

## IN BOARD OF SUDBURY SELECTMEN

TUESDAY NOVEMBER 19, 2019

Present: Chairman Daniel E. Carty, Vice-Chairman Patricia A. Brown, Selectman Janie Dretler, Selectman Jennifer Roberts, Selectman William Schineller and Interim Town Manager Maryanne Bilodeau.

The statutory requirements as to notice having been complied with, the meeting was convened at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall – Lower Level.

Chairman Carty called the meeting to order.

### **Opening Remarks by Chairman**

Chair Carty made several announcements:

Illicit discharge detection and elimination (IDDE) inspections to be started this week in compliance with state regulations and stormwater safety in the Town. Further information can be found on the Town website.

The Hosmer House is holding its annual Holiday Open House on December 7, 8, 14 and 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Holiday tree lighting will be December 7<sup>th</sup> between 4:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Broadacres Town Forum – Community Design Charrette on Thursday, November 21, 6:30 p.m. at Town Hall.

Selectmen's Office Hours - December 7, 10:00 a.m. at Peet's Coffee. Selectwomen Brown and Dretler will be present.

DPW has installed temporary traffic lights on Wayside Inn Road in connection with repair work being done on the damaged bridge. It is anticipated that repairs will be completed by December 31, 2019.

### **Reports from Town Manager**

Interim Town Manager Bilodeau thanked the Board of Health for sponsoring Hazardous Waste Day, which was a success.

### **Reports from Selectmen**

Vice-Chair Brown thanked the Sudbury Senior Center for sponsoring the Veteran's Appreciation Luncheon and the kick-off meeting for Dementia Friendly Sudbury. She noted that Dementia Friendly Sudbury was recorded by SudburyTV for public viewing and stated that the session was most informative.

Vice-Chair Brown stated that she attended last week's Planning Board meeting where the Board of Selectmen (BOS) Housing Choice Initiatives Letter was discussed. The related Town of Needham Housing Choice Letter was endorsed by their Planning Board as well as the Selectmen; the Sudbury Planning Board would like to endorse the letter from the Sudbury Board of Selectmen as well.

Selectman Schineller recognized the Park & Recreation Commission for their assistance with the staffing of the LS swim fundraiser.

Selectman Roberts echoed the words of Selectman Brown regarding the Veteran's Day Luncheon and further commented that she enjoyed that great event.

Selectman Roberts stated that she and several selectmen attended an education funding event at the First Parish Church, sponsored by the League of Women's Voters and the Church.

Selectman Dretler commented that the last several weeks have been particularly busy and she and Selectman Roberts made presentations regarding local government to third graders at the Peter Noyes Elementary School, with mock Town Meeting and a unanimous vote by students to change the “Board of Selectmen” title to “Select Board.”

Selectman Dretler mentioned the open house at the Sewataro property this past Saturday and expressed her interest in having a future meeting to discuss additional purposing of the property. She noted that BOS toured the Loring Parsonage with work continuing at the site.

Selectman Dretler commented that a Broadacres flash vote/survey are available on the Town’s website. She noted that the Planning Board agreed to drafting a joint letter about the Housing Choice Initiative with the BOS and expressed her appreciation for their additional contributions to the letter.

**Citizen’s Comments**

Resident Sam Jackson, 20 Woodland Road, expressed his concern regarding the timing of the Special Town Meeting and the expedient processing of such. He had submitted the petition for the Historic District. Chair Carty noted that Special Town Meeting was included in this evening’s agenda to discuss the calling of the Town Meeting. Topic issues will not be discussed but the Board will discuss what will happen at Special Town Meeting and what occurs after that meeting.

Resident Ray Phillips, 40 Whispering Pine Road, representing the Protect Sudbury organization, mentioned Eversource the Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB) might soon provide a decision. He indicated that such decision could be issued at the most inopportune time, with only a seven-day comment period between issuance of the tentative decision and the final decision by the EFSB. He noted Protect Sudbury is taking steps in advance in preparation of those comments and encouraged the Town to be as proactive regarding a possible last-minute request for comment from the Siting Board. He indicated that the Town should also be concerned about the motion to reopen the case, which was filed in April and has yet to be addressed. He detailed there has been no response from the EFSB based on the motion determining if the project is needed. He stressed that the Town should be proactive and find out what is happening with the motion that was filed in April.

Mr. Phillips stated that Protect Sudbury is always seeking to work with the Town so resources can be put to the most effective use.

**Consent Calendar**

**Vote to reappoint Lee Swanson, 55 Hudson Road, to the Historic Districts Commission for a term ending January 1, 2025**

Chair Carty stated that this item was not to be addressed at this meeting.

**Vote to correct the appointment term of Sandy Lasky to the Council on Aging**

Selectman Roberts motioned and Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To correct the appointment term of Sandy Lasky, 19 Abbottswood Drive, to the Council on Aging for a term to expire 5/31/20.

**Vote to accept two paintings by Florence Hosmer being donated to the Town**

Selectman Roberts motioned and Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To accept two paintings by Florence Hosmer being donated to the Town by Todd Hedges and Beth Coleman, 224 Grape Vine Road, Higganum, CT.

**Vote to approve regular session minutes**

Selectman Roberts motioned and Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve the regular session minutes of 9/17/19, 9/24/19 and 10/1/19.

**Vote whether to approve an increase in the abatement amount for both veterans and seniors in the Tax Work Off Program from \$1,200 to \$1,275 beginning January 1, 2020.**

Selectman Roberts motioned to approve an increase in the abatement amount for both veterans and seniors in the Tax Work Off Program from \$1,200 to \$1,275 beginning January 1, 2020. Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve an increase in the abatement amount for both veterans and seniors in the Tax Work Off Program from \$1,200 to \$1,275 beginning January 1, 2020.

**Tax Classification Hearing**

Present: Board of Assessors: Liam J. Vesely, Chair; Joshua M. Fox, Esq.; Trevor A. Haydon. Director of Assessing Cynthia Gerry and Principal Regional Assessor Harald Scheid.

Chair Carty motioned to open the Tax Classification Hearing for the FY2020 Tax Rate with the Board of Assessors. Selectman Dretler seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To open the Tax Classification Hearing for the FY2020 Tax Rate with the Board of Assessors.

