## TOWN OF DEDHAM

In Re:

DEDHAM TOWN MEETING

**DATE:** Monday, May 15, 2023

PLACE: Dedham High School Auditorium

140 Whiting Avenue

Dedham, MA

**COMMENCING:** 7:05 p.m.

## PROCEEDINGS

THE MODERATOR: The town clerk informs me that we are very close to a quorum, so now the last few people are being registered. Let's call upon the public service recognition committee to make their annual award. The chair recognizes Maryann Martin.

MS. MARTIN: Good evening. I'm

Maryann Martin. I'm one of seven people who are
on the Dedham public recognition committee, and
the seven of us got a very, very -- a nice
problem to have. We were inundated with people
that were nominated to be one of our recipients.

For those of you who don't know anything about the public recognition, each year we ask fellow residents to nominate someone who's doing a kindness, a quiet unsung hero kindness, and this year you guys responded.

It's very hard to pick. So I think we had some really quality people this year.

So I've asked two of my colleagues that are going to come up and present this year's recipients their award. So the first one

who will come up will be Gerry Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Hi. It's my pleasure this evening to introduce Theo McGowan. Theo is a second grader at the Riverdale School. Theo is an avid reader, he loves to play soccer, and he enjoys playing chess. Mostly, Theo loves his dog, Johnny.

For Theo's eighth birthday, he invited all of his classmates to McGaul (?) to celebrate. Sounds like a normal birthday party for a second grader. But what made this birthday party special is that instead of asking for gifts for himself, Theo asked his friends for donations to the Rough Tails Dog Rescue. This selfless act raised over \$200 for the Rough Tails Dog Rescue, and this act of kindness is what makes him the student recipient of the 2023 Dedham Public Service Award.

Theo, I know we already gave you this recognition in our reception just before, but when I mentioned what you had done, our good friends at the Blue Bunny were so impressed by your generosity, that they actually made you a birthday gift. So applause for Theo.

So I'd like to invite my colleague, Allison Sullivan, who's going to present this year's recipients for the 2023 public recognition award.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hello, everybody. In March 2021, three months before graduation, a Dedham High School senior, Jayden, was involved in a tragic accident in which he was struck by a car going 65 miles per hour on the highway. He was in a coma for two and a half weeks, but once he awoke, the following months proved to be challenging in ways his family could have never imagined.

Due to the pandemic, the Class of 2021 missed their junior prom and a true senior year experience. Sadly, when he would have attended the community-run senior prom or walked across the stage at his graduation with his classmates, Jayden was in an intensive rehabilitation facility instead.

When released from the rehabilitation facility in August 2021, Jayden was welcomed home with a car parade and tremendous support from members of his class, the town, and the

2.4

Riverdale community. However, most notably, two women, strangers to the family, went above and beyond in their support: Jean Martins, an occupational therapist, and Sunshine Millea, a physical therapist. When these two women learned what happened, both volunteered their time and expertise to work with him one-on-one while he was at home.

Much of his progress is due to all their hard work and encouragement during their weekly sessions. They continue to go above and beyond and have been able to get him into additional rehabilitation programs and are working on getting him into a program that aids young adults who have suffered traumatic brain injuries and finding a job.

Because of the hard work of Jean,
Sunshine, and Jayden, he was able to walk to
receive his diploma in a ceremony held for him
at Dedham High School in June of 2022, 15 months
after the accident.

For this reason, we recognize Jean Martins and Sunshine Millea with the Dedham Public Service Recognition Award. Thank you,

ladies, and congratulations. If you could all come up, please?

MS. MILLEA: I just wanted to say a quick something, everything that Allison said, of course, but he was doing so well with us working at home that we knew he needed something more, and that's when we found out about Inclusion Fitness. But when we took him for a tour there, we knew that it was the right program, but we couldn't afford it.

So all I had to do was set up a Go
Fund Me, and in four days, we had \$3,000. So I
just want to thank all of you here and everybody
in the Greater Dedham community for pulling
together that quickly to help fund this program
for Jayden to go to.

And he did so well at that, he's even beyond that now. He doesn't need that program anymore. So we've been going to Planet Fitness, and maybe some of you have seen us there in the afternoons. He's been doing really well doing his own exercise program.

I'm pretty sure he's going to go in for surgery to fix his elbow, so Jean and I

2.4

still have our work cut out for us to help him to get over that. But again, I just wanted to thank all the community for really helping him and helping his family. We're so proud of all the progress he's made. He's worked really, really hard, and he still has a lot or work to do, and his mom has been so supportive of him. We've been really happy to get to know this family. I speak for Jean and I when we say how proud we are.

MS. MARTINS: I was just going to say thank you. It's really nice to be honored.

This is definitely our skill set to work with Jayden. And what I will also say is every time we've walked into the house, it's been a wonderful experience for both Sunshine and I.

Jayden and his mother Jacqui are just wonderful, encouraging. It's just been wonderful to work there. We don't always get the same response at work, so it's been wonderful for us to also have this experience working with the two of them. So I thank the two of you also.

MS. MILLEA: I just want to give a

2.4

shout out to not only the committee members that served on this with us, all seven of us, and I'd also like to note that the paintings that they're holding today are from Nancy Howell.

She's a former resident of Dedham. She does them one at a time. They're not mass produced, so it's quite a labor of love. And every year when I ask her, she says, without question, she'd be happy to.

And then the plackets are done by
Mike Humphrey from Precinct 5. He owns Cherokee
Trophy, so if you need a plaque, an embroidery,
anything, please go to Mike. He never, ever
asks for a dollar. And then our friends at the
Blue Bunny.

When I shared Theo's story, he got a nice little private note written inside one of the books in his gift packet, and they said they hope next year I trouble them again with more eight-year-olds who are so generous and kind. But thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Our thanks to Maryann Martin and the members of the public service recognition committee, which, by the way, was a

1.3

committee created by town meeting a number of years ago, and it has one member from each of the districts.

As you know, in 2019, town meeting voted to implement electronic voting. Almost one half of the town meeting representatives here tonight are new either this year or last year, so the town clerk has decided to give just a quick refresher course on how the system works.

MR. MUNCHBACH: Welcome, and thank you. So my name is Paul Munchbach, the town clerk. As the moderator said, Dan Driscoll mentioned that we've used electronic voting for the past two spring town meetings and for the fall town meeting. Everyone is assigned their own individual electronic voting device.

Before we get started, if you could just check the number on the back. If you have Number 118 --I think that you received the wrong electronic voting device -- just see one of the staff members out in the foyer, and they will correct that. So if you have 118 -- sorry, you didn't win anything. It's not one of those. It

1

will not change the channel on your TV or open your garage door either.

So the electronic voting devices are

4 5

3

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

1.3

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2.4

very easy to work. They only have two numbers that are working on there. It's 1 and 2, and also green and red. So if you are voting yes, as you can see from the -- well, the slide that was up there earlier, green means yes, red means no.

Those are your options. So if you vote -- you want to vote yes, you'll vote green. You'll look at your electronic voting device. Once you put in your vote, it will say okay, wait a second. If you're going to vote no, once again, press the no button. You'll see it -obviously, you'll see the same thing. It will say okay.

Those of you who vote, you can vote up until we close the vote. We ask you not to vote until the moderator opens the vote. see the warrant article up on the screen, and then we'll open it for voting. Once we open it for voting, the voting will start. It will last 15 seconds, so you'll have 15 seconds to vote.

If you change your vote within that 15 seconds, just make sure that you check down at your electronic voting device.

So before we get started, I have a couple of sample questions to get started, and if we can put the first sample question up for our town meeting representatives. Will the Red Sox make the playoffs? You have 15 seconds to vote. Green is yes, red is no. We're going to close the vote, so get your votes in. And the tally, please. A lot of optimistic Sox fans here.

The electronic voting device -- also, if you see on the top of the screen, if it passes, you'll see it will be green, and then it will say whether it's a majority or a two-thirds vote. If it doesn't pass, it will be in red. So that way, you'll be able to identify how the vote went on that warrant article.

We also have, and we'll do one more question before we get started, is we have it set up for roll call. So everyone -- all the town meeting representatives, as we mentioned, has their own assigned electronic voting device.

These votes will be recorded.

2.4

All the votes are recorded, even though they might not be showing up on the screen. And the town clerk's office will by bylaw put it up on our town website no later than four days after the town meeting so you can see how you voted or see how anybody else voted on certain articles. So we try to be as transparent as possible.

So we'll go on to the next question, but it will be more of a roll call vote. Do you feel comfortable using the electronic voting device? The vote is now open. Just a couple of more seconds. We're closing the vote. Great, and the vote is now closed.

Does everyone that has an electronic voting device at least see their name when they clicked onto it? If you have a problem with your electronic voting device, and you have x-ray vision, and you can see your name -- if you have a problem with your device, and it doesn't say okay when you had voted, please see myself or Kristen at the front of the auditorium, and we'll make sure we double check your device. Is

everyone good? Great. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

By the way, we have -- I've got more coaches

behind me here than Joe Mazzulla does. These

are the folks that are helping us with the

electronic voting. They've come back again, and

we certainly appreciate it.

A quorum of 227 having been declared by the town clerk, the 2023 spring annual town meeting will please come to order. This is the 98th year that Dedham has used the representative town meeting form of government. Please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(All Rise.)

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. The Chair is pleased to welcome Father Steve Josoma, a long-time pastor at Saint Susanna's Church, to welcome us with an invocation. Father Steve.

**FATHER JOSOMA:** I appreciate the opportunity to begin the session with a prayer.

I first arrived in 1986, and I think the first event I recall being a part of was in the planting of a tree, an interfaith planting

1.3

of a tree, for your 350th birthday back then.

2.4

And after seven years at Saint Mary's in East Dedham, and for the last 22 years at Saint Susanna's, through all these years, it's been -- I think Dedham has been its best when different traditions, groups, ages, and neighborhoods have come together, with neighbors helping neighbors, a COVID task fund to help all sorts of folks in need.

Even now, there's many different parishes working together. There's different faith communities working together who welcome refugees to our land as they begin their time of new hope and a new beginning.

As we come together alone, we can shape our future. I offer this prayer in the light of the founding covenant of our town entered into in 1636 by our first town settlers. They gave the mission statement of Dedham in one sentence, and this is it.

We whose names are here unto subscribed do in the love and reverence of our Almighty God mutual and severally promised amongst ourselves and each other to profess and

practice one truth according to that most
perfect rule, the foundation whereof is
everlasting love.

1.3

2.4

I'm not sure how many knew that the town was founded on the founding principle of love. They seem to understand that the only life giving way forward for all was the way of life. So I offer this as our prayer this evening.

years ago. If there is to be peace in the world, there must be peace in the nations. If there is to be peace in the nations, there must be peace in the nations, there must be peace in the cities and towns. If there is to be peace in the cities and towns, there must be peace between neighbors. If there is to be peace between neighbors, there must be peace in the home. If there is to be peace in the home, there must be peace in our heart.

And so we pray. God of love, God of peace, this fractured world cries out in pain, burns deep into my soul and challenges me to make a difference. God of love, God of peace, God of this world scarred by grief and tears,

ignorance and fear, soften hearts of stone, and 1 2 begin with mine. 3 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Thank you 4 very much, Father Steve. 5 All newly-elected and 6 reelected town meeting representatives, please 7 stand to be sworn in by the town clerk. (Town meeting members sworn in.) 8 9 THE MODERATOR: The Chair would like to welcome the new superintendent-to-be to her 10 11 first Dedham town meeting, Ms. Nan Murphy. met Nan for the first time at the warrant review 12 1.3 committee. As it turns out, her husband and I 14 are longtime colleagues, and he's also a former 15 moderator. So I think we'll get along fine, 16 Nan, I think so. 17 The Chair is pleased to once again 18 nominate Cherylann W. Sheehan of District 6 as 19 deputy moderator. All in favor, say aye. 20 (Aye.) 21 THE MODERATOR: All opposed, no. 22 ayes have it. I'd ask the town clerk to swear 23 in both the moderator and the deputy moderator.

(Moderator and deputy moderator sworn

2.4

in.)

1.3

2.4

meeting tonight, we'll be aware that for many of our members, this is their first experience.

There are 47 new town meeting representatives this year, joining the 80 new members from last year. The reason last year's number was so big, as you recall, because of redistricting, all 39 members in every district were up for reelection, so there was a bigger pool of people.

That means about half of the town meeting representatives in the auditorium this evening are relatively new to this legislative meeting. I hope you will extend a courtesy to them as they hopefully get up and speak and join us in participating in this meeting. And we do ask that all members, especially the new members, clearly state their name and district when speaking.

Let's now review the rules of our meeting. This is a representative town meeting. Elected town meeting representatives shall have precedence over others in speaking, unless voted

2.4

otherwise by the town meeting. When speaking, please use the microphone. State your name and precinct for the benefit of the official stenographer, who creates a permanent record of the town meeting under the direction of the town clerk.

Upon any article, the Moderator may direct that no person shall speak more than ten minutes on any question, unless extended by a vote of the body. In the case of complex articles or issues involving significant sums of money, the Moderator may allow for speakers who are responsible for creating — for presenting critical information to speak more than ten minutes. And we do, at the suggestion of a bunch of town meeting members, have a clock down here, and our official timekeeper for the evening is Joe Hamilton. Thank you, Joe.

Only elected town meeting representatives may vote, including voice votes, which we do not have many of anymore. Others found to be voting will be asked to leave the hall.

When electronic voting is being used,

2.4

a roll call will be held at the request of 15 members or at the discretion of the Moderator. Any member who believes his or her vote was recorded in error may stand and request that their vote be confirmed by the town clerk. All articles will be deliberated in the order in which they are printed in the warrant, except that any member may move that an article be taken out of order. This motion requires a majority vote.

In order to make town meeting more efficient, Dedham's bylaws call for the use of what's called a consent calendar. This means that at the beginning of the meeting, the Moderator reads all article numbers and all budget line item numbers.

If a member wishes to discuss, question, or amend the original motion printed in the warrant, he or she should so indicate by calling "pass." Simply calling out "pass" will suffice. You do not need to be recognized. Those articles that are passed will be set aside for deliberation.

All other articles and line items

that have not been set aside for discussion will be voted by one single vote. A vote will be on the original motion that is printed in your This allows for noncontroversial matters book. to be dealt with quickly so that members can focus their attention on matters that need more attention.

> The finance and warrant committee has met with the proponents of all the articles, except for zoning related, planning related articles. They have closely reviewed them. They've held public hearings on all articles and the budget, again, with the exception of the planning board related.

> That committee, the finance and warrant committee then makes a recommendation on those matters to town meeting. Those recommendations are printed in the book. you vote, you are voting to accept, reject, or amend those recommendations. recommendations only.

> The planning board also holds public hearings on their articles, and they, too, issue recommendations, which are printed in the book.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1.3

2.4

When you vote on planning related articles, you are voting to accept, reject, or amend those recommendations. Any town meeting representative may propose an amendment to those recommendations of either the finance and warrant committee or the planning board.

If you are proposing a significant change or amendment, we would like to have those amendments submitted in writing to the town clerk before we deliberate on them. Significant changes to the motions that are already printed in the warrant book are sometimes referred to as substitute motions.

Whether a motion is a simple amendment or a more significant substitute, they're handled in the same way, and the terms are basically interchangeable. Some motions require a two-thirds vote. In some cases, state law requires a two-thirds vote. In other cases, Dedham's procedural rules require a two-thirds vote.

When a two-thirds vote is required by state law, the Moderator may call for a voice vote and make a declaration based on what he or

2.4

she hears that two-thirds of the members so voted. However, if any seven members doubt that declaration, all they need to do is stand, and an electronic vote will be taken.

Move the question. This is a -- so "pass" is one word that gets used at town meeting differently than it's used in the rest of your life. "Move the question" is probably not a term you use at all in the rest of your life. It means stop debate. So if somebody moves the question, what they're asking the town meeting body to do is stop talking and vote.

There's a high bar for that. Twothirds of you have to agree that it's time to
stop talking and vote. Any member may make a
motion to move the question. However, you
cannot speak on the article, then end your
speech by saying "move the question." So please
remember that.

Questions of quorum. Town meeting representatives may ask to be recognized to raise issues of quorum. If so recognized, the town meeting representative can question the presence of a quorum, but not speak on any other

1 issue or article.

1.3

2.4

If it's determined that a quorum is lacking, that a meeting cannot continue its business, we all go home and come back next Monday night. It does not affect any business already completed, including a vote that was just taken. If the number of members voting is less than a quorum, that vote still stands. We cannot presume that people did not abstain or are in the lobby or out having a cigarette.

Any quorum is presumed to be present until it is successfully challenged. So once the town clerk, which he has done, has declared a quorum, it is presumed to be present until it has been successfully challenged. This is not a Dedham rule. This is a rule that most town meetings adopt.

Reconsideration doesn't happen often in Dedham, but a motion to reconsider a previous vote requires a majority vote. So a majority vote to even reconsider it, and then we would vote on it again. That's if the original vote was taken an hour ago or less. If it was longer than an hour, the quantum to request --

successfully request a reconsideration rises to two-thirds.

No action taken by town meeting is in effect until all articles have been acted upon and the meeting is dissolved. So anything that was voted on in the first night, if we went to a second night, they're all pending in limbo until the meeting is dissolved.

Matters of law will be referred by the Moderator to the town counsel. Questions of town meeting procedure are the responsibility of the Moderator.

I've been asked to let you know that the unveiling of the William B. Gould statue will take place on Sunday, May 28 at 1:00 at the William B. Gould Park on Milton Street right outside East Dedham Square.

Let's move to our blue book. This is the warrant book. This is the agenda, if you will, of what we will be discussing this evening. The warrant is available many months before town meeting. The recommendations are available approximately two weeks before town meeting. The warrant is available on the town

website, and this past year, it was sent out via mail to every member of the town meeting.

If you would turn to Page 3, this somewhat complicated looking chart lists all the sources of money that come into the Town of Dedham. So that top half of the page is entitled "Sources," and you will see state aid, you will see property tax, etcetera. Then below that are "Uses." This is where all the money is being spent in summary form.

years of numbers to the left of that dark line. To the right of that dark line, there is the recommendation of the town manager, and next to that is the recommendation of the FINCOM, the finance and warrant committee, and it's always those numbers that we are voting on. But you can compare them to see what the town manager recommended, what the budget was in '23 -- we're still in fiscal '23 -- and what was actually spent in '22 and '21.

