

IN BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1981

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.

Utility Petitions

Present: Carole Clinton, Boston Edison Company; and Mrs. Seigars, new customer/property owner, Goodman's Hill Road.

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

UP81-4 of Boston Edison Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company for permission to erect or construct, and a location for, poles, 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 the Town:

Boston Post Road, southerly side opposite Stone Road,
One (1) pole.

UP81-5a,b of New England Telephone and Telegraph Company and Boston Edison Company, for permission to erect or construct, and a location for, poles, 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 the Town:

UP81-5a - Mossman Road, northeasterly side approximately 668 feet
northwest of Stone Root Lane,
One (1) Hip guy and anchor.

UP81-5b - Mossman Road, southeasterly side from a point approximately
292 feet northeast of Willis Road,
Two (2) poles
(Two (2) existing J.O. Poles to be removed).

UP81-6 of Boston Edison Company 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:

Goodman's Hill Road, easterly approximately 615 feet northwest of Boston
Post Road, a distance of about 6 feet.
Conduit.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson reported that all appropriate Town officials and abutters had been notified and that a favorable report had been received from the Wiring and Building Inspectors, dated March 17, 1981.

Ms. Carole Clinton of Boston Edison Company showed the plans of the above-listed utility petitions and briefly explained as follows:

UP81-4 is for a new pole for a guy wire to support existing pole #24, opposite Stone Road; the new pole is to be placed on Town property.

UP81-5a,b is for the relocation of two poles and placement of one hip guy and anchor on Mossman Road, necessitated by the construction of the walkway on that road.

UP81-6 is to provide approximately 100 feet of underground service on Goodman's Hill Road for a new home to be constructed on that road.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve Utility Petitions 81-4 -5a,b and -6, all as described above, and as shown on the following plans:

UP81-4 - "Plan of Private Property and Boston Post Rd., Sudbury, Showing Proposed Pole Location and Guy Wire and Anchor", dated January 13, 1981.

UP81-5a - "Plan of Private Property Off Mossman Rd., Sudbury Showing Proposed Locations of Hip Guys", dated January 22, 1981.

UP81-5b - "Plan of Mossman Rd., Sudbury Showing Proposed Pole Locations", dated January 22, 1981.

UP81-6 - "Plan of Goodman's Hill Rd., Sudbury Showing Proposed Conduit Locations", dated January 22, 1981.

MBTA Advisory Board - Assessment to Sudbury

The Selectmen reviewed a communication dated March 3, 1981, to MBTA Designee Clifford Hughes from the MBTA Advisory Board indicating an assessment to the Town of Sudbury in the amount of \$200 for the calendar year 1981.

During discussion it was noted that this assessment is to support the Advisory Board, and the Selectmen expressed varying positions. The Board also expressed uncertainty as to the consequences of the dissipation of the Advisory Board as a result of it not receiving the necessary financial support.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson stated that Mr. Hughes recommends against the Board's support, based on the opinion that the MBTA's budget should include the financial support necessary to keep the Advisory Board functional; accordingly, the yearly MBTA assessment to the Town of Sudbury should support its share of the Advisory Board budget.

Selectmen Cossart and Donald expressed concern that if we did not pay the assessment, the paid staff of the Advisory Board would be let go and this would not be in the best interest of the Town; it being our only salvation in the whole process.

At the conclusion of discussion the Executive Secretary was directed to respond to the MBTA Advisory Board requesting further clarification to the concerns noted above and to so inform Mr. Hughes.

Selectman Cossart added that Mr. Thomas Carroll had expressed to him his desire to work in the capacity of MBTA designee from the Town of Sudbury in the event that Mr. Hughes decides he no longer wishes to serve in that capacity. Mr. Thompson stated that he would so inform Mr. Hughes, adding that Mr. Hughes is very active and seemingly still very interested in serving the Town as MBTA designee.

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To table taking any action relative to an expenditure of \$200 from Account 501-81, Surveys & Studies, for the 1981 MBTA Advisory Board assessment, pending further information/comment from the MBTA Advisory Board and/or Mr. Clifford Hughes, MBTA designee.

