



Town of Orleans

Tel (508) 240-3700

Fax (508) 240-3388

Finance Committee Minutes

19 School Road Orleans Massachusetts 02653-3699

The November 7, 2019 meeting of the Orleans Finance Committee was called to order at 7pm in the Nauset Room of Orleans Town Hall by Committee Chairman Lynn Bruneau. Also present and thus constituting a quorum were Vice Chairman Elaine Baird, Clerk Nick Athanassiou and Committee members Brad Keith, Frank Lucibella, Peter Monger and Bob Renn. Ed Mahoney and Russ Lavoie were absent.

Guests: Kevin Galligan, BOS Vice Chairman and Fin Comm Liaison; Chris Easley, NRSD Regional School Committee Chairman; Greg Levasseur, NRSD Building Project Committee Chairman; Giovanna Venditti, NRSD Director of Finance and Operations; Ian Mack, Judy Schumacher, and Josh Stewart, Orleans representatives to the NRSD School Board; Ron Collins, Orleans Building & Facilities Department Manager and Orleans representative on the Building Project Committee; and Tom Conrad, NRSD Superintendent (who arrived at approximately 8pm after another commitment).

Public Comment: None at this time

Discussion with Nauset Regional High School/Building Committee Representatives

Chris Easley, NRSD Regional School Committee Chairman and Greg Levasseur, NRSD Building Project Committee Chairman

Ms. Bruneau welcomed the NRSD representatives and noted that the Orleans Fin Comm had reviewed the material discussed by the Project team with the Brewster Finance Committee on 10/2/19 and leveraged that material (21+ questions) when developing the Orleans questions which were forward to the Project team earlier in the week. Additional material provided at the Orleans BOS meeting on 9/18/19 was also shared w/ Orleans Fin Comm members.

Ms. Bruneau and Ms. Baird met with NRSD Superintendent Tom Conrad briefly yesterday (11/6) where Mr. Conrad provided the "Bonding Analysis" that had been referred to during the Brewster Fin Comm meeting as well as some "Per Pupil Expenditure" details for FY14-FY18 showing region-wide data for all students in the region (not town-by-town data, and not high school vs. middle school, etc.).

Mr. Levasseur began with Question 3. Project Parameters:

- a. We understand that the MSBA guideline for classroom area is 850 sf whereas the classrooms at NRHS are somewhat smaller. Would the MSBA grant a waiver to NRSD to preserve as many existing classrooms as possible in order to minimize total reconfiguration of all classrooms?

Answer: 950 sf is a normal classroom

With regard to waivers – did not ask for waivers; there's an MSBA space template they must follow. Template for science labs is 1200 sf; sizing for most schools around the state is similar. MSBA wants to make sure everyone has the same access to resources (for quality education). Building N was built 24 years ago; the other buildings in the 1970's; classrooms average 750 sf - the standard at that time. The standards have changed to 950 sf. Because of safety requirements, 50 sf must be kept clear for fire access.

Ms. Bruneau asked if we used the MSBA rules to maximize cost sharing. Yes, in order to cost share with the state, else we wouldn't get the state to contribute to the total cost of the project. This is all they (MSBA) do; they are experts at this.

Mr. Renn – MSBA has a standard for class sizes from 22-24 students; NRHS currently has 16-18 students/class. He feels there should be an adjustment in sf to take into account the smaller occupancy in the classrooms. This was the reason behind the question on the waiver.

Project team explained that for MSBA, there's a system (process) - they say this is how you should build the school and they don't allow much deviation from their process.

b. What elements of the project cost are allowable (covered)? What costs are unallowable (not covered)? From the Brewster Fin Comm meeting, we understand that the MSBA covers 8 cents/dollar to “move dirt”; pays nothing for admin offices and nothing for gyms; only will pay for a 603-seat auditorium. When will we know more about what isn't covered? And what efforts are underway to limit/reduce the impact of the not-covered costs?

