



## 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: September 6, 2018**

The minutes were approved through the following action:

Motion:	Move Approval
Made by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Vote:	9 – 0 – 3
Date:	9 – 25 – 18

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Evans

Secretary

Natick Finance Committee

**NATICK FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**September 6, 2018  
Natick Town Hall  
School Committee Meeting Room, Third Floor**

This meeting has been properly posted as required by law.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kristine Van Amsterdam	Dave Coffey	Jeff DeLuca
Jim Scurlock	Bruce Evans	Patrick Hayes
Robert McCauley	Philip Rooney	Lynn Tinney
Linda Wollschlager		

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

David Gallo	Dirk Coburn	Dan Sullivan
Mike Linehan	Cathi Collins	

**MEETING AGENDA**

1. Public Concerns / Comments
2. Old Business
  - a. Finance Committee Scheduling & SubCommittees
3. New Business
  - a. [Review and Discuss Procedures for FTM and STM #2 Concurrent Public Hearings](#)
4. 2018 Fall Town Meeting Warrant Articles - Public Hearing
  - a. [Article 19 - Capital \(Schools\)](#)
  - b. [Article 20 - Legal Settlements \(Schools\)](#)
  - c. [Article 41 - Snow Removal By-Law](#)
5. Adjourn

*Mr Evans moved to open the public hearing on the 2018 Fall Town Meeting Warrant Articles, seconded by Mr Coffey.*

Article 19 – Capital (Schools)

Anna Nolin, Interim Superintendent, Natick Public Schools

Peter Gray Business Manager, Natick Public Schools

Dr. Nolin stated that NPS is requesting No Action at this time. With the new Town Administrator, to-be-named Facilities Management Manager, and I all relatively new to our positions, we wanted to review the capital plan thoroughly. Although we're requesting No Action at this time, we would like to reserve the right to come back for reconsideration before the Finance Committee before the dissolution of Fall Town Meeting 2018.

Mr. Hayes asked members of the Finance Committee to agree not to block a re-consideration request by the sponsors of this Article. If any members are not willing to reconsider this Article, I will not allow a vote of No Action on this Article tonight (Nine members present agreed to reconsider the Article at a future date).

*Mr Evans moved No Action on the subject matter of Article 19, seconded by Mr Coffey. Voted 9-0-0.*

Mr Evans stated that a lot of this information is what you might see in the forthcoming Capital Expenditure and Capital Improvement plans that you will see later this month. Once, Free Cash is certified, we have a better idea of what we can afford from a capital investment point of view. We have a confluence of events, with the departure of the previous Facilities Manager and that Dr. Nolin and Ms. Malone are new to their positions. This is a temporal problem that we anticipate being resolved and we should allow them to come back to us when their plans are firmed up.

Article 20 - Legal Settlements (Schools)

Dr Nolin explained that she wanted to be completely transparent about this issue. This particular settlement comes during that time where we are confronting several different legal challenges in the district. We're expending our current legal budget to address those legal activities. This \$350,000 settlement has been five years in the making. The insurance plan that might have covered this type of case for the town was not purchased at the time. The last time the policy was renewed, the former Superintendent did not include the arbitration rider. This has since been corrected in our insurance. I'm in the uncomfortable position of requesting \$350,000 since I do not want to take money away from funding student learning activities. I want to emphasize that while observing from the periphery, this was a shocking development, since we had won all prior cases associated with this.

Questions from the Committee:

Mr. Rooney inquired about the nature of the legal issue. Dr. Nolin said that she is in the uncomfortable position of negotiating a settlement that may be bound by confidentiality, but I can tell you that it is a personnel matter.

Mr. Rooney asked whether we've from this issue to reduce the possibility of recurrence. Dr. Nolin stated that professional training and learning not be appropriate to address this, but will learn from this experience.

Ms. Wollschlager asked whether the timing of this settlement would require payment approval from fall Town Meeting or whether it might be deferred to the Spring. Ms. Nolin replied that they will know within a couple of weeks when this settlement is likely to occur; if not, she will request No Action and push it out to Spring 2019.

Mr. Evans asked whether, assuming the arbitration settlement is reach that this is the last anticipated component? Dr. Nolin replied that it is the last phase.

Mr Scurlock asked Dr. Nolin to confirm that she is confident in the not-to-exceed \$350,000 figure. She is very confident that that figure adequate.