Mr. Vesely stated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was for the Board of Selectmen to approve the FY2020 Sudbury tax rate for the four property classifications: residential, commercial, industrial and personal property. He detailed that the Board has the option to adopt a single tax rate for all property classes or to adopt a CIP (Commercial, Industrial and Personal property) shift, which would allow the Board to impose a tax rate up to 50% of higher for the commercial, industrial and personal property classes than for the residential class. He added that the Board would decide to adopt three statutory exemptions; the Residential Exemption, the Small Commercial Property exemption and the small space exemption. He added that Sudbury has no "Open Space" properties.

Selectman Schineller asked if the residential exemption would apply to the Town's new rental developments - Meadow Walk and Quarry North. Mr. Vesely replied that the exemption only applies to owner-occupied rental property.

Selectman Dretler queried about the number of Sudbury homes being used as AirBNB rentals. Mr. Vesely stated that he did not know if that information had been compiled by the assessors. Selectman Dretler mentioned that such information would be helpful in terms of policy setting in the future. Mr. Vesely noted that many towns are dealing with this aspect and he would be interested in reviewing those numbers.

Selectman Roberts questioned the purpose of the residential exemption process. Mr. Vesely indicated that the purpose of exemption was to provide a break to property owners who live in their property and shift the taxes to those owning investment properties which they rent out.

Chair Carty commented that Sudbury will have far more rental properties in the next couple of years and wondered how that changes the Town profile. Mr. Vesely responded that such a trend would likely have an effect on the percentage of properties that may qualify for the residential exemption.

Selectman Schineller commented that properties like Quarry North and Meadow Walk are considered investment properties for the developer who would affect that shift. Mr. Vesely asserted those owners would bear the residential exemption burden.

Resident Ralph Tyler, One Deacon Lane, stated that a comprehensive residential exemption report was provided by Ms. Gerry in 2011, which displayed the burden of shift. He added the lower valued properties have since increased in value dramatically; thus, voting on the exemption might help senior homeowners who are struggling to meet tax payments. He stated this option was not recommended for this year, but preparation should be in place a year before approving such exemption, which would assist with tax equity.

Selectman Schineller commented he had no desire to adopt such residential exemption, but felt it was worthy to keep in mind and revisit. Chair Carty agreed and said review would be beneficial when the Quarry North units are included.

Mr. Vesely addressed the small commercial exemption aspect, noting that the Board has not approved such an exemption in the past, though 34 properties would be eligible for the small commercial exemption, if approved. Many small local businesses would not qualify for technical reasons. He cited as examples the small commercial condominiums at Mill Village, properties on Rte. 117 and various strip malls located on Rte. 20.

Selectman Dretler queried about commercial properties that have filed for abatements. Ms. Gerry responded that over the past five years, the average has been 16% of the total abatements filed and reflect the larger commercial properties, primarily.

Selectman Roberts asked if this usually applies to areas with larger commercial sections to help the “mom and pop” businesses in Town. Mr. Vesely agreed that was the concept.

**Vote to adopt the Small Commercial Exemption for Fiscal Year 2020**

Chair Carty motioned and Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: Not to adopt the Small Commercial Exemption for Fiscal Year 2020.

**Vote to adopt the Residential Exemption for Fiscal Year 2020**

Chair Carty motioned and Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: Not to adopt the Residential Exemption for Fiscal Year 2020.

Selectman Roberts commented there was potential to explore such residential exemptions in the future.

Selectman Schineller asked if the Sudbury Water District is assessed and pays taxes. Ms. Gerry responded that the Water District is assessed but does not pay taxes. Selectman Dretler concurred that the Water District is a municipal entity, like the Town, and for that reason, does not pay taxes.

Mr. Scheid explained that the Town seeks to raise \$89,733,775 through property taxation, with the residential property class paying 93.269% before any tax shift proposal. He asked if the Board wanted the shift method to continue in FY20 with some burden shared by the commercial property owner. Mr. Scheid referred to seven different shift options.

Mr. Scheid stated that for calendar 2018 the assessors compared assessed values in relation to market sales and found the ratio at 95%, which is their target. The market appears to have hit the top and leveled.

Selectman Schineller asked if it was unusual not to raise property assessments. Mr. Scheid responded that this would be the first time in seven years that the values have plateaued, and 2019 sales also indicate a flat appreciation. Selectman Dretler asked how that trend compared to other towns. Mr. Scheid noted that properties closer to Boston show values starting to stall. Selectman Dretler opined that property values are stalled, and property taxes are rising. Mr. Scheid commented that when town budgets increase, the taxation typically must increase as well.

Selectman Schineller indicated that the demand for housing in Sudbury is decreasing, perhaps because of congestion, traffic, schools and taxes. He opined that increasing residential taxes would not help at this time.

Chair Carty commented that another way to view the situation is that supply has increased in relation to demand, with more housing being built.

Selectman Schineller asked if the Board of Assessors could make a recommendation, and Mr. Vesely replied the Board could not.

Selectman Roberts commented that maintaining the same shift factor as last year would keep aspects the same for both commercial and residential properties. Mr. Vesely concurred.

**Vote in accordance with M.G.L. Ch. 40 Sec. 56, as amended, the percentage of local tax levy which will be borne by each class of real and personal property, relative to setting the Fiscal year 2020 tax rates to set the residential factor at 0.9762 with a corresponding CIP shift of 1.33, pending final certification of the Town's Annual Tax Recap by the Massachusetts Department of Revenue**

Vice-Chair Brown motioned and Selectman Dretler seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To vote in accordance with M.G.L. Ch. 40 Sec. 56, as amended, the percentage of local tax levy which will be borne by each class of real and personal property, relative to setting the Fiscal year 2020 tax rates to set the residential factor at 0.9762 with a corresponding CIP shift of 1.33, pending final certification of the Town's Annual Tax Recap by the Massachusetts Department of Revenue.

Sudbury's Means Tested Senior Tax Exemption information was presented by Mr. Fox. He summarized that the means reflects a shift within the residential tax base with several components for eligibility:

- Age – 65+
- Income – Capped at \$88,000 for a couple and \$58,000 for a single filer
- Aggregate net worth
- Assessed value of the home – no more than 110% of the average prior years
- Single family assessment (approximately \$820,000)
- Resident of Sudbury for at least ten years

He detailed that the Board of Assessors tentatively granted 106 exemptions in the approximate aggregate amount of \$423,931 (subject to BOS final vote).

