

Approved February 16, 2022

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Saturday, February 12, 2022, 9:00 a.m.**

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

Neal Goins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introduced members of Advisory in attendance.

Citizen Speak

Odessa Sanchez, spoke in support of Article 44 and the return to Academic Excellence. She stated that she has seen a decline in education at WPS.

Discussion of previous presentations to Advisory (Planning Budget, School Budget, WHA Board, and Citizen Petition)

Planning Budget

- A comment was made that there is some difficulty with this budget while recognizing the hard work of the Planning Department and the volunteer Planning Board.
- Support was expressed for making the half time position full time recognizing that it is hard to hire part time for some specific jobs. However, it was felt that it doesn't make sense to put in new positions when existing budgeted position have not been filled. It was felt that the need for new people cannot be analyzed until there is a full staff.
- A comment was made that Planning is an important part of the town and that goals and development depend on Planning to do their job. It was felt it would make more sense to stop making changes to bylaws and instead focus on reorganizing and hiring the right people and set the goals and process. A suggestion was made to benchmark with other towns to see if there is a better process. It was felt that we get stuck in the same thing we've done for a while without stopping and analyzing that process.
- A comment was made that a certified planner heading the department would make a lot of sense.
- Concern was expressed about the \$50,000 for consulting when Planning didn't use the \$25,000 last year. The \$10,000 was spent on a management consultant rather than someone to help the Planning department plan. Advertising went up when so much is done online for advertising for positions.
- It was felt that leadership needs to stop and look at Planning – similar to what was done with the COA. It was felt an overhaul was necessary to move Planning forward for the next 10 years.
- Agreement with the previous speaker was expressed. The workload in the Planning Department has increased but the salaries of existing personnel are not keeping up with inflation. Planning has not been able to hire because salaries are not comparable. A request was made for a benchmarking of salaries.
- A comment was made that we should be able to charge higher fees to help with the salaries particularly given the large and expensive homes in town. If fees were increased the town would have more money to hire the people at market rate. It was felt that the Planning Department should be making a list of "lessons learned" over the last 10 years. It was felt that the town is less attractive and how can this be improved and then advise the SB. Concern was expressed over the approach and it was felt that Planning needs an analysis of themselves to go forward. It was felt that \$50,000 for management consulting is not a lot to ask.

- Agreement with the previous speakers was expressed and at the end of the day this department has been under resourced for a while and asked to do things. Planning seems to be paying for the “sins of the past.” Current zoning looks like spot zoning. This Planning Board is trying to correct this but it’s not easy. They need the employees. If Arlington has 10 people in a Planning department, why is that? It is difficult to ask for more when Planning hasn’t filled existing positions. The Planning department is different than most departments in town and to do the job correctly the skill level is needed.
- Support for the Planning budget was expressed as the \$50,000 for consulting is needed. An additional comment was made that the town needs to listen to what is said in the management consulting report.
- A comment was made that there is no question the workload in Planning is extraordinary and they do not have the resources to get the work done. It is unclear as to what the resources are given the workload. It was felt that additional funds need to be put towards positions to meet the market rate. Support for Planning was expressed because its needs are so tremendous and the work extraordinary and there needs to be a path forward. It was felt a fee structure should be put in place to support Planning’s work. It was felt that given the service provided it should be met with some type of fee structure.
- A comment was made that it is a myth that fees can cover the salaries. It is nice to think we can raise fees to cover the personnel but it is not realistic given the volume and what the market will bear. Based on an unofficial survey of other towns, each town structures Planning differently. Wellesley has 30,000 residents with 3.5 planners; Newton has triple the population with 24 on the planning staff; there are 15 planners in Brookline with double the population. The staffing concerns are real and we need to look at the big picture if we look at 8 or 9 other towns. The staffing numbers should be higher.
- It was agreed that fees need to be correlated to specific things and that fees can’t be built to cover the costs. The question was asked why we all are guessing and why we are not talking to a planner to get the answers as to why other towns have so many planners; what they are doing that Wellesley is not. An additional comment was made that it is not clear that we are “paying for the sins of the past” as we had two planners in the past and what has happened since then. We have had no one who is qualified do the analysis of the Planning Department. An additional comment was made that we would not allow this in the schools and we did not allow this in the COA. Planning needs to be evaluated. It needs to stop and figure out where it is going.
- Clarification was provided to an earlier comment that it was understood that additional fees could not fully support additional staff. But the salaries that we are offering are not high enough to attract people. The suggestion was made to increase the fees to offset part of the salaries.
- A comment was made that the discussion does not sound like a short answer with more data from Planning but that we are talking about a broader more holistic approach. An additional comment was made that we can ask all the questions but we do not know the questions to ask. It was felt that it is more appropriate to have someone who is a certified planner complete a comprehensive study that would be expected from any department that has grown past its ability,