Answer: Moving target – MSBA has formulas for all parts of the process. State is reimbursing \$333 per sf for construction. Cape construction typically costs \$500 per sf. Tax payers are responsible for the rest. Costs will be known once the project goes out for bid in 2021 (eg, how much for contingencies, fixtures, furnishings, etc. on a sliding scale). NRSD is eligible for 40-45% of the costs of this project. The estimate is 41.67% of the cost of the project. Project cap has been set by the state at \$140mm. Cost estimate is 8 months old. The Project Team is currently refining the submission, room-by-room, questioning size/space. The Committee already voted to reduce the Project by 2500sf. Two cost estimates are coming - one from architect and one from project manager. There is a group of committee members for facilities/ infrastructure assistance. Per Ron Collins - regarding HVAC equipment - initially proposed single heating system but now advising 3 smaller systems, “paired” to complement each other (more efficient). Similarly for AC / cooling - better solution is multiple units; looking to AC all spaces. In December, we will have an updated schematic design with refinements, including AC/Heating, emergency generator (required as NRHS is used as an emergency shelter warming station).

Ms. Bruneau asked about MSBA reimbursement rates for different components of the project. Mr. Levasseur noted that the MSBA pays more for regular classrooms versus science classrooms; no money for administrative offices. The Project picked the size of 10 x 12 (120 sf) for all offices - all will be the same size, one of the largest reductions of the process.

c. If the MSBA-funded 603-seat auditorium “morphs” into a 750 “Performing Arts Center”, has any organization made a commitment (in writing? Irrevocable?) to lease the “Performing Arts Center” and agreed to fund the excess construction and operating costs?

Answer - not yet. 4 groups came to the Building Committee, asking the Committee to look at a larger footprint for the auditorium; they wanted a 900 seat auditorium, in case of a school-wide event. When looking at cost/size factors, that wouldn't fit MSBA's template (MSBA will pay for 2/3 of the projected school population). A venue that would hold 700-750 would work better. That is what is in the schematic design today - with 603 on the main floor (paid by the MSBA) and 150 in the balcony (paid by the towns).

Mr. Renn asked if they would downsize the planned auditorium. Mr. Levasseur said “no”. The Town of Eastham (25% stakeholders in the project cost) uses the campus for meetings as well. He also noted that the Town of Eastham used Town CPC money to rebuild the tennis

courts several years ago. The gymnasium is getting minor renovations – new bleachers, new basketball court floor, new locker rooms/shower rooms, new HVAC/electric.

- d. Can the District modify/reduce the scope of the work within the current estimate for Alt. 4A of \$140mm?
- e. When will the design be frozen? We understand that MSBA funding approval will be communicated in February 2020 - what design changes could be made after that?
Answers to both: Large changes to the project are unlikely at this point; some things are already being designed.

Ms. Bruneau asked if changes could be driven by changing engineering concepts after the approval in February. Reply: The \$140mm is just an estimate. It was noted that Cape Tech had a \$20million difference between their budget estimate and their bonded project total.

Question 4. Campus/System/Building Design:

- a. What type of HVAC system will be included in the renovation?
Answer: 3 systems as outlined above; natural gas; likely emergency diesel generator.
- b. Has any solar technology or other energy-efficient systems/fixtures been included in the renovation/construction?
Answer: Considering solar technology (eg, over the rear parking lots); objective is to achieve State building code LEED certification. Focusing on energy conservation strategies in building “envelope” design.
- c. Building D (current 600-person auditorium) will be gutted and converted into a Student Center and a new 750-person Performing Arts Center will be constructed.
 - c.i. What is the cost (a) to construct and equip the new Performing Arts Center? And (b) to convert the existing Auditorium into a Student Center?
Answer: Don’t have the figures because it’s lumped into the whole project. Based on gross square footage. Will provide numbers when they have more detail.

Overall design is for a separated campus: Gym, cafeteria and auditorium will be in one section that can be used at any time (including by the public); the rest of the school will be separated - for student/academic use.

Ms. Bruneau noted again that the MSBA “model” seems to be based largely on sf.

MSBA requires a utilization of 87% for all classrooms. The buildings/classrooms must be occupied that much each day, each week before they’ll sign off on that. The NRHS Principal and Superintendent Conrad put together a schedule that shows that the spaces will be used 87% of the time to satisfy the MSBA requirement. Boston (MSBA) had never seen a school run on a “block” schedule like NRHS (each student has 4 85-minute classes each day, plus lunch). They still don’t understand it. Project Manager is also having learning curve issues. There are currently 4 classrooms in play: MSBA says we need 31 classrooms, we’ve put in for 35 class rooms. Want to prove it’s a valid request from the school district. Could result in a reduction of square footage. There are 6 new science labs, based on enrollment of science programs at the school.

