

**Needham Finance Committee
Minutes of Meeting of March 20, 2024**

The meeting of the Finance Committee was called to order by Chair Louise Miller at approximately 7:00 pm in the Great Plain Room at Needham Town Hall, also available via Zoom teleconferencing.

Present from the Finance Committee:

Louise Miller, Chair, Carol Smith-Fachetti, Vice-Chair

Members: Karen Calton, John Connelly, James Healy (arrived at 7:25pm), Joshua Levy, Paul O'Connor

Absent: Barry Coffman

Others present:

David Davison, Deputy Town Manager/Director of Finance

Cecilia Simchak, Assistant Director of Finance

Molly Pollard, Finance Committee Executive Secretary

Kathy Raiz, Green Needham

Joe Fernandez, Green Needham

Marianne Cooley, Select Board

Kevin Keene, Select Board

Myles Tucker, Support Services Manager

Dan Gutekanst, Superintendent of Schools

Anne Gulati, School Finance Director

Liz Lee, School Committee (remote)

Hank Haff, Director of Building Design & Construction

Paul Messias, Needham Public Schools Network & Systems Engineer

Jay Fialkov, Trustees of the Needham Free Public Library Chair

Demetri Kyriakis, Acting Library Director

Danielle Tawa, Library Technology Specialist/Archivist

Carys Lustig, Director of Public Works

Shane Mark, Assistant Director of Public Works

Barry Dulong, Director of Building Maintenance (remote)

Approval of Minutes of Prior Meetings

None

Finance Committee Executive Secretary

The Committee welcomed Molly Pollard, recently hired for the Finance Committees Executive Secretary position.

Annual Town Meeting Articles

Pollard Middle School Feasibility Study/MSBA – Article 26

Dr. Gutekanst passed out an FAQ on the Pollard Middle School project previously sent to the Committee. He reported that the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) has invited Needham into the Eligibility Period for the Pollard Middle School Project. This is not a funding agreement but the first step towards a funding agreement. There is a lot of work to be done before that. The subject of the warrant article is to request funds in the amount of \$2.75M for the Feasibility Study required by MSBA. MSBA divides projects into modules. Each module has specific requirements. The Feasibility Study is the deliverable for the Feasibility Study Module. The Feasibility Study Modules follows the Eligibility Period Module and the Forming the Team Module. The deliverables required by the MSBA for the Eligibility Period Module and the Forming the Team Module are being gathered.

The amount of the request for the Feasibility Study was reduced after careful review with Dore & Whitter Architects, the Permanent Public Building Committee and Ms. Gulati from the original estimate in the \$3.9M range to the current request of \$2.75M.

Mr. Connelly asked what the breakdown of the \$2.75 M request and what the deliverables are. He also asked what the timeline is from May going forward. Dr. Gutekanst noted that the project schedule is included in question 12 of the FAQ. The Eligibility Period officially starts May 1, 2024 and launches a 270-day period in which a series of deliverables is to be submitted. Ms. Gulati stated that the first step is to prepare and submit all of the deliverables for the Eligibility Period noted in question 6 of the FAQ. The deliverables include obtaining approval of the project from Town Meeting and have the feasibility funding appropriated. Deliverables also include enrollment information, maintenance policies and amounts spent, the make-up of the School Building Committee, and providing a Compliance Certification statement. The plan is to submit all of these to the MSBA Board of Directors as soon as Town Meeting appropriates the Feasibility Study funds. The MSBA Board of Directors would then decide whether to invite the Town into the second module Forming the Team that forms the project team and then Module 3 which is the actual Feasibility Study. During the Feasibility Study the Town will be looking at a number of project alternatives.

Mr. Haff stated that there are two parts to the Feasibility Study, the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) and the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR). During the Preferred Schematic Report all the other options are explored. The MSBA requires the Town to look at a new construction building, a renovation/addition and various other options even though there is a School Master Plan. Out of this process there will be a preferred schematic design that the MSBA has to sign off on before the Town is invited into the Schematic Design Module.

During the Schematic Design Module, a detailed schematic design is developed of the preferred option as well as a detailed cost estimate. Those become the basis of the Project Funding Agreement (PFA). After approval of the PFA by the Town and by MSBA then the Town would be invited into the Detailed Design Module which includes Design Development, Construction Documentation, and Bidding. All this activity will take place between May 2024 and October 2026.

