

**Wellesley Advisory Committee  
Juliani Room, Town Hall  
January 24, 2018, 7:00 PM**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Todd Cook, Rose Mary Donahue, Tom Fitzgibbons, Mary Gard, Mark Kaplan, Paul Merry, Lina Musayev, Betsy Roberti, Tom Skelly and Andrea Ward.

Tom Skelly called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**7:02 p.m. Citizen Speak**

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

**7:02 p.m. Executive Director re: Capital and Debt Policies**

Blythe Robinson, Executive Director; Sheryl Strother, Finance Director; Ellen Gibbs, Chair, Board of Selectmen; and Beth Sullivan Woods, Board of Selectmen, were present.

The Executive Director commended the budget process so far this year and the cooperation of the departments in helping to reduce cash capital requests for FY19. Although the Town has policies for items like reserves, OPEB/pension funding, and operating budget guidelines, it does not have policies for debt or capital. Such policies would assist Town Meeting in understanding future financial demands.

Debt Policy

- Finance Director and Executive Director have created draft policy using a variety of sources, including municipal and finance association manuals and best practices, as well as information from other towns
- Idea is to set a range to permit flexibility
- Suggesting that inside-the-levy (ITL) debt plus cash capital be limited to 6-7% of recurring operating revenues
  - Recurring operating revenues include ITL debt, State revenues and local receipts
- Spreadsheet for FY19 shows that the Town would be at 6.2% for ITL debt; greater in “out” years
- If outside-the-levy (“excluded”) debt were taken into consideration, the Town would be over 7%
  - However, since excluded debt must be brought to the voters for specific approval, may not be appropriate to include it as part of the range
  - Possibly could have a second range that encompasses all debt
- Engaging in this process of determining range of debt plus cash capital will help the Town understand impact on future operating budgets

There was a question as to how the Town best represents/articulates to the boards that these are what the numbers will be going forward: The great news is that the departments reduced cash capital requests this year, but the bad news is, they pushed requests into the “out” years. One of the decisions the Board of Selectmen (BOS) will have to make is how much to increase cash capital every year (e.g., a percentage increase guideline). This Spring, we will work on developing that capital policy; develop consensus as to how to “rate” projects and help decide what gets done and when. Goal is to have an objective and rational policy.

There was a factual question as to the derivation of the 6.2% figure for FY19: It is the cash capital plus ITL debt (\$9.3 million) divided by recurring revenues (\$150 million); that is the calculation the Town

would be trying to keep in the 6-7% range annually. There was a follow-up question as to whether there is a proposed policy for what that range should be if you include the excluded debt: Not proposing such a policy at this time; excluded debt is a separate funding source; if voters choose to tax themselves more for a project like Town Hall or HHU that's a separate decision. There was an additional question about statutory limits on debt: Those are so high that the Town would never get there (\$500 million).

#### Capital Policy

- Town's current 5-year capital plan is centralized compilation of every board's "wish list"
  - Currently no restrictions on how projects are placed on list; boards develop goals and objectives and projects are put on list; unprioritized wish list
  - Occasional issues to date with projects not appearing on this plan and so haven't had opportunity to percolate/socialize
- Refinement of this will be the subject of work/discussion this Spring
- Want to be able to see how much we are going to devote to capital in any given fiscal year
  - The larger the capital expenditures, the lower the operating budget
- Goal is to establish a process for bringing capital projects forward; agree on ways to prioritize list and give everyone information they need to achieve objectives
- Need to talk about what kind of items are/should be considered capital
  - Historically police cruisers are in operating budget but school computers are in cash capital
  - Trying to put something on paper for boards to mull over; first step; will take input from boards and build consensus

There was a question on inside-the-levy debt: It is current year debt service; principal plus interest. Have tried to keep that to around \$4 million.

There was a question whether, as interest rates rise, that puts pressure on new projects: The Town does level principal financing so that debt service tails down (more conservative approach), also tries to keep terms shorter than maximum allowed in order to maintain its Aaa rating. Treasurer/Finance Department makes decisions about financing terms on each individual project; considers what should be cash capital vs. debt based on size of project or lifespan. There was a follow-up question as to how long the ITL number has been at \$4 million: Maybe the last five years. There was a further question whether the \$4 million figure will increase as bottom line revenues increase: It could; that's why we're talking about establishing a range. The Executive Director and Finance Director are spending time with boards to help them realize how their projects fit on the list and develop a more thoughtful approach.