Mr. Coffey asked what would happen to any unexpended balance – would it be returned to the town's general fund? Dr Nolin confirmed that it would be returned the town. Mr. Hayes noted that this amount is to be expended under the supervision of the School Committee through the School Superintendent and specifies that this may only be spent on this settlement. Mr. Hayes noted further that NPS has bottom-line spending authority under its operating budget, but requires Town Meeting approval for expense expending other money, for example, the school bus transportation subsidy, then return the remainder to the general fund.

Mr. McCauley asked whether this was binding arbitration. Dr. Nolin noted that they are in negotiations to avoid going to binding arbitration.

Ms Tinney asked whether the arbitration had confidentiality agreements on both sides. Dr. Nolin confirmed that both sides must agree to a confidential settlement.

Ms Van Amsterdam asked why, given the duration of this litigation, no one was monitoring it. Dr. Nolin replied that most insurance policies do not cover arbitration. They cover towns or municipalities for termination cases or surprise cases. However, we recently learned that there was a new rider that was added to the town's policy last year. However, we were already into arbitration on this case prior to that addition.

Mr. Rooney asked whether all legal fate fees during this five-year period had been paid and that we are not looking at a significant legal bill on top of this settlement. Dr. Nolin said that one of the benefits to the settlement is that we don't move forward with legal proceedings and incur additional legal fees.

*Mr. Evans moved to recommend Favorable Action on the subject matter of Article 20, seconded by Ms. Wollschlager. **Voted 8-0-1.***

#### Debate:

Mr. Evans said that the questions asked were good questions and we have enough information to move ahead with approval of funding for this settlement. We have enough safeguards to ensure that any funds not expended will be returned to the town's general fund. This is hopefully the last chapter in this

litigation and I think the administration for coming before us and explaining the nature of this request. I also am glad that the town is taking steps to include arbitration in its insurance town-wide.

Ms. Wollschlager also thanked the administration for its transparency and talking about a difficult situation and assuring the Committee that it would come back to us if anything changed regarding the timing or amount of the settlement.

Mr. Coffey thanked Dr. Nolin for her presentation, appreciated the answers to the questions raised and was grateful to the administration for addressing a mess that was created by someone else.

Mr Hayes stated that he and Dr. Nolin chatted briefly about this earlier to help inform the finance Committee's discussion, appreciating the time put into this task and her concern about coming back to Town Meeting to fund this settlement.

#### Article 41 - Snow Removal By-Law

Mr. Paul Griesmer, citizen, Precinct 7

Mr Josh Ostroff, citizen, Precinct 6

Mr. Hayes said that he had received the questionnaire from the proponents as well at as the proposed motion and distributed it to the Committee.

Below is the proposed Snow Removal Bylaw

#### **Article 41 - Snow Removal Bylaw - Motion**

“Move to delete subsection b of Section 18 Snow Removal of Article 50 Police Regulations of the Town of Natick By-Laws which subsection currently reads “b. No person shall deposit snow into any public way after it has been plowed.”

and to insert the following:

“b. No person(s) except employees and contractors of the Town in the lawful or authorized performance of Town snow removal duties, shall either move snow into and leave such snow within, or deposit and leave snow in any improved portion of i) any public sidewalk, ii) street or iii) public way or any part(s) thereof, so as to obstruct or impede regular snow removal operations of the Town.

c. Such prohibition above shall not prevent and shall not apply to the clearing of snow, by persons other than Town employees or town contractors, from either public ways, or improved sidewalk or street portions of public ways, where snow is or has been left un-cleared by Town snow removal operations; provided that i) such snow clearing does not leave snow in sidewalks or streets areas already cleared by the Town, ii) is incidental to or necessary for clearing access to private driveways, private sidewalks, private buildings or mailboxes and/or iii) does not prevent or impede regular snow removal operations conducted by the Town to any greater extent than those regular Town snow removal operations would or should have done.

d. For the purposes of this Section 18, the term “regular snow removal operations” shall refer to and mean those snow removal operations, which are regularly or routinely conducted by the Town, including the manner they are regularly or routinely conducted by the Town, in a timely manner practicable after a snowstorm.

e. For the purposes of this Section 18, the term “public way(s)” shall include all improved streets or portions of improved streets to which the public has right of access.

f. In the event of extreme conditions which would make compliance with subsection b above impractical or which would create a significant hardship regarding such compliance, the provisions of subsection b above may be temporarily suspended by either i) the Board of Selectmen, ii) the Police Chief or iii) the Director of Department of Public Works. The period for any temporary suspension shall not exceed 30 days, however, consecutive temporary suspensions may be made consistent with the first clause of this subsection f. Any such temporary suspension shall be in writing and shall be prominently posted on the Town’s website. Such temporary suspensions may be for the entire town or specified streets or portions of streets identified by address or cross streets.

