

**Advisory Committee Meeting  
Zoom Video Conference  
Wednesday, October 7, 2020, 6:30 p.m.**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Shawn Baker, Julie Bryan, Tom Cunningham, Lauren Duprey, Jake Erhard, 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**

*Liza Oliver*, spoke in support of Article 28 and to correct misinformation. Her statement can be heard here. <https://www.wellesleymedia.org/advisory.html> at 2:04.

**Community Preservation Committee (CPC) – Article 9**

Barbara McMahon, Chair, CPC; Brandon Schmitt, Director, Natural Resources Commission (NRC); and Raina McManus, Chair, NRC were present. The NRC is the proponent of the request to utilize CPC funds for the construction of the Hunnewell bathrooms. There has been a change since CPCs last presentation to Advisory – Alternate A has been added to project to include the possibility of adding splits to heat the bathroom facility for comfortable, full three-season (not year-round) use. The inclusion of the splits is to make the facility a little more comfortable at the end of November and beginning of March. After discussions with NRC, Department of Public Works (DPW) and Playing Fields Task Force (PFTF), there was strong consensus and recommendation that this not be a year-round facility. A year-round facility would change the construction and maintenance features. DPW will assume responsibility for cleaning and maintenance of the facility. This project was discussed at length by CPC and unanimously approved. These bathrooms have been a topic of conversation all the way back to 2003 and 2004. At that time, handicapped accessibility was the issue.

**Questions and Comments:**

- Since these are not year-round bathrooms will they be closed in the winter?
  - They will be locked at certain times.
- Are they only available during sporting times? Concern was expressed about accessibility and if we are making them more inviting than they should be.
  - The goal is to have them open to the public during the time the park is open to the public and during the athletic season – dawn to dusk. Those times can be adjusted if more security is needed.
- Who is responsible for opening and closing them and who is going to own this?
  - Locks can be scheduled to open and close at a specific hour. It is a keypad lock.
- Is it possible to build a structure around a port-a-potty to it make less offensive to the eye as this seems a cheaper alternative?
  - There are environmental costs and issues with vandalism to port-a-potties.
- All the doors and entry will have to meet accessibility guidelines and this wasn't present in the former structure. There is no plan to bring a ramp down from the aqueduct.
- Without the \$50,000 for the splits, the facility could still be open for same period but it would just be cold.
- A comment was made that Wellesley is an active town and people are outside even more. Is there any way that these can be utilized throughout the year if we are spending this large amount of money? With climate change we might not see pipes freezing as early as in the past.

- The fundamental question is what is this building intended to do. To make it weatherproof requires a different construction and is more expensive. The fields will not be in use in the winter.
- Why would you build a more expensive building and insulate it when the use doesn't justify the increased expense?
- How much more are we talking about to winterize the facility?
  - Not sure if we have that answer. A lot of time was spent speaking with former DPW director and PFTF people. There is a very strong feeling that there is not a demand for that type of bathroom during December, January and February. Many people feel we need this type of structure in other areas of town and we need to prioritize the funds for other needs around town. Bathrooms are needed at other areas for the playing season.
- An opinion was expressed that many people are using the park and if the bathroom is not open in the winter can this be revaluated after a couple of years?
- A question was asked about when the bathroom would be completed.
  - Once papers and contracts are signed, the structure could be constructed over the winter offsite and installed as early as late spring.
- Does this need a permit?
  - Yes.
- The cost is \$120,000 from previously approved funds plus \$525,000 from CPC.

### **Update on contract settlements**

The DPW Production settlement was reviewed. It is a three-year contract. The FMD contract is not ready and may not be ready for STM.

### **Questions**

- At the RDF, does someone have to approve the approach?
  - There are a number of long-term employees and newer employees. The settlement is designed to reward and retain long term employees and strong-performing employees. In addition, there are recruiting efforts and bringing people into this field can be challenging. Benchmarking was utilized.
- What is the financial impact of those at step 6 and going to step 7 and is that in the increase or will that be realized by the town later?
  - It is reflected in the cost of impact.
- Has the vehicle location system been acquired?
  - These are beginning to be sourced, and as part of capital the town will be purchasing a subset of these. It is a phased approach because it is cost prohibitive to do it all at once.

### **Discussion and Vote on STM 2 Articles**

#### **Article 2, Motion 1**

Neal Goins made and Jeff Levitan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 1, as proposed by the Board of Selectmen, to see if the Town will vote to take action on certain Articles set forth in this warrant by a single majority vote, pursuant to a consent agenda. The Advisory Committee has unanimously recommended favorable action on each of the Articles, and accompanying Motions thereunder, to be included in the majority vote consent agenda, and they are:

Article 3, Motion 1: Library Supplemental (Personnel/Expenses Correction)

**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 – yes  
Tom Cunningham – yes  
Lauren Duprey – absent  
Neal Goins – yes

Motion passed unanimously 13 to 0.

**Article 2, Motion 2**

Neal Goins made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 1, as proposed by the Board of Selectmen, to see if the Town will vote to take action on certain Articles set forth in this warrant by a single supermajority vote, pursuant to a consent agenda. The Advisory Committee has unanimously recommended favorable action on each of the Articles, and certain accompanying Motions, to be included in the supermajority vote consent agenda, and they are:

Article 13:	Granite Street Land Taking
Article 15:	Amend Establishment of Districts to add Large Scale Solar Overlay District Title (Approved ATM 2017)
Article 19:	Delete Temporary Moratorium on Marijuana Establishments
Article 20:	Amend Registered Marijuana Dispensary Regulations
Article 29:	Rescind or Transfer Debt

**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 – yes  
Tom Cunningham – yes  
Lauren Duprey – yes  
Neal Goins – yes

Motion was unanimously approved 14 to 0.

