

Approved February 8, 2023

**Advisory Committee Meeting  
Zoom Video Conference  
Wednesday, February 1, 2023, 6:30 p.m.**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Shawn Baker, Doug Smith, Madison Riley, Rani Elwy, Gail Sullivan, David Prock, Bill Schauffler, Pete Pedersen, Al Ferrer, Jenn Fallon, Susan Clapham, Neal Goins, Andrea Ward, Christina Dougherty.

Chair Shawn Baker called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and took roll call of Advisory members in attendance.

**Citizen Speak**

*Jerry Nigro, 15 Washburn* – spoke in support of the field lighting and improvements, citing wide support in town. Mr. Nigro also cited the support and approval from NRC and the School Committee for the field lighting.

**Town Counsel legal comments regarding Citizen Petitions**

Tom Harrington, Town Counsel, was present to provide information regarding Citizen Petitions in general as a framework for Advisory’s consideration of Article 43. An explanation of the Warrant and articles and the difference between articles and motions was provided. Town Meeting is the Moderator’s meeting. Information was provided about motions fitting within the “4 corners” of the article; the moderator makes the determination whether the motions fit within the matter laid out in the article, and there is no timeline for this. A comment was made that motion language will be needed for all the articles.

**Questions/Discussion**

- A question was asked about the role of Advisory with the Warrant and the Articles.
  - The bylaws determine this.
- A question was asked as to whether Advisory makes suggestions about motion language if Advisory feels the language is not within the “4 corners” of the article.
  - That would be a question back through the Moderator.
- Is there an appropriate test for motion language?
  - Town Counsel will determine if motions are legal. For example, if a motion violates state law, then Town Counsel will opine that it can’t be done.

A brief explanation was provided about land in town and ownership. There is a single landowner in Wellesley – the corporation of the Town of Wellesley owns the public land. Under statute, various boards are assigned the care, custody, management, and control over certain parcels of land. School Committee (SC) has school land, Natural Resources Commission (NRC) has parks and recreation, Select Board (SB) has general municipal lands; Department of Public Works (DPW) and Municipal Light Plant (MLP) control their land. Town Meeting can’t tell a board what to do with land. Town Meeting can only adopt a bylaw that could restrict or allow the use of land in certain ways but that would be in the form of a bylaw; the respective board, however, still has control of the land.

**Questions/Discussion**

- What throws an item to Town Meeting for approval?
  - In general, Town Meeting has a duty to pass general bylaws, zoning bylaws, and to appropriate money. It also accepts statutes and other things.

- Is there a place in the town documentation where the care, custody, management, and control of land is spelled out for a specific board?
  - When Town Meeting accepts ownership of a parcel of land, it is assigned to a board; if it is not assigned, then it is automatically assigned to the SB. Once the town receives land and it is assigned to a board, Town Meeting cannot take the land away from the board without a vote of Town Meeting.

#### **Article 43 – Establish a Committee to Conduct Analysis on Impacts of Nighttime Sports and Events Presentation**

Clifford Canaday, Judy Barr, and Nancy Cooper were present and provided the motions and presented an overview of the Citizen Petition identified above.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

- A comment was made that this project is in line with all current bylaws that are available. How is the broadness of this question viewed, as it requests changes to the bylaw which seem to fall outside the scope of this project? How do you justify putting in changes to the bylaws?
  - We are asking the committee that would be established to consider the bylaws as part of the comprehensive integrated analysis of what is needed for our public land. We met with the Moderator regarding the motion language.
- A comment was made about the use of the Hunnewell practice field by football teams but that no other events have been seen on this field. A question was asked how this is different from the tennis court lights and if there was precedent for the parties and other events to the degree cited in the presentation and if there is evidence to back up this statement.
  - NRC has been asked if things can be done on town land, like filming movies; the project comes from a private group asking NRC for use of public land. The lights that currently are in use for the football practice field, softball and baseball fields, and tennis courts are already there and being retrofitted now.
- Have there been issues in town with events on those fields?
  - What is happening now sets the precedent for minds to go in other places. This is the time to examine that precedent and ask whether we want these other uses or do we want tighter control of what is there.
- A comment was made that it sounds like what is being said is that there aren't any known issues but that these events could happen.
- How do you view the past 10 or more years of work and studies that have been done, or is it felt that something was missed?
  - This proposal is in response to the action currently going forward.
- Do you feel there are any bylaws that are violated with this project?
  - No, but it violates the past policy of the NRC and past policies can be overturned by new boards. It was understood that for the past 10 years there was a policy. With private new money, there is a new policy.
- Clarification was requested that the previous studies are not incorrect but there is a policy; it sounds like there is a desire for a bylaw change.
  - There are no bylaws for public space which we think should be in place. There has been no opportunity for open dialogue.
- A comment was made that it appears there are two separate issues: the bylaws and the lights, but the focus with this petition is more on changes in the bylaws which the petition doesn't address.
  - We are not looking to change bylaws. We want to create new bylaws. The lights on this field pose additional problems because it is confusing as to which board has the final word. There is confusion about who is responsible for dealing with situations and problems. We are trying to take a step back and look at the comprehensive picture and

