

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

JOINT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2008

Present Programs & Services: Ald. Johnson (Chairman), Freedman, Merrill, Hess-Mahan, Sangiolo, Brandel, Parker, Baker.

Present Finance: Ald. Coletti (Chairman), Lennon, Johnson, Salvucci, Gentile, Parker, Schnipper, Freedman

Also Present: Ald. Swiston, Fischman, Lappin, Mansfield, Vance, Albright, Harney, Linsky, Yates

Others Present: David Wilkinson, Sandy Pooler, Susan Burstein, Marc Welch, Bob DeRubeis, Dori Zaleznik

**REFERRED TO PROG&SERV, PUB FACILITIES & FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#85-08 DANIEL PROSKAUER et al. filing on February 7, 2008 a group petition pursuant to Section 10-2 of the City Charter for a public hearing regarding the cost of construction of Newton North High School, specifically requesting the Board of Aldermen to establish a Guaranteed Maximum Price for the said project prior to the installation of foundations of the said school; and establish a maximum cost of construction of the said project that, in the opinion of the honorable Aldermen, the City can afford without sacrificing the repair and construction of other public buildings. ***NB: Board action shall be taken not later than three months from the date the petition was filed.***

**ACTION:** **PROGRAMS & SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD 8-0**  
**PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE HELD 8-0**  
**FINANCE COMMITTEE HELD 8-0**

**NOTE:** Please refer to the Joint Public Facilities, Programs & Services and Finance Committees Report for the details of this item.

**REFERRED TO PROG & SERV, PUB FAC AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#54-08(2) **PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE** offering a RESOLUTION to His Honor the Mayor requesting he provide to the Board of Aldermen at the earliest possible time the financing plan for a confirmed guaranteed maximum price in order to preserve cost-saving options.

**PUBLIC FACILITIES APPROVED 8-0 on 2-20-08**

**ACTION:** **PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 6-1 (Ald. Merrill abstaining; Ald. Parker not voting)**

**NOTE:** See Note below.

**REFERRED TO PROG & SERV, PUB FAC AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#54-08(3) PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE offering a RESOLUTION to His Honor the Mayor requesting that he request and receive from the State Treasurer a review of the project plans and a review of the project's finance plan and submit said reviews to the Board of Aldermen in order to preserve cost-saving options.

**PUBLIC FACILITIES APPROVED 5-3 on 2-20-08 (Ald. Gentile, Salvucci, Schnipper opposed)**

**ACTION: PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 4-2-1 (Ald. Baker, Hess-Mahan opposed; Ald. Merrill abstaining; Ald. Parker not voting)**

**NOTE:** Ald. Baker asked for an explanation of these two items. Ald. Mansfield said that the original item #54-08 was approved by the Programs and Services Committee and it was then split out into these two items. Because it came to Public Facilities the day after the concrete was being poured, the majority of the Committee felt that that item had no further purpose or validity. They felt it would be more appropriate to have a resolution that was not tied to the pouring of concrete but felt a financing plan for a guaranteed maximum price was crucial for the Board to ask for at the earliest possible time to preserve cost savings options. They also wanted the State Treasurer to review the project and financing plans and then provide the City with his department's expertise on the financing.

Ald. Schnipper explained that she had voted against this in Public Facilities because of the requirement in the statement that they had to receive from the State Treasurer a review of the project plans and a review of the project financing plan in order to go forward. She felt they were willing and supportive of asking the Treasurer for his input but did not feel they needed to wait for him to review the financing plan before they would go forward with the project. Public Facilities voted No Action Necessary on that original item.

Ald. Sangiolo asked Mr. Pooler what communication has taken place between the Executive Office and the State Treasurer's Office since the requested items had been delivered. Mr. Pooler did not know what the status was and that Mr. Parnell would be the person to contact for further updates on this.

Ald. Baker moved approval of these items and the Committee voted in favor.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#57-08 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting to present the following levy limit override ballot question to the voters in accordance with the procedure prescribed by G.L. c. 59 §21C(g):

Shall the City of Newton be allowed to assess an additional \$23,900,000 in real estate and personal property taxes for the purpose of funding operating expenses for the Public Schools and

the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2008. [01-29-08 @ 6:12 PM]

**ACTION:** **PROGRAMS & SERVICES DENIED 8-0**  
**FINANCE DENIED 8-0**

**NOTE:**

**Mayor's Support of \$14.9M Override**

Sandy Pooler, Chief Administrative Officer, said the Mayor was fully in support of a modified override at \$14.9M. This amount would meet the maintenance of effort budgets on both the school and city sides as well as add some enhancements. He also felt that May 20, 2008 would be a workable date for a vote.