Change Orders - Police Station Construction

Present: Michael E. Melnick and James F. Goodman, Permanent Building Committee (PBC).

Change Order No. 3

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To authorize the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen to sign Change Order No. 3 for a deduction of \$379.00 - a change in insurance and brick coursing - in the Construction Contract dated October 6, 1980, with Hugo Construction Co., Inc., for alterations and additions to the Police Station; said Change Order was signed by representatives of Kubitz and Pepi Architects, Inc., and Hugo Construction Co., on March 3 and 5, respectively.

Change Order No. 4

Chairman Murray called the Board's attention to Item #1 of Change Order No. 4, for addition of \$5,375 for the installation of a fire alarm system, and referenced a communication from the Police Chief dated March 23, 1981, in which the Chief points out that such a system is not mandatory, and that, if additional funds were to be expended, his first priority would be a closed circuit television system.

PBC member Michael Melnick expressed understanding of the Police Chief's position, but stated that, although the Fire Alarm System is not mandatory under State statute, the Fire Chief strongly favors its installation. There is some money in the construction account to put back some of those items originally taken out, and the Fire Alarm System is one of those items. Mr. Melnick further stated that the PBC's recommendation is to install smoke detectors at least in the cell area, and wire in the rest of the area without fuxtures. Mr. Melnick stated that the Architects are in the process of preparing a final cost estimate for the television monitoring system, which will show some escalation over the 1980 figure. Mr. Melnick expressed his opinion that the cost might be around \$10,000.

The Selectmen were in concurrence that, when the PBC meets with the Police Chief and the Architects at their usual Wednesday morning meeting, they discuss the matter further in light of tonight's conversation and get back to the Board.

At the conclusion of discussion it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To table any action on Item #1 on Change Order #4 for an addition of \$5,375 - the installation of a fire alarm system - in the Construction Contract dated October 6, 1980, with Hugo Construction Co., Inc.; for alterations and additions to the Police Station, pending further recommendations from the Permanent Building Committee;

and it was further

VOTED: To authorize the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen to sign a revised Change Order No. 4, to be prepared by Hugo Construction Co., Inc., and delivered to the Selectmen's office, which is to include Items #2-5, as noted on the original Change Order No. 4, signed by a representative of Kubitz and Pepi Architects, Inc., on March 17, 1981.

Public Hearing: Street Layouts

Present: Town Engineer James V. Merloni and seventeen abutters.

Chairman Murray convened a public hearing for the purpose of the Board voting and signing layouts of Town ways in conjunction with Articles 21 and 22 of the 1981 Annual Town Meeting for street acceptances.

Town Engineer James V. Merloni stated that when a private way becomes a public way (which is the purpose of these articles) the Town takes over the maintenance of that road - plowing, sweeping, drainage, re-surfacing, etc. Additionally, the Town becomes liable for any injury incurred on that public way caused as a result of any disrepair of the road. (Presently the abutters are liable. Town Counsel concurred.)

Mr. Merloni referenced the plans of the layouts, which were displayed on the back wall of the hall, and addressed several of the questions/concerns raised by the abutters, as follows:

- With the exception of East Street, there are no plans at this time for takings, physical changes to the road(s), sidewalks, and/or widenings.

- The layouts will have no effect on the real estate taxes of any of the property on the road(s).

- On East Street, a turn-around is proposed as part of the layout. (It was a consensus of the East Street abutters present that a turn-around would simply encourage more unnecessary traffic and/or parking at the end of East Street. The abutters agreed that vehicles, including emergency vehicles, have plenty of room to turn around as the road is presently constructed.)

- If the Water District decided to use their property, located at the end of East Street, for a garage (or for any other purpose) it would have to go before Town Meeting or an Annual Water District meeting for approval before it could be used as such.

Town Counsel responded to abutters that there are some sub-divisions where the "use" of streets is precluded, but a public way is open to the public. Town Counsel added that, based on the information he has, residents of East Street cannot stop people from using that road. The abutters assured the Selectmen that this was not one of their concerns, but again stated that they are concerned about additional parking and litter problems in the event the turn-around were enlarged (as planned under this article) at the end of the Street.

