Needham Finance Committee
Minutes of Meeting of April 03, 2024

To view a recording of the meeting on YouTube:
https://youtu.be/gxHzIPllmWc?si=XGDpH36Z4uoNp2ZL

The meeting of the Finance Committee was called to order by Chair Louise Miller at approximately 7:00 pm in the Great Plain Room at Needham Town Hall, also available via Zoom teleconferencing.

Present from the Finance Committee:
Louise Miller, Chair ; Carol Smith-Fachetti, Vice-Chair
Karen Calton, John Connelly, James Healy, Joshua Levy, Barry Coffman, Paul O'Connor (Remote)

Others Present:
David Davison, Deputy Town Manager/Director of Finance
Molly Pollard, Finance Committee Executive Secretary
Ceclia Simchak, Assistant Director of Finance
Kevin Keene, Select Board
Kate Fitzpatrick, Town Manager
Carys Lustig, Director of Public Works
Marianne Cooley, Select Board
Dan Gutekanst, Superintendent of Schools
Lee Newman (Remote), Director of Planning and Community Development
Lars Unjem (Remote), Citizen
Tatiana Swanson, Director of Human Resources

Citizen Requests to Address the Finance Committee

None

Approval of Minutes of Prior Meetings

Moved: By Mr. Connelly that the minutes of meeting March 20, 204, be approved as distributed, subject to technical corrections. Mr. Healy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 7-0.

Annual Town Meeting Articles

Quiet Zone Project (Article 30)

Documents: Needham Quiet Zone Feasibility Study

Mr. Connelly recalled the topic of the Quiet Zone project arising last year, focusing on an appropriation for its design and construction. Concerns were raised about the outdated information presented, leading to the decision to hire GPI to update it. He explained, a working committee worked through the fall and winter to develop a proposal. The article seeks design funds for the project. However, it was noted that establishing a Quiet Zone at the golf course intersection is currently not feasible due to significant associated costs. Mr. Unjem confirmed Mr. Connelly's description of the project and article.

Mr. Healy sought clarification on the risk factors outlined in the memo. Mr. Unjem explained that the risk score is a severity-weighted measure developed by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), with higher numbers indicating greater risk. The existing conditions, utilizing horns, have higher risk scores, while the goal of implementing a Quiet Zone is to improve safety relative to current conditions. Mr. Healy asked for further clarification. Ms. Cooley clarified that the proposal aimed to reduce risk compared to current conditions.

Mr. Unjem provided background on the train horn rule established in the 1990s, which stemmed from private agreements between municipalities and railroads, particularly common in Florida. These agreements allowed the cessation of train horn operation at certain crossings, resulting in increased incidents due to unchanged conditions. Consequently, the federal government intervened, establishing the train horn rule to standardize safety procedures across rail crossings and offering the option to pursue Quiet Zones. Quiet Zones entail additional safety measures to compensate for the absence of train horns, with the risk index based on a scoring methodology by the FRA. The risk index, which in Needham is currently higher than the national average, necessitates implementing supplemental safety measures to mitigate risk. The options include medians or quad gates, among others, to ensure compliance with the Quiet Zone calculator by the FRA, resulting in scores falling below the national average.

Mr. Healy questioned the recommendation to proceed with a scenario that might entail a lesser risk compared to additional safety measures combined with train horns. Ms. Cooley clarified that while adding train horns might further enhance safety, the proposed plan already significantly reduces risk compared to the current conditions with horns only.

Mr. Coffman noted that with the supplemental measures, the average risk falls below the national average. Mr. Healy reiterated concerns about not achieving optimum safety. Ms. Miller pointed out that the goal of this committee is primarily to decrease the noise, not just improve safety. Mr. Unjem highlighted the multifaceted nature of the issue, encompassing safety, quality of life, economic development, and health considerations.

Ms. Smith-Fachetti inquired about the costs needed to enhance safety at the crossings to the national average, separate from implementing a Quiet Zone and asked if we are required to take action. Mr. Coffman clarified that supplemental safety measures would be necessary to eliminate train horns without increasing risk and he, in concert with Ms. Cooley, asserted that all of these safety measures are currently voluntary.