**\$16.4M Override vs. \$14.9M Override**

Ald. Sangiolo asked how Mr. Pooler got from \$16.4M which was proposed at the last meeting, down to \$14.9M. He said the key thing was to have an override that would maintain core services and \$14.9M accomplished that. It also had to be a number that the voters could support and listening to the public, he felt it was a politically viable number and could get enough votes. He said they looked at what the maintenance of effort budgets would be on both the school and city sides and some of the initiatives, and they found this was a number they could work with. Ald. Sangiolo asked what would be dropped to get from \$16.4M to \$14.9. Mr. Pooler said that on the municipal side, both numbers covered maintenance of effort. Some initiatives on the school side that were included in the \$16.4M would be scaled back and it would be up to the School Department to determine would those would be.

**Comparison of Plans**

Mr. Pooler referred to the handout marked "Comparison of Override Proposals" and went over the numbers in each plan. It is attached this report. The payment for Newton North was based on a price of \$195M in the Mayors Plan. The Brandel Plan assumed the cost at \$187M.

**Some Albright Plan Specifics**

Ald. Albright said they had spoken to the School Committee about the \$14.9M override plan. The concepts that they had included in the \$14.9M were part of their plan, but not 100% agreed to by the School Committee. She stated that what they had in their plan was the per pupil allocation (supplies, text books), pupil services (SPED), technology initiative, charter maintenance, and some money for regular education transportation. These were the enhancements above maintenance of effort. On the City side, there was road repair, tree and field repair, back-up server, and one new Planner.

**Some Brandel Plan Specifics**

Ald. Brandel said that they started off with a \$23.9M proposal for two years; and then it went to a \$16.4M one year proposal; and now they were down to a \$14.9M proposal. He said there was a different rationale to each number and suggested a lack of strategy and planning. The Brandel plan was broken into two items: an operating override for one

year; and debt exclusions that were separated into various projects. Even if some of the debt exclusions failed, they would still be able to address the primary problem of the structural deficit. He noted that this was becoming more and more about the school department and he felt they needed to address the primary problem of the structural deficit. Going into FY09, there was an \$11-12M operating deficit. He asked Mr. Pooler and Ms. Burstein what would happen in 2010 and 2011 if they were to adopt the \$14.9M number. He said that all that an operating override did was increase the levy. He wondered if they were trying to close a budgetary gap or were they trying to justify an override. If the public understood that the City had an \$11-12M operating deficit, he felt they needed to explain why they would be asking for one penny more. He would ask that any item that might be adopted, that they understood what would be happening in 2010 and 2011.

Ald. Brandel said that if a debt exclusion was used for Newton North, the use of the capital stabilization fund would change as it wouldn't be used to pay down the debt on Newton North. He referred to a handout marked "Projected Debt Service Requirements and Tax Impacts" noting that for 2012 the peak would be \$352.90 added to the average tax bill. The average tax bill goes up about \$250-\$260/year with the 2.5% increase and that would go up about \$500 with the Albright plan.

#### **Future Finances and Merits of Various Override Plans**

Ald. Sangiolo asked what would happen in FY10–FY12 with the \$14.9M plan in terms of deficit. She wanted to see the numbers. Mr. Pooler said that he didn't think the Brandel Plan closed the deficit in FY10-FY12 and neither did the Albright Plan. If an override didn't go through there would be a substantial cuts in City services. The idea of this override is to get through FY09 without having to do that and then they'll have to deal with FY10-FY12 as they come up. Mr. Burstein said that the numbers that were included in the \$23.9M or the \$16.2M override options in terms of assumption for FY09 and FY10 haven't changed. The \$23.9M for 2 years was just over \$20M for the first year, which included a \$5M one time assumption for the elementary school projects. If that \$5M is taken out, \$16M is left and covers FY10. The debt service that was incorporated in all of the plans for the fire stations and for Newton North is the same for all the plans. Whether it was included in the general operating override or the debt exclusion, the taxpayer still paid for it. The difference would be if the debt exclusion was done this year, then part of next years override would essentially be passed because next year's Newton North and fire stations funding would already be passed.

Ald. Salvucci said that the costs of the City recur every single year and they needed to figure out how to keep spending under control so that they didn't have to keep coming back to the taxpayers. He saw the override as a band-aid approach to the problem. The Board never cuts a budget and he didn't want to cut public safety or lay people off, so he wanted to ask for the minimum money in the override to get over the crisis and then look at the pockets of money Ald. Coletti has referred to in order to help the fiscal situation. He also agreed with Ald. Coletti that they had to support the educational system in the city.

