The meeting was called to order at 7:35 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

March 7, 2019:
K. Duffett made a motion to accept the minutes of March 7, 2019 as written. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The minutes were approved as written.

March 14, 2019:
K. Duffett made a motion to accept the minutes of March 14, 2019 as written. D. Goselin seconded the motion. A. Tanini, K. Duffett, A. Langford, D. Goselin and V. Parks voted in favor of the motion. E. Chambers and J. Clancy abstained. The motion passed. The minutes were approved as written.

Warrant Article 10 – Zoning Amendment: Drive-Through Restaurants along 129 BAOD:
J. Clancy introduced guests, E. Belansky, Chelmsford’s Community Development Director and L. Marrone, Chelmsford’s Director of Business Development. He added that members of the Planning Board and Economic Development Commission were also available to answer any questions. E. Belansky reported that as Route 129 sits today there are elevated vacancy rates and pending re-locations. He said that originally, they had thought that the BAOD would have been enough to spur activity in the area, but that has not been the case. He stated that Route 129 would require significant attention and commitment. He added that the proposed zoning bylaw change was the next step in what is an incremental process. L. Marrone stated that her focus has
been on Route 129. She said that they had received a site readiness grant and had a complete inventory of the area done. She said that they had received a 60-page condition report for the area and there were no major surprises in the report. She reported that there have been some successes thus far including a great success story at 2-4-6 Omni Way (formerly Kronos). She reported that SVN Parsons Commercial Group had purchased these locations which resulted in the following commercial activity: Life Links, Inc. moved and expanded 324 jobs, Comcast expanded with 400 jobs, WNA moved 700 jobs to Chelmsford and the following new companies came to Chelmsford: First Light Bioscience (25 jobs), AutoGuide (20 jobs), MA Dept of Children and Families (150 jobs), and Parisi Associates.

L. Marrone reported that the vacancy rate at Chelmsford Cross Roads at Route 129 was at 16% with 28% of the vacancy being office space. She said that much of the building stock was older buildings with 77% being built prior to 1990. She added that one of the challenges faced by the area was the lack of amenities. She said that two tenants had been lost at 321 Billerica Road within the last six months due to this. She reported that Analog Devices had an exit plan in place for re-locating out of Chelmsford in 2020 which would take three locations: 2 Elizabeth Dr. (250 jobs, 105,000 square feet), 15 Research Dr. (90 jobs, 30,000 square feet), and 20 Alpha Rd., (120 jobs, 71,000 square feet). She added that Cadence at 270 Billerica Rd. (212 jobs, 60,000 square feet) was also discussing leaving Chelmsford. D. Goselin asked what the owners of the buildings were doing to try and prevent business from leaving. L. Marrone replied that they were trying to bring amenities on, but it would take a lot of work and funding for things like adding kitchen equipment and re-doing entry ways. She said that owners were reluctant to take the risk. She added that it was tough to create the impression of a vibrant business park with large vacancies at the entrance of the park. She said that she has been meeting with owners and getting in front of them and while she was making progress, it was slow progress.

D. Goselin asked what realtors were involved besides the landlords. L. Marrone replied that they included firms such as Colliers and C.B. Ellis. E. Belansky pointed out that these brokers were not exclusive to Chelmsford and they dealt with millions of square feet of real estate. K. Duffett asked if the prices were better elsewhere for those that were re-locating out of Chelmsford. E. Belansky replied that none of the moves had been due to cost. He added that it was a matter of what businesses were looking for and supply and demand. He noted that businesses had located to Chelmsford some time ago, so part of the issue may be that they come to Chelmsford, grow and then outgrow Chelmsford. He added that businesses wanted places such as Burlington and Westford with more amenities to attract young talent.

E. Belansky stated that the initial efforts for Route 129 started six years ago in 2013, but they did not move forward at that time. He said that Kronos and Mercury departed in 2015 and Town Meeting responded by adopting the BAOD in October of 2016. He stated that the project at 104 Turnpike Road was under construction and going well, but they had run into challenges in finding an anchor tenant for the restaurant/retail project at 197 Billerica Road. E. Belansky reported that based on marketing interest, one acre at 278-282 Mill Road had been rezoned to permit amenities. He reported that in November of 2018 they had met with the property owner of 330 Billerica Road at which time the interest in drive-through for this location was first discussed. He said that since then the EDC and Planning Board have supported the zoning amendment to allow for drive-through restaurants. E. Belansky stated that the rest of what has
been proposed for this site is all currently permitted. He reported that the owner believes that the drive-through is critical to the 10-million-dollar package deal moving forward.