There was a question whether, since the debt amount is currently projected to be 7.13% in 2023, the Town would need to reduce either cash capital or ITL debt in order to come within the 6-7% desired range: Yes.

BOS would like Advisory input on debt policy; plan to address this in February. Capital policy discussion will take place after that.

There was a question whether departments have been staying within operating budget guidelines by transferring items to cash capital: Maybe; one reason to have this conversation is that pushing items into another bucket or a later year is not sustainable.

#### **7:25 p.m. Executive Director re: Board of Selectmen-sponsored ATM Warrant Articles**

Blythe Robinson, Executive Director; Sheryl Strother, Finance Director; Ellen Gibbs, Chair, BOS; and Beth Sullivan Woods, BOS, were present.

Warrant close to being ready to be signed by BOS on Monday night (1/29). Have approached process a little differently this year; goal is to provide more information/numbers where available (e.g., budgets for Department of Public Works, Sewer, Municipal Light Plant; table of rescinded/transferred debt; table of Community Preservation Committee appropriations) in order to better inform people earlier on, spur questions earlier, make motions process smoother. Some numbers (e.g., Town Hall exterior renovation figures) will not be available until closer to Town meeting due to bidding schedule.

#### Salary of Elected Official (Article 6)

- The one elected official who is paid
- Not a new article; happens every year

#### FY18 Supplemental Budget Appropriations (Article 7)

- Typical to have supplemental appropriation – anticipating three items at this point:
  - Special education costs: Schools have current shortfall due to (i) complexity and number of cases and (ii) reduction in state circuit breaker funds
    - Current shortfall about \$950,000
    - Still hoping for supplemental state appropriation
  - Increased snow and ice budget; Department of Public Works (DPW) has exhausted funds and has at this point requested an additional \$300,000; number may go higher
  - Settlement of union contracts
    - Figure included in this year’s budget to settle DPW contracts wasn’t accurate
    - Now have to cover settlement of police union contracts, but have shortfall of about \$50,000
  - Still keeping an eye on health insurance

There was a request for clarification on the contract settlement piece: DPW contracts were settled and have been paid out; but amount they calculated they needed for those settlements was incorrect so had to use some of the funds set aside for the settlement of the police union contracts.

There was a question whether the issues that are appearing in the news concerning the state Group Insurance Commission (GIC) will impact the Town: Short answer, no.

There was a question whether the BOS would be bringing the supplemental budget appropriations forward as they are individually clarified over the next few weeks: No, will wait til all items are resolved.

#### Revise Revolving Funds (Article 9)

- Two revolving funds (Recreation Summertime Revenues and Recreation Scholarship Revenues) will be removed from this category and reclassified as “gift funds” – result of Attorney General review of last year’s revolving fund bylaw
  - Will not result in any changes to actual operation of those funds
- Building Department Document Fees Fund will be eliminated
  - Original purpose of fund was to use \$50,000/year in permit fees to pay for scanning and digitizing rolls of paper plans
  - Process of scanning backlog should be complete by the end of June
  - Included \$10,000 in FY19 operating budget to cover remainder of work
- Changes to some of the revolving fund amounts (Council on Aging went up; Brookside Community Gardens and Weston Road Gardens went down)

#### Re-appropriate Building Department Document Fees Fund (Article 10)

- Town is just about to adopt electronic permitting; appropriated \$50,000 in FY18 for electronic permitting, but that's not enough
- Up-front costs for electronic permitting anticipated to be \$25,000-\$30,000; annual cost on the order of \$45,000-\$50,000
- Will transfer the accumulated \$170,000 in the Building Department Document Fees Fund to the IT Department to supplement the \$50,000 previously appropriated
- Will have conversation going forward about how best to cover costs across the whole organization (e.g., perhaps raise fees, pass credit card convenience fees along to customer)

There was a comment that electronic permitting will be a terrific tool for the Town and the residents: Much credit goes to IT Director Brian DuPont.

There was a question regarding the convenience fees: They are 2-3% of the total cost; right now some departments (e.g., Council on Aging and Recreation) are absorbing those fees in their budgets.