As I indicated before, I'm going to read each warrant article and each item in the -- each line item in the budget, and if you have

a question, want to discuss or amend, call out the word "pass."

1.3

2.4

By the way, somebody was good enough to send me an old newspaper article. Dedham has been using that pass term since 1945. Now, some of you suggest it's probably time to come up with another word, since what we're actually doing is the opposite of passing, so we may ask the bylaw review committee to look at that.

A thing about yelling out "pass," it's a non-binding, anonymous, don't worry, you can change your mind when we come back to it, because what we'll do is we will take a vote on everything not asked. Well, what am I voting on? You're voting on the original motion, the recommendation to -- you're accepting the recommendation, and then we will go back and talk about the articles and line items that have been set aside when you yell out the word "pass."

If you change your mind, if you've got your question answered in the meantime, there's no public shaming in having called out "pass" and not taking the step when the time

2.4

comes. First of all, almost no one knows who calls out "pass" because it's very just -- it's the only time you can shout from the audience without being recognized.

So it is better to say "pass," and if you have a question, and by the time we get back to it, your question has been answered, you just don't have to stand up. You don't have to own it or anything like that, and we'll just move on, and you will see that happen a lot.

If you look on Page 4, just to get an idea of how the book is set up, Article 2, personnel bylaw changes, so that's the subject matter of this agenda item. The text is right below it. Then in three boxes, shaded gray boxes below, there's the recommendation of the finance and warrant committee. That's always what you'll be voting on.

There's a short, in English, I hope, description of the article, and then there is reference information. So there's a lot of information in the appendices. Nobody likes to read appendices, but there's a lot of information in the appendices if you have any

1 questions about this.

So I'm now going to start reading, and let me know if you want to talk about anything.

Article 2. Article 3. This is the town budget. We're going to come back to a little discussion from the finance committee chair and the town manager before you actually have to vote on anything. But for the time being, we're going to go through each of these line items. We can move at a decent pace.

By the way, if you get left behind on something and want to pass on something we've already called out, just get my attention, and we'll go back, and we'll put a pass sign behind it.

So on Page 6, Line Item 1, 2, 3, 4. Legal services, Line Item 5.

## UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.

THE MODERATOR: 5 is passed. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18.

19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. Human resources, 28, 29, 30. Top of the next page, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. 39, planning

2.4

department, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46. Police department, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51. Turn the page, fire department, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73.

## UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.

THE MODERATOR: 73 is passed. 74,
75, 76, 77, 78, 79 and 80. 81, 82, 83, 84, 85,
86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97,
98, 99, 100, 101, 102. Board of health, 103,
104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112,
113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121,
122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130.
131, 132, 133, and 134. On Page 11, 135, 136.
Debt service, 138. Employee benefits, 139, 140,
141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147.

So two-thirds of the way down that page, there's a bolded expense item called "Total Expense." If you go to the far right, 129,362,918. That's the amount of town expenditures that will be raised by taxes, and you can compare that to prior years.

Article 4 is passed by the Chair. We have a few change -- yes?

	Page 30
1	MS. GILBERT: (Inaudible.)
2	THE MODERATOR: On what, Ms. Gilbert?
3	MS. GILBERT: (Inaudible.)
4	THE MODERATOR: Page 9, which line
5	item?
6	MS. GILBERT: 88.
7	THE MODERATOR: 88, rubbish and
8	recycling. It's passed.
9	??: Mr. Moderator?
10	THE MODERATOR: Yes.
11	??: (Inaudible.)
12	THE MODERATOR: 118.
13	MR. MAHER: Mr. Moderator?
14	THE MODERATOR: Mr. Maher?
15	MR. MAHER: (Inaudible.)
16	THE MODERATOR: 100. So Article 4 is
17	passed by the Chair. Article 5 we're on Page
18	14 prior year bills, Article 5. Article 6,
19	Article 7. Article 8 is passed by the Chair,
20	requires a two-thirds vote. On the next page,
21	Article 9, departmental revolving funds.
22	Article 10, Article 11. Article 12 is a zoning
23	bylaw change that requires a two-thirds vote, so
24	the Chair will pass on that. Article 13.

	1 ago 31
1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.
2	THE MODERATOR: Pass. Article 14
3	will be passed by the Chair. This requires a
4	majority vote. Is there a pass on Article 14?
5	Just shout it out, please.
6	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.
7	THE MODERATOR: Thank you. The
8	original motion for that article is on Page 26.
9	So now we're on 27, Article 15,
10	Article 16, Article 17, Article 18, Article 19.
11	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.
12	THE MODERATOR: Passed. Article 20
13	is passed by Mr. McDermott. Article 20.
14	Article 21.
15	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.
16	THE MODERATOR: Passed.
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
18	THE MODERATOR: No pass on 21?
19	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
20	THE MODERATOR: This requires a two-
21	thirds vote to create a stabilization fund, so
22	it will be passed anyway. 21 is passed. 22.
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass.
24	THE MODERATOR: Passed. 23, two-

1 thirds vote, so the Chair will pass. 24, 25. 2 On Page 39, Article 26. Next page -- did I hear 3 a pass on 26? Is there a pass on 26? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 4 (Inaudible.) 5 THE MODERATOR: You're not usually so 6 low voiced like that, Maryann. Article 27. 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass. THE MODERATOR: Pass on 27. That was 8 9 Article 29 -- Article 27 was passed. Article 27 passed? Thank you. 10 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pass. THE MODERATOR: Passed. 12 Thank you. 13 Article 29, Article 30 on Page 44. Also on that page, Article 31 and Article 32. 14 15 So I'm going to read back to you 16 everything that we at the front here have 17 indicated as being passed. This was a 18 suggestion by selectboard member Demetra 19 Sullivan a couple of years ago, and it works 20 very well. So we're just reconciling the lists 21 here. 22 So here's the collective wisdom of 23 the people on the stage. Article 3, Line Item

5, 73, 88, 100, and 118. That's the budget

2.4

article. Returning to the rest of the articles,

Article 4 was passed, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20,

21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 32. There being

no further discussion, a vote comes on the

original motion of all remaining line item

numbers and articles. All those in favor,

please say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. The ayes have it.

So now we go back to Article 3, Line Item Number 5. That's on Page 6, and it's entitled "Purchase of Services" under the legal budget. Is there discussion, questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

THE MODERATOR: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

We felt it was important because there are some reductions from what was requested in this budget, and a little later along we're going to talk about the difference between a cut and a reduction and what was requested. So to set the stage for why this is happening this year, the Chair recognizes the chairman of the finance and warrant committee, Dave Roberts.

9

10

8

1112

1314

1516

17

18 19

2122

20

1.3

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator. At the beginning of the finance and warrant committee public hearing process, town manager presented a level service budget recommendation, which represented an increase of 5.6 percent over FY '23. This included a 6.9

percent increase of the school (inaudible.)

Given the recent increases to the average residential taxpayer, and following the representations of every department head, the finance and warrant committee requested information and implications of a 1, 2, 3 percent reduction in spending divided equally between municipal and school components.

After reviewing those options, we chose to present a budget with a 1 percent reduction, which equals \$990,000. Our goal was to reduce taxpayer burden without greatly reducing the services that taxpayers received by the town.

As to the implications of reductions and requested budget increases, the town's recommendation includes reduction for legal services, yard waste, and the postponement of

vehicle replacements in the facilities department. To achieve their reduction, the school department indicates that they will maintain class size ratios, but may have a reduction in staff of seven members -- seven positions.

With the above budget modifications and following the nine-zero vote, the finance committee is recommending a 4.75 percent budget increase for FY '24. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. The Chair would like to recognize the town manager to give us a definition of level service. And also, Mr. Goodwin, there have been some changes. People were given an update to Article 3, if you could just explain that, please.

MR. GOODWIN: Good evening, town meeting. Leon Goodwin. I'm the town manager. So just to briefly give you an overview of the terminology that we use, level service versus level funded. Level service is the cost to provide that level of service, which you experience this year, this fiscal year, next year based on cost increases to that service or

line item. For example, everyone knows a dozen eggs last year cost \$3. This year, it's \$6.

If you use one dozen per week, the level service budget would mean that you have a \$6 cost of eggs per week, even though in prior years, that would cost you \$3. A level budget would mean you're only buying six eggs because you're only buying half, and you're using \$3. That's the difference. So that's a level fund versus level service. I hope that is clear to everyone.

We also have a yellow handout in the -- that you were provided with this evening.

The changes to that you see on -- I'll get closer to the mike. There we go. The change that you see there is to Line Item 9 and 10.

Previously, the reserve fund was mistyped into Line 9. It should be in Line 10. There's no bottom line change, but you do have that one line adjustment. That's all.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Do you have more to say, or are you just helping us with the mike?

MR. GOODWIN: I'm just trying to fix

1.3

2.4

1 the mike.

1.3

2.4

THE MODERATOR: Just let me know.

I've got a whole team back here. Technically,
they're not my people, but -- thank you, Jeremy.

One further piece of information on financing the budget. In your warrant book, in the back, on Page A32 -- it's actually the last printed page in the book -- you'll see information about the trend in the average tax bill in Dedham and the changes from year to year. So that may affect some of your thinking and understanding, as well.

So on Line Item Number 5, it was passed. Is there anybody who wishes to discuss it? Hearing none, the vote comes on the original motion of \$285,098. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

Let me just for a second -- let's try to navigate through this very complicated chart. Let's use Page 6 as an example. If you wrote 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 above each of those columns,

the last column, Number 6, this is what you're always voting on, and this is also the column that if you want to change something, this is the column that you're amending.

Number 5, town manager, is there for your information to see what the difference is, if any, between what the town manager recommended and what was ultimately -- what's ultimately being put before you. The line -- the column right to the left of that is the level service class that the town manager described to you, and then there is that dark line, and the three columns to the left give you three years' worth of information on the same line item.

So the key thing to remember is we're always talking about Column 6. But feel free to stop and ask for clarification on any of these things. You can see I've already had two things clarified for me, and I've been doing this longer than you have.

Line 73, the school department budget. The Chair recognizes Kristin Relyea, and Lindsay -- I was going to say Lindsay Lohan.

2.4

1 I am so sorry -- and Andrew Czazasty, the three 2 sponsors of this proposed amendment, which you 3 all should have, right? Do you all have this? 4 It was -- oh, there was no paper, okay. 5 MS. LOWDER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, for recognizing us. My name is 6 Lindsay Lowder, and I'm from Precinct 6. 7 Lindsay Lohan, Lindsay Lowder. 8 9 MS. RELYEA: I'm Kristin Relyea from Precinct 4. 10 MR. CZAZASTY: I'm Andrew Czazasty, 11 Precinct 7. 12 1.3 MS. LOWDER: So Kristin, Andrew, and 14 I are here today on behalf of a group of town 15 meeting members interested in restoring the 16 school budget, Line 73, to the amount in the town manager's initial request, which is an 17 increase of \$495,000. 18 We want to begin by thanking the 19 20 finance and warrant committee for their work in 21 establishing a budget proposal in a particularly 22 challenging year. There were many hard 23 decisions that were reviewed as part of that

process.

Their dedication and careful

2.4

2.4

consideration of the needs of our town was apparent in all our conversations in the last few weeks as we considered this motion.

So as many of you may have heard at the mini town meeting last week, the cuts proposed by the finance and warrant committee would result in a reduction of seven full-time teachers in the areas of specials, extracurricular programming, and academic intervention.

Our proposal today would reverse that reduction. These changes would result in a tax increase of roughly \$44 per household next year, but would allow our schools to retain these teachers and academic programming.

Personally, as a parent of three kids at Oakdale, I can speak to the vital importance of these classes and these programs for our kids. When I ask my kids about their day, all three of them start their answers by telling me what special they had that day, so what book Ms. Dewitt helped them pick out in the library, what song they're working on with Mr. M in music. And these classes may not be considered core

2.4

academic programs, but they really are the heart of how our children experience our schools. And I urge our town meeting members to view them that way.

So part of the situation we find ourselves in is driven by the fact that DPS faces several large one time cost increases beyond their control this year. Among them are extraordinary jumps in the cost of utilities for our schools. The cost of electricity alone increased by 100 percent year over year.

And another increase was a one time above average tuition increase of 14 percent for special needs students that receive services out of district. So that impact alone was \$600,000 of additional cost in the budget.

It's really important to understand that before this request came in to take at another \$495,000 reduction, DPS worked diligently with town management and the school committee to make a first round of \$1.2 million of budget cuts from their original budget -- level service budget proposal.

These initial cuts were painful, but

2.4

liveable. And just to say that again, because the numbers I find a little confusing, the amounts reflected in the town manager's budget column of the warrant reflect programming that has already been cut from level services by \$1.2 million. This first round of cuts included reductions in administrative personnel, materials, supplies, and professional development training.

However, the FINCOM recommendation to cut an additional \$495,000 will eliminate the funding for seven student facing professionally licensed educators and directly impact the quality of education Dedham students receive in these areas of specials, extracurricular programming, and academic intervention.

This is a decision that's not easily reversible, and it's not like putting off a project or delaying the purchase of equipment.

Once we lose these great educators, they are going to be gone.

MS. RELYEA: Thank you. So like many of you guys are probably wondering right now, the first question that we were asking is like

well, wait, is this really necessary? Can we possibly just find the money somewhere else in the school budget? It has to be there. But Lindsay and I have spoken with our interim superintendent directly, as well as several other knowledgeable members of committees.

And we've investigated other avenues for cuts, but we've really been assured that everything that could be spared to avoid the impact to student learning -- so things like supplies, office admin, closing positions that hadn't been filled yet -- these were already cut in the initial 1.2 million.

So as a parent of elementary age students who have suffered loss of learning time through this pandemic, this is a tradeoff I fear that we will regret. The pandemic impact of student learning in Dedham is very real. If you don't realize it, we're seeing it in our MCAS scores. We are hearing reported delays of executive function. We have record demand for in school mental health services, which we cannot accommodate, and we also have demand for intervention support.

2.4

1.3

2.4

The Boston Globe actually recently published a study that was run by Harvard and Stanford, which is quantifying learning loss by town, of which we are included, and shows that students are still further behind than even their parents realize. It's predicting that Massachusetts students in this cohort are going to experience a lifetime loss of earnings in their future careers if this gap is not closed.

So what I want you to understand is we have ground to make up, and now is not the time to pull back programming that supports academic intervention and engages students in our schools.

In addition to the school performance stats, the programs on the line here are providing a critical outlet for relieving stress and anxiety, also developing different modes of intelligence for different learners. To Lindsay's point, these are not nice to haves. These are a core part of the educational experience.

For some of us, the memory of lockdown is starting to fade into the past, but

you might not realize that we're only just getting back to normal and resuming the full suite of programming that kids have missed out on in the last few years. So it just really breaks my heart to think about pulling these opportunities away again -- we're talking about band, we're talking about library time -- when they so desperately need these things right now.

1.3

2.4

Investment in education is an investment in our community, and it's one that these kids more than deserve after what they've been through. So please vote yes on our motion to restore 495k to this DPS budget to retain these seven student facing staff and specials, academic intervention, and extracurricular programming. We hope the town will see this as a worthwhile investment to support our students, our educators and our community.

And now I'd like to introduce a graduate of Dedham Public Schools with a personal perspective on this matter. Thanks, Andrew.

MR. CZAZASTY: So first of all, I want to thank the finance and warrant committee

for creating a conservative budget. I deeply respect that. However, they trimmed too much from the school department's request for my liking.

So at mini town meeting last week, the interim superintendent suggested that without this 500,000, the school department would be looking at cutting library programming and performing arts programming. So I just wanted to note the impact such cuts would have on students.

So as many of you know, in the early 2000's, Dedham was the pinnacle of performing arts in the region under the direction of then fine arts director Joe Rogan and then the middle school band director, Don Heald. If you just look at the trophy case in this hallway here, you'll see how large and accredited our performing arts programs were, and Dedham was a force to reckon with in higher division competitions.

But in the early 2010's, Mr. Rogan retired, Mr. Heald got sick, and the programs collapsed, and the fine arts department took

2.4

about seven years to return to a fraction of what it once was. And students are only in Dedham Public Schools for 13 years, so seven years to build up a program is a long time.

And I'm part of that transition. I remember when I was a freshman at Dedham High back in 2014, marching band was about half a dozen members, and senior year the number multiplied eightfold, and we were steadily increasing our numbers and abilities, and the future looked bright.

But then in 2019, the new fine arts director retired, the middle school band director went to a new district, and performing arts were back to square one. And we're at the point where bands didn't even perform at the Flag Day parade last year. That's always been a symbol of success for our town's fine arts, and their absence shows how bad it's gotten.

It will likely take half a decade for the fine arts department to reach where it was circa 2016, and it will be a generation until we can return to where we were pre-2010. However, none of that will be possible if the schools

2.4

must cut this due to a lack of funding at this critical point. So performing arts in Dedham is at the brink of extinction right now.

Many students won't be able to express their creativity if this cut goes through. I can't tell you how many hundreds of students have gone through this building and found a home performing in the auditorium or in the band room behind us.

Middle and high school students who enjoy the performing arts are a large supportive group. If we cut this funding, we'll have dozens of students entering middle school each year who don't have a feeling of belonging.

As I'm sure you will all remember from your middle school days or your children's middle school experience, finding that niche is vital at that age and has a significant impact on one's mental health. For those concerned with test scores, how can a student perform well on a test if they don't enjoy school?

Studies show that students involved in high quality music programs perform better academically. If you notice, every graduation

three students get to speak: the class president, the valedictorian, and the salutatorian. I want you to keep an eye out during those speeches. Every year at least one student involved in performing arts at Dedham Public Schools is one of those speakers. It's the case every single year.

1.3

2.4

These cuts would come out of elementary schools first, and elementary school is where students first gain this experience as they learn what they like. It isn't easy to get students to pick up new extracurriculars in middle school, and if they aren't at least in the beginning band by the sixth grade, good luck trying to get them into the program in seventh or eighth grade.