E. Belansky pointed out that Town Meeting is not being asked to vote on this project, but rather just on the ability to allow for plans with drive-through to come before the Planning Board. He added that the Planning Board would still do their rigorous review of the project. A. Langford clarified that this article would just allow for the opportunity to have a drive-through in a project plan. E. Chambers commented that it seemed odd that the entire project hinged on the existence of the drive-through. E. Belansky replied that the property owner would be taking on much of the risk and the fast-casual restaurant with a drive-through which is ready to move forward is what the property owner needs for the rest of the project to fall into place. E. Belansky added that the intent was not to turn Route 129 into a Route 9, Burlington, or Drum Hill. He added that the Planning Board had already discussed going back and putting a cap on the number of drive-throughs, if needed. K. Duffett asked how the vote of the Planning Board went. E. Belansky replied that it was a 6 to 1 vote in favor of the article.

**Warrant Article 2 – Amend FY2019 Operating Budget:**

P. Cohen reported that there were just three months left in the current fiscal year and D. Lussier had reached out to department heads and made projections with J. Sousa. D. Lussier stated that there were several projects under Facilities which had not been budgeted for including a lightning strike which had a $10,000 insurance deductible and two asbestos abatements at McCarthy Middle School and the Fire Station for $5,700 and $5,800 respectively. She added that there was also a sprinkler system and chiller needed for the police station for $15,890 and $54,791 respectively. She added that a small amount of funds ($2,500) was also needed for 101 Mill Road to get the property ready for sale. She said that the total facilities budget adjustment from these items would be $94,681.

A. Langford asked what had been hit by lightning. D. Lussier replied that she believed the strike was at the McCarthy Middle School. She stated that under Municipal Administration there was the addition of $8,000 in the Treasurer’s Office for a salary analysis and another $5,000 for temporary personnel to fill in during a maternity leave. She noted that the person on leave would still collect while out, so this would be an additional amount. She explained that the entire amount for the temporary employee was $15,000, but they had enough funding in personnel for $10,000 so only needed the additional $5,000 in funding.

D. Lussier reported that under Public Safety there was $15,000 in expenses for microwave radio equipment. K. Duffett asked if this hadn’t been part of last year’s capital request. D. Lussier replied that it was, but they needed an additional $15,000 to complete the project. She explained that they had wanted to put some of the equipment on a cell tower, but the cell company was going to charge $5,000 per month to put this equipment on the tower. She explained that the Police and Fire Department declined and instead have permission to put the equipment on a water tower in North Chelmsford. She explained that the expense was for equipment needed to place the microwave equipment on the tower. She added that it would save money in the long run. D. Lussier reported that the total budget adjustments would be $122,681. She added that there was also the need to decrease the Treasurer Personnel Services by $10,000 and increase the
Treasurer Contracted Services by $10,000 for part of the funds used for the temporary employee covering the maternity leave.

P. Cohen reported that the expected balance of unexpended funds in the Snow and Ice budget would be $356,492. He said that he would like to suggest that $300,000 of this be transferred to Public Works Expenses for pot hole repairs. He explained that with temperatures going up and down it was a difficult year for pot holes and he would like to see this “snow and ice windfall” go to a one-time pot hole account for reconstruction and improving roadways in town. He said that crews would already be in for Parker Road reconstruction, so it made sense to extend the crews and get work done in the most troubled areas. P. Cohen estimated that state funding for road repairs was probably only enough to take care of 40% of what was necessary. He added that costs for road construction was increasing, and he would like to take this opportunity from the mild winter to get some much-needed repairs done by transferring $300,000 from the snow & ice budget to the highway budget. He noted that if there was a “freak” storm prior to Town Meeting, this adjustment would be revisited.

Warrant Article 19 – Increase Funding for Senior Citizen Property Tax Relief Program:

P. Cohen reported that there were currently approximately 150 participants in the Senior Citizen Property Tax Work-Off Program. He stated that the Massachusetts minimum wage was currently $12 per hour and would be increasing to $15 per hour by 2023. He explained that the hours per participant would be adjusted to the minimum wage. He said that increasing the amount in this program from $100,000 to $150,000 would increase the program benefit to approximately $1,000 per senior. P. Cohen stated that the funding would come from the overlay account for abatements.

