

IN BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1980

Present: Chairman John E. Murray, Anne W. Donald and William J. Cossart.

The statutory requirements as to notice having been fulfilled, the meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman John E. Murray in the Flynn Building.

Rules and Regulations - Local Public Hearing Process

On the question of forwarding comments to the Massachusetts Municipal Association, as requested in a communication dated October 2, 1980, relative to a report of the Governor's Commission to Simplify Rules and Regulations, and in particular on the recommendations of the MMA's Subcommittee which worked on the report and the final Commission recommendations, Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson suggested that the Selectmen circulate among themselves a copy of the "Report of the Governor's Commission to Simplify Rules and Regulations" for review.

Regarding the proposed Legislation to Allow Certain Consolidated Public Hearings by Cities and Towns, Selectman Donald referenced page 72, Item #3, pertaining to "Decision of Board", questioning whether one member of any Commission or Board could adequately get answers to the whole committee's questions on the subject under review. During discussion, it was a consensus that the Selectmen should reach a decision as a unit, rather than as individuals. Chairman Murray expressed his opinion that in this proposal only one Selectman's attendance would be required at any one hearing.

Mr. Thompson commented that there have been some local complaints in the area of site plan hearings, but that on the whole the Town of Sudbury has a sufficient hearing procedure. The Selectmen will comment following further investigation of the proposed legislation.

Use of Town Mappings by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc.

The Selectmen received a request dated October 2, 1980, for the firm of Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., to borrow town mappings for its work in updating the Flood Insurance Study for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, particularly involving a hydrologic and hydraulic study of the Sudbury and Concord Rivers and development of a community map for streams included in the existing study; also to allow the Selectmen's Office to be used as a gathering agent for public input for the project.

Responding to Selectman Donald, Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson explained that this project would not be in any way connected with the Sudbury River Water Diversion Project and expanded on the fact that Sudbury is part of the Federal Flood Hazard Program to which this request addresses itself.

Responding to Selectman Cossart regarding the time requirement on the office staff, Mr. Thompson stated that the project would require some time on the part of the Engineering Department.

Following further discussion, the Executive Secretary was directed to discuss this proposal with Town Engineer James V. Merloni since it would require time and use of mylars from the Engineering Department, and report to the Board next week.

Sites for Preservation as Reservoirs

The Board acknowledged receipt of a communication received October 8, 1980, from the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission relative to possible sites for preservation as reservoirs. The Selectmen concurred that no response was required.

Walkway Easement - Haynes Road

Assistant Town Counsel Thomas M. French explained that, although the Town had previously accepted a walkway easement from the owner(s) of Lots 1 and 2 Haynes Road, the property had been sold before the easement had been recorded, but the new owners of said property have been gracious enough to grant us an easement.

It was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To sign and accept on behalf of the Town a walkway easement from David A. and Evelyn H. Pfeifer, Lots 1 and 2 Haynes Road, dated October 8, 1980, as shown on a plan entitled "Compiled Plan of Land in Sudbury, Massachusetts Showing Walkway Easement, Haynes Road", dated May 6, 1980.

Candidates for Vacancy on Sudbury Housing Authority

Chairman Murray referenced a communication dated October 6, 1980, from the Executive Office of Communities and Development, relative to the resignation of James Huston as State appointee to the Sudbury Housing Authority.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson suggested that through the local newspaper anyone interested in that position should be directed to contact the Executive Director of the Sudbury Housing Authority who has applications to be filled out; any further inquiries can be made through the Selectmen's office.

Appointment - Republican Board of Registrars

In accordance with the recommendation of the Chairman of the Sudbury Republican Town Committee, dated October 4, 1980, it was on motion by Selectman Donald unanimously

VOTED: To reappoint Joseph R. Atwood of 114 Mossman Road to the Board of Registrars for a term to expire June 30, 1983.

Contribution in Memory of Beatrice P. Hopkins

Present: Fire Chief Josiah F. Frost.

It was on motion by Selectman Cossart unanimously

VOTED: To accept, on behalf of the Town, a contribution from Mr. and Mrs. Thomas McSorley, made in memory of Mrs. Beatrice P. Hopkins, to be used for ambulance supplies and equipment.