In high school, they require students

-- for a high school band, they require students

to have previous musical experience, so if we

have cuts in the earlier years, that will come

back to bite when these kids get a little bit

older.

Now let's discuss the impact of cutting our school's library services. So it's

no secret that kids are not reading as much as
they used to. I mean, many people here have
questioned how to get kids to read more, and I
can tell you what won't solve the problem is
cutting library personnel.

And it's more than just reading. Our school librarians act as the defacto tech gurus keeping students and teachers up to date with technology that enhances the classroom experience and helps students better understand the subject matter.

So if you cut school libraries,
you're also cutting technological advancements
in the schools. Students must understand
computer science and research methods to succeed
in higher education and careers, and that
teaching can't start in high school. This must
begin at their elementary schools.

If students don't have this continuous service throughout their 12 years, they'll be disadvantaged when they get to college. So for the advancement of the next generation of students, and for the sake of our school's programs and something our whole town

2.4

can be proud of, I'd urge you to vote for this motion.

THE MODERATOR: The Chair recognizes

Cecilia Emery Butler.

MS. BUTLER: Well, I certainly feel like Debbie downer. My name is Cecilia Emery Butler, and I am a town meeting rep from District 4.

I prepared a sheet of paper with information about pupil spending in Dedham and nearby towns. You should have received it when you signed it. Across the top it says "How Does Dedham School Spending Compare With Nearby Towns?" I compiled this because I wanted to see how Dedham is spending compared to others.

This information came from the Massachusetts Department of Education website for the year '21 -- 2021, 2022. The current year is not available yet. Please refer to the third row in the table. It shows that Dedham has 2,549 in district students, spent an average of \$22,790 per student, had an operating budget of \$58 million, operated seven school buildings, and had a teacher/student ratio of one to 11.2.

2.4

1.3

When compared to nearby towns, several points came to my attention. I list them on the comments section under the table. For example, Dedham's per pupil spending is the second highest. Only Wellesley exceeds Dedham. Dedham's enrollment is about the same as Foxboro and Medfield, all about 2,500, yet Dedham spends \$11.7 and \$14.1 million more than those communities. Canton's enrollment is about 24 percent greater than Dedham, and it spends 59.7 million. Essentially the same as Dedham that spent 58 million.

Please note that the DOE includes expenses like the amount Dedham pays for health insurance for the school department employees. For example, the fiscal year '24 expense for health insurance is 13.5 million, and it is found on Budget Line 141 on Page 11. This includes all school department and town staff, but is not broken down for town meeting, but the Department of Ed does break that down.

It seems to me that other communities have figured out ways to operate their schools for less, and the Dedham School Committee should

look carefully to these other towns for ideas on how to operate Dedham schools. I respectfully urge you to help Dedham taxpayers and vote against the substitute motion, and vote for the finance and warrant committee's motion. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms.

Butler. The Chair recognizes Mr. Delloiacono.

MR. DELLOIACONO: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator, members of town meeting. This is Carmen Delloiacono, Precinct 4.

Mr. Moderator, first off, I'd like to say thank you for keeping up the tradition of having the prayer before town meeting. I think it was very nice tonight to see Father Steve, and I really appreciate the fact you're moving forward with that tradition.

On this particular article, it's -well, it was changed. I shouldn't say article.
The due diligence has been done with this with
respective members of FINCOM. They went through
the town manager's budget numbers, they looked
at it, they did the homework, they came back
with the recommendation.

2.4

I understand, and I could feel the passion about funding the difference, I really do, but it's not that it's tightening the belt. The recommendation is put forward. In the past, it's always had -- you have to identify where you're getting the money. Has that changed, Mr. Moderator, or is it just flatly taxes will increase 40-something dollars?

THE MODERATOR: That rule of the meeting has stopped now for several years because we are far enough below the Prop 2 ½ levy limit to allow town meeting to exercise its prerogatives without hitting the limit.

MR. DELLOIACONO: I wanted to hear that. Thank you. That was my point. It is \$44 in the past, this town meeting. Other town meetings have battled over \$22, \$28 of adding for school science labs, it's only this, it's only that.

I understand it's seven jobs. Due diligence, again, has been done. Contracts have been signed. Will the contracts that have just been signed recently cause another seven jobs the next time, I'm not too sure about that, but

2.4

it has to start somewhere, and this is where.

It has to start with this budget that's proposed tonight. To keep it even keeled, I would recommend and suggest that we support the FINCOM'S recommendation. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

Delloiacono. Dr. Pearrow.

DR. PEARROW: Hi. My name is Melissa Pearrow. I'm from Precinct 2. I'm also a former school committee member.

What I want to add to this conversation is that our school committee has already done a very careful and diligent review. I want to commend the school committee because all the (inaudible) funds that came in, none of them were used for our current staffing. It's only been used for the learning loss that our students have experienced. And we know that that loss has been significant, not just for our community, but for all communities. So this is an unusual time for our community to have the opportunity to fully support our students.

The part I want to add, though, is that 14 percent at a district cost increase,

that was for every district in the Commonwealth, and that added up to a total of 1 percent on top of every town's budget.

So the fact that our budget is losing less than half of that percent -- they have made cuts, they have made very hard decisions about how to do the budget and move forward, and I would please ask that you support this additional motion to return this funding to schools so we can keep the staffing for our students.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dr.

Pearrow. The Chair recognizes Mr. Preston from the finance and warrant committee.

MR. PRESTON: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator. Kevin Preston, finance and warrant committee, Precinct 2.

I actually rise just to clarify one point. There seems to be a misunderstanding that the finance and warrant committee is recommending that seven positions be eliminated or that certain programs be cut. That is absolutely not the case.

That is the case with respect to

2.4

everything that we recommend on the town side of the budget. If we go -- if you look at the numbered line items, there are more than 100 line items that specify what particular things will be funded and what won't be funded. That's decidedly not the case with the school side.

The only thing that the finance and warrant committee recommended if you look at Line 73 is that the original request for 7 percent increase in the budget be reduced to 5.9 percent. If that figure is -- the 5.9 percent is appropriated, it is entirely within the discretion of the school committee and the superintendent to decide how best to achieve those cuts.

The finance and warrant committee and this town meeting have absolutely no input into what decision they make. So if they can find other ways -- and they haven't had a lot of time to study this, obviously. If they can find other ways to achieve that level of a 5.9 percent increase in a less painful way, they're entirely within their rights and duty, I would suggest, to do so, and I'm sure that they will.

2.4

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

Preston. Ms. Carney.

MS. CARNEY: Let me preface my remarks by saying personally, when it comes to spending money, my top two priorities -- number one is health, number 2 is education. So I have a very high regard for education.

THE MODERATOR: Sue, just identify yourself.

MS. CARNEY: Oh, I'm sorry.

 $\label{eq:theorem} \textbf{THE MODERATOR:} \quad \text{We have a lot of new}$  folks here today.

MS. CARNEY: I'm sorry. I'm Sue Carney from Precinct 7.

Now, back, I guess, it was in March, the board of selectmen had a gentleman who came from the Collins Center who came before the board of selectmen, and he was putting forth some indication of how we spend money, and he made reference to the fact that in looking through the budgets of Dedham, he found -- now, this is -- I forget the gentleman's name, but we had a contract with him to give us a proposal on

how we could have a financial plan to move forward.

And he made the remark that the Town of Dedham seems to be able to be guaranteed that 3 percent increase in our income annually was pretty realistic, but he also said that when he looked at the picture, we were spending more than we were taking in.

Now, he did specifically mention -welcome Mrs. Murphy, the school department. He
specifically mentioned that it appeared that the
school department was getting 4 ½ to 5 percent
increase annually. Ladies and gentlemen, I
spent my whole career in education, and I was
involved in more budgets than I care to think
of.

When a school system, in good times or bad, gets 4 ½ to 5 percent annually, there would be a lot of school systems that would be dancing in the street for that. That's a very high annual increase.

And the man from the Collins Center pointed out to us you have 3 percent that you can guarantee coming in, and yet -- and not just

2.4

the school department, ladies and gentlemen, but he looked, and he said the school department annually has been getting 4 ½ to 5 percent. He said you can't sustain that, and he's right.

We can't continue to spend more than we're taking in. Somehow we've been trying to do it, and we've made ourselves work through it, but the school committee this year has gone through hell and high water -- excuse me. The finance committee this year has gone through hell and high waters, pardon my French.

And so I say when you look at this, for a 6.95 proposal to come forward from the school department, understand that there would be school systems that would be absolutely awestruck to get that kind of an increase. Do I believe in strong educational programs, yes, I do, but I also know that money isn't always the answer.

So I'd like to have two questions answered by either a member of the school administration or the school committee. Number one would be is this 495,000 lower than what was requested going to create a loss of an academic

2.4

2.4

program, and number two, is it going to create a significant negative impact on the class size. Because for a very long time, Dedham has enjoyed a very, very advantageous class size. And I'm not minimizing that, but I'm also knowing that when you take 60 children, and you make four classes of 15 fairly routinely, and they have certainly been doing that in the past, it's okay to have 20 children in a classroom.

So I'm saying if they can answer those two questions for me -- will it create a loss in a program or will it detrimentally affect an increase in class size -- other than that, I think we should honor the recommendation of the finance committee and go with their original recommendation. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms.

Carney. Dr. Kelly, do you want to address those questions?

DR. KELLY: I do. Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Ian Kelly, interim superintendent.

Ms. Carney, thank you for the question.

To your first question -- I believe it was the class size, or was that the program

1	
L	
_	

1.3

2.4

elimination?

MS. CARNEY: The program.

DR. KELLY: So this would impact programs across the seven schools. It would not eliminate any co-curricular programs, but it would have an impact on those programs. And again, academic intervention, art, music, PE, and library would be where those seven (inaudible) would be coming from. Second question, class size, this would not increase class size in any way.

MS. CARNEY: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Dr. Kelly.
Mr. Maher.

MR. MAHER: James Maher, Precinct 5.

The first question I have is past 100 (?)

because I had a question about utilities. Are

utilities under the facilities department or

under the school department, because I'm trying

to figure out if the utilities are impacting the

school budget based on what I'm reading here.

THE MODERATOR: I see your connection there. Dr. Kelly. So your question is is the cost of utilities contributing to the school

department's --1 2 MR. MAHER: Based on what I'm reading 3 here in the substitute motion that the cost of utilities spike, which did go up in Article 4 5 [sic] 100 for the facilities department. 6 THE MODERATOR: So are they in the 7 school department budget is really what you're 8 asking. 9 MR. MAHER: They're not in the 10 budget. 11 THE MODERATOR: That's your question? MR. MAHER: Yes. 12 1.3 THE MODERATOR: Don't let me put 14 words in your mouth, but it sounds like that's 15 your question. MR. MAHER: Yeah. 16 17 DR. KELLY: So the school facilities 18 is its own facilities budget. And yes, so those 19 costs -- those utility increases are reflected 20 in that. So under Line 73 is where we bring 21 Line 100 and the school facilities over to bring 22 us to the total request for the school system.

23

2.4

So again, looking at the FY '24 level service, 50,786,550, and then the school

facilities, 485,609, we get the total request. 1 So that roughly \$360,000 increase for utilities 2 3 is reflected in the facilities portion of the 4 school department budget. 5 MR. MAHER: But it's not part of the 6 school budget, it's part of the facilities 7 budget, which was fully funded by the finance committee, correct? 8 9 DR. KELLY: Let me flip over. There's a slight reduction, if I recall. 10 11 about \$120,00 reduction to the facilities 12 department. 1.3 MR. MAHER: So the school budget now, 14 is there an area -- because we can't see it 15 because it's hundreds of pages long -- is there 16 an area in the budget that was cut by \$400,000 17 because of utilities? DR. KELLY: Not in Line 73. 18 19 MR. MAHER: That's what I thought. 20 just want to clarify that an impact on utilities 21 did not impact the school budget because it is a 22 separate line item as part of our budget 23 process, is that correct, beyond -- and the

finance committee?

2.4

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Goodwin.

3 ques

1.3

2.4

MR. GOODWIN: I guess to answer that question simply, when we look at the school budget, we look at it in a combined manner, so that's when we're talking about a 6.9 percent increase, it did include the facilities line under schools, which did include the utility increase. But as far as Line 73 is concerned, it does not include the utilities because they're separated out in this line item budget.

MR. MAHER: Clarification. I'd like to get some clarification how we're actually going to fund this substitute motion.

Originally when I was contacted, I was told it was coming out of free cash, but now I'm being told it's going to be an actual tax increase.

Could someone clarify that for me?

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Arnett.

MR. ARNETT: John Arnett, director of finance. Can everybody hear me okay? So the increase in this line would have a direct impact on the levy as you're going to increase the total expenditures, so it would be an automatic increase to the levy. So it would be directly

impacted to the taxes.

MR. MAHER: Thank you. Lastly, as a parent of a Dedham High student who was in arts and drama and was impacted when the school department cut a class on their own and took out an option for him to go on to music therapy as a class -- excuse me, music theory as a class, which he needed for his music therapy graduate, I'm one of those parents that was impacted in student school committee meeting and during -- and sat for three hours until the end of the meeting to discuss the fact that they were taking opportunity away from a number of children who had a severe interest in music going forward at the collegiate level.

And I just want to make sure that we're making the right decision for our children. But I also want to make sure that all of the information is getting out there on what the real impact is. And I know that the school budget, once they get approval tonight, they can change everything that they got approved through the finance committee. Once it's approved, it's approved as a lump sum, and they can change any

2.4

of the directives that they presented to the finance committee and to the town manager because it's now their budget. It's no longer the town's budget. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Maher.
Ms. Gilbert.

MS. GILBERT: Mary Gilbert, Precinct
4.

I struggle a little bit with this because I do have sympathy for the potential programs that are supposed to be being cut. But I attended many of these financial committee meetings. I saw the in depth analysis, and none of these recommendations came by easily.

I think we need to understand going forward -- people are saying it's only \$44 to our tax bill. Well, this is FY '24. In FY '25, we have a significant hole in our budget that we, as a town -- town meeting members -- and residents -- are going to have to deal with.

That is something that we have to take in consideration when we talk about increasing this budget by 495. I am not in favor of the substitute motion because I

2.4

appreciate the programs and what they're talking about. But I believe, based on Mr. Maher's comment, once they get this budget, they can make a decision not to make cuts to these programs.

They seem to -- and I don't mean to put it down. They go for easy low hanging fruit. There's no reason necessarily to try to get people revved up about we're going to cut the singing, the library. I don't know, ultimately that would be the decision of the schools, but I think the parents should insist you've got this budget, do not cut those programs.

I think that if the parents put pressure on like that, they will not cut these programs. And again, be aware that we have a significant hole in our budget coming up in FY '25, and we also have a school coming online probably within 18 months. Now, that's going to be a significant perhaps 30-year loan that we have to pay off.

And one final point. I sympathize with -- you know, the budget had a one-time hit

-- you know, the utilities. I can't imagine any 1 2 resident that hasn't had this hit to their 3 utilities, to their food bill. \$44 seems minimal. I can tell you that from what I've 4 5 heard back from my constituents, significantly 6 more they pay to on their electric and their 7 food bills, etcetera. 8 We have to start curbing our

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

We have to start curbing our expenses, and this is a very small price, in a sense, to give. I support the article for the financial committee. I do not support, and I respectfully ask that the rest of town meeting come along and support the original motion. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms. Gilbert. Mr. Chapdelaine.

MR. CHAPDELAINE: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Adam Chapdelaine, Precinct 1.

I have a few comments I want to make, but before I make those comments, I want to thank the finance and warrant committee, school committee, town administration, school administration, because regardless of the outcome of this debate tonight, very hard

decisions were made. A lot of thought went into this, and I think it's important to recognize all of that good work.

But I rise tonight in support of the substitute motion as presented by the proponents, and I want to lay out really three things in regards to why I'm supportive.

I want to talk a little bit about the comparative tax burden when we look at Dedham and its neighboring or nearby or similar communities, I want to talk a little bit about budget process, and I want to talk about why I think this is important to me, but also likely important to other parents of Dedham Public School students who are here tonight.

In terms of comparative tax burden, I know there has been a lot of talk over the past couple of years, and certainly during this past election season, about Dedham's tax burden, and it's a real thing. Property taxes are a regressive form of taxation. Survey, after survey, after survey across the nation shows that property taxes are the most hated form of taxes.

2.4

1.3

2.4

So we're not unique in that, right? It's very normal actually that property taxes are looked -- or frowned upon, and that's why Prop 2 ½ went in place. That's why across the country in the late '70s and early '80s, laws like Proposition 2 ½ went in place, to try to control the property tax.

But it's helpful, I think, to look at perspective. So I took a look at the average single-family tax bill as a percentage of household income, and I look at that as an ability to pay metric because basically it's measuring what the tax burden is in Dedham up against what people's ability to pay is.

And I looked at Westwood, Needham,
Canton, Norwood, Foxboro, Natick, and Walpole.

I didn't use any science to pick those
communities, other than that they're nearby, and
I think I've seen some of them on lists that
others have used as comparable communities for
Dedham.

And when you look at that, Dedham is actually just a little bit better than the middle in terms of the average single-family tax

bill as a percentage of household income. We have a lower percentage than Norwood, Foxboro, Natick, and Walpole, only slightly higher than Canton, and a couple of points higher than Westwood and Needham. And I think what that demonstrates is though the burden can be very real for individuals trying to pay that tax bill ever year, we're not out of line. We have a fair level of taxation as compared to our peers.

So I don't offer that tonight thinking I will change the mind of anybody who is feeling stressed by their property tax payment, but I hope sharing that analysis can help those who are here tonight concerned about those to better understand that there is not an undue or disproportionate burden that's occurring here in Dedham.

The next point I want to make is about process. I know that the school committee worked very hard in cooperation with town administration to reduce \$1.2 million from their FY '24 proposed budget, and I know there was a lot of hard decisions that were involved in that.