Public Comment:

J. Clancy asked if there was any public comment prior to the Finance Committee making their recommendations.

G. Diggs stepped forward. He explained that he was not coming forward speaking for the Board of Selectmen, but rather as a resident. He reported that he recently went to a School Committee meeting and he was disappointed in their budget. He said that he wasn’t disappointed that the school budget was too big, but rather was disappointed that it was too small. He stated that he would like to see additional emotional counseling services available. He stated that it was a top story in the Boston Globe and he thought that when children had physical issues they were dealt with, but when there were social or emotional issues they were not always dealt with. He noted that the Police Budget added another safety resource officer. He said that this was not the same thing and he would like to see funds taken out of the police budget and moved to the school budget to allow more support in this area. He stated that he had met with J. Lang and there was a long-term need for social emotional support in the schools. He suggested that by next year J. Lang would want to swap out the SRO for an in-house person at the school. He pointed out that once money is allocated somewhere it is not easy to get it back.

G. Diggs stated that there were two other positions being added to the budget in the form of an OSHA person and a community resources person. He noted that the town only had so many resources. He pointed out that recently the Police Sergeants Union had indicated that the town
“had plenty of money” for the requested pay increase. He stated that adding positions like this reinforces that mentality. He said that OSHA just came up and Chelmsford usually was not the first to adopt something, but more apt to be in the middle of the pack. He questioned if this position needed to be filled immediately. G. Diggs said that the take-away was that that the town could do better economically by controlling expenses. He said that he hoped that the Finance Committee and Town Meeting would look closely at additional spending.

**FY2020 Budget/Spring Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Review, Discussion and Votes:**
The Finance Committee discussed and made recommendations on the warrant articles as follows:

1. **Reports of Town Officers/Committees:**
   J. Clancy stated that Article 1 was for hearing of reports and there would be no action required.

2. **Amend Fiscal Year 2019 Operating Budget:**
   K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommends approval of Article 2 to amend the FY2019 operating budget by transferring $10,000 out of Municipal Administration Personnel, $300,000 out of Public Works Snow and Ice Removal and $122,681 out of the Finance Committee Reserve Fund to the following line items:
   - Line Item #2 Municipal Administration Expenses $23,000
   - Line Item #4 Public Safety Expenses: $15,000
   - Line Item #6 Public Works Expenses $300,000
   - Line Item #9 Municipal Facilities Expenses $94,681
   A. Tanini seconded the motion. K. Duffett commented that she was happy to see the extra snow and ice funding go toward road work. D. Goselin agreed saying that he didn’t think it would be anything that anyone would disagree with. J. Clancy added that all of the transfers made sense to him. He called the vote. All voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will unanimously recommend approval of Article 2. (7 in favor)

3. **Funding for Collective Bargaining Agreements:**
   P. Cohen stated that there would be no action requested for Article 3 at this time. He noted that they were still in meetings.

4. **Nashoba Valley Technical School District FY20 Assessment:**
   K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 4 to appropriate $3,101,017 to fund the FY2020 Nashoba assessment. E. Chambers seconded the motion. J. Clancy mentioned that the Nashoba superintendent, business manager and past and present members from the Nashoba School Committee were present at the meeting if anyone had any questions for them. J. Clancy asked about the post-graduate students and how the shift in assessment worked if seats did not fill. D.
Pigeon replied that the seat would only be open to a post-graduate student if it was not filled by an undergraduate student. She said that the cost of the program was the same for either student. She added that with unfilled seats funds shift from minimum contributions to additional assessment. K. Duffett asked how this would relate to school choice which could also result in an open seat. D. Pigeon replied that it was similar. She noted that the change would not be enough to reduce the cost. K. Duffett asked how many hours per day the graduate students had school. D. Pigeon replied that they had a regular school day of 6.5 hours per day. A. Tanini asked how many total post-graduate students were currently enrolled. D. Pigeon replied that there were currently 20 students. A. Langford asked if there was a maximum amount of post-graduate students which would be accepted. D. Pigeon replied that there wasn’t, but that the most she had seen was 25. K. Duffett asked if the post-graduate program was a one-year program. D. Pigeon replied that they could come back for a second year, but that most finished the program in one year. K. Duffett asked about the flow of the day with perhaps just one post-graduate student in a particular program. D. Pigeon replied that it worked as all grade levels could be in class at the same time as work was project based. K. Duffett asked if Nashoba offered any evening programs. D. Pigeon replied that they did not have any programs at night at this time.

