

MINUTES
Warrant Committee Meeting
March 15, 2021

Warrant Committee Members	Participating remotely: Sharon Tatro (Chair), Ed Vozzella, Robert Sliney, Jeremy Marsette, Kristine Barton, Newton Thompson and Amanda Hall Absent:	
Guests	Kristine Trierweiler, Town Administrator Nicholas Milano, Assistant Town Administrator Michael Marcucci, Selectman Sarah Raposa, Town Planner Teresa James, Planning Board, Chair Sarah Lemke Blake McDermott Seth Meehan	
Meeting Location	By remote participation via Zoom	
Meeting Times	Meeting convened: 7:00 pm	Meeting adjourned: 8:55 pm
Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minutes for March 8, 2021 were unanimously approved by those Warrant Committee Members in attendance at the time of the vote. 	
Operational Budgets (including votes taken)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None 	
Warrant Articles (including votes taken)	Warrant articles approved unanimously by Warrant Committee members in attendance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 4 “PEG Access Cable Related Funds” ● Article 33 “Solar Photovoltaic Facilities Overlay District” 	
List of all documents and exhibits used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Medfield FY2022 Budget Summary Sheet, dated March 2, 2021 ● FY2022 Capital Budget list and FY21-26 requests ● Proposed FY22 Budget Guidance Framework (so-called Lexington Model) prepared by Selectman Gus Murby. ● Stimulus announcement from Representative Auchincloss including a PowerPoint presentation entitled “American Rescue Plan - State and Local Funding - Medfield” ● Review of Town Finance prepared schedule entitled “CARES Spending to date” 	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None 	
Follow-ups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None 	
Dates for Meetings including WC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Warrant Committee Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 18 (Water & Sewerage Board) ○ March 22 (Citizens’ Petitions) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 25 (Final budget vote) ○ March 30 (if necessary) ○ April 1 (Warrant Hearing)
Names of people participating remotely and why	All Warrant Committee members and invited guests participated remotely; see above for names of attendees.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sharon Tatro opened the meeting at 7:00 pm and 1) recognized members of the Planning Board to present their articles; 2) introduced Michael Marcucci who gave a history of the Town’s Capital Budgeting practices and an overview of the current FY2022 request; 3) requested a review of various financial items including: the Lexington Model; stimulus announcement from Representative Jake Auchincloss; CARES spending to date; a review of any vote-ready warrant articles; and an update from Town Finance on the status of FY22 budget. ● PLANNING BOARD WARRANT ARTICLES - Sarah Raposa presented the following articles sponsored by the Planning Board. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Article 33 “Solar Photovoltaic Facilities Overlay District”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sarah Raposa explained the primary purposes of this articles as: 1) to promote and regulate the use of residential, commercial and municipal Solar Energy Systems (SES) within Town and encourage their location and use in a manner that minimizes negative visual and environmental impacts; and 2) to create a Town-wide Solar Photovoltaic Overlay District (PVOD) to allow new SES to locate efficiently and in areas that will have the least visual and environmental impact. ii. The Planning Board engaged solar planners (paid for out the Planning Department operating budget) to understand SES technologies and worked with the Medfield Energy Committee to get their approval. iii. Sarah addressed a prior Warrant Committee question regarding the siting of solar panels in a residential area, answering that the owner would have to follow all setback guidelines for an accessory structure, similar to those for siting a shed. b. Article 34 “Authorize \$20,000 for Zoning Diagnostic” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sarah explained that the diagnostic is a tool for the Planning Board as it strives to make other amendments to the zoning bylaws. ii. The zoning diagnostic was a recommendation of the just-completed Townwide Master Planning project which recommended to review, revise and update the Zoning Bylaw so that growth is guided

in support of the Master Plan goals in 1) promoting economic development, 2) providing a wide range of housing for a broad range of incomes and 3) ensuring that housing needs are equitably distributed throughout the Town.

