

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Juliani Room, Wellesley Town Hall
Wednesday, February 6, 2019, 7:00 p.m.**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Julie Bryan, Todd Cook, Rose Mary Donahue, Mary Gard, Bill Maynard, Paul Merry, Dave Murphy, Lina Musayev, Betsy Roberti, Mary Scanlon, Tom Skelly and Andrea Ward.

Tom Skelly called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

7:00 p.m. Citizen Speak

Amy Gottschalk, 44 Audubon Road, spoke about the additional section line item in the School budget:

- This section is necessary to maintain flexibility in the schools.
- The school year is not in sync with the budget year; decisions are made without actual numbers (for example, this year there were 36 more kindergartners than projected).
- Projections versus actuals were quite different and 51% of sections are at or above guidelines.
- There is not an accurate count of kindergartners when creating the budget so the flexibility in the budget for another section is important.

7:05 p.m. Update on Wellesley Office Park Project

Michael Zehner, Planning Director; Tom Harrington, Town Counsel; Tom Ulfelder, Board of Selectmen (BOS); Catherine Johnson, Chair, Planning Board; and Blythe Robinson, Executive Director, were present.

- Last Monday the BOS authorized Jack Morgan to submit the 40R application to the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD).
- 40R is the relevant zoning provision. 40R has minimum density requirements; developer would have by-right ability to create 550 units, in two phases.
- What is being proposed could be accomplished under chapter 40A and chapter 40B, as well. However, with 40R there are certain protections and certain incentives, both financial (payments to the Town) and in terms of the Town's ability to include affordable units on its Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI) as soon as the building permit is granted. With a 40A project, the units wouldn't be counted in the SHI until a certificate of occupancy is issued. The developer also has protections under 40R because of limitations on appeal rights and bonding.
- Infrastructure is important to this project. It has been determined that there is sufficient water, sewer, electrical and traffic infrastructure to service the initial 350 residential units. However, developer has committed to upgrade infrastructure now, given anticipated future development. Town will use some of its incentive payments from the state to cover part of those costs. These are reasonable ways to support infrastructure improvements to support total housing units. The Project of Significant Impact (PSI) process will be used to further review municipal impacts for potential hotel and additional office space uses.
- Traffic: ideal outcome will be signalization of Williams Street and the frontage road, and addition of a slip lane to help with access to Route 95/128. This will help with existing traffic conditions. Approval is needed from the state Department of Transportation.
- The addition of the 350 units would bring Wellesley's SHI over the 10% threshold (would bring us to 10.7%) and give the Town safe harbor against future 40B development projects. However, the number of affordable housing units could potentially reset with the 2020 census data. The

exact percentage depends on the denominator of the equation (the number of total housing units in Wellesley, which is currently 9,090).

A request was made to review the implications of and the likelihood that the units will be rental versus condos and the impact on affordable housing units. A question was also asked about what happens between Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the rights the Town has.

- Phase 1 has only 350 units and all of these would be rentals. Hanover only develops rental properties. Keeping the units rental would be part of the development agreement. If the units were hypothetically owner-occupied then only 25% of the units would count towards the SHI, vs. 100% of the units if they are rental. Phase 1 also reduces office space by 70,000 square feet. There will be an upgraded pump station, updated water line and upgraded sewer line. John Hancock will partner with the Town on these. In addition, there will be structured parking and storm water improvements as well as traffic improvements (traffic signal, slip lane).
- The timeline for further development is unknown at this point. John Hancock would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for PSI/site plan review to re-examine the infrastructure for hotel, assisted living/elderly housing and certain increases in office space. The improvements in water and sewer infrastructure will accommodate the full build-out of the site. Retail space is maxed out at 12,000 square feet; not developing this as a destination shopping area for people, but rather to have amenities for people living there.

A question was asked about public safety and emergency vehicle access to the property: Emergency vehicle access will be the same as it is today. Emergency vehicles travel down Route 9, exit at the first exit, U-turn under the bridge and then access the site. Fire and Police have not expressed any issues with this. There was discussion at one point about creating a median break along Route 9; however, Police and Fire feel there would be potential problems with that (e.g., will the break be clear during all seasons, would oncoming traffic stop if signal activated only in emergency situations, etc.). Fire and Police don't have issues accessing WOP today, although acknowledge there may be more frequent access following development. Currently there is a Police detail in the afternoon; with a signal, that detail may not be needed. If do need Police detail, then they would be able to operate the signal. John Hancock has committed to covering the costs of additional radio equipment for emergency communications with the buildings.

