



Natick Finance Committee

Pursuant to Chapter 40, Section 3 of the Town of Natick By-Laws, I attest that the attached copy is the approved copy of the minutes for the following meeting:

Town of Natick Finance Committee

Meeting Date: March 22, 2018

The minutes were approved through the following action:

Motion:	Approval (as amended)
Made by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Vote:	11 - 0 - 0
Date:	4/24/18

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Evans

Secretary

Natick Finance Committee

NATICK FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 22, 2018

Natick Town Hall

School Committee Meeting Room 3rd Floor

This meeting has been properly posted as required by law.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Hayes, Chairperson
Cathleen Collins, Vice-Chairman
Bruce Evans, Clerk
David Coffey, Member
Michael Linehan, Member
Robert McCauley, Member
Jim A. Scurlock, Member
Dirk Coburn, Member
Linda Wollschlager, Member
Jerry Pierce, Member Left at 9:45
David Gallo, Member 7:45 arrival

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Philip Rooney, Member
Kristine Van Amsterdam, Member
Daniel Sullivan, Member
Cathy Coughlin, Member

AGENDA:

1. Public Concerns/Comments
2. Town Administrator's FY2019 Budget – Public Hearing
 - a. Selectmen's Budget – Adjustments
 - b. Employee Fringe Benefits - Adjustments
3. 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing
 - a. Article 38 – Limit Automatic 2.5% Increase in FY2019 Property Tax
 - b. Article 14 – Capital Improvements
 - c. Article 2 – Committee Reports
 - d. REVISED: Article 7 – Fiscal 2019 Omnibus Budget (including the Affordable Housing Trust budget)
 - e. Article 6 – Fiscal 2018 Omnibus Budget - Adjustments
 - f. Article 24 – Acquisition of Mechanic Street
 - g. Article 29 – Amend Natick Zoning By-Laws: Inclusionary Affordable Housing Requirement
 - h. Article 30 - Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map
5. Adjourn

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman, Patrick Hayes

ANNOUNCEMENTS/CITIZENS CONCERNS:

Monday night at 6:30 in Selectmen’s Room there is a public meeting to discuss Camp Arrowhead changes – moving the residential portion of Camp Arrowhead.

MOTION

Move to open the Natick Finance Committee 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote:	10-0-0

Article 29 – Amend Natick Zoning By-Laws: Inclusionary Affordable Housing Requirement

Ms. Terri Evans, Planning Board – Seeking referral

We’re up to ten substantive revisions of this Bylaw. I originally thought because we were using the state model as a basis it would be a relatively straightforward process. We went back to the drawing board to make changes to achieve getting funds for affordable housing. Town Counsel requested changes. In trying to get the Density Bonus Provision nailed down with the Planning Board, it was apparent that developers and builders in Town hadn’t seen this provision at all that also made it infeasible to present this as a positive main motion. We have to ensure that all voices are being heard and this is properly vetted. I request referral back to the Planning Board.

Questions from the Committee:

None.

MOTION

Move to refer the subject matter of Article 29 – Amend Natick Zoning By-Laws: Inclusionary Affordable Housing Requirement back to the Planning Board

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Coffey
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Coburn: Thank you for coming in and explaining the reasoning behind the motion.
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Article 30 - Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map

Presented by Mr. Jamie Errickson

Mr. Errickson Last night the Planning Board voted in favor of both motions. It has been reviewed by Town Counsel and he is comfortable with the language of the motions.

From Novus Agenda 3/22/2018

2018 March 22 – As approved by PB (Motion A 4-1 vote; Motion B 4-1 vote)

Page 1 of 1 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting #30 Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map Article #30 Proposed Motion Move that the zoning bylaws be amended as follows:

Motion A

Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, as follows:

- Extend, add, and/or amend the Downtown Mixed Use (DM) district to include the entirety of the following properties: Town of Natick Assessors' Map 43, Lots 412, 415, 416, and 417;

Motion B

Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, as follows:

- Extend, add, and/or amend the HOOP II Overlay District to the following properties: Town of Natick Assessors' Map 43, Lots 412, 415, 416, and 417.

Questions from the Committee:

Ms. Wollschlager: The existing structures in that district – do they conform to the new zoning?

Mr. Errickson: They non-conforming today and will continue to be non-conforming. If someone chooses to redevelop that property, then they will have to adhere to the zoning in place.

Mr. Coffey: Is there a specific project in the pipeline that requires this change?

Mr. Errickson: No.

Mr. Coffey: One of these buildings seems to jut in to the industrial zone – how does that affect this?

Mr. Errickson: The map is for reference only and it's possible that is not the case - if it is it will have to be rectified.

Mr. Linehan: Why is the curved area not getting put into the HOOP district?

Mr. Errickson: That is a part of the Cochituate Rail Trail.

Mr. McCauley: What was the genesis for this change?

