

**Advisory Committee Meeting  
Zoom Video Conference  
Wednesday, October 20, 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.

Neal Goins called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and introduced the above listed members of Advisory in attendance.

**Citizen Speak**

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

Also present were Meghan Jop, Executive Director, Town of Wellesley; Jeff Wechsler, Chair, Board of Public Works; Catherine Mirick, Chair, School Committee;; Jeff Damico, Owner's Project Manager (OPM), Compass; Tom Goemaat, Chair, PBC; Matt King, Permanent Building Committee (PBC); David Lussier, Superintendent, Wellesley Public Schools; Cyndy Mahr, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations, Wellesley Public Schools; Catherine Johnson, Chair, Planning Board; Don McCauley, Director, Planning Department; David Himmelberger, Wilder, Shea & Himmelberger.

**PFAS Update**

DPW met with the Select Board to move forward with an application for ARPA funding of \$1.5 million for the interim solution. At that meeting, there was a discussion of PFAS issues raised at the Board of Public Works meeting by two residents. The DPW director described the residents who were very knowledgeable of these matters (a doctor and a chemist). They are not in support of the plan to move forward. Their alternative proposal is to move forward exclusively with MWRA water. Based on the discussion, The proposed language of the ARPA funding application was modified to all to keep all options open. The plan for Article 6 is to move forward with the motion for building water treatment facilities. The DPW director indicated that additional facilities would need to be built if the Town were to use only MWRA water. The approval of the ARPA funding application will not be known before STM.

- A request was made to summarize the issue and the plan to move forward.
  - The alternative to switch to all MWRA supply would not meet current and future demand absent additional construction to increase capacity to meet the Town's demand. DPW feels the best course of action is to treat the Morses Pond well to diversify the Town's sources of water. The objective is to get plant back up and running.
- Clarification was requested of the demand from MWRA and other wells.
  - We struggled this summer to maintain water supply and we had a rainy summer and implemented water restrictions. We don't have current capacity through MWRA to meet demands.
- Is there supply with the MWRA connection?
  - MWRA would be happy to sell us water.
- A comment was made that Wellesley has a favorable cost situation because of its own wells. A question was asked that if the town were to go to MWRA would this increase costs.
  - Yes, this will cost more. There will be 15 – 20% rate increase for the use of MWRA water for this past summer and those bills will come due next year. If we were to go 100 percent MWRA then rate increases could be double the 15-20% increase for partial

MWRA use. We pay a premium for one million gallons. Morses Pond pumps 1.5 million gallons.

- A question was asked if there is a reason that citizens are bringing this up to stay with the State source and not local.
  - Their rationale is that they are coming at the issue from a public health perspective. The idea is that if the MWRA source has not had any PFAS detection, then it is preferable to drink that water rather than our treated water for PFAS. They are not convinced that treatment will be successful.
- Is the State water tested and how do we know doesn't have detection?
  - It is tested and it is non-detect.
- A comment was made that we would be at non-detect if treated.
  - MWRA water source is more protected versus our groundwater source with more development around it.
- Do we qualify for any State or federal funds?
  - We hope that we will be eligible for additional funding. We are looking into other funding sources.
- A comment was made that the quality of the MWRA water is not a given in the long term.
  - There is diversification by treating our own water. We never considered going to a single source because of the benefits of a diversified supply.
  - In addition, there is a timeline to get the amount of water we need and we can't do it today. It is a multiple year process and we will still have to use water on a local level.
- What is the timing of the ARPA process and when do we expect to hear back?
  - Norfolk County just opened the process and there are five levels of review but they have 50 percent of towns' funds on hand so that on approval funds are transferred at that time. It is expected to be weeks not months. They are trying to expedite the process when applications are received.
- Are we aware of any State level program to address this problem?
  - There is nothing available. We are working with DEP and everything is done with their guidance and approval.
- Are the filtration systems designed such that they can be replaced if standards change?
  - In general, yes but the specifics a little more complicated.
- Is the number we are looking at and approving borne by the rate payer?
  - Yes it will be a rate impact.

## Article 2 Update

Hunnewell final budget changes were presented and reviewed.

## Questions

- A question was asked about the \$1.2 million for photovoltaics (PV) for the Hardy project and why this amount was still in the budget.
  - It is in the number going to Town Meeting because this is the number that was in the total package when it was submitted to MSBA. The same number submitted to the State has to come to Town Meeting. However, this doesn't mean that the town will borrow the total amount. The intent is to have MLP partner with the School Committee on Hardy and those conversations will continue and School Committee will make a request from MLP for the funding of the PVs. This is a timing issue as the numbers for Hardy were submitted to the state the first week of July.
- A comment was made that the explanation of the steel bids should be provided at Town Meeting because it's not in the Advisory write up.
  - This is recognized and it is under control.

