

**Needham Finance Committee
Minutes of Meeting of October 19, 2011**

The meeting of the Finance Committee was called to order by the Chair, Matthew Borrelli, at approximately 7:04 pm in the Charles River Conference Room at the Public Services Administration Building (Temporary Town Hall.)

Present from the Finance Committee:

Matthew Borrelli, Chair; Richard Reilly, Vice Chair

Members: John Connelly (arrived 8:45 pm), Richard Creem, Gary McNeill, Steven Rosenstock, Lisa Zappala, Richard Zimbone

Also Present:

Kate Fitzpatrick, Town Manager

David Davison, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Finance

Maurice Handel, Chair, Board of Selectmen

Gerald Wasserman, Vice Chair, Board of Selectmen; Chair, Green Communities Study Committee

James Healy, Member, Board of Selectmen

Michael Greis, Member, Green Communities Study Committee

Citizen Requests

No citizens requested to speak.

Approve Minutes

MOVED: By Mr. Reilly that the minutes of October 5, 2011, as revised and recently distributed, be approved. Mr. Creem seconded the motion. Mr. Rosenstock stated that he had not had an opportunity to read the minutes. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0-1 with Mr. Rosenstock abstaining.

Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 3: Amend Zoning By-Law – Apartment – 2 Zoning District

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee reconsider the vote that the Finance Committee will make a recommendation at Town Meeting regarding Article 3: Amend Zoning By-Law – Apartment – 2 Zoning District. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Mr. Rosenstock stated that the Committee should reconsider only if something new came to light. Mr. Creem stated that there is additional language limiting the structures to 3,000 square feet. Ms. Zappala stated that the changes apply only to the nursing facility. Mr. Rosenstock asked whether there is a financial implication. Mr. Creem stated that he thinks any financial implication is *de minimus* since the change applies only to one development. Mr. Borrelli stated

that Ms. Newman and Ms. Bailin stated they would supply information regarding the financial impact. Mr. Zimbone stated that the effect will be positive, but there is a question of the degree of magnitude. Mr. Rosenstock stated that there could be costs such as for ambulances. Mr. Zimbone stated that they are replacing a nursing home with 72 beds with another with 72 beds. Mr. McNeill stated that they are just modernizing the facility. Mr. Reilly added that North Hill is a good citizen of the Town and one of the biggest taxpayers.

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of Article 3: Amend Zoning By-Law – Apartment – 2 Zoning District. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion. Mr. Creem stated that it would be helpful to have data from the Planning Department for preparation for Town Meeting. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 4: Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations for New England Business Center

MOVED: By Ms. Zappala that the Finance Committee reconsider the vote that the Finance Committee will make a recommendation at Town Meeting regarding Article 4: Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations for New England Business Center. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Mr. Handel stated that the purpose of the article is to spur development by reducing the restrictions on development and what can be done by right. There has been much discussion over the last three years which led to the idea that if the restrictions were loosened and more businesses were allowed by right, then the NEBC would be ready to catch the next wave of development. Mr. Borrelli stated that the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor of this article. Certain zoning changes were made at the last Annual Town Meeting, and the CEA said they would be back for additional changes this fall. The changes should have a positive impact according to the CEA.

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of Article 4: Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations for New England Business Center. Ms. Zappala seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Rosenstock asked whether the benefit would be higher property values with larger buildings. Mr. Handel stated that there could be bigger buildings, with higher heights and higher floor ratios. Mr. Rosenstock asked if any part abutted residential areas. Mr. Handel stated yes, but there is a buffer area of 350 feet around the neighborhood where buildings can't go to the full height. Mr. Rosenstock asked if the Town infrastructure could handle the additional traffic. Mr. Handel stated that the infrastructure can handle the development at the rate that the Town anticipates. However, there could be an issue if there were full expansion all at once.

