

**TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
Town Hall Council Chambers
November 25, Monday**

Present: Ken DiFazio, Chairman
Michael Smart, Vice Chairman
Arthur Mathews, Councilor
Rebecca Haugh, Councilor
Christopher Heffernan, Councilor

Also Present: Robert Hedlund, Mayor
Joseph Callanan, Town Solicitor
Richard Swanson, Town Auditor
Christine Howe, Program Manager

Recording Secretary: Mary Barker

Chair DiFazio called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. He reported they would take measure 19 107 first- since the Mayor is delayed.

19 107-Rezoning Request for the Historic Mill District

Principal Planner Eric Schneider provided an update on the public process. He reviewed the minor changes from the initial proposal. Page 1- amending the zoning map as well as the ordinance with the five parcels under discussion. Everything remains as submitted until page 4. At the bottom of page 4; based on comments from both the public and full council last week, they've added a section requiring any projects of ten units or greater include a 10% affordable component (based on the 80% low income factor). This was discussed in the last meeting and encapsulated in the documentation. Note – 80% or less. Based on HUD regulations, 80% of median income for a family of 2 is \$71,400. A developer could propose a ratio of less than 80%, but that will be included as the minimum to guarantee they get an affordable component so that the town can count the project in its affordable housing numbers.

The next page has changes that were made early on. For new construction on the Mill building property, they reduced the original proposed FAR from .5 to .35, which is a significant reduction and from 5 to 4 story maximum (of 50 feet). It's a reduction in potential density if the Mill building were to be torn down, and something residential was reconstructed.

For reconstruction on other properties within the overlay, they kept the FAR at .3 (lower than the Mill property) but reduced the height from 4 to 3 stories.

That's the summary of what's been done. Planning Board has discussed it at a meeting last week but not made a recommendation. Their next meeting is on December 3, 2019.

Vice Chair Smart asked if 10% is the normal percentage? Could it be 20%? Mr. Schneider responded that the average is 10%. Boston and Hingham are 20%, but most surrounding communities are 10%. For a family of 4, that would be \$84,900. They leave open for a proposal that would give a different mix, but this is the minimum median. It's worded as 80% or less. Vice Chair Smart asked who regulates it? Mr. Schneider responded that it would initiate from a proposal and what a potential developer felt was feasible. This will all be through special permit; nothing by right, so there is room for negotiation.

Vice Chair Smart asked if every proposal goes to BZA? Mr. Schneider responded yes. Vice Chair Smart also commented on the antenna. The one at Hingham shipyard looks horrible. There is nothing in the plan on the stack. The tower is a marker of something not to be proud of. If they are going to put lease equipment on it, it can't look like the one at Hingham Shipyard. They need to put something around it. There is nothing in the rezoning that covers this.

Chair DiFazio noted he spoke to the administration over the last few years. They need to come up with a plan to fund the deconstruction, but he isn't sure it is feasible. Before any development can take place on the property, the incinerator building has to come down. He isn't sure it is financially possible to remove both the building and stack. It may be asking too much to get both down at the same time. He thanked the administration for taking a proactive approach, for including a 10% low income housing following the Housing Production plan and listening to the citizens.

Vice Chair Smart confirmed that no development can happen with the incinerator building; if anything were to happen, they are stuck with a stack that's an eyesore, and covered with antennas. He understands the funding mechanism, but requests to bring it back and do more research to deal with the monolithic structure.

Councilor Haugh asked if the affordable component is forever and would it depend on rental vs. ownership. Mr. Schneider responded that he is unsure they would have control in perpetuity. It is being addressed at the outset of the program, so they could set conditions at the BZA level. He will finalize and get back to the committee.

Councilor Mathews asked if the 10% component would make the whole parcel eligible for calculation in the land -use calculation for affordable housing. With Queen Anne's off the books, he would want to be sure it is eligible for counting. Mr. Schneider responded yes. Councilor Mathews said he would be willing to go to 15% or 20% if it protects and maintains the town's level.

Chair DiFazio summarized that the committee will wait to hear from the Planning Board and back from the Planning Department, then re-convene.

19 109-Amendment to Zoning Ordinances-Billboard Relocation Overlay District-Citizen Petition

Route 3 Billboards

The chair reported he would take both matters together, since they are interrelated. He invited the Mayor to the table with the solicitor and the program director.

The chair reported there have been a number of meetings with several of the parties. It's important to go over a chronological list of events that have taken place:

“A summary of events and information which have been discovered as a result of many Ordinance Committee meetings since September 3, 2019 when Ms. Amy Kabilian appeared before the full Town Council complaining of the adverse effects of the 611 Pleasant Street EBB. Moving back a little bit, on December 4, 2017 the Zoning Amendment, 17 127 entitled Zoning Amendment to Create a Commercial Corridor Overlay was referred to the Ordinance Committee. As this zoning amendment relates to the Billboard Overlay District, the Ordinance Committee minutes of January 29, 2018 indicate that the Ordinance Committee requested the following information- Councilor Heffernan asked for an explanation of the Billboard Relocation Overlay District. Mr. Luongo explained how this amendment would essentially remove all billboards on 3A, but noted that it would allow up to three billboards on Route 3. Councilor Mathews asked for clarification on the guidelines developed by the director of Planning and Community Development. Mr. Luongo explained how the town would have more content control over the billboards on Route 3. And lastly, Councilor Haugh inquired as to the involvement the town has on content control of the current billboards on 3A. Our Mayor, Mayor Hedlund asked to approach the committee and he explained how the town has no control over what advertisements may be placed on the current billboards but that the town would have local control over any new billboards in this ordinance going forward. He mentioned the possibility of relocating billboards throughout the town to areas that are less of a problem for surrounding neighbors.

On February 20, 2018, a joint public hearing was held on the zoning amendment to create a commercial corridor overlay district. The public hearing was continued to March 5, 2018, at which time it was closed.

On March 26, 2018, the Planning Board voted unanimous favorable action for the zoning amendment to create a commercial corridor overlay district. On that same date, the Ordinance Committee voted favorable action as well, and forwarded the zoning amendment to the full Town Council.

As a result on April 2, 2018, the zoning amendment, 17 127 was voted favorably by the full Town Council. Unbeknownst to the Town Council, or the general public, on April 10, 2018, the Mayor signed two applications for electronic sign permits for two faces located at the 611 Pleasant Street location. Unbeknownst to the Town Council, or the general public, on July 27, 2018, this town entered into the Billboard Relocation Agreement between the Town of Weymouth and Cove Outdoor, LLC.