Ms. Bruneau asked if MBSA regulates the size of the cafeteria (typically in use 10:45am - 12:30pm). They do not. Having a larger café with kitchen equipment will change this. The HS will have a full-blown kitchen. This will include the home economics area and add 10 cooking stations in it.

Another part of sf considerations is ceiling height for science labs. Higher ceilings provide room for storage; facilities for gas to escape.

c.ii. What is the cost to simply upgrade the current 600-seat Auditorium?

Answer: Can't give a number. Everything is built in concrete, it's solid, to change the seating, you have to destroy it. Auditorium is used for several events. Behind the stage there's no adequate space for scenery, art, etc. The footprint that's been there 47 years is inadequate. Also trying to get public spaces away from school operations as noted above.

c.iii. We understand that MSBA will cover only two-thirds of the seating in an Auditorium / Performing Arts Center, ie, 603 seats for a 905 student population. What's the motivation for the larger (750) seating capacity since 20% of the larger capacity's cost will be unallowable (not covered)?

Answer: see response to Question 3.c above.

d. Under Alt. 4A, Building C (current Woodworking/Metal/Ceramics Studios) will become a classroom building and Building N (current classroom building) will become arts classrooms / studios.

d.i. What is the cost to upgrade the HVAC and windows in these two buildings and to continue to use them for their current purposes?

d.ii. What is the additional cost to re-configure them to their new, switched purposes?

d.iii. Since Building "N" was built in 1994, has the MSBA been asked to grant a waiver on the classroom areas in the relatively new building (ie, to keep the current smaller-sized classrooms rather than converting them to the larger state standard)?

Answers: Building "N" needs to be changed; classrooms wrong size; Music is currently in D building, Arts is in C, want to move it together (keep "like" curricula together). Use building "N" to metal/other arts w/ access by public (eg, for adult education). The Auditorium s/be accessible for use by all. Project Team spent 6 months considering building/classroom utilization.

All of the HVAC needs to be re-done. Building "N" needs to be brought up to new energy codes. The systems were put in place in 1996.

Mr. Renn – we understand the systems need to be upgraded; however, it's about the flipped use of those 3 buildings (eg, the bays for auto and trade shops that were in the original design in the 1970's). Building "N" has space between 1st & 2nd floors that would allow for the installation of mechanicals (HVAC, etc).

e. What is the plan to replace the deteriorated wood siding on most of the buildings?

Answer: some will be repurposed for interior/exterior decoration (cypress wood); possibly some to wood-working department. (Ms. Bruneau suggested selling it on ebay to help with the Project debt).

e. If not already addressed in discussions above, what is the anticipated on-going annual maintenance cost for the new and renovated buildings? How is this being estimated and how will the towns be assessed for these costs? The new Police Station and new DPW facility in Orleans are both high tech buildings - both take a lot more electricity than the older buildings did, for example, and both require high tech technicians to run the buildings when something goes wrong (eg, with security systems, computer systems, etc.). (This topic came up during the Brewster Fin Comm member commentary at the end of their meeting - but not during their Q&A - thus there were no "answers".)

Answer: Re annual maintenance cost – not sure. Hope the new "systems" are more efficient, don't know about costs. Security systems, computer systems will be new – looking at cameras, the loop road will be blocked off by a gate, separate parking area to east of football stands. Back two-thirds of campus will be off-limits to public. Students will have a pass system to go through the gate. Everyone else will have to go through the office.

Ms. Bruneau asked again about the NRSB budget – where is the day-to-day maintenance in these numbers?

Ms. Venditti noted that these (maintenance) costs are in the HS operating budget. \$550K annual maintenance budget for middle & HS – eg, painting, new flooring, desks, etc

Ms. Bruneau asked about anticipation of operating costs for the new building. – i.e., electricity usage going up because of all the new technology?

Mr. Easley - Most of these new schools had a facilities manager; the Committee feels that we should hire one early (to become familiar w/ the project and w/ the new building as it is being constructed). This would be an investment that will pay for itself to fine tune on-going utility costs, etc.

It was noted that there is an NRSB Building Project Committee meeting next week. Project management strategies will be discussed (on 11/13 or 11/20) - and on 11/19, the Executive Director of the MSBA will be here for a Q&A session at the high school. No meetings are scheduled between 12/12/19 – 1/2/20 due to the holidays.