The schedule that was developed during capital planning assumed that the MSBA process would start as early as December 2023 not May 2024. By accelerating the deliverables up front in the Eligibility Period the Town can stay on track with the capital planning schedule leading to an October 2026 STM and a November debt exclusion to approve construction funding. Detailed design and bidding would occur from January 2027 to May 2028 and construction from July 2028 through August 2031.

Mr. Haff stated that it is desirable to get the Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) on board as soon as possible, preferably during schematic design. The Feasibility Study budget includes review and consultation with the CMR. The Pollard School will be a complicated project with students on site during construction.

The request of \$2.75M is for Designer Basic Services in the amount of \$1.65M, Additional Services in the amount of \$467,500, OPM Services in the amount of \$557,500 and CMR preconstruction services in the amount of \$75,000. The request will be expended between May 2024 and October 2026. The amounts are allowances based on other MSBA projects and Dore & Whittier projects. The original estimate was based on a percentage of construction and was subsequently felt to be too high.

Mr. Levy asked what contributed to the estimated cost increase for the Pollard School project from roughly \$200M last year to over \$300M this year. He remembered energy efficiency upgrades contributed to some of the increase. Ms. Gulati stated that the schedule was pushed out a year and the escalation factor is one of the reasons for the increase. Another is the energy efficiency changes. The MSBA has changed their energy guidelines to now require the LEED Silver standard as a mandatory element of the construction. Mr. Haff stated that in order to get the additional reimbursement bonus points, up to 4 percentage points, the specialized energy code would have to be realized, which is already a requirement in Needham. The Town has accepted the specialized energy code and it will be required starting July 1, 2024. Having the additional percentage points on a project of this scale could mean that each percentage point could be worth half a million dollars. There are caps on the cost per square foot to which MSBA applies their reimbursement, MSBA has increase their reimbursement rate to up to \$605 per square foot. Any unit cost above that are ineligible for reimbursement. Some projects are coming in at \$900 per square foot.

Another significant increase was that the Master Plan estimates were based on \$360 per square foot and the estimate was updated to \$560 per square foot. The MSBA is reporting on their website construction costs from \$650 to \$1,000 per square foot. It is hoped that the current estimate will not change but it is a ballpark figure.

Mr. Connelly asked at what point will zoning implications, special permit applications, the amount of parking needed, wetland issues or other site issues be addressed? Whether it will be done within the Feasibility Study period? Mr. Haff indicated there will be preliminary discussions with Planning and the Conservation Commission, but the actual permitting wouldn't come until design development. The traffic study will be done during schematic design. While the options are being completed the architect will be assessing what the zoning requires and how

to accommodate the parking associated with the zoning. They will be looking for opportunities for additional reimbursement through the IRA Inflation Reduction Act funding sources for things like geothermal.

Ms. Miller asked if there would be a financial consultant to help with all the tax rules that may make it more advantageous to use solar? Mr. Haff thought a financial consultant may be needed. Mr. Davison indicated that the Town's special counsel will be able to help with this.

The MSBA reimbursements come during the project and the IRA reimbursements don't come until the end of the project. There are multiple Net Zero buildings that the MSBA has funded and there may be opportunities to visit some of them.

Mr. Connelly asked when the designer selection process will take place. Mr. Haff stated that depending on how rapidly all required documents can be submitted to MSBA, designer selection will hopefully occur in November or December 2024 at the latest. It is anticipated that disbursement of funds would start occurring in the fall of 2024 and that the feasibility study would be completed in one year and funds disbursed in that time frame. There is a significant body of work that the designer will have access to that will help the process.

Mr. Connelly wondered if all this work that has been done was taken into consideration when setting the fee. Would that reduce the fee and if Dore & Whittier Architect was selected could a lower fee be negotiated? Mr. Haff indicated that the negotiations would not start off with the full amount. Even if Dore & Whittier were selected, they would still have to go through confirming the program and they would have to go through all the alternatives in more detail, which has not happened yet. The work on the Master Plan was very conceptual and a lot more detail needs to occur. The building structure is not brand new and will not meet current building code in many instances.