D. Pigeon stated that the prevailing cost of a community college education would be between $6,500 and $10,000 per year depending on the program. K. Duffett commented that by charging just a few dollars more the post-graduate students could be excluded from the enrollment count. D. Pigeon reported that she had reached out to the recently retired Department of Education School Finance Manager, Mr. Hatch to run a simulation on the removal of the post-graduate students. She said that they used the actual numbers and then did the exercise to remove all 20 post-graduate students. She reported that Chelmsford’s students per town percentage would only decrease by .03% and the total change in assessment would be estimated at $11,645. E. Chambers asked how the budget wouldn’t decrease with the removal of 20 students from multiple programs. J. Savoie responded that since post-graduate students fill empty seats, the overall assessment would remain unchanged. K. Duffett commented that while she understood the amounts were not currently material there could still be implications to the post-graduate students as programs grow moving forward. She said that she appreciated the information provided by D. Pigeon, but still thought that there could be implications for the tax payer going forward and it was a topic that should be discussed. She added that philosophically she believed that the post-graduate students should contribute to their education.

A. Tanini questioned the potential impact of things like the new Billerica High School resulting in Shawsheen Tech having extra space. D. Pigeon replied that the Billerica High School had no bearing on Nashoba. J. Clancy added that Billerica was just an
example and there could be a new high school in a district town. L. MacDonald replied that looking at a five-year enrollment average there are ebbs and flows. He added that some of the trend can be directly attributed to the opening of a new high school.

D. Pigeon pointed out that the overall Nashoba budget was just increasing by 2.5% and their net school spending was barely over the minimum. She said that Chelmsford Public Schools were 36.4% over the required minimum net school spending while Nashoba was only over by 5.7%. She added that four or five years ago Nashoba had been under the minimum required net school spending while all eight-member towns are well over the required net school spending.

E. Chambers commented that it seemed as if it was considered “okay” to spend money on some things, but not on others. He said, for example, that $75,000 to rehabilitate a building for seniors seemed to be easily approved. J. Clancy pointed out that the source of funds for the senior housing project was the Community Preservation Fund, so it was like comparing apples to oranges. E. Chambers said that he was okay with spending a little bit of money on young people who may then get a job and stay in the community. He noted that the Chelmsford Public Schools made up over 45% of the town budget, yet he had no children and received no benefit from that. J. Clancy responded that the percentage was actually more than 50% of the budget going to the Chelmsford schools. E. Chambers said that the numbers of post-graduate students have been small for a number of years and he was okay with that. He added that if the number of Chelmsford post-graduate students was closer to 15 or 20 then more discussion would be warranted. A. Langford commented that she tended to agree with E. Chambers. She said that after seeing the analysis which D. Pigeon had provided that she was less concerned with the post-graduate students. She added that it offered a different opportunity for students to stay local and get a well-paying job. She said that in the grand scheme of things it was a lot of reward for a small amount of funding.

J. Clancy stated that it was a credit to the administration of Nashoba which had addressed a lot of the concerns held by the Finance Committee. He said that they had listened to the concerns and addressed them by providing information. He agreed that if the number of post-graduate students did increase in the future it should be kept in mind and reviewed further. A. Langford commented that she was thankful that K. Duffett had brought up the issue from an awareness perspective. K. Duffett added that even though the post-graduate students may not be a material issue now, she said it was important to keep in mind going forward. J. Clancy stated that Nashoba had a well-run budget and it was up to the liaisons from the Finance Committee to reach out earlier and have continuing conversations. K. Duffett agreed saying that Nashoba had incorporated feedback from the Finance Committee into their budget which resulted in having less questions. J.
Clancy called the vote. J. Clancy, K. Duffett, D. Goselin, E. Chambers, A. Langford and V. Parks voted in favor of the motion. A. Tanini voted against the motion. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 4 by a majority vote. (7 in favor, 1 against)