On an unknown date, pursuant to the Overlay District ordinance passed on April 2, 2018, the town's Planning & Development Department approved a one-page guideline for implementation of electronic billboards in Weymouth. Some eight months after the Mayor's signing of the billboard relocation agreement on April 19, 2019, the 611 Pleasant Street board with two faces and no light blocking technology was erected and the lights went on, on both faces. Many neighbors were upset.

Twenty days later, on April 24, 2019, District 4 Councilor Mathews, responding to a citizen's complaint about the activation of the 611 Pleasant Street electronic billboard, sent his written concerns to the town administration, requesting any information for any aggrieved residents. In July of 2019, some three months later, the 611 board is lowered due to neighborhood concerns.

On September 3, 2019, Weymouth citizen Amy Kabilian appeared before the Weymouth Town Council complaining about the adverse effects on the property owners of several neighborhoods as a result of the 611 board. Her complaints were referred to the Ordinance Committee, and stands as one of the items on tonight's agenda.

On April 24, 2019, Councilor Mathews, responding to the citizen's complaints about the activation of the board, sent his concerns to the administration. The Mayor, having heard of the complaints about the 611 board conducted a citizen forum at Abigail Adams on October 1, 2019. It is at this time the public is made aware of the particulars of the billboard relocation agreement. The forum outlines the unexpected adverse effects of the 611 billboard, answered citizens' questions and offered several options moving forward.

On October 21, 2019, measure 19 109 was referred to the Ordinance Committee. This was a citizen petition by Robert Delaney requesting an amendment to the billboard zoning ordinance by abolishing the overlay zone.

On October 28, 2019, after a meeting with the Ordinance Chair, constituents, Cove, the town solicitor and other administration officials, the town solicitor issued a memo outlining the issue of possible monetary damages if the billboard relocation agreement is voided resulting in the town rescinding the overlay district ordinance.

On November 12, 2019, the Ordinance Committee updated the public with regards to citizens' concerns over Route 3 billboards. Also, a joint public hearing was conducted with the Planning Board and the public hearing closed with regards to Measure 19 107 with regards to citizen petition, the revocation of the billboard relocation overlay district ordinance.

On November 13, 2019, Cove, voicing their concern and frustration with the town to reach a consensus over moving forward with what boards, issued a letter stating they were illuminating the 611 board on November 19, 2019.

On November 17, 2019, the administration, via presentation to both the Town Council and Ordinance Committee, provided a status of the signs and proposed signs under the agreement with Cove, outlining the four plus options to be considered going forward.

On November 18, 2019, the Planning Board voted to reject measure 19 109 to abolish the overlay district ordinance.

On November 19, 2019, both faces of the 611 electronic billboard have been illuminated and they have been to date.

Lastly, today, I, as Ordinance Committee chair, received a letter from the residents of Century Road, Kipling Road, Price Way, Mandalay Road, Ponderosa Drive, Ford Road and Holly Hill Circle; containing over 100 signatures supporting a proposed option to the 611 board. I have distributed this letter to all Ordinance Committee members, as well as the Mayor this evening. It essentially selects one of the options proposed by either Cove or the administration. The pertinent terms of their proposal: remove the 611 board; move the 613 board as far south as possible, with one face, facing north, with light blocking technology; sign a new permit for the Finnell Drive south side location with two boards, facing north and south, perpendicular to the highway, with light blocking technology. The town would be required to pay Cove \$2.5 million for removal of the 611 board, and the loss of revenue from one face on a new 613 board location. 42 acres of open space land would be donated to the Town of Weymouth by James Bristol and lastly, the Town of Weymouth would settle with all North Weymouth billboard landlords.

That brings us to this evening at which time I will now open the floor, either to the Mayor if you have comments, or to the Ordinance Committee if you have questions”

The Mayor was joined at the table by Joe Callanan, Town Solicitor and Christine Howe, Program Manager. Mayor Hedlund reported he was happy to accept the President’s invitation to be here tonight. In the Charter, the Council was to provide him with questions in advance. He was obviously happy to waive that and answer anything in a candid way. In terms of the timeline, there is probably a lot of stuff that’s been left out. It would be about a 15-page timeline if it included all the internal meetings to try and reach resolution or a compromise.

The three most important things were at the same time Councilor Mathews responded to the citizens’ complaints, the administration received the same complaints. He did three site visits and met with Director Luongo and the neighbors in the evening when the sign was on. Another event that should be in that timeline, subsequent to the event (unsure of the date and seeing this timeline for the first time), there were two meetings at Ralph Talbot School over the course of the summer and into the fall, prior to the lengthy meeting at Abigail Adams that occurred the first week of October. Those are three other important points. There has been a significant amount of time spent on this with the administration as it has with the Council, obviously not just hearing the complaints, but trying to come up with a solution and/or a compromise. It has dominated most of his day and his staff’s time and the Planning Dept. is a little behind because of it.

Chair DiFazio asked, given the different proposals, do they feel that the town is in a financial position to provide funds to resolve this?

Mayor Hedlund responded that was one of the options on the table. He like that idea. There were different scenarios; some not realistic. They pursued the least costly of these with Cove to determine if it was something they could do. There are two pressures on that; one would be Cove's timeline. They would have to have reached an agreement before the end of the year. He discussed the options and had a meeting with residents and Cove was there to discuss that option. There may have been some expectations of those in the room. He left that meeting liking the concept and with a promise to pursue it. In subsequent discussions with Cove, and the timeline they were on, and given their contractual obligations, it made it almost impossible. He asked Cove if they could defer some of the payments. The amount that would have had to come from free cash. Procedurally he didn't know how they would have gotten it to the Council and had it go through before the end of the year. That aside, conceptually speaking and looking at the free cash situation, which is a moving target, they are pretty significantly oversubscribed on what that number will eventually be. They don't have a definitive number; they know the range that they are in. Just the planning committee immediate needs have been identified at about \$12 million right now. He has pressures on him to make determinations like committing to a ladder for the fire department that had to have a price locked in by Wednesday of this week. So the timing from the budget standpoint couldn't be worse. Aside from the deadlines from Cove, and the amount of money they're talking, he would have loved to have the luxury of having that kind of free cash to commit to this, that wouldn't impact or even significantly impact the capital needs list. That \$12 million does not include what they would like to commit to the stabilization fund and set aside for snow and ice contingency. It does not include items arising from the Abigail Adams project, which it looks like they will have to do additional borrowing for that particular project. That's the short version; yes, it was an option they liked and discussed publicly with residents and Cove in that meeting, and pursued it, but he can't make it work with those factors.