not necessarily to look at bylaws but to set policies for the town and what residents want for their neighborhoods. We aren't going after specific bylaws because it's up to the proposed study committee. We are not only looking at the current situation but looking forward to seeing what is wanted and how to manage situations across the town.

- A comment made that this is broad and seems to be a separate issue and it was felt that stopping this project was to meet that goal does not seem like the way to do it.
- A request was made of Town Counsel to comment on the existing legal process for the lights and if Town Meeting could set policy in this area that would require changes to bylaws.
  - Town Counsel responded that although he is not involved in the permitting process, he recalled that in 2018 or earlier, the initial work at the high school stadium occurred and it required a site plan special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA); that permit did not include lights. To comply with the Zoning Bylaw, that permit needs to be amended to include lights. If the special permit did not include bathrooms and team rooms, then part of the amendment would be to include that as well. The first step before an applicant goes to the ZBA is to go to the Design Review Board (DRB). It is the understanding since this is a School Committee (SC) project that the schools are currently before the DRB. The DRB makes a recommendation and the ZBA then grants approval or disapproval. The original special permit did not include lights. Therefore, the permit needs to be amended to include lights.
- A question was asked of Town Counsel: As there is some confusion in the way our town works between those responsible for a potential change to a bylaw and setting policy and if that policy is potentially a change to a bylaw, are there guardrails for the various boards that have care, custody, control, and management of the town's lands on what they can and can't do?
  - Town Counsel replied that the status of the land in question is under NRC, and they have the final say as to what happens on that land. NRC's long-standing arrangement with the School Committee is for use for school purposes. It's an interesting situation where one board has the care, custody, management, and control and allows another board to operate off that land. It's the NRC's land and they determine what happens. A current board cannot bind a future board. If Town Meeting wants to put control on land, it needs to be done through a General or Zoning Bylaw.
  - If Town Meeting were to say a board could not do something with their land, it would be aspirational and a suggestion by Town Meeting and not a requirement. If Town Meeting wants to place specific controls on land, it needs to do so through either a general bylaw or a zoning bylaw.
- Since this is park land, is there no zoning bylaw on it?
  - Town Counsel replied that park land can be zoned. The Dover Amendment overlays this, and an educational use can't be prohibited with a zoning bylaw. Or if it is, then accommodations need to be made.
- With respect to Motion 1, how would installing these 80-foot lights impact the goal of maintaining tree canopy?
  - An environmental study was cited that with increased light, the trees get confused and think it's still summer and keep their leaves longer; in the spring the trees produce leaves sooner. The trees lose leaves in order to rest in the winter. The tree's rhythm is affected by these lights. Concern was also expressed about the light's impact on baby turtles on the Brook Path; a statement was made that with artificial lights, the hatchlings will not follow the stars. It was felt that there are unintended consequences of the lights.
- Is this binary-- that there are lights or no lights-- or are there types of lights that are less impactful on these types of things, for example, the lights at the tennis courts which are lower and perhaps have less impact?