Ms. Miller highlighted that not all crossings qualify for Quiet Zones, and emphasized the overarching objective of reducing train horn noise while ensuring safety standards across Needham. Mr. Coffman questioned the rationale behind the committee's request for $750,000 for the study. He proposed considering the MBTA to conduct the study, noting the substantial cost difference between internal and external consultants for the design phase, which could potentially save around $300,000 on expenses.

Ms. Cooley explained the plan is to initially pursue Keolis (MBTA contractor) for the project's design, but if they are unavailable, the $750,000 will be funds allocated to hire an external consultant. Ms. Smith-Fachetti inquired about the potential liabilities of using an outside consultant.. Ms. Cooley clarified that there wouldn't be additional liability, as Keolis is required to review and approve the work. Mr. Healy asked about the committee's communication with Keolis. Ms. Lustig described Keolis as responsive during the early stages of the project but recent attempts at communication went unanswered. She highlighted Keolis's longer project timelines compared to external firms. Ms. Smith-Fachetti raised concerns about potential bottlenecks even if an outside consultant is hired. Ms. Lustig explained that using an external consultant might result in more control over scheduling. Mr. Healy inquired about Keolis's stance on Quiet Zones. Ms. Lustig mentioned Keolis and MBTA's general preference for train horns as the primary safety solution. Mr. Unjem notes the rationale for the MBTA's stance are the previously aforementioned studies from the 1990s.

Mr. Healy inquired about the funding for construction, noting the $3.4 million cost and its impact on the levy. Ms. Miller clarified that the project is currently modeled at closer to $2.7 million in the CIP, and current projections indicate going over the 3% limit. Mr. Healy expressed reluctance to vote on the design without a firm plan for construction financing.

Mr. Coffman asked about potential recommendations for upgrades from Keolis and who would bear the expenses if the town took no action. Ms. Lustig explained that the MBTA would cover the expenses, but expressed uncertainty about their willingness to make upgrades. She also mentioned some of our crossings do not have technology that would not be acceptable for new crossings, for example newer gates with constant warning time that rely less on the discretion of the driver. Additionally, she described the median solution, which involves installing a physical barrier between lanes to prevent vehicles from weaving through the gates.

Mr. Levy sought clarification on whether Great Plain Ave would be incorporated. Ms. Cooley responded that it is included in the design phase She mentioned the possibility of including Great Plain during planned renovations but noted that plans are still evolving. Ms. Lustig then brought up challenges related to signaling equipment. She highlighted issues with the physical size of the equipment and the need to find suitable locations for installation. Mr. Levy inquired about maintenance costs for the new equipment. Ms. Lustig mentioned previous conversations with the MBTA regarding potential maintenance fees charged to communities, but clarified that they have not yet done so for any communities that have implemented the equipment. Mr. Levy raised concerns about the potential interference of medians with snow plowing and maintenance activities. Ms. Lustig noted that temporary medians with stanchions may require regular maintenance due to potential collisions, while more permanent solutions like granite curbs would pose fewer maintenance challenges.

Mr. Coffman emphasized the ongoing presence of horn sounds particularly at the golf course. Ms. Smith-Fachetti sought clarification on the number of residents impacted by those horns and whether there were plans to address the situation. Ms. Cooley acknowledged the need for further discussion and planning to find a satisfactory resolution. Mr. Connelly expressed his estimation of a significant capital expense, likely exceeding $10 million, to address the golf course. Ms. Smith-Fachetti raised concerns about the fairness of solving the problem for the majority of town while leaving a minority still affected by train horns. Ms. Cooley emphasized the benefits of reducing horn sounds but acknowledged that some residents would remain affected. Ms. Smith-Fachetti reiterated the need for a clear long-term plan and cost estimates. Mr. Cooley emphasized the importance of clarity in communication regarding the plan's impact on reducing horn sounds and what is possible in different locations.