Chair DiFazio asked if the option presented tonight is in Ms. Kabilian's petition.

Mayor Hedlund responded that he was just seeing the petition and had a brief time to look at it during Mr. Schneider's presentation. It is essentially what they discussed in that meeting.

The chair opened the discussion to his committee members.

Councilor Heffernan asked the Mayor if they know what is the approximate cost of settling with the North Weymouth billboard owners. Solicitor Callanan responded about \$40,000 per year. Mayor Hedlund added that's their current aggregate rent. Councilor Heffernan asked if this would be in addition to the \$2.5 million to pay for the removal. Ms. Howe responded yes. Mayor Hedlund added, unless they wanted to do a buyout of some sort; right now their leases are in perpetuity.

Councilor Mathews reported that he received the petition this afternoon with about 100 signatures of residents mostly of his district. It looks like they went and got signatures from those in the area of the 611 board. He would go on record supporting their initiative. He would not mind spending some funding to remove all or some of these billboards. As a councilor, if you submitted a measure to town council he would support funding. Free cash came in certified at \$7 million; it was a couple of million more than the estimate that the town had at the time. He understands there are other needs in the town, but this would be a one-time payment that would be a long investment that would help out some of those aggrieved residents in that neighborhood. In addition, if it means they would not have to put money into the stabilization fund this year (because they have been the last few years), he would support that as well. As one councilor, one personal opinion, if the mayor would submit a measure that would help the aggrieved neighbors and pay some funding to remove he would be supportive.

The mayor responded that he wouldn't have a problem working with the council in a collaborative way, but they would have to consider whether to impact stabilization or other things that could impact bond rating to add to the bottom line, he thinks they should vet that. If they want to take a look at the recurring capital needs list; many have been recurring. if the council wants to suggest to the administration areas that they want to forego... They discussed it internally. One of the biggest items is the ladder truck he referenced. If they want to defer that as part of this discussion, they lose the locked in price that they have to commit to by Wednesday. They were informed by the builder because of tariff situations and cost escalations, it will be a higher priced ladder next year if they were to defer it. It's a question of priorities and if they want to have a discussion about what those priorities are...he does not want to come back and get beat up because they took something off this list. He'd be happy to have that collaborative discussion maybe through a Budget subcommittee vehicle.

Councilor Mathews responded that he is not on that committee. He asked what the free cash estimated figure was in budget presentation. It was not \$7 million; it was a few million less. The mayor responded that they work off projections until they have the number certified by the DOR. Councilor Mathews responded that if the free cash figure came in correct, they would not be able to afford the items referenced from the capital list either. There is money available and there is \$650,000 in the reserve fund that has not been used for any measure. The mayor responded that impacting the reserve fund would affect the bond rating. Councilor Mathews responded that in his eighteen years on the council, there have been measures received utilizing the stabilization fund and it did not affect their bond rating. Mayor Hedlund noted the town just got an improvement in their bond rating because they moved away from practices that utilized it. The changes they made are what has improved their standing with the bond agencies. Councilor Mathews noted he is getting the gist that the mayor does not want to allocate funds to remove the billboards. The mayor responded that he would love to have other town's standing. He 'd like to be in that position. It's an easier way to get out of this position and he'd love to be able to do it.

Chair DiFazio asked if they do not want to spend money, what do they have, or are they still in the negotiation stages with Cove?

Mayor Hedlund responded that they have tried to be open and honest. When they ask Cove to make a concession, it affects their relationship with Bristol. There are multiple parties involved, with contracts with each other. They have worked with Mr. Bristol to make concessions. He is scheduled to discuss with Bristol's partner, who is outside the internal discussion. Cove had changed things fifteen times in the course of the discussion. The administration was on the phone 4 hours in the aggregate with Cove today, and the mayor is also working on Union Point and had to step out at times. As part of the options presented, the reduction in the amount of faces that Cove is entitled to and permitted for requires a buyout. In the absence of having the luxury of writing a check for \$2.5 million, which has other ramifications- it would limit their ability to do other things that were benefits laid out in this whole concept, like what the future of the 42 acres on Finnell Drive. As they look to alternatives and hoping to preserve some of those benefits, Cove needs the four faces they are entitled to. So they tried to compromise the locations for those faces. It would be less of a benefit to Mr. Bristol; the town would lose some of its revenues.

Chair DiFazio said if they have a position they are looking at.

Mayor Hedlund responded that residents from the Finnell neighborhood and the Century Road, Kipling Road neighborhood were involved in the last meeting. The two options that it boiled down to was the \$2.5 million buyout and the existing board coming down; one face further south, and two faces on the opposite side of the highway. The other option discussed that day was two faces on the southbound lane and a single at the existing site facing north, and one further south, facing south, all with sightline technology. Those were the last two options discussed in that meeting. Obviously the preference was the buyout. They made the commitment to pursue it and see if it could be fleshed out. The discussion they had today involved the other one; the four-faced compromise.

Chair DiFazio asked if they pursued not having to spend any money, there would be a double perpendicular double-face at Finnell; correct? Ms. Howe responded she was not sure of the engineering; she is not comfortable saying it would be perpendicular. Chair DiFazio asked if that was the plan; two boards on the highway at that location? He asked if there is one board at 611 of two faces? Mayor Hedlund responded one face, facing north. Chair DiFazio continued then one face further south on towards the Hingham line facing south? Solicitor Callanan responded, correct. Chair DiFazio asked without paying anything, do they still get the other benefits: 42 acres and all the North Weymouth boards down and the Route 18 problem? Mayor Hedlund responded, correct. He said he was unsure of the timing on North Weymouth, or it could be in conjunction with the existing. Solicitor Callanan said it was still up in the air. The mayor responded they would either come down immediately or- some of them still have a year on their leases; some two. The chair said he wasn't in favor of either option.