Selectman Schineller inquired what the award per household would be. Ms. Gerry responded that the number would average at \$4,000. Mr. Fox noted that some recipients receive an award of under \$100 and some at \$6,000.

Selectman Dretler asked how many Sudbury homeowners had applied. Mr. Fox responded that 109 applications were received. Three were not awarded due to technical flaws in the application. He noted that the number of

applicants had decreased slightly from last year, adding that the number of applicants has been consistent over the years. He noted BOS could increase the aggregate amount to 1% of the residential levy, if they wish to do so.

Chair Carty commented that Sudbury is one of the few towns in MA that provides the Means Tested Senior Tax Exemption. Mr. Fox agreed, adding that there was just a handful (two or three) local towns that participate in the exemption.

Mr. Fox agreed with Selectman Schineller's assessment that the qualifying households do not have school-age students so there is less burden on the infrastructure, and long-term Sudbury residents deserve a benefit for paying into improvement of services and infrastructure for many years.

Selectman Schineller asked if there are seniors in the Town who do not know about the program. Mr. Fox responded that Ms. Gerry conducts an assessor's outreach program to inform residents about the program. Ms. Gerry commented that each year there are three or four new applicants and many inquiries are received throughout the year.

Selectmen Roberts confirmed that the Board would be voting on the applications that have already been submitted and will go through the same process next year. Ms. Gerry confirmed.

Mr. Tyler affirmed that the goal of the Massachusetts Circuit Breaker is to bring property taxes down to 10% of the senior income. He suggested providing further benefit (achieving the 10% level or less) via presenting proposals to the Massachusetts Legislature for changes in state law supported by a Town Meeting vote.

**Vote in accordance with Chapter 169 of the Acts of 2012, the total FY20 cap on the exemptions granted by the Means Tested Senior Tax Exemption shall be .5189% of the residential property tax levy.**

Chair Carty motioned and Selectman Dretler seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: In accordance with Chapter 169 of the Acts of 2012, the total FY20 cap on the exemptions granted by the Means Tested Senior Tax Exemption shall be .5189% of the residential property tax levy.

Chair Carty moved to close the public hearing. Selectman Dretler seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To close the Tax Classification hearing

Mr. Vesely commended Ms. Gerry and her staff for their efforts.

Vice-Chair Brown asked if this report would appear on the Assessor's website. Ms. Gerry confirmed.

**Approve transfer of license for the sale of Wine & Malt with Cordial Beverages**

Present: Alexandre Alvarenga, Manager/Owner of Franco's Trattoria

Mr. Alvarenga stated that he bought Franco's Trattoria on September 30.

Chair Carty asked if this was the first wine and malt beverage license that the applicant had applied for. Mr. Alvarenga responded this was his first wine and malt license and maintained that he would commence with the necessary training.

Selectman Schineller asked if the menu and the staff would remain the same. Mr. Alvarenga responded in the affirmative.

Selectman Roberts inquired about the training. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau stated that the program involved TIPS training (Training for Intervention Procedures), which was standard-type training for those serving alcohol, wine or beer and required certification as well as renewal of such certification.

Chair Carty asked about the timeline for obtaining the license. Mr. Alvarenga responded as soon as possible; possibly a month. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau informed the Board that once the vote was taken tonight, the application would go through the state ABCC (Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission) process.

Chair Carty asked Mr. Alvarenga if he had taken ownership of the restaurant. Mr. Alvarenga stated he had, and the restaurant was open and waiting for the license in order to serve wine, malt and cordial drinks. He noted that Mr. Franco's license had expired.

Chair Carty asked if there were any comments from other departments regarding this license. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau stated that other Town officials had no comments.

Selectman Dretler stated Mr. Bruno ran a wonderful restaurant. She welcomed Mr. Alvarenga and hoped he would be as successful as Mr. Bruno was. Mr. Alvarenga stressed that the menu and family atmosphere of the restaurant would remain the same.

Selectman Schineller motioned and Selectman Dretler seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve the application of Logus Corp., d/b/a Franco's Trattoria, 365 Boston Post Road, Sudbury; Manager Alexandre Alvarenga, for a Transfer of License for the Sale of Wine & Malt with Cordial Beverages, under G.L Ch. 138, s. 12, from Natalie's Restaurant, Inc., d/b/a Franco's Trattoria, Manager Franco Bruno.

Chair Carty motioned to close the licensing public hearing. Vice-Chair Brown seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To close the licensing public hearing.

**Authorize Town Manager to sign the WestMetro HOME Consortium Subrecipient Agreement**

Present: Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development

Mr. Duchesneau stated the WestMetro HOME Consortium Subrecipient Agreement was presented to the Board on May 13, 2019 regarding last year's agreement.

Chair Carty inquired about the distinction between the May presentation and this evening's request. Mr. Duchesneau detailed that the May approval represented the approval for the last fiscal year as result of a HUD audit and the Agreement which will be renewed at this time each year.

Vice-Chair Brown inquired about the Subrecipient Agreement. Mr. Duchesneau stated that the Agreement is between the City of Newton as the HOME program administrator and the Town of Sudbury, as the recipient of \$600.

Selectman Schineller confirmed that the approval involves receiving funds. Mr. Duchesneau responded affirmatively.

Selectman Dretler motioned and Selectman Schineller seconded the motion.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To authorize the Town Manager to sign the WestMetro HOME Consortium Subrecipient Agreement on behalf of the Board of Selectmen, and give the Town Manager the ability to sign the Subrecipient Agreement each subsequent year in the future, as requested by Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development.

**Joint meeting with Park & Recreation Commission, Council on Aging, and Sudbury Public School Committee and update with architect regarding Fairbank Community Center cost estimate**

Present: Bill Barletta, Facilities Director, Ned Collier, Principal - ICON Architecture, Mark McDevitz, Project Designer – ICON Architecture; Park & Recreation Commission, Council on Aging and Sudbury Public School Committee.

Mr. Barletta introduced Mr. Collier and Mr. McDevitz and stated that the Fairbank Community Center working groups have been working with the architects on this feasibility study.

Chair Carty introduced members of the Fairbank Working Group Jeff Levine of COA (Council on Aging), Mara Huston of Park & Rec., Sylvia Nerssessian of SPS (Sudbury Public Schools) and Selectman Janie Dretler, BOS (Board of Selectmen) liaison for the working group.