VOTE: The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Reconsideration of Request for Reserve Fund Transfer – Pollard School Project

Mr. Davison stated that Mr. Popper requested that Finance Committee reconsider the Reserve Fund Transfer request that was approved at the October 12 meeting. Mr. Popper negotiated all the change orders and needs \$25,000 rather than \$40,000. He would like to amend the request for a Reserve Fund Transfer from \$40,000 to \$25,000.

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee reconsider the October 12, 2011 vote to approve the Reserve Fund Transfer in the amount of \$40,000 to the Public Facilities project. Mr. Rosenstock seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

MOVED: By Mr. Reilly that the Finance Committee approve the Reserve Fund Transfer request in the amount of \$25,000 to the Public Facilities budget to cover the Pollard School project overage. Ms. Zappala seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Zimbone stated the he still has the concerns stated last week that the project overrun costs need to be clearly explained to Town Meeting. Mr. Borrelli asked if there was any recourse from anyone involved in the project. Mr. Davison stated that the matter is now ended, and there is a signed agreement. He stated that the PPBC determined at their meeting that there is no recourse against the civil engineer, though they will not use him again in the future. The types of measurements that are required of a civil engineer were done. However, ADA compliance requires micro measuring, so the slope was found to be 3% when it needed to be 2 ½ %. The general contractor ripped out the work and redid it without an appeal process, which he did not have to do, in order to allow the school to open on time. The original sidewalk had been built to specification. The committee felt the contractor acted in good faith to resolve the issue.

VOTE: The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Minuteman School Update

Ms. Zappala stated that there was a Minuteman School Council Meeting. The number of enrollees from Needham has increased from 26 to 34 students. The school's overall enrollment target is 800, and they are close to meeting that. The school has a large number of post secondary students. There was a large unexpected capital need of \$375,000 to fix part of the building that was condemned by the Lexington Fire Department. Needham will be assessed for part of that. Otherwise the budget is okay.

Ms. Zappala stated that approval from all sixteen member towns was secured to pay for a feasibility study of future needs at Minuteman. They are completing an enrollment study paid from their operating budget and have not yet expended the feasibility funds. There are proposals of new ways to share costs, and discussion of changing the member town agreement and the cost sharing formula. She stated that Ms. Fitzpatrick looked at Needham's costs under different cost sharing proposals and the Town came out similarly in the different situations. Ms. Zappala stated that there was discussion about MSBA reimbursement for a building project. The school wants to increase the percentage of reimbursement because a large number of enrollees are from

non-member towns. They are also trying to persuade some non-member towns to join. Ms. Zappala stated that she is not sure that they could get a unanimous vote for a capital expansion project. The feasibility study will take one year, so they are moving forward, but slowly. Mr. Zimbone asked whether there could be a capital surcharge for nonmember towns that send students to Minuteman. Ms. Zappala stated that it seems that they cannot, so they are looking for legislative relief. Nonmember towns can be charged only with operating costs. In response to a question from Mr. Rosenstock, Ms. Zappala stated that the formula is based on a three-year rolling average based on enrollment, but it is a complicated formula. Once they determine a new formula with some certainty, the Town can evaluate it further. Mr. Davison stated that currently, the Town gets one assessment from Minuteman that includes capital and debt service.

Mr. McNeill asked if the Town knows the per pupil cost of sending a student to Minuteman vs. the High School. Ms. Zappala stated that the figures are not comparable because the School Department does not include benefits or facilities costs, so their cost appears lower. She added that Minuteman has lowered costs for member towns, and begun charging more for nonmember towns. Mr. Davison stated that they are seeking relief because out of district tuition is set by the state. Vocational education is much more expensive than academic. In order to achieve some economies of scale, there are regional schools. The per-student costs will be presented at budget time. Mr. Borrelli asked whether the increase from 24 to 36 students is part of a trend. Ms. Zappala stated that the number is trending upward, since the school is making more efforts to increase enrollment from member towns. Ms. Zappala stated that there would not be anything more to report until after the next meeting in March, and that she will provide updates when the budget comes in.

Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 8: Adopt Stretch Energy Code

MOVED: By Ms. Zappala that the Finance Committee reconsider the vote that the Finance Committee will make a recommendation at Town Meeting regarding Article 8: Adopt Stretch Energy Code. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0. (Mr. Connelly had not yet arrived.)

Mr. Borrelli stated that Committee members received a letter from Mark Gluesing outlining counterpoints to the recommendations of the Green Communities Study Committee.

Mr. Zimbone stated that the Green Communities Study Committee issued a report stating the five criteria required to become a Green Community, which included adopting the Stretch Code. The Stretch Code is a change to the building code. The study committee recommended going forward with the Green Community requirements for reasons presented in the report, including energy savings and potential grant funding. The committee's analysis of the costs associated with the Stretch Code indicated it would require a 2-4% increase in building costs, depending on the size of the building. There would be offsetting savings, but payback time varies. It did not include the incremental cost to the Town Building Department. It is not agreed how much this would cost the Town, but it is expected to be less than one FTE. However, the Building Department would ask for an additional FTE to cover other needs as well.

Mr. Zimbone stated that there were also arguments against adopting the Stretch Code. There is concern about the Building Department's workload and the ability to successfully implement the regulations without causing delays and complaints. Another concern is that once the code is adopted, the Town is required to accept changes made to the code by the state unless there is a vote to specifically opt out of a change. Mr. Zimbone stated that as a member of the Green Communities Study Committee, he voted against the Stretch Code because he had deep concerns about whether the Building Department can handle it particularly since the regulations are not clear cut and definitive. Mr. McNeill stated that he supports Mr. Zimbone's comments, but that he is in favor of the Stretch Code because it is not as burdensome as described. In addition, independent HERS ratings will assist the Building Department and possibly alleviate some work. It would be beneficial to all. He also stated that many builders are already operating under the code. Mr. Zimbone stated that there was a builder on the study committee who stated that some builders in town were taking shortcuts in the area of energy savings. That builder thought that the Stretch Code would level the playing field by preventing cutting corners. However, because of concerns about the building department the builder also voted against the stretch code.

Mr. Reilly stated that the State is expected to adopt these provisions soon, and asked whether it would make sense to seek grant money while it is available. Mr. Zimbone stated that numerous towns have adopted the code, but that he was concerned about the requirement to accept changes. He stated that he will not recommend adopting the Stretch Code without more information about the financial implications to the operating budget and how it can be funded. Mr. Zimbone recognized that the downside to delaying implementing the stretch code is that it would push forward the base year that is used for calculating the 20% energy savings requirement. However, he is confident that the energy consultant hired by the Town will find more than 20% in possible savings going forward.

Mr. Reilly stated that it is a trade-off of possibly one FTE versus the grant money. Mr. Wasserman stated that it is estimated that approximately 10-15% of one FTE is needed to educate developers and homeowners. The grant money would be around \$150,000. Of the grant money, approximately \$10,000 could be used to pay that person. Mr. Wasserman also stated that if the code is approved now, it will go into effect in January 2012. Then the old and new codes would be concurrent for six months, allowing an eight month transition period. If the Town waits for the code to be enacted by the state next year, there would likely be no transition time. He stated that developers will need to be trained. However, many developers who work in other towns will already be trained. Mr. Wasserman also stated that the HERS ratings should save some time for the Building Department. Mr. Zimbone stated that the HERS raters are trained, tested and licensed by the state. The cost of the HERS rating is included in the 2-4% cost figure. The rating report is given to the building department as a basis for the inspection. However, HERS ratings are not needed for every project. The Town Building Inspector can accept the HERS report or not. It is open to interpretation. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that the Building Inspector stated that he would need an additional 10-15% of one FTE, or 200-400 hours per year, which is roughly \$8,000-\$10,000 per year. Ms. Zappala stated that while there is additional cost to the homeowner that it is returned in energy savings.