Ald. Baker said that Proposition 2 ½ limited the increases in taxes and expenses were going up beyond that limit. The Blue Ribbon Commission suggested that the only vehicle with which to maintain the quality of education and the quality of public safety was an override. The longer they wait to act on this, the worse the problem will get. They needed to get the vote on the ballot and let the voters decide. He also didn't think there was 2/3 of the Board prepared to support the debt exclusion option. He felt the \$14.9M was a responsible number. Ald. Harney noted that the Blue Ribbon Commission recommended overrides and debt exclusion overrides as well. He and several other Aldermen docketed an item 2 years ago to fund Newton North with a debt exclusion and that item did not pass. He was inclined to support the Brandel plan.

Mr. Pooler said he would put something in the packet this week showing how they got through FY08; what was increased in free cash and local receipt revenues, the impact of the overlay revenues, the impact of the overlay changes. These were one time changes they were able to make and they couldn't expect to do that over and over. Because Prop 2 ½ doesn't catch up with expenses, overrides will be necessary to maintain levels of service. Mr. Pooler had not delivered this information at the time of this report.

Ald. Gentile said he didn't think they could ask people for this kind of money and the City needed to tighten their belts. Until they can show the voters that the City has done all it can, he felt that did not have the right to ask them for more money. He noted that he would not vote for any particular plan. He would vote to put the final question on the ballot as it was up to the citizens to decide what should be done.

Ald. Lennon felt that the public needed real details on why these various override options were needed. He felt unable to defend the overrides at this point like he was able to defend the Newton North project.

Ald. Parker said they needed a sustainable plan. All three plans add more than the 6% increase that the Superintendent said he needed to operate the schools. Even at 6%, projected out over several years brings the budget to a very unsustainable point. Since the Brandel plan is added the least (about 7%) it seemed to him to be the most sustainable plan.

Ald. Parker also felt they needed transparency in all these plans. By 2011 the debt service for Newton North will be \$9.8M, 2/3 of the override money. He felt it was better to break these out separately so that people can see exactly where the money was going. An override was necessary and they needed an override that the people would support and pass. He believed it was the Brandel plan.

Ald. Swiston said she felt the voters needed to be given a voice by giving them options and it would not be too complicated. Ald. Lappin said that before they start another project like the elementary schools or design work on any other capital projects, it needed to be put on the ballot first and the get the public's support before they start allocating money.

Ald. Hess-Mahan said that a Newton North debt exclusion in isolation would be very divisive. He also said they didn't have a good enough number for the elementary schools to put a question before the voters with an amount they would be held. He didn't think debt exclusions were a bad idea, he just didn't think these were the right ones at this time. The Albright plan was formed out of careful thought and was not done in a vacuum. They worked with the Mayor and the School Committee on this. Using one time sources to cover problems this year sounds attractive, but that would leave them in a bad position next year. He felt the full \$14.9M was the best choice. He said they had to look at the way the City operated and it had to be done in conjunction with the Mayor and the Schools. The best way to narrow the structural deficit was to have enough money in the budget so they could look to revenue enhancements and cutting spending. He didn't feel any plans addressed the structural deficits in a more permanent way.

Ald. Schnipper said that communities with which Newton compared itself, have it as part of their yearly routine to pass smaller overrides and those are much less painful than waiting and having one huge override. They've accepted the fact that 2 ½% is rarely enough to provide the services they want. Ald. Hess-Mahan noted that Lexington, for example, goes for smaller overrides just about every year for a total of about \$14M. Newton had one huge override for \$11M. Ald Schnipper said that the schools have had increased enrollment and there was no such comparable growth on the City side. By law, the schools have to provide special education services. Those services were not discretionary and a significant part of the schools budget attended to those costs. She knew there would be debt exclusions in the future for potential projects but felt it was very different to put a debt exclusion on the ballot for a project already in progress. She wanted to see an override on the ballot and give the citizens the chance to decide what they want. She supported the \$14.9M plan.

Ald. Fischman said Newton was attractive to families primarily because of the school system and the city services. He felt keeping the schools healthy would be to the benefit of the city. The city services need to be addressed and affirm to the people that their needs were being met. He felt they had to work together to figure out how to get more money into the city through development and other methods. He supported the \$14.9M plan. He felt that debt exclusions for new projects was a good idea but not for Newton North right now.