Ms. Miller asked about the description in the warrant regarding the reference to 20 to 22% reimbursement rate which seems low. Ms. Gulati stated that is referencing the effective rate of the total cost of the Sunita L. Williams School project. The reimbursement rate starts at 31% then goes up with the incentive points but there are a whole range of costs that are ineligible for reimbursement. Ms. Miller indicated that the cost of the land purchase should not be included in calculating the effective rate of reimbursement. For the Pollard project we should be looking at the cost of construction and what the real reimbursement rate will be. This will make a huge difference to the financial analysis the Finance Committee is putting together on debt service. She also asked why there are so many ineligible costs. Mr. Haff indicated there is a cap on the cost per square foot and anything over that amount is an ineligible cost. The MSBA will not contribute to the renovation of an auditorium, they only allow one gym and any renovation associated with the second gym would be ineligible, and there is a cap of 8% of the construction cost for site work. The Sunita L. William School project ran up against many of these caps. By citing the 20-22% rate the School Department wanted to be conservative. The rate without the property purchase was 26.5%. Dr. Gutekanst noted that in question 15 the reimbursement rate is addressed. Ms. Miller suggested that the article description reference what the reimbursement rate was for the Sunita L. Williams School.

Mr. Levy asked how much discretion the MSBA has in inviting Needham into the program. Ms. Gulati indicated the expectation is that if Needham is able to reach all of the eligibility milestones we should be accepted. For the reimbursement rate there is a statutory requirement that the MSBA has to follow so there is not much discretion there. There may be some discretion in certain areas if it can be proved that there is a programmatic need for an area such as the auditorium stage so some of those costs could be eligible.

Citizen Requests to Address the Finance Committee

Citizens' Petition – Single Use Plastics Ban By-law Article 45

Kathy Raiz and Joe Fernandez of Green Needham introduced themselves. They worked together on the plastic bag ban. They reviewed the proposed Citizens Petition Article 45 for the Single Use Plastic Ban By-Law. They have a new petition in place that would expand the ban on single use plastics. It is drafted in two phases, Phase 1 would be to ban polystyrene packaging material, single-use plastic straws, single-use plastic stirrers, plastic splash guards that would go into effect on January 1, 2025 and Phase 2 would be to ban water bottles one liter or less which would go into effect on January 1, 2026.

They have been in touch with the Charles River Chamber and a survey went out last week with no response and went out again on Monday, March 18th. There are eight responses so far. The Chamber seems to be fine with the initial Phase 1 ban. There has been some pushback on the water bottle ban as businesses were concerned about lack of revenue. There are about 24 different towns and cities in Massachusetts, mostly on the Cape, that have a water bottle ban. Ms. Raiz has been reaching out to some of those towns to see what the results have been. Anecdotally many of the stores say they were initially concerned about the effect on revenue but they were able to modify or pivot and it is not an issue.

Studies have shown that water in plastic bottles contains microplastics and nanoplastics. Another study by the New England Journal of Medicine linked nanoplastics to heart attacks, stroke and early death. Water can be provided in aluminum or glass bottles. There are alternatives to the items listed in Phases 1 and 2.

Plastics are not valuable in the recycling stream and less than 10% is recycled.

Ms. Calton asked if there is data on the financial impact of plastic bag and water bottle bans and have businesses left towns because of them. Ms. Raiz indicated they are hoping to get data on these issues and are looking forward to the responses from the survey. The survey asked what part of the ban businesses could support and which parts they couldn't and why. On the issue of the straws there wouldn't be a total ban, but they would be provided only on request. Straws wouldn't automatically be brought with a drink. The water bottle ban would mean residents could no longer buy water bottles one liter and under. Mr. Healy stated he was very much against that.

The Board of Health did not feel there would be any additional cost in enforcement. Ms. Miller indicated there was a concern about the impact on the economy and whether businesses would leave Needham.

The reason water bottles were chosen and not soda bottles is the huge increase in plastic water bottles over the years. 86 billion were sold in the US in 2021, more than 30 times what was sold annually in the 1990s.

Ms. Smith Fachetti asked if the towns that have adopted the ban, then had to provide more water fountains or refill stations. Ms. Raiz reported that some have done so. Some towns have provided a map of where reusable water containers can be filled with tap water.

Mr. Levy asked about the fee schedule. They are working with Town Counsel on a fee schedule to make it a flat fee.

Ms. Miller requested the results of the survey when it is available. They are hoping to have the results in the next week or two.