The East Street abutters were in agreement that it would not be to their advantage to have the Town layout East Street as a public way and create a turn-around at the end of East Street. Abutter Robert D. McCart, 19 East Street, presented the Board with a petition dated March 23, 1981, signed by 17 East Street abutters (the majority) opposing Article 22.

Mr. McCart told the Board that he received a verbal concurrence of this petition from Mr. Louis Yered, property owner on East Street, now residing in California.

It was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To reject the proposed Town layout of and turn-around on East Street, in conjunction with Article 22 of the 1981 Annual Town Meeting, as requested by the majority of the abutters of property located on that street (see petition dated March 23, 1981);

and it was further

VOTED: To move indefinite postponement of said Article 22 at the 1981 Annual Town Meeting;

and it was further

VOTED: To approve and sign the layouts for the following Town Ways: Adams Road, Silver Hill Road, Sunset Path, Thunder Road and Wilshire Street, as shown on the following plans, all "as laid out by the Town of Sudbury":

- "Plan of Adams Road, Sudbury, Massachusetts", dated February 16, 1981;
- "Plan of Silver Hill Road, Sudbury, Massachusetts", dated February 24, 1981;
- "Plan of Sunset Path, Sudbury, Massachusetts", dated February 10, 1981;
- "Plan of Thunder Road, Sudbury, Massachusetts", dated February 10 & 13, 1981; and
- "Plan of a Portion of Wilshire Street, Sudbury, Massachusetts", dated February 2, 1981.

Public Hearing: Federal Revenue Sharing Funds

Present: Town Accountant John H. Wilson and Town Treasurer Chester Hamilton.

In accordance with the Federal Revenue Sharing Act regulations, Chairman Murray opened a Public Hearing to consider the use of Federal Revenue Sharing (FRS) Funds as an offset to the total Town of Sudbury Budget for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982.

There was no written citizen input and no citizens appeared for the hearing.

Executive Secretary Richard E. Thompson referenced a communication dated March, 1981, from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, enclosing a check on the amount of \$6,230.00 representing a percentage of the adjusted current value of refuge lands, in accordance with Public Law 88-523. In accordance with the terms of the U.S.C. 715s, such proceeds are to be expended for the benefit of public schools and roads.

It was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To use monies received from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, in the amount of \$6,230.00, received under date of March 1981, to equally offset Town of Sudbury Budget Account #110, Sudbury Schools, and Account #400, Highway, in accordance with the terms of U.S.C. 715s.

Mr. Wilson stated that he would inform the Finance Committee of the Board's action.

MBTA Assessment Formula Data

The Board noted receipt of a communication dated March 6, 1981, from the MBTA Treasurer-Controller in response to the Board's request for assessment formula data, and directed the Executive Secretary to forward a copy of the same to the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, Town of Maynard, and to Clifford Hughes, MBTA designee.

Massachusetts Municipal Association (MMA) Bill H-2892

It was on motion by Selectman Donald unanimously

VOTED: To support the Massachusetts Municipal Association's Legislative Position Paper No. 2 - Community Residence Siting Bill H-2892 dated February 28, 1981, and to so inform Senator Chester Atkins and Representative Lucile Hicks, with a copy to James W. Segal, Director, MMA.

Transfer Request - Fire Department Maintenance, Account 310-31

Present: Fire Chief Josiah F. Frost.

Following a brief explanation by the Fire Chief, it was on motion by Selectman Cossart unanimously

VOTED: To approve request for transfer No. 1004, dated March 19, 1981, from the Reserve Fund to Fire Department Maintenance, Account No. 310-31 for repair of the heating system in Station 2, increased fuel costs, and equipment maintenance, as noted on the above-numbered transfer and as requested by the Fire Chief in his communication of March 19, 1981.

Relocated Utility Poles, Landham Road

The Board noted receipt of a communication dated March 18, 1981, from the Town Engineer expressing his concurrence with the relocation of Boston Edison poles on Landham Road, in conjunction with Utility Petition #81-1.