#### Special Education Reserve Fund (Article 11)

There is a possibility, depending on where we end up with the budget this year, that we will put money into the Special Education Reserve Fund (established last year). No dollar figure will be included in the warrant; decision will be made closer to Town Meeting.

#### Acceptance of Granite Street (Article 23)

- Residents of Granite Street petitioned BOS in 2016 to have street accepted as a private way
- BOS/DPW determined that, if accepted, road needs to be widened and repaved
- Qualifies as a "level 2" street – Town pays 75% and residents pay 25%
  - Cost to Town anticipated to be \$195,000
- Project did not go forward at 2017 ATM due to budget constraints

There was a question whether the Town ever declines a request from residents to accept street: Not very often.

There was a question where the 75/25 split on costs comes from: It comes from the street acceptance policy, adopted by BOS in 2006.

There was a question whether acceptance of a street has an impact on property values: Not really.

There was a question clarifying whether the \$195,000 figure is the Town's share: Yes; we have a 25% contingency in there right now so if anything we hope the figure will go down.

#### Traffic and Parking – Designate as Receipts Reserved (Article 26)

True housekeeping: Municipal Modernization Act (MMA) requires passage of an article at Town Meeting to designate that receipts from parking lots and meters go into a traffic and parking fund (or else they go into the general fund). This should have been done last year. This article will transfer all funds from the start of FY18 up to the first day of Town Meeting.

#### Traffic and Parking – Purge Uncollectable Parking Ticket Fines (Article 27)

- Town has not written off unpaid parking tickets back into the 1980s
- Recommendation is to purge fines older than 2010; keep items on the books that have accrued over the past 7-8 years
- While BOS can waive accumulated penalties, only Town Meeting can waive original tickets/fines

- Amount to be purged via this article still being analyzed
- Town does have a strong collection record over the past 13 years – over 95%; we are doing everything we should be doing
- Current Registry procedures help with collection (individuals with uncollected tickets are “marked” and can’t renew drivers’ licenses and registrations until they pay)
- Going forward, need process to purge uncollectable fines every five years or so

There was a question as to whether there are “chronic offenders” whom the Town could pursue: No – if so, it’s likely they have moved away, sold car, passed away, stopped driving, etc.

#### Recreational Marijuana Moratorium (Article 28)

New state regulations were passed that allow Towns that voted “no” on the recreational marijuana referendum question to extend the moratorium.

This is a zoning bylaw change; done similarly in other communities.

There was a question whether the article needs to have some language extending the date past the date that was included in last year’s article: Will check with Town counsel. (Note: Executive Director followed up with information that no such language is needed; under state law, the warrant article’s changes to the zoning bylaw will serve to extend the moratorium).

#### General Bylaws Update (Article 32)

Minor/housekeeping changes to the Town bylaws:

- Items that the Town Government Study Committee pointed out ought to be corrected
- Corrections to list of BOS appointments in Article 19 (e.g., Sustainable Energy Committee not on list)
- Corrections to employee titles (e.g., “IT Director”) and department names (“Facilities Management Department”)
- Remove telecommunications subcommittee that is no longer needed
- Request from Youth Commission to reduce number of members from 7 to 5
- Removing references to horses
- Some clarifying items (e.g., role of associate or advisory members on committees)
- There is a “tracked” version of the bylaws

#### Animal Control Bylaw Update (Article 33)

Animal control bylaw update is more significant. State law on animal control changed in 2012 and our bylaw is not compliant. The article:

- Aligns our bylaw with state law re: classification and processes for dogs about which Town receives complaints
- Clarifies fines and fees
- Adds language about kennels
- Current leash law is being retained because we understand it works well
  - Dogs off their own property need to be leashed
  - Dogs on Town property are governed by the regulations of the Town “owner” (e.g., Schools, NRC)
- One area not addressed is dog waste
  - If we can’t “catch” people in the act and actually issue a ticket, what’s point of having a regulation
  - Animal control officer does a good job of educating/providing lawn signs to residents who are experiencing problems; mutt mitts provided in various locations

#### Alcohol in Town Buildings (Article 34)

Will make it possible to issue one-day licenses to non-profit organizations (e.g., the Friends of the Library); no alcohol allowed in School buildings. Building “owner” must approve; event sponsor must obtain liquor liability policy, trained servers, police detail, etc.