- Lower lights don't light the field brightly enough for the greatest safety of the players. The alternative included within the motion is to look at alternative sites that are not in residential areas, not in a wetlands area, and that have trees further pushed back. There are some of those within a certain radius. We are not saying use diesel-powered portable lights; we're saying use something that's already there or a space that's already there. We don't want to create something new.
- Will there be costs associated with this committee and if so where will the money come from?
  - There are a number of academics who are interested in this topic on both sides of the issue and there could be an RFP asking for pro bono services. There are also attorneys who are interested in this question who might be interested pro bono.
- Is Wellesley an outlier in the way the different levels of reviews and approvals are required for projects privately funded on town land versus projects funded through taxpayers that go through Advisory and Town Meeting, and that Wellesley has a robust set of bylaws for residential and commercial property but not as robust for uses on town land? Is this the way it is in many Massachusetts towns?
  - Town Counsel replied that it's pretty much the same across the state although Wellesley might have more access to funds and that might make it different in Wellesley. A board which has the care, custody, management, and control of land does not need Town Meeting approval to do something on the land. The board does need to go to Town Meeting for an appropriation if it needs money to do something on the land. Town Meeting doesn't approve projects for boards; it only approves the funding if taxpayer money is needed. Wellesley's bylaws do not treat public land differently than private land although there are occasional references to certain requirements for municipal land. There are a few Massachusetts towns that exempt town land from zoning bylaws.
- A comment was made that there is a bylaw about accepting funds and a process to accept gifts.
  - Town Counsel replied that not every board has a right to accept gifts, and boards have different requirements. SC has the right to accept gifts for educational purposes and the SB can accept gifts for any purpose. If a gift is to the NRC, then it would require SB approval.
- A comment was made regarding Motion 1 that there is no representation by any of the town boards that have the actual care, custody, management, and control of the public lands. In addition, there are no representatives from SC, NRC, or the SB and the committee does not include representatives of any user group, leaving the only voting members on this committee to be the resident abutters to the land. How do you persuade Town Meeting that it should create a committee that is incomplete and unbalanced?
  - The boards that have been asked to participate in an ex-officio capacity are boards that protect the town's interests. Other boards can contribute. Workshops are envisioned and with 34 people, work groups can be developed and the work groups can ask individuals to come in and provide their thoughts and experience. This is a Citizen Petition for citizens to be involved in protecting public space.
- A comment was made that it will be important to tell Town Meeting why more stakeholders are not formally included, and Town Meeting will likely be looking for inclusion of those stakeholders.
- A comment was made that there does not seem to be a precedent where Town Meeting has approved the creation of a committee on a broad policy topic like this. While the town has multidisciplinary task forces and working groups on issues like DEI or transportation and mobility, those groups have not been created by Town Meeting. It is understood that Town Meeting in the past created committees that addressed elements that are unique to the operation of Town Meeting or to the structure and operation of town government, e.g., the committee for

electronic voting in 2018, the town government study group, and the facilities maintenance committee.

- Is there a precedent where this is an appropriate committee topic to bring before Town Meeting and to ask the Moderator to appoint a committee that has a charge different in scope from what a Moderator-appointed Town Meeting committee typically would have? This seems to be a bit of uncharted territory to ask the Moderator to do this.
  - We are not asking Town Meeting to create the committee. It's perhaps called a cutting-edge approach, but the model would be for citizen involvement in public land protection and that's not unusual in other places in the country. We can provide examples.
  - We are looking to include committees like Planning, Wetlands, the Health department, Police, and Climate Action. The committee would want to come up with a plan that would be something that the town would adopt so it would be looking for plausible and workable solutions with the schools and the NRC and ultimately those groups would be involved in consultation.
- Was it intentional that the motion says the ex-officio members would be staff as opposed to board members?
  - It's a cooperative partnership between elected people and staff people. Staff people do the work and the implementation. It was felt that staff have a better understanding of the process.
- Since the Comprehensive Unified Plan will be updated in a few years, why should we create a separate committee that might be duplicative of that effort and will address these issues about protecting space around town?
  - It's the time to do it now as we can be a body that could be plugged into it. When decisions are being reached, there will be this little public space conversation sitting on their shoulder, putting a voice in the deliberations for all the creatures in Wellesley. It is parallel, interlocking, and interdisciplinary, and this is the time to get it going.
- A comment was made that it feels duplicative, and could this group have their voice heard during the comprehensive plan process?
  - That is why Planning and other groups would be included on the committee: to know what is being discussed relative to public land.
- A question was asked about Motion 2 with respect to the 17 sites and the 17 or 18 different topics that must be researched and investigated in multiple ways, which is about 290 different deliverables that must be figured out; this would be similar to what would be done in a comprehensive plan. Would a year be enough time to complete everything to be ready for Annual Town Meeting (ATM) in 2024?
  - There's some advantage to having 34 people with the ex-officio members. The committee could be broken up into individual task forces, and then a matrix management organization could be created to pull everything together. The neighborhoods have a stake in this. There are implications for all of us and other considerations such as other types of land in town.
  - Time is of the essence, and it is good to get a jumpstart on this and do it in coordination with the comprehensive plan.
- A follow-up comment was made that it is a tight timeframe to pull all this together for a 2024 ATM. If the committee's findings result in proposals for bylaw changes, then perhaps a report could be issued for 2024 ATM and then look to a Fall 2024 Special Town Meeting (STM) or the spring 2025 ATM.
  - The proposal was written so it could propose bylaw changes. It did not say that the bylaws would be completed. The target date of September 2023 was at the request of the Moderator.