Town Casualty Insurance

Present: Town Accountant John H. Wilson and Town Treasurer Chester Hamilton.

The Board was in receipt of a communication/report, dated March 19, 1981, from Town Accountant John H. Wilson, submitted at the request of the Selectmen following their joint meeting with the Insurance Advisory Committee (IAC) to discuss that Committee's recommendations/dated February 2, 1981, regarding updating the Town's insurance coverage.

During discussion with Mr. Wilson regarding his recommendations, as noted in his report of the 19th, Mr. Wilson expressed support of the IAC's recommendation to delete the "special risk accident policy", which we now purchase annually from the Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company for \$3,000, and instead deposit that amount into a special interest-bearing account to be used to pay directly for any medical costs incurred by Police and Fire Department employees from injuries - a method of self-insuring, which would save money and eliminate one policy.

Chief Frost expressed his opinion that the special risk accident policy should be retained, since this policy has been in effect for a very long time and is part of the Fire Department's contract. (The Chief was referring to a provision in the Department's current contract which restricts any insurance coverage changes.)

At the conclusion of discussion, the Board concurred with the recommended policy and resultant budget changes of the IAC and the Town Accountant, as noted in the Town Accountant's report of March 19, subject to further consultation on the matter of becoming self-insurer with the IAC and the Town Accountant, in accordance with tonight's comments from the Fire Chief.

Minutes

It was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of March 12, 1981, and the Regular Session of March 18, 1981, both as amended; and the minutes of the Executive Session of March 18, 1981, as drafted.

Future Bonding

Present: Town Treasurer Chester Hamilton and Town Accountant John H. Wilson.

Chairman Murray stated the purpose of this meeting was to try and come to an agreement with the Town Treasurer as to whether or not the amount of money estimated for Fiscal 82 for Debt Service would be adequate.

Mr. Hamilton stated his opinion that the Debt Service budget had been presented conservatively, and that he could not be sure that the amount budgeted was adequate, simply because we are guessing on what the borrowing next year will be. Mr. Hamilton explained that the prime rate will be approximately 14% next fall, and that the Town's rate would be approximately one half of the prime rate. Mr. Hamilton went on to say that the amount recommended by the Finance Committee for Temporary Borrowing under the Debt Service budget (\$100,000) was most likely based on two borrowings of Two Million Dollars each at a rate of 10, 9 and 8%, and that in his opinion the line item was underestimated. Mr. Hamilton stated that the borrowing this year was more than what the Town has ever borrowed in its history, and that he did not feel this would happen again.

Chairman Murray asked what the Town received on interest from our investing borrowings now. Mr. Hamilton said that the Town receives twice what the borrowing cost is from investment of the money borrowed before expending it for the intended purpose.

Chairman Murray asked about the possibility of combining all the trust funds, etc., and investing them. Mr. Hamilton responded that this could be done, but that it would not amount to a very large investment. Town Counsel concurred with the Treasurer and added that, if the funds were invested, they would have to be conservative investments such as savings accounts, term certificates, and stock, but that if it were not a cash transaction, there would be no interest involved.

On the subject of the Harry Rice Will, the Board expressed concern of the time lapse in not hearing anything since a large portion of Mr. Rice's estate is to come to the Town. The Executive Secretary was directed to get a status report on the same from Attorney John C. Powers.

Chairman Murray thanked Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Wilson for their attendance this evening.

Chairman Murray recessed the meeting at 9:25 p.m.; the meeting was called back to order at 9:30 p.m.

Joint Meeting with Finance Committee and Assessors

Present: Michael J. Cronin, Jr., and Stefanie W. Reponen, Finance Committee; and Assessor Donald P. Peirce (came in later).

Chairman Murray stated that the purpose of tonight's meeting with the Finance Committee and the Assessors was to attempt again to arrive at some consensus in light of Proposition 2½ on two major points: 1) should we expend to the maximum allowed under Proposition 2½, as addressed in the Selectmen's letter of March 4, 1981, to the Finance Committee; and 2) whether or not we should proceed with Town Meeting monied articles or adjourn to a date certain when we might have firmer information on the January 1, 1981 property valuation, Cherry Sheet figures, etc.

