

Approved September 29, 2021

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Wednesday, September 22, 2021, 6:30 p.m.
Advisory Committee Public Hearing
Wednesday, September 22, 2021, 7 p.m.
Zoom Video Conference**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Neal Goins, Tom Cunningham, Patti Quigley, Shawn Baker, Jake Erhard, Jennifer Fallon, John Lanza, Corinne Monahan, Jeff Levitan, Doug Smith, Susan Clapham, Al Ferrer, Wendy Paul, Pete Pedersen, Madison Riley.

Neal Goins called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

6:30 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

Minutes Approval/Liaison Reports/Administrative Items

Minutes Approval

Doug Smith made and Patti Quigley seconded a motion to approve the September 1, 2021 minutes.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Patti Quigley – yes
Tom Cunningham – yes
Jake Erhard – yes
Jeff Levitan - yes
Doug Smith – yes
Susan Clapham - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Wendy Paul – yes
Pete Pedersen - absent
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

September 1, 2021 minutes were approved 13 to 0.

Jenn Fallon made and Corinne Monahan seconded a motion to approve the September 8, 2021 minutes.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Patti Quigley – yes
Tom Cunningham – yes
Jake Erhard – yes

Approved September 29, 2021

Jeff Levitan – yes
Doug Smith – yes
Susan Clapham - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Wendy Paul - yes
Pete Pedersen - absent
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

September 8, 2021 minutes were approved 13 to 0.

Liaison Reports

Citizen Petition/Doug Smith – due to the timing with Planning’s review and vote, a Supplemental Report will most likely be needed for this Article
Planning/John Lanza – Planning voted on Article 9, Outdoor dining, and unanimously approved the article as it was presented to Advisory.
Schools/Jenn Fallon – District has opted to participate in the three-prong COVID testing program sponsored by the State. This was presented to the community on September 21.

Administrative items

The Chair, Neal Goins reminded Advisory that the upcoming Public Hearing is not for dialogue but for listening to citizen comment. Advisory’s Public Hearing will remain open until next week’s meeting on September 29. Next week there will be time for public comment and then Advisory will turn to discussion and voting on the STM Warrant articles.

Draft write ups are due September 27. Draft motion language has been received.

7:00 p.m. Public Hearing on the October, 2021 Special Town Meeting Warrant Articles

The purpose and process of the Public Hearing was described. The Public Hearing is for citizen input on the articles for Special Town Meeting. A description of the purpose and role of Advisory Committee was provided. Advisory does not set priorities and policies for the town. Advisory’s role during its Public Hearing is to listen and to not engage in dialogue. However, Advisory members may ask questions for clarification. This is not the time to ask questions, but a citizen can ask Advisory to investigate a question. Advisory Committee members were introduced.

Each of the Warrant Articles for Special Town Meeting was read and open for comment.

Article 2 and Article 3

Kaitlin Braun, 11 Ingersoll Road – spoke in support of Article 2 and 3 citing the environmental benefits of the net zero buildings.

Mike Braetz, 105 Suffolk Road – spoke in support of Articles 2 and 3 citing the very thoroughly studied, vetted, and debated HHU process over the last 10 years and the support from a majority of town residents.

Todd Ofenloch, 24 Sabrina Road – spoke in support of Articles 2 and 3 citing the HHU master plan committee’s focus on the evaluation of the existing infrastructure at Hunnewell, Hardy, and Upham and the confirmation of the need for two schools.

Approved September 29, 2021

Sharon Gray, 12 Arnold Road – spoke in support of Articles 2 and 3 citing the need to focus on what kids need that has been balanced with the town’s fiscal responsibility and that the process to reach this point has been very thorough.

Julie Bryan, 54 Fuller Brook Road – spoke in support of Articles 2 and 3 citing the support from Town Meeting in 2018 and 2019; the discussions of these projects that have spanned more than 15 years (and in included in the Town-wide Financial Plan; the community involvement; and the need to provide reliable facilities for student learning and the tools for teachers to provide the education.

Jessica Fixler, 55 Kingsbury Street – expressed support for both Article 2 and 3 and agreed with previously stated comments in support of rebuilding Hunnewell and Hardy.

Kelly Norris, 9 Highgate – expressed concerns about and does not support Article 3 and felt it’s not the right time for the project due to declining enrollment, high construction costs and the unknown costs for the Hardy project.