There was a question where the liability requirement of this bylaw will be listed: Within the alcohol regulations of the Board of Selectmen.

#### Amend Town Bylaws – Fines in Compliance with State Law (Article 35)

In the course of the Board of Health updating its regulations and fines, Town counsel realized that Town bylaws are sprinkled with language authorizing fines “up to” a certain amount; state Attorney General requires that fines be for a specific amount.

There was a question whether the fines must be published and approved by Town Meeting: Yes.

There was a question whether there is a dollar figure for the purging of the uncollectable parking tickets: Talking to vendor; expect it will be lowered to around \$170,000.

There was a comment that the Town should make sure that the amounts listed for each fine represent the newer, increased amounts that some boards (e.g., Board of Health) had been considering.

There was a comment that experience shows fee structures are reviewed only sporadically; perhaps Town should try to set up process to review periodically: Online permitting will be a great way to start.

#### Rescind or Transfer Debt (Article 40)

Previously there were two articles, but now combined into one. Two different types of actions:

- Rescind amounts on four borrowings
- Transfer/repurpose unused proceeds on four other projects and then rescind original debt
  - Can’t just sweep into general fund; need Town Meeting action
  - Funds remaining from Fuller Brook and Bacon Street projects transferred to Cliff Road project
  - Funds remaining from High School and St. James projects used to reduce debt on Tolles Parsons Center (TPC)
  - Line up projects: exempt-to-exempt, length of borrowing, similar purpose

There was question whether we did this last year at Town Meeting: Yes, put some funds from the High School into TPC. Try to match up projects.

There was a question on the two articles that relate to legal fees and settlement of claims (Articles 41 and 42) and whether, if the Town carries insurance (it does), we really need Town Meeting to authorize payment: Will check with Town counsel; may have to do with BOS ability to authorize only a certain amount without Town Meeting approval. We always carry this article in case something comes up. There were follow-up requests to identify the source of payment for a “substantial claim” (e.g., police case) and to confirm that Article 41 matches our insurance (e.g., directors’ and officers’).

There was a question whether there will be an expense absorbed into the parking budget as a result of the ticket write-off: No, they have never been posted so don’t have to do that.

There was a question whether there is inconsistency in the proposed animal control bylaw: No, the rule is that all dogs not on their own property must be leashed on a leash of not more than seven feet; but dogs on Town property are subject to the specific requirements of the board/commission/officer that controls that piece of Town property. There was an additional question as to what “temporary restraint” means in the animal control bylaw: Usually means the dog is confined to its home.

**8:15 p.m. Community Preservation Committee FY19 Appropriations**

Barbara McMahon, Chair, Community Preservation Committee (CPC); Alan Port, Vice Chair, CPC; Catherine Johnson, Member, CPC; Mason Smith, Member, CPC; Michael Zehner, Planning Director; and Jill Creevy, Softball Improvement Committee; were present.

Introduction and Background

- Adoption of Community Preservation Act (CPA) in 2002 was one of the best things Town did
- CPC is a 9 member committee
  - 4 members appointed by moderator (one of those traditionally appointed by Wellesley Housing Development Corporation)
  - 5 members appointed by Town boards: Planning Board, Recreation Commission, Natural Resources Commission, Wellesley Housing Authority and Historical Commission
- CPA funds can be used for open space, recreation, community housing and historic resources
- CPC takes stewardship of Town’s money very seriously; projects this year are interesting and show breadth and depth of what CPA funds can be used for
- CPC also takes very seriously its decision guidelines—e.g., does project fit into Town’s capital plan, will it benefit a large number of Town residents, is there another source of funding or is this an orphan project that might not get done in any other way without CPA support
- Wellesley is one of 172 communities that have voted to take part in the CPA
  - Number of participating communities has grown a lot, with Boston and Springfield recently signing on
  - State trust fund is being spread ever more thin across the state
    - Next year predicting a state match of only 15% (down from 100% when we signed on in FY02 and 20% in FY17)
    - Hoping that fees at registrar’s office will go up this year and help replenish the state trust fund
- Wellesley is a “1% Town” – we have a 1% surcharge on our tax bills (some other Towns have 2% (Needham) or 3% (Weston) surcharge)
  - For FY18, local funding was \$1.26 million and state match was \$206,000; about \$30,000 in interest income annually