1.3

2.4

That wound up having the town manager recommend a budget for the finance committee, and then the finance committee did their due diligence and ultimately made a decision, I believe in late March or early April, to recommend this cut. And unfortunately -- and some of this falls on me and others who are just getting caught up on things -- a lot of this didn't come to light until just about a week ago at mini town meeting, and it's forced many of us to have what is a pretty strained or controversial debate tonight.

And what I would argue for, again, whether or not this motion is successful tonight, is in the future to use that long range model that was referenced by a prior speaker developed by the Collins Center and think about putting together a process where members of the finance committee, members of the select board, the school committee, school administration, and town administration work over the course of the fall, look at the long-term picture, understand what those future pitfalls are, and develop budget guidelines so that the town manager and

2.4

the school superintendent can build a budget that conforms with preset budgetary guidelines as set by the leadership elected and appointed of this town.

And that would give all of us more time to socialize, understand, and potentially advocate for changes instead of feeling like we needed to rush between mini town meeting and tonight to advocate to protect some of these core services that have been outlined.

But the final point I want to make is really why I think this is important. And I used to work in town government, and often when school folks would be advocating for more money, I would wonder, man, why are people so passionate about this, why is everybody so upset or agitated about school cuts. And this was before I either had children or had school aged children, and I now have children, one at the ECEC, one at the Riverdale.

And as I think about it, I better understand that every parent's child is only in kindergarten once and then first grade once, and so on and so forth. So for that year, that one

year that your kid's in kindergarten, they don't 1 2 get that service, they don't get that special --3 they don't get that librarian, they don't get that special attention. That's forever lost. 4 5 It can be replaced in a subsequent budget, but your student, your kid, didn't get that benefit. 6 7 So I think that's why it's so 8 important as we continue to work through some of 9 the challenges, some of the tax burden challenges, the process challenges that have 10 11 been described here tonight, that we think about protecting what's provided to the students in 12 the Dedham Public Schools. So for those 1.3 14 reasons, I ask those here tonight to vote in 15 favor of the substitute motion. 16 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. 17 Chapdelaine. 18 I know this is your first Welcome. 19 town meeting. I don't know your name. 20 MS. SCHELL: Well, hi. I'm Ashley Schell from Precinct 2. 21 22 THE MODERATOR: Welcome. 23 MS. SCHELL: Thank you. So I just 2.4 want to speak out. I am in favor of the

substitute motion being presented, and I want to say how much support, obviously, we know the schools and teachers deserve, which I think we can all agree upon. It was evident coming out of the pandemic.

1.3

2.4

I am both a Riverdale parent and a volunteer in the school library, so I've witnessed benefits that are art, library, music, PE intervention, all these teachers provide to the kids. We know that the kids need breaks from the traditional classroom setting.

Reducing their time in PE, whether they're not — where they're usually getting out energy and also problem solving with their classmates, loss of that time would deprive them of important social development. Taking time away from art and music would cut down on creative outlets that kids have, which are desperately needed as the stress increases in other areas.

But specifically, I want to speak to the hour I spend every week at the Riverdale Library, yes, checking out books and shelving them, but also, I've listened to the lessons that are being taught by the amazing librarian

1 there.

Of course, there's what you'd expect: lessons on nonfiction, fiction, women's history month, and what have you. But the students are also being taught to be aware, for example, of their digital footprint and what their internet activity means for them, not just now, but as they go out and try to find jobs or get into schools.

They're also learning how to identify credible sources for projects, how they can sift through the vast quantity of information that their generation is being bombarded with and know what to rely upon. These are the skills that they'll need, not just as students, but as adults. And if we reduce the amount of library time that these kids get, it is going to impact them, not only now in their childhood, but for years to come.

I implore each and every one of you to think about the long-term effects of the reduction of seven teachers and what that will mean to the kids who have already gone through so much throughout this pandemic. Let's give

2.4

1 them more opportunities, not less. Thank you.

1.3

2.4

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms.

Schell. Ms. Daly. I've kind of figured out who's next here.

MS. DALY: I'm Vivian Daly, Precinct 2, and I am a graduate of Dedham High School, Class of 2009.

So I am in favor of the substitute motion to maintain the originally proposed budget for the Dedham Public Schools, and I wanted to just speak a bit about why that is. Our interim superintendent has made it very clear that extracurriculars will be impacted by this, such as libraries and band, and I want to provide some perspective about what that may mean for your children.

I don't have children, but I moved to Dedham in the sixth grade, and the library in the middle school was my after school program. Both my parents worked, and I'd go there every day after school until 3:30 or 4:00 when my mom picked me up. It's also where I met my best friend who was my maid of honor, and whose wedding I'll be in later on this year.

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 best friends to this day. 10 11 12 1.3 14 15 16 17 18 to vote in favor of it, as well. 19 THE MODERATOR: 20 21 MS. STEPHENS: 22 I'm from Precinct 6.

1

23

2.4

These are lifelong friendships that your kids could be making. It's amazing to hear about how kids are learning about their digital footprints, but also think about the relationships that they're making in the library. I also did color quard, so I was in the state championship color guard and marching band for multiple years, and those are still my So these aren't just skills that your kids could be learning, but these are relationships that could be lost if impacts to

these programs are made. And by impacts, I think that means reductions, as this is a reduction in the budget. So I'm in favor of the substitute motion, and I encourage other parents, town meeting members, Dedham residents

Thank you, Ms. Daly. Ms. Stephens, thank you for your patience.

So I'm Ann Stephens.

I'd like to say, first off, that I'm also a graduate of the Dedham Public Schools,

but it was a little bit before 2009. I'd also like to say that -- I was going to say all of these things that have already been covered. So I did have a lot more to say when I originally got up to speak, but I won't bore you guys with that.

I will say that after mini town meeting, I walked outside, and I was just really considering what the impact of the loss of seven full-time employees would look like, and it devastated me. Many of the things that Andrew had mentioned when he was up there definitely came to mind. I have children all over the place. I've got one at the high school, I've got one at Avery --

**THE MODERATOR:** I'm glad you clarified that.

MS. STEPHENS: -- one will be at the ECEC, not next year, but the year after. So I'm in this for the long haul. And I do spend also a lot of time volunteering at the schools, and I see firsthand what the educators that are in jeopardy of losing their jobs do on a daily

1 basis. It is invaluable.

And given that we don't expect a lot of these budgetary increases to be ongoing, I don't think that I can justify voting to cut these positions. And we have been told that ultimately, that's what will happen.

Did anybody go to Spongebob this past weekend? So at the cast party, they went around from student to student, and they asked each person to share a positive shout out with another member of the cast or crew. So just think about that. Like first of all, what an impactful way to build people up. Middle schoolers really need that. And that was all thanks to the music and art teachers, along with a lot of the other supportive staff members.

The Avery Institute is the programming for summer that serves as basically a camp for the month of July for many first through fifth graders here in Dedham. Basically the librarians, the art teachers, the music teachers, phys ed teachers, they all run programs each week, and they are always the most popular and the first to fill up.

After school enrichment is another way that these particular staff members contribute. The Avery School offered four spring enrichment options for students. Three of the four were run by the librarian and the physical education teacher.

November 2, where the Metro West survey results highlighted that one of the biggest issues with students in Dedham was that they don't have a sense of belonging. COVID certainly didn't help with that. And kids that have that sense of belonging are going to be more successful and are going to be better prepared to be good citizens.

The programming provided by the staff that is in danger of being cut is vital to the sense of belonging for a lot of students. So I am in favor of the substitute motion, and I urge you all to vote with me.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Thank you for your patience, as well.

MS. HOWARD-KARP: Marisa Howard-Karp,
Precinct 3.

1.3

Those of us who know Ann Stephens know that she generally deserves the last word. So I'd like to absolutely move the question.

THE MODERATOR: So moving the question is a vote that the body takes. The body has to decide to cut off debate. It requires a two-thirds vote. So yes means cut off debate; no means no. Let's try a voice vote. We're going to try it. All those in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: No.

(No.)

THE MODERATOR: The ayes clearly have a two-thirds vote. So the vote now comes on the -- so what you're voting on is the substitute motion. You're voting on the higher number. So if you're in favor of the higher number, you vote yes. If you're not, vote no.

The original motion of the finance and warrant committee is always the standing motion we vote on. If there's an amendment to that motion, you vote on the amendment first to see whether you want to substitute it for the

1 original motion.

1.3

2.4

So if the substitute passes, then that's the law of the land. If it fails, then we will go back and vote on what the finance and warrant committee has recommended. So if you're in favor of the proposal to add money back, that's a yes. If you're not in favor, that's a no. It's important that that be clear. Don't be afraid to ask if you're not sure. Are you sure, Mark? You're nodding your head there -- okay, he's sure.

The vote is open. On your electronic indicators, please vote green for yes or red for no.

The voting is closed. 164 town meeting representatives having voted in the affirmative, and 79 in the negative, the substitute motion does pass.

Move to Line 88, rubbish and recycling. Ms. Gilbert.

MS. GILBERT: Just a clarification.

Mary Gilbert, Precinct 4. So there are going to
be cuts in the pickup of the rubbish. Is it
rubbish or yard refuse? So I'd like that

clarification. I believe it's yard refuse.

1.3

2.4

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Goodwin.

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator, Ms. Gilbert, town manager. This would be a reduction to the yard waste budget, which is included in the overall rubbish and recycling budget, and this is part of the 5 -- or \$495,000 decrease that was approved by the finance and warrant committee.

So within that would be a \$253,071.50 reduction to rubbish and recycling, which would reduce the leaf pickup in town. We're working on the exact numbers, but it would take it from the current number of 34 down to something significantly less than that in the 12- to 14-week range.

MS. GILBERT: That was my question.

I last heard when I was at the meeting it was 12 weeks. So the clarification I want, is that six weeks in the fall, six weeks in the spring? How are you doing that, is it A week, B week; is it three and three? What's going to happen, because that's going to be very noticeable to the resident.

1	MR. GOODWIN: So the public works
2	director is still working with our vendor on
3	that. It probably won't be exactly evenly
4	divided. We're going to try and do it in the
5	least impactful way possible, cutting out the
6	service in the middle of the summer when the
7	least number of people use it and trying to time
8	it so that we get the most leaves in the spring
9	and the most leaves in the fall to at least
10	impact the residents.
11	MS. GILBERT: And one more question.
12	So this is, again, for fiscal year '24?
13	MR. GOODWIN: That's correct.
14	MS. GILBERT: So that goes from
15	January to June of next
16	MR. GOODWIN: That goes from July 1.
17	MS. GILBERT: Excuse me, yeah, July
18	to June?
19	MR. GOODWIN: That's correct.
20	MS. GILBERT: So fiscal '25, we're
21	going to start discussions on that budget, and
22	you're going to see is this an experiment to
23	see how we work this, and if town if
24	residents start saying I've got 50 bags of

1 leaves, I can't handle this anymore, you will 2 listen and perhaps amend that, or not? 3 my question. Thank you. 4 MR. GOODWIN: We're always opening to 5 listening. THE MODERATOR: 6 Chief Driscoll. 7 CHIEF DRISCOLL: Jim Driscoll, 8 Precinct 4. 9 If the yard waste is cut, is there going to be an option where residents can take 10 11 the additional yard waste that isn't picked up 12 and take it someplace to dispose of it? THE MODERATOR: Mr. Goodwin. 1.3 14 MR. GOODWIN: I'm tempted to make Joe 15 walk all the way from the back there down to the 16 front here, but I'm not going to. 17 Unfortunately, we don't have a drop-off location 18 for yard waste as of this time. There are 19 private services that are available that I know 20 that other communities do offer. We're trying 21 to avoid that, again trying to be strategic and 22 figure out the weeks that would be most 23 impactful and important for our residents.

quess the answer to that question is there is

2.4

not a drop-off location. 1 **THE MODERATOR:** Any other questions? 2 3 If not, the vote comes on the original motion, as published on Page 9 in this last column. All 4 5 those in favor, please say aye. 6 (Aye.) 7 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 8 ayes have it. Mr. Maher, are we finished with 9 Line Item 100? 10 MR. MAHER: Yes. 11 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. All those in favor of the original motion on Line Item 12 13 100, please say aye. 14 (Aye.) 15 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. The 16 ayes have it. Thank you. 17 Line Item 118 on Page 10 under Veterans Services. Ann Mercer. Ms. Mercer. 18 19 MS. MERCER: I couldn't give up my 20 chance to get to the microphone. 21 THE MODERATOR: You're not going to 22 talk about the (inaudible), right? 23 MS. MERCER: No, no, I know. I mean, 2.4 I'm going to make something up now. No, I was

just curious as to why there was such a big drop-off in the expenditures versus past years. It's the veterans. You want to make sure they're not getting poked.

MR. HAMILTON: Great question. Joe Hamilton, Dedham VSO. That cut came out of our Chapter 115 program as a state funded program, and it follows the federal poverty line.

So essentially, to be a recipient, you have to be the veteran or the widow or widower of a veteran who's not remarried. And at that point, the state reimburses the town 75 percent of what we pay out, and the numbers now, which is not a bad thing -- 115 numbers are somewhat down, and we're hoping that's because people are doing okay -- so that money that could have been cut from the budget will not affect any veterans at all in Dedham.

MS. MERCER: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

Hamilton. Any other discussion? The vote then

comes on the original motion for Line 118. All

those in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. The
ages have it. Thank you.

That concludes our consideration of Article 3, which is the operating budget. Now we're moving to the capital budget, which is Article 4. And Mr. Goodwin, maybe it would help if you explained. We just have a couple of small changes here from what's published in the book -- or Mr. Arnett, whichever.

MR. ARNETT: John Arnett, director of finance. So what you'll see here, there's only a couple of small changes to this schedule that you'll see here. Again, this goes through the deliberations through CEC. The department requests the CEC, the town manager, and then the finance and warrant committee.

The small change that you'll see is in Line 19, vehicle replacement, as part of the cuts that we are looking at for that 1 percent on the town side. This was part of that.

They're just replacement -- they're rolling stock for the vehicles. We could forego that one more year, so that was removed.

Another small change, which is Item

1.3

2.4

Number 41, Colburn Street traffic calming, the survey that went out -- this was part of this whole process. We put it in there for approval. However, part of that survey came back, did not meet the requirements for it, so it couldn't move forward. So hence why you're seeing the reduction there of that \$100,000 from funded to no longer funded.

So what you'll see there is the free cash use, what dropped from the original in the book from about \$1.3 million to the \$1.2 million. And then the bonded number at the far right is the amount of money that would give the authorization to the town treasurer to go out and issue debt for those projects.

So that's what this recommendation is for. This year, we also threw in their grant, so you can see that we are seeking grants to fund other types of large projects.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Mr.

Arnett is referring to the handout you got, the freestanding yellow page. That's the capital budget that replaces the one that's in the book. But as he indicated, the changes are pretty

minor. So if you look on the far right hand two columns, "Free Cash" and "Bonded," and go all the way down to the bottom, you'll see that we're using \$1,266,000 in free cash. The number in the book was higher than that, but the fact that it's lower reflects just what Mr. Arnett explained. The number being bonded is the same as in the book, so that hasn't been impacted.

1.3

2.4

So the way this very complicated looking chart works is every project that has a number beside it and the free cash and bonded line has been approved, as recommended to you, and it's either in the free cash line or the bonded line, depending on how it's being paid for. So the sum totals of those columns are down the bottom. You won't have to look at this again for years. So any questions before we vote? Ms. Gilbert. Ms. Mercer.

MS. MERCER: Ann Mercer, Precinct 4.

I have a question kind of similar to Mr. Maher's earlier, insomuch that it references another portion of the agenda. On Page 35 -- it is Article 22 -- the rescind prior authorized, yet unissued debt -- and when I was reviewing

both, it seemed as though -- I just want some clarification.

1.3

2.4

There seemed to be some redundancy between projects on the capital expenditure list and on that table. And I just was wondering like did they happen, did they not happen, is it just sort of like a carryover because it didn't happen?

THE MODERATOR: Good. Mr. Arnett.

MR. ARNETT: John Arnett, director of finance again. So what you'll see in Article 22, and I'm sure we'll be talking about this in the future later on, but what that article really is doing is that some of these projects, which were voted on in the past, what we're doing is we're authorizing a different source of funds. So there's some that are not redundancies.

In the current article, in Article 4 tonight, these are new projects in Article 4.

If you may see some redundancies or anything of that nature, that's not the case. These are referring -- what you would see in the future article is in regards to prior approved last

1 year's capital projects.

1.3

2.4

MS. MERCER: So why am I seeing them again? I'm confused still, sadly.

MR. ARNETT: Which one are you
referring to is redundant?

MS. MERCER: Like let's say number -well, the first one on that list, "Entrance
safety vestibules, 23 DMS construction FY '24
Riverdale design." Maybe that's not the best
one, but I think I highlighted it.

MR. ARNETT: That's actually a really great one. We can talk about that. I'd love to clarify that. So that one is when projects come in, that one has been talked about at great length during the finance and warrant committee, and effectively, there's a growth in the cost of that project from design phase, build, COVID, all these other things that go along with that. So what you're seeing here in Article 4 is the additional authorization to complete that project.

THE MODERATOR: Let me try, Ms.

Mercer. So Mr. Arnett, in Article 22, the

entrance safety vestibule project was originally

1	intended to be borrowed?
2	MR. ARNETT: That is correct.
3	THE MODERATOR: And now we're
4	changing our mind and rescinding the borrowing,
5	but we're going to use free cash instead?
6	MR. ARNETT: I would say we're being
7	a little bit more fiscally responsible using
8	cash rather than issuing debt and increasing
9	THE MODERATOR: Cash is cheaper.
10	MS. MERCER: So we're just going to
11	pay up front instead of doing okay.
12	THE MODERATOR: So what you're seeing
13	in Article 4 is in addition to this, due to the
14	cost of the project, so they're not really
15	related. Is that correct?
16	MR. ARNETT: Correct, because the
17	total cost is \$700,000 authorization for the
18	total project.
19	MS. MERCER: Okie-dokie. Thank you.
20	THE MODERATOR: I applaud you for
21	correlating two articles.
22	MS. MERCER: I did my homework.
23	THE MODERATOR: Ms. Gilbert.
24	MS. GILBERT: Mary Gilbert, Precinct

4. Fiscally responsible, I like that language. 1 2 So I have a question on Line 19 and 3 20 where you're putting out to bond \$30,000 and \$50,000. Is there not a policy that you're not 4 5 going to bond? It's on this yellow sheet. So 6 let's see. I might have given you -- it's 7 probably 20 and 21. 8 MR. ARNETT: 20, town facilities. 9 MS. GILBERT: The town -- the gutter 10 replacement. 11 MR. ARNETT: Gutter replacement and 12 the cupola. That's all part of a larger project 1.3 I know that you've talked in much more cost. great length about anything dealing with the 14 15 Ames building. So I'll let the town manager 16 answer that one. 17 MS. GILBERT: Oh, that's a nice pass. 18 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Ms. Gilbert, for the question. So you've mentioned Line 19, 19 20 Line 20, and then I would like to draw 21 everyone's attention to Line 23, which is 22 600,000. 23 MS. GILBERT: Yes, that was something

I was going to ask.