A question was asked about the timing and when Advisory will be able to review the development agreement and financials: Town hopes to hear back from DHCD re: 40R bylaw approval by the end of February/early March. The BOS will be calling for a STM and may do so without knowing the outcome from DHCD. There was discussion about the possible dates and timing for a STM and the need for Advisory to review both the 40R bylaw and the development agreement. The 40R bylaw will be ready for release soon; the development agreement is not going to be that complicated and may be two or three weeks away from release.

A follow-up question was asked whether the Planning Board (PB) would be holding a public hearing and voting: Yes, the PB will hold a public hearing and will discuss, vote and produce a report.

There was a question as to what would happen if John Hancock sells the site after Phase I is completed: In the future, whoever takes over the site from John Hancock will assume the host agreement provisions; the agreement will run with the land.

A question was asked about natural gas: Only a few tenants utilize gas so there is little focus on gas service. The focus of the sustainability groups has been on electrification.

A question was asked whether the infrastructure expenses would be split between the Town and the developer and whether what is being proposed for infrastructure is for Phase 1 or for the entire project: The infrastructure improvements will cover the entire project even though DHCD only needs it certified for Phase 1. However, there is always concern about unintended consequences, which is why the PSI process will be a check. Water, sewer, and electrical services are more than sufficient for the site.

A question was asked whether the 40R success payments will more than offset Town contributions towards infrastructure improvements: Yes; the bonus payment calculation is conservative; John Hancock is paying for significantly more of infrastructure costs than the Town will; also, Town doesn't pay the \$500,000 in infrastructure costs until it receives the payments from DHCD; need to keep in mind that if this were a 40B project, Town would be responsible for all these costs. A follow-up comment was made that it was not clear in the analysis whether the property tax revenues shown are absolute or incremental; need to understand the reduction in tax revenue due to the office space that is coming offline.

A question was asked if there has been further discussion about public transportation at the site, such as access to the MBTA station or the commuter rail: There has been discussion; given that the project is a few years out, that conversation that will continue/evolve. John Hancock is now a member of the 128 Business Council, which operates a shuttle up and down Route 128 to provide service to the MBTA stations. Prior to that, John Hancock operated a shuttle to and from the site.

A question was asked about the projected increase in elementary school children: There is projected to be an increase of 36 students in grades K-5. A follow-up question was asked as to what school this increase impacts: School Committee has indicated that there would no issue absorbing the school children into the system. Regardless of where they are located, Wellesley needs 350 affordable units in Town in order to get to the 10% safe harbor and these units will have some accompanying school-aged children. The Town is in a better position dealing with a known project rather than multiple, scattered, unknown 40B developments. Hanover developed two other rental projects in other communities and the number of children is actually lower than projected. Hanover's experience over time is that fewer children live in the same number of units.

A follow-up question was asked if there is a rate or rule of thumb for the number of school-aged children (SAC) for each unit: Yes, the estimate is generally 0.25 SAC for each unit, but the actual number of children is usually lower. Another follow-up question was asked whether Fiske could absorb these children. A comment was made that we are several years out and we are building a new school, enrollment is down and the Town needs to tackle transportation and school busing in Town in general. A further comment was made that the estimate of the 0.25 SAC per unit applies to all grades (K-12), so need to halve that number to see impact on K-5 alone. Enrollment at Fiske has declined more than this. Town is in the midst of school building project and will need to redistrict anyway.

A question was asked whether there are any 350-unit complexes in Wellesley now: There are not.

A question was asked how the number of trips was calculated, as it seems like an intense development on an insular piece of property: There is traffic for multifamily residential projects. Wellesley's traffic engineer is reviewing the assumptions used by the developer's traffic engineers. The projected net difference in overall trips is 17 more trips in the morning and 53 in the evening. The new trips will be in the opposite directions to the existing traffic; the issue is the volume of traffic on the frontage road and Route 9. In the morning, 2,000 vehicles travel westbound on Route 9 plus 500 on the frontage road. It is not believed that adding an estimated 77 vehicles into the 2,500 will cause an issue on Route 9. In the evening, there are 2,100 vehicles westbound on Route 9 plus 1,000 on the frontage road. Again, adding an estimated 82 vehicles is a small number entering a huge flow of traffic.