CPA Financials

*FY19 Estimated Revenue \$1,543,816*

Local surcharge \$1,324,589\*\* (number taken from CPA Financial Plan, 1/23/18 draft)

State Match 189,227

Interest 30,000

*CPC Approved Appropriations for 2018 ATM*

Debt Service North 40 (applied under Art. 8) \$550,244

Administrative Expenses 65,000

Appropriations to Reserves (historic, housing) 320,000

Morses Pond Beachfront/Bathhouse Study 40,000

Reconstruction of Sprague Field Tennis Courts 150,000

Vernal Pool Boardwalk/Observation Deck	50,000
Gas Leak Detection Equipment/Training	2,500
Stone Fish Ramp at Fuller Brook Park	5,000
Phase I Reconstruction of Duck Pond Foot Bridge	38,500
Sub-Area Land Use Study and Plan	25,000
Phase II Track and Field Project – Bathrooms	175,000
Wellesley Housing Authority Property Analysis	200,000
Fells Branch Library Roof Project	<u>30,000</u>
	<b>\$1,651,244</b>
Pending projects	536,000
(softball improvements and archiving)	
<i>Total Potential 2018 ATM Request</i>	<b>\$2,187,244</b>

#### Proposed FY19 Projects

- Total recommended appropriation will be \$1.6 million (will be higher (\$2.2 million) if CPC approves two projects (softball improvements and Wellesley Historical Society archiving) that have not yet been voted on)
- Debt service on North 40 is \$550,000 this year
  - Satisfies 10% open space requirement
  - \$10 million in CPA funds were allocated to purchase the North 40

There was a question whether the cost of the North 40 debt service is included in the \$1.6 million figure: Yes.

- Administrative expenses (\$65,000) can be used for consultants, etc., and any unused portion reverts back into the undesignated fund
- Appropriations to reserves for historic and community housing are each \$160,000
- Morses pond beachfront and bath-house study (\$40,000)
  - Jointly funded by CPC and Recreation (Recreation contributing \$40,000)
  - Will provide Recreation with a complete analysis of what the community wants in terms of renovating the bath house, other services/programs; schematic site plan and drawings
  - CPC expects that a construction/rehab project will take place down the road
- Sprague field tennis courts (\$150,000)
  - Sharing costs with DPW (\$150,000 contribution from them)
  - Will also benefit Recreation and Schools
- Series of NRC requests
  - Vernal pool boardwalk and observation deck (\$50,000)
  - Gas leak detection equipment and training (\$2,500) – will help identify and collect data on trees and sections of lawns lost due to gas leaks; DPW and NRC staff will be trained to use equipment
  - Fish ramp at Fuller Brook (\$5,000) – part of original Fuller Brook project but had been taken out; alewives go up stone spillway to get to State Street Pond
  - Phase 1 of Duck Pond bridge (\$38,500) – fully expect bigger request next year to cover actual construction; area will become ADA compliant
- Planning Department Sub-Area Land Use Study and Plan (\$25,000)
  - Equal match (\$25,000) by Planning Department
  - Once Housing Production plan is complete, can bring in consultant to identify site where development/redevelopment (mixed use/affordable, etc.) could take place

- CPC very supportive; has looked forward to having an opportunity to help in the housing area
- Phase II High School Track and Field restoration – installation of bathroom facilities (\$175,000)
  - Joint request of Schools, Recreation/Playing Fields Task Force (PFTF); one-third funding by each of CPC, Town and private
  - Lower cost than initially anticipated
  - Subject to NRC vote on 1/25
- Wellesley Housing Authority (WHA) Analysis of Barton Road and Morton Circle properties (\$200,000)
  - This has been a long time coming
  - Wellesley Housing Authority working with Mass Housing Partnership to see what might be done at the two sites
    - Barton Road particularly appealing because of amount of space and location near major interchanges
    - Will also look at Morton Circle (senior and disabled housing), which is in tough shape
  - Complete analysis of all redevelopment possibilities

There was a question whether Barton Road and Morton Circle have had upgrades within the past twenty years because, if so, Town Meeting will recall those investments: Some of the units on the Washington Street part of Morton Circle haven't been upgraded at all. The thinking for Barton Road is, is it even possible to do a whole different type of project – e.g., multi-story apartment complex. Whole new world out there: thinking about public/private partnership; perhaps success there would give WHA the ability to do something significant at Morton Circle. Barton Road would be a mix of subsidized and market rate housing; similar projects have been done in Somerville and elsewhere. Would still remain rental properties so that Town would get full 40B credit for all units.