Mr. Michael Cronin of the Finance Committee responded that the Finance Committee has not reached a consensus to date, but that this will be a topic of discussion at their next meeting this coming Thursday.

Mr. Cronin expressed that his main concern is that the January 1, 1981, property valuation inflation factor is not a firm figure, and that they have nothing from the Board of Assessors indicating this factor. After some discussion, Mr. Peirce replied that it should be possible to have a final figure by mid-May or early June.

Mr. Cronin expressed his preference to use unallocated funds close to a maximum allowed under Proposition 2 1/2 but to be prudent in holding some funds in reserve in case we get hit hard by the Cherry Sheet, and a lesser than now estimated inflation factor for property values as of January 1, 1981.

Mrs. Stefanie Reponen of the Finance Committee responded that in her opinion we should postpone Town Meeting to a date certain when we have better information but should be prepared if Town Meeting desires to proceed, to recommend where current estimated unallocated funds should be budgeted.

Mr. Peirce brought those in attendance up-to-date by stating that he and McGee and Magane had analyzed the 1980 sales, and they showed that a 12% inflation factor was a conservative figure and would withstand any challenge by the State when the State determined a factor based on their own analysis of 1980 sales.

In response to Mr. Cronin, Mr. Peirce stated he did not know when the State would conduct their sales analysis.

Also in response to Mr. Cronin, Mr. Peirce stated that they had submitted all the 1980 property sales on Form 3S to the Bureau of Local Assessment two weeks ago, which had to be done by March 31, indicating that the Assessors proposed to increase assessments by a uniform percentage factor as of January 1, 1981.

Mr. Cronin asked Mr. Peirce if the Assessors would be willing to give them in writing a statement verifying the 12% 1980 residential housing inflation factor. Mr. Peirce replied that he had done the analysis, but the other two Assessors had not, and that he would be willing to discuss the same with the full Board of Assessors and respond to the Finance Committee.

Selectman Cossart strongly suggested that we should proceed with the best estimates possible at this time that have been analyzed and projected by the Board of Assessors with the help of the Town Treasurer, the Town Accountant and the Selectmen's office, and that he did not feel it was necessary to make the Assessors put it in writing.

On the subject of so-called Cherry Sheet figures, Chairman Murray referenced the Town Accountant's letter of March 23, which in part recommended that we proceed with Town Meeting with the estimates available today, and referenced the preliminary notice of estimated charges and receipts (Cherry Sheet) for Fiscal Year 1982 from the Department of Revenue (received today) which shows our original estimates per charges and receipts were within \$14,000.

Mr. Cronin stated that the Finance Committee at its meeting last Thursday had taken straw votes and allocated a total of One Million additional dollars to certain departments but again expressed concern that this may be a soft figure, but that the Finance Committee would be addressing this issue again next Thursday. Chairman Murray indicated that the Board of Selectmen would be present at that meeting to further discuss this issue with the whole Finance Committee.

On the question of whether or not to proceed with Town Meeting with the monied articles or adjourn to a date certain, Mr. Cronin stated that he would poll his committee on this subject next Thursday.

Chairman Murray thanked everyone for attending tonight's meeting and expressed his hope that the Finance Committee and the Selectmen could arrive at a consensus next Thursday.

Trade-in - Trojan Loader, Highway Department

In the absence of the Highway Surveyor, it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To table taking any action regarding the procedure of trading in a 1973 Trojan loader by the Highway Department, as recommended by the Highway Surveyor in a communication dated March 18, 1981.

Current Items of Interest

Town Bounds

The Board acknowledged receipt of a response, dated March 17, 1981, from the Town of Hudson, stating their willingness to join with Sudbury in a perambulation of a mutual Town boundary for re-placement of a bound marker. Before scheduling a joint meeting on site with representatives of the Town of Hudson, the Executive Secretary was directed to confirm with the Town Engineer that this bound involves only the two towns - Hudson and Sudbury.

