Town of Concord

Finance Committee
22 Monument Square
Concord, Massachusetts 01742-0535

AGENDA

Concord Finance Committee

October 8, 2020

7:00PM
via Zoom Webinar and broadcast on MMN

Zoom Access Info:

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:
Please click this URL to join. https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88472489829?pwd=TTgzZ0NKN3lXeUtodGZLMW92U0VJZz09
Passcode: 510395

Or join by phone:
Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 9128 or 888 475 4499 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5257 (Toll Free)
Webinar ID: 884 7248 9829
International numbers available: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kc1KK5pu4u

1. Minutes, July 23, 2020, others as available
2. Update: Committee Resignation, Peter Fischellis
3. Update: Long-term Capital Planning Task Force- (Elise Woodward, 30 minutes)
4. FY22 Guidelines- Process & Timetable
5. Remote Participation
6. Chair's Report
7. Observer Reports
8. CFO Report
9. Citizen Comments

Reminders:

- ***Next Regular Meeting:*** October 29, 2020
- ***FY22 Guidelines Meetings:*** TBD
- ***When Finance Committee members anticipate being absent from a meeting, it would be appreciated if they would notify Chair Mary Hartman by email at: maryhartman7@gmail.com***

Supporting materials for agenda items are available online at www.concordma.gov/fcmtgdocs . Materials are generally uploaded on the Tuesday prior to the Regular Meeting.

Draft #2

Town of Concord
Finance Committee
Meeting Minutes – July 23, 2020

Present: Dean Banfield, Peter Fischelis, Greg Guarriello, Mary Hartman, John Hickling, Richard Jamison, Dee Ortner, Parashar Patel, Christine Reynolds, Wade Rubinstein, Phil Swain, Brian Taylor, Thomas Tarpey and Andrea Zall

Absent: Karle Packard

Others Present: Finance Director Kerry Lafleur; Recording Secretary Anita Tekle

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Ortner thanked Ms. Tekle for the thoroughness of the minutes. On a **MOTION** made by Ms. Ortner and seconded by Mr. Hickling, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Tarpey, Hartman, Hickling, Guarriello, Taylor, Patel, Swain, Zall, Rubinstein, Jamison and Fischelis all voting Yes), it was **VOTED** to approve the minutes of May 14, 2020, as amended.

In reviewing the June 4, 2020 minutes, the Committee agreed to follow up with the Town re: its presentation of capital projects in the Town Warrant.

On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Ms. Hartman, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Tarpey, Hartman, Hickling, Guarriello, Taylor, Patel, Swain, Zall, Rubinstein, Jamison and Fischelis all voting Yes), it was **VOTED** to approve the minutes of June 4, 2020, as amended.

In reviewing the June 25, 2020 minutes, Ms. Lafleur clarified, in response to a question from Mr. Rubinstein, that a "legal deficit" is possible only at the end of the fiscal year, in the Snow & Ice account. Any other overages require year-end transfers from accounts with a surplus balance.

On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Ms. Reynolds, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Hartman, Hickling, Patel, Swain, Zall and Jamison all voting Yes; and with Tarpey, Guarriello, Taylor, Rubinstein and Fischelis all abstaining), it was **VOTED** to approve the minutes of June 25, 2020 as amended.

FY22 Budget Cycle

Mr. Banfield noted that due to the delayed Annual Town Meeting (ATM), he and Ms. Hartman will jointly assume leadership roles for the Finance Committee (FC), with Ms. Hartman and Ms. Reynolds assuming responsibility for the FY22 budget items, and Mr. Banfield covering FY21 items through ATM. Ms. Hartman noted that in a normal year, we would be discussing FY22 at this time, with the budget guidelines (GL) presented as a percentage of the prior year's budget. At this point in the meeting, Ms. Hartman assumed the role of Chair.

Ms. Reynolds discussed the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR), noting that the FC held a hearing in November 2019, during which the SGR was defined and identified for FY21 (2.16%). That number was reached averaging two data points—the financial market's prospective view of inflation using the 10-year T-Bill rate as of 7/1/19 and the latest available local CPI (Boston, Cambridge, Newton, MA-NH). She noted that the 10-year T-Bill as of 7/1/20 is 0.69% and the local CPI as of May 2020 is 0.6%. The average of these numbers is 0.645%, which would be the SGR calculation for FY22.