Chief Frost commented that this is the first gift received by the Fire Department in memory of someone. Chairman Murray referenced the Chief's letter of acknowledgment dated October 3, 1980, and on his recommendation, the Executive Secretary was directed to likewise send a letter of appreciation from the Selectmen.

Chairman Murray recessed the meeting at 7:20 p.m.; the meeting was called back to order at 7:30 p.m.

Utility Petitions

Present: Carole Clinton, Boston Edison Company, Richard A. Flier, 65 Ruddock Road, and Ralph M. Holmes, 301 Peakham Road, both abutters; and Steven F. Doyle.

In conformity with General Laws, Chapter 166, Sections 21 and 22, the Board considered the following Utility Petitions:

- UP80-16 - of Boston Edison Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company for permission to erect or construct one (1) guy wire and anchor to be used in common by them, upon, along and across the following way of the Town:  

RUDDOCK ROAD, westerly side, approximately 375 feet north of Balcom Road, One (1) guy wire and anchor.
- UP80-17 - of Boston Edison Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company for permission to erect or construct, and a location for, a pole, and such other fixtures including anchors and guys as may be necessary to sustain or protect the wires of the line, to be used in common by them, upon, along and across the following public way of Town:  

GOODMAN HILL ROAD, northeasterly side, at Kato Drive - One (1) pole (One (1) existing JO pole to be removed).
- UP80-18 - of Boston Edison Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company for permission to erect or construct, and a location for, a pole, and such other fixtures including anchors and guys as may be necessary to sustain or protect the wires of the line, to be used in common by them, upon along and across the following public way of Town:  

STOCK FARM ROAD, northerly side, approximately 10 feet east of Shadow Oak Drive - One (1) pole (One (1) existing JO pole to be removed).
- UP80-19 - for permission to lay and maintain, and a location for, such a  
a&b line of conduits and manholes with the necessary wires and cables therein, under the following public way of the Town:
  - 19a STOCK FARM ROAD, at and southeasterly from Shadow Oak Drive a distance of about 24 feet - conduit from pole 120/11; (Boston Edison Company and New England Telephone)

- 19b        STOCK FARM ROAD, at and southwesterly from Shadow Oak Drive  
            a distance of about 53 feet - Conduit from  
            pole 120/15. (Boston Edison Only)
- UP80-20 - of Boston Edison Company only for permission to lay and  
            maintain, and a location for, such a line of conduits and  
            manholes with the necessary wires and cables therein, under  
            the following public way of the Town:
- PEAKHAM ROAD, westerly approximately 440 feet northeast of  
            Whispering Pines Road, a distance of about 8  
            feet - Conduit.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson reported that all appropriate Town officials and abutters had been notified and that communications had been received from both the Building and Wiring Inspectors, both dated October 3, 1980, recommending the approval of all the above-listed petitions.

Regarding UP80-16, abutter Richard Flier expressed his concern regarding the location of the pole which, it appeared, would be on his lawn. Ms. Clinton of Boston Edison assured Mr. Flier that the pole and anchor would be placed on Town property, approximately 6' back from the existing pole, and explained the necessity of the placement due to the leverage required. Also, Ms. Clinton stated that this is the last pole on the street - the rest of the utility wires are underground - and the weight factor and the curve of the road further necessitated a guy wire and anchor wire at this location. Ms. Clinton stated that she would make every effort to notify the abutters when the anchor and guy wire are installed.

Regarding UP80-20, Mr. Ralph Holmes expressed that he was in favor of the petition for underground service on Peakham Road, as explained above. Ms. Clinton explained that underground service is available to the Holmeses because the new owners of abutting property are willing to have the connection made to the underground service on their property for the Holmes' service.

At the conclusion of discussion it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve Utility Petitions 80-16, 17, 18, 19a, 19b, and 20, all as described above, and as shown on the following plans:

- UP80-16 - "Plan of Ruddock Road, Sudbury, Showing proposed location, guy wire & anchor", dated July 15, 1980.
- UP80-17 - "Plan of Goodman Hill Road, Sudbury, Showing proposed pole relocation", dated June 3, 1980.
- UP80-18 - "Plan of Stock Farm Road, Sudbury, Showing proposed pole relocation", dated May 5, 1980.
- UP80-19a&b- Plans 117A and 117B, both entitled: "Plan of Stock Farm Road - Sudbury, Showing Proposed Conduit Location", and dated May 5, 1980, of Boston Edison Company; and UP80-19a - "New England Telephone and Telegraph Co. No. 9-80, Plan for Proposed Conduit Location", dated August 26, 1980.