Old Sudbury Road - Flashing Speed Control Signal

In response to a question from Selectman Cossart, Chairman Murray informed the Board that Safety/Juvenile Officer William Carroll has been in contact with the State Department of Public Works, District 4, regarding the possibility of installing a flashing speed control signal on Old Sudbury Road. The Selectmen agreed that the ideal time for the installation would be sometime before school opens in the fall when it is anticipated that a larger number of children will be walking to the Peter Noyes School. Selectman Murray noted that the cost of the installation would be paid by the Town, following which the Town could apply to the State for reimbursement. Chairman Murray added that the Town does not qualify for the installation of a second signal at the School's furthest exit/entrance on Concord Road (this is also the area where the walkway crosses Concord Road) because of its distance and physical relationship to Noyes School. Chairman Murray stated that Officer Carroll would get back to the Board with the actual figures for the installation. Mr. Thompson added that in order to accommodate installation before school opens, this expenditure could be handled through the Finance Committee with a Reserve Fund Transfer.

Dudley Road

On the recommendation of Selectman Cossart, the Board directed the Executive Secretary to inform the Town Engineer that the Selectmen would like to review his final report/comments of the Dudley Road hearing (traffic problems) prior to the same becoming available to the public; and, if possible, at its next meeting April 1, 1981.

Unlicensed Dogs

On the recommendation of Selectman Cossart, the Board directed the Executive Secretary to inform Dog Officer Betsy M. DeWallace of the Board's request that she proceed with the filing of formal complaints against the owners of unlicensed dogs for the calendar year 1980 through the South Middlesex District Court.

(Later in the evening, the following Current Items of Interest were discussed:)

Grant Application - Council on Aging/ACTION

On the recommendation of the Executive Secretary it was on motion by Chairman Murray unanimously

VOTED: To authorize the Executive Secretary to file an application, on behalf of the Council on Aging, through the ACTION Mini-Grant Program for the funding of transportation of the elderly, and to sign and execute all contracts and documents related thereto.

Communications Received

The Board acknowledged receipt of the following communications:

- 1) from Town Counsel concurring with a letter from Building Inspector Joseph E. Scammon, dated February 26, 1981, to the Chairman of the Wayland/Sudbury Septage Disposal Facility Operational Review Committee, especially noting that formal site plan approval is not required for the Septage Facility;
- 2) from Ms. Judy Mack of 51 Hudson Road, dated March 15, 1981, commenting on the open space tax classification. The Executive Secretary was directed to respond to the same;
- 3) from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, received March 20, 1981, submitting the Middlesex County Assessment, showing a total assessment for July 1, 1981, through June 30, 1982, of \$302,357.00;
- 4) from the State Department of Environmental Quality Engineering (DEQE), dated March 13, 1981, to Coatings Engineering Corporation, relative to the possible expiration on March 27, 1981, of the DEQE's conditional approval of Coatings' Final Engineering Report and Plans, unless specified data is received as requested by the DEQE; and
- 5) from the Wayland Highway Department, dated March 18, 1981, relative to resolving the matter of debris along Route 20 from the Sudbury Landfill area. The Selectmen agreed that this should be handled by Highway Surveyor Robert A. Noyes, who also received a copy of this communication.

Middlesex County Advisory Board - Budget Committee Alert

Following discussion, it was on motion unanimously

VOTED: To support the Chairman of the Middlesex County Advisory Board's position paper received in the Selectmen's office March 23, 1981, specifically, 1) that any additional monies that must be spent by Middlesex County for Fiscal Year 1981 come from surplus funds, 2) that the Board supports legislation giving final budget authority to the Middlesex County Advisory Board, and 3) that Middlesex County should not assess cities and towns any more for Fiscal Year '81 and that county government should comply with Proposition 2 1/2 fever in Fiscal '82,

1981-82 Operating Budgets

The Executive Secretary submitted to the Board a draft of a letter to the Finance Committee, dated March 23, 1981, relative to the 1981-82 Operating Budgets, proposed unallocated funds for departments under the control of the Board of Selectmen. The draft was approved as amended.

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-Clerk