Ald. Albright felt that many people who wanted a debt exclusion question on the high school wanted it so they could vote against it. She wanted to ask for an operating override that would ask for enhancements for the city and the schools. She wanted to keep things together and not break things out and be divisive. She would vote for whatever override the Board put forth but she hoped it would not include a debt exclusion.

Ald. Sangiolo said that she agreed that neither plan solved the structural deficit, but she wanted everyone to look at which plan caused the least damage years out and that's the one that should be put on the ballot. The Albright plan was looking at maintenance of

effort “plus”. She felt the “plus” would be difficult to sell to the voters considering the cost of the new high school.

Ald. Danberg said development in the city would help and could bring between \$20M - \$25M in additional revenue. She wanted the Board to remember that when it came time to looking at parcels for possible development in the future. She agreed with Ald. Schnipper in that most communities built in overrides as they knew 2 ½% was not enough to keep their municipalities going. She supported the Albright plan.

### **“Education Override”**

Ald. Coletti felt the Brandel plan came very close to the number the override should be, but to cloud the issue with debt questions for Newton North or anything short of Carr School would not be the right thing to do. He felt the Albright plan went too far. It assumed that the School Department was in agreement with their plan and it locked in a process that wasn't even started yet. It was a compromise number that the executive department was forced to come down to but a number that was felt could pass with a vote. He was also concerned that there was money in this plan for the design of elementary schools and they haven't even had the first meeting to determine the impact of that project. He estimated it as a \$240M problem over the next 10-12 years with no state assistance. He felt the best question to put on the ballot was one that related to one major item that could be defended. It should be as simple as possible: Should the taxpayers be asked to increase the operating budget for FY09 by \$12M. This was the difference between the Mayor's Allocation Budget and the Superintendent of Schools requested budget and brought it back to the basic assumption that this was an education override.

He said this was not about keeping police and fire as they could do that in the normal municipal budget process. He stated that as Chairman of the Finance Committee, they will not cut Fire and Police and DPW, etc. They would do a salary freeze and go through line item by line item to keep those services intact. This was about whether or not they wanted to support the Superintendent's recommended increase in the School's operating budget. If this override did not gain the support necessary to pass, and the schools had to increase their class sizes and services were diminished, then people's property values would be affected because Newton would no longer be as interesting to people who wanted to move here for education. Citizens would then realize that a \$500 tax increase was not worth a \$30,000 decrease in their property value. Connecting this override to the schools, as it really should be, would help the School Department and School Committee go out and get the support they need and make it successful.

Ald. Coletti said that the Board has gone from one body to separate entities coming up with various plans and he felt it pre-empted a lot of the work that needed to be done collaboratively between the Schools, the Mayor, and the Board of Aldermen in the next couple of months. He said that under Proposition 2 ½ the law said that the voters have the right to be heard on a reasonable question to be put to them if it's so requested. He said he didn't think the Board had the right to say there shouldn't be an override vote. If

the public voted it down because they didn't believe it was the right thing to do, that was within their authority. He didn't think it made sense for individual Aldermen to put their names on any of these plans as it had to be a unified effort.

Ald. Baker said that while this is primarily being used for the Schools, the City also needed resources as well. He said they were trying to find a vehicle with which to accomplish those goals through the right override number. It was "one city" and the \$14.9M number would accomplish maintenance of effort on both sides plus preventative maintenance and mandates. He felt the debt exclusion override question was coming at the wrong time and could not support it.

Ald. Lappin said that if Ald. Coletti could fund the operating budget with other sources, she would like to see that before voting on an override. Ald. Lappin wanted to know that there was agreement with School Department on what they would do with the money if the override passed.

### **Reducing the Deficit**

Ald. Coletti said that the Assessing Department put in an analysis of their account. He said they could declare \$3.3M surplus by the end of this year, and they're going to actually surplus \$1.6M. That one move done by June 30 would be enough to retain the Police and Fire. He felt they had to hold the Mayor accountable for not using the health insurance surplus and instead reducing next year's health insurance operating budget by at least \$2M to make up the balance of the shortfall, and contribute another \$500,000 in free cash.

### **Additional FTEs to Schools**

Ald. Johnson asked Ms. Zaleznik why there had been a 101 FTE increase in 2008. Ms. Zaleznik said there had been an increase in enrollment and 8 modular classrooms had been installed and needed to be staffed. They also needed to equalize services between the 2 high schools such as math and writing centers for MCAS and supportive services for Special Education. No administrators were added. Most additions were in instruction, some in pupil services in special education, clerical was reduced, aides were increased for special education, 3 custodians were added, and administrative support was added with the introduction of the math coaches.