WHA

- Several members expressed support for this Article.
- A comment was made that the presentation was helpful to understand the difference between WHDC and WHA.

School Budget

- Explanation of the voting on Article 8, the Omnibus budget was provided and Advisory will be voting on the entire budget in one vote. Individual budgets that are over guideline will be voted

supportive or unsupportive. Further clarification was provided that individual budgets can be amended at Town Meeting with a motion from the floor.

- A comment was made that if things were clearly laid out in the school budget then the budget could be supported. However, it feels like the schools are hiding what their real intent is. For example, the schools couldn't have been more confusing about FTEs. They are bringing in more support staff as subs, or assistants and their cost is a fraction of what it costs for new teachers. It looks like there is a 10 to 1 ratio of staff to students, but that is not true. A further comment was made that it seems what the schools are focusing on is not giving the students a good education. It was felt that the focus on academic excellence and student well-being should be tied together. It was felt that Wellesley seems to be not focusing on academic excellence. Every year the budget increases and the schools seem to get worse. It was further stated that the member does not support the school budget.
- Another member commented that he will vote against the school budget and against the Omnibus budget to send a message. It was further commented that the school population has gone down and the employees are going up. It was felt that the schools need a large reduction in costs and that they are overstaffed. An additional comment was made that the schools need to get costs in line and get employee numbers in line and focus on curriculum. It was further stated that the school department is out of control. It was felt that we are running a business and it needs to be run like running a business.
- Another member agreed with the previous speakers up to a point. It was felt that with the number of students going down and the number of employees going up the answers from the schools were unsatisfying. It was asked why the numbers are going in a different direction. A suggestion was made for future Advisory Committees to get a sense of the IT budget as it appears they don't have a plan to level technology expenditures over time. There doesn't appear to be a phased retirement approach to purchases. It was suggested in the future it might be good to have the schools come in to talk about infrastructure and technology separately. Concerns were expressed about the identified trends and the IT budget. Separately the schools can come in and talk about staffing.
- A member commented that the school budget is within guideline and new initiatives being proposed with math specialists at the elementary level and school adjustment counselors, are still within budget guidelines set by the Select Board. It was further commented that it was understood that Advisory's role is not to run the schools but to look at financial expenditures. School Committee is ultimately responsible for making decisions to spend funds. When the schools were asked to reduce their capital budget they did that to bring it within guidelines. They made the effort to respect the limits set by the town. The schools are addressing issues raised about academic concerns.
- Agreement with the previous speaker was expressed and the comment made that the schools did come in within guidelines. It was felt that the academics are strong and the excellence is there. There is a decrease in enrollment numbers but the schools need to compensate for the pandemic and help students catch up. The IT budget needs to be examined. Do the schools have turnback?
 - Yes there was turnback. They did come within guidelines which is better than previous years.
- It was agreed that the schools are with in guideline and at some level it is hard to argue with line items. However, this is seen as an opportunity to make a statement about the overall direction of school system. It was felt that the enrollment issue is a major issue. People are voting with their feet and leaving the system. It was further commented to suggest it is just the pandemic or demographics is not acceptable and the member will not support the budget on this basis. It was also felt that a previous exchange regarding questions on the bucket of \$1.6 million was unclear and support for the Omnibus budget will be withheld for this reason.
- A member commented on the quality of schools based on personal experience with five children who went through the Wellesley Public Schools. All had no issue academically and socially at

the next phase. An additional comment was made about the decline in students and increase in FTEs. It was also felt the IT budget needs further study.