5. **Nashoba Valley Technical School District Roof/Window/Door Replacement Project:**
   K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 5 to authorize the borrowing of $3,704,616 for the roof, window and door replacement project at Nashoba. A. Tanini seconded the motion. D. Goselin said that it had to be done. J. Clancy added that the MSBA reimbursement would be for 55% of the project. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 5 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

6. **Fiscal Year 2020 Chelmsford Public Schools Operating Budget:**
   K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 6 to appropriate $61,000,000 for the FY2020 Chelmsford Public Schools operating budget. A. Langford seconded the motion. A. Langford stated that she had some concerns with the school budget, but none that would be a reason to recommend against it. She stated that one concern was the addition of a full-time world language teacher given that they only currently taught two languages. She stated that the cost for just salary of $97,000 to service such a small population seemed excessive. She added that when she asked about the position it seemed to be more about setting up the student exchange program. She said that having this position would be wonderful, but she didn’t think it was needed right now and she would rather see more caution as to how the money was spent. A. Langford stated that another concern was the enrollment numbers, especially in looking at the fifth grade. She said that the numbers at the elementary schools were not getting smaller and it looks like there would be 25 students in classes at McCarthy and Parker next year. She noted that once teachers were removed they didn’t necessarily come back. K. Duffett pointed out that people were not losing their jobs. J. Clancy said it was just a shift in positions. A. Tanini said that she agreed that in the middle schools it was important to have smaller numbers in classrooms. She added that J. Lang had indicated that he would reevaluate the numbers at the fifth grade and would adjust and add a teacher, if needed. A. Langford asked where the money would come from to add a teacher back. She questioned how teachers would address the social emotional needs of students in a classroom with 25 children. She added that she also did not like the idea of relying on technology to teach the children. J. Clancy commented that it was frustrating, but the schools did have budget autonomy. A. Tanini added that they had open public meetings. K. Duffett stated that if the School Committee did not agree with the hiring of the world language teacher they had the power to not support it. A. Langford noted that she was “okay” with about 98% of the school budget. J. Clancy commented that he too shared the
concern of the class size in the elementary school. He added that he thought that there could be an uptick in enrollment with the new housing that is being built. He added that with full-time kindergarten available, if someone was already a part of the school system they were more likely to stay in the district. He said that this could lead to spacing and staff issues. He said that the schools were trying for their third application with the MSBA to build a new high school which would shift the current high school to be the middle school and Parker to be another elementary school. He said that this would alleviate the spacing concerns, however, given that they were on the third attempt the project was a long way away from happening, if ever. He said that currently the spacing issues have been addressed with modular classrooms, but they weren’t a permanent solution and the older ones on the middle schools would be coming up for repair or replacement. J. Clancy added that he wasn’t thrilled with the addition of a world language position either but reiterated that the schools had budget autonomy and the budget was in line with the amount provided to the schools by the Town Manager. He added that similar to the discussion with Nashoba, the Finance Committee should attempt to be part of the discussion earlier. A. Langford agreed but noted that the school budget had a difficult time line and the specifics of the budget are not always known earlier.

K. Duffett commented that she was pleased to see several projects using funding from the community education fund so that they would not have to ask for funding from the capital plan. K. Duffett asked why a percentage of funds couldn’t be used in other buildings where there was child care. D. Lussier replied that the money stayed with the child care fund and while they could do something like K. Duffett is suggesting, they made the choice to keep the funds with the Westland’s school. J. Clancy commented that the school budget presentation gets better each year and it is light years ahead of where it was in the past. He called the vote. All voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will unanimously recommend approval of Article 6. (7 in favor)