Ms. Reynolds noted that this number is very low. The FC agreed last year to achieve the SGR over a period of time. The question was raised whether it is appropriate to calculate the SGR rate over this unusual period—do we put it into a forward-looking tax growth projection? Or do we put it aside for this year, since it has been such an aberrant year?

Ms. Hartman commented that the SGR is different from the GL. She suggested that the budget entities be notified of the current SGR sooner rather than later. Ms. Reynolds suggested that the SGR not be based on an aberrant year. Mr. Tarpey commented that 10-12 years ago the Japanese economy entered an inflationary period, which was thought to be aberrant at the time, but turned out not to be. He noted that we have no way of knowing whether the current financial trends will continue. The SGR calculated by the FC is a number that is adjusted every year, for the upcoming five years. He felt that the FC should hew to the principle of the SGR as designed, understanding that the FC's hopes and beliefs are taken into account when determining the GL.

Mr. Banfield noted that the Feds are giving away money at 0%, which is driving an economy with a very low inflation rate. He concurs with Mr. Tarpey's comments that we should retain and publish the SGR, which is indicative of the macro world in which we operate. The GL is how we adapt to the reality of what is happening now; i.e., how we apply the SGR to the GL is up to the FC.

Mr. Hickling noted that Japan is currently experiencing negative inflation rates. He noted that, as defined, the SGR intends to address the growth in tax rate in terms of the growth in residents' income, and we don't have sufficient information about the latter. Ms. Reynolds noted that the growth in income is not used in calculating the SGR, since we don't have sufficient data. Mr. Patel asked whether we should be looking at projected CPI numbers. Ms. Reynolds noted that we use actual CPI numbers (not projections). Ms. Hartman responded that we average the 10-year T-Bill rate (which is what the market projects for inflation) with the actual CPI. It was noted that last year's SGR was 2.16% vs. a GL of 3.25%.

Mr. Banfield commented that if the FC were to publish an SGR of less than 1%, there would be a lot of pushback from the community. He felt that such a low SGR is unrealistic, and would have to be footnoted with an explanation that SGR is different from the GL. Mr. Hickling noted that the intent of the SGR is to send a message about the budget cost drivers, so that publishing the number in advance of the development of budgets/negotiating contracts would carry some weight. Mr. Banfield noted that we are operating in an environment of extremely low inflation, and this point should be emphasized and be considered when negotiating service or labor contracts. Mr. Ortner suggested that the SGR for both last year and this year be included in the budget letters, to put the issue into perspective and give the budget entities an inclusive context.

Mr. Rubinstein noted that we are losing federal and state money, but do we know how the current financial situation is affecting local residents? Ms. Reynolds responded that we don't have a good source to obtain that information. Mr. Jamison emphasized that the SGR is a worthy long-term goal, and we should not try to reach it in one year. He felt it important to communicate that the FC looks at the bigger picture, recognizing that an overall local CPI might not track the cost growth in the Town's salaries and benefits. Mr. Banfield noted that the SGR maps the direction for budgets to follow.

FY22 Guideline Information Request Letters

The draft GL Information letters to each of the budget entities were reviewed. Ms. Reynolds noted that the loss in revenue is still unknown, most likely in the range of 3-6%. Mr. Hickling suggested

that the issue of significant costs associated with the new "models" for schools under COVID-19 be factored into the letters.

On the Town letter, Ms. Ortner suggested that the litigation expenses for FY21 should be actual and not projected, since the actual numbers should be known by November. She questioned the need for an October meeting with the budget entities. Mr. Banfield noted that the deadline for publishing the GL is November 30, which will require preliminary GL meetings in October. He noted that last year the FC missed the November 30 deadline by six days. Ms. Reynolds commented that preliminary meetings are helpful to understand the context of the budget that will be prepared. Mr. Patel suggested that the wording include something along the following: "At this time we anticipate having a meeting in October and request that you provide your best estimates at that time. We understand that the situation is fluid in these unusual times and circumstances." Ms. Reynolds noted that the School Department (SD) is required to come up with budget numbers for the Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education (DESE), and we are required to come up with numbers prior to the Warrant being finalized. Ms. Hartman suggested that the language be softened to be more collaborative, recognizing that the revenue forecast will be unknown by November 30. In response to a question regarding revenue projections for FY22, Ms. Lafleur commented that the FY21 revised state budget will be available within the next few weeks. She does not feel that it will be any more difficult to project revenue this fall than it was last year.