- A general comment was made that the budget document gives a lot of detail.
- A comment was made that the amount of information provided is the most seen in 10-15 years. It was felt that Cyndy Mahr has buttoned up budget and finance over this period of time. An additional comment was made that the schools talked about the \$1.6 million which in the past has never been identified. In the past it was not known if it was in the Select Board or School Committee budget. And they cannot talk about it in detail because it will jeopardize negotiations, but it was felt that the fact that they included it is great.
- A comment was made that the principals, teachers, superintendent, and the central office care about the kids and the programming. Adding the math specialists is important as many teachers do not come out of teaching programs with a high level of math training. Subs have always been an issue for the district so having permanent subs is another step forward in making sure kids feel comfortable in the environment and it saves money.
- A comment was made that the IT budget is very detailed and there is a detailed plan. The IT budget has taken a hit over at least the last 6 years when the schools needed to cut capital. It was felt that there are some things such as enrollment and why we are not redistricting earlier that are concerning. It was felt that perhaps there are things that could save money but it cannot take away from the social and emotional learning and the academics. It was felt that the students are well taken care of.
- A comment was made that although the school budget is within guidelines, it does not mean money is adequately allocated. It was felt that Advisory should act as manager of funds. The WPS overview, goals and accomplishments were cited and it was felt that students should not be global citizens and that they should be focusing on being good U.S. citizens. It was felt that there is nothing in the WPS statement about working with parents. It was further commented that specific initiatives were mentioned but the details did not show this. A question was asked as to the actions school system is taking to catch up for the two years suffering during the pandemic.
- A comment was made that we do not have a system in place of determining why students are pulling out and going to other schools. It was suggested that perhaps an independent evaluation of the school system is needed. An additional comment was made that saying that the U.S. News and World Report is wrong, is not the right attitude and that something needs to be done. If we felt that academic excellence has declined over the last seven years. An additional comment was made that it is uncertain how to vote on this – approve it as it is within guidelines but perhaps add recommendations to the write up. It was added that the number of students is dropping and it appears to be higher than in other school systems. Uncertainty on how to vote on this was expressed.
- A member expressed empathy for the schools as they are running a labor-intensive business. However, it was felt that it was difficult to follow the approach to the budget related to head count and FTEs in the time of declining enrollment.
- A comment was made that there is so much information in the school budget and it can be seen as a very confusing budget. An additional comment was made that the schools are not a business and sometimes what has to be done does not make business sense. An example was provided of a student with high special needs. WPS is taking kids along to be full members of their peers and this requires aides. It was further commented that this may not make sense from a top picture down.
- A comment was made that as a non-educational professional, we should trust the professionals to make decisions as to what is a good education. It was felt that perhaps there could be more transparency. But there is a law that we must teach every child. An additional comment was made that the schools meet the students where they are. Enrollment it is what it is and it was felt that the schools keep an eye on it. The schools are taking a full school offline and will save

money with permanent substitutes. It was felt that the elimination of the lower-level math aides and replacing them with higher level of math specialists will help with math. School adjustment counselors are being hired to help with the social and emotional wellness. It was felt that these measures will help address the whole child. FTEs go down because of enrollment but the schools used this to fill in with these additional resources. It was felt that the building assistant is critical because there is no assistant principal at the elementary level. It was felt that the schools are trying to do what is best for the students. A comment was made that the information is in the budget document.