The Project Team referred everyone to the Project website for up-to-date information. It was noted that Brewster is currently responsible for about 46.42% of the project cost (based on student enrollment figures). The Brewster BOS has indicated a preference for a 20-year bonding scenario (examples for 20, 25 and 30 year were given). Mr. Easley said further that the NRSB School Committee would be meeting on 11/14 to consider an overall voting strategy for the project - whether to have the school district sponsor the voting process (a fully separate polling process), or to let the towns take the Project vote to the polls on a town-by-town basis.

With regard to bonding strategies, Mr. Lucibella asked which is better – level debt service or level principal? As noted, Brewster BOS voted for a 20-year level debt strategy.

The interest rates (4.25% - 4.75% interest) were used as an example; however, we don't know what the interest rates will be (Cape Tech estimated and voted on their project at 4% interest - and bonded at a little over 2% - saving approximately \$20mm in total costs).

Returning to the Orleans Questions:

Question 1. Costs and Financing

- a. Please provide clarification regarding “Choice” and “Tuition” programs - in particular, who qualifies for which program, under what circumstances?
 - a.i. Who pays how much for “Choice” and “Tuition” - the student, the town and/or the state?
 - a.ii. What is included in the payments amount (academic expenses, capital outlay, transportation, OPEB, debt service, other)? Does this cover a proportionate “fair share” of the total operating costs now?
 - a.iii. Who determines the payment amount, how often is it changed? For “Choice”, we understand that the state pays \$5k/student - but does the town or the student pay anything more?
 - a.iv. With the new building, can these amounts be increased - eg, Tuition for Truro and P'Town students, or an additional amount for the “Choice” total for the 200+ “Choice” students - to cover the proportionate “fair share” of the total annual operating costs going forward?
 - a.v. If we are losing money with the “Choice” program, we could opt out or otherwise limit participation, right?

Answers: Mr. Easley noted that NRSD negotiates a 3-year tuition plan with Provincetown & Truro. (The newly established tuition amount is \$18.4k per student per year.) Any classes/students who can't attend in their system (because their system doesn't provide high school classes at all, for example) "tuition" into NRSD. If another town doesn't offer a particular class (eg, French II), then that participation would be a "Choice" agreement. There is a possibility of Ptown & Truro joining NRSD at some point, but not immediately, as there would be no benefit of doing this right now for a benefit from MSBA for this project. Arguably, Ptown and/or Truro could partner up with another school district (eg, DY or Monomoy). The school "Choice" reimbursement is established by the state at \$5k/student. NRSD can establish how many "Choice" students they choose to accept each year.

Mr. Renn stated that he feels this is economically unfair to the town when the average cost of educating each student is \$20,000 - \$30,000 per year. There are 285 students coming into the district from other towns. We are subsidizing 75% of the cost of each student. This doesn't make direct economic sense. Tuition students are paying closer to the cost of \$20K versus "Choice" students.

Superintendent Tom Conrad joined the meeting at this point (at approximately 8pm).

Josh Stewart, a member of the NRSD and the Orleans Elementary School (OES) committees, noted that OES had previously participated in school "Choice" programs (though not now). Elementary school classroom sizes had averaged 13-14 students, so they used "Choice" students to "fill" the classrooms. His argument was that they turned empty seats into \$5,000 seats with school "Choice". They used that additional income to pay for technology, other "extras". Participation in "Choice" is not driven by financial need at this time.

Mr. Renn noted that "Choice" could be a buffer for the school system. There are currently 219 students coming to NRHS via "Choice", 22-25% of total population, which helps to drive the need for the facilities, staffing etc. How will "Choice" be dealt with going forward?

Ms. Bruneau asked Superintendent Conrad if the reimbursement cost for "Choice" has been changed/could it go up.

Superintendent Conrad noted that he has been involved with "Choice" for 26 years. The state reimbursement has been \$5,000 every year. Ptown & Truro don't have high schools; they have to enter into agreements relative to tuition. NRSD has spent 4-6 months working w/ both towns – would they be open to join NRSD? NRSD has been trying to get a financial commitment from a capital standpoint. The result: \$481/per student who attended NRHS. The new tuition agreement is \$18,400/student/year. Each of those 2 towns has to pay for the bus service (expensive). What do to about special education issues? The town the student is from would have to pick up the extra cost. He thinks it's a very fair contract. Superintendent Conrad will provide copies of the contracts to Fin Comm at the end of the meeting (however, he did not). Population studies show 25% of all students leaving the Cape over the next 20 years. The superintendents across the Cape think that a number of high schools on the Cape will be eliminated/consolidated over time.