Mr. Banfield questioned whether the Middle School (MS) project should be included in the letter about the CPS operating budget. He also noted that it is not necessary to break out SPED costs, since that is now only broken out for out-of-district student placements. Ms. Reynolds noted that SPED costs can no longer be identified within the budget. Ms. Banfield commented that separating out SPED costs creates tension in the community; we are caring and providing for all students in what should be considered a holistic budget. Ms. Reynolds suggested that the change in the insourcing of SPED delivery last year affected the budget. She suggested a change in wording of the letter asking how changes to the SPED model impacts the budget. She did not feel that the SPED savings that the SD has emphasized (by bringing more services in-house) are obvious in the budget. Ms. Reynolds agreed to accept input into changes to the letters, which she will re-draft.

On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Swain and seconded by Ms. Ortner, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Tarpey, Hartman, Hickling, Guarriello, Taylor, Patel, Swain, Zall, Rubinstein, Jamison and Fischelis all voting Yes), it was **VOTED** to authorize Ms. Reynolds to send the letters as reviewed and amended, incorporating the suggestions made at the meeting.

FY22 Observer Assignments

Current observers briefly reviewed the activity of their assigned committees, so that FC members would have a better idea about assignments for the coming year. Ms. Hartman asked all to make choices (1st, 2nd and 3rd) within the next week, after which she will re-distribute the list.

FY21 Budget Cycle—2020 ATM Warrant Articles

At this point, Mr. Banfield assumed the role of Chair. Mr. Banfield announced that the tentative date for the ATM is Sunday, September 13 at 1:00 pm at the Doug White Field at the high school. He has invited the Town Manager and the School Superintendent to meet with the FC in early August, with public hearings scheduled for August 17 and 18 (for the FC) and August 19 for the Planning Board. Once the hearings have concluded, the FC will deliberate and vote recommendations. He noted that the last date for finalizing the FC Report is August 24.

Five-Year Tax Projection for FC Report

Mr. Banfield shared charts which displayed different ways of reporting on increases to the tax levy: (1) cumulative changes in the tax levy for existing taxpayers; and (2) the % change in the tax levy. If we were to include the projected cost of the new MS, the tax rate would increase 8.5% in FY22. If the CMS Stabilization Fund passes, then this number could be reduced to 6%. He noted that in the past, the five-year projection has not included prospective debt that had not yet been authorized.

Mr. Patel commented that if the intent is to show the projected tax burden on residents, does it make sense to show the property tax levy, and not include other revenue sources? Ms. Hartman noted that the five-year projection is being done as a result of a Town Meeting vote several years ago. The challenge for the FC is to make the information clear and understandable to the audience. She suggested that the information be simplified. Ms. Reynolds noted that the charts are part of the larger FC Report, through which a lot of financial information flows. The tax impact calculator is based on the assessed value chart that appears in the FC Report.

Mr. Banfield suggested that the information be included twice—once with the MS and once without the MS, since there is such a significant difference. Mr. Rubinstein suggested that a narrative be included to explain the impact of capital projects on the tax rate. Mr. Banfield noted that in drafting the projections, he took everyone's projected numbers, tossed out the high and low, and averaged the results.

Finance Director's Report—FY20 Year-End Transfer

Ms. Lafleur presented her request to approve FY20 year-end transfers. She noted that the Town Budget includes 39 distinct line items, approved by Town Meeting. Transfers between the lines are allowed only by one of the following methods: (1) further Town Meeting action; or (2) under a procedure outlined in MGL Ch 44, §33B. Under the latter, line item transfers are allowed between May 1 and July 15 with the approval of the Select Board and FC. She requested the following transfer:

From Line Item 18 (Snow Removal)	$39,000
To Line Item 38 (Social Security & Medicare)	$39,000

She noted that the snow removal budget has a year-end balance of $86,567, prior to this transfer. She also noted that Line Item 38 expenditures were higher than anticipated due to an increase in the number of part-time employees hired; these employees are not eligible for participation in the Retirement System. Mr. Banfield noted that the snow removal surplus would otherwise have gone into free cash at year-end. Ms. Lafleur noted that there is no penalty for taking this vote after July 15.