Annual Town Meeting Articles continued

General Fund Cash Capital – Article 25

Library Renovation Young Adult Area

Ms. Miller reminded the Committee that last year, a feasibility study, the Library Space Utilization Study was funded. Mr. Kyriakis reported that the study was completed by Utile Inc. in August 2023, which was incorporated into the Library's 2023 strategic planning. Four priorities were identified: the Young Adult Area, first floor Childrens Area, the Rosemary Entrance and Multipurpose Room, and the Highland Entrance. The Library was completed 20 years ago and libraries are used in different ways now. The teen area was created for desktop computers whereas now most students are bringing their own laptops and they spread out all over the second floor. They are one of the Library's largest user groups. The number of teens in the Library can create a bit of friction with the adult users. They are well behaved but create a lot of noise. Currently the young adult area is 800 sqft. The proposal is to increase it to 4,000 sqft. The current teen space tends to not be utilized because it gets very hot very quickly. The new area would include seating and moving the collection that is housed where the teen room will be located. This first phase request is for the design of the young adult area in the amount of \$454,000.

Mr. Connelly asked how the design cost was arrived at. Mr. Haff responded that it was based on all the soft costs for this phase from design through bidding with the architect and engineers. It also includes the OPM costs that include the cost estimator, commissioning agent and so forth. The Building Design and Construction department would be the OPM but would bring in independent cost estimators and commissioning agents. The project is an interior renovation. The projected construction cost is estimated at \$2.286M and does not include the soft costs. The construction funds will be requested in May 2025 and is expected to be debt.

Mr. Levy asked if the current teen space is not being used, can adults use the space. Mr. Kyriakis indicated that could be considered. Mr. Fialkov said it could be as simple as removing the Young Adult sign. Mr. Levy asked once the space is complete would the space have

different sound level restrictions from the rest of the library. Mr. Kyriakis answered that is hard to determine at this time. There will be some sound mitigation done in the construction and the space will have a glazed enclosure.

Library Technology

Mr. Kyriakis reported that the request of \$47,000 is part of the three year plan to replace technology that includes four self-checkout PCs, catalog computers monitors, Chromebooks, laptops, a pay-station computer and monitor and gaming systems. This is for the first year of the cycle. After three years there will be a gap between the next cycle. Much of what is being replaced was purchased in 2013.

Non-Public Safety & Public Safety Data Centers & Networking Equipment

Mr. Davison stated that this is a frequent article. This is the money that is used to replace major switches, servers and other equipment and services for the Towns technology system. It generally takes about three years to expend. The funds cover planned replacements and emergency situations. This is a necessity irrespective of the configuration of the Town and School IT departments and supports townwide functions.

Powers Hall IT & AV

Mr. Davison explained that there are two parts to the request. One is to address the blue hue of the projections at Town Meeting and at performances. Some of these expenses are being incurred now from the operating budget totaling approximately \$30,000. If the Finance Department is unable to cover the cost of the work currently being done, a reserve fund transfer will be requested. This should be known in the next 30 days or so.

The larger project involves the projection system and the wireless systems: replacing equipment that was purchased through donations when the Town Hall was first reopened in 2011. Mr. Tucker stated that the equipment can be unreliable. Mr. Messias noted that there were a lot of feedback problems during last year's Town Meeting. The space needs rewiring and re-grounding. Some "band aids" have been applied, but even these are failing. In addition, the equipment is out of life. For example, replacement parts for the projector are unavailable.

Mr. Healy inquired if it was fair to say one of the reasons to do this is for performances, such as the Great Hall Series, not just for Town Meeting. Mr. Tucker stated that the work done will benefit municipal uses of the space and benefits to performances is incidental. The primary driver are municipal meetings, including Town Meeting. Mr. Messias stated that a consultant was hired to evaluate the space and give an estimate of the cost for the project. Performance use was considered in the evaluation but there will be no theatrical lighting included.

Mr. Healy stated that it is important that the groups using the performance hall, as well as other groups using town facilities, contribute to the cost of these forums. Mr. Tucker stated that for performances the Town charges the group 5% of ticket sales in addition to a facilities fee. The ticket receipts go into a revolving fund that is used to help pay for repairs and upkeep. It is probably time to look at the 5% fee to determine if it is adequate.

This \$600,000 request was included in the Capital Plan.