- A comment was made that the analysis is one-sided, as the possible cost of not installing the lights is missing from the analysis. From a cost-benefit analysis, a number of potential costs are outlined, such as extra police detail, but the use of alternative sites would have a cost, and perhaps a benefit, but if, for example, the school teams need to go elsewhere to play, there would be additional costs, such as bus transportation costs.
  - This is why we are looking at alternatives as it has to be balanced. It's going to be an incremental change in cost and an incremental change in benefits so we would have to have something as a comparison.
- Other people might be needed on the committee to provide this information.
  - They don't have to be on the committee; they can provide input to the committee.
- A comment was made that the people who serve on the NRC and SC are volunteers and there has been a great amount of work done on this project.
- Since all the voting members on the proposed committee are abutters, there might be some bias for a committee whose goals are to set policies for the town and perhaps change bylaws; the ex-officio members are important: have these groups been approached and have they signed on, or are you waiting to have those deeper discussions to see how the vote goes?
  - We've been talking to people.
- Is the 5.1 million lumens the number?
  - That's the number that's agreed upon, and it's the result of adding up the firepower on each of the lights on each pole. They've done a good job in preventing skyglow but they say there will still be an impact on the ground and in the spillage area.
- A question was asked of Town Counsel regarding the composition of the committee as noted in the motion and if the moderator is compelled to follow this or if he has some discretion in selecting members as the warrant article said an independent comprehensive analysis would be performed.
  - Town Counsel replied that the moderator will have to choose the committee as defined as abutters to the various properties and doesn't have leeway to select the next best resident.
  - A comment was made that the Moderator has a plan in mind as to identifying people.
- What is the legal effect of Motion 2 or is it aspirational?
  - Town Counsel replied that in his opinion, Motion 2 falls into the category of aspirational motions.
- A request was made for evidence and specific examples of existing trees in Wellesley that have been damaged by lights and that needed care, such as on Route 16 near the Hunnewell fields or near Dana Hall?
  - This information came from an article. But there are studies about the impact on songbirds in your backyard and about the turtles on the Gulf Coast as hatchlings are decreasing in survival because they are going the wrong way because of LED lights.
- A comment was made that any additional information can be shared with Advisory at any time.
- A comment was made that the information presented seems to be one-sided with assumptions being made and no costs. It was further commented that this is asking the town to drop the years of research and time already spent. It was felt that it is highly unlikely people will do this work pro bono.
- Is there a detailed cost analysis as to what this will cost for the study and detailed analysis of cost for putting these events in a different location including bus and transportation costs?
  - We are asking the committee to identify and collect this information and do an alternative site analysis.
- A comment was made that it will be difficult for Town Meeting to consider this and to vote to hold up a project that has been worked on for multiple years, without the costs to consider.

Approved February 8, 2023

- A comment was made about the amount of time already spent on these projects by volunteers and a question was asked as to how this can be put aside. It was noted that these people are not included on the committee.
  - There has been huge amount of work done examining this project that has not seen the light of day because voices have not been heard. This information can be provided.
- A question was asked about the cost of using alternative sites for sports games.
  - The idea would be to save money by setting up a committee and to consider using alternative sites.
- Clarification was provided that a building permit is not needed to install the lights.