Councilor Haugh noted that a lot of the issues talked about have been the impacts to the residents. She spends a lot of her time commuting and looking at the board. She sees it every day and notes it's so poorly designed that it can't be seen, coming north. Even with clearing trees, she doesn't know how it will effectively be seen (compared to Hanover's). What is the benefit of keeping it and not pursue a double face at 613? If she's not mistaken, Century Road is impacted by 611 and 613. She doesn't understand why they can't pursue a double faced at 613 and make sure it's engineered correctly, so not only does it not bother the residents, but the people who it's designed to be seen by (traffic) can, because literally every day coming home she can't see it although she is looking for it. Even when you get to it, you have to look straight up; she doesn't understand how it's an effective billboard and who is going to purchase ads on it. Mayor Hedlund responded that the short answer on that is that 613 creates more problems for that neighborhood than the existing board. Ms. Howe responded that there would be additional processes with the 611 board (unsure- not spoken into the microphone). Mayor Hedlund said if you look at ... Councilor Haugh said you see a little light just after you pass the Hingham line; you'll see there's something there, then you go around the bend, and you literally can't see it unless you are looking up. Mayor Hedlund responded 613 with sightline technology, there will still be an area that will affect that neighborhood. To him, 613 is not an option. Councilor Haugh asked for double or at all? Mayor Hedlund responded that it creates more problems. Councilor Haugh said 611 is a huge mistake on so many fronts, and even if it is left up, it will be interesting to see who purchases ads on it. She yielded to her other committee members.

Vice Chair Smart agreed; you can't see it unless you are too close to it and looking straight up and potentially causing an accident. He noted the mayor indicated a lot of dates were missing and he's right; Chair DiFazio didn't put in all of the dates. Mayor Hedlund responded that it wasn't a critique. Vice Chair Smart responded he understands that and there were meetings with all of the neighborhood groups and there have been several even up until today. Last week there were some they were invited to (Christine sent him an email at 11:00 for a 4:00 meeting on the same day that he couldn't make). What he sees if he goes back through to the January 29th meeting when Artie asked about the regulations, but they were going to have some type of regulation and oversight on that which typically is done at the ZBA when they ask about hours of operation; where will the dumpster be put; how high is it; the fence is going to be here; and with a billboard, maybe they just didn't know or have the experience to (since there are none in the town). To get to his point about the meetings, the only group that didn't have meetings was Century Road. If you go back to prior to the meeting of the Zoning Board, and the public hearing we had here, you had already met with several of the neighborhood groups, except Century Road, so those folks who came in prior to... Mayor Hedlund asked if he referred to prior to the adoption of the overlay? Vice Chair Smart responded yes; he sees that as a huge problem and a mistake that those folks weren't brought in to at least say, we're putting a billboard in that will be a couple hundred yards away. The mayor responded right; they have addressed this a lot. The vice chair responded that Councilor Mathews had a good point that if there was an option to put some type of funding there to somehow protect that neighborhood that was really left out of the loop. You included, it seemed like everyone else (and not councilors). We don't find out about those meetings

with Cove; again, charter says you don't have to, we don't find out about those until we read about it in the newspaper, or we get a complaint from one of the neighbors that says a board's going up. Again, it's a huge mess, and it was a mistake to not include those folks when they were being called in. We had calls from those coming in for the public hearing for the overlay, back in April 2018; that were telling us to vote this overlay, and those are the folks you had already met with. But these folks, you never got a chance to sit down with them and we didn't know about it. We didn't know there was a deal or contract that was pending or sitting outside, the second we vote this overlay that they would be in. He doesn't know how, and hasn't been in communication with you, having been sick for a couple of months, but he doesn't know how to make it right for those folks, but Artie had a decent point to say that if there's an option to spend some of the funding resources that are available, either the free cash or stabilization or something like that, that we need to do that. The plan that you just mentioned sounds like there are some pieces of those elements in it, but it doesn't sound like it's fully there. There isn't anything on paper, and there are still meetings going on today. He appreciates that they are doing that. Second, they have a measure for zoning- 19 109- if they vote it either up or down, how does that affect the town's ability to continue to negotiate with the Century Road folks, or any of the other groups? Does it affect them adversely; is it good or bad? What does the solicitor think- he indicated that it probably was not the best option to vote that but he'd like to hear from the mayor. The mayor responded that he heard a couple of questions. Back to the zoning issue to make sure they're clear on that. They didn't go out and ask for meetings but what the Planning Department did with the overall zoning package which had those three main components. To send out a letter to every civic organization in the town explaining that they're looking at zoning changes and if that civic organization would like to have them in to make a presentation, Planning would avail themselves to anyone and everyone. That was publicized in a news story, on social media and the town website, in addition to the direct mailings that went out. Pond Plain Civic and North Weymouth Civic associations, Weymouth Business Association and South Shore Chamber took them up on it. Those four definitely, and the mayor participated in three of them with Planning.

They then did their outreach with their folks. Pond Plain put it in their newsletters. Councilor Smart was there. They did as much as possible; they didn't mail to Century Road or have a Century Road neighborhood meeting, frankly because they didn't think Century Road would be impacted. If they knew this was going to happen there wouldn't be the need for a meeting because there wouldn't have been a billboard going there. To go back even further on this timeline, and this has been stated prior, and the residents have heard him say, when they were approached by Cove, his initial response was that he had no interest in billboards.

Their goal was to remove billboards in Weymouth, and it wasn't until two things happened almost concurrently that they came back and said that as part of this arrangement, they would find a suitable location on Route 3 for this new technology that's utilized which doesn't have impacts, that included sightline technology (that's not on the board, which is a whole other issue). They could come up with a plan to remove the Route 3 billboard, in addition to that; that is at the same time Finnell property

changed hands and there was an outcry from that neighborhood. Simultaneous to when this series of events was unfolding, and they were looking at the zoning changes. It turns out that when the billboard company told them what areas in town were suitable, and looking at industrial areas, Mr. Bristol controlled most of the land and they thought this was a good way to have some discussion with him and asked if he would hold off on developing this property if this billboard opportunity was to arise. It was a bargaining chip that they had with him and a means for them to build into the deal to buy most or all of the 42 acres, and stave off industrial development and/or a massive housing project which he had started work on. He has an approved ANR plan for that site and that neighborhood was extremely upset about the plan. That's in an area that's zoned for that and it's in an area that's zoned industrial. The alternative could be to utilize 40B to do what he wanted to do there, and that he had started the process to do. If it hadn't been for those events, and had they known, they wouldn't have had a Century Road meeting because they wouldn't have even gone down this road. The billboard company did not anticipate it; certainly Planning did not anticipate it, and he is not a billboard expert and didn't anticipate it, he's relying on people who supposedly had more knowledge.