g. After consultation with the Police Chief and the Director of Public Works, the Board of Selectmen may exempt any improved portion of i) any public sidewalk, ii) street or iii) public way, or any part(s) thereof, from the provisions of subsection b above. Such exemption shall be subject to subsequent revocation by The Board of Selectmen shall have the authority to modify or to revoke any exemption under this subsection.

h. Enforcement of this By-Law shall be in accordance with Article 92 of the Town By-Laws with the exception of the following schedule of fines and specific provisions:

Violations before November 1, 2019:

Any and all occurrence(s) Notice of Violation

Violations subsequent to November 1, 2019:

First occurrence: Notice of violation

Second occurrence: \$50

Third occurrence: \$100

Fourth and subsequent occurrences: \$200

The property owner committing such violation shall be liable for any and all fines under this section. Any property owner employing other persons for snow removal purposes shall be responsible for any violations committed by such other persons. Each day upon which a violation occurs shall constitute a separate violation, provided that no subsequent violation may be cited until a notice of violation has been received for the preceding violation.”

Mr. Ostroff stated that this is about the fourth time that the subject matter of this Article has been before Town Meeting. It was referred back to the sponsors by Town Meeting. A couple years ago, a more comprehensive bylaw was proposed and rejected because people felt that the bylaw was too far

and had unintended consequences in some cases. Last Spring, the Article would have prohibited anyone from depositing snow in a public way at any time. However, a referral motion carried at Town Meeting due to the ambiguity of the definition of “public way”. Ninety-five communities in Massachusetts have snow and ice removal bylaws that relate to sidewalks. This proposal has a relatively straightforward goal – to make it safer for citizens to walk on sidewalks during winter months by prohibiting people from putting excessive amounts of snow on top of sidewalks after the snow had been removed by normal snow clearing operations.

Mr. Griesmer said the reason for the referral motion at Spring Town Meeting was the definition of what quote “public way” means. “Public way” includes the improved area of the public way, not only the street but the sidewalk also. The public way doesn’t can be set back as much as 5 to 10 feet from the curb. This would have prohibited someone from clearing their driveway or sidewalk onto their front lawn. There is a technical correction to the proposed motion – in subparagraph c, on the third line from the bottom and/or should be changed to “and”. Under Police Regulations in the town bylaws, it states that no one other than someone operating in conjunction with town duties can obstruct the public way. In this case, no one other than town employees and contractors for snow removal are permitted to deposit snow in the public way as part of their snow removal activities. It’s impossible for a DPW plow truck or contractor plow truck to deposit snow in the public way, including sidewalks and lawns. This bylaw exempts DPW and contractors from this bylaw. It does apply to any private person depositing snow on a public way, including streets and sidewalks. Conversations with the DPW indicated that there are people who put three-foot piles of snow in the middle of the street or will push it onto a sidewalk that it knows the DPW is going to clear. Paragraph c provides the ability for private citizens or contractors not hired by the town to plow their property as long as t they do not make the cleared sidewalk worse (i.e., after the sidewalk has been plowed). The bottom line is you must have legitimate access to clear your driveway or sidewalk. For example, the downtown businesses need to be able to remove snow from their sidewalks and have no place to put it other than at the edge of the curb (in the public way).

The term “regular snow removal operations” is included as a frame of reference. A citizen must be able to remove snow from the point where their driveway meets the roadway portion of the public way. There are also many sidewalks that are never cleared by town snow removal operations. The town has a stated policy of its snow removal activities, including sidewalks that it plows. There is a provision for temporary suspension of this bylaw by the Board of Selectman to accommodate snow accumulations from very large storms. There is also an exemption section that acknowledges that there are some sections of town that would have a hard time complying with this bylaw, and enables the Board of Selectman to exempt those sections of town from this bylaw.

#### Questions from the Committee:

Mr. McCauley asked who is responsible for administering the fine schedule. Mr. Ostroff noted that this is handled in varying ways in different communities. Right now, there are no identified mechanisms for enforcement of this bylaw. However, it may be similar to leaving a car in a street identified as a snow emergency street that would result in a \$50 fine for impeding snow removal operations. The DPW will

occasionally have cars towed when they impede snow removal operations. The Board of Selectman left it up to us to determine who would enforce this bylaw, most likely, the DPW or Police department. Mr. Griesmer added that, suppose someone creates a significant snow barrier causing people to walk unsafely in a street, this provides the opportunity for them to be notified that this is not acceptable and if it continues the enforcement officers may tell them that they may be fined if it persists.