- A long view was offered based on personal experience. It was commented that the level of rigor that goes into the budget preparation has come a long way and that here is a high level of detail that was missing in the past. The build-up of the final project is weeks of work by staff to identify the needs. There is a lot that doesn't make it into the budget. What does make it in budget reflects things that teachers feel are needed. The FTEs reflect the needs in the classrooms and the buildings and is addressing the social and emotional needs of students and the math needs which suffered during the pandemic. There are pre-pandemic needs that are being addressed. The budget comes within guideline. It was felt that there are tremendous professionals working in the schools. A comment was made that we have professionals in town bringing forth this budget that we need for the students. It was felt that the Zoom meeting platform and the need for information and there was less time to work with School Committee impacted Advisory's review of the budget. It was felt there is an opportunity going forward to have different level of engagement with the schools.
- A comment was made that the budget is within guideline but comparing it to Planning's budget who are so overworked. It was agreed that the schools are doing a great job in many areas. However, it was felt that the focus of the budget is of concerned. An additional comment was made that the budget keeps going up and that just because it is in guideline doesn't mean it is correct. An opinion was expressed that the standards are dropping. It was agreed that Wellesley students are successful but it was felt there is a shift in the thinking of the school system. It was felt that academic excellence and the focus on social wellness are not mutually exclusive and that the U.S. News and World Report ranking is a factor and a realistic point of view even if it is not the only point. It was felt that we need to address why people are leaving town. It was felt replacing teachers with less qualified individuals is not the answer.
- A comment was made that Advisory does not only look at finances as a finance committee does but Advisory has a broader mandate to look at everything in a department. It was expressed that the role of Advisory to Town Meeting is to advise if something doesn't seem right. It was further commented that the head count issue is difficult. The transparency was questioned. Concern was expressed that DE&I does not have its own budget. It was felt that knowing the number of teachers of color is an important statistic. It was felt that there were issues in the IT budget and the direction of IT was questioned. It was felt that School Committee was unwilling to ask the hard questions and that Advisory has an opportunity to take a position and to let Town Meeting know that it is not happy with the way things going. It was further commented that yes, schools are within guideline but that doesn't mean anything. It was felt that Advisory should let town meeting know that it is not happy with the school budget because it is not transparent.
- Advisory's bylaw regarding oversight was referenced (11.3).
- A comment was made that the schools are not running a business system but they are running an education system. It was felt to extent the schools are not spending money efficiently then money should not continue to be layered on and that all expenses need to be reassessed and that the schools are over resourced. An additional comment was made that there is additional money in the overall budget for maintenance at the schools. An opinion was expressed that the schools are draining the coffers of the town and that 60 percent of the town's budget is spent on schools even

though enrollment is going down. It was felt that we need to send a message to the schools. A comment was made that the guidelines are not mandates.

- A comment was made that there is much detail in the budget document and the detail is there even though the schools didn't specifically review it in their presentation. It was suggested that maybe there be a deep dive next year into SPED and IT spending. It was reiterated that there is a vast amount of data in the budget book. An additional comment was made about the concerns expressed about the school budget and the budget is large but a large portion of the budget is consumed by a certain percentage for steps and lanes. It was felt the district is addressing concerns. There is an overriding need to pay the staff. It was felt that the schools do a great deal of work to meet the needs of the students.
- A request was made for transparency around why students are leaving the district. A request was made to ask School Committee for the data they have collected.
- Support for education was expressed but it was felt that the story does not make sense. It was felt that the expenses do not reflect taking a school offline. It was felt that even though there is declining enrollment the expenses are increasing. An opinion was expressed that there is a crisis in confidence in what is going on in the schools. It was felt it does not matter how much data there is to support decisions, the confidence behind the data is not there.
- A comment was made that the schools, in addition to meeting the needs of the students, have a long-term strategic plan that they are trying to implement pieces of as well. An additional comment was made that the schools are taking the opportunity in the reduction of classroom teachers to add math specialists and other things. They are funding the strategic initiative within the budget guideline rather than through an override or by going over guideline. It was felt that the schools are trying to address areas about which people have raised concern while remaining fiscally responsible. The people in the education business believe in the students and try to meet the needs of all students. It was felt that the schools are within the budget guidelines and that Advisory shouldn't be doing the job of School Committee.
- A comment was made that there is not a question of the integrity of School Committee or the commitment of teachers to education. However, it was felt that too many issues have been raised. It was felt that there is no connection with local colleges in terms of students providing free tutoring. It was felt that an independent audit of school system is needed. It was felt there needs to be a look at the effectiveness of the funds being spent.
- A comment was made that the commentary in the Advisory Report should reflect the wide variety of concerns that need to be addressed by the school leadership.

