

Approved April 7, 2021

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Wednesday, March 31, 2021, 6:30 p.m.**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Shawn Baker, Julie Bryan, Jennifer Fallon, Neal Goins, John Lanza, Jeff Levitan, Bill Maynard, Deed McCollum, Corrine Monahan, Patti Quigley, Mary Scanlon, and Doug Smith.

Julie Bryan called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

6:30 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak

6:31 p.m. Town-Wide Financial Plan (TWFP)

Tom Ulfelder, Chair, Select Board (SB); Colette Aufranc, SB; Sheryl Strother, Finance Director; Meghan Jop, Executive Director; Lise Olney, SB; Ann-Mara Lanza, SB; and Beth Sullivan Woods, SB were present.

An overview of the TWFP was presented including guiding principles; significant highlights; operational budgets; cash capital projects including those being funded with inside-the-levy debt; the major project financing schedule with outside-the-levy debt exclusions; a summary of sources and uses and the balanced budget; and key financial planning issues in FY22 and beyond.

Discussion

- A question was asked if the forecast actual for 2021, versus the FY21 budget, is utilized in building the FY22 budget rather than the budget?
 - 2021 is monitored constantly, and spending is down for a lot of reasons. Traffic and parking receipts and hotel/motel/restaurant revenues are suffering, but building permits and excise taxes are doing well. FY21 will be a good year and will contribute to the bottom line this year because of lower expenses. Revenues are down, but are conservatively forecast.
- Why is Weston receiving \$3.8 million from the feds and Wellesley is receiving only \$2.8 million as these amounts are supposed to be on a per capita basis?
 - It is unknown but it is perhaps because Weston is in a different county than Wellesley.
- What is the confidence in the amount of state aid?
 - At this point we do not know the restrictions and guidance on the parameters of the aid. These are revenue replacements due to cuts made as a result of lost revenue. The town is waiting for guidance from the Federal Treasurer and the State. Because of the unknowns, projections are conservative.
- In FY20, investment income was \$1.6 million but it is \$400,000 for this year.
 - This is due to lower interest rates.
- A question was asked why an adjustment is not made to present a balanced budget in the outyears to show what cash capital and inside-the-levy would like and provide a realistic view as to what departments can expect in the outyears.
 - Departments are asked what they need over five years. Projects are prioritized on a year-to-year basis to see what can be funded within the 6.2 or 6.8 limit. The way we do it gives

the departments the full picture and the process becomes more of a team project with department heads.

- A comment was made that it seems like everyone had to cut the same amount and that does not seem as equitable as it sounds. Who decides which project gets pulled out?
 - Everything is on the table, and Select Board, Advisory and various boards all have input. It is up to the boards to gain support for projects. There is a prioritization plan evaluated internally and externally.
- What is levy growth?
 - Proposition 2 ½% allows for an increase in taxation of 2 ½% plus the estimate of new growth which is new construction that is brought online.

7:20 p.m. Article 26 and 27 Presentation

Meghan Jop, Executive Director; Tom Ulfelder, Chair, Select Board (SB); Colette Aufranc, SB; Lise Olney, SB; Ann-Mara Lanza, SB; Beth Sullivan Woods, SB were present.

The proposed establishment of the Wellesley Affordable Housing Trust (AHT) to replace the existing Wellesley Housing Development Corp. was brought forward. Wellesley recently received a housing production award and has met the 10% obligation of 40B. The Affordable Housing Actions and the Housing Production Plan were reviewed. The process for establishing the AHT, considerations, and benefits were presented, along with the proposed AHT Board of Trustees composition, powers and oversight.

Discussion:

- Is the AHT seen as a funding entity or as something broader?
 - Everything would be on the table and all available options would be evaluated. Budget and priorities would be evaluated to determine what will be tackled first. For example, there are state and federal rental programs available, but that would not be something the AHT would focus on now although they could in the future.
- A question was asked about the AHT purpose, and a comment made that the language seems very broad. Additional concern was expressed that there does not seem to be enough direction given to the board and that the goals and needs of the town have not been articulated.
 - The Housing Production Plan is a five-year plan.
- Would the AHT set the goals?
 - The AHT is a public body and will be expected to make goals and initiatives public and go through a public process to determine the primary needs. These goals and initiatives will be approved by the SB. The goals of the AHT are identified as production and preservation of housing for low- and moderate-income residents. How this is achieved would be the mission and action plan of Trustees with approval of the SB.
- AHT comes up with goals and not the town?
 - They are a body of the town. Massachusetts Housing Partnership (MHP) suggests that the goals and needs of the town be established and the AHT supports those goals and needs. Housing goals were identified in the Unified Plan.
- Is the AHT a public body and are meetings open to the public and subject to open meeting law?
 - Yes.
- What is difference in operation between the WHDC and the AHT and what is the benefit of the AHT?
 - The AHT language is more explicit about both the members and the power of the committee. It also eliminates approval of an action by the SB. It brings money on the books for the town. Also, WHDC did not have staff. With the AHT, a fractional portion