Mr. Errickson: This entire corridor needs consistent zoning.

Ms. Collins: If I were a property owner and wanted to re-develop a property, would this permit me to use the by-right or the HOOP II zoning right?

Mr. Errickson: Yes.

Ms. Collins: But I can't do both?

Mr. Errickson: Theoretically there's no preclusion in the zoning bylaw to not use both.

Mr. Hayes: How does one have Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) on half of two parcels and why?

Ms. Evans: You'll note there's a similar sort of setback for the Residential General (RG) zone and that was a standard setback that tended to be used at the time they weren't paying attention to property lines, but were looking a fixed number of setbacks in the right of way.

MOTION

Article 30 - Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map
 Motion A Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, as follows: • Extend, add, and/or amend the Downtown Mixed Use (DM) district to include the entirety of the following properties: Town of Natick Assessors’ Map 43, Lots 412, 415, 416, and 417

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Article 30 - Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map
 Motion B Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, as follows: • Extend, add, and/or amend the HOOP II Overlay District to the following properties: Town of Natick Assessors’ Map 43, Lots 412, 415, 416, and 417

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Town Administrator’s FY2018 Budget – Public Hearing

MOTION

Move to open the Town Administrator’s FY2018 Budget – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Pierce
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Employee Fringe Benefits Adjustments

John Townsend, Finance Director

Medicare has a slight adjustment; Retiree Health Benefits had a slight adjustment; those are the only two adjustments besides the healthcare portions. Health Plan and Retired Health Plan costs have changed 63% school; 37% Town. Cost for all health plans is \$12,828,353.32.

Questions from the Committee:

Mr. Coburn: Do we know that the providers will be offering these plans over the 3 years we are locked into?

Mr. Townsend: We expect that they will be but it’s not guaranteed.

Ms. Wollschlager: It looks like the Fallon Benchmark costs have gone up since the budget book was issued – why are we able to get the savings? Has the mix changed – what’s happening?

Mr. Townsend: The real savings was HSAQ – I anticipated a higher jump than actually came in. We did a better analysis with regard to the number of plans – it actually is slightly lower than it was previously. There is a fairly clear pattern of how plans come and go throughout the year.

Ms. Wollschlager: Are these numbers in step with the number of new hires?

Mr. Townsend: Yes those are included in here.

Mr. Linehan: You said that it’s 75/25 for the lowest cost plan but the other plans are in the to 62% - is that even if there’s a five dollar difference between plans? This one is at 75% and this one at 62%?

Mr. Townsend: Yes – the quirk in this is that Fallon offers the two types of plans – the Select Care and then there’s a Direct Care. Direct Care is primarily centered in Worcester and is a rather confined network and is the lowest cost plan but I think not very many people enrolled in that because it’s out in Worcester – so we said that Fallon is the low cost plan because that’s the most prevalent.

Mr. Linehan: But let’s say another plan came very close to it but didn’t quite meet it – it would still be a 62% plan rather than a 75% plan right?

Mr. Townsend: Yes.

Mr. Linehan: Does that make a distinction between family and individual? Does each get balanced separately or how is the decision made – did you look at all the individual plans and say this is the one?

Mr. Townsend: They take an average of them both.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action in the amount of \$15,826,586 for employee and retirement benefits, \$12,406,787 Total Other Personnel Services; \$150,000 Total Performance Plan; \$3,269,799 Total Retiree Health Benefits for a total of \$15,826,586

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	Ms. Collins: I’m glad we were able to refine things to find every savings we can. Mr. Evans: None.
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Mr. Hayes: There was a spreadsheet I put on NovusAgenda– essentially there are four budgets to make the Omnibus Budget work between Town Administration and School Administration collaboration to balance the budget. There are four budgets that are involved in this and Town Administration is asking the Finance Committee to reconsider Public Works, Community Services, Debt Service, and Facilities Management to make some adjustments as you see on this spreadsheet. If we take Favorable Action on those they tie to what’s in the motions for Article 7.

Public Works Budget

Mr. Hayes: Town Administration is requesting reconsideration because there has been a reduction in this budget since we previously voted.

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Public Works Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Mr. Hayes: Town Administration is proposing salaries of \$3,833,225, Expenses of \$2,268,705, Municipal Energy of \$1,517,450 and Snow and Ice Removal of \$550,000 for a total Public Works Budget of \$8,169,380.

Questions from the Committee:

Ms. Collins: Under the changes section it says \$48,680 but the difference between what we voted and what we’re being asked to vote is only \$46,587 - ? It doesn’t appear that the \$2,093 was included somewhere by I have not had a chance to tick and tie that.

Ms. Wollschlager: When we voted the original budget that number was not included, it was taken out early on but in our original materials it was in there . . .

Mr. Hayes: Mr. Townsend, as far as you know, are the numbers I just read on the revised budget correct?