Mr. Healy inquired about the likelihood of Great Plain not being included in the Quiet Zone plan. Ms. Fitzpatrick emphasized the need to conduct feasibility studies to gather necessary information. Ms. Cooley added that the diagnostic study aims to ensure readiness for implementing changes at specific intersections, acknowledging that the process would take time to unfold. Mr. Healy raised concerns about potential delays if construction prevented the implementation of Quiet Zones at certain locations, to which Ms. Cooley acknowledged the possibility and reiterated the gradual nature of the process. Ms. Calton followed up on Ms. Smith-Fachetti's point regarding the reach of train horn sounds, questioning whether the noise would still impact residents beyond the immediate area, to which it was agreed by several in the group there is an apparent radius. Mr. Unjem noted factors like engineer behavior, weather conditions, and equipment compliance could influence the noise level.

Ms. Miller inquired about regulations regarding horn loudness and compliance monitoring. Mr. Unjem explained the prescribed decibel range for train horns and the lack of monitoring equipment at crossings that would ensure compliance. Ms. Cooley added that full compliance with regulations might lead to increased train noise overall and is not something we push for.

Mr. O’Connor shared an observation regarding a tragic incident from over 20 years ago involving train horns and a young girl's death, suggesting that this event may be brought up at Town Meeting. Ms. Cooley, acknowledged Mr. O’Connor's point and the story as a tragedy, while noting it didn’t occur at a crossing. Mr. Unjem clarified the nature of Quiet Zones, explaining that they only regulate the routine use of train horns when approaching crossings but do not restrict their use in emergency situations. Ms. Calton connected the discussion to safety standards and suggested that train horns should operate at appropriate levels for safety reasons. Ms. Cooley noted the difference between train operations rural locations versus urban areas. In her opinion, the train horns as they are in Needham, are more than sufficient. Ms. Smith-Fachetti inquired whether public safety officials were on board with such changes. Ms. Lustig clarified that in previous discussions both the police and firefighters had no issues with the updated signal technology, and noted that if the signals were to fail we’d be mandated by the MBTA to update to the constant warning time signals.

Ms. Miller shared personal experiences with train-related accidents, expressing concerns about the potential risks associated with Quiet Zones, particularly in cases of equipment malfunction. Mr. Levy echoed Ms. Miller's sentiment, citing instances of malfunctioning equipment on existing infrastructure and highlighting the importance of ensuring safety measures are effective. Mr. Healy expressed reservations about voting on the proposal without a clear understanding of its financial implications and potential impact on the town's budget. Mr. Connelly acknowledged Mr. Healy's concerns but emphasized that the proposal is funded by free cash and aims to initiate an education process to inform future decisions. Mr. Connelly stressed the importance of weighing the benefits of the proposal against other capital projects.

Amend Zoning Bylaw- Solar Energy Systems (Article 20)

Mr. Block introduced the changes, explaining that the amendment aims to permit various types of solar installations, including small and medium-scale ground-mounted systems, parking canopies, and building-mounted canopies. Mr. Block highlighted the regulatory framework, specifying that small-scale ground-mounted systems up to 1,500 square feet would be allowed in side yards and rear yards. However, in front yards, such installations would require a special permit, with additional screening requirements. Ms. Smith-Fachetti sought clarification on setback requirements. Mr. Block clarified that installations would need to comply with either district-level setbacks or setbacks specific to primary or accessory structures, depending on the application. He explained that accessory structures may have smaller setbacks than primary structures.

Mr. Levy inquired about the mounting of ground-mounted solar systems. Mr. Block explained that the method of installation depends on factors such as soil conditions and topography. Commonly, ground-mounted systems utilize some form of a cement base. Mr. Levy raised a question about whether ground-mounted solar systems would contribute to lot coverage calculations. Mr. Block clarified that while the surface area of ground-mounted systems would be counted toward lot coverage, it would not be double-counted. However, if solar panels extended beyond the footprint of a building, the additional surface area would be included in lot coverage calculations.

Ms. Smith-Fachetti asked if the amendment would permit the construction of parking canopies over existing school parking lots. Ms. Newman confirmed that the bylaw would indeed allow for such installations, provided they adhere to existing parking lot regulations. Ms. Miller sought clarification on extending solar installations over driveways. Mr. Block explained that dimensional regulations would control such installations. If a driveway extended to the edge of the property where construction is permitted, solar installations could extend over it. However, if the garage marked the limit of permissible construction, solar installations would not extend beyond it.