On a **MOTION** made by Ms. Hartman and seconded by Mr. Jamison, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Tarpey, Hartman, Hickling, Guarriello, Taylor, Patel, Swain, Zall, Rubinstein, Jamison and Fischelis all voting Yes), it was **VOTED** to authorize the year end transfer of $39,000 from Line Item 18 (Snow Removal) to Line Item 38 (Social Security & Medicare).

Chair's Remarks

Upcoming Meetings:

- July 30 – no meeting
- August 4 – School Department will attend
- August 6 – Town Manager will attend
- August 17 – public hearing—Town budget & articles
- August 18 – public hearing – School budget & articles

Mr. Banfield reported on the recent Chair's breakfast: (1) 2229 Main Street Committee is conducting outreach on future uses of the land; they do not feel that they have received sufficient feedback to date; (2) Climate Action Plan—Brian Foulds is seeking commentary on the draft plan; (3) the School Department must send its approved budget to DESE by July 31; a draft will be presented to the School Committee on July 27.

Observer Reports

Select Board—Mr. Banfield reported that the SB has been approving monthly 1/12 budgets for FY21. Ms. Hartman reported that there are a lot of financial implications due to climate action initiatives; the Town and Library Corporation are renegotiating the financial terms of maintaining the library buildings (the Town prefers to conduct the maintenance inhouse, with the Corporation reimbursing the Town). This should be monitored.

School Committees—Ms. Hartman reported that the SD FY21 budget will be available online tomorrow. Among the high-level assumptions is that there will be no cuts in staff. This has been a challenging several months for the SD.

Board of Health—Mr. Guarriello reported that the BOH has given to the Police Department authorization to act as agents for enforcing social distancing. There has also been a lively discussion of the West Nile Virus and how it is impacting Concord.

Economic Vitality Committee—Ms. Zall reported on a number of retail initiatives that are taking place. Changes are being made to the Thoreau Street District that will involve Town funds. Initiatives are in place to assist small businesses impacted by the pandemic. It is important that the FC monitor these proceedings, since the Town has the potential of losing several businesses that bring visitors to Concord. She noted that there are lots of empty store fronts and more to come.

Correspondence

Mr. Banfield noted receipt of an email from resident Dorrie Kehoe, expressing concerns about the proposed new agreement between the Town and the Library Corporation. The Town is repositioning itself to assume responsibility for basic maintenance of the library buildings.

Article 16—TIF Agreement

Ms. Reynolds noted that this article will be heard at the August 17 public hearing. She asked whether Town Appraiser Lane Partridge would be present. Mr. Banfield agreed to invite Mr. Partridge to attend. Ms. Hartman indicated that she had prepared an analysis of the proposed TIF, with a reduction in the number of years (17 years to 15 years) and the amount of the TIF. She noted that the developer has agreed to shorten the term of the agreement. This information will be available prior to the hearing. Mr. Patel asked whether an agreement has already been reached with the developer. Mr. Banfield responded that a Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared. He also noted that an amendment to the TIF has been proposed by a private citizen.

On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Ms. Ortner, and on a roll call vote (with Reynolds, Banfield, Ortner, Tarpey, Hartman, Hickling, Guarriello, Taylor, Patel, Swain, Zall, Rubinstein, Jamison and Fischelis all voting Yes), it was **VOTED** to adjourn the meeting at 9:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Anita S. Tekle
Recording Secretary

Documents Used or Referenced at Meeting:

- Draft FY22 Annual Budget Data Request Letters
- Memo from Kerry Lafleur to FC requesting approval of FY20 year-end transfers (dated 7.15.20)

Draft

Town of Concord
Finance Committee
Annual Town Meeting – Votes on Amendments
Meeting Minutes – September 13, 2020

