to the Human Resources Board for the purpose of granting salary increases to employees in Job Groups 50 and above in the classification plan. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

Article 6 (Set Salary of Elected Official)

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 6, as proposed by the Board of Selectmen, to see if the Town will vote to fix the salary and compensation of the Town Clerk at \$91,423.00, as provided by Section 108 of Chapter 41 of the General Laws, or to take any other action in relation thereto. The motion was approved unanimously (14-0).

9:55 p.m. Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters

CPC (Lina)

Asking for schematic designs for softball fields
Will vote that first at next meeting (February 28th)

SBC (Jane)

Meeting tomorrow night

PBC (Rose Mary)

Library coming to PBC tomorrow night re: Article 19 (Main Library interior renovation)

10:00 p.m. Adjourn

Alena Poirier made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion to adjourn; the motion was approved unanimously.

Items Reviewed During Meeting

- Memo from Doug Stewart, Assistant Town Engineer, to Mike Pakstis, Director, DPW, re: Easement Abandonment at 111 Westgate and 115 Westgate (November 14, 2017)

- Email from Dennis De Schino and Site Plan for Proposed Rezoning of 170-184 Worcester Street and 7 Burke Lane (February 11, 2017)
- *Article 37: Electronic Voting for Town Meeting*, Presentation by S. Peter W. Jones (February 14, 2018)
- *Town Meeting Electronic Voting Survey* (August 9, 2017)
- *PFTF Presentation on WHS Field Phase 2*, Presentation to Advisory Committee (February 14, 2018)
- *Human Resources Board Presentation to Advisory Committee* (February 14, 2018)