Also present were Linda Chow, School Committee, and Jay McHale, Chair, NRC, who provided some additional information regarding the light project. This information can be found in the [Executive Summary](#) and [Hunnewell Track and Field Phase II](#)

- A map of the light levels was provided showing the 150-foot parameter from the field and the low level of light in that area. This project has been approved for the highest standard of lighting based on the computer modeling.
- The history of the project was reviewed. The duly elected board, SC, was approached by the NRC about priorities for further enhancing the field. This started as a joint discussion between the two boards. SC voted the priorities, bathrooms and team rooms, and those remain top priorities.
- This has been a process in collaboration with the town and other boards.
- The most efficient LED and environmentally friendly lighting is being used to provide community friendly outdoor sports lighting. Dark Skies experts were brought in.
- There will be a limited number of games over a limited number of nights.
- The conclusion was that the impact would be negligible.
- Acoustical sound experts were also brought in.
- A process was followed.
- Two elected boards were involved in a collaborative effort with numerous meetings and dialogue.
- An historical perspective on private funding was provided. The town has limited funds. All costs, including operational costs, were considered in the analysis and the impact to the taxpayer is null.

### Questions

- A request was made to comment on the concern voiced by citizens about “scope creep” and the possibility of an increase in the number of night games and practices, even though a set amount was agreed to.
  - SC heard when meeting with the neighbors about slippery slope concerns. SC took steps on controls that could be put into place to reassure them. When NRC considered the proposal and voted on it, they set certain conditions and built in the parameters for the number of nights which would be allowed. NRC voted on motions with the understanding that these parameters would be part of the conditions of approval by the ZBA when they issue the permit; the conditions would be included with an amendment to the site plan approval. NRC would need to vote on the change in the numbers. Board members are elected, and accountable to voters, and their concern is to take into consideration the needs for the entire town. The NRC takes its role very seriously. Any change of land use must go through a process.
- The Petitioners cited “scope creep” with private football teams; how limited would lighted use of the fields be?

- PFTF wouldn't allow usage by a club team even during the day. SC put in its use based on what a school would typically use. The conditions for the use of the lights were explained. Anybody who wants to use the field besides the schools would have to go to the NRC. The environmental report factored in 100 hours of use.
- Could private parties, concerts, and the like easily happen at this field? And has it happened at other fields associated with the schools in town?
  - Right now, the lighted field is for school use. Anyone who wants to use the field would have to petition the NRC.
- How were the police, traffic, and trash concerns considered?
  - Sound was a high concern of neighbors, so an acoustical engineering firm was brought in. The lighting poles are being leveraged to mount speakers and direct them downward and focused, much like what is being done with the lights. Currently the speakers are pointed out horizontally. There is an existing sound use policy. Recommendations were made to the sound policy specific to night usage. With respect to traffic, the Wellesley police are familiar with handling events with large numbers of people, and they have policies and procedures that they follow. Parking has also been addressed with the police. DPW partnered with the schools and committed to making sure that the area is clean after a game. FMD (high school custodians) clean up after a game.

### **Article 39 – Amend Wetlands Bylaw and non-criminal disposition for Wetlands violations presentation**

Jay McHale, Chair, NRC; Brandon Schmitt, Director, NRC, were present and provided a summary of Article 39 to amend Wetlands bylaw.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

- When will NRC and Wetlands vote on this?
  - Although both committees have reviewed this, it is not clear if they have yet voted.
- Does this take away the possibility of an appeal?
  - Those receiving a citation still can appeal. Ticket shows how to appeal.
- How many tickets are issued per year?
  - A summary was provided.
- Do many go through an appeal process?
  - Most can be resolved without formal enforcement action and resolved with cooperative action by the resident and the office.

### **Community Preservation Committee (CPC) Presentation**

Barbara McMahan, Chair, CPC, was present and provided an overview and update of CPC, including a discussion of Article 16 and Article 24.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

- Clarification was requested about the map that showed an option for a bathroom in the restricted zone.
  - Option 1 for the Sprague field bathroom is being pursued.
- What is DPW's role in the Sprague field bathrooms?
  - DPW will be able to do some of the site prep work and some plumbing. There is easy access to electrical and plumbing by being near the FMD building.
- Is the remediation at Morses Pond strictly erosion?
  - It is mitigating existing erosion.
- \$100,000 for administrative expenses is an increase over last year which was \$85,000?



