

Approved October 6, 2021

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Wednesday, September 29, 2021, 6:30 p.m.**

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.

Catherine Mirick, Chair, School Committee; Dave Cohen, Director, Department of Public Works; Melissa Martin, School Committee; David Lussier, Superintendent, Wellesley Public Schools; Jeff Wechsler, Chair, Board of Public Works; Amy Frigulietti, Assistant Executive Director, Town of Wellesley; Meghan Jop, Executive Director, Town of Wellesley; Don McCauley, Director, Planning Department; Tom Goemaat, Permanent Building Committee (PBC) were also present.

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

Continuation of Advisory's Public Hearing on October 2021 Special Town Meeting Warrant Articles

Chair, Neal Goins asked for additional comments on the October 2021 STM Warrant Articles.

No additional public comments were provided.

Patti Quigley moved and Doug seconded a motion to adjourn the Advisory Public Hearing.

Roll Call Vote

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

Advisory Committee's Public Hearing on the October, 2021 Special Town Meeting Warrant was adjourned 13 to 0.

Update on Drinking Water/PFAS

Dave Cohen and Jeff Wechsler provided an update on Article 6 – Drinking Water/PFAS

Questions:

- A question was asked if other treatment methods have been tried.
 - Nothing has been tried yet. The interim treatment is a combination of granulated activated carbon and ionic exchange and this is being used mainly because of availability. Other systems are also more technical and complex - one is not recyclable so the used membrane would be sent to the land fill. There are pros and cons with each. The consultant and peers feel this is the right solution for Wellesley.
- When will we hear about updated costs?
 - PFAS treatment is evolving. We hope to have a cost for Town Meeting but there are several factors we are watching including the price of materials such as steel. We may leave the borrowing authorization where it is and when we go out to bid then we might not need to borrow it all.
- Does the cost include the building?
 - Yes, the cost includes the building which will be a brick clad building to match what is there. We are looking at other building types. However, with a steel building we won't get as much life. But we will consider all options. Nothing has been decided but this is how the cost is estimated.
- What is the source of PFAS and why is the Morse Pond well higher than other wells in town?
 - We don't have a sense of a specific source. In Hudson they have direct parties to investigate. We will continue to investigate as to the source.
- Are there two solutions being used?
 - The interim solution is in trailers initially while the permanent solution is being constructed. There are two types of treatments in the interim phase and one in the permanent phase.
- What was the comment or question that required additional information?
 - A statement was made that we can't get rid of PFAS and there was a question about the way to treat it. We think we can treat it and we see evidence that we can. It is a serious problem and persistent in the environment. The treatments don't work forever. There is an on-going maintenance cost with this. But it can be done and is being done. There was additional concern that it is not fully understood what we can do or how long we need to treat this. Staff and consultants are aware that things may change. We will continue to evaluate what we do over time. We are doing this with DEP and working closely with them on the solutions being implemented.
- Is it accurate that the water was previously tested and identified compounds but they were below the acceptable level and that there is a change in the reporting?
 - We sampled for PFAS in 2014 but there was no regulation at that time for it and the testing was not as sensitive. When testing now, the testing techniques have improved and we were able to test lower.
- Are there other compounds that are unregulated contaminants that might have a similar situation and pop up in 2 or 3 years and is it possible MA might change the acceptable level?
 - Yes there are other unregulated compounds.
 - Two other towns have shown that PFAS chemicals can be treated successfully, and the state standards are strict, and may change in the future.

Discussion and Vote on October 2021 STM Warrant Articles

Article 5

Shawn Baker made and Patti Quigley seconded a motion favorable action on Warrant Article 5, as proposed by the Select Board, that \$164,838.00 be appropriated from Free Cash and added to amounts appropriated under the 2021 Annual Town Meeting to the Select Board for the Facilities Management

Approved October 6, 2021

Department for \$158,606 of Personal Services in accordance with new Pay Schedules for the FMD Custodial Union, AFSCME and \$6,232 of expenses.

Roll Call Vote

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

Advisory recommends favorable action, 13 to 0.

Article 6

Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 6, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, that the Town appropriate \$6,800,000 to the Board of Public Works for all costs related to construct and reconstruct water filtration systems. This includes authorizing the Town Treasurer to borrow such amounts in accordance with applicable law. It also includes authorizing the Town Treasurer, with Select Board approval, to borrow some or all amounts from the MWRA and enter a loan agreement and financial assistance agreement with the MWRA.