Mr. Collier described his firm and the sustainability aspect of the proposed Fairbank Community Center. Mr. Collier outlined the important aspects that ICON Architecture considered for the Fairbank Center:

- Building Rejuvenation
- Reducing Energy Demand and Lowering of GHG Emissions
- Health & Well-being – including Accessibility
- Universal Design

Mr. McDevitz stated that they were tasked with doing a feasibility analysis and commented that ICON reviewed previous Fairbank feasibility studies, analysis of the surroundings of the site and analysis of the existing building. Mr. McDevitz stated that ICON presented the preferred concept and had attended many stakeholder meetings. They looked at risks of renovating what is there and tried to determine the most viable path moving forward.

Mr. Collier confirmed that ICON had made this presentation to other Town groups recently and was asked to define several terms:

- General contractor = GC
- Construction Manager = CM
- Owner's Project Manager = OPM
- Commissioning = Cx
- Estimated construction Cost = ECC
- Total Project Cost = TPC

Mr. Collier mentioned the three players involved with a capital project: owner, architects/engineering team and general contractor.

Mr. McDevitz highlighted the amount of meetings they had held to assess the needs of uses. They looked at multiple options and the top one was being presented tonight.

The ICON team explained the potential use of the existing building if it were broken up and designated for use by the three user groups, with the pool being retained. Mr. Collier did not recommend renovated as they did not feel it would meet the needs. He said building limitations could affect any potential cost savings renovating the existing space to attempt provide stakeholders to meet their missions. He said there would be ongoing benefit to the utility costs in the future of a new building.

Selectman Schineller asked how the utility bills with today's structure would compare to a design concept recommended by ICON. Mr. Collier responded that the improved higher quality building envelope construction should create up to 85% reduction in energy loads. Collier presented current comparable project costs for other similar projects:

- Library/Community Center – Providence, RI – 65,000 GSF - \$560/SF
- Community Center – Connecticut – 35,000 GSF - \$550/SF
- Community Center – Massachusetts – 50,000 GSF - \$525/SF

Mr. McDevitz noted the current proposal would have been priced at \$23.5 million two and half years ago, now the proposal estimate reflected a 14% escalation rate (approximately \$27.5 million).

Selectman Roberts queried about what drives the escalation rate. Mr. Collier responded labor and building materials greatly contributed to the escalation factor.

Mr. Collier explained that for the Sudbury Community Center the per square foot cost estimate for construction was anticipated at:

- Range \$515 - \$525/GSF
- Gymnasia \$385/GSF

Mr. Collier added that the construction cost/GSF (Cost per Gross Square Foot) included:

- Site demolition
- Robust wall assemblies (durability)
- Commercial or catering kitchen
- Audio/Visual integration within (some) program rooms
- Multiple cladding options – brick, curtain wall, etc.
- Site work (playing courts, gardens, parking, etc.)
- VRF HVAC system – individual control/comfort (VRF is Variable Refrigerant Flow)

Mr. Collier noted that there are limited economies of scale; smaller buildings tend to cost more on average.

Mr. Collier explained that there would be 30% added to the Estimated Cost of Construction for Total Project Cost. The Total Project Cost includes:

- Owner's contingency
- Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF+E)
- Design team fees
- Utility fees (there are typically rebates)
- Specialty consultants
  - Hazmat
  - Geotech
  - Survey

Mr. McDevitz stated that this doesn't represent everything.

Chair Carty noted a discrepancy with the numbers presented by the consultants regarding the existing Fairbank building. Mr. McDevitz stated that one set of numbers represented the calculations from 2018 and there was an issue with ICON software programming regarding appropriate updates and directed the Board to the numbers presented originally.

Selectman Roberts noted there was a substantial increase in shared space, and Mr. McDevitz said that was a key part of the strategy.

Selectman Roberts commented that the major jump was between the shared spaces. Mr. Collier stated it was the strategy to make the program work at a smaller square footage than it might otherwise have been. He stated the Senior Center user group and the Park and Recreation user group have worked closely to determine which shared spaces overlap is their usage and how they would be able to work together on a daily basis going forward. Mr. Collier stated that the dedicated space for each user group was the minimum need to meet each of their stated missions and that the shared spaces were negotiated by the Senior Center and the Park and Recreation user groups to determine how each group could share space to achieve greater economy. Mr. Collier stated the emergency shelter space is just under 12,000 sq. ft. in the aggregate.

Mr. May of the Council on Aging noted that for emergency purposes, ICON recommended combining and repurposing certain spaces.

Ms. Huston commented that shared spacing currently is difficult because recreational activities reflect a different schedule throughout the year - summers have the camp program and seniors have programming running 12 months per year. The biggest issue involves having one large indoor space which is the gym. Historically, the seniors are forced to have limited use of the gym because of Park & Recreation activities, which ultimately impacts space needed for the two user groups.

Mr. Collier emphasized the importance of including environmental analysis - sun orientation during the seasons, prevailing winds and the potential for solar energy. Mr. Collier reviewed passive house building construction (of the 20<sup>th</sup> century). He felt there were great opportunities here. The goal of such new buildings is to simplify and reduce costs of building systems by leveraging the environment.

Mr. Collier referred to the "block diagram" option that the user groups preferred, which included two courtyards and the user areas clustered around a dense area of shared spaces in the center of the structure. He detailed that each user group area would have their own entrance. Mr. McDevitz spoke about proposed user group space layouts: senior center, recreation space and locker rooms, and Sudbury Public School administrative offices. He further described the shared spaces and pool area.

Selectman Schineller inquired about the sizes of program/shared spaces and related occupancy numbers including the multi-purpose area and the gym. Mr. McDevitz provided such detail. Mr. McDevitz noted that the Information Technology space would continue to serve the Town and SPS.

Selectman Roberts asked about net to gross area calculations. Mr. McDevitz explained those calculations which reflected the square footage required. He said for the total you need to consider the walls, the circulation, and the structure reflecting the elements such as closets, etc. in the gross calculation. Mr. Collier spoke of furniture space considerations.

Mr. Collier described the demolition of the existing structure stating that it would happen in the second phase of the project. He stated that new construction would happen first and then the user groups would move into the new building and the existing building would be demolished. Mr. Collier stated a 10% contingency is included in the Total Project Cost.