UP80-20 - "Plan of Peakham Road - Sudbury, Showing Proposed Conduit Location", dated August 12, 1980.

Joint Meeting with Town Treasurer

Present: Chester Hamilton, Town Treasurer.

Chairman Murray welcomed Town Treasurer Chester Hamilton for the purpose of reviewing the status of the bond offering in connection with the police station addition article and the possibility of the impact thereon of Proposition 2 1/2.

Town Treasurer Chester Hamilton requested a consensus from the Board regarding the term of borrowing \$540,000 for the Police Station addition, as he is nearing completion of the Disclosure Document. Mr. Hamilton commented that it will be difficult to set up a term of bond offering until we know whether Proposition 2 1/2 passes. Mr. Hamilton, however, recommended a short-term (5-year) borrowing, as compared to a 10-year borrowing because of the interest differential of \$90,000. Mr. Hamilton further commented that when Proposition 13 passed in California, it was practically impossible for any municipality to borrow for a period of 6-9 months.

Mr. Hamilton discussed the confusion/doubt, with the passage of Proposition 2 1/2, in the area of limited/restricted opinions from Bond Counsel regarding tax exemption status for persons buying municipal bonds.

Mr. Hamilton commented that the Town is in a very favorable position to borrow at this time, since next year our debt service will drop by \$146,000 and we only have two years of bonding debt left. This may be to our advantage if we have to go to bonding; and with 10-year borrowing, Mr. Hamilton felt he could work in the Police Station. Mr. Hamilton stated that he would borrow for 7-8-9 years to keep within the 2 1/2% limit, if necessary, on the debt service budget.

Mr. Hamilton stated that he would be faced with short-term borrowing in mid-November as a result of the anticipated delay in tax revenues.

Mr. Hamilton replied to Selectman Cossart that he would like to have the Disclosure Document completed by October 30. Selectman Cossart stated that he would not rule out the 10-year borrowing because of the interest differential, and suggested that Town Accountant John Wilson give the Board some insight on this.

At the conclusion of further discussion, Chairman Murray thanked Mr. Hamilton for attending.

Joint Meeting with Edward L. Glazer and Department Heads, Boards, Commissions - Proposition 2 1/2

Present: Edward L. Glazer; various Town Officials, Department Heads and Committee Chairmen and/or Representatives.

Chairman Murray welcomed Edward L. Glazer and the various Town officials and Committee Chairmen and representatives for discussion relative to the impact of Proposition 2 1/2. Chairman Murray commended Mr. Glazer for the excellent report, submitted to the Selectmen, which was in turn distributed to various Town officials and departments/boards/committees with the request that they attend tonight's meeting with a breakdown of budget cuts to accommodate the cutbacks suggested by Town Accountant John H. Wilson in his communication of October 3, 1980.

Mr. Glazer paraphrased the report he had submitted to the Selectmen dated October 7, 1980, and revised October 14, 1980, as follows:

- Proposition 2 1/2 is a petition by the Citizens for Limited Taxation which will appear on the November 4 ballot as a referendum question and will become Massachusetts law 30 days from then, provided 30% of all voters casting votes vote either for or against it. If passed, Proposition 2 1/2 can be amended or repealed by the General Court, subject to the Governor's veto.
- some of the provisions of Proposition 2 1/2 are ambiguous; the major provisions are:
  - 1) 2 1/2 % Property Tax Limit - the total property taxes assessed by cities and towns cannot exceed 2 1/2% of the total fair and market value of those properties; or, the tax rate cannot exceed \$25 per thousand of valuation and in Sudbury's case it would mean a reduction in FY81-82 of \$918,760 or 7.6% of the 80-81 tax levy.
  - 2) Reduction in Motor Vehicle Excise Tax-from \$66 per \$1,000 of value to \$25 per \$1,000 of value - in Sudbury's case, the reduction for FY 80-81 excise receipts of \$652,000.