A question was asked whether the Police Department has the manpower to control the switch at the light during peak hours: Chief Pilecki has said that it is hard to staff the evening detail. John Hancock is willing to continue paying for this, as traffic westbound is not great in the morning. Chief Pilecki's concern has always been that the project will introduce "exiting" trips from WOP in the morning, and whether a detail would be needed then; that is why he supports signalization.

The time factors for traffic may evolve as the project develops. There are currently nine office buildings on the site with vehicles primarily entering in the morning and exiting at night. As office buildings are replaced with other uses, trips in and out of the site won't just happen in the morning and the evening. When the traffic is traveling might vary over time, and this will be covered in the PSI process.

A question was asked if there is comparative traffic data: This was analyzed as part of the study and Planning will send these materials to Advisory.

7:48 p.m. School Committee re: FY20 Budget and ATM Warrant Article 11 (Special Education Reserve Fund)

David Lussier, Superintendent, Wellesley Public Schools (WPS); Kathy Dooley, Technology Director, WPS; Cindy Mahr, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations, WPS; Joan Dabrowski, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, WPS; Matt Kelley, Chair, School Committee (SC); Melissa Martin, Vice Chair, SC; Linda Chow, Secretary, SC; Sharon Gray, SC; and Michael D'Ortenzio, SC, were present.

Great deal of work has gone into this budget; the School Department and SC have been deliberating on the budget for two months.

Changes to Special Education Funding Approach

Will begin with the new special education (SPED) funding approach, as this sets context for some of the other decisions and the budget. No other piece of the budget is as hard to project or as variable, from both the revenue and the expense side.

The prior approach to SPED funding was based on actual needs, but also "what if's"/placeholders for potential needs – e.g., students on the cusp of needing more restrictive placements. As the Schools closed out FY18, turnback to the Town was very significant, including unspent salaries of \$549,000 and unspent expenses of \$233,000. This represented an opportunity cost of unspent funds and created the perception that the funds were not needed and/or are mismanaged. The School Department and SC reviewed this approach to determine whether these should have been budgeted in the first place and what is the right approach in budgeting SPED costs.

The new approach for SPED funding attempts to isolate the variability of the SPED revenues and expenses. Budgeting will now be done only for actual known expenses (e.g., out-of-district tuition and transportation); no placeholders or reserves are being included in the FY20 budget.

A question was asked where the turnback goes now: All turnbacks go to the Town's Free Cash.

There was a review of SPED out-of-district (OOD) placements and what was budgeted and voted in FY19, the adjusted budget in the fall, and the FY20 budget request. In FY19, \$876,553 was over-budgeted. The over-budgeting also helped solve the issue with the circuit breaker funding.

A question was asked if the FY19 "voted" budget means voted by Annual Town Meeting (ATM) or by SC: The FY19 budget was the one voted by ATM. A follow-up question was asked if the FY19

“adjusted” is adjusted by the School Department: The adjusted budget was voted by SC in the fall of 2019 based on known costs. There is a lot of shifting of personnel from the time ATM approves the budget to the time school begins. The adjusted budget creates a more realistic budget view from which to build the FY20 budget. An additional question was asked if the bottom line of the budget is the same between the voted and adjusted budgets: Yes, the bottom line is the same; the categories are shifted around.

The impact of the new SPED funding approach going forward is that there might be needs that are not known now. There are two mechanisms available to handle this – (1) the SPED Reserve Fund, which is growing slowly with Medicaid funds; and (2) a supplemental appropriation, if the variance is greater than the amount in the fund. FY20 will be the first cycle and it will take several years to see how it plays out. The new approach carries the risk that things can happen that weren’t anticipated, but the hope is that the Reserve Fund will cushion this.

A question was asked, if SPED costs were to come in much higher and a supplemental appropriation were needed, would that be voted in March at ATM: The following year’s ATM will close out the previous year; Schools would wait as long as possible before asking for supplemental appropriation.