Mr. Creem asked whether new sheet metal inspections have caused a burden for the Building Department. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that there is additional work, but that it comes with

additional fees. The Building Department will be asking for additional hours, possibly 10-15% of an FTE. It would not cause any additional headcount. Mr. Creem asked how confident the Town is that the grant money will be there. Mr. Greis stated that the grants are funded by power companies paying for emissions, and so the funding is there, and there will be no problem getting the grant. He stated that there could be a second round of grants, but Mr. Zimbone stated that was not guaranteed, and that additional grants could be need-based.

Mr. Creem stated that the Finance Committee should consider a narrower question than Town Meeting might consider. The focus should be whether there is a financial implication to the Town, and if so, whether it is material. Mr. Rosenstock stated that Committee should think about the financial needs of the Town, but also of the homeowners. Mr. Zimbone stated that the Town has satisfied four of the five requirements to be a Green Community, and therefore the Town should be able to qualify if the Stretch Code is passed. Mr. Borrelli stated that he is not as confident based on language in the report. Mr. Wasserman stated that he was very careful in wording there report, but that he is confident. Mr. Healy disagreed, and stated that he felt there was not a sufficient answer to four of the five requirements: there is no efficient vehicle plan; there is not yet a plan for 20% energy saving; and there is no letter from Town Counsel regarding energy research zoning as a right. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that the energy consultant's report would be ready on October 31. Mr. Rosenstock stated the Committee could wait and not vote on speculation. Mr. Creem stated that if the Finance Committee did not vote, its previous vote to make a recommendation at Town Meeting still stands. Mr. Borrelli stated that the committee should wait until the following week to obtain more information on this article.

Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 14: Appropriate for Senior Center

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee reconsider the vote that the Finance Committee will make a recommendation at Town Meeting regarding the Special Town Meeting Article: Appropriate for Senior Center. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Creem stated that under Robert's Rules of Order, if there is a motion to reconsider two or more votes in a sequence of votes, then it is the earlier motion that will be considered. In addition, a motion to reconsider is in order only if it is made by someone who voted on the prevailing side. In this case, in order to reconsider Mr. Connelly's motion that the Committee recommend adoption of the Senior Center article, one of the members on the prevailing side of the earlier vote must make the motion. Since it was tied, the motion is considered to have failed under Robert's Rules. Therefore it must be a dissenting member that moves to reconsider the prior vote.

MOVED: By Mr. Creem that the chair rule that Mr. Zimbone's motion to reconsider be ruled to be not in order.

Mr. Zimbone stated that he was concerned that Mr. Creem is trying to force his position on this matter and avoid further discussion. He stated that the Finance Committee has a new member who should be allowed to take a position. Mr. Zimbone also stated that the Committee has never followed specific rules in this type of situation, but usually tries to develop a resolution. Mr.

Borrelli asked members to offer only concise opinions on the Article in question. He stated that the Committee needs to make a recommendation on the issue. He stated that he understands that the concern that the minority opinion will not be heard, but he will make sure those opinions are expressed.

Mr. Creem stated that he made his motion because one Committee member is absent because of a planned, expected business trip and will not have the opportunity to vote at this time. He stated that he feels that the Committee is not in a position to vote on this issue tonight. He has asked the chair to reschedule the vote to a time when all members are present, despite that the recommendation will not be in the printed warrant (which is a routine occurrence and of little significance to Town Meeting Members). He felt this would suggest to Town Meeting that the Committee is seriously deliberating the matter. Thus, Mr. Creem stated that he believes the motion to reconsider the vote on this article tonight is not in order. Ms. Zappala stated that to make the proper motion under the rules stated by Mr. Creem, a dissenting person would need to make the motion, which is someone who voted against Mr. Connelly's motion to recommend adoption of the article at the last meeting. Mr. Creem stated that at the last meeting, first Mr. Rosenstock made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend that Town Meeting not adopt the article. Mr. Rosenstock's motion was voted down. Next, Mr. Connelly moved that the Committee recommend adoption of the article. Mr. Connelly's motion did not pass because of a tie vote. Then the Committee passed a motion to enter "recommendation to be made at Town Meeting" in the warrant. Mr. Creem stated that only the Connelly and subsequent "recommendation to be made at Town Meeting" motions would properly be considered for reconsideration, as those seeking to recommend adoption of the Article no longer have an interest in the Rosenstock motion. When there are two motions in a sequence, the earlier one would be the subject of the motion to reconsider (if the earlier in time motion is reconsidered, the second in time motion deemed not to have taken place).