7. Fiscal Year 2020 General Government Operating Budget:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 7 to appropriate $65,541,461; transfer $6,000 from the Wetlands Protection Act Revolving Fund; transfer $2,367,748 from the Sewer Capital Improvement Fund; transfer $652,705 from Sewer User Revenue; transfer $129,112 from Stormwater Management User Revenue; transfer $68,972 from Cable Television License Revenue; and transfer $159,260 from the Childcare Revolving Fund for the FY2020 Town’s General Operating Budget. A. Langford seconded the motion. K. Duffett stated that she was in support of the addition of the OSHA and social services personnel. She added that she thought that the town did a great job with the budget. D. Goselin agreed that the town could not sit back and take no action regarding OSHA, but he suggested that a consultant could be used to help point out the town’s strengths and weaknesses and train others within town.
He explained that he did not think there should just be one person hired and put into the DPW who was “Mr. Safety”. He said that the risk was real, but there was the need for it everywhere. He said that he thought that a consultant could analyze the current situation, train others and cover more ground. He also questioned why the OSHA person would report to the DPW and why they wouldn’t report “higher up” showing how important the town takes safety. E. Chambers responded that when they had met with the DPW it was clear that G. Persichetti understood that the person was not a DPW employee but would work for the whole town. E. Chambers said that during the discussion on OSHA there had been talk of a consultant, but the need was not for a one time consult. He said that it was an ongoing, everyday need. He added that he was in favor of the OSHA hire. E. Chambers said that he had less support for a community services coordinator. J. Clancy added that the OSHA position was a documentation and paper intensive position which would be an ongoing need. He said that he was concerned as to what could happen if things were not being properly documented. He stated that the position would require focus and coordination to make sure that the town was compliant, and that documentation was taking place. D. Goselin commented that he thought that down the road a full-time person would not be needed. A. Tanini agreed that she would like to first see a consultant even if the cost would be more. She said that the position would evolve over time though she did think there would be the need for a full-time person. She added that she was nervous of the town hiring the right person right away when the path of the position may not yet be understood. She suggested hiring a consultant this year to figure out what was needed and then making the hire next year. She added that with that said, she still supported the budget as presented.

E. Chambers stated that he was not sure of the need for a community services coordinator. He said that one had already been added for the schools. He added that it seemed like hires were being made to coordinate others and he did not see a need for it. He noted that once a new position is added it stays forever with all of the costs that go along with it. J. Clancy responded that they were trying the social worker at the Parker school this year as a pilot program to work with the two guidance counselors. He said that initially he too questioned the need for both an OSHA person and a social worker, but after talking with G. Persichetti about the OSHA hire and Chief Spinney about the social worker he understood the need better. He stated that even though the social worker would not report to the Police Department, Chief Spinney had indicated that the addition of the position would positively impact his department. A. Langford added that the time at calls may not change, but the new position would decrease future calls, especially repeat calls. She explained that they would help facilitate getting help for those that need it. J. Clancy added that the clinician’s case load had grown exponentially and the grant for this may be evaporating. A. Langford commented that she also did not love the idea of another full-time position. V. Parks said that she had a concern regarding potential
liability from this position. J. Clancy added that he was concerned that there wasn’t a clear picture of what this position looked like and also questioned if there would be any associated liability exposure to the town from this type of position. He questioned what license and insurance the person would have, what the position would look like and what advise they would be providing. V. Parks questioned if the position was modeled after something else that has been successful in other towns. J. Clancy said that theoretically it was a good position. He asked P. Cohen if there was a job description. P. Cohen replied that the position existed in other towns. He explained that it would operate similar to how R. Jackson operates as the Veteran’s Agent. He said that people with issues would be put into contact with the social worker who would direct them where they could go for help and follow-up with them. He said that the position wasn’t to provide immediate help in a crisis such as offered by 24-hour facilities. He said that the person would not be treating people but would provide the educational component and direct them to where they could get help. He said that the person would also help get information out on things such as suicide, stress, hoarding, etc. V. Parks asked if this person would be on call or just work during the day. She asked how it worked in other communities. P. Cohen replied that they would work a normal day of 9 AM to 5 PM. He added that they may participate in evening meetings or presentations. He added that the information would also be available online. J. Clancy commented that there was a public mental health crisis and the state no longer addressed this issue as they used to. He added that there were no longer places where people with these issues could go as it was being handled on a community by community basis. D. Goselin asked what would happen if Town Meeting objected to these positions and did not approve the budget. J. Clancy replied that line items in the budget could be addressed at Town Meeting. He explained that items and funding could be removed or decreased, but they could not be increased or added. D. Goselin stated that he was conflicted. He stated that he 100% agreed that something should be done regarding OSHA and he did not want to do nothing, but he also didn’t support the immediate full-time hire. J. Clancy commented that even though there was not always agreement, he wanted to commend the Town Manager, Finance Director and Town Accountant for producing a well thought out, reviewed and discussed budget. He called the vote. J. Clancy, K. Duffett, E. Chambers, A. Tanini, A. Langford and V. Parks voted in favor of the motion. D. Goselin abstained from voting. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 7 by a unanimous vote with one abstention. (6 in favor, 1 abstain)