- It is increased because CPC is moving forward with deed restriction on the North 40. There could be a cost to whomever holds the deed restriction. CPC is hoping there was some study money. Last year most of the funds went back. We can't have a government entity hold the deed restriction.
- Has there been any progress on the Historical Society's new building?
  - We are not ready to bring the request this year, perhaps next year.
- A chart of money taken in and spent and the balances was requested.
- Is there a surplus that carries over year to year?
  - Wellesley has a CPA trust. There is a chart that gives a financial plan for CPC and will show the reserves. Reserves are to use in the future.
- Over time does CPC use current year funds in total?
  - The historical chart will show this.
- Given the reserves, is there ever a year to not collect that 1%?
  - That would require a change and a vote of Town Meeting to remove Wellesley from the CPA. We've have had conversations to increase the percentage to 2% as there are advantages to being a 2% community.
- Are you turning money back from aqueduct bathrooms?
  - Yes, as the cost was significantly less than anticipated because DPW did a lot of the work.
- A question was asked about the funding of the Hunnewell bathrooms.
  - In 2018 CPC appropriated funds for bathrooms at the high school track and field.
- Do you anticipate a similar amount from the state for this year?
  - The state recommended that we factor a lower percentage, a 35% match, when budgeting for FY24.
- Are the bathrooms at Sprague the same as what is being installed on the aqueduct?
  - Yes.
- Are the bathrooms connecting to town sewer?
  - Yes.
- Can people in town submit for a grant from CPC?
  - Yes. Perrin Park pickleball court and additional specialized equipment at the Warren playground were cited as examples of citizen-led initiatives.

**Article 24** – Background information was provided regarding requesting a Special Act of the state legislature to allow the use of CPA funds on Wellesley Housing Authority properties.

### Questions/Discussion

- Does this need to be approved by Town Meeting before it goes to the legislature?
  - Yes.
- Is there a list of potential housing authority capital needs that could be provided for Town Meeting?
  - There is a list of capital needs that have been identified; not all are an allowable use of CPA funds. We participated in a capital needs assessment program through the Massachusetts chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials (NARO). NARO provided the Housing Authority with a list of capital items. There is a five- and ten-year plan, together with suggestions for how this could be accomplished. Different projects have been identified as potential allowable projects.
- Undesignated money was explained.
- Is there support for the Special Act?
  - We have very good representation in the state legislature.
- Is there a risk that the state will back off giving us WHA funding?

Approved February 8, 2023

- The state has historically underfunded these projects and we've been assured that the state formula will not change by this.
- Is there a time limit, and can you start again next year without Town Meeting?
  - It will have to go through Town Meeting again.
  - There have been early conversations about using CPA community housing money to support a community housing coordinator position in town.

#### **Administrative**

- There are two meetings next week.

#### **Minutes Approval**

Jenn Fallon made, and Madison Riley seconded a motion to approve the January 25, 2023, minutes.

#### **Roll Call Vote**

Neal Goins - yes

Jennifer Fallon – yes

Andrea Ward - yes

Al Ferrer - absent

Wendy Paul – absent

Pete Pedersen - yes

Madison Riley – yes

Rani Elwy - yes

David Prock - abstain

Christina Dougherty - abstain

Gail Sullivan – yes

William Schaufler – yes

Susan Clapham - yes

**The January 25, 2023 minutes were approved, 9 to 0 with 2 abstentions.**

#### **Liaison Reports**

*MLP/Neal Goins* – list of questions sent to MLP; might come back to discuss a couple items.

*Schools/Jenn Fallon* – standards-based grading presentation and discussion; continued discussion of budget; update regarding the contract.

*HR/David Prock* – information that was requested is being worked on.

#### **Adjourn**

Bill Schaufler made, and Pete Pedersen seconded a motion to adjourn.

#### **Roll Call Vote**

Neal Goins - yes

Jennifer Fallon – yes

Andrea Ward - yes

Al Ferrer - absent

Wendy Paul – absent

Pete Pedersen - yes

Madison Riley – yes

Rani Elwy - yes

David Prock - yes

Christina Dougherty - yes

Gail Sullivan – yes

Approved February 8, 2023

William Schauffler – yes  
Susan Clapham - yes

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

**Meeting Documents Reviewed**

<https://www.wellesley.ma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/1967>

- Advisory Presentation 2.1.23
- Article 43 Draft Motions Rev.\_1.30.23
- CPC – 2023 Financial Plan draft
- CPC – 2023
- CPC – CPA Revenue and Expenditure History
- Executive Summary for Advisory – Hunnewell Track and Field Phase II Enhancement Projects
- Hunnewell T and F Phase II for Advisory 02012023
- Wetlands Bylaw Brief for Advisory