Present: Dean Banfield, Peter Fischelis, Greg Guarriello, Mary Hartman, John Hickling, Richard Jamison, Dee Ortner, Parashar Patel, Christine Reynolds, Wade Rubinstein, Phil Swain, Brian Taylor, Thomas Tarpey and Andrea Zall

Absent: Karle Packard

During the Annual Town Meeting, the Finance Committee assembled briefly on three occasions to take votes on the following three amendments that were proposed during the meeting:

ARTICLE 10 – Town Budget

Resident Henry Dane proposed an amendment to change the proposed appropriation in Line 2A Legal Services from $344,585 to $250,000, and to further restrict transfers from other accounts to the Legal Services account. On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Mr. Patel, it was **VOTED** (with 13 in favor and Mr. Swain opposed) to recommend a **NO VOTE** on Mr. Dane's amendment.

ARTICLE 10 – Town Budget

Resident Leslie Michelle Touw proposed an amendment to transfer the sum of $291,000 from Free Cash to the Concord Free Public Library in FY21 for the purpose of restoring surplus funds that were transferred at the end of FY20 from the Library to Legal Services. On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Mr. Guarriello, it was unanimously **VOTED** to recommend a **NO VOTE** on Ms. Touw's amendment.

ARTICLE 16 – Approval of Tax Increment Financing Agreement

Resident Tanya Gailus proposed an amendment to Section A5 that would substitute a new Section A5 for the existing Section A5 in the TIF Agreement. On a **MOTION** made by Mr. Hickling and seconded by Ms. Ortner, it was **VOTED** (with 11 voting in favor and 3 abstentions) to recommend a **NO VOTE** on Ms. Gailus's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita S. Tekle
Recording Secretary

Approved by Select Board 10.05.2020

DISCUSSION DRAFT
2021 ATM Planning Calendar

October 1, 2020

[ADD NATIONAL & STATE ELECTION, TOWN CAUCUS, AND TOWN ELECTION DATES]

02.27.21	Town Meeting Preview Meeting
02.27.21	Warrant Opens
03.19.21	Draft Warrant Articles Due
03.26.21	Warrant Closes
03.30.21	Warrant Review Meeting with Town Counsel
04.02.21	Warrant to Printer
04.09.21	Warrant Back from Printer
04.13.21	Warrant Mailed to Households
03.16.21	Note: Town Manager's Budget to SB (90 days before ATM, Town Charter § 16)
04.27.21	Select Board Public Hearing
04.29.21	Finance Committee Public Hearing – Town & CPC
05.06.21	Finance Committee Public Hearing - Schools
05.11.21	Finance Committee Public Hearing – Enterprise Funds
05.13.21	Planning Board Public Hearing
06.04.21	Moderator's Staff Planning Meeting (Moderator, ATM Coordinator, Dep Town Mgr., Dep Moderator, Public Info Dir., CCHS Asst. Principal, MMN, WIQH, Facilities Dir., Fire Chief, Police Chief, IT Dir., Dir Pub Health, Town Clerk, Speaker Timer)
05.20.21	Deadline for SB and FinCom Recommendations on Articles
05.21.21	FinCom Report to printer
06.01.21	FinCom Report back from printer
06.03.21	Deadline to mail FinCom Report to households (11 days pre ATM—10 days + 1 additional day for Memorial Day)
05.21.21	Deadline for Submission of Motions
05.25.21	Motions Review Meeting w/ Town Counsel
05.28.21	Deadline for submissions for Town Meeting Materials
06.01.21	Town Meeting Materials sent to printer
06.01.21	Town Meeting Materials posted on Town website
06.08.21	Town Meeting Materials back from printer
06.12.21	ATM Set-up (morning)
06.13.21	Annual Town Meeting 1:00 p.m.