2.4

1.3

MR. GOODWIN: So combined, the total project would be 680,000, and we expect to lump those together as a project, which would then put it within the realm of something that we should be bonding for.

MS. GILBERT: You just decided to
make it a separate line item, as opposed to --

MR. GOODWIN: As it was submitted into the capital process, they were separate, but as a recommendation, we would lump them together.

MS. GILBERT: Could you not, though, put the 80,000 -- there's free cash that you didn't spend on something. Take that 80,000 out. That bonded number will drop by 80,000. You still have 600,000 you're going to spend.

MR. GOODWIN: We could have. This was somewhat strategic in our work with the finance and warrant committee to preserve free cash going forward, to use bonding responsively on certain projects. It was, I think, one of those situations where it made sense at the time to lump them together. Certainly town meeting could with some of the information you have

tonight say okay, town, you could go and spend 1 2 free cash on those. Our recommendation at the 3 time was to bond it as a \$680,000 project. 4 weren't looking at it separately. 5 MS. GILBERT: Right, but again, I 6 would -- we just saved 100,000 in free cash, 7 which is great. We'll still say 20 if you pay 80 grand and take that off the bond. 8 9 MR. GOODWIN: It's certainly an 10 option that the town meeting could entertain. 11 It's not something that we were recommending. 12 MS. GILBERT: Right. So if the town 13 meeting wanted to entertain that, what is the 14 process, Mr. Moderator, for that to happen? THE MODERATOR: You need a substitute 15 16 motion in writing, please. 17 MS. GILBERT: So I can't do -- can we 18 take 80,000 and put it in free cash? Obviously, 19 I can't write anything right now. 20 THE MODERATOR: Well, let's put it 21 this way, Ms. Gilbert, you could write it, but 22 you're asking do we have to write it. So what 23 you want to do is take the 30 and the 50 and 2.4 move it from the bonded column to the free cash

	Page 99
1	column?
2	MS. GILBERT: Yes. I just didn't
3	know the process if that was possible.
4	THE MODERATOR: That's close enough.
5	So that's your substitute motion, that those
6	sums be moved to the free cash column instead of
7	the bonded column; is that right?
8	MS. GILBERT: Correct. Thank you.
9	THE MODERATOR: So you're moving
10	that?
11	MS. GILBERT: I'm moving that.
12	THE MODERATOR: Is there a second to
13	that?
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.
15	THE MODERATOR: Is there a discussion
16	on the amendment, this amendment from Mary
17	Gilbert? Yes, sir?
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
19	Thumbs up.
20	THE MODERATOR: Thumbs up, okay. You
21	may have to thumbs up on your machine there for
22	a minute, but we'll accept that as like exit
23	polling. So we've got one vote there.
24	MS. GILBERT: Am I done with like

Page 100 THE MODERATOR: I think so, Mary, 1 2 yeah. 3 MS. GILBERT: Thank you. THE MODERATOR: You made your motion. 4 5 It's been seconded. 6 MS. GILBERT: Thank you. 7 THE MODERATOR: Now, let's make sure 8 people understand what we're voting on, which is 9 another obstacle. Is that clear? Are you ready 10 to vote on it? Any questions? 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Point of order. 12 1.3 THE MODERATOR: Point of order, state your point of order, please. 14 15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) THE MODERATOR: Sure. 16 So we're 17 looking at the yellow page that was handed out, 18 and you will see on Lines 20 and 21 there are 19 two projects, which are components of a larger 20 project. They have to do with some needed 21 repairs at our town hall. 22 Ms. Gilbert is recommending that the 23 \$30,000 project and the \$50,000 project, that 2.4 yes, they will be done, but we will use free

	_
1	cash instead of borrowing money to do it. So
2	are you going to pay cash for the car, or do you
3	want to put it on a payment plan. Mr. Loporto.
4	MR. LOPORTO: Bob Loporto, Precinct
5	5. Can we still discuss the article before we
6	vote on the amendment?
7	THE MODERATOR: Oh, yeah, we always
8	discuss them before we vote them, yeah. So go
9	ahead.
10	MR. LOPORTO: I shall proceed. Can
11	someone from the finance and warrant committee
12	discuss the amendment and what they think about
13	it?
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Loporto,
15	are you asking for us to take a position on
16	this, the finance and warrant committee?
17	MR. LOPORTO: A position, maybe not.
18	THE MODERATOR: They can't do that,
19	Bob.
20	MR. LOPORTO: They can't do that?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
22	MS. DALY: Vivian Daly, Precinct 2.
23	I think the town manager oh, sorry, you
24	didn't recognize me.

THE MODERATOR:

I do now.

MS. DALY: Thank you. Vivian Daly,

Precinct 2.

2.4

I think the town manager mentioned something about just now making a decision to keep that bonded versus free cash, to have more free cash available. Could maybe the town

manager or someone else further explain that?

THE MODERATOR: Either Mr. Goodwin or Mr. Arnett, if you could just explain the pros and cons. What goes into deciding what's bonded and what's free cash? What's the up side and the down side of using free cash, because free cash is not free cash, right?

MR. ARNETT: Correct. John Arnett, director of finance. So the benefit of having some free cash or residual free cash is for future ability to move as we go into the fall town meeting -- or fall town meeting, upcoming town meeting.

Because there's added liquidity at the very baseline, so think about it almost like if people are evaluating your personal finances, how much is in the bank account, if you will. So it talks about how much cash you have in the background. So it helps the town as far as credit agencies would see us.

1.3

2.4

So when we go out to bond, and they would take -- let's say they would actually look at that number and say, well, how much do you have on hand is one of the metrics that they use. So having a little bit larger bit of free cash as we go out to bond helps keep us at that Triple A rating or higher Triple A rating, as well as others. So that's the benefit of preserving free cash moving forward.

THE MODERATOR: And the benefit of using it instead of bonding is that it's cheaper in the long run?

MR. ARNETT: That is also correct.

So it's a give and take. It's a little bit of a piece back and forth, and it goes through a long discussion process to figure out where's a good level to end at.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, sir. So is that clearer? There are pros and cons to switching something from free cash to bonding. No questions?

2.4

So we're going to vote on Mary
Gilbert's amendment, and that is that these two
project do, indeed, be funded, but they be
funded by taking the money out of free cash
instead of borrowing.

Let's go to the clickers. All those in favor -- whoops, is there a question? So that motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor of doing that, as Mrs. Gilbert has recommended, please vote yes. If you don't agree, vote no. Voting is open.

Voting is closed. Please show the votes. 68 having voted in favor of the amendment, and 166 voting against it, the amendment fails. Is there any other discussion on Article 4, because now we have to pass the whole thing?

Hearing none, let's try this by
voice. The vote comes -- well, actually we need
two votes. Let's do this with clickers. The
projects that are being borrowed does require a
two-thirds vote, so we need two votes.

All those in favor of borrowing \$5,025,000 for the projects shown on this sheet,

please click yes on your clicker. Vote no if you don't agree. The vote is open.

3

4

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) THE MODERATOR: Hold your point of

5

order. We're in the middle of a vote.

6

7

voting on the bonding column. Was that your

8

point of order? I should have listened to you.

We've got the wrong one up.

9

It's not always possible for people to see the

10 11

amendment, but this is one of the reasons why in

situations that would cause them to propose an

12

every case where it is possible, if you know

1.3

you're going to do it, if you give us the

14

wording ahead of time, this would all be pre-

15

populated. But sometimes in the course of

16

asking questions, you discover that you do want

17

to amend something, so that's fine, as well.

18

fashioned way. Here's the original motion, and

We're going to do this the old-

19 20

it's nothing you haven't already seen, but we

21

have to have the wording right. The bonding

22

So the motion is that the sum of

23 2.4

\$5,025,000 be borrowed to pay for Projects

attorneys are very particular about this.

2.4

Number 10 -- thank you for your patience. So the reason we have to take two votes is because any time we borrow money, that's a two-thirds vote. To use free cash is just a majority vote, so we have to do two votes.

So the first motion we're voting on is to borrow money, per Article 4, and that reads that the town borrow \$5,025,000 to pay for the cost of items -- and these are the projects on your sheet -- Items 9 through 12, 20 through 23, 35 through 38, 42 and 47, as shown on the table. So you've had this. You've seen this. So all I did is translate this table into those words. Is that part clear?

So we're going to do the borrowing first. If you're in favor of borrowing \$5,025,000 for the projects that I just enunciated, please vote yes. If not, vote no.

Voting is closed. 211 having voted yes, 18 no, that is a two-thirds. The borrowing is approved.

The second part of our escape (?) from Article 4 reads that the town appropriate 1,366,000 -- no, that's not right, that's not

right -- that the town appropriate 1,266,501 for 1 Articles 6 through 8, 15 through 17, 24, 31 2 3 through 32, 39 through 41, 43 through 45, and 48 and 49, as is shown on this table. Are there 4 5 any questions? Let's try a voice vote. All in 6 favor, say aye. 7 (Aye.) 8 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 9 ayes have it. Thank you. 10 We'll now move to Article 8. 11 there any questions on Article 8? It's passed 12 because it requires a two-thirds quantum. That's moderator talk for vote. Hearing no 13 questions, the vote comes on the original 14 15 motion. Let's try for unanimous. All those in 16 favor, say aye. 17 (Aye.) 18 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 19 ayes have it. It is a two-thirds vote. 20 Article 10 was passed from the floor, 21 I believe, sewer enterprise fund. Questions, 22 comments? Mr. Loporto.

There's an increase of \$4 million. I was

MR. LOPORTO: Bob Loporto, P5.

23

2.4

wondering if someone could just speak to that increase.

2.4

MR. ARNETT: John Arnett, director of finance. So you'll see a substantial change of that \$4 million that is being referred to. That is actually a federal mandate through the EPA. In prior years, you would have seen this being funded through free cash at the tune of -- it has been increasing year over year from 200, 300, \$400,000.

This is the next phase in that permitting process for stormwater. So that can no longer be generated through free cash, as we just had a basic discussion on. I would have liked it completely out, and we would have zero gone, and that's only for one year.

So this is an additional -- we've had an open meeting on those fees before, but that's what this is. That is -- it's an operational expense mandated from the federal government passed down to us that we have to pay. So that's what this money is for.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

Arnett. Are there any questions on Article 10?

Let's try for a voice vote. All those in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. The ayes have it.

We move to Article 12. This is a zoning bylaw, so first we call for the report of the planning board. The Chair recognizes the vice-chair, Jessica Porter.

MS. PORTER: Thank you. So we have several planning and zoning articles on the warrant this year. You've already dealt with some of them in the consent agenda. But I just wanted to introduce myself, Jessica Porter. You're also going to be hearing tonight from our chair, Mike Podolski, and our planning director, Jeremy Rosenberger.

In terms of Article 12, the planning board held a duly noticed public hearing on March 22 and April 12 that included public testimony on Article 12. On April 12, the planning board voted unanimously, with a quorum present, to recommend to town meeting that Article 12 be so voted.

2.4

1.3

Article 12 will regulate and define electric vehicle charging stations. The planning board issued a report explaining the recommendations on this and every other zoning article on April 13, and you'll find that in the back of your book. On Page A15 is where that starts. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have on Article 12.

THE MODERATOR: Are there any questions on Article 12? Ms. Hornblower.

MS. HORNBLOWER: Patricia Hornblower. So I'm just a little bit confused about this article. I've read it like 15 times. I talked to a member of the planning board today because I did have questions on it, because you're talking about regulating stations. So I understand completely that we do need a bylaw that has to do with this type of vehicle because it's going to be very much in our future.

But then you jump and you start talking on the same page about the different kinds of charges that they're going to have, and as I spoke to -- I don't want to throw Mr.

Bethany under the bus. I did speak to him about

2.4

that, yes, but I want to have permits, and I want people to have the wiring, and the wiring inspector. So I get that part.

So we're jumping from one issue, then we're going to another issue, and then it keeps going down, and it goes to the special permits and to all zoning districts, and then you go from residential. So it's like so many different things going on here. But then the sentence that really got me was parking spaces with EV charges would count toward the parking requirement of a given development.

So right now, if you go to BJ's or you go to Wegmans, and you have a place to park, curbside parking, or if you're pregnant, which would have been great 40 years ago for me when I was waddling around town, and then you have veterans, which I totally support, then you have — if you have a child — now, I do understand that those aren't mandated. Those are up to the development, they're up to the restaurant, they're up to anyone. It's not mandated, as handicapped is.

But now, I asked, well, if I can't

find any parking or I have to drive way over like University Station to find parking, what happens to me? I'm not going to go park in one of those EV's and come out with my gas guzzling SUV and see what someone is going to do to me.

So I just don't understand the way this article is written. There's like five different things going on, and then you're throwing in the parking, and I just don't understand why it wasn't better defined.

was included because we wanted to make it clear that if -- let's say a development would require 26 parking spaces, based on the number of units if it was a residential development. We didn't want to suggest that they had to have 26 regular spaces, an additional two or three or whatever the new building code is going to require for electric vehicles. They still only need 26 stations -- the 26 parking places.

I will tell you at a municipal level, the planning board actually talked about this issue with the town recently and asked that any town and municipal lots -- for instance, at town

2.4

hall and also at the Keystone lot, there are EV charging stations that are open to everyone and is not marked that it is EV charging only.

And in general in the planning board, when we talk to developments about their parking, we actually are in a position to be able to talk about not just that they have EV stations, but also how they treat those, as well as others; for instance, expectant mothers, curbside pickup.

It's also an issue that I think in general, based on experience of planning board members, and also on your call today, that the planning board has talked about actually at our meeting at 6:00 tonight under new business discussing more broadly.

So I will tell you this actually does not suggest -- this allows people to put in EV spaces. It does not require that those spaces be marked EV only. I will tell you from a personal perspective, I drive an EV car. I think most of them are pretty friendly and wouldn't actually do anything to your car.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms.

Porter. Further questions on Article 12? The being none, the vote comes on the original motion, which is that it be so voted. It does require a two-thirds vote. Let's try for a voice vote. All those in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. It is

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. It is a two-thirds vote.

Article 13, proposed amendment to the zoning bylaws, report of the planning board.

Ms. Porter.

MS. PORTER: Thank you. I'm here again. The planning board held a duly noticed public hearing on March 22 and April 12 that included public testimony on Article 13. On April 12, the planning board voted unanimously, with a quorum present, to recommend at town meeting that Article 13 be so voted. Article 13 adds a definition of human occupancy to our zoning bylaws, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

THE MODERATOR: Questions on 13?
Yes, Ms. Carney.

MS. CARNEY: On Page 2 of the handout

1.3

2.4

2.4

-- well, actually it was mailed through the mail from the planning board department -- under Article 13, see, I'm confused about how we decide how many stories there is to a building. And I know within the last 12 to 18 months, the zoning board, even though we have -- apparently our bylaw says 45 feet, or pretty much four stories, they voted to approve six stories, and it's for a hotel coming right into town.

So maybe I don't understand how they're defining what a story is, because that's a big -- why bother having a requirement for height restriction if you exceed it by 50 percent, and the planning board, of course, allowed five, which is still over and above why we have that restriction.

So here's the part I don't understand. It says -- and this is where Article 13 -- you go down to the paragraph just about where it says the planning board recommendation, and it's describing human occupancy and how it impacts story, and it says, "The portion of the building with more than one half its height, measured from the finished

floor to the finished ceiling, below the grade 1 2 used exclusively for storage, mechanical 3 equipment, and utilities associated with allowable use of said building" -- and it goes 4 5 on to say "shall not be considered a story." What's that? 6 MS. PORTER: 7 I wonder if commas would 8 be helpful there. So I think the grammarian in 9 me would say "finished ceiling, below the grade, used exclusively for storage." 10 11 MS. CARNEY: Below what grade? 12 MS. PORTER: So we're talking about 1.3 basements, lower -- we're talking about lower 14 levels, basements that are used exclusively for 15 storage. So I think that we're missing a comma. 16 Did I catch that right? 17 MS. CARNEY: Well, I don't know the comma is going to clear up my confusion here, 18 but -- I don't know, it impacts story, and I'm 19 20 concerned with what people are approving for 21 stories. 22 MS. PORTER: So this is specific to 23 the definition of human occupancy. Can I try to 2.4 answer your question around how it impacts

stories?

The planning board had a project in front of us that wanted to have four stories above ground, let's say, above grade and one story below grade, and the story below grade was only going to be used for storage.

MS. CARNEY: Storage.

MS. PORTER: Right. We needed to add this definition to have clarification that that would not be considered a five-story building, that that would be considered a four-story building. Because a story, as the planning board was thinking about it -- and this caused also, I think, some confusion at the building department -- was kind of how to enforce it consistently, that a story is something that involves human occupancy. And this allows us to clarify what's the difference between a story and storage.

MS. CARNEY: So that's where the one half of the height measured from floor to ceiling comes in if, in fact, it's really not only going to be used for all intents and purposes storage and equipment?