NOTE: excise tax reductions affect us now FY 80-81; other proposition 2 1/2 items apply to FY 81-82, which will result in a 11% reduction in FY 81-82 Town spending.

- 3) Elimination of Fiscal Autonomy for Local and Regional School Committees.
- 4) Elimination of Compulsory and Binding Arbitration for Police and Firemen.
- 5) Imposes a 104% Limitation on other governmental agencies such as Regional School Districts, Counties and etc., while the Cities and Town are subject to a 2 1/2% tax cap.

Mr. Glazer critiqued Proposition 2 1/2 as follows:

- 1) Local Control to override Proposition 2 1/2 by Sudbury's open Town Meeting would be very difficult because the timing of the election and referendum process.
- 2) Increased Reliance on State - towns, such as Sudbury, will become more dependent on state revenues to support local expenditures.
- 3) No Reduction in Level of State Spending - Proposition 2 1/2 limits local spending, but does not directly impact on the level of State spending.

In summarizing, Mr. Glazer pointed out that Proposition 2 1/2 covers a wide range of financial matters making it difficult to differentiate between those we support and those we do not by voting for or against the entire question; how will the Massachusetts legislature properly interpret our vote?

As a property owner in Sudbury, with a house valued at \$100,000, one can expect to save approximately \$200 on his tax bill and about 62% on his motor vehicle excise tax, while, at the same time, one can expect, or must be willing to accept, reduced Town services as a result of a reduction in Town spending due to the Town's loss of these tax revenues under Proposition 2 1/2.

Chairman Murray called on Town officials, department heads, and committee representatives to comment and/or explain how their budgets could be cut if Proposition 2 1/2 passes, as suggested by the individual hypothetical budgets in a report from the Town Accountant dated October 3, 1980.

(Mr. Thompson offered copies of Mr. Glazer's report through the Selectmen's office.)

Alan Grathwohl - Chairman of Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District Committee  
LSRSDC

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$379,000 plus \$34,000 to accommodate the Town of Lincoln's suggested cutback under Proposition 2 1/2.

Mr. Grathwohl stated that the following possible recommendations may be suggested to the LSRSDC:

- \$60,000 cut by full-funded METCO and special needs programs.
- \$35-37,000 under capital allocations and "creative accounting" cutbacks.
- \$60,000 savings in some areas of providing services.
- \$235,000 frills.
- would like to retain the athletic program.

Fire Chief Josiah F. Frost

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$140,000 including inflation factor.

Chief Frost stated that with a budget based on 92% personal services, in order to accommodate the suggested budget cutback, it would be necessary to make a sizable reduction in personnel, which would result in the closing of one fire station.

(Mr. Thompson commented that it is estimated that Massachusetts will lose twenty million dollars in Revenue Sharing under Proposition 2 1/2.)

Joseph D. LoPresti - Superintendent of Sudbury Public Schools

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$580,707.

Dr. LoPresti stated that the obvious place to begin a budget cutback of the magnitude suggested would be in the staff which comprises 80% of the Sudbury Public Schools' budget - 169 teachers staffed now would be reduced by 30 teachers, plus cutbacks in other accounts and workshops, which means a severe cutback in the level of service and quality of education.

Betsey M. Powers - Town Clerk

Mrs. Powers stated that the Town Clerk's budget fluctuates from year to year depending on the number of elections per year. Her FY81-82 budget will be less than FY80-81 because there will be less elections. The cost for a November election is about \$3,000 whereas an annual Town election costs about \$1,900. Responding to Mr. Grathwohl, Mrs. Powers said that elections could not be combined because the qualifications of voters are not the same.

Chester Hamilton - Town Treasurer

Hypothetical Budget: \$300,669 Debt Service

- Debt Service will be reduced by \$146,000 in the next Fiscal Year because it represents bond interest and principal on a school which is being paid off now.

- the problem will be with the police station addition bonding factor - with 10-year bonding the debt service budget will be \$299,000.

- the budget showed an increase last year due to the Disclosure Document preparation; next Fiscal Year may require only an updating of the Document.