Mr. Townsend: Yes they are correct.

Mr. Coburn: Where are the changes?

Mr. Hayes: In the line items there is an Administrative Assistant \$46,587 and Administration part-time salary \$2,093 removed that totaled a \$48,680 reduction – what we voted was \$8,215,967 what they’re asking for now is \$8,169,380.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on the reconsidered amounts in the Public Works budget: salaries of \$3,833,225, Expenses of \$2,268,705, Municipal Energy of \$1,517,450, and Snow and Ice Removal of \$550,000 for a total Public Works Budget of \$8,169,380.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Evans: No comment Ms. Collins: Not having been here when we originally voted this I don’t know what we voted but the changes but I do know the two changes are reflected in the bottom line number.
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Community Services Budget

Mr. Hayes: Town Administration is seeking reconsideration – changes are Teen Center Supplies, reduced by \$8,600, the Proposed Salaries new number is \$1,378,814 which is the same as we voted previously and Expense of \$514,064 which reflects the \$8,600 reduction. Previously FinCom voted Favorable Action on \$1,901,378,

Questions: None

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Community Services Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	Ms. Collins: none Mr. Evans: none Mr. Coburn: Several public meetings on the programmatic change to Camp Arrowhead – is there anyone here who knows if the outcome of that programmatic change is covered by this budget? Mr. Townsend: Unknown.
Vote: Carried	10-0-1

Mr. Hayes: The Town Administration’s proposal is Salaries of \$1,378,814, Expenses of \$514,064 for a total consolidated budget of \$1,892,878.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action of the Community Services budget: Salaries of \$1,378,814, Expenses of \$514,064 for a total budget of \$1,892,878.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Linehan: The salary budget doesn’t change any from what we previously voted but I think that if that precipitates something we can revisit. Mr. Evans: None Ms. Collins: I’ll be voting against this because we continue to not get 100% reimbursement for the Farm Director and the Assistant Farm Director as we’re entitled to.
Vote: Carried	10-1-0

Board of Health Budget

Mr. Hayes: The Finance Committee voted \$630,823 for Board of Health. The Town Administration is requesting \$650,823 and increase of \$20,000 which is related to the Opiate Prevision Outreach expenses. The new proposed budget is \$563,823 for Salaries, \$37,850 for Expenses, \$49,150 for Other Charges for a total of \$650,823.

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Board of Health Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Coffey: What is the \$20,000 going toward? We’re throwing money at this – but we don’t know what the money is being used for. This expense is for personnel expense – it’s a continuation of the prior initiative – I’d just like to know what this \$20,000 is specifically going towards. Is all \$20,000 going toward a contract employee or not? <i>Mr Townsend can’t identify where the entire amount is going but it is presumed that most is</i>

	<p><i>going toward the contract person who is working on the opioid task force. This is a continuation of the prior mission \$30,000 voted in the fall for a contractor in lieu of hiring a full time person.</i></p> <p>Mr. Coburn: I'll support reconsideration – I reserve judgment on whether I would vote for the \$20,000.</p> <p>Ms. Wollschlager: I'm not going to support reconsideration – I don't think we should be asked to vote on something that we don't know where the money is going. So I'm not going to support it. I do support the work of the Opioid Task Force but I won't vote on a \$20,000 increase when we don't know specifically where it's going.</p> <p>Mr. Coburn: We should stick with the position we have since we don't have the information to form an opinion on the alternative amount.</p> <p>Mr. Hayes: Mr. Townsend is here representing Town Administration tonight primarily because the Acting Town Administrator is out on a health issue. I believe if he was here, he would be able to answer this. I wanted to make sure people understood that the knowledgeable person is not here tonight for those reasons.</p>
Vote: Not Carried	2-8-1

Questions from the Committee

Ms. Collins: New information regarding the \$20,000 requested for the Opioid Task Force: I reached out to one of the Board of Selectmen members and was informed that they received a presentation a couple of weeks ago. That \$20,000 would be split \$10,000 for Personnel Services for the consultant and \$10,000 for Expenses of the Task Force.

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Board of Health Budget in light of new information regarding the \$20,000 requested for the Opioid Task Force

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coffey
Seconded by:	Mr. Pierce
Motions or Debates:	<p>Mr. Coburn: I still don't know enough to justify going forward with this. I feel somebody who is fighting this battle should be here to make the case for this. Do we know what the Board of Selectmen did on this? I have heard the vote of the Selectmen which makes me more comfortable I will support this.</p> <p>Ms. Collins: There's only money for the expenses the amount was removed for the Consulting Services. I would encourage us to approve the \$20,000 at this point. I support that the people should be here advocating but what I'm hearing it's not yet pulled together enough for them to present a plan. I don't believe that, knowing the management of that department, he would not let us not have enough information on this. I think Mr. Chenard would have been able to answer this off the top of his head. I think we need to give Mr. White a change to put together a plan. The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 (Ms. Collins</p>