8. **Finance Committee Reserve Fund:**

K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 8 to appropriate $400,000 to the Finance Committee Reserve Fund. A. Tanini seconded the motion. J. Clancy stated that it was nice to have the availability of emergency funds and the amount did factor into the reserves and bonding. He called the vote. All voted in
favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 8 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

9. **Fiscal Year 2020 Capital Budget:**
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 9 as presented to appropriate $3,473,018 for the FY2020 capital budget. A. Tanini seconded the motion. K. Duffett commented that she wished there was more funds to spend on road improvements. J. Clancy thanked K. Duffett for serving on the Capital Planning Committee. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 9 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

10. **Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Drive Thru Restaurants Along Route 129 BAOD:**
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 10 to amend the zoning bylaw to allow drive-through restaurants along the Route 129 BAOD. E. Chambers seconded the motion. J. Clancy commented that he would be voting in favor of this article. He said that he was willing to trust the market research that said that the drive-through for a fast-casual restaurant was what was needed to get things started along Route 129. A. Langford added that E. Belansky had made it clear that the vote was not for the drive-through itself, but just to provide the opportunity to request it. She said that if business owners were willing to renovate and just needed a little help with such an opportunity then she was in favor of it. E. Chambers commented that it seemed a little odd to him that they could not get any rehabilitation done without the addition of a drive-through window. A. Langford responded that it was a big risk to renovate and since the restaurant with the drive-through was the only “sure thing” the business owner was probably unwilling to take the risk without this. J. Clancy stated that given the location it did make sense to him. He explained that it was a gateway at the edge of town near the forum and the highway. He added that projects would still need to go before the Planning Board for review and approval of renovations. A. Langford said that with this option some of the amenity issues for businesses in the area could be addressed. J. Clancy stated that other businesses may be waiting for the “first person to jump in” and this business owner was ready and willing. He said that it was a step in the right direction. E. Chambers questioned if fast-casual would be approved, why not fast food like a McDonalds. A. Langford responded that last time there was this type of discussion there was an uproar as residents did not want more fast food restaurants. J. Clancy noted that fast food could have a negative connotation and didn’t necessarily attract the younger generation. K. Duffett commented that she was in favor of this article though she did not want the area to become built up. She said that it would be nice to have an additional pleasant place to go for lunch. J. Clancy commented that this landlord was ready to rent. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will
recommend approval of Article 10 by a unanimous vote. (6 in favor, 1 member had stepped out)

11. Fiscal Year 2020 Sewer Enterprise Fund Operating Budget:
E. Chambers made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 11 to appropriate $3,923,122 from Sewer Enterprise Revenues for the operation of the FY2020 Sewer Enterprise. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 11 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

12. Progress Avenue Sewer Pump Station Upgrade:
P. Cohen stated that there would be no action taken on Article 12.

13. Sewer System Inflow and Infiltration Assessment:
P. Cohen stated that there would be no action taken on Article 13.

14. Fiscal Year 2020 Stormwater Management Enterprise Fund Operating Budget:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 14 to appropriate $758,029 from Stormwater Management Enterprise Revenues for the operation of the Stormwater Enterprise and authorize the borrowing of $550,000 for capital equipment. J. Clancy pointed out that this would be funded by the amount added to the sewer bills. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 14 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

15. Fiscal Year 2020 Forum Ice Rink Enterprise Fund Operating Budget:
P. Cohen reported that the amount for Article 15 was the same as last year at $110,000. K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 15 to appropriate $110,000 from the Chelmsford Forum Enterprise Revenue Fund for the operation of the Chelmsford Forum in FY2020. J. Clancy asked if the amount of $110,000 had worked well. P. Cohen replied in the affirmative. J. Clancy called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 15 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

16. Fiscal Year 2020 PEG Access and Cable Enterprise Fund Operating Budget:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 16 to appropriate $542,849 for the operation of the PEG Access Enterprise for FY2020. A. Langford seconded the motion. J. Clancy commented that there was the concern of the decrease in fees coming in. He added that he hoped that the current legislation did not pass. He stated that there would have to be some way to keep it going as it was the way
many residents could consume meetings. He noted that it was good news that the PEG Access Enterprise was in good shape with capital projects completed. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 16 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