As the process unfolded after that, they had no involvement from the neighborhood at any point in time after it was publicized in the newspaper and public hearings the council held and mailings from OAB, so it never arose on any front. If people had come to them and said they think this is going to be a problem, we would have tried to respond to it and would have looked at it and if it was a problem they would have shut this down. So now here they are.

Vice Chair Smart asked before he goes to the measure and the rollout of the zoning, on June 29, 2017, July 12, 2017 (those were at the McCulloch and at the high school), billboards were not part of it. The mayor responded that he'd let Planning answer that, but it was in the power point presentation at Pond Plain. He doesn't recall if it was in the N Weymouth one, but he didn't think the power point changed from one to the other, but he deferred to Planning on that and he's sure they still have the power point. Vice Chair Smart responded that he didn't believe the power point was included at those earlier presentations and asked if he could just answer the question about the measure. The mayor responded that as the measure was filed and coincided with the discussions they had about some of the compromises; if it were adopted it would lock in some of the existing agreement and wouldn't undo the zoned and permitted two locations- 611 and 613 that are already permitted.

Chair DiFazio asked for confirmation that if the measure 19 109 were passed, the board at 611 would remain, with no sightline blocking technology. Mayor Hedlund responded that they've committed to installing that at whatever location and whatever final arrangement they arrive at with them. Chair DiFazio confirmed that two boards would remain, potentially with sightline blocking technology. He asked if it would apply also to 613? Ms. Howe responded correct. He asked if there would be any other boards installed? Solicitor Callanan and the mayor both responded no. The chair asked if the North Weymouth boards would be taken down? Solicitor Callanan responded that if it were to pass, honoring the original agreement, then whether the North Weymouth boards would

come down immediately or whether they would at the end of their lease term--this would depend on who Cove sells their billboards to. If they sell to Clear Channel they would come down immediately. The chair asked about the Route 18 billboard – would that be rectified? Solicitor Callanan responded yes. There's a problem with Abington Planning getting that to conclusion, but Cove is committed to finishing that. The chair asked if they would obtain the 42 acres? Solicitor Callanan responded probably not. The chair asked what the general cost to the town of Weymouth would be if that passed. There'd be four faces; 611 and 613. Are there any other costs if that were to pass? The solicitor responded that they would have revenue coming in but it would be insufficient to buy the land at Finnell.

Councilor Heffernan asked if the agreement to install sightline blocking technology is binding? When Mr. McClary was here before he seemed to be noncommittal to certain aspects of it and saying it didn't exist in New England. They could potentially go to PA to be able to see it. They saw his presentation that had one frame of the sightline blocking technology. He wants to make sure if they are looking to do this, that they have the sightline blocking technology 100%. The mayor responded that the solicitor could speak more definitively but with all the things they talked about, whether it was the commitment from Bristol, or whether it's about them talking about the sightline, it will be somewhere with a consensus and have it memorialized, yes. He has reiterated that on every occasion. Councilor Heffernan asked if he had anything in writing? Solicitor Callanan responded no, but they've agreed since they began talking about this; when it first went up, they were going to put sightline technology on any boards that they erect in the future. Councilor Heffernan responded that he wants something in writing; based on actions in the past, they most definitely would need it in writing. Ms. Howe responded that they have not considered any alternative proposals that do not include sightline blocking technology.

Councilor Mathews followed up on the vice chair's earlier comments. He found the original posting on the town website. It was not officially proposed. This was a draft Commercial Overlay District that was given to the Ordinance Committee on October 2, 2017. It's 31 pages long and doesn't include a single mention about billboards. He wanted this noted on the record. One thing he heard earlier in the comments- Mayor Hedlund spoke of potential revenue or loss of revenue. He doesn't care if there is no revenue, or whether anyone gets a single dime from this. He would rather use this money to alleviate the residents. He doesn't want to see them receive any revenue if there is a way to help the residents; the aggrieved neighbors. The mayor responded that will be the case if either of the two options they discussed. Under either of those two scenarios, there's no revenue – the revenue, in a sense would be the 42 acres. They are trading the acres for revenue. If that scenario was the final solution in the compromise, they are trying to fight for a portion of the recurring revenues from the operation of the billboards, that could go to any other issues that arise to be mitigation related, earmarked for those neighborhoods. They would like to maintain and the revenue would go for that purpose. The solicitor can give him more information, conceptually that part of the discussion. They're not in it at this point as a source of funding- they're trading revenue for mitigation. Councilor Mathews added an additional point, about the 611 board and the

face or faces staying on that board. He attended both of those meetings with other counselors at Ralph Talbot School, and when Mr. McClary gave his presentation, he had up on the power point a cone of light blocking technology coverage and a pie chart. It was clear in that cone that if the billboard at 611 remained it would still impact that neighborhood. Some of those residents, especially on Price Way, and the comment was made about the town buying shades, which he thought was absurd. The second part was the developer who said that they would take to Mr. Bristol about adding arborvites behind some of the houses on Price Way. Leaving that the way it is, 611 Pleasant Street, even with light blocking technology, will not help that entire neighborhood. It may help some, but it will not help that entire neighborhood. Please consider that as you move forward with your negotiations. He said to Christine he was not sure she was on board yet when those summer meetings were held, but he remembers those things from those meetings. People took pictures of them. One gentlemen said he would sell his house right then and they could put a billboard in his yard if they would buy his house. Because there's nothing they can do to help them. That has to be considered before leaving a single face up at 611. The mayor responded that those boards that were shown, those cones (early summer, if not spring)- since that time the GIS Department with data from his engineer has put together more clearly understandable renderings than what he had at that meeting for all of the locations.

Councilor Mathews said he would rely on what a professional has said. He asked if they were better than what he had? Because they were from the consultant who basically deals with this throughout the United States, not someone from GIS (no offense to GIS but he didn't believe their expertise was in light blocking technology). He looks at the 611 which he has talked about for months, as a disaster, from height, size, light blocking technology standpoints. He urged they consider this – it will not help all of the residents. Mr. McClary apologized at that meeting, because he could not help all of the neighbors if 611 stays. Mayor Hedlund responded that is why he said what he did earlier; 613 creates more problems than it solves. Solicitor Callanan added that it is because it impacts more people. Councilor Mathew asked what happens if while they are still negotiating, Cove decides to sell the boards? What if they decide they are sick of this and just decide to sell? Then what happens? The mayor responded that is a good question and he asked the solicitor to respond. Mr. Callanan responded that 2 faces would go up at 611 and 2 faces would go up at 613; that is the original deal. Ms. Howe added that they have been engaged in these good faith negotiations. They understand the position of the town and that is why they have waited and worked with them all this time. Solicitor Callanan added that the four face solution on two boards at 611 and 613 is not even Cove's preferred option. They don't want to go there either but they're running into financial deadlines and have said if they don't come up with a deal, they will have to go with that.