	<p>looked online during this meeting)</p> <p>Mr. Coffey: I'm not sure why someone is here to do this – it is getting on track – the fact that it has been handed off to the Board of Health is a step in the right direction. I would like to see us put the \$20,000 back in to give this program a chance to move forward.</p> <p>Mr. Linehan: My memory has been jogged and we did push back when they came to us last time – the consultant idea came up – we moved this to the Board of Health – so I recall we did encourage this direction – so given that information I would support reconsideration this time around.</p>
Vote:	11-0-0

Mr. Hayes: The Administration requested \$563,823 for Salaries, \$37,850 Expenses, and \$49,150 for Other Charges which includes the Opiate Prevention Outreach Expense inclusive \$20,000 for a total of \$650,823.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action of approval of the Board of Health Budget in the total amount of \$650,823 broken out as \$563,823 for Salaries, \$37,850 Expenses, and \$49,150 for Other Charges

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	<p>Ms. Collins: We need to support the progress. Mr. Linehan: None.</p> <p>Ms. Wollschlager: I would ask the Chair to see if we could get some more detail on this \$20,000 as we have had many questions on this.</p> <p>Mr. Coffey: I would ask that we move forward to support this. I also hope this discussion brings forward that the sponsors come forward to explain to us the value their requests bring to the Town.</p> <p>Mr. Coburn: I'm happy to support. When sponsors come forward it furthers understanding of their needs and therefore their cause.</p> <p>Mr. Linehan: The Board of Health is a very responsible board and if they had known anyone but Mr. Chenard needed to be here to support this request they would have been.</p>
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Debt Service

Mr. Hayes: The originally voted budget was \$12,486,771 the Town Administration is proposing a reduction to \$12,385,021 which is a reduction in principle and interest due to the deferral of certain projects through the fiscal year – Pleasant Street, South Main Street, and the Parking Garage.

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Debt Service Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Mr. Coburn
Motions or Debates:	Ms. Collins: Does this budget continue to assume that we would pay any interest or debt costs for the West Natick Fire Station if the Board of Selectmen does not reconsider their position on doing that with an override? Will we be looking for any money in this budget? Mr. Townsend said not in the FY19 budget. Even if it was a BAN, the payment would probably be in FY20.
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Questions:

Mr. Evans: When we’re talking about deferral – deferral to when?

Mr. Townsend: One year.

Mr. Coffey: If an agreement is reached on 22 Pleasant Street we would not be able to start paying for that for at least one year?

Mr. Townsend: That’s correct.

Mr. Hayes: That’s correct until you come to we have fall Town Meeting where we can make adjustments to this FY19 Budget.

Mr. Coffey: How can we enter into an Agreement to pay for something is there’s no money to pay for it?

Mr. Hayes: Because Town Meeting authorized the Selectmen to enter into an Agreement for up to \$3.2 million dollars. The funding mechanism has been given to the Selectmen already.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on the Debt Services Budget in the total amount of \$12,385,021 broken out as \$147,203 for Leased Equipment, \$6,400 for Leased Land, \$8,552,071 for Principle, \$3,679,347 for Interest.

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins: This is part of the effort to close the gap – I think we should support this. Mr. Evans:
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	11-0-0

Facilities Management

Mr. Hayes: The Finance Committee recommended Favorable Action in the amount of \$3,355,972. Administration is seeking a budget in the amount of \$3,308,705, a reduction of \$47,267 related to taking out a custodial floater intern which was one of the new initiatives.

MOTION

Move to reconsider the Facilities Management Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Coffey: The rational for this was that we would recognize

	<p>some savings in overtime – so I’m wondering if we’re robbing Peter to pay Paul here – we’re going to kill this position and end up paying the money in overtime costs. I’m questioning the wisdom of that – is there some explanation? Mr. Townsend: I wasn’t part of that particular conversation, however I will state that the overtime budget for the Facilities Management has not increased as a result of this decision – if there’s any effect on the overtime it’s not increasing the budget.</p> <p>Mr. Coburn: I’m also concerned about the impact of cutting the internship which seemed to have ample justification. However I will support the proposed reduce number.</p>
Vote: Carried	10-1-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action of approval of the Facilities Management Budget in the total amount of \$3,308,705, broken out as \$2,685,405 and Expenses \$623,300.

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	<p>Ms. Collins: I think the Acting Town Administrator had to make some hard decisions this is one of them. I look forward to having an opportunity to put some of these back in if more funds become available.</p> <p>Mr. McCauley: Director of Facilities Management prides himself on keeping a good handle on the overtime budget – so I’m in favor of this.</p>
Vote: Carried	10-1-0

Affordable Housing Trust

Mr. Hayes: This is not a budget voted on by Finance Committee, it is a new budget submitted by the Acting Town Administrator in the amount of \$50,000 so we don’t need to vote reconsideration on that.