Chair Carty inquired about the cost of possible demolition. Mr. Collier responded that such cost would be \$184,000 which Chair Carty thought to be pretty cheap. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau mentioned the costly consideration of asbestos removal and other related demolition components.

Bobby Beagan, Park and Recreation Commission Chair, asked why the gym was listed as a possible deduction. Ms. Mara Huston responded that there are some people who are wondering if it should be dropped but that she felt it is important to keep.

Mr. McDevitz noted that renovation costs for the existing building reflected a cost of \$450 per square foot or \$21,000,000, and is predicted to cost \$20.8MM overall. He noted that typically there is risk (the unknown factors) when considering renovation.

Selectman Schineller queried about the renovation estimate from former Town Manager Rodrigues which was approximately \$5-8M. Mr. Barletta stated that the previous estimate was based on a walk-through assessment to repair basic deferred maintenance such as the heating system, roof, and windows but not reconfiguration and full renovation of the building.

Selectman Dretler asked if such a renovation proposal would include phasing. Both Mr. Collier and Mr. McDevitz said that the proposal did not include a phasing aspect and the user groups would have to find new homes during renovation/construction which would cost money. Chair Carty noted that this option could be more expensive than a rebuild. Mr. Barletta agreed that a complete renovation to meet the programmatic needs, rectify all the deferred maintenance and code issues could cost substantially more. Chair Carty asked Mr. Barletta if he had a level of faith in the cost assigned to the renovation of Fairbank. Mr. Barletta said that he would apt to be more conservative (higher cost), but the Center presented many potential unknowns.

Mr. McDevitz noted that once a construction threshold is crossed regarding the value of the building, every aspect must meet current building code standards. He reiterated that for these reasons, new construction is the favored option over renovation.

Selectman Dretler maintained that with the new construction option, the user groups would be able to continue all existing programming vs. renovation involving leaving the building and later returning, which could have programming impact for the users.

Chair Carty summarized that \$27.5 million reflected the cost of new construction and \$21 million+ for renovation came with costly unknowns and the expense associated with moving the user groups.

Selectman Roberts asked how the new construction option would affect the long-term building/environmental (positioning/sunlight). Mr. Collier agreed that the environmental benefit would be lost with the renovation choice. Lower operation costs were better captured with the new construction option. Mr. Barletta noted that the Town would not get the benefit of optimum efficiencies (maintenance/repair and utility cost efficiencies) over time if the renovation option was considered.

Vice-Chair Brown thanked the ICON team for presenting concept options, noting that it was most helpful to understand the numbers presented. She asked for long-term estimate of the cost of operating the building. Vice-Chair Brown requested clarity with respect to any portion of the building which could be retained. Mr. Collier responded that the plan reflected renovation of the building in its entirety. He added that he examined the scheme related to removal of the school wing, and there was not significant benefit with that option. Chair Carty noted that such numbers were not required for tonight's meeting, but would be appreciated in consideration of future meetings such as Town Meeting.

Selectman Roberts requested additional information regarding the gym. Selectmen Roberts clarified to P&R about why it an important part of the project She emphasized that the renovation using the existing space doesn't account for needing more space and that the new plan reflects a needs analysis. Selectman Schineller stated he was not sure this was done by Park & Rec.

Mr. Tyler commented that this is the third group of architects that have presented a Fairbank Feasibility study and the results are like the previous feasibility studies done. He noted that previously, according to the Finance Director, taxpayers would be paying an additional \$270 per year to finance such project, which represents the buying a cup of coffee every day. Chair Carty commented that opinions would be reserved for later.

Ms. Huston presented the document “Recreation Revenue YTD 2019 – Answering key questions based on data from recreation program reservation system data 1/1/19 – 11/17/19,” which addressed:

What is Park & Recreation program revenue?

- YTD Program Revenue - \$929K
- Includes programs listed in the brochures
- Revenue does not include private rentals of the gym, rooms or pools

Where does this revenue come from?

- Outside Fairbank (fields, courts, private locations, etc.) – 36%
  - Gym – 32%
  - Program Rooms – 16%
  - Pool – 16% (does not include pool rentals for diving, swimming, etc.)
- Multi-Location Programs – 47% of Revenue at Fairbank Center and outside
  - Sudbury Summer, Teen Center, Wild Wednesday, Preschool Pals
- Single Location Programs – 53% of revenue

Who Uses Our Programs?

- Sudbury residents – 89% of Revenue
- Non-Sudbury residents – 11% of Revenue

How many programs run or are cancelled?

- Number of active programs – 119
- Number of programs cancelled – 49
- Every program counts as one program regardless of revenue
- Example: Sudbury Summer - \$186K is counted the same as Table Tennis (\$25)

Why are programs cancelled?

- Low Enrollment
  - New programs being tried by creative staff
  - Improved marketing will help
- Staffing
  - Example: October Fall Festival, fall swim lessons

Do We Need the Gym?

- If we had the new facility now, the \$296K gym revenue could be:
  - Gym - \$262K
  - Fitness studio - \$6K
  - Program Room - \$27K additional revenue
- Without the Gym:
  - Significant loss of revenue (potential \$262K or 28% of current revenue)
  - Redesign of proposed Multipurpose Room to support active programs
  - Significant impact on life-long learning, meals and programs for Seniors
  - Loss of community room for many other purposes, i.e., meetings, private rental opportunities, community events

- Significant impact on sharing potential between recreation and seniors. The key to successfully sharing the center is two active indoor spaces.
- Current revenue data to answer key questions

Comprehensive financial analysis will be done as we move forward.

Chair Carty commented that additional proposed space would not affect the Park & Recreation aspects of program cancellations due to staffing or lack of marketing. He noted that he was less concerned about Park & Rec. revenue and had concerns about full utilization of a very expensive 25,000 square foot addition (which would include sharing), which he believes would likely not be filled at any one time. Ms. Huston responded that the proposed new gym would be twice the size of the current gym with a divider so that two different programs could take place at the same time. She added that the existing space is 1,480 square feet (two program rooms) and the new proposed space would have 1,800 square feet with three possible dividers.

Chair Carty reiterated that it is still a big jump to sell the voters on this aspect. Ms. Huston stressed that the small, existing gym was the limiting factor regarding programs to be offered and rentals and a divided gym allows for more opportunities. Ms. Huston noted that additional analysis would be done, as noted in her presentation.