Town Building Security and Traffic Cameras

That is a request to replace the cameras are currently mounted on the exterior of the Town Hall that are non-operational or dying out and replace the cameras that are currently at the intersection of Dedham Ave. and Highland Ave. and the intersection of Chestnut St., Chapel St. and Great Plain Avenue. The cost estimate to replace them is \$190,000. These cameras at the intersections are not used for triggering the lights or enforcement. These are traffic monitoring cameras for Public Safety not video detection cameras that trigger the lights. The video is used after a traffic event not during.

Mr. Messias state all the servers for the cameras on buildings are out of date and many of cameras need to be replaced.

Public Works Facilities Improvements Phase 1 Design– Article 32

The request is for design funds for Phase 1. Ms. Lustig reviewed the proposed project covered in Phase 1. The first phase is to relocate the fleet services from 470 Dedham Ave into an addition to the Jack Cogswell Building located on Central Avenue next to the Recycling and Transfer Station. It will provide a modern facility to maintain equipment and will take some of the pressure off the 470 Dedham Avenue site. This first phase does not require subsequent phase to be completed. All phases can be completed separately.

Mr. Connelly requested information about the proposed addition and construction costs. Mr. Haff responded that the addition is approximately 10,000 sqft and would be attached on the right-hand side of the existing building. Mr. Haff described the recent flooding at the building, with 2 inches of water in the maintenance bays and the office space. The fleet relocation to the Jack Cogswell site should have minimal impact on the traffic as once the staff arrive in the morning they stay until the end of the day. Vehicles brought for maintenance typically arrive the night before on a scheduled maintenance plan, unless there is an emergency. The project would go through Planning and possibly through Conservation to get approvals.

The current Public Works building is sixty plus years old and provides poor accommodation for staff. Over the years additions and improvements were made where they could be made. Mr. Haff listed the deficiencies of the existing building, including rusting beams, lack of sprinkler, emergency generators and in storage bays, poor ventilation, and lack of handicap accessibility.

The projected cost of the Phase 1 building that is anticipated to be requested at the 2026 STM is \$19.6M and is listed in the Capital Plan. That amount includes contingency and cost escalation. It is a basic building but requires heating, cooling, toilet facilities, specialized equipment, a force main sewer connection to Marked Tree Road and needs to meet the specialize energy code.

Ms. Lustig noted that there have been many plans over the years to do something to the building. There are many wetlands' restrictions at 470 Dedham Avenue and relocating the fleet services to a secondary site would make it more functional. She reviewed the history of the building.

Mr. Levy asked about putting solar at the site. Ms. Lustig reviewed the struggles with putting solar arrays on the Jack Cogswell Building. Laws have changed over the years. With the current

law, having multiple solar installations on one parcel is possible. However, the Department of Public Utilities has been slow in implementing the new rule. There is a plan to pursue placing a solar array with this addition.

Mr. Connelly asked about the high cost per square foot. The price per square foot is high due in part to the specialized equipment needed in a garage such as vehicle lifts. The breakdown of the equipment is listed in Appendix O of the final report. Links to the report will be sent to the Committee.

Mr. Connelly noted that the Pollard and DPW projects will be requesting funds at the October STM in 2026 and about the financing plan. Mr. Davison stated that the DPW Phase 1 project would be financed by the 3% debt service line within the levy and won't require an override. The Pollard appropriation will either happen at the same Town Meeting or in the same fiscal year depending on how quickly the Pollard project moves along.

Ms. Miller asked about the wash bay. The wash bay will remain at 470 Dedham Avenue and is included in Phase 2 as are spaces for staff and new shops. The total cost of all five phases is estimated to be \$86M.

Per the Five Year Capital Plan design funding for Phase 2 at Dedham Ave will be requested in 2026 for the amount of \$2.4M. Construction funds for Phase 2 will be requested in 2027 for \$19.6M. The construction costs are conceptual estimates. Ms. Miller noted that each phase was broken down into \$20M projects.

Fire Engine– Article 28

Mr. Healy stated that the E1 Cyclone Two engine will be taken out of service and a 2025 E1 Typhoon would be purchased. The 2013 piece will be the backup for the 2025 engine, replacing a 20 year old engine.