Ms. Smith-Fachetti further inquired about the possibility of installing solar panels on accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Mr. Block clarified that solar installations on or as ADUs would be subject to existing regulations and the article would not create non-conformities.

Mr. Connelly raised a question regarding the requirement for a special permit for small-scale ground-mounted solar installations in the front yard, noting that visibility from neighbors is not significantly different in the front yard compared to the side or rear yards. Mr. Block explained that the decision to require a special permit for front yard installations was a public policy choice to balance accessibility for homeowners while considering the greater visibility and visual impact of installations in the front yard. Mr. Coffman expressed concern about the surface area limitations for homes that have already maximized their buildable area. Mr. Block clarified that the intention of the amendment was to provide additional options beyond rooftop installations, which may not be feasible due to factors such as roof structure and orientation. He emphasized the aim to utilize public policy to enable more applications of solar energy systems. Mr. Coffman suggested the possibility of building a tunnel with panels on top over a driveway to maximize solar energy generation, but Mr. Block interjected that he would still be subject to dimensional regulations. Ms. Miller asked about the taxability of these structures both commercially and privately. Mr. Davison suggested that commercially they will be taxable, and in terms of private property the change to the home value is what is relevant as a tax basis.

Planning Consulting Assistance (Article 9)

Documents: Special Financial Article Request DSR5: Planning Consulting Assistance

Mr. Block highlighted the potential benefits of future zoning bylaw amendments and the need for additional funds to support planning initiatives. He mentioned the importance of addressing challenges and promoting economic growth in the town, citing an example of a microstudy about current regulations requiring too much parking. Mr. Healy expressed skepticism about allocating funds for undefined projects, preferring a more targeted approach based on specific needs brought to the Finance Committee. Ms. Smith-Fachetti inquired about the status of previous appropriations and remaining funds, seeking clarification on how the funds were utilized and the balance remaining in the account. Ms. Newman provided details on previous appropriations, mentioning that most of the funds went toward rezoning around the Muzzy property, with the remaining amount primarily used for the MBTA Communities Act. She reiterated this appropriation would allow the planning board to act quickly when required.

Mr. Healy highlighted the town's reserve fund of $1.8 million and expressed hesitation about the current appropriation's lack of project specificity. Mr. Levy echoed concerns about prior appropriations, suggesting a preference for funding multiple projects. Ms. Newman defended the approach, citing the variability of projects that arise and detailing plans for upcoming studies, including a parking study. Mr. Block added insights into future demands for zoning modifications and large house studies, emphasizing the need for fiscal impact assessments. Ms. Miller acknowledged Mr. Healy's concerns, noting the necessity of Town Meeting votes for such projects.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee not recommend adoption of Article 9: Planning Consulting Assistance. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Levy noted that the lack of specificity is the issue. Mr. Healy agreed that is the primary issue, but also mentioned the reserve fund is available for unexpected requisitions.

The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:19pm.

Public Works Infrastructure (Article 32)

Ms. Miller noted that the current appropriation amount is significantly lower than in previous years.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of Article 31 Public Works Infrastructure, assuming the free cash is available and certified. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ms. Miller explained that despite the high free cash, there are various demands on it this year. While they are appropriating less for Public Works infrastructure, there are still funds available from past appropriations. She emphasized that the current investment level in infrastructure, at $1 million, is insufficient for their needs long term. Mr. Coffman asked for clarification. Mr. Healy reiterated there are other priorities for free cash, and since public works has additional funding, they can withstand the smaller allocations this year, however in future it will need to increase.

The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:23pm.

Article 17 Expand State Funds for Public Ways (Article 17)

Ms. Miller noted this is annual article for Chapter 90 funds. Mr. Healy noted that the funds are not noted in the article but asserted that this article allows the spending of whatever funds are received.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of Article 17: Expand State Funds for Public Ways. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Levy noted some of these funds were being saved up and asked about their current level. Ms. Lustig stated it was around $7 million but that around $2 million will be used for known projects.

The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:25pm.