There was a question whether this helps Wellesley in terms of the Housing Production Plan: Yes, if the properties remain rentals. Interestingly, Waldo Court, off Linden Street, which CPC helped fund, is a very desirable WHA location; residents take great pride in units there; great investment for the Town.

There was a question as to what the \$200,000 will be spent for: Think about everything we went through for 900 Worcester Street; now we have to do that for both properties. Includes site surveys, wetlands analysis, environmental review, survey work, title work, fiscal feasibility; multi-pronged, complicated set of evaluations in order to make attractive to developer. There was a follow-up question as to who would undertake the survey: They already have the names of consultants who do this kind of work; will put it out to bid; laying all the groundwork to entice partners to come forward and to answer all their questions. There was an additional question as to where the \$200,000 figure comes from: Estimate that WHA received from Mass Housing Partnership for the nature of the work and the size of the properties.

There was a question how we could be sure that, at the end of the whole process, there won't be fewer subsidized units than there were to begin with: Legally, the project is not allowed to result in fewer subsidized units; Barton Road has to end up with at least 88 subsidized units. There was a follow-up question as to whether rents would increase for residents: No. Very structured categories of rent (e.g., "very low," set to probably 50% of area median income (AMI)) with caps. Would hope to see a range of income categories in a final project—not just "very low" and market, but also middle income (80-110% of AMI).

There was a question whether the residents have to be, and have been, notified about this project: WHA has already communicated with the residents; we're a long way off from anything happening.

There was a comment that this type of plan will help the Town see what kind of developments are possible and what is our preferred scheme for development of the property; we can establish some of the goals, which we wouldn't be able to do if a developer simply came in seeking approval for a specific plan.

- Fells Branch library roof (\$31,000): Oldest public building in town
  - Facilities Management Department (FMD) put out bid for historically accurate (wood shingle) roof; estimate came back close to \$80,000 vs. about \$50,000 for asphalt roof
  - Historical Commission asking CPC for the difference between asphalt and shingle (\$31,000)
  - FMD paying \$50,000
- Wellesley Historical Society (WHS) archiving project (\$36,000) *CPC HAS NOT YET VOTED*
  - Would allow continuation/completion of business, club and organization archiving project that CPC has supported in the past
  - WHS has done a great job of outreach to community; CPC proud to participate
  - Some discussion about whether CPC should continue to fund archiving if this is going to become a regular part of WHS operation
- Softball Field Improvement Committee (\$500,000) *CPC HAS NOT YET VOTED*
  - Request for \$500,000 to improve two primary softball fields in town – citizen group with support of DPW and PFTF
  - Jill Creevy presented
  - Would re-do Lee Field (Wellesley High School varsity field) and Hunnewell II (JV field; located next to Reidy); fields extensively used by youth leagues and adult leagues
  - Issues include safety (trees, uneven field, walkway across brook to field); lighting; pride/equity; non-regulation size (high school field not long enough; tournament or playoff games not allowed; considered one of worst two fields in league); lack of electricity (need generators for pitching machines); drainage
  - Committee comprised of parents (former and current), coaches (former and current), players (former and current)
  - Initially met with all users to develop wish list that covers all levels
  - Took wish list and received PFTF and Wellesley Little League overall support
  - Raised \$9,650 in grants and donations to have initial design plans drawn up
  - Improvements are simply to create sound softball fields, not glitz/glamour: will include dugouts (place to put equipment during game), improve accessibility to Lee field, brick presence to blend in with new High School features, backstops, overhang and fencing at Hunnewell II, scoreboards at both fields, renovated batting cages, tree budget and beautification
  - Have met with NRC and need to make requested modifications in terms of amount of brick surfacing and tree at Hunnewell (one of oldest in Town)
    - Challenges with root systems of trees
  - Overall goal is \$750,000 range for project; hoping to get CPC funding and rest from fund-raising; busy writing grants
  - No Town funding: DPW will do some labor
  - Goal is to “level the playing field”

There was a comment that improvements to the softball field are long overdue: In general CPC has been very supportive of this project; a little disappointed that Town cannot find any money in budget to fund this project. Biggest reason CPC has not yet voted is that it is waiting for NRC to come back; it's NRC land; nothing can happen until NRC signs off.