Janet Smith - Goodnow Library

Mrs. Smith stated that a cutback in the Library's budget would mean a reduction in staff and Saturday and Sunday closing of the Library.

Joseph E. Scammon - Building Inspector

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$15,396.

- close the Hosmer House to save \$7,400.

- dismiss one custodian.

- reduce some supplies and repairs.

Joseph J. Slomski - Finance Committee

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$300.

- main concern, no recourse to override Proposition 2 1/2 where local budgets are concerned.

- visualized the Finance Committee getting very involved with all budget cuts.



(There was a brief discussion regarding the outcome of Proposition 2 1/2 and it was noted that depending on how strong the vote was, the legislature could substantially change it or provide alternatives to Proposition 2 1/2.)

Chairman Murray read a communication dated October 14, 1980, from the Board of Assessors, which indicated that to cut back \$4,366 it would be necessary to eliminate the Assessors' travel money and reduce salaries to \$1.00 each. Also, it would be necessary to keep assessments at 100% (i.e. the \$16,000 Special Town Meeting article appropriation) - the only other option would be to eliminate a part-time clerk and reduce services accordingly.

John Lindgren - Assistant Highway Surveyor

Hypothetical Budget Cut: \$91,345,

- \$12,000 position open for a heavy equipment operator which would not be filled.

- reduce the extra hire account by 50%.
- eliminate \$8,000 in the overtime account.
- reduce by 41% snow/ice outside contracts.
- cut 12% across the board.

In total services, Highway Surveyor Robert Noyes stated that the Department would have to do more in-house to cut down on outside contracts - this would mean a cutback on services by the Department. There could be charges for certain services, such as: curb cuts and permits, etc. Mr. Noyes said that the drainage program could be eliminated.

Sergeant Peter B. Lembo - Police Department

Sergeant Lembo read Police Chief Lombardi's report dated October 9, 1980, which indicated cuts in various line items totaling \$72,000 with the largest cut being in the overtime account or the possible laying off of 5 patrolmen.

Isabelle Stone - Tax Collector

- \$2,000 for equipment which she will not need again.
- attorney fees are always subject to change depending on tax titles.

Judith Cope - Chairman of Conservation Commission

- would like to keep her secretary.
- land purchase budget could be reduced.
- cut down on consultant fees and use the Engineering Department, if possible.

James V. Merloni - Engineering Department

- cuts would be essentially in personnel since the budget is 94% personnel services and 6% maintenance.

John C. Cutting - Planning Board

- special studies line item would be reduced.

John H. Wilson - Town Accountant

In the 950 account, \$20,000 a year is for unemployment; this would go up to close to \$450,000, not including the Regional; however, there would be a reduction in benefits.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson referenced an October 14, 1980, communication from the Administrative Secretary indicating reductions in the 501 Selectmen's budget to reach the hypothetical budget cut of \$9,000 including clerical reductions and a budget decrease of \$4,080 in the 503 law account.

At the conclusion of discussion, Chairman Murray suggested that budget reductions be submitted in writing to the Selectmen's office. Selectman Donald added that areas which positively cannot be cut should also be included in the information submitted.

Chairman Murray thanked everyone for attending tonight's Proposition 2 1/2 meeting, and again thanked Mr. Glazer for a job well done.

The meeting was recessed at 9:20 p.m. for coffee; the meeting was called back to order at 9:35 p.m.

Survey of Licenses and Fees

Town Hall Rental by Sudbury Players

Present: Edward Shulkin, President, and Janet Monahan, Business Manager, both of Sudbury Players.

President of the Sudbury Players, Edward Shulkin, submitted and read to the Board their communication dated October 14, 1980, to the Selectmen in response to notification from the Executive Secretary of the Board's desire to raise the rental fee for the Town Hall facility, as discussed at its meeting of September 15th.

Mr. Shulkin stated that, although the Sudbury Players felt and understood that it was necessary to raise the rental fee for economic purposes, the timing was such that it would be very difficult for the Sudbury Players to absorb this increased rate as their budget for the season had already been calculated at the lower rental cost and to raise the cost of ticket sales would also involve higher sponsor fees and other considerations.