<u>Special Town Meeting Warrant Articles</u>

Amend FY2024 Operating Budget (Unnumbered)

Ms. Miller asked if this is the only change expected to the FY2024 Operating Budget. Mr. Davison affirms and elaborated the article proposes increasing the appropriation for debt by $14,525 and reducing the reserve fund by the same amount. This adjustment aims to pay off a bond anticipation note in full when it matures in June, thus avoiding additional costs for rolling it over.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of unnumbered article Amend FY2024 Operating Budget. Mr. Levy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:26pm.

Town-Owned Land Surveys (Unnumbered)

This article was previously discussed.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of unnumbered article Town-Owned Land Surveys. Ms. Calton seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:27pm.

Unpaid Bills of a Prior Year (Unnumbered)

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of unnumbered article Unpaid Bills of a Prior Year in the amount of $23,653.42. Ms. Calton seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Levy asked why these numbers have increased in recent years. Mr. Davison asserted that is due to late vendor billing post-Covid. Mr. Levy asked if there is a time limit. Mr. Davison said it is ideal that they bill within 30 days but counsel recommends the vendor be paid. Ms. Calton inquired if there is any interest payments or late fees. Mr. Davison replied there is not since it is the vendor who billed this late.

The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:30pm.

Public, Educational, and Government Programming (Unnumbered)

Ms. Miller explained these are funds for the Needham Channel.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of unnumbered article Public, Educational, and Government Programming in the amount of $471,657.00. Ms. Smith-Fachetti seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0, at approximately 8:31p.m

Auditorium Upgrades (Unnumbered)

Documents: May 2024 Special Town Meeting: Article 8: Appropriate for Auditorium Upgrades and Improvements

Dr. Gutekanst presented a proposal for auditorium upgrades and improvements across three venues: the High School auditorium, the Pollard auditorium, and the Newman auditorium. It was found that significant repairs and upgrades were needed due to outdated and non-functioning equipment to bring the spaces up to code. The proposed funding allocation aimed to cover immediate code work, including fire retardant curtains and rigging repairs, which were essential for safety. Additionally, funds were earmarked for design work at the Newman Auditorium. Mr. Healy sought clarification on the budget breakdown, specifically distinguishing between funds allocated for code work construction (approximately. $98,000) and those for design (approximately $247,000). His concern was that a significant portion of the proposed budget was for design, which raised questions about the potential impact on future budgets and debt models when it is time for construction (initial estimate around $2 million).

Dr. Gutekanst noted what is not in the plan yet is the need for further upgrades at the high school auditorium, particularly regarding sound systems, which are currently outdated and in need of replacement. He emphasized the urgency of addressing these issues, given the reliance on rented equipment for performances. Ms. Smith-Fachetti inquired about the expected lifespan of the new. Dr. Gutekanst explained the shift from analog to digital systems and the challenges this presents, emphasizing the need for a different approach to equipment maintenance and usage. He elaborated he'd like to implement a policy where a Needham Public School employee must be present when the equipment is being used by outside groups. Mr. Levy sought clarification on whether community groups would still have access to the facilities, to which Dr. Gutekanst affirmed, but hinted at potential increases in usage costs due to the need for trained personnel on-site.

Ms. Miller raised the possibility of using funds from a revolving fund for facility rentals to supplement the proposed upgrades. However, Dr. Gutekanst expressed doubt about the availability of sufficient funds. Ms. Calton questioned whether future building renovations were considered when planning current projects, to avoid redundant work. Dr. Gutekanst explained that minimal upgrades were planned for Pollard auditorium, with a focus on essential improvements while prioritizing investments in Newman Auditorium. Mr. Healy expressed support for necessary repairs but sought more information on the proposed design phase's future expenses and its alignment with the capital plan and debt management.

Ms. Miller suggested breaking down the allocation of free cash and establishing priorities in case the anticipated amount differs from expectations. Mr. Davison acknowledged the uncertainty but expressed confidence in the current estimates. Mr. Healy raised concerns about the prioritization of projects between the town and school sides, especially in relation to debt management policies. Mr. Levy, however, leaned towards recommending adoption of the article, highlighting a philosophical disagreement regarding whether to proceed with design funding without clarity on future construction financing as well as the durability of designs.