of the SB staff would be provided to work for the AHT and additional staff would be pulled in as needed.

- A comment was made that there are general guidelines for the types of expertise for the Trustees and they are appointed by the SB, but there is not a requirement to be a town resident.
 - It is preferable to be a town resident but there may be a situation where someone with expertise needs to be pulled in. Town residents will be weighted higher. There is also longevity to consider if a resident moves out of town and their tenure is valuable to the AHT. It would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- There was a discussion about limiting the number of non-residents.
- A concern was expressed about the lack of planning and the lack of oversight.
 - The SB appoints members of the AHT, and the SB can remove a member. It takes a lot of work to achieve affordable housing in any town. The AHT will be populated by people with a real interest, talent, and enthusiasm for developing affordable housing in town.
- It appears as if the AHT does not have a lot of oversight but a lot of ability to make decisions and borrow money. Why is there not a need for more oversight?
 - There are over 100 housing trusts in Massachusetts and there is always this type of tension and it is part of the conversation. There is tension between the need for nimbleness of the public body and its independence to control assets of the town. There is no example where this independence has gone awry. During the research it was found that it is much easier for the AHT to function if it has a level of independence. AHT will have close cooperation with the SB and other boards. There are many ways in which the AHT has quite a bit of oversight and the SB has a lot of control. There will be a lot of close communication between Select Board and AHT.
- Does the use of CPC funds require Town Meeting action? Why are CPC funds not automatically given to the AHT?
 - CPC still approves all the funding it might chose to fund. CPC needs to spend a certain percentage of funds for affordable housing. CPC does not have to give the funds to the AHT. The AHT would make request to CPC and once CPC makes that choice to fund an AHT initiative then that CPC action requires Town Meeting approval. Some towns have approved giving direct CPC funding to an AHT. Wellesley is not set up that way.
- What is the AHT funding source?
 - CPC inclusionary zoning payments, developers' payments, and the potential of 40R payments.
- What would be the process if there were changes in the powers down the line?
 - It would require Town Meeting action to modify the bylaw but would not involve going to state legislature for approval.
- A comment was made that peer communities such as Concord and Lexington are utilizing the AHT as a nimble way of creating affordable housing. Small and large communities are utilizing the AHT.
- A comment was made that the Massachusetts Affordable Housing guidebook recommends a vision be established as this focuses the community on the goals.
 - The Housing Production Plan established a road map for priorities which will be the starting point for the AHT mission statement and trust. Engaging the board of trustees in the mission and vision allows them to have agency and ownership. The guidebook is for communities starting at ground zero. Wellesley has had the HDC and the work the HDC did is very similar to the work AHT anticipates doing.
- There are seven voting members -- a Select Board member and six board member; are there any CPC members?
 - It does not preclude CPC members.

Approved April 7, 2021

- Does the town hold CPC funds until they are expended?
 - CPC funds are not transferred until the use is approved Even though approved, the finance director and treasurer hold the funds which are earmarked for whatever project CPC approved.
- Where does the AHT get money?
 - HDC has received funds from exclusionary zoning payments. Once the HDC is dissolved, these funds will be given to the AHT. CPC funds that were given to the HDC would flow back to the CPC and would have to be re-allocated to the AHT and approved by TM.
- Who is doing the audit?
 - A third party has been hired.
- When the SB voted Monday 3 to 2 in favor of the AHT what were the concerns of those that voted against it?
 - The same questions about oversight were raised. However, from research the concerns about independence are not uncommon and factors in dissent. There were questions about creating the trust first with the creation of the mission and the vision coming second. Other concerns were the Board composition and the issue of opening it up to non-residents.