Discussion:

- Is this under the levy limit?
 - Funds will be borrowed by the Enterprise Fund and will not be tax impact dollars. This will impact rate payers.

Roll Call Vote

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

Advisory recommends favorable action, 13 to 0.

Approved October 6, 2021

Article 7

Shawn Baker made and Patti Quigley seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 7, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town appropriate \$150,000 from Free Cash certified as of June 30,2021 for supplemental legal costs and add that amount to funds appropriated to the Select Board at the 2021 ATM.

Discussion:

- A comment was made that Advisory has asked twice about being more aggressive on legal fees including considering fixed fee pricing or other structure and it would be great to see an effort to reduce these fees in this manner.

Roll Call Vote

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

Advisory recommends favorable action, 13 to 0.

Article 9

Shawn Baker made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 9, as proposed by the Planning Board and Select Board, that the Town amend the Zoning Bylaws to permit outdoor dining in certain business and commercial districts without requiring a Special Permit and to make certain other changes to the provisions for dining in business and commercial districts by amending and deleting certain definitions

Discussion:

- Planning considered the motion language and approved is unanimously.

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

Approved October 6, 2021

Pete Pedersen - yes
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action, 14 to 0.

Article 10

Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 10, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town authorize the Select Board to waive the right of first refusal under a permit issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals with regard to the refinancing of 50 Grove Street provided the Owner and the Select Board enter an agreement under which the Owner commits to renew the project-based Housing Assistance Payment Contract under Section 8 of the U.S. housing Act of 1937 for at least 60 years or other maximum affordability period required by the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency as a condition of its financing the sale of the property and the waiver is limited to the refinance transaction as reflected in the Agreement and other terms and conditions the Select Board determines are in the best interest of the Town.

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 - yes
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

Advisory Committee recommends favorable action, 14 to 0.

Article 2

Shawn Baker made and Jeff Levitan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, as proposed by the School Committee and Permanent Building Committee that the Town appropriate \$55,000,000 for the design, construction and project management related to establish a new replacement facility for the Hunnewell Elementary School under the direction of the Permanent Building Committee. This includes authorizing the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Select Board, to borrow this sum in accordance with applicable laws, subject to the Town approving a debt exclusion for the project. This motion also includes that the Town appropriate \$3,500,000 from an addition to the borrowing described above and/or from Free Cash certified as of June 30, 2021 for increases in costs related to the relocation of students from Hunnewell to other schools during such construction

Discussion:

- An opinion was expressed that there is a long set of issues with the Hardy and Hunnewell School projects although there is recognition that people have spent a lot of time devoted to these issues. It was felt COVID has disrupted the whole thought process for the Town on these schools. It was added that on top of the normal enrollment attrition, 284 additional students left the district last

year and another 17 left this year for a total of 301. This reduction was more than the enrollment of any one of the following schools: Fiske, Hardy, Upham or Schofield. It was also felt that the town effectively lost another elementary school on top of the current plan to reduce schools from 7 to 6. It was felt that 5 schools rather than 6 are needed as we can't tell how many students are coming back and no one can tell. It was felt that it is a prudent decision to step back and think about approving one school now. It was added that there is no argument that the schools need work but that the big question is how many we need to build. Hardy has state support. Given the town has already spent \$3.5 million on feasibility for Hunnewell, there is not much difference in cost between Hunnewell and Hardy. It was felt that Hardy has more utility. Support was expressed for Hardy given the state support.