During FY04 to FY06, she noted that a number of positions were cut at time when the population in the schools was growing. To move things forward, they ultimately added people to keep the programs going. She also noted that page 87 of the School Committee budget book goes through FTEs that were added.

### **Grants for Schools**

Ald. Swiston felt that Newton had underused grants and hadn't applied for as many as they should. Ms. Zaleznik pointed out Newton has applied for many, many federal and state grants and they have obtained almost \$10M in funds. This grant information can be found on the Newton Public Schools website in the Guide to the Budget for FY08.



**Vote for Substitution**

Ald. Baker had moved to replace the \$23.9M number with \$14.9M. The Programs & Services Committee voted 3-4-1 and the motion failed to carry. The Programs & Services Committee then voted on the original item with the number of \$23.9M. Ald. Parker moved to deny this item and the Committee denied it by a vote of 8-0.

Ald. Schnipper moved to replace the \$23.9M number with \$14.9M. The Finance Committee voted to deny this motion. The Finance Committee then voted on the original item with the number of \$23.9M and denied it by a vote of 8-0.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#58-08 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting an appropriation in the amount of \$88,000 from Budget Reserve for the purpose of funding the costs of a special election to present the levy limit override ballot question to the voters. [01-29-08 @ 6:12]

**ACTION: PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**  
**FINANCE APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Salvucci not voting)**

**NOTE:** Both Committees voted to approve this item with no further discussion.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#88-08 ALD. BRANDEL, SANGIOLO AND PARKER proposing that the following question be put before Newton voters in accordance with the procedure prescribed by G.L. c. 59 §21C(g):  
“Shall the City of Newton be allowed to assess an additional Ten Million Dollars in real estate and property tax for the purpose of funding operational expenses?”  
[02-12-08 @ 11:13 AM]

**ACTION: PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 6-1-1 AS AMENDED TO \$12 MILLION (Ald. Hess-Mahan opposed; Ald. Baker abstaining)**  
**FINANCE APPROVED 4-3-0 AS AMENDED TO \$12 MILLION (Ald. Gentile, Schnipper, Lennon opposed; Ald. Salvucci not voting)**

**NOTE:** Ald. Freedman moved to replace \$10M with \$12M. Both Programs & Services and Finance Committees voted to approve this item as amended to \$12M. The final language for this will be prepared for the full Board meeting.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#88-08(2) ALD. BRANDEL, SANGIOLO AND PARKER proposing that the following question be put before Newton voters:  
“Shall the City of Newton be allowed to exempt from the provisions of Proposition 2 ½ the amounts required to pay for the bond issuance in order to fund certain capital projects?”  
[02-12-08 @ 11:13 AM]

**ACTION:** **PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 4-2-2 AS AMENDED TO “FUND NEWTON NORTH HIGH SCHOOL” (Ald. Freedman, Parker, Sangiolo, Brandel in favor; Ald. Hess-Man, Baker opposed; Ald. Johnson, Merrill abstaining)**  
**FINANCE MOTION TO APPROVE FAILED TO CARRY 2-4-1 AS AMENDED TO “FUND NEWTON NORTH HIGH SCHOOL” (Ald. Freedman, Parker in favor; Ald. Gentile, Coletti, Lennon, Schnipper opposed; Ald. Johnson abstaining; Ald. Salvucci not voting)**

**NOTE:** Ald. Sangiolo said the reason the Brandel plan separated out into a debt exclusion the 2 elementary schools was because since the Mayor was going out for \$5M in design fees, they thought it had already gone through the process. In the meantime, they have learned there was no real discussion within the community about whether or not there should be a renovation or rebuild plan for the elementary schools. She apologized for the confusion and had no problem taking those off the table.

### **Carr School**

Ald. Coletti said that if they were going to do a debt exclusion override ride, it should be for the Carr School. It was a \$5M project that they knew they'd have to make provisions for very shortly. He said they just came up with a plan for 30 year bonding that was going to take care of the high school. He noted that the executive department was proposing the full bond authorization of \$13M to replace all the water meters in the city which would mean a water rate increase. Asking citizens for a debt service override for Newton North, when Newton North was going to last for 50 years, was inappropriate. It would be a nail in the stake of the override. The Carr School would be a much better opportunity for a debt exclusion override, they could stop buying modular classrooms and take back the largest elementary school and get it into good shape while it was empty. He also felt they needed to look at the acquisition of Aquinas College. The sisters were willing to work with the city and take the mortgage back. For short money, they could take another step towards getting the school space they needed. Ald. Sangiolo agreed.