Mr. Thompson commented that the Selectmen are dealing with approximately 160 permits, licenses and fees, and that the Sudbury Players should not feel

singled out. Also, the higher rates in the Town Hall facility are low compared to surrounding churches and buildings, some of which Mr. Thompson mentioned, and it was still questionable whether or not these increases would, in fact, cover the cost of the additional fuel which would be used.

Selectman Donald suggested that perhaps a special arrangement could be worked out in the case of the Sudbury Players since they use the Town Hall so frequently. During discussion, it was mutually agreed that it might be more appropriate for the Selectmen to waive the increased fee, as suggested by Chairman Murray, rather than create special exceptions for the Players.

Responding to Selectman Cossart, Mr. Shulkin explained the following schedule of the Players: 8 weeks of three evenings during the winter; and 6 weeks of three evenings in the spring.

Also responding to Selectman Cossart, both Mr. Shulkin and Ms. Monahan concurred that using other stages for rehearsals would not be recommended, because it is extremely important for performers to know their environment.

Mr. Thompson commented about the school closings and the ramifications of the Town Hall offices. The Loker School Cultural Center was also commented upon and it was learned that a decision was expected to be made tonight in Wayland on that. On the recommendation of Chairman Murray, the Selectmen suggested that the Players contact Mrs. Joan Grathwohl, Acting Chairman of the Sudbury Local Arts Council, for some discussion and possible coordination of some of their activities relative to their possible future use of space in Town public facilities. Mr. Shulkin stated that the Players would contact Mrs. Grathwohl and thanked the Selectmen for that suggestion.

Following the conclusion of discussion it was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To adopt the proposed revisions of the Selectmen's Policy for Use of Town Hall Facilities with the recommended fee changes to become effective June 1, 1981, unless the actual cost relating to utilities necessitates raising/adjusting those fees at that time.

The Selectmen agreed that, by holding the new fee schedule until next June 1st, it would allow a more accurate picture of actual costs of utilities.

#### United Presbyterian Church Application

Following discussion relative to the September 4, 1980, application from the United Presbyterian Church of Sudbury, to use the Town Hall for church school classes on Sunday mornings, it was a consensus that for a small group of young children there is probably a more appropriate place within Town buildings, such as the Loring Parsonage or the Finance Committee meeting room in the Flynn Building, which they could use and which would not require so much heat. The Selectmen directed the Executive Secretary to convey this message to the representative of the Presbyterian Church, and to also inform them that they will be allowed to continue to use the lower Town Hall until other arrangements are made.

Mr. Thompson commented that the Willow School uses the Town Hall facility on a regular basis, but it is usually during the day and, therefore, does not necessitate additional heat.

Selectman Donald asked what the policy was for use of the Town Hall by the Girl Scouts, since she had received more than one request recently. Mr. Thompson explained that generally he would not encourage routine use of the Town Hall by the Girl Scouts because very often it is used by official Town groups for various reasons; however, Mr. Thompson stated that it might be available on an occasional basis.

#### Survey of Licenses and Permits

Mr. Thompson references the October 9, 1980, communication from the Administrative Secretary, Janet Silva, which addressed concerns/comments by Selectman Cossart at the Board's September 15th meeting regarding the Survey of Licenses and Permits. In addition, Mr. Thompson commented that the Building Department and the Board of Health have updated their fee schedules for permits and licenses.

Mr. Thompson further commented that a recommended fee change under the Selectmen's schedule might be appropriate now dealing with liquor licenses; at the Board's direction, Mr. Thompson is to schedule a meeting with license holders, as soon as possible, to discuss the same, since license renewals must be completed in November.

#### Coatings Engineering Corporation Site Plan Scale

Chairman Murray referenced a communication dated October 8, 1980, from Coatings Engineering Corporation requesting the Selectmen to waive requirement 1.c of the Selectmen's Site Plan Submission Rules and Regulations to allow Coatings to submit a site plan with a scale of 1"=40'.

Selectman Cossart commented that his initial reaction was not to endorse this request due to their performance, adding for the same reason he voted against the permit for additional storage on March 28, 1979.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson replied to Selectman Cossart that all other changes were made on the plan in accordance with the Building Inspector's communication of October 3, 1980 to Coatings.