- A question was asked about the swing space portion of Article 2 given the new conversation about Upham and the emails received this week. A request was made to hear from the proponents of Article 2 about the swing space process.
 - An update was provided by School Committee on the swing space. School Committee is continuing to investigate swing space options. Since 2019 the plan was to use internal swing space. However, due to COVID related enrollment changes, another option was developed that is being socialized with the community. The key points of Option A and Option B for swing space were reviewed. These are not finalized and School Committee is working through the best solution for swing space.
- A question was asked on the swing space proposal and why it is coming out at this point.
 - Plan A is executable but it is difficult to execute. Prior to COVID enrollment changes there wasn't space to do Plan B. It became an option this year. There is also a financial difference of \$1.7 million between Plan A and B and School Committee is trying to figure out the best option for students across the district. Plan A spreads students out among a variety of schools.
- A comment was made that Hunnewell is important to the town in its location and that the Town has decided it wants neighborhood schools. By taking Hunnewell offline it leaves a whole section of town without a neighborhood school. Support was expressed about the need to update our schools. It was expressed that the district's new option for swing space is doing exactly what Advisory has asked of School Committee for many years and that is to be as efficient as possible. School Committee is coming up with something more efficient with Plan B. Support for the Hunnewell project and the swing space was expressed.
- A question was asked of those Advisory members who recently toured the schools and if they could offer observations or comments.
- A comment was made that it was disheartening to see the condition of the schools and the lack of space. Teachers are doing an outstanding job working in these conditions. Surprise was expressed at the condition of the schools and the working conditions. The schools need to be updated. The Hunnewell ceilings are badly water stained. Shock was expressed to see how rooms are divided up and the sharing of spaces. Some spaces look like closets that are being used. However, concern was expressed about the voting on Hunnewell. Support was expressed for both schools to provide a decent and healthy learning environment.
- A comment was made that a tour was taken a few years ago and the conditions were appalling then and since then there has been a fire at Hunnewell, a tree that was falling, multiple leaks and electrical issues. The principal, teachers, parents and FMD have done an amazing job creating an educational environment under the conditions.
- A comment was made that it is necessary to take a long view of the schools and that 10 years ago a system evaluation was completed on the schools and at that time Hunnewell had so many critical systems that were failing. As a member of Advisory it was felt that there was a responsibility to go back to see what the conditions are now and support for the previous observations about the conditions was expressed. An additional comment was made that it is well

past the time to replace these facilities and that these are not facilities that we should be using. When these schools were built Special Education programs did not exist.

- A comment was made that this was the first time touring these schools and it was appalling to see the condition of the schools and it feels like we abandoned these schools 10 years ago. It was expressed that there is a need for one school and it should be Hardy. It was felt that fiscally we can't afford \$125 million and we don't know the student population and how much it is decreasing. Concern was expressed for the unstable economic situation.
- A comment was made with respect to the Hardy process and that this town is beholden to follow the MSBA process which is a two-step process. The town must ask for approval for funds from residents and then we can proceed. We are about 30% through the design process. MSBA requires town approval at the end of feasibility and schematics. If approved, then we can proceed to get more detailed information. SMMA used their background and experience with these projects to develop a cost structure with contingencies on various components.
- A question was asked if the Hunnewell bids have been received. PBC will see bids on October 14 and hopefully approve a bid at that meeting. Then the Select Board and School Committee will approve the bid the following week. The vote is required on Hardy before we get bids for the state process and that's why the costs are not known. Hunnewell has a three-step process with the town and Hardy is a two-step process with the state.
- A comment was made that the buildings are in dire need. By comparison the "new" Sprague is almost 20 years old. If we want to keep neighborhood schools then we need to address these needs. We must take the long view and neighborhood schools are supported by the town. We are already contracting from 7 to 6 schools which allows students to spread out across the district in appropriate class sizes. Enrollment fluctuates and we can't get a school online in 2 years. We don't want to get into a situation where we are reacting. Now is the time to move forward.
- A question was asked if the \$70 million for Hardy is a very solid number or if it could be more.
 - Although there are no bids MSBA has looked at the costs and three firms have estimated costs. The \$70 million will handle any of the extra work that might be needed and there might be cost savings or the contingency funds will be used.
- Clarification was provided to a comment that the Hunnewell school was smaller than Hardy. Both schools are planned to have the same number of classrooms.
- A comment was made that it is short sighted to base a long-term plan, that has been developed over last 15 years, on a 2-year trend in enrollment. These buildings need to be replaced. When Hardy was built it was too small. We need to plan for the future. These buildings are not the type of building children should be learning in. It is important to move forward with the next step and we can't keep putting this off. Buildings that are currently in good condition will eventually experience deterioration over time. Hunnewell is the only school in that section of town.
- Additional clarification was provided that Hunnewell is 76,000 square feet and Hardy 80,000 square feet. The Hunnewell site has a smaller area and has wetlands.
- A comment was made that effectively building 2 schools at the same time feels extremely ambitious and introduces unpredictability and risk. Although acknowledging that 2 new schools need to be built, it is not understood why both need to be done at the same time. There is risk in doing 2 large projects at the same time. Although work has gone into planning Hunnewell, how viable is this design in the future? Can we put the plans away and be fine?
- As a result of a short 6-to-9-month delay because of COVID there is an elevation of the price. There will be an additional large cost increase by delaying one school. The town built a new high school and has been completing school building renovations for years. The town has a lot of knowledge on how to do this and has hired professional consultants to help. It was felt that this is our generation paying for the delay of the generation before us and buildings were not taken care of. We need the buildings and the longer we wait the more the cost goes up.