Leanne Leibman, 31 Hampshire Road – does not support Article 3 citing concerns about building two schools at this time due to unknown costs, the tax burden to residents, and assumptions that are believed not true or accurate.

Charlotte Zawel, 11 Sagamore Road – felt this was rushed and that there is still a lot of work to do and asked that a full traffic study be completed before voting and to look at external environmental impacts.

Pamela Posey, 6 Bradford Road – expressed strong support for Articles 2 and 3 and felt that HHU has followed a process to address the urgent needs at these schools and that the town has had a strategic approach to upgrade school facilities for many years.

Lisa Fico, 48 Mayo Road – expressed strong support for Article 2 and 3 citing the life, safety, and health concerns in the buildings.

Sara Shanahan, 18 Brookdale Ave. – expressed strong support for Articles 2 and 3 citing the work started 5 years ago; the HHU master plan and the fiscally prudent recommendation from the HHU planning committee to build two schools with 19 classrooms per school and reserve on the third school until there is enrollment need.

Victoria Ostler, 115 Great Plain Ave – expressed full support of both Articles 2 and 3 and felt it is the town’s duty to provide the best educational experience for the children of the town, not only for students today but for students in the future.

Joe Hickson, 298 Weston Road – expressed support for Articles 2 and 3 and 4 and agreed with previous points made and added that the Hardy project has wide general support from the Hardy community and this is an opportunity to capitalize on MSBA reimbursement and this is a matter of opportunity costs.

Lina Musayev, 26 Cedar Street – expressed support for Articles 2 and 3 and emphasized that it is not possible to have all costs known for the MSBA process which requires a vote at this time. She further added that by not supporting Hardy at this time jeopardizes \$13.5 million of MSBA funding.

Brooke Rosenbaum, 92 Royalston Road - expressed support for both Articles 2 and 3 citing the many years spent discussing and studying the need to rebuild Hardy and Hunnewell School.

Approved September 29, 2021

Matt McGeough, 190 Bristol Road – questioned the town’s responsibilities in embarking on two projects at the same time as these projects will be the most expensive projects in Massachusetts on a per pupil basis. He asked that a closer look be taken on this citing the narrow vote to push with the Hardy plan and a lot has changed over the past two years.

John Pastore, 29 Bristol Road - expressed no support for Articles 2 and 3 citing the number of children leaving the district, the global supply chain crisis. He asked for an update of all costs around this project.

Kelly Friendly, 42 Willow Road – spoke in support for Articles 2 and 3 and advocated the need for appropriate educational facilities for the town’s youngest learners and those educational facilities draw people to town. She felt that the project has not been rushed.

Deb McConnell, 12 Sabrina Road – expressed support for Articles 2 and 3 citing the conditions in the buildings and the work that has been done over the years.

Kristin Haddon, 91 Arnold Road – expressed support for Article 2 but not for Article 3 citing the safety issues related to the increase in the number of children who need to cross Route 9 to get to school. She felt that the Hardy site is not what is best for the health and safety of the children of Wellesley.

Katie Griffith, 457 Weston Road – expressed support for both Articles 2 and 3 citing the conditions of Hunnewell, Hardy and Upham and the difference in the facilities at the newer schools, Bates and Sprague.

Christine Norcross, 19 Jackson Road – spoke in support of Articles 2 and 3 citing the trust and respect for the people who have been working on these projects and that people want to move to Wellesley because of the schools.

Katherine Cort, Fisher Ave.- spoke in full support of Articles 2 and 3 citing fiscal responsibility in moving forward with two buildings instead of three.

Joelle Reidy, 60 Prospect Street – expressed support of Articles 2 and 3; look at what done over past 10 years and trust the experts. Moved her for the schools and have not been disappointed. But we need to pay attention to the schools for kids.

Eileen Tortora, 15 Arnold Road – spoke against approving Articles 2 and 3 citing the emotional and physical health of children post COVID and felt that plans not in place for children’s emotional health.

Adjourn

Jake Erhard made and Patti Quigley seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The Public Hearing remains open until September 29, 2021

Roll call vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – yes
Corinne Monahan - yes
Patti Quigley – yes
Tom Cunningham – yes
Jake Erhard – yes
Jeff Levitan - yes
Doug Smith – yes

Approved September 29, 2021

Susan Clapham - yes

Al Ferrer - yes

Wendy Paul - yes

Pete Pedersen - yes

Madison Riley – yes

Shawn Baker – yes

8:20 p.m. Meeting was adjourned 14 to 0.