2.4

MS. PORTER: 1 Right. Below grade. 2 MS. CARNEY: Right, below grade. 3 Thank you very much. MS. PORTER: Thank you. 4 5 THE MODERATOR: Any other questions 6 on Article 13? This requires a two-thirds vote. 7 We can try for a unanimous. All those in favor, 8 please say aye. 9 (Aye.) 10 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. ayes have it. It's a two-thirds vote. 11 12 Article 14, proposed amendment to 13 Dedham zoning map. MS. PORTER: 14 So I'm going to do the 15 legal part first while I wait for the map to 16 come up, and I do have a couple of slides. I 17 know it's late. I'm going to go very fast. 18 this is a very important amendment, and so we 19 want to make sure that everybody understands 20 what they're voting on. 21 So the planning board held multiple 22 meetings about Article 14, including a duly 23 noticed public hearing on March 22 and April 12,

that included public testimony on Article 14.

2.4

1.3

2.4

On April 12, the planning board voted unanimously, with a quorum present, to recommend to town meeting that Article 14 be so voted. As part of our due diligence, the planning board reviewed the legal requirements and location of the overlay district proposed by Article 14, which I'll be talking to you about shortly, and determined that it is an eligible location and requires a majority vote of town meeting.

We flagged this, both for legal reasons, and also because most of the zoning changes are actually a two-thirds vote. We want to make sure you all understand this one is a majority vote. So you will -- I'm going to try to give you the highlights, but you'll also find the detailed report with an FAQ beginning on Page A17 of your appendix. I'm going to start by showing you some maps and give you some context.

You can see -- it's a little faint maybe, depending where you are; there's also maps in the back of your book -- but what you'll see is a map of Dedham, and then there's a highlighted circle kind of at the bottom, which

is basically an area around the Dedham corporate center T station.

In 2020, Massachusetts established the MBTA community zoning law to encourage more and denser housing around subway, commuter rail, and bus stations. This is a way to promote economic development and to meet the Commonwealth's housing shortage without overloading our roads and highways.

Dedham spent two years studying this legislation, including whether or not we should even comply. That included joint meetings between the select board and the planning board, numerous meetings of town counsel, and engaging Stantec Consultants to do an analysis of whether Dedham could create a zoning district that would meet the requirements of the law without changing the character of our neighborhoods.

So here's what we are proposing: a small overlay district around the Dedham corporate commuter rail station, which is already a multifamily housing neighborhood. On the map that you see, that's within the pink circle.

2.4

1.3

2.4

please. Great. So specifically, the zone would be -- if you do the bump out -- so it's not even the whole pink circle, and then we have a blowout here, which I'll try to just not look at it. So if I'm pointing in the wrong place, give me a little bit of the benefit of the doubt.

If you could advance the slide,

So the specific area includes Legacy Place, the Avens, and Jefferson Station

Apartment complexes, the MBTA commuter rail parking lot, extra space storage, the Fairfield Inn, and the parcel on Quabish Road across from Whole Foods, which was recently approved for a mixed use project.

I'm going to give you some
highlights, and then I'll be here for questions.
The first thing that you should know is it's
what's called an overlay district, which means
that it can be used to create housing if people
opt to do that, but it doesn't change the
underlying zoning in this area, which is
research, office, and development. So people
could still go in and build exactly what they
could build today, or they have the opportunity

1 to build housing.

1.3

2.4

The district also allows for housing to be created without a special permit. So any project would still have to go through site plan review with the planning board, have to meet all of the requirements around landscaping, pedestrian and traffic circulation, setbacks, massing, all of those standard practices. It just would mean that they don't need a special permit to create it.

Next, the district has to have the ability to hold 1,569 housing units, but the town is not required to build those units. So we've identified an area that can hold that number of units, but again, we're not required to build that.

In some portions of the district, you'll notice on the map some have dots really close together, and some have dots that are farther apart, and those represent a difference in density. So the areas on the map that you see with lots of dots, those could be built to a density of 30 acres a unit -- or sorry, 30 units an acre, which is similar to what we've seen out

in the Avens development.

3 4

-

2.4

Those areas where you see fewer dots and more white space, those could be built to a density of 15 units an acre, which is similar to townhouses seen in some areas in town already.

One that I think of, because I had a friend who lived there, is on Durham Road near the Manor.

The board created those low density areas to respond to recent housing studies, and I'm showing that we had a lack of smaller two-and three-bedroom type housing that can be attractive for older people to downsize into and to attract new families who are just starting out. And also because near the Robinwood Lane neighborhood, we thought that would be a more appropriate size development than something with larger density or things that could currently be built according to our bylaws.

So I'm just going to summarize the implications of your vote. I think I might have skipped over my notes to talk, so I'm going to make sure I get it now. So if Article 14 passes, we will be in compliance with state law and eligible for many forms of grant funding, as

3

4 5

6 7

9

8

11

10

12 1.3

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

2.4

well as protected from any punitive actions that the state might take to encourage communities to comply.

If Article 14 fails, we could lose access -- well, we will lose access to certain types of grants the state has been very clear about, and also open to punitive actions from the state. I will say that when this first came before us two years ago, there were serious questions, I think, on the planning board, and also on the select board about whether we should comply.

Through a lot of work, we found a way that we can comply that's I think very good for Dedham, and as we've gone through this process, we've also heard more and more signals from the state that they intend to penalize communities that do not comply. So with that, I'll take any questions, if there are any.

THE MODERATOR: Any questions on this Because of state law, this article article? requires a majority vote. There being no questions, the vote comes on the original motion that it be so voted. We can try for a voice

Page 125 1 vote. All those in favor, say aye. 2 (Aye.) 3 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. That is 4 a majority vote. 5 Article 19. The Chair recognizes the 6 chairman of the planning board, Mr. Podolski. 7 MR. PODOLSKI: Good evening, town 8 meeting representatives. Mike Podolski, 9 chairman of the planning board. I guess this a perfect time for us to 10 11 start to discuss the definition of a hotel. 12 We're all so wrapped about all our other 1.3 enthralling articles. However, we have good 14 news. 15 Quick history. Is our motion up? 16 initially voted unanimously to support a 17 redefinition of the hotel, which is already in 18 our bylaw. However, at the mini town meeting a

week ago Monday night, we heard numerous comments, very good comments, and suggestions as to maybe we should revise our initial definition, which is in your book, which we voted to support.

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

So at 6:00 tonight, the planning

2.4

board met, and we voted 5-0 unanimously that instead of moving to define hotel tonight, we would instead have a new original motion in which we are going to suggest that the article be referred back to the planning board for further study and report back.

We realized after listening to very good public comment that perhaps we didn't give this article as clean a look as we should have, maybe because it was an article proposed by citizens and not one of our own articles. So to try to rectify that, we are now going to ask that our new original motion be the one that you vote on, which is to let's defer voting on the definition of a hotel until a future town meeting.

THE MODERATOR: Are there any questions for Mr. Podolski? Yes, Ms. Uppencamp.

MS. UPPENKAMP: Thank you. Molly Uppencamp, Precinct 3.

So I guess part of this is a question for Mr. Podolski and the planning board. In hearing arguments at the mini, evaluating it, and talking about it with many people, this

1 really seems like a solution without a problem.

The example you brought up at mini of one time ten years ago when part of a hotel was used as a college dormitory causing problems seems like a very rare and isolated incident, and that creating a zoning code and a fine and everything for something that seems to not really happen of people staying at hotels for extended stays of over four months.

So while I appreciate that the planning board heard some of those comments before and has proposed a new original motion, I, myself, am still intending to vote no on this. I don't think it needs further study and report. I think we can just say this is done and move on.

So unless there's a specific problem, that you think that we absolutely need to have this limitation on hotel stays and the imposition of a fine to solve, I am intending to vote no. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms. Uppenkamp.

MR. PODOLSKI: Well, Mr. Moderator, I

1.3

2.4

2.4

don't know if you want -- but that motion is not going to be before you yet tonight, unless you do vote down our new original motion.

THE MODERATOR: The original motion can always be amended. So someone would have to propose an amendment that says that it be indefinitely postponed, and then that would be voted on.

MR. PODOLSKI: That's fine.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Czazasty.

MR. CZAZASTY: Andrew Czazasty,

Precinct 7.

So first off, I want to thank Mr.

Brogan for agreeing to the motion to postpone
the first study, and I respect that the sponsor
realizes that the article needs some work. I'm
voting no on the new original motion. I'm going
to explain why.

So I'm really not in favor of this article in any form, and the planning board can amend this as much as they'd like, but I know many others would just disagree with the underlying proposal. I don't think I can vote for any form of limiting how long someone can

1 stay in a hotel.

1.3

2.4

So even if the proposal comes back in the fall with amendments for exceptions, there's so many unique and valid situations that the article will shut out. So if this article creates so many exceptions, then I don't think we should even make a rule at all. I think there's no reason for the town to get involved in this kind of stuff, and there's no reason for this article to go in effect.

So I would say this body and the planning board have more pertinent issues to discuss, and I hope that if I vote no, we can get rid of this article for good. So I urge all of you to vote no on the substitute motion.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Czazasty. The Chair recognizes our town counsel, Lauren Goldberg.

MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Lauren Goldberg.

So under zoning, there is a bar about bringing back the same article within two years if we vote no. And so that's why we instead vote to refer to committee, because that way

1 there can be further discussion.

1.3

2.4

It doesn't mean that the planning board has to bring an article back, and it doesn't mean that there will definitely be something on the warrant in the fall. It just means we're not going to take action on it now.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Lauren.

MR. PODOLSKI: Could I add to that,

Mr. Moderator?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, sir.

MR. PODOLSKI: So one of the reasons that this matter came up was two reasons. One is the planning board is supposed to try to be proactive. And over the many years that I've been on the board, it seems like we're always operating reactively to a project that comes to us. So for once, we're trying to anticipate potential problems. We missed -- we swung and missed on the first article here, so we're saying let us go back and give it greater study.

But the second reason is we just permitted, albeit about a year -- or over a year ago now a hotel right on Eastern Avenue here.

And many of the conditions that are now in this

2.4

proposed article are a part of the certificate of action for that hotel. So we're looking to try to make it a standard across our -- we think we have five hotels now -- for the entire town.

One of the things that was pointed out at the mini was that we didn't do, shame on us, a study of other towns to see how they handle it. But just ignoring it and not -- to me, a hotel is a place of temporary residence. It's not a place where you go and live. And I think that's what really is the heart of this problem.

A hotel, to me, is a place where you go when you're traveling and you stop for a night or two, you're a businessman in town for a trip, you're visiting relatives so you come and stay at a hotel rather than go to the home of the people. This is an attempt to say, look it, if you live there more than 120 days, you're getting into being a rooming house, as opposed to a hotel. And that's really what the initial intent of the article was.

Yes, we missed whether or not if someone had a very bad casualty in their house,

and they were having it repaired, they should be 1 2 able to get an exception or an extension; if 3 there was a possibility of domestic violence, 4 that yes, they should be able to stay and get an 5 extension. But at some point in time, hotels 6 are not rooming houses. They're places of 7 temporary occupancy. And that really was the purpose of the article initially, albeit it can 8 9 be made much better with better exemptions. THE MODERATOR: Mr. Delloiacono. 10 11 MR. DELLOIACONO: Thank you, Mr. 12 Moderator, Mike. This doesn't eliminate what's 1.3 already on the books. Isn't there fines in place? Would this article eliminate what fines 14 15 are in place for people that stay in hotels too 16 long? 17 MR. PODOLSKI: There's no fine for 18 it. MR. DELLOIACONO: There's nothing in 19 20 place at all, so someone --MR. PODOLSKI: There is a definition 21 22 of hotel in the bylaw, but no fines. 23 THE MODERATOR: Carmen, kind of 2.4 address your question out there, and then

1 | we'll --

1.3

2.4

MR. DELLOIACONO: My apologies.

THE MODERATOR: -- and then we might come back to that.

MR. DELLOIACONO: I do apologize. I thought there was something in place already for people to stay in hotels for extended -- over the extended time. Is there not a law that you can't stay there currently? If you're in a hotel -- there's hotels up on Elm Street. I know that they were occupying people for over the amount of time.

This isn't something new. I thought there was something on the books that actually said that if there was someone in there longer than the amount of time, they would be -- were not allowed. Maybe it's just as simple as that, it's not allowed. There is no fine in place.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Podolski.

MR. PODOLSKI: Mr. Moderator, I'm going to ask if Kenneth Cimeno, the building inspector for the town, could answer. My understanding is there are no fines in place right now for long-term stays in hotels.

So under

1

## THE MODERATOR: Mr. Cimeno,

2

commissioner of buildings.

3

the current definition of a motel or hotel, it's

MR. CIMENO: Good evening.

5

"a building or buildings intended and designed for transient overnight and extended occupancy

6 7

divided into separate units within the same

8

building, with or without public dining

9

10

23

"If such hotel or motel has

independent cooking facilities, such as in the

12 Residence Inn" -- so like in the Residence Inn

in Dedham, they have independent cooking

facilities.

facilities, along with the room itself, and this

is something that's currently allowed under our

bylaw -- "such unit shall not be occupied by any

guest for more than four continuous months" --

which means if someone is occupying that room

for more than four continuous months, it's a

violation of our zoning bylaw under the current

21 definition -- "nor may the guest reoccupy any

22 unit within 30 days of a continuous four-month

stay" -- which means that, again, if they were

24 -- if they came back within the 30-day period of

time, that would also be a violation of the bylaw -- "nor may the guest stay more than six months in any calendar year."

So again, these are all provisions to prevent people from staying for long periods of time in the current bylaw. "No occupants of such hotel or motel may claim residency at such location." So again, the bylaw currently states that we should not -- they cannot claim residency, as Dedham residents.

So this is the current definition as it's currently written. These are all the restrictions currently on the books. If you — I think the planning board's intention was to study this particular section of the bylaw and maybe make some modifications to it. I believe that's the intent of what they're trying to convey tonight.

Because we have had some examples in the past where we've had -- we had a situation where there was a hurricane, I believe in Puerto Rico, and a number of residents of Puerto Rico stayed at the Residence Inn, and there may have been other hotels, but I was aware of the

Residence Inn, and they were there for more than four months.

Of course, the community came around and supported that particular situation, and there was no action taken by the building department, whereas, again, it was something that the community supported, and again, this was both on a state level and on a federal level. Both the state and federal government wanted to have this situation happen.

So again, we have this bylaw.

There's been some situations where we've had some potential problems. I've never had an individual situation where an individual staying at a hotel for more than four months -- I never got a complaint about that. But theoretically, you know, I could get a complaint about that, but in my years of enforcement, we haven't received any individual complaints.

But it's on the books. It's to discourage, as Mr. Podolski was saying, long-term occupancy of a hotel as a residence.

Again, that's the reason why they have the resident provision in there also because they

2.4

don't want people to basically use the hotel as a long-term, say, apartment or other type of long-term rental.

So again, that's the current definition on the books. I wanted to make sure that people understood what the current definition is. The planning board, again, wants to study this, maybe make some modifications to maybe change some of these provisions. But again, I just wanted to make sure that people were clear as to what the current definition is.

Does anybody have any questions about what I just said, because it is confusing, because it's zoning.

THE MODERATOR: Any questions for Mr. Cimeno? Thank you.

MR. CIMENO: Thank you.

MS. KRAUSS: Shari Krauss, Precinct

6. I'm taking the opportunity to speak from the podium, so thank you.

It's really important that we understand as a community that there are many, many reasons that might lead folks to need to stay at a hotel, not as a desired residence, but

often reasons of personal devastation.

1.3

Zeiler.

These folks -- Mr. Loporto, you talked about the tragedy that led the groups of refugees to our town, and that it was the will of the people to support their continued residency at our hotel space. Not everybody who's in such a position has the self-advocacy, has the voice, has the opportunity, has the broad reach such that folks know how to go about advocating for themselves in such dire circumstances.

And so while it may be that for you,
Mr. Podolski, you get to use hotels as a
vacation spot, that you have that luxury, that
many of us may have that luxury, not all people
get to do that. So unless we're in the cast of
Melrose Place, you can just assume that a hotel
is not a desired residence, but that it may be a
place of need.

So I will be voting no on this article, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Ms.

1 MS. ZEILER: Thank you. Jean Zeiler, 2 Precinct 6. 3 If I understand this correctly, if we vote for Article 19, the new recommendation, it 4 5 would go back to the planning board, and you 6 could study the entire language of the article 7 and actually achieve what people are looking for here, which is to not limit -- could possibly 8 9 use that to not limit the stay, whereas if we vote against this new article, we go back to the 10 11 old article, and if we vote no, we're going to 12 keep the definition that limits how long people can stay. 1.3 14 So it seems to me that the planning 15 board's new original article is the better way if we want to -- if some of us would like to not 16 17 have this limit on people. MR. PODOLSKY: Your description is 18 accurate. 19 20 THE MODERATOR: Procedurally, if the 21 original motion -- the original motion is to 22 study it. There is an amend -- Ms. Uppencamp,

MS. UPPENCAMP:

(Inaudible.)

did you move that?

23

2.4

2

111213

14

15

9

10

1617

18

20

21

19

22

2324

THE MODERATOR: Okay. If this fails, then this article is dead. Neither vote changes what the existing situation is, explained by the building commissioner. So I understand it's a little confusing to have a zoning bylaw, as the building commissioner explained it, on the books, and yet we're also debating this. like parallel processes here. But if you send it back to the planning board, the planning board can study it. In fact, the planning board doesn't need permission of town meeting to study They can study it on their own. So I think I'm going to defer to town counsel here. Thanks for standing up.

MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator. I think the way the moderator described it is accurate. I just wanted to emphasize that the description of the article talks about what the differences are.

This article, the first original motion, was just to take that one line or one half of a line that's in strike three (?) out of the bylaw and to add the last sentence to the bylaw. So if the original -- the first original

is voted, then we would still have this bylaw,
and it would be amended as it provides in the
actual article.

1.3

2.4

What the zoning -- what the planning board has done -- has said -- they have said we heard issues. We don't think this is ready for prime time based on those issues, and so we're going to ask you to not take action on it tonight, to just skip it, with the understanding that we may or may not bring it back in the future. So there's no change to the limitation on stays if we vote yes on this motion, the original motion.

THE MODERATOR: Are there any questions for Lauren Goldberg while we have her here?

MR. AKULA: I have just a quick clarification. James Akula, Precinct 4.