Mr. Rooney noted that his concerns seem to be addressed in the proposed bylaw.

Ms. Tinney asked for elaboration on plans and responsibility for education. Mr. Ostroff said that the DPW sends out an annual snow removal notification that describes snow removal activities, shoveling out fire hydrants, etc. They could also use social media to get the word out. In addition, there will be conversations among citizens where they might identify that there is a problem using the sidewalks in winter and asking them not to deposit snow on the sidewalk. Ms Tinney said that she appreciated the education, but was concerned about pitting neighbors against each other.

Mr. Coffey asked why this bylaw wouldn't take effect in November 2018 rather than November 2019. Mr. Griesmer noted that the results of Fall Town Meeting would be unlikely to be ratified by the AG's office, since the AG's office has 90 days following the closure to certify that this bylaw is legal. Mr. Hayes noted that it is 90 days, plus 7 days for any town appeal.

Mr. Evans said that this is an improvement over the previous bylaw and saw it working as the noise bylaw. If you get enough complaints about too much noise, then the enforcement authority can urge the responsible party to reduce or eliminate the noise. Does the prohibition of dumping snow on a public way apply to private contractors hired to clear a parking lot of an apartment building where the town doesn't plow the sidewalks and they are pushing snow pile onto the sidewalk, preventing safe access to that sidewalk, and forcing pedestrians to walk in the street. Mr. Ostroff stated that the intention of this bylaw is to start at a more basic level where the bylaw requests that private parties don't dump snow on public ways already cleared by the town. Mr. Griesmer noted that if enough residents want to walk on that particular sidewalk, the best way for that to be accomplished is to add that to the DPW plowing plan and fund additional resources, as required.

Ms. van Amsterdam noted that some contractors may plow early during a snowstorm then return later in the day after the town has plowed the public way, including sidewalks, and plow again to clear remaining snow. Some contractors pile snow so high as to interfere with visibility of other traffic coming from one road to another road. Who would be responsible for removal of this barrier? Mr Griesmer stated that, ultimately, it is the private owner of that property who is responsible and the property owner must get the contractor to change the behavior.

Ms Wollschlager asked about the email from Chief Hicks posted on NovusAgenda. Mr. Ostroff stated that he had sent an earlier version of this proposed bylaw to Chief Hicks and that there is some misunderstanding about how the bylaw would be enforced. I think that this should be reviewed by the Board of Selectman in a public form. Mr. Ostroff continued by saying Chief Hicks may not have understood the scope of the safety hazards. Mr. Hayes noted that Chief Hicks has a meeting tonight with the Board of Selectman to cover all the Articles and responded to the request by the Town Administrator for comment on this bylaw. This Wollschlager noted that it troubles her that the police



department stated that it does not have the resources to enforce this policy. Mr. Ostroff replied that education on this issue is a priority and that it is complaints – driven. On any given day, the police department must decide how to respond to citizen complaints. Enforcement of this bylaw could also be through the DPW and/or the Board of Selectman, acting as road commissioners. Mr. Griesmer suggested that we ascertain whether or not we have a safety problem associated with snow removal and his sense is that we do.

Ms. Wollschlager stated that Chief Hicks stated in his memo that he's still not convinced that this is a public safety issue. I'd like to see have your assurance that you will get the police department on board because otherwise, doesn't make sense to have this bylaw.

Mr. Hayes said that he would read the message from Chief Hicks into the public record, as follows:

“ On Tue, Aug 7, 2018 at 9:43 AM, Joshua Ostroff <joshua@ostroff.net> wrote:

Chief and Lt,

As you may recall, last year Town Meeting referred Article 27 to the BOS. This would have amended Article 50, Section 18 to provide more clarity and better enforcement on sidewalk snow issues. They are not going forward with it, so I am preparing to submit a citizen's petition before August 16 at 5pm. Before I do, I appreciate any comments on the attached. I also will ask for a representative of the NPD to attend the FinCom hearing on this in September (no idea when it will be scheduled yet). If it's appropriate for the Safety Committee to weigh in, that's fine too.