FY20 Budget Guidelines and Overview

The FY20 budget guidelines (3% from BOS; revised SC guidelines of 3.65%) and historical budget guidelines (BOS guidelines for Schools have been decreasing since FY16) were reviewed. The FY20 estimated revenue sources were reviewed, with the bulk of the revenue coming from the tax base.

A question was asked if there is discussion at the state level to adjust state aid: There are ongoing discussions at the state level.

A question was asked about the contracts that end in FY19 and how the renewals are considered in the budget: Assumptions were built into the budget.

The architecture of the budget process was presented as a pyramid, with Level Service being the base layer and largest share of the budget. “Level funding” means providing the same standard of service, taking into account changes required by enrollment and legal mandates. The Strategic Plan initiatives and Other Critical Needs are built on top of the Level Service. The Schools are in the midst of developing a new strategic plan.

The internal budget guidelines to staff and budget drivers were reviewed. Budget drivers include:

- *Student enrollment* is declining district wide and in particular at the elementary level. In the last 12 years (School Year 08-09 to School Year 19-20), K-5 enrollment has declined by 375 students
 - The relationship between enrollment reductions and staffing was discussed. There are 107 elementary classrooms this year. Over 10 years the number of sections has declined from 117 sections in 2008-09 to the current number of 107. The distribution of these students determines whether you can reduce staffing as a result; if the district dropped 100 students, it might be only one student in each classroom; very dynamic process and can play out in ways that seem counter-intuitive.
 - The “kindergarten round-up” is just beginning for 2019-20, which will help determine the real numbers versus the projections. There are several schools where classes are right at the cusp of size guidelines; might stay at two sections or break to three. Unless you are consolidating due to a retirement, there are important staffing decisions that need to be done in advance.

A comment was made that since 2014 the SC policy around class size guidelines has been very strict and there are budgetary implications from this. Guidelines account for why, even though enrollment is going down, there could be a section increase. Currently grade levels can be closed at one school and a student will be reassigned to a nearby school with capacity. But there is a human side to this with neighborhood schools.

A question was asked whether class size guidelines are in the teacher contract or are discretionary: Class size guidelines may be referenced in the contracts but they are SC policy. They are not absolute guidelines; can make exceptions in particular cases (e.g., a special education student who spends some time in the classroom, perhaps with an aide). The guidelines reflect ranges of where Schools strive to be in order to create manageable class sizes for teachers and productive learning environments for students.

- *Compensation* is another budget driver. All contracts expire at the end of the current school year. The cost impact of current staff is estimated at \$2.2 million. Turnover savings were originally projected at \$750,000 for FY19 but have fallen short of that; as a result, Schools have reset turnover savings projections to \$650,000 for FY20.
- *Increases/decreases to Mandates and Fixed Costs* are other budget drivers. Projecting total decrease of \$772,899 for all these
 - Largest decreases are in SPED OOD expenses (\$955,496) and SPED professional services (\$99,717)
 - Largest increases are reduction in circuit breaker offset (\$126,211) and technology software maintenance (\$82,095)

There was a question as to what is driving the reduction from the adjusted FY19 budget to the FY20 request (the \$955,496): Approximately \$655,000 of that is student-driven change; students who are aging out of the system. After accounting for that, there was still a \$300,000 surplus in the adjusted FY19 budget; that was backed out when building the FY20 budget.

There was a comment that last year there was a revenue shortfall insofar as the Schools had overestimated the total cost of the SPED expenses that were eligible for reimbursement; the issue was not with the state reimbursement rate but with the estimate of eligible expenses. For FY20, the district is looking at the model and being more conservative.

A question was asked about the athletic facilities cost (increase of \$25,000 for FY20) and how the late opening of the 900 Worcester Street facility impacts this: Schools had been budgeting to use that facility as of October; have had to shift money because paying rent at other locations for pools and rinks.