There was a question as to whether NRC is the only approval that needs to take place for this project to go forward, e.g., that Town Meeting will only have an opportunity to vet this via the CPC appropriation: That is correct. Have worked out with DPW that they would be manager of project and so CPC funds would be appropriated to them. BOS would at some point have to vote to accept the gift of private funds; project would also probably have to go before Design Review Board re: brick work.

There was a request for clarification on the CPC budget insofar as it looks like potential total appropriations for FY19 would exceed revenues for FY19—will remainder come from reserves: Yes. CPC takes in about \$1.5 million each year, but CPC doesn't recommend appropriations of \$1.5 million every year (last year \$780,000); tends to build up reserves. CPC has tradition in town of only drawing on money existing in the accounts at the end of the prior fiscal year; all appropriations would come from existing sources (reserves and undesignated funds), not any FY19-raised tax funds (though we are allowed by law to do so). Town has enough CPA funds to fund all requests made.

There was a question whether unused funds go back to CPC (e.g., Fuller Brook project): Yes, and we are also anticipating getting some funds back from NRC, e.g., the mobile phosphorous inactivation unit approved last year was not as expensive as consultant originally believed.

There was a request for clarification on the financing/budget for the softball field project: Hired Gale Associates (engineers/architects) to do initial studies; going back to construction level drawings after NRC; \$750,000 is expected total project cost, with \$500,000 coming from CPC. No Town funds involved; remainder after CPC funding will come from fundraising. NRC is not in the business of maintaining/rehabilitating fields; Schools don't spend money on fields; DPW has offered some labor but doesn't have money in its capital budget for more.

There was a question whether Recreation could help finance the project: They don't have the capital budget for this either; bottom line, though, is that it is all Town money, whether it comes from CPC or a departmental capital budget. This would be CPA funds serving a different segment of the community.

There was a comment that the Town has an obligation to provide equal support and resources to women's athletics.

There was a question where the PFTF stands on this project: Have met with them twice; they are in full support. Have looked at whether there are other fields the girls could move to instead; that would be much more expensive.

There was a question how Reidy Field was funded: Privately, before CPC was allowed to spend funds on recreation.

### **9:25 p.m. Approval of Minutes/Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters**

Rose Mary Donohue made and Paul Merry seconded a motion to approve the minutes from January 10; the motion was approved unanimously.

#### PBC Liaison Report (Rose Mary)

- Town Hall envelope exterior project will be coming in with additional costs due to additional identified needs
- Looking at a few hundred thousand dollars over figure Advisory was shown by PBC
- Fairly significant work: reinforcing wall on west gable end of roof pulling away; seismic reinforcing of masonry wall and roof connection
- Cheaper to do additional work now rather than in next phase
- Pulling bid packages together in next few weeks; bids due back on March 21

- Very tight with Town Meeting starting March 26
- Experience is that FMD pushes hard and does a good job keeping costs down

#### Schools Liaison Report (Tom F.)

- School Committee held its public hearing last night
- Consensus on 3.5% budget; they will vote on that next week
  - Budgeting circuit breaker at 73% for next year, average for last three or so years
    - Still possibly contingent on Governor's budget
    - Superintendents' association is lobbying for 75% reimbursement for next year
  - Initial projection for current year SPED shortfall is \$950,000

#### **9:35 p.m. Adjourn**

Rose Mary Donahue made and Mark Kaplan seconded a motion to adjourn; the motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Items Reviewed During Meeting**

- Town of Wellesley, *Capital Policy* (Draft – 12/28/17)
- Town of Wellesley, *Debt Policy* (Draft – 12/28/17)
- *Calculation for Debt Policy*, Spreadsheet, January 24, 2018
- Town of Wellesley, *Warrant for the Annual Town Meeting* (Draft – Version 3.0)
- Background Memo, Board of Selectmen, *Warrant Articles – 2018 Annual Town Meeting*
- Community Preservation Committee, *Presentation to Advisory Committee*, January 24, 2018
- Community Preservation Committee Table of Appropriations, Warrant Article 15
- Wellesley CPA Financial Plan: July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2023 (Draft 1/23/2018)