Chair Carty stated that he was shocked by the extensive cost for renovation and agreed that renovation did not make good sense. He expressed skepticism about the need for such an increase in proposed space. Chair Carty indicated that a decrease in cost estimate would be easier to present to the voters. He stated he would like an option B.

Park & Recreation Commission member Mara Huston emphasized that the new design is not excessive and it is flexible.

Ms. Lasky clarified that the shared space would also be used by the Senior Center during the day, Monday through Friday. Ms. Huston stated that the space identified is not excessive.

Mr. Beagan stated the recent Sewataro purchase had an impact on the Fairbank Community Center project.

Selectman Dretler asked which rooms were currently designed as Park & Recreation program rooms. Ms. Huston detailed that Room 1 (next to the gym), Room 3 (the room around the far corner where the billiard table sits) and the toddler rooms down the hall.

Bobby Beagan said that even higher voter concern about this project may be due to the Sewataro acquisition which Park & Rec did not support.

John Beeler, Chair of COA, stated that he had concerns regarding the architects having enough money to address all the Town's questions regarding the project. He commented that a necessary discussion/presentation was taking place but should not take place at 10:00 p.m. He suggested such discussion be conducted at 6:30 p.m. and be the only agenda item.

Mr. Beagan stated the gym is a key piece of running Park & Recreation programming at the Fairbank Community Center. He asked the Chair why the gym being considered for elimination as the gym is important for revenue-generating programs.

Selectman Dretler mentioned that it would be helpful to understand more about elimination of certain project pieces and then conduct an informed discussion about it, while considering that these are programs that have allowed residents to utilize engaging Park & Recreation programs for their children at a price point that is affordable.

Chair Carty commented that if Option B was not considered and the \$27 million did not pass at Town Meeting, then what does the Town do?

Selectman Dretler asked Chair Carty what his ideas regarding reduction of scale might be and what his thoughts are for an Option B. Chair Carty responded that such discussion could not easily take place at this time, but could be a discussion for the Selectmen in order to determine what is being included on the Town Meeting Warrant. Selectman Dretler stated that it would be helpful to have the discussion at tonight's joint meeting with all the user groups in attendance.

Jim Marotta, Park & Recreation member, stated that he was in favor of the gym proposal concept but could not support the cost estimate proposal because it would mean a Town Meeting override. There was no financial analysis to quantify the financial deficit that there would be, and currently there is no programming analysis to determine if the facility fits the needs of the existing Park & Recreation department. He detailed that the "use agreement" needed to be "hashed out" between the Park & Recreation Department and COA.

Selectman Roberts said that the business case could come and that the three user groups will continue to collaborate and work to complete financial analysis regarding the cost of the actual build, the long-term efficiencies of the maintenance, and current revenue in consideration of bigger and better space. The affordable programming this offers our citizens is important and that currently year after year employees work in a sub-par space. She affirmed no one wants a tax override, but the time has come to address this project which is an investment in the community.

Jeff Levine of COA stated that demographics must be considered, and the senior population is growing dramatically. Since October 2015, it has increased by over 500 and the trend is continuing. He opined there are many people like him, who are trying to retire and stay in Sudbury and the cost of downsizing does not reflect much cost savings. He emphasized that seniors currently represent 28% of the Town and pay 28% of the tax revenue. COA programming could fill up every one of the program rooms (with programs already in demand). Chair Carty repeated that he wanted to present something to the Town that would pass.

Resident John Sherman, 42 Raynor Road, asked if there was a difference in the life expectancy of a renovated building vs. a new building analyzed from a cost standpoint. Mr. Collier responded that the same standard would apply to renovation and new construction, but operating cost would not be the same, with new construction having the advantage.

Selectman Schineller indicated the proposed plan was a good plan and not as problematic as the costly plan proposed last year because design "needs" were reflective of two user groups, not three, as SPS was not included. He stressed that this plan accounts for the placement of three user groups and the costs of housing them someplace else in Town. He did recognize that this plan probably had a low chance of passing due to the cost, and understood that the seniors reflect an unserved population that could utilize additional space. Selectman Schineller added that he did not have a sense of what underserved population Park & Recreation served because young families have other resource opportunities for their children. He stressed that he would like to have related utility analysis presented to the Board and agreed that the existing condition of the Fairbank building is terrible and advocated for putting the proposed plan on the Warrant. However, he stated that he wanted an alternative but that perhaps the idea of a simple renovation was debunked at this meeting. He pondered the idea of the SPS user group at another property in Town, such as a school gym(s). He suggested that people think outside the box when planning for this important project.

Selectman Dretler asked if SPS could respond to the question about whether it is possible to use the school gyms. SPS Superintendent Brad Crozier responded that the school gyms are used for intended purposes - to educate students from 7:00 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. daily. He added a SED (Sudbury Extended Day) lease is in place for use of common spaces and school gyms until about 6:00 p.m. and there are other user groups during the week and

weekends, such as Sudbury Youth basketball. Superintendent Crozier mentioned the summer is the only opportunity for deep cleaning, resurfacing of the school floors and school capital projects.

Chair Carty reminded the Board that their Fairbank goal is the focus for this discussion and there are three tenants to be included at the Fairbank Community Center as defined in our annual goal: COA, Park & Rec. and SPS. Selectman Schineller stated to put the project on the ballot but he doesn't support it because it's too expensive.

Ms. Huston suggested that the group reflect and consider the mission of Park & Recreation which is not to create expensive programs for high-paying salaried people. She stressed that the mission of Park & Recreation is to create affordable programs to support residents of the Town, including youth and adults; with the pool having more adult use. The multi-location programs listed fill critical child-care needs for families. She was surprised to discover the number of families that cannot afford such Park & Recreation offerings and hopes that with a new building and decreased utilities expense, the economic gap might lessen.

Mr. Beagan stated that he felt badly for the Task Force in consideration of the time and effort that has been put forth with strong user group cooperation that had not taken place with the previous Fairbank iterations. Mr. Beagan stressed he would not expect anyone would want to participate in yet another related Task Force and indicated that the attitude expressed at this meeting was poor. Chair Carty asserted that another Task Force formation would be avoided by every means possible.