- CARES FUNDING BREAKDOWN:
 - a. Kristine Trierweiler reviewed the schedule entitled “CARES and FEMA Totals as of 03/13/2021” noting that the Town has expended the full amount of CARES funding.
 - b. The just-announced round of new funding to the Town is estimated to be \$1.28 MM in direct recovery funds and does not include additional funding that may come from the Commonwealth, Norfolk County and dedicated school funding.
 - i. Though there are no specifics yet, the funding is expected to be distributed in two different cycles and needs to be spend by 2024.
 - ii. There are also no specifics yet on how this funding can be spent, but we do know that it can’t be used to cut taxes.
- OPERATING BUDGET REVIEW:
 - a. Sharon Tatro stated that even though we now know that stimulus money is coming from the government, we still need to review all budget line items in order to get a balanced budget.
 - b. Comments from Warrant Committee members on the current budget deficit and the use of stimulus monies.
 - i. Bob Sliney stated that this is not an opportunity to use the federal stimulus monies to cover over problems; though it helps significantly, we still need to work through our long term issues and stick to the financial discipline that we as a Town are creating.
 - ii. Jeremy Marsette noted that the stimulus funds are one-time funds and should be spent on one-time projects.
- REVIEW OF THE LEXINGTON MODEL
 - a. The basic rationale for the schedule is to split revenues between Town and Schools (for example, 25%/75%, respectively); over time, this ratio has been stable.
 - b. Sharon posed the following question to the Committee - Should the Lexington Model be adopted as our budgeting methodology or just be a tool in the Committee's budgeting toolbox?
 - i. The consensus of the Committee is that it may be a good yardstick for directional purposes, but each

	<p>year is unique requiring that the budget be tailored to that year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Given future uncertainties, it is difficult on the Schools to work within a predetermined percentage constraint. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CAPITAL BUDGET REVIEW: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sharon (Chair of the Capital Committee) introduced Selectman Michael Marcucci who gave an overview of the Town's past and current capital budgeting processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mike noted that how we got here grew out of prior years' planning for capital needs that were often overlooked or sidelined when major operating expenses arose. ii. Mike noted that as a former Warrant Committee Liaison to the Capital Committee, the way that the capital budget was established was a function of how much was left over from the operating budget and then allotted to capital. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At that time, department heads didn't schedule their capital assets needs out over time; rather the approach was <i>ad hoc</i> resulting in underfunding capital. ● In essence, capital was squeezed into the Operating budget. iii. Now, our process is trying to get a handle on a normal replacement schedule. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Developing a capital asset inventory was the first step and we now have it organized in one place. ● The next step was to work with department heads to establish an asset replacement schedule. ● Cleaning up our capital budgeting process has also allowed us to clean up our operating budget process. ● Our objective is to have a stable capital schedule in order to make appropriate funding decisions. iv. Discussion turned to the Capital Stabilization Fund article which is requesting \$750K. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jeremy Marsette expressed concern about all the items that are being financed; he suggested a policy statement be established on how to finance assets, then the Town can plan acquisitions on a staggered basis.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mike Marcucci shared this concern, but noted that the Town would not have been able to replace key assets (eg, fire trucks) without financing; overall, the cost of debt is modest. ● Bob Sliney noted that we should have some method of informing the Town of balancing our financial resources to meet both operating and capital needs. How it should be presented is an open question. ● Mike envisions a public hearing about capital needs and sources of funding. ● WARRANT ARTICLE REVIEW AND ACTIONS TAKEN: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Article 4 “PEG Access Cable Related Funds” - approved. b. Article 11 “Disposition of Lot 1, Icehouse Road” - awaiting revised language that will bundle Lots 1 and 3 for disposition; also, regarding the Committee’s interest in having the article clearly delineate that the proceeds may only be used for capital purposes, the Town is governed by MGL, Chapter 44, Section 33 that specifically addresses “Sale or Other disposal of Realty; Disposition of Proceeds”. c. Article 33 “Solar Photovoltaic Facilities Overlay District” - approved. d. Article 34 “Authorize \$20,000 for Zoning Diagnostic” - deferred until all components of the operating budget are finalized. ● There being no other business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded and voted unanimously by a roll call of all Warrant Committee members present. ● The meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted: Newton H Thompson

Approved minutes to be sent to: nmilano@medfield.net