FY20 New Requests Within Guidelines

- Level Service positions: Total of 7.35 FTEs; \$421,690 of costs and \$102,500 in benefits. Many of these positions are driven by caseload
 - 5.15 FTEs for SPED
 - 1.0 FTE for additional K-5 classroom section
 - 0.4 FTE to bring Director of Library and Innovation (vacant) up from 0.6 FTE to full-time position in order to fill it
- Strategic Plan positions: Total of 7.60 FTEs; \$562,393 in costs and \$147,500 in benefits
 - Investing in computer science at Wellesley Middle School (WMS) (0.6 FTE)
 - Completion of world languages implementation at the K-12 level (1.0 FTE at elementary level and 2.5 FTE at WMS)
 - A number of initiatives to help students achieve success every day

- Academic resource center for general education students at Wellesley High School (WHS) (0.5 FTE)
 - Adjustment counselor at WMS/WHS (0.8 FTE)
 - Increased math support at Fiske and Schofield (1.0 FTE)
- District-wide position on diversity, Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (1.0 FTE)
 - Follows racial climate assessment; movement within community to make this a priority for Wellesley
- Other Critical Need positions: Total of 0.6 FTEs; \$32,333 in costs
 - Includes 0.2 FTE increase for the Assistant Athletic Director (currently a 0.6 FTE position); Wellesley has the largest athletic program and participation levels in the state
 - The 0.4 FTE WHS main office secretary position is to help with safety and security; likely will come back next year for additional help on this

A question was asked whether there are security cameras at each WHS entrance and whether they are monitored live: Yes, there are security cameras, but no, they are not monitored live; footage can be reviewed later.

A question was asked about the Director of Diversity position and what it is expected to cover vs. what the district has been doing in the past: In the past, the district relied on the METCO director to do a lot of things that were beyond that job description. As a result of climate assessment study, district wants to go deeper in teacher recruiting/retention and staff training for teachers and administrators; also, diversity is bigger than race. There are some curriculum implications, as well; district felt that needed single position to be focused on these issues and still draw on other resources/staff members.

An Advisory member expressed some concerns about the FY20 budget. Given the new way of budgeting for SPED that is being introduced this year, there is the risk of additional costs down the road. There are a lot of FTEs in this budget, including 7.6 FTEs from the Strategic Plan, which seems higher than in recent years. Although the reasons behind the new positions are understood, this feels like a lot to ask of the Town all in one year, especially an unusual one in which the Town is transitioning to a new way of handling SPED.

Need to distinguish between “caseload” and “non-caseload” FTEs. In the FY20 budget, 6.15 FTEs (4.0 headcount) are caseload (meaning driven by legal requirements) and 9.40 FTEs (8 headcount) are non-caseload. Of the 8 non-caseload headcount, half are for world languages.

A question was asked as to the cost of the world languages program in headcount, salaries and benefits: This year represents the last phase of implementing the world languages program; last step in the bridge to the WMS language program, where all languages are available beginning in 7th grade. FY20 budget moves this choice of languages to the 6th grade. Curricular changes will be coming, as students will have different levels of proficiency than previously.

There was a question about the Director of Library position: Schools want to make it a full-time position, because haven’t been able to fill it for last two years as a 0.6 FTE position. By bringing it up to full-time, the district saw an opportunity to also redefine the position to include technology/media/etc. needs. There is no increase in benefits as those were already included for the 0.6 FTE position.

A comment was made that the FY20 budget is \$484,000 over guidelines and while there are many pieces to the budget and the decision on how to build the budget is up to the Schools, one new position alone (Director of Diversity) represents \$125,000 of that variance and perhaps could be deferred: If Schools didn’t believe strongly in this position, it wouldn’t be in the budget.

A question was asked if there was a recommendation in the racial climate survey to support the Director of Diversity position and what the impetus for the survey was: The impetus for the survey included incidents involving Wellesley students several summers ago. The district wanted to dig deeper to understand the culture within the schools for students, teachers, and parents. The consultant's recommendations included creating a discrete position at the assistant superintendent level; Schools recommendation is for a director-level position. Schools would not be able to attract a candidate at a 0.5 FTE level.

A question was asked as to whether the SC has a subcommittee that would interface with the new director: There is a Diversity Leadership Council that provides stewardship and meets regularly to assess forward progress; the new director would help lead this group.

FY20 Fees and Budget Offsets

These are the collected revenue sources; there is no fee change in the assumptions. From FY18 to FY19, \$200,000 of circuit breaker funding was carried forward. No circuit breaker revenue has been carried into future years. Revenue receipts are down because the district is not tuitioning in as many students.