- A breakdown of \$2.8 million for busing and TLC was requested.
  - \$1.1 million is actual busing costs for an additional 6 buses plus a bus monitor and \$1.4 million is for TLC staffing across the 4 schools for two years
- Why is \$1.4 million needed for TLC?
  - It is in the swing space model approved by School Committee.
  - The TLC program will be across 4 schools and will need to be replicated across those schools and staff will be needed to support this in-district program. Putting all TLC students together in one school was evaluated but it was decided that it is more important to keep TLC students together with their peers and not all together as a unit.
- Confirmation was requested that the price of steel would be locked in December.
  - Yes
- A question was asked if PBC feels that there is enough contingency built into the price of steel.
  - Yes
- The rationale for not using Upham for the swing space was requested as this would eliminate the need for 6 buses and 5 teachers for two years.
  - School Committee looked at this option to understand all of the options. Option A for swing space had the least impact to the communities as the projects are completed. This method keeps students with peers and allows redistricting for the entire district at same time.
- What was cost of Option B on swing space? Confirmation was requested that if Hunnewell project is not approved that the swing space is entirely related to Hunnewell. Would Upham be available for a later Hunnewell project?
  - The cost delta between Option A and B was \$2 million. Hunnewell needs swing space because we are building at the site of current school, Hardy does not need swing space. The MSBA requirement is that when we exit the Upham school, it can't be used as a K-5 school without being rebuilt or drastically renovated. If we do that then we would have students continuing to learn in older schools for a longer period of time.
- How many children are in the Skills program?
  - 25 to 30 students. The Skills program is currently based at Upham.
- How many students are in the TLC program and what is the cost per student in the Swing Space Option A.
  - There are 15 students in the TLC program. The cost per student has not been calculated. We educate kids in the district how they need to be educated.
- A question was asked if the swing space costs were included in motion.
  - Debt exclusion will be for borrowing. Swing space is operational costs that will be funded from free cash. The ask of Town Meeting is the total amount broken down with capital costs and swing space operating costs coming from free cash. PBC has control of all capital funds.

### **Article 11 Update**

A Planning Report is required for Citizen Petition. Planning learned that the citizen group is not going forward with Article 11 at STM.

There was reluctance on the part of the Planning Board to endorse the rezoning. The Planning Board wanted to bring a more targeted article to Annual Town Meeting with the petitioners working with the Planning Board. Instead of the rezoning of the 2 parcels an amendment would be made to the General Residence district regarding permitted uses for properties that front on Washington street and Route 9.

### **Questions/Discussion**

- A comment was made that there are businesses all around and across the street.

Approved October 26, 2021

- The zoning district speaks to edges of the property and not across the street. Of the five properties in area – one is multi family; one has an historic overlay for General Residence; The Unitarian Church is General Residence; and the conservation land at the Clock Tower Park. This could seem like spot zoning if the two properties were re-zoned to business within this area.
- The petitioners recognize the Planning Board’s position on this and although they do not agree with some of the Planning Board’s’ decision they felt it to be a more pragmatic decision to come back in the spring.

## **Minutes Approval/Liaison Reports/Administrative Items**

### **Liaison Reports**

*Select Board/Patti*– met with Meghan Jop to discuss the schedule for ATM; presentations and ideas from department heads. There is recognition of the tight schedule. Meghan is working to combine calendars. Dates for Select Board presentations to Advisory are January 26, department budgets; February 16, Select Board articles; March 2, the final TWFP. Motion language is due February 4. Department heads have requested that instead of coming to Advisory twice that a video of an overview of department be provided. Two presentations are useful for Advisory - FMD capital presentation on November 15 (this will be taped) and December 13, the Select Board summit and talk about their budget.

*FMD/Audit/Madison Riley* – FMD will attend the January 19 Advisory meeting for questions on capital. Audit: At the recent audit meeting cyber security was the main topic of discussion. IT presented its efforts for training and backing up of data but despite their efforts there is a lot more that can be done. RFQ has been issued for an assessment of cyber security in the town. The is to start assessment in December.

*Recreation/PFTF/HR/Wendy Paul* – PFTF: combination restroom/team room/concession stand; and lighting package were discussed. Currently this is with NRC as the landowner to look at lighting and building projects. Concurrent sound and traffic studies are being conducted. Recreation: Moses Pond had another COVID summer with tremendous use. Recreation is looking at staffing and the layout of the dock which impacts staffing; the Moses Pond bathhouse study is underway but Recreation is not looking for an appropriation for the bathhouse due to workload of FMD. HR: there is a discussion around policy language; they are also discussing the 50/60 series as well as 40 series.

- What is the timing of the NRC vote on the lights?
  - It’s currently not on the meeting agenda.

*Library/Corinne Monahan* – the library is working on COVID policies; discussing their capital budget and updating the 5-year capital plan.

*DPW/Pete Pedersen* – In addition to PFAS previously discussed there were two additional items discussed at the recent DPW meeting. The cost of trash disposal is going up and DPW is in the process of getting bids from various trash haulers. There also was discussion about creating a storm water entity to handle storm water going forward and this will be discussed when DPW presents to Advisory.

- A question was asked that with the cost of the disposal of trash going up has there been any discussion of the Town providing trash pick-up.
  - There has been no discussion about this.
- What is intent with storm water ?
  - It is unclear – storm water to be paid for on an enterprise basis.

Approved October 26, 2021

*PBC/Al Ferrer* – In addition to the information presented tonight, PBC’s recent meeting and conversations were discussed and concern was expressed over the detail provided for the \$3.7 million and unanticipated supply issues with respect to the Hunnewell project.

- Clarification was provided and that some of the detail of the \$3.7 million for swing space was presented tonight but that more detail would be helpful.

**Minutes**

Jeff Levitan made and Madison Riley seconded a motion to approve the October 13, 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
- Shawn Baker – yes

October 13, 2021 minutes were approved, 14 to 0.

**Adjourn**

Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon 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 was adjourned at 8:48 p.m., 14 to 0.

Documents reviewed <https://wellesley.ma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/1317>

- Report of the Planning Board, 2021, STM, Citizens Petition
- Hunnewell ES Budget

Approved October 26, 2021

- Draft 10/13/21 Advisory minutes