You said something earlier that I didn't quite understand. If we do take action on the amendment, as written, not on the new motion, does that kill the opportunity for something to come back in the fall? For example, if we vote no on this, and then no on

2.4

this, so there's still the six-month, a year and a four-month, blah, blah, blah, but there's no actual penalty for it, so it's never come up before, would that kill any chance of this coming back for a little while, at least?

MS. GOLDBERG: Mr. Moderator?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. GOLDBERG: If we vote no on this, and we're back to the planning board's main motion, and that fails, then what we have is the bylaw that already exists, and this exact language couldn't come back for two years. It doesn't mean that the planning board couldn't come up with some other substantive amendment to this.

MR. AKULA: That sounds to me like a no on both, like kind of kill this dead. That's why I'm probably going to try to vote no on both.

 $\begin{tabular}{lll} \textbf{THE MODERATOR:} & Go \ ahead \ again, \ Ms. \\ \\ Goldberg. \\ \end{tabular}$ 

MS. GOLDBERG: Mr. Moderator, thank you. So the only thing that voting no on this does is get us back to the original main motion

that's printed in your book. If we vote no on that, as well, then this exact language can't come back for two years. But everything in this bylaw that is in regular plain text is in the bylaw already. So what it means is we'd have just what we have in the bylaw now if people vote no on both.

(Off the record discussion.)

MS. GOLDBERG: Well, hello, it is me again. I just wanted to point out -- and the moderator so kindly didn't embarrass me, which I appreciate -- to remind me that this is the original motion. So the motion that's in the book is gone. It just doesn't exist.

So if you vote no on this, then essentially, we have the bylaw that we have. If you vote yes on this, then we can come back within the next two years with something substantively different. So this, saying yes gives us the opportunity to look at it again within the next couple of years.

THE MODERATOR: Let me ask. Are any of the proponents of this article here, ready to speak and explain their motivation for us.

MR. PODOLSKI: I haven't seen them,
Mr. Moderator. Mr. Brogan appeared at our
meeting on May 10, and he was very much in favor
of us taking the --

THE MODERATOR: For the benefit of new members, the ordinary process is is the person who proposed the article gets to speak first, and they kind of set the table -- this is what we want to do, this is why we want to do it -- and then we work off that. You either agree with them, you want to amend what they proposed, or you want to reject what they proposed. We're in a little unusual situation here.

MR. PODOLSKI: And one proponent did call one of the members of the board today and said they were in favor of taking the article back and trying to reword it. I don't believe any of them are here tonight. This is not a planning board warrant article. As I told you earlier, this was brought by citizen petition.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, ma'am?

MS. PENDLETON: Christina Pendleton,

Precinct 7.

I've been here so long, I don't even

2 3

know if I -- anyway, I do feel like we're talking in circles. I'm very much against this. Whether we vote no once, vote no twice, do it in two years -- I just agree completely with Mollie that this is a problem that doesn't exist.

But I did want to say one thing. In case this does move forward -- you know, I asked that a couple of things be considered last week, and something else that just occurred to me tonight in the course of the discussion is if there are families staying in hotels -- which just for people who might not know, I work with families in need, and this is a very, very common occurrence that for many reasons families are placed in motels, hotels -- if those families have children, and they're not allowed to be considered Dedham residents, where do they go to school while they're here.

So I guess that's a question about the current bylaw, and it's just something that I hope will be considered when we do revisit this topic, because as in any situation, I don't think kids should suffer the consequences, especially since it doesn't appear we have a

1 problem.

1.3

2.4

And I would actually love as a last point to -- I'd love for us to explore a bylaw that says if you brought a motion that is taking up all of this time and discussion, and you're not here, that we don't talk about it if nobody for the proponent is here. It just doesn't seem to make sense, respectfully.

I'm happy to stay here until
whenever, but if we're discussing something that
no one in this room thinks is a problem, and
we've spent all this time, it seems like a waste
of everybody's energy. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms. Pendleton. Ms. Martin.

MS. MARTIN: Maryann Martin, Precinct 5.

I actually love the idea of going back and looking at it further, because I think this is incredibly complex, and I don't think it's as simple as either you embrace families or you don't or you hate or you love. I think it's really complex.

I think this is a wonderful

opportunity for us to look at things, like what's the definition of a tenant versus a guest in a hotel. Because I know if people are, quote, "tenants," and they're not those families in need, just the bad apples, it might be hard for the hotel to evict a tenant, whereas they can probably kick out a guest.

There's like all those little nuances that I think really have to be looked at before we embrace going with our current bylaw, which, as Ken explained, it is what it is, no more than 30 days -- I mean, four months, can't come back within 30 days. Those are the rules on some of them. But I think it's worth a deep dive. I don't think we all have the answers, and I don't think any of us feel good about a family living in a hotel, but we don't want them homeless.

I think that everyone in this room has empathy for anyone in those situations.

Let's just make sure it's in the best interest of the family, the hotel, and the rest of us, the school system, everything. Take it all in, and maybe come back with a better, tighter, cleaner we're all on board article. That's it.

Page 148 THE MODERATOR: 1 Thank you, Ms. 2 Martin. Yes, sir? 3 MR. LANGMEAD: Josh Langmead, Precinct 5. I move the vote. 4 5 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. So the 6 question takes a two-thirds vote. Let's try for 7 a voice vote. All those in favor of stopping 8 debate and voting, say yes. 9 (Yes.) 10 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 11 (Nein) THE MODERATOR: So we come on the --12 13 there is no amendment to the original motion on 14 the table. We have an original motion, which is 15 a new original motion, new in the sense it's different from the one in the book. 16 17 original motion is always the original motion. Even if it was the fourth version of it, it's 18 19 still the original motion.

So what you're voting on, yes or no, is does this issue get referred back to the planning board for further study. Is that clear? A yes vote is yes, send it back. A no vote is don't send it back.

20

21

22

23

2.4

2 3

By the way, the planning board doesn't need our permission to study anything, so if we vote this down, it doesn't mean they can't or won't come back. So don't start the conspiracy theories on that if that happens. All those in favor of the original motion, that this be referred back to the planning board — we're going to do this on the clicker. Hey, I didn't last this long, trying to guess these votes, believe me.

The vote is open. You're voting on the original motion, yes, if you want to send this back to the planning board; no, if you do not.

Voting is closed. 129 have voted to send it back to study, 102 have voted against, so we refer it back to the planning board at this time. Thank you.

Article 20. There is an original motion, but there is a substitute motion, as proposed by Mr. McDermott. Mr. McDermott.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. Moderator. William Shaw McDermott, Bridge Street in District 1. And I have somebody

1.3

2.4

helping me. My computer crashed. We're using hers. Her name is Ann McDermott. She's an alum of Riverdale School and has recently moved backed to Dedham in our house with her two-year-old, her husband, and her 14-year-old dog, so she's good to go.

Thank you very much for considering
Article 20 at this late hour, and I'll try to
keep this as brief as I can. This article asks
town meeting to favor a moratorium of limited
scope and duration in order to allow the
planning board to study the effects of large
scale developments on traffic and water. And we
did so here by substitute motion, which in
working with town counsel, I substituted the
word "favors" in Paragraph 4 for the word
"imposes" so that we would -- if this were
adopted tonight, you would favor the moratorium
that I describe.

First, this is a voluntary, not a mandatory moratorium; secondly, it applies only to large scale residential developments; third, applies only to the issuance, the issuance of special permits; and fourth is only one year in

1.3

duration.

"moratorium" means because there may be some confusion in the description given, I give you the Merriam Webster's definition on the screen, and it says what it says. And I'd just ask you to understand that my view is that a moratorium is not a ban, as described in the materials you have, and it was not intended to be such. And as I said in public statements, it was not such, and it definitionally and legally is not such,

that which I propose.

To be clear as to what the word

Going on to the broader point, I'm very grateful for the feedback I've received from across the town and the consideration the planning board gave to this. I've worked with them, as you all know, or many of you know, for many years, and I applaud them for many of the initiatives they indicated tonight. And I've received this from many corners of the town, and I want to thank you for all those comments.

Some have asked why I did not ask for a more comprehensive moratorium on all classes of development. Some have asked why I did not

ask for a mandatory moratorium in the form of a zoning amendment, as town meeting has approved relative to, for example, mixed use housing recently and other matters.

The answer is that I wanted to thread this needle to find a goldilocks just right solution to allow the planning board to continue their work as needed, but to elevate this to the top of their agenda to indicate the urgent need to study the effects of large scale developments on traffic and water.

The timing is propitious. The 2030 master plan committee, in which I served for a period over two years, having been the chair of the master plan committee and the update committee previously, in previous iterations, has submitted a draft to the planning board, and the board will be working through the balance of the year on the draft. These are topics of immediate concern to the general public and deserve reflection.

Indeed, the word "traffic" appeared in every quadrant -- as appears in every quadrant of the town was the number one issue

identified in focus groups in the 2020 and 2022 study period and drafting process.

And water has gained attention and concern with each passing year, and even on this very day, this very day, when the Dedham-Westwood Water District announced a Level 1 water restriction, and if we're using recent past as a prologue for the future, we can expect that restrictions advance will ensue for a long period of time, perhaps as in past years, through to October.

Now, the drivers of the needed discussion are long-term trends of development and population, and here are some data. You will see here on the screen the data that relate to land use and developable acres that in 1980, when I was a Dedham voter, there were 2,000 undeveloped acres at that time for potential for development.

By 2001, that number shrunk, all acres considered, to 834.50 acres, and on forward to today, after the approval of the planned residential development on Lowder Street in West Dedham and other such developments in

West Dedham, is down to approximately, and I

approximate -- I asked for an exact figure that

I haven't gotten yet -- approximately 160 acres

And today, by contrast to 2001, where 701 of those potentially developable acres were SRA, which is basically West Dedham, is down now to about 65 acres there, and in the rest of the town, there is approximately 36.80 acres in SRB and 17.50 acres in general residence. So roughly in equivalence of the number of acres in SRA, less Dedham and the available acreage for development in the rest of town, and there are some, of course, commercial numbers, which are referred to in the column on the rest. That indicates to you an amazing set of developments over that period of time and accelerated even to the present.

Now, looking to the general population in Dedham, you will see here a 60-year sort of study of that, and these are from the U.S. census data, except for the last column, which is an estimate for the rural population review. And you see that Dedham has

all in.

2.4

approximately the same number of people today that it did in 1970.

2.4

And in Westwood, which is highly material for purposes of your consideration tonight, in 1970, Westwood had 12,750 people.

Today it has over, apparently in 2023, 17,000 people and was estimated to be a population of 19,500. We also include some student population data just to show you how even though a smaller town, Westwood, has a greater student population above the overall population of schools and in Westwood.

All of these are perhaps indicative of certain demographic factors that are a little different in Westwood than in Dedham. But these data suggest these things: traffic congestion north, south, east, and west of Dedham, like death and taxes, may be a part of our future. Five exits on Route 95 and already approved developments in both Dedham and Westwood say so.

Demands on water usage will continue to increase in both Dedham and Westwood. The demands in the Dedham aquifer, both for the Bridge Street wells and the Fowl Meadow wells,

need vigil attention, as does the trajectory -- and importantly so, the trajectory of reliance on MWRA water supply, which is costly to town residents.

The Westwood population growth and development strategies are not in Dedham's control and are part of our -- but are a part of our problem. But intelligent land use planning is within our control, for which we need better understanding and metrics of traffic and water.

On top of all of this, the U.S. EPA has announced a demanding regulation for PFAS pollution calculations, lowering that number per trillion to four parts per trillion, which will cause temporary or permanent restrictions on water supply. The planning board has suggested we do not have the resources to do this work, and that is not so. The slide on traffic studies that follow show the following, that one, we have received a United States Department Transportation grant of \$207,841.44.

Importantly, that is really dedicated and should be considered so for safety purposes. However, it does say, as you will read in the

studies of major and minor collector roadways. We have mitigation funds, including just recently \$100,000 from Lowder Street planned residential development developers, and then we have, may I just emphasize this, all previous traffic studies. The planning board did acknowledge to me in discussions that yes, there are a myriad of traffic studies, and I assume nobody has thrown the studies away, and the data is available.

bolded language, that it will also include

And I'd just ask you to consider when thinking about the issue of cost, we're in the era of big data. It doesn't mean we have to go up. We do everything we've already done.

Mercifully, courtesy of all those things that are going to make Massachusetts a leader in this country, for better or worse in our artificial intelligence, and for the best big data, we got big data and at a very modest cost. If such is necessary, we can get somebody to write appropriate programs for that.

Let me just turn to the subject of water. And on water, today, as I said, was the

2.4

recurrence of repeated cycles of water restrictions and bans. The question that comes from Samuel Taylor-Coleridge, which you all remember from the Dedham Schools, water, water everywhere, not a drop to drink. Is that the right question from the rhyme of the ancient mariner? No, it isn't.

We are not in danger of not having drinking water and others in the house. However — but we must take care and understand the effects of development on the protection of our aquifer and the cost of supply for the Dedham-Westwood water district and the Massachusetts Water Authority. So I would just say in closing —

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Point of
order --

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me. A point of order cannot interrupt a speaker.

MR. MCDERMOTT: In closing, some may say or think this article is inspired by concerns about development pressures in West Dedham. That is an old and shop worn perspective. Thirty years ago, when my wife

Hope was here, and I led an effort with others across the town to preserve the land known as Wilson Mountain Reservation from an 850,000-square-foot mall, that was not our concern.

It was not 20 years ago a concern when a group of us led an effort across the town, many of whom are in this hall today, to block a 570 proposed unit development proposed —— I've got a picture of it right here in the brochure we sent out —— for the Readville Yards. We did it then. And 20 years ago, we proposed, against some opposition, the initiation of a master plan proposal.

And more recently, just seemingly ten years ago, but it was perhaps slightly fewer, we proposed, with some opposition from town leadership, the idea of doing the town acquiring the Ames Schoolhouse for the town and creating a joint safety and fire department and converting the police station into a town green. We did all that, and I think that reflected our interest for the entire town.

So I am asking you if you would support the substitute motion that I have

proposed by a yes vote, and it is according to town counsel by majority, and get us onto the track of doing a serious study of traffic and water as a consequence of the developments that we have in this town. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

McDermott. Point of order out there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

THE MODERATOR: Duly noted. I will tell you that we give a little bit of leeway to the proponent of an article. I will work out a system with my good friend, the timekeeper, to keep me a little closer appraised. Mr. Podolski.

MR. PODOLSKI: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator, town meeting representatives. As was stated in your warrant book that you received, the planning board voted to indefinitely postpone this article, and in light of the substitute motion that's been made by the proponent of the article, it's time now for us to tell you why we did this.

Mr. McDermott was provided with two nights of hearings, albeit the second night of

2.4

hearing, he had to leave to go to the airport.

But he's known a long time that the board does

not necessarily -- is not in favor of this type

of moratorium. Whether the words are "favor" or

"imposed," it doesn't matter to the planning

board.

There's a number of reasons that were discussed in the public hearings with Mr.

McDermott. First of all, the expense of a town-wide study is unknowable at this time. We don't know how we would ever study all of the entrances and exits that come into and out of this town and do it in a year and do it for less than \$500,000.

I beg to differ with Mr. McDermott that any traffic studies that were done more than five years ago are irrelevant [sic]. They don't mean anything in today's Dedham. The town has changed. There's much more development in this town. We have to do new studies to make them accurate. So to say we could base our conclusions on some kind of a study that was done a few years ago is just not -- it's incorrect.

The time and expense of a comprehensive study of water -- at our hearing on this article -- one of the hearings, we had the Dedham-Westwood Water District come in. The director was there. They had done a projection on their supplies of water. They say they're good through 2030. Obviously, more development, more consumption of water, but that certainly doesn't mean that we don't have enough to undertake the continuing development in the town.

1.3

And we also now have the hookup to the MWRA so that in the event of a drought, such as last year, and water supplies get too low, we can now call on MWRA hookup to keep our supplies adequate.

The board is right now in the midst of reviewing the master plan, which Shaw alluded to, and that master plan was -- and we're about to finish up with our comments on it -- was done over a two-year period. Twenty-five residents of the town contributed, including Shaw.

Nowhere in that master plan does it propose a town-wide study on traffic, and nowhere in that

2.4

plan does it propose implementation -- it does propose implementation for droughts, but it doesn't certainly base it on development in the town.

Water District, and they say they have plenty for now. The board does not want to set unrealistic expectations that we could secure funding for and complete a comprehensive water and traffic study in one year. That's almost impossible to do, and we can't ask our staff to do that. It has to be done by knowledgeable experts, groups that do traffic studies, groups that do hydrological studies. That's the only way you're going to get an accurate report.

And finally, we did consult with town counsel about the standards, the legal standards of whether this is an appropriate mechanism brought by the petitioner for bringing a temporary moratorium on the premises that are described in the article. And for that, I'm going to ask that town counsel come up and comment on the moratorium substance itself, with the Moderator's permission.

THE MODERATOR: Yes. Ms. Goldberg.

MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator. So I think it's fair to say that with the change that's been recommended to say the town favors, this is just a sense of the meaning. And basically, as Shaw indicated, that's something that we had talked about a bit earlier when we were talking about his moratorium article, and that is that you have to have very good reasons to impose a moratorium, and you have to be able to demonstrate that.

And so here in Dedham, obviously water and traffic are a big and important issue, but not as compared to -- not in direct relationship to this proposal. So it was our feeling that even -- that this one would not have been likely to be approved by the attorney general as a bylaw amendment for that very reason, and that even if it was that it would be subject to challenge, based on the content of the proposal.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Mr Podolski.

1.3

MR. PODOLSKI: Thank you. For the reasons previously stated, and based upon town counsel's opinion that the articles proposed probably won't meet the legal standard, we request that you vote no on this substitute motion. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Further questions or discussion? Mr. McDermott.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Just to be clear, I think this article, by using the word "favors," does not impose a moratorium. It gives the planning board the opportunity to use that thing, that mechanism, and that is -- we've concurred on that, and therefore, it will not be subject to attorney general review, and will not be subject to challenge.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. McDermott. Mr. Czazasty.

MR. CZAZASTY: Andrew Czazasty,

Precinct 7. I just have a question about

procedure. So if we vote yes on the substitute

motion, then that's that, and if we vote no,

that means we go back to the original motion of

indefinite postponement, correct?