Councilor Mathews responded that in one of the proposals that Ms. Swain gave them earlier this evening, from her meeting of the neighbors that attended a meeting with Cove, said that they could take money over a period of time. It seemed like they may have broken out the payment into three. They say they've run out of time and money, but Ms. Swain gave them something that said they would take three payments over an 8-9 month span. He didn't have it in front of him but it was something Ms. Swain emailed

him and that was provided by Cove from the meeting. If they are running out of money, it seemed like they are willing to take money over time. Earlier this week, she sent an email to the council outlining those options. Ms. Howe responded that if she remembered that conversation correctly, that was equal to the \$2.5 million and they wanted \$2 million up front, before the end of the year, and it would need to be taken up by council, which would take time. Councilor Mathews responded that the way he read it, he thought it was six installments...Ms. Howe said the other two payments they could stretch out over two fiscal years and they could reduce the first payment to \$1.75 million. Either way they are up against it with the days remaining to November 25th and thirty days to come up with \$1.75 million. They weren't willing to spread it out equally. They wanted the majority up front and could take small chunks later. Councilor Mathews responded that he thought it was \$650K within a couple of weeks, and then \$1.7 million in February, and the remainder in July.

Solicitor Callanan responded that would have involved draining the reserve fund, which would have consequences on the bonding they would have to do for the Chapman project. If the reserve fund is drained in the middle of the year, they may have reserve fund measures in the Mayor's administration, but it would be May or June when they wouldn't still have free cash. So the bond companies don't have a problem with tapping the reserve when there's only two months left in the fiscal year, but if it's done halfway through the fiscal year, it would have consequences on what they would have to pay on bonds. The basis point is \$160,000 over a \$160 million bond. Even if they got hit for three basis points, it's over half a million dollars.

Councilor Mathews said, based upon their letter, they seem willing to negotiate the money spread over time. Mayor Hedlund said that was actually based on a suggestion he made in that meeting. It's almost impossible to come up with \$2.5 million for them before the end of the calendar year. He asked if they could phase it out; whether it's over two fiscal years and they asked to leave the room. They had some discussion later that day with their financing people and got back to them with that scenario, which wasn't much different. It was not what he asked for, number one, and there were also some ramifications with his contractual arrangement with Bristol.

Solicitor Callanan said they hadn't talked yet about this part; a three-faced solution means they don't get 42 acres at Finnell. They've had discussions with Mr. Bristol under the scenario that if they were to buy a board off Cove, they still have expenses to pay to other people. Mr. Bristol would not be able to convey 42 acres to the town on Finnell; he would have to reserve some for development. The mayor added that they wouldn't have had enough revenue to forego; to offset that to get the 42 acres. Councilor Mathews asked if he put that in writing? The mayor responded that he hasn't put anything in writing because every day he goes back to him with something new because it's based on what he comes back with from Cove. He'd like to get everything in writing and put it in front of everyone. This is what they are trying to accomplish.

Councilor Mathews responded that this is what is going through his mind- they had a public hearing with a presentation from the administration on November 12th. During that

public hearing they were given a list of options and he thought they were... Ms. Howe interjected that those options were from Cove. Councilor Mathews agreed; he was thinking option 4 with the petition tonight with close to 100 signatures from residents in the district he represents, and they are sitting here tonight talking about it when it seems like that option is not viable. But in that presentation, he believed it said the land would be purchased, or donated. So that has changed since the public hearing? Since the 12th- this is something new. He was under the impression, and Councilor Haugh is holding up the power point from the 12th. It said under that option, Bristol would donate the land to the town. So that's changed? That's what they are telling him now; because that's a significant change from November 12th and you are just telling us now, an hour into the meeting? Solicitor Callanan responded that as the mayor described, there are ten parties to this arrangement and what you have are proposals from Cove. They didn't have proposals from Cove that were vetted by administration or Mr. Bristol; they were proposals from Cove for discussion.

Ms. Howe added that as they mentioned, looking at the final two proposals, a four-faced proposal or three-faced with a buyout. As the mayor stated, that was something they really wanted to do and make work. But as the solicitor said, they have been vetting them more thoroughly over the last 14 days and more and more details have come out that make some options more viable than others. Unfortunately, as part of that three-faced solution, all 42 acres wouldn't be preserved. As was stated, Mr. Bristol would need a portion of the land to be reserved for industrial development to help make the funding work, because the town can't forego revenue it doesn't have part of the agreement. Once they've exhausted all the revenue, then there's only so much money to go around. They felt it wasn't an option to have development down there because that was the whole purpose of the Finnell proposal. Yes, there would be a billboard at the end of that land, but all 42 acres would be preserved. That was the compromise they saw with that solution. If there isn't all 42 acres preserved, then based on the feedback they received from the residents in all the discussions, then there isn't a purpose to putting that billboard there.

Councilor Mathews stated for the record that Cove's proposal of alternatives is discouraging to the neighborhood; the neighbors that have been here since April and talking to the councilors. They're given a proposal on November 12th, and went through the neighborhood gathering signatures to make sure everyone agrees to it and then all of a sudden it's not there anymore. The mayor responded that it is equally frustrating for them because they go through this exercise on a daily basis now for the last two months. They want a solution too. He's gone back to Bristol on multiple occasions with new scenarios and asking for new concessions. Some are acceptable and some are not. It's been kind of a moving target.

Vice Chair Smart noted that the solicitor said the clock is ticking as far as getting ready to sell them. The solicitor responded that they have bids coming in but they have to make payments in the first week of December. The vice chair asked if they have given the town a deadline that this has to be resolved before Cove transfers ownership? The solicitor responded, no, not for selling it, but they have given deadlines. They're running out of

time. They've solicited bids and are getting them back in the next couple of days. Vice Chair Smart asked if the bids are to sell the boards? The solicitor responded yes, to get and install. The vice chair asked if it's the calendar year? The solicitor responded that it's probably closer to next week than the calendar year. Vice Chair Smart asked where it leaves the mayor with the ability to continue to negotiate or will he then have to negotiate with another entity? The mayor responded that if Clear Channel comes in there will not be negotiations. This is their window for negotiations.