A question was asked as to how the SPED tuition for students coming in from other towns is calculated: It's been a \$45,000 fee in the past regardless of cost. In the future, the district will look at the actual cost to provide the service and tuition will be based off of that.

A question was asked whether the decrease in athletic fee revenue is due to a decrease in participation caused by the FY19 increase in athletic fees: No; the FY19 budget overestimated the projected revenue; adjustments were made for this in the FY20 budget.

A summary of the FY20 budget as compared to the FY19 budget and FY19 adjusted budget was presented and discussed. The FY20 budget request represents a 3.65% increase over the FY19 budget. Base funding represents a 2.94% increase; Strategic Plan investments represent a 0.95% increase; and Other Critical Needs represent a 0.04% increase.

A question was asked as to whether the School Committee is in favor of ATM Warrant Article 11 (SPED Reserve Fund additions): Yes. The SPED Reserve Fund was established in 2017 for the purpose of paying for unbudgeted SPED costs. ATM appropriates Medicaid reimbursements to the fund; this will be part of the motion this year under Article 11 (\$170,000 estimated for that component). In addition, this year SC is discussing with BOS about making an additional appropriation to build the fund to allow it to be used to stabilize against unexpected SPED costs. It is expected that this additional amount will be \$500,000; details are still being worked out. The SC is in support of the motion.

A question was asked whether the funds would stay in the Reserve Fund if they were not used: Yes, money remains in the fund until drawn down as needed. A follow-up question was asked whether, if money were drawn from the fund, the SC would look to the following ATM for an appropriation to bring the fund back up to an appropriate level and whether there is a trigger amount that is too much in the fund: SC and BOS are working on the mechanics. Under state statute, the fund is capped at 2% of the School budget, but there is no expectation it will get up to that level. Once the money goes into the fund it has to be used for SPED purposes and money can't be pulled out to put in Free Cash. The statute requires the funds be used for unbudgeted or unanticipated SPED costs including transportation.

A question was asked if Reserve Fund spending would require approval from both BOS and SC: Yes.

The expectation is that the Reserve Fund is likely to be used due to the lean budgeting for and variability of SPED expenses.

A question was asked about the average SPED funding shortfall each year: This can be provided.

A question was asked about the FY20 budget summary and whether the base funding (2.94% increase over FY19) is required to meet the teachers' steps and lanes increases: Yes, the 2.94% increase is required based on the contracts; given the BOS 3.0% guidelines increase, this left 0.06% for all remaining School budget initiatives; this is the challenge in creating the FY20 budget.

FY20 Capital Budget

- \$1.1 million in cash capital; technology equipment (\$890,000) is largest driver of the capital budget
- The five-year capital plan was presented; shows capital expenditures fairly stable, with a slight spike in FY22 due to further technology equipment replacement

A question was asked about the schedule for replacement of capital equipment and whether that is pre-determined or whether replacement occurs when devices break: There is a set lifetime/replacement cycle for each major type of equipment (e.g., desktops have seven-year cycle, laptops five years, and iPads four years). A very detailed asset database is maintained; the budget is built on those items that are to be retired. A follow-up question was asked if the lifespans of equipment could be stretched out: Seven years for a desktop is a long life and much of the software no longer works with the older hardware. The replacements are not based on wear and tear, but instead on the lifecycle that software companies have built around it. The operating system doesn't work with software updates so hardware needs to be upgraded to move forward. Also, there are security issues with the old hardware.

A question was asked whether there is trade-in value for equipment: Yes, equipment is traded in to the repair company.

A question was asked as to the difference between a document camera and a projector: The document camera is connected to the projector. ELMO is the brand.

A question was asked about the network and what that means: There are 35 switches that connect all the wires that come from the end points (classroom jacks). A follow-up question was asked if the network has a lifecycle and if so, what that is: This will be provided later but it is believed to be five to seven years.

An Advisory member commented that the overall School budget process is currently much more transparent than in the past and that the School Department/SC are much more open with the sharing of information. The SC, Dr. Lussier and his staff were complimented for providing the transparency to help Advisory and the Town better understand how the School budget is put together and for accepting questions and providing requested information.

There was a discussion of Advisory Committee's supportive/unsupportive votes on departmental budgets that are not within guidelines.

Advisory thanked the Schools for their professionalism, hard work and transparency on the budget.