8:30 p.m. Discussion and Vote on 2021 ATM Warrant Articles

ARTICLE 2: Neal Goins made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to receive the Reports of the Select Board on the Town-Wide Financial Plan and Five-Year Capital Budget Program.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, 12 to 0.

There was a brief discussion about the Articles to be included in the consent agenda.

ARTICLE 3: Neal Goins made and Mary Scanlon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 3, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to act on certain articles set forth in this warrant by a single vote, pursuant to a consent agenda. The Advisory Committee has recommended favorable action unanimously on each of the articles to be included in the consent agenda, and they are:

Approved April 7, 2021

Article 9: Set Revolving Funds Amounts for Next Year
Article 10: Injured on Duty Stabilization Fund Appropriation
Article 11: Special Education Reserve Fund Appropriation
Article 12: Baler Stabilization Fund Contribution from Free Cash
Article 13: Water Program
Article 14: Sewer Program
Article 35: Appoint Fire Engineers

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 3, 12 to 0.

ARTICLE 8, MOTION 2 (Omnibus budget). Neal Goins made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 8, Motion 2, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to appropriate \$179,360,362 to the Town Boards and officials for the purposes outlined in the 2021 Omnibus Budget.

Discussion:

- Concern was expressed about the outyears in capital planning. A fair number of investments have been deferred, and it will be a challenge to manage the coming years.
- A comment was made that department boards and committees were polled regarding the planning process and feel as comfortable as they did two or three years ago. Boards have been happy to work in the difficult environment to come up with a plan and a budget to work for this year. But, there is concern going forward. The Select Board and staff have done a fantastic job to get to a balanced budget with all the moving parts. Difficult decisions were made. Concerns were expressed about the future.
- A comment was made that it is not clear how much longer projects can be pushed and that getting to a balanced budget may not be as easy in future years. We have paid attention to assets and infrastructure over the past years and concern was expressed about losing this momentum.
- A comment was made that the upward pressure on budgets from the schools is also not likely to go away in the future.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes

Approved April 7, 2021

Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 8, Motion 2, 12 to 0.

Town Clerk budget: Neal Goins made and Corinne Monahan seconded a motion to express support for the proposed FY22 Town Clerk operating budget, not including benefits and merit pool allocations, which will result in a 2.47% (\$9,463) increase over FY21. (*metric for criterion is 2.77%*)

Discussion

- Clarification was provided that, although the 2.47% is under the 2.5% guideline, the number that must be in the motion is different than the number used to compare against the 2.5% metric. Specifically, there is one additional parameter that goes into calculating the number for the 2.5% comparison, and that is the modeled COLA on MVP. This puts an additional \$1,600 in the Town Clerk budget, which then puts this budget over 2.5%. This process was put in place to reflect completely and accurately what the increase is.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – no
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory expresses support for the Town Clerk FY22 budget, 11 to 1.

BOH budget: Neal Goins made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion to express support for the proposed FY22 Board of Health operating budget, not including benefits and merit pool allocations, which will result in a 14.61% (\$158,669) increase over FY21.

Discussion

- Clarification was requested as to what the increase is for.

Approved April 7, 2021

- These are the additional hours added to nursing staff and the environmental officer at the BOH and to the licensed social work staff that were added last year at Special Town Meeting. Half the salary was paid for by CARES funding, and the other half was supported by Special Town Meeting. We are paying for what has already been approved. Also, flu vaccines tripled in price.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon – yes
Deed McCollum – yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory expresses support for the Board of Health budget, 12 to 0.

ARTICLE 8, MOTION 3: (transfer funds from Free Cash to Available Funds). Neal Goins made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 8, Motion 3, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to transfer the sum of \$3,781,347 from Free Cash, as certified on July 1, 2020, to reduce the tax rate.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Warrant Article 8, Motion 3, 12 to 0.

ARTICLE 21: Neal Goins made and Jeff Levitan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 21, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to authorize the Select Board to petition the General Court for special legislation authorizing said Board, as the local licensing authority, to issue licenses for the sale of wine and malt beverages only, or all alcoholic beverages, to be drunk on

Approved April 7, 2021

the premises under section 12 of chapter 138 to restaurants and function rooms with a seating capacity of less than fifty (50), subject to the maximum number of such licenses as authorized by section 17 of said chapter 138, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Discussion

- Motion is virtually identical to the article.
- Support for the article was expressed, but concern was expressed that this is a policy that the SB can change at any time. Town Meeting members will be voting to give the SB authority all the way down to 0.
- A comment was made that restaurants make a significant investment in the business and it is difficult if the rules change.
- A comment was made that people who have a license would be grandfathered in. The process of approval to change the numbers is the concern.
- Concern was expressed that the delegation of flexibility was not totally thought through, but this change is very timely and necessary to attract commercial interest in town.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 21, 12 to 0.