Question 1.b What is the current cost per student to operate the high school? (Brewster Fin Comm had estimated the cost at \$29k/student.) How does that compare to state guidelines - and if there is a substantial difference, what drives the difference? Will this new building make it worse - or better?

Ms. Bruneau asked why the per-pupil numbers are so different between towns. Ms. Veneditti explained that the per-pupil costs are based on the number of students. It's the total expenses divided by the number of students/town.

Superintendent Conrad explained there are fewer less than 100 students in the Wellfleet school system. The town funds an after-school program for the students. This is why the cost per-pupil-per-town, as to what each town funds within their budget, may vary. The average cost is \$20,710 in Nauset; the state average is \$16,465. Superintendent Conrad referred to the specialty courses that were added which increases the per-pupil cost. NRHS is one of the top high schools in the state. Every HS on the Cape has school "Choice". Superintendent Conrad looked at each program at the school to see how many students in each program were "Choice". If "Choice" were eliminated, they would have to cut 80 program/section choices. "Choice" money for NRHS brings in revenue of \$1.1mm. Conrad feels that money would fund 25 teachers. There were 23 AP classes and 650 AP exams taken last year. By reallocating their staff, NRHS was accepted into and able to offer the International Baccalaureate program.

Question 1.c. Please clarify the debt process. We think we understand that the District issues the debt and that the towns have to agree on the term (eg, 30- or 25- or 20-year bonds). Each town then pays debt service to the District via the debt exclusion raised by the town.

c.i. Is the debt amount calculated before or after the state's contribution is applied?

c.ii. How are the capital costs allocated?

c.iii. How does each town's liability appear on its balance sheet?

c.iv. What's the timing of the towns' decision about the bonding strategy? And how much more/more detailed financial information will TA's and FD's have before then as a basis for decision-making?

c.v. Brewster discussion referred to a "bonding impact analysis" - what is this?

Mr. Keith noted that high quality school systems typically correlate with higher property values. He also asked what the school's credit rating is. Superintendent Conrad noted AA+.

Mr. Lucibella asked if the District will bond out all \$140mm or that amount less the state's contribution.

Mr. Conrad referred to his conversations with other towns, some of whom are leaning toward 20-year bonding.

Mr. Keith urged the Board to consider a longer term, given the current (narrow) spread between short-term and long-term borrowing.

Mr. Lucibella asked if all of the towns would share the bond equally. The percentage each year will fluctuate based on the number of students from each town. They will indicate the yearly debt service. The District will hold the \$97mm of debt.

Back to the Orleans Questions

Question 2. Demographics and Class Size

2.a. With regard to demographics:

2.a.i. In previous discussions, we were advised that the projected high school capacity of 905 students was developed by the MSBA; however, in response to the Brewster Fin Comm's questions, it appears that this projected enrollment was developed by the NRHS Building Committee in 2017. Whose number is it?

Answer: Superintendent Conrad explained that the 905 number was determined by the MSBA. He wants to discuss this with Mr. McCarthy (MSBA Executive Director) on 11/19. Conrad noted that they could have appealed the 905 number.

2.a.ii. Over the past 12 years, from 2007 to 2019, the high school enrollment has shown an overall downward trend from 1041 to 921. In view of this trend, what is the District's current projected high school enrollment over the next 30 years (ie, 2020-2050)?

2.b. With regard to the educational plan at NRHS:

2.b.i. What are the MSBA's guidelines regarding class size?

Answer: Superintendent Conrad noted that NRHS looks at all 5 sections that a teacher is teaching. The smaller class size benefits the students as they get a more personalized approach from their teachers.

2.b.ii. What is the current and projected average class size at NRHS?