MOVED: By Ms. Zappala that the Finance Committee reconsider the vote on Mr. Connelly's motion to recommend adoption of the Article: Appropriate for the Senior Center. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion.

VOTE on Ms. Zappala's motion: 6-2, with Mr. Creem and Mr. Rosenstock dissenting.

Mr. Borrelli stated that he told Mr. Lunetta that he would read his previous comments for Mr. McNeill. Mr. Borrelli read the statement made by Mr. Lunetta at the October 12 meeting.

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the Finance Committee recommends adoption of Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 14: Appropriate for the Senior Center in the amount of \$8,075,000 and print the Committee's recommendation in the warrant. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McNeill apologized for his absence at the previous meeting, but added that he is well informed about what transpired at the October 12 meeting. Mr. Rosenstock stated that his only issue with the article is the form of financing that has been proposed by the executive body. The other issues are now history. He stated that the proposed financing will leave the Town with no contingency on paper. Also, it should be understood that the \$2 million from the

roads program is not deferred but cut out. Mr. Rosenstock stated he does not disagree that the Town needs a Senior Center, but the Town needs to understand that if infrastructure is added, it must be paid for. Mr. Rosenstock stated that it is risky to have no contingency because in his experience something always goes wrong.

Ms. Zappala stated that she was part of the tie vote. While she wants to support the project because of the need for a new Senior Center, she questions the financing plan. She feels the Committee should put aside all other issues. She stated that members should consider only the question of whether financing the project within the 3% limit at \$8.575 million is a bad recommendation on behalf of the Finance Committee. She asked for the Finance Director for an update on what the contingency would be.

Mr. Davison stated that he produced the Facility Financing Plan in June in response to a request from the Board of Selectmen to show how to finance an \$8 million project within the 3% policy guideline for debt being financed within the levy limit. Every year the capital plan is built around that 3%, no more and no less. If any of that money were to slide into the operating budget, it would be difficult to bring back, as it is difficult to reduce operations. That is why there is a capital plan. The plan used to be a one year plan, and four year wish list. The Town Manager has changed it to a Capital Improvement Plan with one year plan, plus four year plan of anticipated needs. Only under extraordinary circumstances would something come in early to the CIP. One recent example was a boiler that went out that was not anticipated to need replacement within the next five years.

Mr. Davison stated that the plan needed to support an \$8 million project along with other items had to be financed with debt including the Quint Fire truck, the DPW snow trailer, the DPW 8 bay cover, and the \$1.1 million project at Pollard. As a result, the roads program was reduced down to \$600,000. With the Senior Center project within the 3% debt capacity, the amount for contingency is tighter than in previous reports. The General Fund revenue growth is also higher than assumed. The average growth in General Fund Revenue (backing out debt and other exclusion overrides) over the last 20 years, with both good and bad times is 4.4%. The interest rate assumption of 6% is conservative. Rates today are lower, ranging from high 2% to low 3%. There have been no coupons above 5% in over 10 years.

Mr. Davison stated that the following changes have occurred since the June report. The Town issued some debt in October at less than 3%. This low rate allowed the Town to commit to pay down principal faster. This would increase the uncommitted portion of debt capacity in the Facility Plan. The Pollard roof project is coming in under the planned cost because reimbursement under the Green Roof program has been approved. \$3.5 million in debt was approved for the project, but the PPBC expects to return about \$700,000. There should be a vote at the Annual Town Meeting in 2012. In addition, the Town has identified a parcel of land to purchase which will be paid by debt. This purchase was made possible because of the above changes. However, the Town still has more debt capacity than expected. Mr. Davison stated that the previous night, the School Committee decided not to proceed with a \$1.1 million project at Pollard, which also freed up capacity. Mr. Davison stated that this leaves approximately \$2 million to deal with an unexpected problem and still have sufficient debt capacity in the Facility Financing Plan.