Selectman Cossart suggested that perhaps the Board should consider amending the Selectmen's Submission Rules and Regulations. Mr. Thompson did not feel that was necessary since any applicants submitting new site plans in the future would be required to use the 1"=20' scale. Chairman Murray added that in this case, Coatings is submitting for the purpose of showing an "as built" plan; it was not a new site plan.

At the conclusion of discussion it was on motion by Selectman Cossart unanimously

VOTED: To waive requirement 1.c of the Selectmen's Site Plan Submission Rules and Regulations to allow Coatings Engineering Corporation to submit a site plan with a scale of 1"=40', as requested in their communication dated October 8, 1980.

Mr. Thompson responded to Selectman Donald, that the plan will be approved by the Building Inspector following a determination by him that it is in compliance.

Confirming Action Regarding Site Plans

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To confirm action of the Board on October 6, 1980, of approving and signing the following site plans:

- a. #80-222 of Joseph C. deFranco for property at One Union Avenue, plan having been revised in accordance with the Board's vote of August 25, 1980, and pertinent release relative to sub-drain tie-in to Town storm drains having been obtained from Mr. deFranco.
- b. #80-219 of Sousa Oil Company for property at 475-477 Boston Post Road, plan having been updated with as-built conditions and storage tanks installed in accordance with the Board's vote of July 28, 1980.

Minutes

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve the minutes of the Town Fathers Forum of September 22, 1980, and the Executive Session of October 6, 1980, both as drafted; and to approve the minutes of the Regular Session of October 6, 1980, as amended.

Current Items of Interest

Dog Pound

Chairman Murray asked Selectman Cossart to comment on the status of the lease for the Dog Pound. Selectman Cossart assured the Board that he would follow up on that, since he had been waiting to hear from Mrs. DeWallace's attorney. Assistant Town Counsel Thomas M. French stated that the office had received a communication from her attorney, and that he would see that Selectman Cossart received a copy of it.

Cease and Desist - Belcher Drive

Selectman Donald questioned the status of the Cease and Desist Order Belcher Drive. The Executive Secretary and Assistant Town Counsel briefly commented on the possible suit to get a declaratory judgment to determine the authority on those lots on Belcher Drive.

Sudbury River Diversion

Selectman Donald informed the Board that she attended the Conservation Commission's last meeting, and there was some discussion with Wayland Consultant Jerome Carr, as to what steps Sudbury should take concerning the Sudbury River Diversion.

Selectman Donald said that some topics under discussion were the Beckett well, Hop Brook and the necessity of a professional advisor (concerning the Sudbury River diversion) for Sudbury, and that she would report further to the Board.

Capital Improvement Program

Responding to Selectman Cossart, Mr. Thompson informed the Board that he had requested all boards under the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen, who planned to submit Capital Improvement Programs to the Long Range Capital Expenditures Committee, to submit them first to the Board of Selectmen for review.

Haynes Property/Flynn Building Work

Responding to Selectman Cossart, Mr. Thompson stated that he spoke to Highway Surveyor Robert Noyes, who assured the Executive Secretary that he would give the project on the Haynes Property, next to the Flynn Building, top priority. There have been some changes in the original plans with mutual consent.

Town Bounds

Selectman Cossart reminded the Executive Secretary that he should follow-up with the Town Engineer on the missing Town bounds.

Letter of Appreciation to Police Chief

Selectman Cossart directed the Executive Secretary to prepare a letter of appreciation to the Police Chief, on behalf of the Board, expressing their gratitude for the efforts of his Department in the area of control/enforcement of juvenile crime, etc.

Communications

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson referenced receipt of the following communications:

- from Town Counsel Paul L. Kenny, dated October 10, 1980, written to Mr. Bernard J. Kane, relative to the location of his septic system on his neighbor's property.
- from the Town of Wayland Highway Department, dated October 8, 1980, informing the Board of Selectmen that Wayland cannot change the working hours at their Sanitary Landfill at this time, as requested by the Town of Sudbury.
- from the House of Representatives, dated October 8, 1980, informing the Town of a Public Hearing on Local Aid Formulae to be held on Monday, October 20, 1980, in Room 236 of the State House.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Attest:

Richard E. Thompson  
Executive Secretary