1 THE MODERATOR: Yes, that's right.

MR. CZAZASTY: That's confusing. Am

I allowed to still speak?

1.3

2.4

THE MODERATOR: Sure.

MR. CZAZASTY: So I have to be against this substitute motion and in favor of the recommendation to indefinite postponement.

I know Mr. McDermott has great intentions, but I don't believe a moratorium on a new development is in the best interest of the town for a housing shortage, and if we implement this moratorium, then I believe we're seriously limiting our options for solving the crisis.

In addition, I don't see the reason for a town-wide traffic study. Completing it in one year is unrealistic and also unnecessary. We have specific streets that need traffic studies, and I believe it's best to do this case by case instead of having a giant study that may include streets that aren't problematic.

And additionally, I really don't see why a traffic study would require a development moratorium. And the same goes for studying the water usage. I mean, studying water

2.4

availability is a valid concern, put a freeze on new development, and I don't believe it's necessary for such a study. So for those reasons, I would urge members to vote no on the substitute motion, but yes on the original motion to indefinitely postpone.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Czazasty. Ms. Gilbert.

MS. GILBERT: Mary Gilbert, Precinct
4. Move the question.

THE MODERATOR: Always a crowd pleaser. Move the question. I was talking to the town clerk. I don't know that we can think of more than one or two times in our time to move the question has failed.

The town meeting has a good sense of when the rhythm has rhythmed out, and also, people have the courtesy not to prematurely try to move the question, which is a tactic that, you know, could theoretically be adopted in order to kind of cut people off from speaking.

So with that little history lesson, the vote comes on moving the question. It requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor,

1 please say aye.

1.3

2.4

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. It is a two-thirds vote.

So we are first voting on the amendment. The amendment is that the word "favor" be substituted for the word "impose," which has the effect of turning it into a sense of the meeting, as opposed to a strict bylaw change. Any questions on that?

If you're in favor of substituting the word "favor" and making it a sense of the meeting, you can vote yes. We're going to do the clicker for this one, and hit green on your voting device. If you're opposed, vote no. The voting is open.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

THE MODERATOR: Yes, that goes first, and if that passes, then that's it. If that -- I mean if it fails, we then have to move -- we have to have something resolved. So if the amendment fails, then we vote on the motion not amended.

MR. MAHER: A no vote on this then

1 goes to the original (inaudible)? 2 THE MODERATOR: Yes, that's correct. 3 Why don't you go to the microphone. Other people might be interested in your question. 4 5 MR. MAHER: (Inaudible.) 6 THE MODERATOR: You're right, Mr. 7 Maher. I'm trying to remember that almost half of this audience is at their first or second 8 9 town meeting, so your point is taken. I understand, sir. 10 11 MR. AKULA: This is James Akula, 12 Precinct 4. So if we vote yes on this and 1.3 change it to "favor," then the amendment passes with the word "favor"? 14 15 THE MODERATOR: If you vote yes on 16 this, the amendment is inserted, and then we 17 would vote on the original motion as amended. MR. AKULA: So even if it's a yes and 18 then no? 19 20 THE MODERATOR: You could, you could. 21 I'm not sure why you would, but you could. 22 Maher is correct. The one exception that I make 23 -- and this happened at a previous town meeting, 2.4 as well. When I told my tellers -- we don't

have tellers this evening -- or when I can sense like rumbling, that people aren't sure what a yes and no is, for me, that stops the train.

So rules of procedure are very, very important, but if people don't know what they're voting on, that's a larger issue than strict adherence, as long as we don't allow speeches that would talk in favor or opposed. When people are saying just tell me what I'm voting on, I do take that as a point of order, even if it's in the middle of a vote.

So the vote is open on the amendment. So are you in favor of Mr. McDermott's amendment to substitute the word "favor" instead of "impose," turning it into a sense of the meeting versus a true bylaw change.

The vote is closed. 32 people having voted in favor of the amendment, and 196 opposed, the amendment fails. Now we go back to vote on the original motion, which is that it be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor -- we went back and forth on whether this required a report of the planning board, but I think people -- you had a hearing on it, and you had a

1 quorum present. Thank you, sir. 2 Using, again, your voting clickers, 3 if you are in favor of indefinite postponement of Article 20 -- remember it does not have the 4 5 word "favor" in it -- please so indicate on your 6 -- oh, they're going to put it up on the screen, 7 I guess. Because the motion is indefinite 8 postponement, it's only a simple majority. 9 vote is open. 10 The vote is closed. 212 having voted 11 in the affirmative, and nine in the negative, 12 the motion to indefinitely postpone carries. 1.3 We move to Article 21, which calls --14 MR. BROPHY: Point of order. 15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, sir. 16 MR. BROPHY: Matt Brophy, Precinct 2. 17 Motion to adjourn. 18 THE MODERATOR: You're out of order, 19 Matt, you're out of order. 20 MR. BROPHY: Withdrawn. 21 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. 22 MR. BROPHY: Why am I out of order? 23 THE MODERATOR: I was just going to 2.4 explain that. I'm exercising a little bit of

2.4

the broad powers that the Dedham bylaw and Mass. General Law gives to the moderator, which is we've only got a couple of articles left, guys. If you want to go home, you can go home, but we're all back here next Monday night, because nothing we have voted on has any effect until we dissolve the meeting, and we cannot dissolve the meeting until we have considered every article, either accepted it, amended it, or passed it. I think I read that right.

Article 21, creation of a special purpose stabilization fund. Are you speaking on this? No, okay. Any questions on the article? It requires a two-thirds vote. There doesn't seem to be anybody wanting to talk about it. Let's try for a voice vote. All in favor, say

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. ayes have it. Thank you.

Article 22, rescind prior authorized You got a short explanation earlier.

> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry. It was a

two-thirds vote. I have to say the words. 1 2 Thank you. 3 Article 22, rescinding prior authorized -- questions? 4 5 ANN ?: (Inaudible.) 6 THE MODERATOR: Okay, good. Ann's 7 good, the rest of you good? Okay. This is a majority vote. Let's try a voice vote. All 8 9 those in favor, please say aye. 10 (Aye.) 11 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 12 ayes have it. Article 23 on Page 36. It's a two-1.3 14 thirds vote to pass this. It involves 15 borrowing. Questions? The vote comes on the 16 original motion, two-thirds vote. Let's try for 17 a voice. All in favor, say aye. 18 (Aye.) 19 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. It is a two-thirds vote. 20 21 Article 27 -- 26, sorry. I think 22 this was passed from the floor. Questions, 23 discussion on Article 26 on Page 39? 2.4 being none, the vote comes on the original

motion that it be so voted. All in favor, say aye.

2.4

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no.

(No.)

THE MODERATOR: The ayes have it.

Article 27, also on Page 39. Discussion? Ms.

Martin.

MS. MARTIN: Maryann Martin, Precinct 5.

I'm really not even too sure who I'm asking this question to. So when I first saw this article, I thought it was kind of silly, and then I was sitting at the FINCOM debate, and Mr. Butler got up and made a brilliant presentation, and it seemed like we have lots of opportunities for grants to get the job done without tapping the town for more money.

Mr. Goodwin had said during that meeting that without -- if this article was to pass, we still would have the right funds for a, quote, "park." So I'm just -- I'd like to see us get everything we want to get, but I love the idea of not paying for it. So if anyone has

insight into that, if Mr. Butler is here. 1 2 just thought he did a great job. 3 THE MODERATOR: The proponents of this article are not here, right? 4 5 MS. MARTIN: They're not. I just 6 happened to witness the discussion, and I just 7 thought it was brilliant when Mr. Butler got up 8 and said basically on the committee we've got 9 the following grants going out, and it looked like we were going to get everything we wanted 10 11 without having to tap the town. 12 THE MODERATOR: Your interpretation 13 of Mr. Butler's presentation was that we don't 14 need any bonded money? 15 MS. MARTIN: It sounded like he was 16 supporting Mr. Brogan's article without really 17 supporting it. THE MODERATOR: Mr. Goodwin? Ms. 18 19 Duncan. 20 MS. DUNCAN: Meg Duncan, Precinct 1. 21 I love the town green project. I think it's 22 been one of the best projects we've worked on, 23 and I take an opposite view, Maryann, that any 2.4 additional grant money I think should be used to

2.4

expand and use better materials, maybe even do

Phase 2 at the same time as Phase 1 so we could

have the best park possible. I'm totally

against this idea to rescind any funding.

Thanks.

THE MODERATOR: The original motion is that this not happen. So remember if you don't want it to happen, you're voting yes when we get to voting. Mr. Maher.

MR. MAHER: Jim Maher, Precinct 5.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Mr. Maher, and then Mr. Goodwin. You were there. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MAHER: First off, I voted in favor of the town green, and I will still vote in favor of the town green. But when I allocated \$2.55 million, I expect that any grant money that comes in cuts into that \$2.5 million so that we're providing a \$2.5 million park.

And if we're going to expend any money over that 2.5, it has to come before town meeting, even if it's grant money.

So let's stay with our park where we're already in the planning stages, we're

2.4

already in the development stages of it. If we do receive grants -- are successful in receiving grants, that should knock down the \$2.5 million so there isn't an impact on the overall cost. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Goodwin.

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Mr.

Moderator, and thank you everyone who has asked questions about this.

So just to clarify, we have \$2.55 million that's been appropriated by town meeting, and then we have, in fact, already issued the debt for that. So again, just to clarify, I am supportive of the motion here in the book that it be indefinitely postponed because any other motion would be actually to abandon the project, and then we would have to go through this complicated process of reassigning this debt to another project in town, so you would not actually be lessening the amount of the debt burden that the residents are experiencing.

We are on a path, as was mentioned previously, a design path, to bring a design to

2.4

4.

the select board on May 24, the current path, which is to bring forward a design, a concept, a cost estimate, and continue on that, all the while pursuing grants. And, of course, we are pursuing a lot of grants to help defray the cost and to enhance the park, if possible, as well.

So I think we're in the middle of a process. I would really appreciate it if we could continue on that process, and that would be my ask of town meeting. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Ms. Gilbert.

MR. GILBERT: Mary Gilbert, Precinct

Just a point of clarification. I know that the bonding on that 2.55 is actually 1.7 and change; is that correct?

MR. GOODWIN: The bonding on the original 2.55 is 1.7 because we repurposed 784 and change from the ECEC, which was also bonded proceeds. So we currently have debt issued funds in the amount of 2.55 million on hand.

MS. GILBERT: Right, but in the previous meeting, as you had mentioned, there was 700,000 and change applied to the town

	1Be - 1/2
1	green, so you put out to debt 1.7. So we're
2	already at 2.55?
3	MR. GOODWIN: We are at 2.55 of debt
4	for the town green currently.
5	MS. GILBERT: So if you get
6	additional grants, I think some of the comment
7	was would that lower the debt?
8	MR. GOODWIN: And I think that's to
9	be seen, depending on the amount of the concept
10	and the estimates that we have come in and what
11	the grant is for exactly.
12	MS. GILBERT: Right. So again,
13	you've pulled back some was it Article 22
14	were some unissued debt? You said we're going
15	to pull that back.
16	MR. GOODWIN: That was unissued debt
17	that we chose to instead fund those projects
18	with free cash.
19	MS. GILBERT: With free cash, right.
20	So again, when I read and I perhaps have been
21	a little dense on this, and I apologize it's
22	1.7 that was put out to bond in fiscal year '23,
23	just in March, this past March?
24	MR. GOODWIN: Combined with the ECEC

1 money, we have 2.55 of debt on this project.

1.3

2.4

MS. GILBERT: I understand that, but that previous debt was another year, the ECEC money. What you put out to bond in March was 1.7 million?

MR. GOODWIN: That's correct.

MS. GILBERT: So there's still
unissued debt, is there not, on the 2.5 that we
voted a year ago on -- so there's still a little
room to add to what you need to do?

MR. GOODWIN: Although if you follow that to its logical conclusion, then we would have \$3.2 million of the total project, which I would have to ask counsel to ask on that, because my understanding is that town meeting gave us \$2.55 million of debt, no matter how that debt was obtained, whether it was from the ECEC or via the recent issuance. But again, I'd have to defer to counsel on that.

MS. GILBERT: Well, that's my understanding, too. So the price on that project is 2.55. You've already issued debt. I originally spoke against the article. I think 2.55 -- if that's what we're going to spend, I

don't want to see us spend any more. I think

it's excessive, but we'll see. I think 2.55,

that's sort of what I believe it should be, and
I am supportive of indefinitely postponing this
article.

1.3

2.4

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. McGee.

MR. LOWDER: Bert Lowder, Precinct 6.

I'd like to move the motion.

THE MODERATOR: We know this by now.

Move the question takes two-thirds vote. Let's

try for a voice. All those in favor of stopping

debate and moving to the voting -- that's called

move the question -- please say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. The ayes have it. It is a two-thirds vote to move the question.

Now what is before you is the original motion that this idea of rescinding the authorization not happen, that it be indefinitely postponed. A yes vote is a vote to indefinitely postpone the rescission of the debt. So is that clear? Let's try for a voice.

1 This is -- I'm sorry, yes? 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Help me 3 understand again. Yes means keep this in? THE MODERATOR: Yeah. Here's the 4 5 shortcut. Always look at what the 6 recommendation says. Don't look at the article. 7 Look at the recommendation. The recommendation 8 is forget about it. So if you want to 9 indefinitely postpone it, vote yes. Believe me, 10 that's a common thing. Let's try by voice. All 11 those in favor of indefinitely postponing, 12 please say aye. 1.3 (Aye.) 14 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. It's 15 unanimous. 16 From town green, leaf blowers, 17 Article 28 on Page 40. The original motion is 18 that this proposal, which is proposed by some 19 town meeting members that it be indefinitely 20 postponed. Jean Zeiler. 21 MS. ZEILER: Thank you. Jean Zeiler 22 Precinct 6. 23 My name is on this article, and I

just want to say that the sponsors of the

2.4

article took heed of comments at mini town 1 2 meeting that were very valid concerns about this 3 article. So I'm not standing here to oppose the finance and warrant recommendation. I actually 4 5 support it at this point. 6 We do hope this article -- we're able 7 to bring it back because there also was a lot of 8 comments in favor of some of the concepts of the 9 article, so anybody who has knowledge about any of this, you're welcome to join us to discuss 10 11 it, so maybe we can bring it back. 12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Ms. 1.3 Zeiler. Anybody else wishing to discuss this, 14 considering that both the proponents and the 15 opponents agree? Does anybody want to discuss? 16 So the motion before you is that it be 17 indefinitely postponed. All those in favor, 18 please say aye. 19 (Aye.) 20 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 21 (Nay.) 22 THE MODERATOR: Sorry, the ayes have 23 it.

Article 30 on Page 44, amendment to

2.4

the general bylaws concerning purchasing. 1 recommendation of the finance committee that it 2 3 be so voted. Discussion, questions? Hearing none, the vote comes on the original motion that 4 5 it be so voted. All in favor, please say aye. 6 (Aye.) 7 THE MODERATOR: Opposed, no. 8 ayes have it. 9 Article 32 on Page 45. Mr. McDonald. 10 MR. MCDONALD: I realize that we are 11 the only thing that's standing between you and walking out that door. So we haven't said 12 1.3 anything all night long, so that means we have a lot of time. 14 15 THE MODERATOR: Get that clock going, 16 Joe. 17 MR. MCDONALD: Well, since we're the 18 proponent, does that mean I get more time? THE MODERATOR: You're the proponent 19 20 of an amendment. 21 I'm only kidding. MR. MCDONALD: 22 THE MODERATOR: Mr. McDermott is --23 MR. MCDONALD: Mr. McDermott is, I'll 2.4 just comment, is a very distinguished member of

2.4

our community who has done a ton of work for a lot, and I know there was some question, that he deserves all the time he needs in order to explain something. He has definitely earned that within this body.

So a substitute motion tonight on Article 32 from the select board. We had a discussion in our meeting the other night, and the feeling was that it was a valid request with a couple of amendments. And what we wish to provide in our substitute motion is that instead of the town moderator and the town manager, we put the town clerk, and instead of a cell number, put the word "telephone," and, of course, in order for elected and appointed town boards and committees to transmit meeting notices.

We all know that during the pandemic when we had remote town meetings, you had to provide your email address, and there was only a small number of town meeting members that we had to accommodate at the town hall in order to do it.

So our substitute motion is let's get

2.4

the town clerk -- town meeting members to give what you have already given to your district chair to the town clerk so that during the year when there's many announcements and documents, we shouldn't be sending it just during town meeting, throughout the year. So hopefully you'll agree with the substitute motion, and we can start filling the inboxes. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Discussion on the amendment? Mr. McDermott.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Just for clarity, I
support the amendment.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, sir. No further discussion, then, the vote comes on the substitute motion. You should have a handout, and as well as explained by Mr. McDonald, chair of the select board. It's up on the board. So using your voting devices, please indicate your acceptance or your rejection of the substitute motion.

203 members having voted in the affirmative, and 17 in the negative -- oh, Mr.

McDermott -- the substitute motion, which does, indeed, substitute for the indefinite

Small point of order.

postponement, does pass.

MR. MCDERMOTT:

When I joined the town meeting in -- was elected in 1988, there was a town moderator by the name of H. Holton Wood, who was a man of incredible distinction and just a wonderful person. He was succeeded by a gentleman named Daniel Driscoll, who has been the model of good humor, sagacity, and insight. He has now served for 30 years tonight as a town moderator, and I want to just congratulate him. And may I say he has raised the standard of haberdashery in the town, as well.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.

McDermott.

It has been moved by Mr. Burke and seconded by Mr. Springer that the 2023 special annual town meeting be dissolved. All in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

THE MODERATOR: All opposed, no. The ayes have it. Goodnight, and God bless you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.)

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS NORFOLK, ss.

I, ARLENE R. BOYER, a Certified Court
Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby
certify:

That the proceedings herein was recorded by me and transcribed by me; and that such transcript is a true record of the proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this 3rd day of June 2023.

Arlene R. Boyer, CVR Notary Public

My Commission Expires November 21, 2025