- A comment was made that the proposal is to approve Article 2 and 3 and that there is no proposal on the table to go from 6 to 5 schools. Delaying one project is keeping open a school with poor conditions.
- Another tour observation was provided and agreement expressed with the previous comments. It is important to make sure students are in the right environment to learn and to benefit from great teachers. During the tour it was observed in several classrooms that one room serves multiple purposes and separate dedicated space is lacking.
- A comment was made that it is clear both schools need to be replaced but it is a hard time to be doing both these projects at the same time and there are too many variables right now. It was felt that this project should be put on hold and then see what happens in the next couple of years.
- A comment was made that we need to be open eyed and clear about the population and that the kids are not coming back. A further statement was made that the birth rate is falling in the US and that there was no COVID baby boomlet. It was stated that the birth rate is not going to cause kids to come back and that it is difficult for young couples to move into Upham and Hunnewell because of the housing prices. An opinion was expressed that this is not the only way forward on these schools and that the plan for these schools should be on a rolling basis. It was stated that the use of modulars at Schofield is acceptable to the district but not acceptable at Hunnewell. It was felt that we can either support both schools or we decide about one school or the other. It was further stated that there were no significant changes to the Hunnewell design in the wake of COVID. For example, are common spaces a good idea with COVID? It was felt that this should have come back to Advisory with a design discussion. Further it was felt that it is an historic amount of debt for the town and greater than any other time in the history of Wellesley. A question was asked as to what this is going to look like when it goes to the polls. It was felt that putting 2 schools to the voters is not the way to get the schools done and that we need to turn back and do the right thing for the Town.
- A comment was made that the proponent has reviewed the facts, schools and plan and they feel it is the best plan. The modulars at Schofield were designed to be much more long term than those at Hunnewell. We are in fact replacing two (2) schools with one (1) school. COVID has turned our world upside down and the common spaces will help people spread out. We redid the library, a much newer building than Hardy and Hunnewell, because we felt it needed it to be done. We have two schools that need to be redone.
- A comment was made that there is a plan to take care of the schools that was started in 2005 and was updated in 2012 and will be updated as we evolve. Generationally these things were not taken care of before. The district has spoken with experts in enrollment and real estate. Young families move into many different districts in town. It was felt that we can't look at enrollment on a 2-year basis and that we need to look at it on a 10-year basis. It was felt that planning on 6 schools is a smart thing for Wellesley. A further comment was made that we don't know what the historic debt is for our town and information on historic debt was requested.
- A comment was made that these projects have significant financial impact but they have been vetted for years. PBC is comprised of professionals who, along with other professionals, have placed the right price tag on these projects. A comment was made that members of Advisory have the responsibility to look at two things - the financial impact on the Town and what the value is for our Town outside of the price tag. It is the responsible decision for us to move forward for the value it brings to Town and it is the most important thing on which we can weigh in. It was felt that Advisory has a dual role – financial and what the value proposition is for the Town.
- An opinion was expressed that we can't look at pure dollar figures and can't talk historical dollars. It was felt if we don't build these schools, they won't come. People evaluate communities and their choice could be affected by whether there are new schools. Communities around us, such as Newton and Needham, built new schools. The teaching staff is also attracted

to communities with better schools. If we continue to ask teachers to teach in the conditions in these schools, it was felt they will go elsewhere and the money invested in staff development is lost. We need to reinvest in our assets and we can coast on our reputation for only so long. The average tax bill being discussed is at the highest point. The enrollment contraction is going from 7 to 6 schools and it will be a long-contracted process to go to 5 schools. School age students are not evenly distributed throughout town.

- A comment was made that a long-term view on enrollment is needed. It was felt enrollment will come back. COVID has had a major effect on enrollment and we will get over this. It was felt we didn't have to be doing 2 schools at the same time. It was felt Hunnewell should have been done a while ago and that this could have been timed better. It is hoped that the \$70 million will cover everything for Hardy. It was felt that there is not a choice as the Town needs the schools. The surrounding towns such as Newton have been building schools over a period of time. We need to continue to invest in our children. Wellesley education has always been fundamental as to why people move to town.
- An opinion was expressed that premium prices for materials are inflating bids. It was felt that costs will come down and that there is no worry about delaying a project. It was felt that this will give us time to see if the 6th school is needed. It is believed that we shouldn't be building assets we don't need.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – no
Corinne Monahan - yes
Patti Quigley – yes
Tom Cunningham – no
Jake Erhard – no
Jeff Levitan – no
Doug Smith – yes
Susan Clapham - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Wendy Paul – yes
Pete Pedersen - yes
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action, 10 to 4.