Mr. Connelly expressed agreement with Mr. Levy's perspective. He highlighted that the study has already been conducted, and the identified need for improvements is significant for both school and community arts programs. Mr. Connelly argued that without completing the design phase, they cannot properly assess the project's priority against others and allocate resources accordingly. Mr. Coffman mentioned that the prioritization of town objectives needs to be presented at Town Meeting.

MOVED: By Mr. Levy that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of unnumbered article Auditorium Upgrades and Improvements in the amount of $344,558. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a role call vote of 7-1 at approximately 8:48pm.

Rescind Debt Authorizations (Unnumbered)

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of unnumbered article Rescind Debt Authorization. Mr. Coffman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 8:49pm.

Debt Service Discussion

Documents: Debt Service models

Ms. Miller presented various scenarios regarding the town's financial situation, particularly focusing on debt service and the impact of proposed projects. She discussed the implications of different scenarios on the town's debt levels, considering factors such as excluded debt, revenue growth, and interest assumptions. Ms. Miller highlighted the need to prioritize projects and possibly delay certain initiatives to ensure financial sustainability. She also emphasized the importance of considering taxpayer affordability, especially with significant increases in excluded debt projected over the years. Ms. Miller’s initial scenario assumed all debt related town articles are approved but suggested potential adjustments to project timelines and reimbursement rates to mitigate financial strain on taxpayers. The assumptions of each scenario are provided in the document she presented. Mr. Coffman asked about the projected revenue, and Ms. Miller clarified she assumed 4% growth. Ms. Miller noted that after today the scenarios would have to be adjusted to add in the auditorium work and reiterates more projects will come up as time goes on.

Ms. Miller explaind the scenarios need to be evaluated based both on the fiscal policy and the tax burden. Mr. Coffman clarified that the tax exclusions must be voted on. Mr. Levy asked what assumptions were made about the timing of the debt. Ms. Miller assumed 25% following authorization, 50% in year 4 and the residual in year 5 or 6, noting that she followed the assumptions provided by Mr. Davison. Mr. Levy asked if free cash has any impact here. Ms. Miller noted while it is possible to decide to pay for something with free cash rather than CIP there is no direct impact.

Mr. Coffman asked about the perception of exceeding the 10% vs the 3%. Mr. Davison highlighted that exceeding the 10% threshold within the levy limit might be perceived more negatively than exceeding it with excluded debt. Mr. Davison clarified that while the policy specifies a 3% limit for general fund recurring revenue, the 10% limit considers all revenues. He underscored the significance of staying within the 3% limit to ensure sufficient funds for the operating budget. Mr. Healy reiterated that not controlling the 3% can lead to an operational budget problem. Ms. Miller highlighted that this plan does not include additional maintenance projects that will inevitably need to be done. Ms. Miller highlighted that as the budget increases, even if debt exclusion votes occur, the taxes still increase making the town less affordable. Mr. Levy noted the nature of the debt being a fixed cost once it is incurred, the only place to cut in the case of economic downturn is the operating budget. Ms. Miller emphasized that Mr. Levy's point speaks to the importance of the 3%. Ms. Miller asked what the debt cost assumption is. Mr. Davison replied that the models all assume 7% and currently the cost is around 5%. Ms. Smith-Fachetti mentioned that may make these worst case scenarios. Mr. Healy agreed, but reiterated Ms. Miller's earlier point that these numbers don't include many unknown projects that will come up.

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee move to executive session under exception 3: to discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining with ITWA and NIPEA, where an open meeting may have detrimental effect on the bargaining position of the public budget and the chair declares not to return to open session before adjournment. The chair declares not to return to open session before adjournment. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0 at approximately 9:12 pm.

Executive Session

Adjournment

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee meeting be adjourned, there being no further business. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 8-0, at approximately 9:22 p.m.

Documents: Needham Quiet Zone Feasibility Study; May 2024 Special Town Meeting: Article 8: Appropriate for Auditorium Upgrades and Improvements; Special Financial Article Request DSR5: Planning Consulting Assistance, Debt Service models

Respectfully submitted,

Molly Pollard

Executive Secretary, Finance Committee