Thanks, Josh

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

message From:

**James Hicks** <hicks@natickpolice.com>

Date: Wed, Aug 8, 2018 at 1:34 PM

Subject: Re: Sidewalk snow bylaw, revisited

To: Joshua Ostroff <joshua@ostroff.net>

Cc: Brian Lauzon <Lauzon@natickpolice.com>

Josh,

This would be hard for me to support simply because we would not have the resources to enforce it. I have difficulty making laws that we know we will not enforce on a regular basis. The only time we could do this is if someone calls. Then it becomes selective enforcement and puts the officers in a difficult position. We can talk more.

**Fwd: Sidewalk snow bylaw, revisited**

**James Hicks** <hicks@natickpolice.com> Wed, Sep 5, 2018 at 9:09 PM

To: Patrick Hayes <phayes.fincom@natickma.org>

Cc: Melissa Malone <mmalone@natickma.org>

Good evening Patrick,

I had a discussion with Town Administrator and she asked me to pass along a statement on the proposed Snow Removal Bylaw Amendment. as I will be in the BoS meeting tomorrow night. I decided to pass along a response I originally sent to one of the sponsors and my statement remains the same. I have a concern about creating laws for the sake of creating laws especially if it presents an unrealistic expectation that it will be enforced. In addition I'm still not clear if this is a true public safety issue. Please let me know if you need any additional information."

Mr. Rooney asked whether or not the Police were the only enforcement entity or can multiple entities enforce this bylaw? Mr. Ostroff noted this is correct and the enforcement authority varies from town to town. In Arlington, for example, the Police enforce it. In Boston, Inspectional Services enforces it. In Natick, the enforcement is not limited to the police department.

Mr. Coffey noted that Article 27 at Spring Town Meeting was referred to the Board of Selectman and asked whether the board had done anything with it. Mr. Griesmer replied that they hadn't done anything with it.

Mr. Hayes asked about the temporary suspension section of the proposed bylaw and whether it required a meeting or a public hearing with the Board of Selectman and whether the DPW or the police department would need a meeting. Mr. Griesmer said it would be a Board of Selectman meeting, but that DPW and the police department would not require a meeting.

Mr. Hayes asked questions about section G of the proposed bylaw – exemptions from the proposed bylaw and whether the BOS would need to have a public meeting to exempt certain roadways from this bylaw. Mr. Griesmer noted that he did not know of any statutory requirement for exempting public ways from a bylaw, but that changing a street name or making a two-way street a one-way street would require a public hearing.

Mr. Hayes asked which specific town employees or departments are authorized to enforce this bylaw. Mr. Griesmer stated that Article 92, section 3, sub-clause 3 states that the Town Administrator can refer enforcement to any municipal officer. He went on to say that in our charter, the Town Administrator has the ability to delegate certain activities to any subordinate. Mr. Hayes asked if the Town Administrator delegates enforcement of this bylaw to a subordinate, does that person have the ability to enforce the bylaw and/or levy fines.

Mr. Hayes asked whether there was any named organization responsible for bylaw enforcement other than the Police Department. Mr. Griesmer stated that the way the Town Charter works, when you read something that states the Town Administrator can delegate any activity to a municipal employee for action. Mr. Hayes said the Town Administrator receives a complaint and chooses not to refer it to a municipal employee, then the only enforcement organization is the Police Department. Mr. Ostroff confirmed that is the case.

Mr. Hayes asked whether a designated municipal employee that the Town administrator designated to take action on the complaint have the power to issue citations and/or levy fines? Mr. Griesmer indicated that the language in Article 92 allows them to have that power. Article 92 states that any person witnessing a violation of any town bylaw may report the incident to the enforcing organization or person. Those persons may be designated as police officers, municipal employees designated in specific town bylaws or state laws where the state of Massachusetts is responsible for enforcement or the Town Administrator, who may refer this to a municipal employee for action and disposition of non—criminal violations of the bylaws. We wanted to give the Town Administrator latitude to choose the municipal organization and allow that organization to determine how best to address enforcement of this bylaw.

Mr. Evans moved to recommend favorable action on subject matter of Article 41, as amended, seconded by Ms. Wollschlager, **Voted 7-3-0.** Mr. Hayes noted that we have no recommendation for Town Meeting.

Debate:

Mr. Evans stated that while this motion is not perfect, it is a really good first step and achieves the primary objective of increasing public safety by reducing the likelihood of people, particularly small children walking in the streets to avoid snow banks blocking the sidewalk.

Ms. Wollschlager supports the objectives of this Article, but is troubled that we don't have support from the Police Chief on enforcement. I'm hoping that the sponsors will talk with the Town Administrator and get greater clarity on how this bylaw might be enforced before Town Meeting.