ARTICLE 23: Neal Goins made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 23, as proposed by the Advisory Committee, that the Town vote to improve the requirements for delivery of the Advisory Report to Town Meeting by amending Article 11 of the General Bylaws, and/or other appropriate bylaws, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes

Approved April 7, 2021

Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 23, 12 to 0.

ARTICLE 26: Neal Goins made and Mary Scanlon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 26, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to 1) accept the provisions of Chapter 44, Section 55C of the Massachusetts General Laws to establish a trust to be known as the Wellesley Affordable Housing Trust Fund, whose purpose shall be to provide for the creation and preservation of housing that is affordable in the Town of Wellesley for the benefit of low and moderate income households; and 2) amend the General Bylaws of the Town by inserting a new Article 20 to be entitled “Wellesley Affordable Housing Trust Fund”, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Discussion

- Concern was expressed that there are too many pieces that are not quite there with the AHT and it needs further refinement. Lack of oversight and lack of residency are two of the concerns.
- Support was expressed for the AHT concept and it would be great to move forward at some point, but concerns were expressed regarding the desire to have a nimble organization for which funding has not yet been identified. If we need to go back to TM for funding approval, then it is not nimble and potentially not able to take advantage of an opportunity. Oversight with some guardrails is needed.
- A comment was made that it is important for the town to have vision and control. The town has the Housing Production Plan, but parameters are needed and there needs to be more definition of what is being achieved with this new entity recognizing that the new entity must exist in order to move forward with additional affordable housing.
- Clarification was provided that the AHT goes back to Town Meeting for approval of funding only if CPC funds are requested. The AHT can spend what money they have in the trust, but CPC funding requests would have to go to TM for approval.
- Concern was expressed that the majority of funding is through CPC funds, and in order to obtain those CPC funds we need to wait to Town Meeting and this is an imposed delay.
- A comment was made that it does not seem like this is all the way done for different reasons. The concern is with controls and oversight. But the need is there for affordable housing.
- A comment was made about the power of the trust to borrow money without oversight. If the trust borrows money collateralized by property they own and it is a bad investment and the trust cannot make payment on the loan, how is Wellesley not on the hook for the money? What happens if the AHT defaults on a loan for some reason and someone takes over property owned by Wellesley?
 - It is statutory. If the trust incurs debt, the town is not a guarantor legally.
- The town is not a guarantor for debts of the trust legally, but practically what will happen?
 - No property will be conveyed to the AHT. The HDC does not currently own any property. The housing authority owns the existing low-income properties and these are not under Town of Wellesley control. \$400,000 would be transferred from the HDC to the AHT. For new properties, with the expected expertise level on the board a risk assessment would be completed. There is explicit language that borrowing would not default to the Town of Wellesley.
- What happens if it is a bad loan and AHT cannot pay, what are the options for AHT?