Ms. Nersessian queried if this proposal was not favored, are there options for the BOS to consider, such as a Plan B? Chair Carty reiterated that he is one of five BOS members and speaking for himself he would try to avoid having to go through such a process again. He recognized that the Task Force and the user groups have devoted tremendous time and effort to the project and agreed that the final product was a good one and was willing to put the project on the Ballot but also wanted to see a Plan B presented.

Selectman Roberts commented Town asked for a conceptual plan for the Fairbank Center. She said that adding additional plan options was not the ask of the working group nor was a price cap and that it is late in the process to be asking for these. She stated she felt the Fairbank location is a great location due to proximity to public safety, centralized nature, and being next to playground and fields.

Selectman Dretler explained that the history of the new Fairbank working group began in January and again in May due to the Town Election with new people represented in the working groups. She was involved with this iteration for 11 months. She recognized that the new working group composition had been superior, with multiple weekly meetings. and suggested the implementation of a Plan B would likely take another equivalent period of time.

Vice-Chair Brown stated the Selectmen do not tell the voters what to do. She noted that she was unable to attend Thursday's presentation, and this was the first time she has seen the proposed plan with cost estimate and felt that the considerations of renovation vs. new had to be further shared with the voters. Selectman Roberts stated that those answers had been addressed at this meeting earlier in the evening. Vice-Chair Brown responded that further explanation needed to be presented. Selectman Dretler acknowledged that additional financial work needed to be done but the prior iterations of Fairbank Center proposals had been studied by the Working Group as well.

Selectman Dretler indicated that preparing for Plan B would involve additional funding and extended time and asked to hear suggestions about lowering the cost given the data presented. Chair Carty responded that he would be happy to speak to this and noted that the Fairbank topic had been included on almost every BOS meeting agenda since he assumed the role of BOS Chair.

Selectman Dretler asked for Selectman Brown's opinion. Selectman Brown said this was the first time she was seeing the presentation and that she was still coming up with reactions but that the group would face questions.

Selectman Roberts expressed the plan reflects the user group needs and that the Board should be careful about the message they are sending the community with how they view and talk about the project.

Selectman Dretler asked Chair Carty what his thought were regarding reduction of the plan. Chair Carty responded that he would eliminate the described main gym and employ the area in the middle asturned a multi-use gym. Selectman Dretler thanked Chair Carty for sharing his thoughts.

Mr. Marotta stated that the Board has hired experts and it should rely on what the experts bring forward. Selectman Schineller recommended consideration of RFPs in consideration of SPS space.

Selectman Roberts opined that she hoped that the prospect of a Plan B did not squeeze the original project so much that current and future user needs would not be met.

Ms. Huston asked if Option B could be the \$21,000,000 renovation with no new space.

Chair Carty asked the Board if they wanted to proceed with creating a Plan/Option B. He was the only one to raise his hand.

Selectman Dretler stated that if the Chair wanted to reduce the cost by eliminating the gym it would bring the cost down \$2,000,000. Mr. Levine said eliminating the gym affects the ability to share space. Selectman Dretler agreed that if the plan were reconfigured the cost may increase and, then the user groups would have to take another vote. She stated that all the current user groups currently support the plan as presented. Mr. Beagan stated that the Park & Rec. voted to move forward with the conceptual plan presented pending a final design vote with operational costs included, and sought to address some of Mr. Marotta's concerns as well. Selectman Roberts acknowledged that it would be helpful to work on a business case which would include: demographic trends, program use trends, current revenue gaps, space for additional programs and long-term maintenance costs and reductions that would be achieved through improved environmental footprint and structure of the building.

Sandy Lasky, COA member, noted that part of such a proposed business case should consider that if the project is postponed, a yearly 7% increase will occur and over time the construction cost would increase substantially.

Interim Town Manager Bilodeau noted that COA voted in favor of the conceptual plan and wanted to work on a room use agreement, and that SPS also voted in favor of the Plan. She opined that this was one of the first times that all user groups agreed about the project and worked hard on such plan, though it is smaller than what was asked for. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau affirmed that a temporary leasing concept was also explored but that it was risky as space could be sold after being retrofitted. She suggested that everyone re-group and that she would speak with Bill Barletta and ICON to explore any other possibilities. Vice-Chair Brown asked if Interim Town Manager Bilodeau could also obtain related financial analysis. Interim Town Manager Bilodeau agreed to do so and recognized that associated cost estimates for the project would increase with time.

Lisa Kouchakdjian of SPS asked Mr. Collier if it could become fiscally irresponsible at some point not to take some action regarding the Fairbank Community Center. Mr. Collier responded that becomes a value judgement, and that buildings take care and maintenance with ongoing investment as needed, and it is a mistake not to do it. He stated that the Fairbank Center needs investment in some form. Ms. Kouchakdjian further questioned if an improved Fairbank Center would add any value to the Town, which might defer some of the related cost associated with increased taxes. Mr. Collier responded that the long-term investment cost would have to be addressed with further concrete terms and the benefits to the Town are best left to the boards/committees. Justification is always the issue with such projects. He opined that the flipside is the Town can make the decision about what it can afford and an alternative method is to design working backward from there. He said this was not their charge. He acknowledged that the charge given ICON was to come up with a middle ground while containing programming and associated costs.

The Park & Recreation Commission voted to adjourn their meeting.

The Sudbury Public School Committee voted to adjourn their meeting.

The Council on Aging voted to adjourn their meeting.

**Acknowledge receipt of a Citizen Petition for a Special Town Meeting pursuant to G.L. c.39, s.10, for the purpose of creating an Historic District on a 3+/-a. portion of land shown as Assessors Parcel K06-0602, located at 554 Boston Post Road, Sudbury; said Historic District to be known as Stone Tavern Farm Historic District; 2) Discuss and determine the date on which the Special Town Meeting would be held; 3) Call the Special Town Meeting and 4) Open the Warrant for 10 days per Town bylaw.**

Present: Town Counsel Jonathan Silverstein (via conference call)

Chair Carty stated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to acknowledge receipt of a Citizen Petition, to call Town Meeting, to open the Warrant, and to determine the date of the Town Meeting. He stated that the Selectmen's Office and the Planning Board Office received much related correspondence over the past week and emphasized that the Town of Sudbury is not putting this petition forward and this is a Citizen Petition which submitted more than 200 signatures. Chair Carty explained the appropriate scheduling guidelines which must be followed.