Mr. Coffey: Can someone give us a presentation on this?

Randy Johnson, Chair, Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Ribbon cutting ceremony is tomorrow. Bacon Street Project is looking for completion by the end of June. Trust has discussed for the first time in 10 years the trust is represented in the budget through this specific line item \$78,000 that the warrant article requested last year was based on a formula and a what if? Scenario and looked at the minimum allocation to affordable housing that would be 1% of the total tax levy and that’s where the number was derived from. It’s extremely important that there is a predictable budget so the Trust can do planning. Ideally the opinion of the trust is the wish that funding would be set in the same vein as it was set last year – with the application of this formula – if the Town were a CPA (community Preservation Act) community what would the minimum amount to the Trust fund be?

Questions from the Committee:

Mr. McCauley: The line item we’re voting here is \$50,000. Are you actually seeking the \$81,500 that the formula would require? Mr. Johnson: This was a financial commitment

which enables us to do what we do and ideally the same sort of level would be on an annual basis so we could have a predictable budget to do our work.

Mr. Hayes: For members information: The Affordable Housing Trust is now a line item – a page in the budget book in the Committees Commissions Section. With that the FY2020 budget any member could expect to see a budget action for the Affordable Housing Trust.

Mr. Coffey: Is there a specific project in the pipeline you need this money for? Mr. Johnson: There are three projects we are working on now that these funds could be used to facilitate work on.

Mr. Linehan: There’s a federal project that provided funding that has been eliminated ... Mr. Johnson: There is consideration of the termination of the HUD Home Program and we get an annual allocation from the MetroWest Home Consortium and about 5 years ago it was about \$100,000 per year and currently it’s down to about \$40,000 per year so the direction is downward and its potential outcome is zero. I’m not really sure where this is in the federal budget.

Mr. Linehan: Where does the MetroWest Consortium get their money?

Mr. Johnson: It is HUD money.

Mr. McCauley: Is there anything specific that is on the docket now that you won’t be able to do because you’re not getting the higher number?

Mr. Johnson: No these projects are on-going and the funds need to become predictable for us to move forward on those.

Julian Munich, Precinct 5

The Trust funding in the past were mitigation funds and federal trickle-down money and some land that they have gotten from the Town. Because they didn’t have a predictable budget they were forced to be reactive rather than planning with foresight.

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action to add \$50,000 to the line item for Affordable Housing Trust

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Evans
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
	<p>Mr. Evans: It’s encouraging that the Committee sees a need for this and is willing to increase the amount. What I wanted to provide is a quick perspective on the impact of this. I was at the Natick Education Foundation Shining Light Awards. One of the organizations there was able to get two working parents with children to move out of their shelter into homes provided by the Housing Authority. That is an example of how this should work and it helps people’s lives. It’s valuable and it’s underfunded.</p> <p>Ms. Collins: I’ll be supporting the \$50,000 because we haven’t heard the reasoning why it has been reduced. I supported the \$78,000 last year. This is \$50,000 and I would rather vote for a number that is steady and grows over time. We are not a Community Preservation Act (CPA) community and it was voted down when it was on the ballot previously. I believe this group does fabulous and important work and it’s a step in the right direction to be added to the budget.</p>
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Coffey: I would ask members to vote the \$50,000. We have

	<p>to make these decisions looking at the big picture-the \$20,000 we questioned earlier could be strongly supported if we had heard the rationale – many cuts have already been made and I think we should stay within the range that the administration suggests.</p> <p>Mr. Pierce: I applaud the work the Trust does – I am going to support the lower number because of the tight budget but I want you to know applaud your work.</p> <p>Mr. Linehan: I’m going to support the \$50,000. We have a Housing Authority and an Affordable Housing Trust which in different ways support affordable housing – we also have a Planning Board which addresses affordable housing. The existence of an Affordable Housing Trust was to administer the proceeds of a Community Preservation Act which as a previous speaker said the Town of Natick resoundingly defeated in the past which begs the question to some degree why we ever established an organization to spend money that the Town voted against ever receiving. They exist, they do good work which is why I support the \$50,000. They started out with significant federal assistance now it’s less and may go to zero. We should continue this but I feel if the people in this Town didn’t want a CPA – why did we create an organization in the Town to spend money that the people didn’t want to raise?</p> <p>Mr. Hayes: From my perspective, the Affordable Housing Trust is a pretty capable group of people working hard to deal with some of the difficult social challenges that we have in this community and find some ways to get solve a social challenge and is a worthwhile thing for individuals and the Town of Natick to support. We in this committee hear from different folks often enough to see that budgets are about priorities. I have been close enough to watch the Deputy Town Administrator, Director of Finance and the Acting Town Administrator and their staff and the School Administration work on closing a rather large budgetary gap and I’ve watched the visible pain on the faces of some of these people when they made decisions to cut hundreds of thousands even millions of dollars out of their budgets. Tonight this committee has been asked by Town Administration to do the same thing – to remove some of the things that were priorities of those different departments and the administration – that they have come to the conclusion now that for the good of the whole budget they need to take some things out. I firmly believe that the Affordable Housing Trust has a place in this budget but I’m not sure what the appropriate funding level or curve for growth or how it ranks in priority in terms of other Town needs. I can’t support the \$70,000 at this point in time.</p>
<p>Vote: Carried</p>	<p>11-0-0</p>