17. Fiscal Year 2020 Golf Course Enterprise Fund Operating Budget:

P. Cohen reported that the amount for Article 17 was unchanged from the prior year at $30,000. K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 17 to appropriate $30,000 in Golf Course Enterprise Revenues for the operation of the Golf Course Enterprise for FY2020. A. Langford seconded the motion. J. Clancy asked when the work on the green would start. P. Cohen replied that work would begin right after the end of golf season in October or November. J. Clancy called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 17 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

18. Annual Authorization of Departmental Revolving Funds:

P. Cohen reported that the amounts for the revolving funds for FY2020 would remain the same as last year. K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 18 to authorize the funding of the revolving accounts for FY2020 as presented. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 18 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

19. Increase Funding for Senior Citizen Property Tax Work-off Program:

K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 19 to increase the funding for the Senior Citizen Property Tax Work-off Program by $50,000 to a total amount of abatements of $150,000 per year. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 19 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

20. Cemetery Improvement and Development Fund:

K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 20 to transfer $50,000 from the sale of graves and lots to the Cemetery Improvement and Development Fund. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 20 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

21. Community Action Program Fund:

K. Duffett made a motion to approve Article 21 to appropriate $10,000 to the Community Action Program. A. Langford seconded the motion adding that it was a good program.
All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 21 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

22. CPF: FY20 Debt Service, Admin. Expenses, & Reserves:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 22 as presented to appropriate $50,000 for administrative expenses, $200,000 for budgeted reserves, $404,393 for FY2020 debt service and $100,000 into each of the three CPF areas of open space, historic resources and community housing. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 22 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

23. CPF: Recreational & Open Space Capital Improvement Funds:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 23 as presented to appropriate $50,000 to community preservation open space and $50,000 to community preservation recreational use. A. Langford seconded the motion. K. Duffett commented that she had attended the CPF meeting the other morning and had forwarded along several charts about eligibility for Community Preservation Funding. She said that she also wanted to thank the Community Preservation Committee for their hard work. J. Clancy called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 23 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

24. CPF: Façade & Signage Improvement Program:
P. Cohen reported that no action would be requested on Article 24.

25. CPF: Affordable Senior Housing at 86 Richardson Road:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 25 to appropriate $75,000 from the Community Preservation Fund General Reserve for the preservation of 16 units of senior affordable housing located at Brianna Lyn Estates. A. Langford seconded the motion. J. Clancy commented that it was admirable how small the amount requested was given the total cost of the rehabilitation project. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 25 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

26. CPF: Varney Playground Tennis Court and Pickleball Court:
K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 26 to appropriate $95,000 from the Community Preservation Fund General Reserve for the reconstruction of the Varney Playground two tennis courts into one tennis court and one pickleball court. A. Langford seconded the motion. J. Clancy said that he would still like to see them fit in two pickleball courts, even though he somewhat understood why they
could only fit one. He called the vote. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 26 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

27. Street Acceptances – Alyssa Way, Fay St., Galloway Rd., Hall Rd., Mission Rd.:

K. Duffett made a motion that the Finance Committee recommend approval of Article 27. A. Langford seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed. The Finance Committee will recommend approval of Article 27 by a unanimous vote. (7 in favor)

J. Clancy requested a quick write-up from any Finance Committee member who voted “nay” or abstained from voting on any articles. He said that this would help him to write the chairman’s letter. He asked that members also let him know if there were any materials that they would like to be included in the book such as for the schools or Nashoba to let him know. K. Duffett asked if J. Clancy wanted to divide up sections of the letter to make it less burdensome for him. J. Clancy replied that he appreciated the offer of help but thought that the letter being in one voice would be better. He added that providing “blurbs” on why they voted as they did would be helpful.

A. Tanini asked when the next meeting would be. J. Clancy replied that usually there was a tri-board meeting with the Board of Selectmen and the School Committee. A. Tanini asked if changing the Finance Committee meeting night to a different night could be explored due to conflicts in September. J. Clancy replied that he could reach out and see if there were other options with rooms as well as with Tele Media.

K. Duffett made a motion to adjourn. A. Tanini seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela A. Morrison