DRAFT

DISCUSSION DRAFT
2021 ATM Planning Calendar

October 1, 2020

06.14.21__14	(Rain Date) Annual Town Meeting 5:00 p.m.
06.14-18.21	Additional ATM Sessions as Necessary

HOLIDAYS & EVENTS RELEVANT TO SCHEDULE

Rosh Hashanah	Sundown 09/18/20 to sundown 09/20/20
Yom Kippur	Sundown 09/27/20 to sundown 09/28/20
Columbus Day Observed	10/12/20
Veterans Day Observed	11/11/20
Thanksgiving Day	11/26/20
Hanukkah	Sundown 12/10/20 to sundown 12/18/20
Christmas Day	12/25/20
New Year's Day	01/01/21
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	01/18/21
Presidents' Day	02/15/21
School Vacation	02/15/21 to 02/19/21
Passover	Sundown 03/27/21 to sundown 04/03/21
Good Friday	04/02/21
Easter	04/04/20
School Vacation	04/19/21 to 04/23/21
Patriots' Day Observed	04/19/21
Mother's Day	05/09/21
CCHS Graduation	06/05/21
Father's Day	06/20/21

DRAFT

State Regulatory Framework

Before COVID, the MA regulations basically require a robust in-person meeting. Remote participation, at best, is a minority of the committee members, a physical quorum is required. Those participating remotely can only do so when in-person attendance is 'unreasonably difficult'. When any member participates remotely they must get prior approval from the chair, providing their reason and facts which support the 'unreasonably difficult' assertion. There are NO mentions in the regulations of remote participation in public meetings by _the public_. That the regulations are silent on this, I assume this means that a local policy may or may not support such participation at its discretion, but the assumption is that with a quorum of the body present, the public can always attend in person.

940 Mass. Reg. 29.10 (key elements for our discussion)
(4)(b) "A quorum of the body, including the chair or, in the chair's absence, the person authorized to chair the meeting, shall be physically present at the meeting location as required by M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(d);"
(5) "Permissible Reason for Remote Participation. ....a member of a public body shall be permitted to participate remotely in a meeting ... only if physical attendance would be unreasonably difficult."
(7)(a) "Any member of a public body who wishes to participate remotely shall, as soon as reasonably possible prior to a meeting, notify the chair or, in the chair's absence, the person chairing the meeting, of his or her desire to do so and the reason for and facts supporting his or her request.

Governor Baker issued an Executive Order on March 12, 2020 allowing remote participation by _all members in any meeting_ without prior permission and formally suspended **(4)(b)** above. The order also required provision of 'adequate, alternative means of public access....without subscription, toll or similar charge to the public'
'This order shall remain in effect until rescinded or until the State of Emergency is terminated, whichever happens first'

Concord Policy Highlights

The Concord Select Board adopted a remote participation policy in 2013 consistent with 940 Mass Reg 29.10. The Concord policy makes explicit a set of 'unreasonably difficult' situations. The policy was intended to only be used IN RARE OCCASIONS (caps in the policy document).

(7)(a) above in the Regulations is specified in the Concord Policy as requiring 48 hour notice to the chair, narrowing the more elastic 'as soon as reasonably possible' stated in the State Regulations.
Remote participation is limited to one member per meeting.
Valid reasons are defined as:

a) Personal illness or disability that does not affect the Board member's ability to perform his or her duties as a Board Member.

b) A family or other personal emergency

c) Military service.

d) Significant geographic distance.

THE TOWN DOES NOT GUARANTEE AVAILABILITY OF REQUIRED EQUIPMENT AT ANY PARTICULAR TIME OR LOCATION (caps in policy)

And… here's the cherry on top:

"The chair of any Board for which a request is received to participate remotely shall provide to the Board of Selectmen, no later than December 31 of each year, a report that indicates the date of any meetings for which remote participation was requested, the name(s) of individuals making the request, the determination of the chair for each request, and a summary of any logistical, technical and compliance issues related to remote participation."

In various actions of the Select Board, the policy above has been set aside in stages to permit full remote participation, including citizen attendance and participation when appropriate. The initial relaxation was for 'only essential committee work', which was the Select Board and any committee having a regulatory or legal need to meet. Remote participation was eventually expanded consistent with the Governor's Executive Order, to include all committee work.

When the Governor's EO is terminated or the State of Emergency ends, the State regulations will revert, as must the Town's policy to be in compliance with the State regs. Short of Legislative or Regulatory reform of 940 Mass. Reg. 29.10, we will be once again required to have a minimum of a quorum present in person to conduct FinCom business, and while the Select Board would be allowed to loosen the 'one remote participant' restriction in the Concord Policy, members must still overcome the 'unreasonably difficult' hurdle to be allowed to join a possible multi-member Zoom adjunct to any public meeting.