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action to add \$70,000 to the line item for Affordable Housing Trust

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coburn
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Coburn: We’re not talking about slow and steady growth we’re talking about a drop from last year. I’m going to support this number as a statement. Mr. McCauley: When you think about the small dollars versus the need I will support the \$70,000 number.
Vote: Not Carried	2-9-0

REVISED: Article 7 – Fiscal 2019 Omnibus Budget (including the Affordable Housing Trust budget)

SECTION A

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section A under Article 7 Motion A1: that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount of \$64,952,439 for Natick Public Schools Salaries and Expenses to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	9-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section A under Article 7 Motion A2: that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount of \$1,594,984 for the purpose of operating the South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical School (Joseph P. Keefe Technical School) to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	9-0-1

SECTION B

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section A under Article 7 Motion B1: that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount of \$7,192,893 comprised of \$39,100 for Emergency Management, \$137,572 (comprised of \$50,638 in salaries and \$86,934 in expenses) for Parking Enforcement, \$7,016,221 (comprised of \$6,741,458 in salaries, \$267,263 in expenses, and \$7,500 in other charges and expenses) to be raised \$7,112,893 from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019 and \$80,000 from Parking Meter Revenues

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins

Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section B under Article 7 Motion B2: that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount of \$8,716,273; \$8,467.273 in Salaries and \$249,000 in expenses, for the purpose of operating the Fire Department to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

SECTION C

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section C under Article 7 Motion C1: that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount of \$8,169,389 comprised of Salaries \$3,833,225, Expenses \$2,268,705, Municipal Energy of \$1,517,450, and Snow and Ice \$550,000 for the purpose of operating the Department of Public Works to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section D under Article 7 Motion: that the Town vote to appropriate the Health and Community Services Budget comprised of Community Services (Salaries \$1,378,814 and Expenses \$514,064) of \$1,892,878; Board of Health (Salaries \$563,823, Expenses \$37,850, and Other Charges and Expenditures \$49,150) of \$650,823 for a total of \$2,543,701 to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section E under Article 7 Motion: that the Town vote to appropriate the Administrative Services Budget comprised of Board of Selectmen (Salaries \$1,006,197, Expenses \$279,550, Other Charges and Expenditures \$93,000, Contract Settlements \$1,383,000, and Recruitment \$15,000) of \$2,776,747; Personnel Board Other Charges and Expenditures \$1,000; Town Report Professional Services \$4,100; Legal Expenses (\$334,600, Other Charges & Expenditures \$7,500)

\$342,100; Finance (Salaries \$1,126,811, Expenses \$358,480, and Other Charges & Expenditures \$75,000) of \$1,560,291; Information Technology (Salaries \$347,899, Expenses \$619,000, Other Charges and Expenditures \$354,000) \$1,320,899; Town Clerk (Salaries \$262,222, Expenses \$49,350) \$311,572; Elections (Salaries \$62,840, Expenses \$52,350) \$115,190; Sealer of Weights and Measures (Salaries \$30,400, Expenses \$890) \$31,290; Community Development (Salaries \$860,005, Expenses \$64,350) \$924,355 for a total of \$ 7,387,544 to be raised from Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Linehan
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section F under Article 7 Motion: that the Town vote to appropriate the Committees and Commissions Budget comprised of Finance Committee Expenses \$37,800; Commission on Disability Expenses \$750; Natick Cultural Council Expenses \$700; Historical Commission, Expenses \$750; Historic District Commission, Expenses \$550; Affordable Housing Trust, Expenses \$50,000; for a total of \$90,550 to be raised from Free Cash Fiscal Year 2019

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section G under Article 7 Motion: that the Town vote to appropriate the **Shared Expenses Budget** comprised of **Insurance and Benefits**, Employee Fringe \$15,826,586 (comprised of Other Personnel Services \$15,676,586, Other Personnel Services Merit and Fringe \$150,000); Property and Liability Insurance Purchased Services \$756,237; **Retirement** Contributory Retirement \$9,393,294 (comprised of Pension Assessment \$9,393,294, ERI Assessment 0); **Non-Contributory Retirement Pensions** \$23,122; **Debt Service** \$12,385,021 (comprised of Leased Equipment \$147,203, Leased Land \$6,400, Principle \$8,552,071, Interest \$3,679,347); **Reserve Fund Finance Committee** Reserve Fund Other Charges \$250,000; **Facilities Management** \$3,308,075 (comprised of Salaries \$2,685,405, Expenses \$623,300): for a total of \$41,942,965 to be raised from