Mr. Rosenstock stated that the Senior Center was coming at the expense of the roads program. He asked about the salt shed, and how it was being financed. Mr. Davison stated that the salt shed would be built with Chapter 90 money. He stated that he expects the request authorization for borrowing at the next Annual Town Meeting, with repayment from Chapter 90 money. There will be a borrowing authorization, but no long term bond will be issued. The Town can seek a state anticipation note available when state reimbursement affects an expenditure. Chapter 90 money is an allocation that must be accepted by Town Meeting. The project must be approved by Mass Highway in order to get the funding. It is available for roads, bridges, equipment to service roads and facilities to support road services. Mr. Reilly asked where the Chapter 90 money would have been used in earlier plans. Mr. Davison stated that it was scheduled to be used for downtown street-scaping. However, there are zoning and planning issues, and the Town is not ready to roll out those improvements. The Planning Board is looking into a public/private partnership for that project. In response to a question from Mr. Reilly, Mr. Davison stated that he stands by his June Facility Financing Plan, because of the assumptions including the higher interest rate and lower revenue growth factor. Mr. Creem stated that he recently chaired a workshop that addressed interest rates. He stated that one of the panelists was asked about the future of interest rates, and she said she was confident about where rates would be for the next 6-12 months, but beyond that she would not hazard a guess because of economic uncertainty. Mr. Creem stated that the Town should not tolerate excessive risk for no reason, as it is the wrong approach.

MOVED: By Mr. Creem that Mr. Zimbone's motion be laid on the table.

Mr. Creem stated that this financing decision is one of the most important issues facing the Town. The Committee knew of Mr. Lunetta's business trip, unlike Mr. McNeill's absence at the last meeting. Committees routinely put off discussing important issues until all can be present. He stated that there is no reason not to poll the members for an available time to meet. He previously proposed this to the chair, and it was rejected and he does not know why. There is no compelling reason to put the vote in the warrant at this time. He added that he hoped the rush to put forward a vote was not to take advantage of Mr. Lunetta's absence and inflate the vote. He stated that equity strongly favors protecting Mr. Lunetta's right to vote and that no harm would come to the Town by delaying the vote. He added that the motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. Rosenstock seconded Mr. Creem's motion to lay Mr. Zimbone's motion on the table.

VOTE on Mr. Creem's motion to lay on the table: 2 in favor (Mr. Creem and Mr. Rosenstock) and 6 against.

Mr. Borrelli stated that he discussed the expected vote with Mr. Lunetta and tried to find a way to provide for a proxy vote, but the Open Meeting Law precluded that. Mr. Borrelli stated that he sought comments from Mr. Lunetta and presented them. He reiterated that Mr. Lunetta opposes recommending the article. Mr. Borrelli stated that he took exception to the comment that he is inflating the vote. He stated that while he was on the SCEC, he has always made sure

the plan was fiscally responsible. He thanked Ms. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Davison for their hard work.

VOTE on Mr. Zimbone's motion that the Finance Committee recommend adoption of the Article: Appropriate for the Senior Center: 5-3 with Mr. Rosenstock, Mr. Creem and Ms. Zappala dissenting.

Mr. Rosenstock noted that the three most senior members of the Committee, all three being former chairs, voted against the article. Mr. Zimbone commented that he is the next most senior member, and a former chair, and that he also has concerns, but that they were not sufficient to vote against the article.

Finance Committee Updates

There was discussion of scheduling. The next meetings will be October 26 and November 7.

Adjourn

MOVED: By Mr. Zimbone that the meeting be adjourned, there being no further business. Ms. Zappala seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0, at approximately 9:37 p.m.

Documents: November Special Town Meeting Warrant, 10/19/2011 final draft; letter from Architect Mark Gluesing to Finance Committee dated October 16, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Louise Mizgerd
Executive Secretary/Staff Analyst

Approved December 14, 2011