- All affordable housing units are under DCD oversight. In the worst-case scenario if an affordable housing tenant cannot be found the property might be forfeited and sold as a market rate unit to meet obligations to resell. There might be a bail out.
- What could AHT borrow money for?
 - The AHT could borrow for a number of things. Different AHTs borrow money to develop affordable units but we do not have land for a major housing development. We do not have the leverage to get that type of borrowing.
- What the AHT would borrow for is to buy or build buildings?
- Why is borrowing the only thing that does not have guardrails around it? When it comes to money, it is desired to have more town involvement. Can the borrowing be something the SB discusses and approves?
 - The amount of borrowing is very low in terms of the AHT because of the number of hoops to go through to get a mortgage. A bulletproof revenue stream needs to be shown. Borrowing is a fairly limited tool. The majority of the SB wanted to create flexibility for the AHT.
- A comment was made that this article does not feel like it is ready for prime time based on the discussion on accountability. It is necessary to think through how the town's interest is represented in the process of affordable housing.
- A comment was made that it is important to get this right and 3 to 2 SB vote gets attention. In terms of timing, it does not feel that there is a crisis so we can wait to do more work on this.
- Clarification was provided from the SB meeting where Town Counsel was asked the same question and there are some town models, generally smaller towns with more land to purchase, that have more restrictions on purchasing and borrowing. Towns with less land to develop generally have fewer restrictions. Town Counsel said that both models work. AHT is a conduit for outside developers to get things done and is essential to get the mission done. There is a limited scope of the AHT to do things on their own. The AHT does not have a lot of ability to work and they need to go through town to get things done. It was felt there are adequate guardrails about how this is going to operate.
- A comment was made that we need this and need to be able to move forward this. SB and Town Counsel looked into this well. Concern was expressed that all these topics will come up at TM. Support was expressed because we need to move forward with affordable housing, we have not done a good job, and this will help us
- Clarification was requested about Town Counsel's advice that some towns have regulations and procedures around transactions that we are not proposing and that he has seen both work.
 - Yes, the recollection is that some towns require SB approval for transactions but this is more prevalent in towns with lots of land to develop.
- A comment was made that the AHT is not the developer. The trust helps developers and interested parties find creative and legal ways to develop housing which advances the goal of having more affordable housing. This is a way of achieving goals rather than the AHT itself being a developer. The AHT is acting as a facilitator.
- A comment was made that the language of the bylaw says duties are very broad and that they can borrow money. An additional comment was made that practically the town is not on the hook but the idea of a board being able to borrow money is of concern. Concerns were expressed about the process and it feels rushed. It was felt it would be much better to go to Town Meeting with SB as a unanimous vote. There are also questions around language about the people who serve on the board.
- It was felt that the options for Advisory are either to vote, or table the discussion and vote after reviewing additional information. It might be helpful to watch the SB meeting, discussion and vote, and understand the details of why voted the way they did. There is enough uncertainty that additional time to get more information might be useful.

Approved April 7, 2021

- A comment was made that the anecdotal benchmarking has the appearance of being data but it is not helpful to the decision-making process. It was felt, for example, to hear that other towns have more or less restrictions on duties is not data on which to base a decision because it is unknown which towns were looked at. It would be more helpful to give a comparison of the different towns and why there are the differences. In general, it was felt more real data would be helpful to support the motion.
- A comment was made that it is uncertain what additional information will come if the motion is tabled as the issues with the procedures are that they are just not tight enough.
- Support for tabling the motion was expressed so that the SB meeting could be reviewed. A request was made to have the SB or Executive Director come back to address these issues directly. It was felt if a vote were taken now it would not be unanimous.

Doug Smith made and Shawn Baker seconded a motion to table the vote on the motion for favorable action on Article 26.

Discussion:

- A comment was made that it would be helpful to have Town Counsel available next week.
- A comment was made that having time to think this through and get more information in the next 6-7 days will be helpful.
- A comment was made that this needs to be put together better. The feeling was expressed to take the vote as there will be no significant additional information by next week. Nothing will change.
- Concern was expressed about a no vote as it may give TM the impression that there is something fallible about having a housing trust.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – no
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – no
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - no
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – no
Corinne Monahan - no
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – no
Julie Bryan - yes

The motion to table the vote on the motion for favorable action on Article 26 was approved, 7 to 6.

A comment was made that it would be helpful for Advisory members to take the time to watch the SB meeting as many questions were asked and answered.

9:22 p.m. Administrative Matters/Liaison Reports/Minutes

Minutes Approval

Approved April 7, 2021

Corinne Monahan made and Jeff Levitan seconded a motion to approve the March 24, 2021 minutes.

Roll call vote:

Bill Maynard – yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins - yes

The March 24, 2021 minutes were approved 12 to 0.

Liaison Reports

Schools/Jenn Fallon – At the recent School Committee meeting, the comprehensive reopening plan was presented and there was a facilities update. Elementary schools start back full-time on Monday.

Administrative Matters

There was an update on the Advisory Report progress. Outstanding write-ups should be submitted as soon as possible.

9:37 p.m. Adjourn

Jeff Levitan made and Corinne Monahan seconded a motion to adjourn.

Roll call vote

Bill Maynard - yes
Patti Quigley – yes
John Lanza – yes
Mary Scanlon - yes
Deed McCollum - yes
Jennifer Fallon – yes
Jeff Levitan - yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Shawn Baker – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Jake Erhard – absent
Tom Cunningham – yes
Lauren Duprey – absent
Neal Goins – yes