And that the above Total Budget Amount be raised from the following sources:

Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2019	\$	2,536,047
State Aid	\$	12,605,030
Local Receipts	\$	16,199,234
Free Cash	\$	4,150,000
Overlay Surplus	\$	1,000,000
Title V Septic	\$	7,684
Water-Sewer User Fees	\$	2,218,150
Golf User Fees	\$	43,871
Capital Stabilization Fund	\$	2,962,240
Premiums	\$	97,542
School Building Assistance	\$	123,167

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan

Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION H (see handout given to Finance Committee by Chair Patrick Hayes on 3/22/2018)

MOTION

I

Motion H1 (Requires majority vote):	
Move that the Town vote to appropriate the Total Budget Amount shown below for the purpose of operating the departments	
Water & Sanitary Sewer Operations	
Salaries	\$ 2,048,018
Expenses	\$ 7,899,579
Other - Chgs. & Expenditures	\$ 4,788,550
Total Sanitary Sewer	\$ 9,947,597
Utility Billing	
Salaries	\$ 115,755
Expenses	\$ 89,000
Total Utility Billing	\$ 204,755
Fringe Benefits	
Other Personnel Services	\$ 547,384
Other - Charges & Expenditures	\$ 315,114
Total Benefits	\$ 862,498
Water & Sewer Debt Service	
Principal	\$ 2,335,173
Interest	\$ 698,215
New Debt Service	\$ -
Total Debt Service	\$ 3,033,388
Water & Sewer Reserve Fund	
Expenses	\$ 200,000
Total W & S Reserve Fund	\$ 200,000
Motion Total	\$ 14,248,238
And that the above Total Budget Amount be raised from the following sources:	
Tax Levy of Fiscal Year 2010	\$ -
Free Cash	\$ -
Stabilization	\$ -
Overlay Surplus	\$ -
Title V Septic	\$ -
Water-Sewer User Fees	\$ 14,248,238
	\$ 14,248,238

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Evans
Motions or Debates:	Mr. Linehan: Other Personnel Services issue
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Motion H2 (Requires majority vote):	
Water/Sewer Indirect Cost Allocations	
Move that the Town vote to APPROVE the following indirect cost allocations raised in the General Fund:	
COMPLETE ALLOCATIONS	TOTAL
WATER SERVICE	\$ 2,508,783
SEWER SERVICE	1,088,814
MWRA SERVICE	6,350,000
UTILITY BILLING COLLECTOR	204,755
RETIREMENT COSTS	389,546
HEALTH, MEDICARE, LIFE, INS.	472,952
DEBT	3,033,388
RESERVE	200,000
SUBTOTAL - DIRECT	10,793,178
PERCENTAGE ALLOCATIONS	TOTAL
DPW Administration	\$ 128,906
Engineering Services	295,884
Equipment Maintenance	377,607
Highway Sanitation Recycling	274,906
Facility Maintenance	63,986
Public Safety	115,953
Finance - Administration	72,688
Finance - Assessing	8,926
Finance - Collector/Treasurer	87,062
Finance - Comptroller	65,884
Town Administrator	134,324
Community Development	89,435
Information Technology	115,857
Procurement	30,440
Human Resources	51,037
Legal Services	55,764
Property & Liability Insurance	273,899
Utilities	52,002
Vehicle Fuel	100,562
Sub Total - General Fund	\$ 2,395,124
Water Sewer Staff Performing General Fund Functions	Total
GIS Services	(39,874)
W/S Admin. Asst. - DPW	(38,528)
W/S Admin. Asst. - Collector	(64,941)
Snow and Ice Removal	(33,631)
Subtotal - Water Sewer	(176,974)
SUBTOTAL - GENERAL FUND	\$ 2,218,150
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	13,011,328
And that the Sum of \$2,218,150 appropriated in the General Fund be raised from the following source:	
Water-Sewer User Fees	\$ 2,218,150
(See Motion for Section G, Article 7: Shared Expenses (Unclassified))	\$ 2,218,150

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	Ms. Collins \$2,218,150 same as funding source in Motion G
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section I under Article 7 Motion 1: that the Town vote to appropriate the Sassamon Trace Enterprise Budget comprised of **Operations** Salaries \$300,236, Expenses \$345,419, **Fringe Benefits** Other Personnel Services \$55,866, Other Charges & Expenditures \$11,812, **Debt Service** Principal \$212,230, Interest \$32,656 for a total of \$958,219 to be raised \$270,000 from Fiscal Year 2019 Tax Levy, \$688,219 to be raised from Golf User Fees.