### **Concerns**

Ald. Fischman said he didn't think Programs & Services should vote on an item that was not docketed. It seemed to him that there should be testimony from the Mayor and have finance look at it if it were being changed to Newton North only. Ald. Johnson said that there had been many conversations about this in the past that included Newton North and several other items.

Ald. Gentile said that there would be a Guaranteed Maximum Price sooner rather than later as the Mayor was going to have to ask the Board for the additional bonding. The bond authorization needed to be in place before the City could sign a contract with the construction manager. The sooner they get a GMP and bonding in place, the sooner they can be reimbursed from the state and all this would be moving forward fairly quickly. What would it mean to put a debt exclusion for the high school on the ballot? Ald. Brandel explained that a debt exclusion just excluded debt from the levy. If the debt

exclusion failed in the vote, the high school would be carried as part of the Mayor's financing plan. Ald. Gentile did not think this was the right time for a debt exclusion for the high school. Ald. Albright thought that if the voters voted against a debt exclusion override for the high school and the project went on as planned, that would not be the right action to take. Ald. Swiston said this was just asking the voters for a different voting mechanism for this project. She felt they shouldn't be afraid to ask the question.

Ald. Parker moved approval of this item in Programs & Services to amend this to replace "certain capital projects" with "Newton North High School". He felt the elementary school projects were premature and that the fire stations were small enough that they could be done out of the existing debt plan.

The Programs & Services Committee voted to approve this item by a vote of 4-2-2. The Finance Committee voted to approve this item and the motion failed to carry by a vote of 2-4-1.

#40-08            HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting that the Board of Aldermen call a special election to present the levy limit override ballot question to the voters. [01-29-08 @ 6:12 PM]

**ACTION:**        **APPROVED 7-0 FOR AN ELECTION DATE OF MAY 20, 2008**  
**(Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**

**NOTE:** Ald. Baker recommended the date of Tuesday, May 20, 2008 for the vote. This date gave the Elections Commission adequate time to prepare the ballots and the election.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#23-08(2)        ALD. COLETTI requesting that a non-binding ballot question regarding the city's expenditure of over \$185 million in bond appropriations to construct a new Newton North High School be placed on the proposed override ballot for voter reaction in spring of 2008. [01-15-08 @ 11:15 AM]

**ACTION:**        **NO ACTION NECESSARY 7-0 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**

**NOTE:** A non-binding ballot question can not be done on a non-municipal election so Ald. Johnson moved No Action Necessary.

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#87-08            HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting an appropriation in the amount of \$158,344 from Free Cash in order to supplement funding in the snow and ice control accounts for the Parks and Recreation Department. Any funds unspent will not be transferred to other accounts. [02-12-08 @ 6:20 PM]

**ACTION:**        **PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 7-0 AS AMENDED TO**  
**\$194,434 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**  
**FINANCE APPROVED 7-0 AS AMENDED TO \$194,434 (Ald. Salvucci not voting)**

**REFERRED TO PROGRAMS & SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES**

#107-08 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting an appropriation in the amount of \$40,000 from Free Cash to the Parks and Recreation Department for the purpose of funding removal of trees that have been identified as hazardous. [02-26-08 @ 6:10 PM]

**ACTION:** **PROGRAMS & SERVICES APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**  
**FINANCE APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Salvucci not voting)**

Appointment by His Honor the Mayor

#104-08 MARIETTA MARCHITELLI, 100 Waverley Avenue, Newton, appointed as a Trustee of the Newton History Museum at the Jackson Homestead for a term to expire on February 1, 2011. (60 days: 5-3-08). [02-26-08 @ 3:25 PM]

**ACTION:** **APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**

**NOTE:** Ms. Marchitelli did appear for the meeting, however, due the length of the meeting she was dismissed and the Committee approved her appointment.

Re-appointment by His Honor the Mayor

#103-08 MICHAEL CLARKE, 38 Halcyon Road, Newton Centre, re-appointed as an *Alternate Member* of the Newton Parks & Recreation Commission for a term to expire on January 1, 2011. (60 days: 5-3-08). [02-19-08 @ 3:41 PM]

**ACTION:** **APPROVED 7-0 (Ald. Hess-Mahan not voting)**

Motion to Adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcia Johnson, Chair