Article 3

Shawn Baker made and Tom Cunningham seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 3, as proposed by the School Committee and Permanent Building Committee that the Town appropriate seventy million (\$70,000,000) dollars for the design, construction, equipping and establishing a new replacement facility for the John D. Hardy Elementary School under the direction of the Permanent Building Committee. The school is expected to have a useful life of 50 years. The Select Board may borrow amounts for completion of the project under applicable laws. The Town may be eligible for a grant from the MSBA up to the lesser of 34.9% of eligible, approved project costs or the maximum amount determined by the MSBA. Any grant amounts received will limit the amount of borrowing and the Town may incur. Any appropriation is subject to the Town approving a debt exclusion for the project.

Discussion:

- Support was expressed and the State is providing a significant contribution to this project.

- Support was expressed although in listening to Public Hearing speakers and reading emails received the main concerns expressed with Hardy are safety, cost, traffic, and environmental impact. It was felt that it was surprising that these things came up after all the work.
- Hardy is very early because of the MSBA process. All issues will be addressed the same way they were for Hunnewell.
- Safety about Route 9 is related to where children are redistricted from and the lengthy redistricting discussions and decisions.
- The traffic issues will be addressed with a Route 9 curb cut or circulation on site. PBC is working through all those issues. It is not known yet what the State will allow us to do for a slowdown lane. PBC has also talked about access through Lawrence Road. SMMA and the traffic consultant are working on the traffic. PBC's understanding of the goals/mandate around Hardy were to eliminate queuing on Weston Road. Three alternative plans were developed with SMMA on how to do that. School Committee has voted on one of the alternatives to accomplish that goal and this will be inserted into the SMMA plan. The plan needs to be reviewed with the police. The estimate of what it will cost to get the queuing off Weston Road is included in the total estimate. There is not a significant up charge.
- Route 9 access, as designed into the preliminary design, is an exit lane/transfer lane off Route 9 and needs to be approved by DOT. DOT will be concerned about queuing on Route 9. However, the plan does not utilize Route 9 in afternoon. The traffic engineer thinks it is safe.
- A question was asked if a traffic study will be completed before moving forward?
 - The vote will be before the traffic study is completed. The MSBA process requires the Town to vote in 120 days from the time the MSBA approves the project. They don't care what gets done or does not get done. MSBA wants a preferred solution and schematic design. Their focus is program and size of classroom. They don't care about traffic and the site. Traffic study is done with the number of cars queuing and the percentage number of families driving to school. The solution is to get cars off Weston Road for that purpose.

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 - yes
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action, 14 to 0.

Article 4

Shawn Baker made and Corinne Monahan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 4, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to transfer three parcels of land at 818, 822 and 826 Worcester Street to the School Committee for school purposes to be added to the land area of the Hardy

Approved October 6, 2021

School. The transfer is subject to an affirmative vote of the Town to approve a debt exclusion for the project issued under Article 2 of this Special Town Meeting.

Discussion

These three (3) properties have already been purchased by the town and this Article transfers ownership to School Committee to use for the Hardy project.

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 - yes
- Madison Riley – yes
- Shawn Baker – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action, 14 to 0.

Minutes Approval/Liaison Reports/Administrative Items

Liaison Reports

Schools/Jenn Fallon – School Committee voted for lights on Hunnewell field. This now goes to NRC. There was a debate about swing space. The approval of the lights will eventually come to Town Meeting for approval.
COA/Corinne Monahan Corinne - exercise equipment is being purchased; various activities are available; Thanksgiving dinner is being planned; open house Sat. October 2 and 3.

Minutes Approval

Jenn Fallon made and Al Ferrer seconded a motion to approve the September 22, 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 - yes
- Madison Riley – yes

Approved October 6, 2021

Shawn Baker – yes

September 22, 2021 minutes were approved, 14 to 0.

Corinne Monahan made and Doug Smith seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting .

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 - yes
Madison Riley – yes
Shawn Baker – yes

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m., 14 to 0.

Documents reviewed

<https://wellesleyma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/1300>

- PFAS Update – PowerPoint
- WPS Swing Space Redistricting 9.28.21 - PowerPoint