9:22 p.m. Discussion and Voting on ATM Warrant Articles

Article 14 (Sewer Program): There will be a 5% increase in sewer rates for residents; 6.2% increase overall and capital expenses are driven by the purchase of equipment.

Article 15 (MLP): There is a decrease in expenses and a marginal decrease in personal services. MLP will still have a cash flow deficit but will continue to make the \$1 million payment to the Town via Article 8, Motion 1.

Article 14 (Sewer Program)

Andrea Ward made and Mary Scanlon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 14, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, to see if the Town will vote to appropriate the sum of \$9,825,658.00 (NINE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED FIFTY-EIGHT DOLLARS) to be raised from the sources set forth in the Warrant for the 2019 Annual Town Meeting, to be expended under the direction of the Board of Public Works for the purposes of operating and managing the Sewer Program, or to take any other action in relation thereto. The motion was approved unanimously (12-0.)

Article 15 (MLP)

Andrea Ward made and Julie Bryan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 15, as proposed by the Municipal Light Board, to see if the Town will vote to appropriate the sum of \$36,135,600.00 (THIRTY-SIX MILLION ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS) to be raised from the sources set forth in the Warrant for the 2019 Annual Town Meeting, to be expended under the direction of the Municipal Light Board for the purposes of operating and managing the Municipal Light Plant, or to take any other action in relation thereto. The motion was approved unanimously (12-0).

9:45 p.m. Minutes Approval

Andrea Ward made and Paul Merry seconded a motion to approve the January 16, 2019 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

9:45 p.m. Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters

There was a discussion of Article 8. The actual departmental budget numbers that ATM votes in Article 8, Motion 2, do not include COLA and benefits, which are addressed elsewhere. For purposes of its guidelines analysis and votes, however, Advisory *does* consider the benefits and COLA. Finance will prepare a budget summary chart showing the budget requests for each department/board, including COLA and benefits, for Advisory's guidelines comparison purposes (the "Jack Morgan" chart). The BOS has not discussed the budget yet, as all the numbers are not in. By February 20, the Town will have an idea about health insurance. Currently the budget is unbalanced.

A question was asked whether the additional days in this year for payroll are unusual and whether this is impacting the budget: According to Finance, this is an unusual year.

Advisory will meet Saturday, March 2, 2019, to continue voting on articles.

Schools/Jane Andrews – School Building Committee update:

- The architect presented a Hunnewell swing space option that would use modulars on the Sprague parking lot; Hunnewell principal positive about idea; the grass field next to Sprague (not the turf field) would be paved over for a parking lot for two years and then the fields would be replaced; students would be bused from Hunnewell; modular themselves are in the range of \$1m, not including installation; this idea needs more study
- There is an idea to make the Cameron Street lot into two levels, with the lower level even with the lower level of the Library parking garage; increasing capacity in the Cameron Street lot would help the Town as well as the Hunnewell School

DPW/Bill Maynard

- The \$400,000 additional appropriation is no longer needed as the bids for the water meters came in lower than expected

Human Resources (HR) Board/Julie Bryan

- HR Board will be voting on the bylaw change (to allow HR Board to approve personnel policy changes instead of Town Meeting) and would like to present to Advisory next week

9:46 p.m. Adjourn

Andrea Ward made and Jane Andrews seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed During the Meeting

- *Wellesley Office Park 40R Smart Growth Zoning, Wellesley Board of Selectmen Public Hearing Presentation, January 28, 2019, Power Point*
- Wellesley Office Park materials circulated to Board of Selectmen for its January 28, 2019 meeting, including: Fiscal Impact Analysis by Fougere Planning & Development (January 21, 2019); Memo to Michael Zehner from Frank Holmes, Stantec, re: Infrastructure Improvements (January 17, 2019); Memo to Michael Zehner from Jeffrey Dirk, Vanasse & Associates, re: Access Improvements (January 17, 2019); Letter from Kien Ho, BETA Group, re: Preliminary Traffic Summary (January 23, 2019); Letter from Richard Joyce, Municipal Light Plant, to DHCD (December 31, 2018); Letter from David Hickey, DPW, to DHCD (January 24, 2018)
- *FY20 School Committee Budget, Presentation to Advisory, February 6, 2019, Power Point*