Interim Town Manager Bilodeau explained that the Town Meeting had to be held within 45 days of receipt of Citizens Petition and the Warrant had to be open for a minimum of ten days and closed a minimum of 25 days before the Special Town Meeting. She detailed that the Special Town Meeting could be held on Tuesday, December 24<sup>th</sup>, Friday, December 27<sup>th</sup> or Saturday, December 28<sup>th</sup>, which is in the middle of school vacation and might result in poor voter turnout due to that reason.

Attorney Silverstein stated that the mentioned dates were not ideal times for holding a Town Meeting due to the holidays and agreed that the voter turnout at such time would likely be suppressed. He discussed how the BOS was bound by the dates regarding the 45-day requirement and explained that there is case law indicating that there is no actual penalty for not meeting that specified deadline (the law provides directory action and not mandatory action). Attorney Silverstein suggested that the Special Town Meeting could be delayed by a week or so for the reasons mentioned.

Selectman Dretler asked if the Special Town Meeting could be held earlier. Attorney Silverstein noted that in accordance with Town bylaw, the Warrant must be open for a minimum of ten days.

Interim Town Manager Bilodeau asserted the Citizen Petition's signatures had been certified.

Vice-Chair Brown motioned that the Selectmen acknowledge receipt of the Citizens Petition calling Special Town Meeting. Selectman Roberts seconded the motion.

It was on motion one opposed and four in favor – (4-1) Carty-aye, Brown-aye, Roberts-aye, Dretler-aye and Schineller-opposed.

VOTED: That Selectmen acknowledge receipt of the Citizens Petition calling a Special Town Meeting.

Chair Carty commented per Attorney Silverstein's recommendation, that Special Town Meeting be held on January 2.

Louis N. Levine, attorney for Anne Stone, stated he agreed with Attorney Silverstein and opined that this is not in the historic district; it's an address and the intent of the petition is to affect the permitting. Attorney Silverstein stated there were timing constraints of holding of Special Town Meeting and indicated that the Selectmen did not have unilateral authority to determine whether to hold such a meeting or not as that is dictated by statute, but the Board has some latitude about the timing of such a meeting. He would not be comfortable advising the Board that it has the discretion not to call a Special Town Meeting at all.

Resident William Miniscalco, 126 Hemlock Road, stated that conducting such a Special Town Meeting could be rejected by the Selectmen in accordance with a similar situation in the Town of Lincoln.

Resident and co-signer of the Petition Jeffrey Samuel Jackson, 28 Woodland Road, stated that the Town of Hopkinton recently had a similar one property district situation. Mr. Jackson detailed that the neighbor who lives across the street from Stone Farm would also want their property included in the historic districting in the near future.

Selectman Schineller asked if the purpose of the petition is to save the barn and save Stone Farm. Chair Carty responded that the petition itself was not to be discussed tonight, but the scheduling of the Special Town Meeting was being discussed per the agenda.

Attorney Levine commented that the day after New Year's is not a great day to conduct Special Town Meeting in consideration of residents still traveling and requested that a later date be considered. Selectman Dretler commented that Sudbury Public Schools would have resumed after vacation for two weeks and with that consideration, most families would be available on January 2. Attorney Levine stated Sudbury is an affluent town and a lot of people would be taking their kids out of school until possibly January 4<sup>th</sup>. Chair Carty asked if other dates were available for such meeting. Interim Town Manager commented that dependent on Attorney Silverstein's opinion, Thursday, January 2<sup>nd</sup> with LSRHS being available, Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup> with Curtis School being available and Monday, January 13<sup>th</sup> LSRHS and Curtis School would be available.

Selectman Schineller asked if the Board would have another opportunity to consider additional articles to be added to the Town Meeting Warrant. Selectman Schineller suggested keeping the warrant open for 15 days. Chair Carty responded that a BOS meeting could be called for such a discussion. Selectman Dretler indicated she was uncomfortable with further extending the warrant date.

Selectman Schineller stated he would expect there was a plan to protect Stone Farm, which would require funding and asked the Board members if establishing the single property historic districting would help save the barn. He stated that he wanted to include an article to raise \$8 million to acquire Stone Farm and to renovate the Stone Farm barn to the Historic District Commission and the Historical Commissions' standard and to complete the project within 60 days. Chair Carty acknowledged Selectman Schineller's comment.

Resident and Finance Committee member Susan Berry, 4 Dawson Drive, suggested the Board consider the schedules of other Town boards when scheduling the Special Town Meeting and article discussion.

Mr. Jackson stated that given the applicant's history, he was not in favor of extending the Special Town Meeting date. Chair Carty acknowledged such comment.

Vice-Chair Brown moved to hold the Special Town Meeting on January 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. Chair Carty seconded the motion, as amended.

It was on motion one abstain and four in favor (4-1). Carty-aye, Brown-aye, Dretler-aye, Roberts-aye and Schineller-abstain.

VOTED: To hold the Special Town Meeting on January 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Selectman Roberts moved to open the Special Town Meeting Warrant this evening, November 19, 2019 and close the Special Town Meeting Warrant on December 2, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. Chair Carty seconded the motion.

It was on motion one abstain and four in favor. Carty-aye, Brown-aye, Dretler-aye, Roberts-aye and Schineller-abstain.

Selectman Schineller stated that he abstained because he had not received the complete certified Citizens Petition.

Chair Carty recommended postponing the Selectmen's vote on item 8 of the Consent Calendar due to additional applications received.

**Citizen's Comments (cont.)**

Resident Len Simon, 40 Meadowbrook Circle, inquired about a Fairbank Community Center warrant article being included at the Annual Town Meeting. Chair Carty responded there would be a Fairbank article included at May Town Meeting.

**Discuss Upcoming Agenda Items**

*November 21*

- Brief Meeting before Town Forum – extension of liquor license

*November 22*

- Special Town Meeting Articles to be discussed

*December 3:*

- Executive Session at 5:15 p.m.
- DLS Presentation
- Joint Meeting with FinCom
- Joint Meeting with Planning Board (Brief meeting)
- Housing Choice
- Liquor License Renewals

*December 17:*

- Open 2020 Annual Town Meeting Warrant
- Camp Sewataro Update
- CSX Appraisal Update
- Town Hall Blue Ribbon Committee
- Vocational Education Guidance Committee

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:24 p.m.

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Maryanne Bilodeau  
Interim Town Manager-Clerk