Councilor Haugh said she didn't understand why they couldn't negotiate with Clear Channel. In October, Framingham made a deal with Clear Channel that removed old billboards in downtown Framingham to put a board or two up on I-90. They had a big open meeting before anything was passed and proposed as far as zoning and let Framingham run free ads on it just like Cove is doing to Weymouth; plus giving Framingham money. It literally looks like the same exact deal Weymouth has with Cove. She doesn't understand why they have that mentality, when Weymouth doesn't even care about the money. They just want to solve this problem as cheaply as possible. Can they go to a more reputable company like Lamar Out Front or Clear Channel and say help us, because as they're talking here and their own GIS is trying to figure out light blocking technology. No one who works for the town of Weymouth understands billboard lights. She said this is their job; that's why they're getting the profits; why are we doing their job?

Ms. Howe responded that they will buy something permitted. The only thing real is the existing billboard. If another entity came in they would be looking at a pro forma buyout. The mayor responded that the solicitor has spent more time on this than he, but the short answer is that they are going to buy something that's permitted and legal rather than buying a concept, and Cove's in a position where they have to sell, and Clear Channel's going to buy something that's real. The only thing real right now is a permitted board and an existing board. Ms. Howe added that these exist in perpetuity as they learned with the 3A boards. If another entity came in they would be looking at projection with the pro forma and revenue. The total buyout would be close to \$10 million. that's probably more in the ballpark of what they would want to negotiate a board that they're projecting all this revenue off of. She didn't think they would come in and buy from Cove and then ask the town where they could move it to and negotiate a new location, without a cost to that. Councilor Haugh responded that she didn't think anyone would want to buy the one that's currently sited. You can't even see it. She said this is a very frustrating night.

Councilor Heffernan noted the two dates just talked about. When does the town have to make a decision. Solicitor Callanan responded that they heard those two dates from Cove. They mentioned getting paid by the end of the calendar year. As they discussed less payment and more trying to come up with a solution that doesn't involve picking capital projects over paying. That's when they got more specific about their deadline they have to pay, which are dates in the first week of December. Councilor Heffernan asked if this is an arbitrary deadline on their end or do they have financial obligations? The solicitor responded that they have financial obligations. Councilor Heffernan responded that they never submitted to the audit to know that. He also wanted to know where they are in the

negotiations. Are they at a tipping point, where they could have a solution, or are they still in the middle of it? The solicitor responded that they are still in the middle; also the audit provision of the agreement doesn't include this information; it talks about revenue sharing, not their credit worthiness.

Councilor Mathews asked if the billboard is taken down only on one side, does it affect the structural engineering? Would it come down in a storm? The mayor responded that he is not an engineer. It was discussed today. Solicitor Callanan responded that they would have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to have it taken down and re-engineered for a single face. They would keep the frame and cover it. it wouldn't be lit, but would remain. It would look like a square. Councilor Mathews said this would not be aesthetically pleasing, but he is saying yes, there is an engineering issue and their solution is to remove the light part, and leave an empty black structure. The solicitor responded that it wouldn't be empty; it would be covered. Ms. Howe added that's because it was engineered as a two-faced board. They are trying to find a solution to mitigate some of those impacts. The mayor responded that is the one that's obfuscated now with the trees that Councilor Haugh mentioned that would not have lights on.

Chair DiFazio noted they've spoken about protecting Century Road and the 611 board. They all found out early on that that this is the worst possible location they could have sited it. The scenarios include a Finnell board. He's getting emails that they do not want that board. He's not sure he agrees with them, but many people don't want it. No one but the administration can make the decision. At least one councilor here is willing to vote yes and possibly taking town funds to alleviate the adverse consequences of any of the boards on anyone. He is unsure how much that councilor is willing to spend, but he asked that they consider potentially using some town funds, if the return is that they minimize the adverse effects of the boards. Obviously this has gone on for many months, and he hasn't heard that they would know by December 15th or December 10th, or January 1st, but it would be nice to know that they are getting closer to a resolution because the emails aren't stopping and the petitions aren't stopping. They are still coming in.

Councilor Haugh asked if they hypothetically went forward as a town with the \$2.5 million so there's only one side at 613 and two at Finnell, would they then have to pay to take down 611, or would it be included in the \$2.5 million? Ms. Howe responded that it is included. Solicitor Callanan responded that they always anticipated foregoing the revenue so it was to be included in the \$2.5 million. Ms. Howe added that's where the issue of the Finnell land comes in. Councilor Haugh said they would get the Finnell land, pay the \$2.5 million and nothing else? Ms. Howe responded that they aren't guaranteed all 42 acres of Finnell. They would exhaust all available revenue they have through the agreements by paying Cove and they owe obligations to LoRusso, Bristol and the North Weymouth boards. As a result they couldn't guarantee all 42 acres. Bristol indicated he would need to reserve a portion for some development. Councilor Haugh repeated; they would not have to pay to take down 611? Solicitor Callanan responded that it would come out of the \$2.5 million. They would also forego the proceeds from the sale of one of the faces and about \$125,000 yearly revenue. Under these three-faced scenarios, the

town would be paying out, and foregoing all of its future revenue with no guarantee they can protect the 42 acres.

Councilor Heffernan suggested if they are seriously considering paying out \$2.5 million, they should have the auditor take a look at the financial implications and make sure they are looking at it to make the most informed decision. He understands there is a time crunch with three weeks until the holiday, but he feels if they have that information available they can then make an informed decision. The mayor responded to the chair that he would make everything available as early as tomorrow to accommodate his schedule.

Chair DiFazio thanked the presenters. The matter will remain in committee.

19 109-Amendment to Zoning Ordinances-Billboard Relocation Overlay District-Citizen Petition

Chair DiFazio reported that the other issue brought up in the previous discussion is measure 19 109, which has gone to public hearing and received a negative recommendation from the Planning Board:

On November 18, 2019 the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that the Weymouth Town Council reject the petition as submitted, or alternatively, to take no action on measure 19 109.

He reported that they have asked specifically what the ramifications are by passing that petition of the mayor and solicitor and has received the answers he needed to move forward. He asked if the committee wished to deliberate further.