Citizen Petition – Academic Excellence

- Support for the intent of the Citizen Petition was expressed. A comment was made that the need is understood but it is not clear how it would work. It was felt there is not enough work done to define the mechanics and how it would translate into action? This petition may be supported because it is necessary. An opinion was expressed that School Committee and the schools have their own agenda.
- Agreement with the previous speaker was expressed and that the priority of the school system should be academic excellence. It was felt that this is the right intent but the mechanics are not clear.
- Agreement with the previous speakers was expressed and agreement that the town needs this. It was felt that academic excellence is not a racist thing. It was felt that academic excellence helps everyone. It was felt that we as a community should focus on the education of all students so they can succeed when they leave schools. It was felt that this will be positive if done properly
- A comment was made that the Citizen Petition does not accomplish anything and it is not put together well. A request was made to hear back from School Committee about a town wide committee that was put together several years ago to evaluate what we are measuring schools on

and how that is being measured which was to be issued in The Report Card. An additional comment was made about how we measure academic excellence. It was further commented that we also need to ask how our children are surviving and that mental health cannot be ignored. It was felt that it is not clear what this petition is doing.

- A question was asked if the petitioners will make a formal motion which would outline the mechanism.
- Agreement was expressed with comments by previous speakers. It was felt that tactically one thing the schools can do is have more AP courses.
- Agreement with previous speakers was expressed and it is difficult to untangle this discussion from the previous conversation on the budget. It was felt that the school system is not perfect and that there is work that still needs to be done but the school system should not be evaluated as the same way as a business. It was felt that the Citizen Petition is too vague to be helpful.
- Agreement with the previous comments was expressed. A comment was made that there it is not a clear structure as to how this would be implemented. The intent and priorities of the proponents were questioned. A comment was made about the peer pressure to take AP courses and that if students only take AP courses to compete with each other then it might not be the right path to take.
- Support was expressed for the passion and conviction of the proponents and it was felt that this is coming from a good place. However, it was felt that this is not the way to address the concerns by managing the curriculum through town bylaws. There are channels to manage this such as voting and people need to get engaged with what is happening. Low voter turnout was cited. It was felt that this is not the appropriate way to influence the curriculum.
- A comment was made that there are five positions on School Committee and that parents who want to be involved can run for office. It was felt that a focus on academic excellence is specifically removing attention from tasks that focus on the whole child such DE&I. No support for this Article was expressed.
- Agreement with previous speakers was expressed. It was felt that academic excellence is a goal for the schools but that the way this is formulated is problematic. The metrics and how goals are set are problematic. An additional comment was made that ratings can be gamed routinely. It was felt that running schools through various petitions is not the best way. There are School Councils at each school with parent members. It was felt that there is a lot of opportunity for parent input.
- No support of the petition was expressed and a comment made that if someone is unhappy about the system, then they should run for office and do something about it. It was felt that we cannot micromanage the School Committee. Frustration with the petition was expressed and how it would be initiated questioned.
- A comment was made that the education of whole child should be supported and that academic excellence is one piece of the bigger picture. It was felt that carving it out as it appears doesn't seem appropriate.
- A comment was made that the proponent did present an action plan including a parent advisory group of seven members.

Discussion and Vote on 2022 ATM Warrant Articles

Article 2: Shawn Baker made and Patti Quigley 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

Jennifer Fallon – yes

Approved February 16, 2022

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 on Article 2, 14 to 0.

Article 4: Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 4, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, that the Town vote to amend the General Bylaws by making changes to the Classification and Salary Plans, relating to the establishment of new classifications, reclassifications of current positions, and the deletion of classifications, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

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 on Article 4, 14 to 0.

Article 5, Motion 1: Shawn Baker made and Patti Quigley seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 1, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, that the Town vote to further amend the Salary Plan established at the 1950 Annual Town Meeting, effective July 1, 2022, as recommended by the Human Resources Board, by striking the existing pay schedule for the non-bargaining unit, non-management personnel (Job Groups 40-49) and inserting the new schedule as set forth in the Motion and Warrant.

Roll Call Vote

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

Approved February 16, 2022

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 on Article 5, Motion 1, 14 to 0.