Mr. McCauley agreed that we have a safety problem and stated that he consistently sees this problem each winter, especially around the schools. Further, he pointed out that community education is really important to raise awareness.

Mr. Coffey expressed disappointment that this was referred to the Board of Selectman by Town Meeting and the board took no action in response to that referral, they are not taking responsible action. I have no patience if the Board of Selectman as an issue with this because they had the opportunity to take action and chose not to do so. I'm unable to challenge the Police Chief's assertion that he doesn't have the bandwidth to enforce this bylaw. If a noise violation was reported, other things being equal, a police officer would respond to that call and investigate. Mr. Coffey downplayed the need for citizen education about snow removal.

Ms. Van Amsterdam said that she is unable to support this bylaw due to the ambiguity regarding enforcement of this bylaw. I'm concerned that the statement provided by Chief Hicks, as requested by the Town Administrator. This leads me to question where the Town Administrator is on this bylaw. I'm also curious whether the silence from the Board of Selectman is abdication or something else, and I cannot support this bylaw until this is resolved.

Mr. Scurlock said that during a snow emergency, Chief Hicks may feel that the police department has more pressing issues than enforcement of this bylaw. He expressed concern that the Board of Selectmen has not weighed in on this bylaw, and cannot support this bylaw at this point.

Mr. Rooney said that this effort began a few years ago and I was opposed to it then. Considerable progress has been made since that point and I can support it now. My reading of Chief Hicks's comments is that he is most concerned about the ability to enforce this bylaw.

Ms. Tinney recommended that the sponsors take the opportunity to do increase the clarity of the enforcement of this bylaw. I agree that Chief Hicks is concerned about enforcement and think that we are setting a standard for snow removal via this bylaw and need to communicate this standard.

Mr. Hayes states that he supports this bylaw tonight with reservations about enforcement, how we communicate about exempt roads because there is nothing in the bylaw that specifies how that is to be done. He suggested that there may be an opportunity in a few places to add clarity prior to Town Meeting, but will support it because he views it more positively than negatively.

*Mr. Evans moved to close the 2018 fall Town Meeting warrant review, seconded by Ms. Van Amsterdam, **Voted 10-0-0.***

Meeting scheduling:

Mr. Hayes said we're reviewing all the marijuana Articles on September 13. Those are four Articles – one Article is the zoning bylaw change to create marijuana overlay districts which has multiple motions to it and each zone identifies a specific area in town where the overlay districts can be located, the excise tax motion, the Article that makes a Board of Selectmen the licensing authority for marijuana licenses, and I forget the 4<sup>th</sup> Article. It's very possible that discussion on these Articles will carry through to a second night. That's why September 20 is open right now. The Planning Board scheduled a public hearing on the marijuana Articles on Thursday, September 20. So, we're likely to need to reschedule some things and probably will meet on September 20. Mr. Hayes also said that we need to have all the Articles for fall 2018 Town Meeting completed by the end of September. Special town meeting #2 is scheduled for October 2, 2018 and may spill over to October 4, 2018. I'd advise the Committee to keep October 4 open in the event that we need to meet as a finance Committee that evening.

On the concurrent stuff, the Chairmen of the Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and I may still have a discussion, we will probably hear those Articles concurrently, soul open the fall 2018 town meeting warrant review and the special town meeting #2 warrant review concurrently, but will need to vote on each motion separately (town meeting, special town meeting).

SubCommittee Assignments:

Mr. Hayes distributed subcommittee assignments through NovusAgenda. All the subcommittee chairmen are only on the Committee that they chair; all other members are on two Committees. There probably will be some changes for the Spring 2019 town meeting warrant review and budget review because Ms. Collins runs out of time to be on the finance Committee in the middle of March 2019 and though she will be a member of the Education and Learning subc's ommittee, we'll need to shuffle assignments when her tenure on the finance Committee ends due to her reaching the 12 year term limit.

Mr. Evans said that he reached out to Mr. Chenard on scheduling the capital subcommittee and asked for some dates to review the capital investment and improvements.

Ms. van Amsterdam also stated that all members are welcome at subcommittee meetings, regardless of whether they are members of that subcommittee are not.

Mr. Hayes also said that he is looking into working with town administration to have checkpoint meetings throughout the year, so that we understand the issues confronting the town prior to hearing them in a budget review or warrant hearing. The intent is to work with the Town Administrator and her department heads to have a quarterly discussion to keep us up to speed and, hopefully, get questions answered ahead of the budget review or warrant hearing.

*Mr. Evans moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Van Amsterdam **Voted 10 – 0 – 0***