Ms. Miller noted that when the Committee had talked about vehicle and equipment replacement weeks ago, they had talked about trying to smooth out annual use of Free Cash for cash capital using the capital improvement fund. For FY2025 the amount that is being requested for vehicle replacement is low at \$1.1M total in cash capital to be funded through Free Cash. If the Fire Engine is funded using Free Cash rather than borrowing within the levy, as provided in the Town Meeting warrant, this would free up a not insubstantial amount out of the 3% levy because of the way in which the town borrows for the fire trucks. It would free up approximately \$400,000 in the three peak years depending on how it is financed, and it could be as much as \$600,000 in the peak year. The Town is still waiting for Free Cash certification from the State. The financing for this Article depends on the amount of Free Cash. There was a discussion whether the language of the warrant article needed to be amended to provide for both alternatives. Mr. Davison stated that the way the warrant is worded is fine, because it provides for the greater quantum of vote on debt. It could be amended at Town Meeting to a funding source with a lesser quantum of votes.

General Fund Cash Capital – Article 25 continued

LIFEPAK 15 V4 Monitor/Defibrillator

Mr. Healy stated the LIFEPAK is for an ambulance for \$44,671. The current one is beyond its life expectancy.

Personal Protective Equipment

Mr. Healy stated that there are two categories of PPE. There is personal protective equipment for new personnel and for promotions and to repair damaged PPE that is budgeted in the operating budget under capital.

This request of \$54,290 is for the existing fire fighters whose PPE is out of date and is greater than ten years old. Each fire fighter has two sets of PPE. There is a five-year replacement cycle so their primary equipment is never more than five years old.

MOVED: By Mr. Connelly that the Finance Committee recommend the adoption of Article 25 to appropriate for General Fund Cash Capital in the amount of \$4,739,438 for the specific categories as set forth in the warrant. Mr. Levy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Amend General By-Law Periodic General By-Law Review – Article A38

Ms. Miller reported that a committee was formed by the Select Board for the purpose of looking at how often should the by-laws and charter be reviewed. The committee met four times and the result was that the review of the charter is being postponed. However it was felt the by-laws should be reviewed every ten years with years that end in a five starting in January 2025.

It would not change the way by-laws get updated at the request of committees and boards but would make sure the by-laws are in conformance with each other. This would be for cleaning them up, modernizing language and making sure things are consistent. It would be a holistic review.

Mr. Connelly asked about the genesis of this effort. Ms. Cooley stated that the genesis of the effort started with conversations with the Town Manager, and it was seen as good governance. If changes were thought to be needed, they would be referred to the proper jurisdictional board. The committee would highlight what is inconsistent and ask that it be put on a work plan. The committee would be reconvened every ten years. Town Counsel would be consulted but would not be a member of the committee.

Mr. Healy was concerned about the substance of the by-law and that the stakeholders need to have a definitive role in the process and not just be consulted. He was also concerned that some by-laws have an effect on the Charter. He would like to see language included that states that the work of the committee would not affect the Charter. He also felt that the Town Moderator should be involved. Ms. Cooley noted that the Moderator had been invited to participate in this effort and he appointed a representative. He would be invited to be involved in future efforts as well.

Ms. Cooley stated the comments made are duly noted and will take them under advisement.

Mr. Connelly stated that there is no financial implications for the article and the Committee should not speak at Town Meeting about it.

Updates

Ms. Miller reported that there were two meetings with the Select Board, Needham Housing Authority and Community Preservation Committee. As of this past Monday, it seemed likely that CPC was not ready to vote the Linden-Chambers Article. Ms. Cooley noted that the CPC was meeting tonight and may be voting. She requested that any questions please be forwarded to her ahead of time so she can forward them to the CPC. It is a complicated deal financially. The Town is putting up a large amount of money to support a Needham Housing Authority project.

Mr. Healy asked again that Committee members be ready to help out with Town Meeting presentations. Ms. Miller asked that all Finance Committee members please provide any preferences for particular articles.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2024.

Adjournment

MOVED: By Mr. Healy that the Finance Committee meeting be adjourned, there being no further business. Mr. Connelly seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0, at approximately 9:04 p.m.

Documents: FY2025 Department Budget Requests, Updated 3/8/24 Draft ATM Warrant, Pollard School FAQ, Pollard Feasibility Study budget, Plastic Water Bottles handout

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Copley
Administrative Specialist