Article 5, Motion 2: Shawn Baker made and Susan Clapham seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 2, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, that the Town vote to further amend the Salary Plan established at the 1950 Annual Town Meeting, effective July 1, 2021, as recommended by the Human Resources Board, by striking the existing pay schedule for the Merit Pay Plan (Job Groups 50-69) and inserting the new schedule as set forth in the Motion and Warrant.

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 on Article 5, Motion 2, 14 to 0.

Article 5, Motion 3: Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 5, Motion 3, as proposed by the Human Resources Board, that the Town vote to appropriate \$185,000 to the Human Resources Board for the purpose of granting salary increases to employees in Job Groups 50 and above in the classification plan.

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 February 16, 2022

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

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 5, Motion 3, 14 to 0.

Article 29: Shawn Baker made and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 29, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town change the reporting structure of the Climate Action Director from the Climate Action Committee to the Executive Director and update related language in Section 19.

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 on Article 29, 14 to 0.

Article 49: Shawn Baker made and Susan Clapham seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 49, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to authorize the Select Board to appoint one or more of their own number as fire engineers.

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 on Article 19, 14 to 0.

Article 38, Motion 1: Shawn Baker made and Madison Riley seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 38, Motion 1 as proposed by the Planning Board, that the Town amend the general

provisions by adding a section to the Purpose section to promote sustainable building and land use practices.

Discussion

- Several members expressed support for the motion. Comments included:
 - It would have been better if Planning had waited and worked more with CAC.
 - CAC is behind this article
 - The bylaw allows for regulations to be written
 - It is difficult to be against sustainability which is desperately needed.
 - It was felt that this is making work for a board that is underwater.
 - Sustainability should be part of the planning approach.
 - Support expressed for having a sustainable planner. This would be better than imbedding it in everything that is being done.
 - Need to recognize that an external board is putting pressure on Planning Board and there is direct tension between the two.
- Support was expressed for the sustainability goals and action plan of the town but that a plan, that we don't know yet, is being incorporated by reference.
- An additional comment was made that this should be more precise and specify what the guidelines are. It was felt that the goals at this point are open ended.
- A comment was made that climate action goals were approved and the name of the committee changed but that these were goals and not a mandate. A request was made to acknowledge what said last year on this issue in the Advisory Report. Support for goals was expressed but it was felt these should not be open ended and subject actions of another committee on how planning deals with these.
- Agreement with previous speakers' comments was expressed. An additional comment was made that Wellesley should not do more than the state and federal government as this will put Wellesley at a competitive disadvantage.

Wendy Paul made and Doug Smith seconded a motion to table the vote on Article 38, Motion 1 to allow for time to review Advisory's previous Reports and discussions on this topic before voting.

Discussion

- Several members felt Advisory is not ready to vote on this for this now and that it is important to look at the history of Advisory's considerations.

Roll Call Vote to table the vote on Article 38, Motion 1

Jennifer Fallon – yes

John Lanza – yes

Corinne Monahan - absent

Patti Quigley - yes

Tom Cunningham – yes

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

Approved February 16, 2022

The vote on Article 38, Motion 1 was tabled, 11 to 2.

Article 38, Motion 2: Shawn Baker made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 38, Motion 2 as proposed by the Planning Board, that the Town amend the Project Approval for Projects of Significant Impact to require a greenhouse gas emission study be performed by engineers with expertise in the area and include a review of it by the Planning Board.

Discussion

- A comment was made that Wellesley should not be imposing requirements that are not imposed by any other agency
- It was felt that a requirement is being put in the bylaw.

John Lanza made and Shawn Baker seconded a motion to table the vote on Article 38, Motion 2.

Discussion

- Several members expressed support to table the vote on Article 38, Motion 2 to review previous Advisory considerations on this.
- A comment was made that we do not want to get ahead of regulations and this is a rapidly changing are. It was felt that the rules will change again.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes

John Lanza – yes

Corinne Monahan - absent

Patti Quigley - yes

Tom Cunningham – yes

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

The vote on Article 38, Motion 2 was tabled, 11 to 2.

Article 38, Motion 3: Shawn Baker made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 38, Motion 3 as proposed by the Planning Board, that the Town amend section 22 Design Review to include a review of greenhouse gas emissions by the Design Review Board.