### **Article 3**

An update on the Board of Health (BOH) expenses was provided, and since they are lower than what was already voted they don't need to be re-voted. (The total amount of the tax impact is \$61,000, while the original number included CARES money.)

### **Article 4, Motion 3**

Neal Goins made and Corinne Monahan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 4, Motion 3, as proposed by the Board of Selectmen, that the Town amend the vote taken under Motion 2 of Article 8 of the 2020 Annual Town Meeting by increasing the sum appropriated to the Board of Public Works by \$194,399, said additional sum to be raised by a transfer from General Government Provision for Contract Settlements, to the Department of Public Works, as set forth in the Motion and Warrant for this 2020 Special Town Meeting including the agreed-upon Pay Schedules.

### **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 – yes  
Tom Cunningham – yes  
Lauren Duprey – yes  
Neal Goins – yes

Motion was unanimously approved 14 to 0.

### **Article 9, Motion 1**

Neal Goins made and Mary Scanlon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 9, Motion 1, as proposed by the Community Preservation Committee, to see if the Town will vote to appropriate \$524,450 to the Department of Public Works for construction of a restroom facility at Hunnewell Field, such appropriation to be funded with funds made available entirely from the Community Preservation Fund undesignated balance, as set forth in the Motion and Warrant for this 2020 Special Town Meeting.

### **Discussion and Comments:**

- Concern was expressed about overall costs and that the project has been around for over a decade.
- Much research was done; this is not just a set of port-a-potties, and it is something that cannot get tipped over or vandalized.
- This is a good use of CPC money.
- Many alternatives have been discussed and considered, and trust was expressed that the research is complete.
- Bathrooms are needed at these locations. Strong support was expressed for this. It is believed that CPC has done its homework.
- A suggestion was made that NRC and CPC provide appropriate background information at Town Meeting.

- A question was asked about the cost of facilities in neighboring communities, and whether this is comparable in cost. This wasn't brought up but it is a good question.
- Concern was expressed that this is being brought forth during a time when the town is looking at a debt exclusion that's very costly. Addition concern was expressed that it could be the tip of the iceberg, i.e. that bathrooms in other locations will be proposed. Although a solution to the bathrooms is needed, concern was expressed about whether this type of facility is the best choice. Do we know if we have the right prioritization for all these projects?
- Concern was expressed that there were still some red flags and a question was asked if CPC had experience with this size building or should PBC manage it.
- CPC is a grant making committee and this would not be a CPC-run construction project. Once the money is appropriated to DPW, then DPW is responsible for the building. CPC has made grants larger than this grant. CPC is not the administrator of the project. CPC is the steward of the town's CPC money and there is a set of criteria that projects need meet before money is granted. This bathroom is a priority for the people using the fields. CPC takes these projects very seriously and this project fits into CPC's Financial plan. For example, CPC money can't be used to build a new school or to pave a road. This is the reason the town signed onto the CPC Act.
- This is not a PBC project. Prefabricated structures and fields are under DPW jurisdiction.
- NRC is the proponent. It is NRC land. The bathrooms are part of the original master plan from the PFTF.
- Fields are under the jurisdiction of various boards.
- It would be helpful to learn what comparable communities spent on similar structures. It is challenging to get comparable community information. This is a ten-year problem the town has been trying to solve. The mobile solution of the port-a-john was a substandard solution. Container bathrooms were grossly over bid. This proposal is for what it takes to build a building that is not fancy in anyway except to provide a permanent bathroom that can be done in a sustainable way. Looking at comparable communities can be helpful but it doesn't reflect today's prices. This is meeting current standards. Nevertheless, NRC will try to get a cost from Natick for TM.
- In 2015 – 2016, NRC came to Advisory with a structure costing \$300,000 and it was deemed too expensive back then.
- Due diligence has been completed on cost and comparables by CPC.
- In sum, there are three issues being raised -- 1) Have we looked at comparables in other towns to make sure the bids are appropriate; 2) Are there cheaper alternatives that would meet our standards/criteria; and 3) Is this part of a prioritized plan for restroom facilities at Town fields. The proponents provided responses on all three points.

**Roll call vote**

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

Neal Goins – yes

Motion was approved 11 to 3.

**Administrative Matters/Liaison Reports/Minutes**

**Minutes Approval**

Mary Scanlon made and Deed McCollum seconded a motion to approve the September 30, 2020 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 – yes  
Tom Cunningham – yes  
Lauren Duprey – yes  
Neal Goins - yes

Minutes were unanimously approved 14 to 0.

**Liaison reports**

*Recreation / Mary Scanlon* – Recreation ran a summer program within constraints of the virus. Also, they are bringing a request to Annual Town Meeting for the renovation of Morses Pond for \$5 million; CPC is offering to fund some of it but not all, and CPC is enthusiastic about the project.

A comment was made that the background of the Morses Pond renovation should be provided to the new members of Advisory. An additional comment was made that all boards should look at the TWFP to see where the capital projects fall in terms of timing.

*Schools / Jenn Fallon* – SC held a seminar for TMM about the H and the U of the HHU projects. There were not too many questions and the meeting ended early

Non-TMM Advisory members need to request Zoom access to Special Town Meeting from KC or Brian Dupont.

**9:05 p.m. Adjourn**

Patti Quigley 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 – yes  
Tom Cunningham – yes  
Lauren Duprey – yes  
Neal Goins – yes