2.b.iii. What is being done to review/revise the education plan, i.e., courses offered and class sizes, to reconcile any differences between the MSBA's guidelines and the District's projections? (understanding that the education plan drives both facility needs and staffing needs)

2.b.iv. To what extent will programming and demographics drive the design to more non-state-standard classroom sizes - and thus potentially lead toward more not-covered costs? (eg, state standard is 22-24 students; NRSD more typically is 16-18 students)

2.c. We understand from your meeting w/ the Brewster Fin Comm that there is at least some discussion with other nearby schools with regard to programming to try to share opportunities and limit overlapping expenses (eg, the MIT autonomous car participation w/ Cape Tech). But how rigorous is the programming sharing effort? What are the criteria? We're not trying to micro-manage NRHS programming - but rather to understand the cost drivers behind the programming-which-drives-the-educations-plan-which-drives-the-building-design - thus all cost considerations. And of course faculty costs too.

Answer to 2.c. Shared Programing – have discussed sharing space with Cape Tech. Finding ways to help each other, with each of the Cape school districts. Ms. Bruneau suggested pursuing private donations for special programming (eg, the MIT autonomous car program).

Mr. Galligan, BOS Vice Chairman and Fin Comm Liaison, encouraged NRSD to contact Cape Light Compact sooner rather than later to get better energy-related incentives. LEED certification would require an energy model - which would then provide a better sense of certain operating costs.

Mr. Renn noted that he still has doubts about the Project; however, he suggested revisiting the Project budget and cost estimates and revising / finalizing the numbers prior to bringing the Project to the towns for a vote.

Ms. Baird asked how to best consider long- and short-term bonding strategies based on the allocation percentages given for each town (eg, Brewster 46% and Orleans 20%).

Ms. Bruneau thanked Superintendent Conrad, Ms. Veneditti, Mr. Easley, Mr. Levasseur and Mr. Collins for their efforts to date on the Project and for their participation this evening. She also thanked NRSD School Committee members Ian Mack and Josh Stewart for their presence and participation. The Project is clearly of critical importance to all in Orleans and the other towns in the Nauset District.

Review and Approval of Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

-Thursday, October 24, 2019 - Approval of minutes from October 24.

Mr. Renn suggested a correction to the text (“high-end residential and all non-residential property”) and Ms. Baird noted a typo in the spelling of Mr. Mathison's name. **Motion to approve the minutes as corrected by Mr. Renn; second by Ms. Baird; approved 6-0-1** (Mr. Monger abstained as he was absent from the 10/24/19 meeting).

Review Action Items / General Updates:

-Ms. Bruneau provided a brief follow-up to Brian Sosner's Public Comment at the 10/24/19 Fin Comm meeting. Mr. Sosner had met w/ Finance Director Cathy Doane who directed him to the BOWSC for any questions regarding the sewer betterment by-law; to the BOH re sewer tie-in fees; to the Affordable Housing Trust re their initiatives and incentives. Also, George Meservey has a list of town-owned properties (most of which are restricted-use).

-Ms. Bruneau referenced the storm-water article in the 11/7/19 Chronicle which outlined a \$12mm project that could take 15 years to solve. Tom Daley presented the topic recently to the Marine & Freshwater Quality Committee but this is a brand new topic - worth further Fin Comm discussion and understanding.

Finance Committee Liaison Reports - postponed

Review Schedule for Upcoming Meetings:

-Thursday, 11/14 – COA Director Judi Wilson; possibly other COA Board members. Meff Runyon, BOS Liaison for the COA will be attending.

-Wednesday, 11/20 - BOS meeting w/ annual external auditor's report; Water Dept. on proposed water rates and updated Asset Management Plan; likely no change in water rate structure at this time (w/ have to vote at Town Meeting); also Affordable Housing Committee/Trust

-Thursday, 12/12 – DPW Director Tom Daly & Natural Resources Manager Nate Sears on Town Landings and Beaches

-Thursday, 12/19 – DPW Director Tom Daily and Building & Facilities Manager Ron Collins on the Town's Buildings & Facilities

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn by Ms. Baird; second by Mr. Renn; approved unanimously 7-0-0.
Meeting adjourned at 9:34pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Stacy Faber, Recording Secretary

All documents referenced are in the Finance Committee Drop Box except as noted:

1. November 7, 2019 Fin Comm meeting agenda
2. Orleans Fin Comm Questions for the NRSD Building Project (11/5/19)
3. Fin Comm Action Items
4. Fin Comm Liaison Assignments

Finance Committee meeting minutes approved at the December 12, 2019 Fin Comm meeting.

Motion to approve by Mr. Monger; second by Mr. Athanassiou; approved 5-0-2 (Messrs. Lavoie and Mahoney abstained as they were absent from the November 7 meeting).