Discussion

- A comment was made that we should not have for ourselves if more than state and federal– less competitive situation. There is talk at federal level for regulations and the state is doing a similar thing. Let’s postpone the decision until we feel comfortable.

Shawn Baker made and John Lanza seconded a motion to table the vote on Article 38, Motion 3 consistent with the prior motions to review previous Advisory Reports for the history of this issue.

Discussion

Approved February 16, 2022

- A comment was made that the 2020 STM commentary and other Advisory Reports contain information as well.
- A comment was made that the Climate Action Plan follows what the state is doing therefore if the state comes out with regulations they will be incorporated.

Roll Call Vote

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

The vote on Article 38, Motion 3 was tabled, 11 to 2.

Article 38, Motion 4: Shawn Baker made and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 38, Motion 4 as proposed by the Planning Board, that the Town amend Section 1D to include a definition of “heat pump” and amend Section 19 YARD REGULATIONS to allow heat pumps in setback areas of properties as defined in the Motion.

Discussion

- It was noted that this motion is different than the previous ones in that it makes technical changes to allow people to do something rather than imposing rules that may carry additional costs. Potentially environmentally friendly way to do so. This is prescriptive rather than open ended.
- Agreement with previous speaker – support voting on this one and not tabling
- Agreement expressed – technology advancing too – this is reflective of today’s technology
- Agreement expressed – making process easier not imposing burdens on homeowners
- Support expressed by multiple members – specificity appropriate; reduces a barrier for those who want to install these; this is more closely tied to the building and not an aspirational goal. Specific and measurable.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – yes
Corinne Monahan - absent
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 February 16, 2022

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

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 38, Motion 4, 13 to 0.

Minutes Approval/Liaison Reports/Administrative Items

Liaison Reports

BOH/John Lanza – BOH is holding a joint meeting with the Select Board (SB) to discuss the mask mandate in public *Planning/John Lanza* - Planning will have a joint meeting with the SB to discuss the budget. Planning is an independent board so it is a discussion.

HR/Wendy Paul – HR will present new policies to Advisory on March 2; there is a link to the policies posted on the town’s website; policies are in a period of comment and review. HR to meet and vote after the commentary period

Recreation/Wendy Paul – Public Hearings on the pay for play piece are on-going. Recreation will present to Advisory either February 23 or March 2.

NRC/Al Ferrer– a memo in response to questions was circulated.

PBC/Al Ferrer – at a recent meeting PBC did not answer questions on the heat pumps reallocated to the Hunnewell system. Advisory liaisons asked that the gas system not be destroyed as it was felt if support from a gas fed system was needed, it is best to leave the connection in place. Concern was expressed that we will be boxed into single fuel source system that may be a cost disadvantage to the town. These systems take a lot of maintenance.

- A question was asked if the projects that are going all electric are planning additional outside the envelope insulation or keeping it as they traditionally do.
 - These buildings are being built to LEED standards.

DPW/Pete Pedersen – DPW is presenting to Advisory on March 2

CPC/Doug Smith – CPC voted to approve the total amount for Hunnewell lights that NRC is putting forward.

Coming Attractions and Questions

- Is there a meeting on February 23?
 - Yes and potentially Recreation will be presenting and it will be used to continue voting on Articles
- Middle School paving project – School liaisons will be working on the write up of this and should coordinate with DPW liaison.
- A request was made not to vote on Articles on February 23 due to it being School vacation week.
- There was a request for an updated calendar and article assignments.

Wednesday, February 16 – Select Board Warrant Articles; FMD – Article 17 – Land Use Lease; Article 21 – HS LED lights

Wednesday, February 23, 2022 – Discuss & Vote ATM Warrant Articles

Wednesday, March 2, 2022 – Final TWFP; MS Paving; Recreation Article 31; HR Article 25; DPW Article 19

Adjourn

Al Ferrer made and Doug Smith seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Roll Call Vote

Jennifer Fallon – yes
John Lanza – yes

Approved February 16, 2022

Corinne Monahan – absent

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 12:15 p.m., 13 to 0.