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	Ms. Collins change for Personal to Personelle
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

MOTION

Move to recommend Favorable Action on Section I under Article 7 Motion 2: that the Town vote to approve \$43,871 indirect cost allocations from the General Fund to be raised from Golf User Fees as delineated below:

Motion 2 for Sassamon Trace Enterprise Fund - Section I under Article 7:	
Move that the Town vote to APPROVE the following indirect cost allocations raised in the General Fund:	
PERCENTAGE ALLOCATIONS	TOTAL
DPW ADMINISTRATION	
Community Services -Recreation and Parks	
DPW LFNR	
Equipment Maintenance	
Highway Sanitation Recycling	
Finance	
Town Administrator	
Procurement	\$ 121
Human Resources	\$ 121
Property & Liability Insurance	
Vehicle Fuel	
LF & NR	\$ 9,227
EQUIP. MAINTENANCE	\$ 5,065
RECREATION	\$ 8,209
TOWN ADMINISTRATOR	\$ 6,636
FINANCE	\$ 7,835
PROPERTY INSURANCE	\$ 3,902
GASOLINE/DIESEL	\$ 2,755
SUBTOTAL - GENERAL FUND	43,871
And that the Sum of \$43,871 appropriated in the General Fund be raised from the following source:	
Golf User Fees	\$ 43,871
(See Motion for Section G, Article 7: Shared Expenses (Unclassified))	\$ 43,871

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Article 6 – Fiscal 2018 Omnibus Budget - Adjustments

MOTION

Move no action on Article 6 – Fiscal 2018 Omnibus Budget - Adjustments

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coburn
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Article 38 –Limit Automatic 2.5% Increase in FY2019 Property Tax

Mr. Paul Connolly

This is a typical motion on the floor of Town Meeting – since Proposition 2 ½ this motion has become important. I feel that for the past 5 years the Town Administration has recommended to maximize the amount of money we take from the citizens. The problem with this is that many people in the Town haven’t had increases in income and they are still having to pay more and more for services they don’t think they are getting. The suggestion is that we reduce the tax levy by one half.

Motion read by Mr. Hayes:

"Move that the Town transfer the sum of \$_____ from Free Cash to be used by the Board of Assessors to reduce the tax levy for Fiscal Year 2019 (July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019)." \$1,300,000

Questions:

Mr. Coffey: If we reduce our tax levy this year by any amount wouldn’t that reduce the amount we could take on 2 ½ next year.

Mr. Connolly: No each year the levy limit can go up – it has been changed – the levy limit is computed you don’t lose anything by taking.

Mr. Townsend: That is correct.

Mr. Coffey: What would we cut in order to do this?

Mr. Connolly: I think it would be worthwhile trying not to take the whole 2 1/2 especially with the school coming up.

Mr. Coffey: Would it affect our bond rating negatively if we do this?

Mr. Townsend: I believe it would.

Ms. Collins: Are you suggesting that we use Free Cash to reduce the tax levy essentially? Mr. Connolly: Yes.

Ms. Collins: Why do you think we’re going to have a larger number of Free Cash when that’s not what I’m hearing.

Mr. Connolly: I suspect the Free Cash we’re getting back will follow as past years have.

Ms. Collins to Mr. Townsend: The \$3.2 million that we just used to fund the FY19 budget correct?

Mr. Townsend: Yes.

MOTION

Move indefinite postponement of Article 38 – Limit Automatic 2.5% Increase in FY2019 Property Tax

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms. Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Motions or Debates:	<p>Ms. Collins: The Town has used money from tax levy – I already feel like I’ve had to make concessions in the budget that I’m not happy with but have to live with. I know that this budget is a very reasonable spending plan. I think we have supported the budget, we’ve made concessions we don’t have a million dollars in Free Cash. The only responsible move here is indefinite postponement.</p> <p>Mr. McCauley: We were arguing about \$20,000 earlier this evening to go to causes like Affordable Housing and Opioid Task Force – I think the reasonable thing is indefinite postponement of this Motion.</p> <p>Mr. Evans: We are in a difficult circumstance where the new growth revenues are not keeping up with the new growth in costs – it’s irresponsible to put forward this motion.</p> <p>Mr. Scurlock: The dropping of our bond rating would cost us millions and it does not make any sense to jeopardize our bond rating.</p>
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

Article 14 – Capital Improvements

Postponed to April 24th 5 pm.

MOTION

Article 14 – Capital Improvements None

MOTION

Move to close the 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. Coburn
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote:	10-0-0

Article 24 – Acquisition of Mechanic Street

MOTION

Article 24 – Acquisition of Mechanic Street

Moved/Motioned by:	Ms Collins
Seconded by:	Mr. Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURN

MOTION

Motion to adjourn.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr. McCauley
Seconded by:	Ms. Collins
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote	10-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.