A motion was made by Councilor Smart to recommend that they forward the measure to the full town council with a recommendation that they vote it down- a NO vote. The motion was seconded by Councilor Haugh. Chair DiFazio reported that passage would severely limit the town's efforts to negotiate a resolution. Although the objectives of the whole relocation agreement were noble, but with too many moving parts and so many parties. The implementation of that agreement was done very poorly. One of the reasons is the Guidelines with regard to Electronic billboards that are a single page. He still doesn't know when they passed, since they aren't dated. He also doesn't know how a permit application could have been signed without looking at the site to confirm there were no adverse effects. He's used to the kind of restriction they have in things in this town, but for some unknown reason they got one page of guidelines and no restrictions or communications with administration or neighbors beforehand. Once the permit was signed and the state got it, it was done. They don't want to limit the administration even further from the ability to negotiate. A Yes vote means NO on the revocation of the overlay district. UNANIMOUSLY VOTED.

19 111-Safety Zone (20 miles per hour speed limit) on a Portion of Pleasant Street

Owen MacDonald presented the measure with a little background. Columbian Square is a confusing, congested, and with the exception of some state highway locations, the highest

crash location in town. The town engaged the services of a design consultant who came up with an improvement plan that was vetted before a number of stakeholders in the area and it achieved widespread support. The cost of that plan would be approximately \$6 million. They hoped for and anticipated mitigation funds from Union Point to implement that. Obviously, that didn't work out.

The measure proposed for tonight is one of a few concepts that were intended to provide safety improvements at a relatively low cost, an affordable cost. The specific measure is to implement a "safety zone." He would explain exactly what that constitutes. It's the area on a portion of Pleasant Street, essentially, from Torrey Street, north to an area just below the post office parking area, in the heart of the square.

Vice Chair Smart asked if the location is within the marked triangle. Mr. MacDonald responded yes. There is a lot of traffic; Pleasant Street is heavily travelled. Businesses in the square use the back sidewalk; there is a lot of pedestrian activity. There is parallel and angled parking, a lot of parking and un-parking maneuvers, and street crossings on controlled street crossings.

The intersection itself is not very easy to negotiate either on foot or in a vehicle. Pleasant is the through street at the intersection. Traffic does not necessarily have to stop, so the intent here is to maintain a safe speed on Pleasant Street going through the square. "Safety Zone" is a program that was instituted by the legislature in 2016 intended to allow a statutory 20 mph speed in an area of significant safety need and an area where a good driver would maintain a relatively safe speed.

Vice Chair Smart asked why the approach from Union and Columbian Streets also wouldn't have the 20 mph limit. Mr. MacDonald responded that they could consider it. It requires a speed study be done. The vice chair asked about the study that was done for traffic lights in Columbian Square? There have been several, but maybe they could use the historical data from that to include the zone in and out of the square? Mr. MacDonald responded that they would need current data; a recent speed study and they can do that. They have the information for Pleasant. Also, the other two streets have stops; Pleasant is a through street.

Chair DiFazio noted they could ask them to look at it and potentially do another measure. Mr. MacDonald reviewed the speed study. The intent as implemented by MassDot, that the regular driver would be reasonably travelling. The speed is set at the 85th percentile to account for speedometer imperfections.

The chair noted that the problem when travelling on Pleasant is not that they're moving too fast, but they are moving and not expecting to have to stop. Those that are stopped too long nose into the intersection, and the unexpected stops are what is the problem. Do they feel this will help? Mr. MacDonald responded that this is enforceable. There are two warning signs on either end, that are of no consequence, which surprised the stakeholders. The chair summarized that there would be some enforceability after the

signs are up, for police to find those going over 20 in the zone? Mr. MacDonald responded that it can be done.

Councilor Mathews asked if this wouldn't affect the traffic flow, but it is essentially going for pedestrian safety? At peak times in the afternoons, sometimes the traffic is going zero. It queues up, sometimes as far back as St. Francis Church. So is this a safety mechanism only; not traffic flow. Mr. MacDonald responded that is correct for this particular proposal.

Councilor Haugh noted that the turn lanes were added about a year ago that helped. She asked if he foresees any other improvements that could be done low-cost after this one? Mr. MacDonald responded that they will be taking parking off the two corners. There will be a measure brought before council in the near future with regard to traffic direction on Chapman Street and additional parking to make up for parking that would be lost in this area. Also, as one enters the square from both ends, Pleasant Street is fairly wide open particularly from the northern end from the high school. The square can kind of sneak up on you if you aren't paying attention. They will look into putting a couple of speed feedback signs similar to others put up around town under the Complete Streets program. Councilor Haugh asked if there are any other safety zones in town. Mr. MacDonald responded yes; at Wessagusset Beach.

Vice Chair Smart asked if, as part of this, any flashing crosswalk signs included similar to the school here and at Jackson Square? The crosswalk coming from Union taking the right on Pleasant, the crosswalk is almost on the blind side on the right. They could think about flashing lights. Mr. MacDonald responded that they are a consideration but they are expensive. Vice Chair Smart responded that it is about safety.

Councilor Mathews agreed with the vice chair. He would rather see pedestrian safety crosswalks than speed feedback signs. If it's about pedestrian safety, then crosswalks make more sense.

Councilor Heffernan agreed with his colleagues. There have been several pedestrian accidents there in recent years, and it's become a problem area. Even if it's a bit of money to expend, it would be a wise investment.

The chair asked the price of the flashing crosswalk. Mr. MacDonald responded that it's based on bid pricing according to each contract. It was \$40,000 each under the Complete Streets program. Councilor Mathews asked if there were any grants out there for it, given that the state has said these are designated areas. Mr. MacDonald responded that under Complete Streets program (and he is seeking additional funding under it) the way it is set up MassDOT interprets the regulations they set up. A five-year plan was set up. But because they anticipated the mitigation funds, they told the state to ignore it in the five-year plan and the state is holding them to it.

Councilor Mathews asked if any consideration for hours of use or is this 24/7? Mr. MacDonald responded that the state has been approached repeatedly about it over the

years but is not willing to allow it. The measure is scheduled for public hearing next Monday. Vice Chair Smart asked Mr. MacDonald to seek pricing for solar powered crosswalks. The \$40,000 figure seems a little excessive. Mr. MacDonald responded that the contractor probably made some money on that one.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:22 PM, there being no further business, a motion was made by Councilor Mathews to adjourn and was seconded by Vice Chairman Smart. UNANIMOUSLY VOTED.

Respectfully Submitted by Mary Barker as Recording Secretary.
At the request of Councilor Mathews, these minutes were transcribed as legal.

Approved by Ken DiFazio as Budget/Management Committee Chairman
Voted unanimously on 21 January 2020