Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes


Absent: Cliff Brown, Dennis Doughty, Kelly Hardebeck, Bobbie Knable, Stanley L. Spiegel, Christine Westphal

Also attending: Superintendent Andrew Bott, School Committee Member Susan Wolf Ditkoff, Petitioner for WA 19 Anthony Ishak, Pharm.D (TMM 1)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

Announcements: Update on meetings – April 23, 24 and 25 – also on 23rd 6pm presentation on TMM survey. [subsequently changed to April 30th at 6 pm]

MEETING AGENDA

1. Review and possibly vote on Article 19 Amend Article 8.23.1 of the Town’s General By-Laws – Tobacco Control. (Ishale)

   Kim Smith offered an overview of the subcommittee’s preliminary deliberations on Warrant Article 19, details of which can be found in the subcommittee’s report.

Dr. Anthony Ishak addressed the Committee and shared additional thoughts regarding this Article. He thanked Kim for her report and noted she summarized the issue thoroughly. Over the last 3 or 4 years use of flavored tobacco has taken off like a rocket. If you aren’t attuned to this, you may not recognize the severity of the problem and the groups of youth that it effects.

FDA statistics are probably an underestimate of our Town’s actual violations. 10.3% failure rate – violations and inspections locally. In the ideal we would go after everything and ban everything but we cannot easily or realistically do that. Adults will stop smoking too. A question of how it will impact retailers financially but this is a health decision and protection of our youth. Retailers are able to find other things that they are able to sell when other items become prohibited.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Q: When we had similar articles that affected the business community, the former health director often provided business owners with an extended period of time for them to make adjustments to their business plans. Is the effective date of this legislation as soon as the AG signs off or is there leeway to allow for adjustment. Did the subcommittee recommend a period of adjustment for retailers to be included in the proposed amendment to the by-law?
A: Health Department Advisory Council on Public Health would be getting back with a statement/position before Town Meeting. As of now, the adjustment period would be between the time Town Meeting approves the change and the AG’s office signs off on it, which is not more than three months.

Perhaps there should be a time after it is hopefully approved so businesses will have an opportunity to reorganize their business plans and structure. Once there is certainty a roll out period would be useful.

Other communities have something similar, but they are health department regulation changes, and retain exemptions for adults.

How would you word an amendment to change the date

Banning styrofoam and banning these types of products. Use up inventory and then find new products. If banned you make your arrangements and swap out the product.

Q: Does this apply to e-cigarettes and other cigarettes? A: All flavored products.

We have to submit this to the AG because we are a Town and are making changes to our by-laws – which must be sent to the AG for review and approval to be sure they are consistent with the laws of the Commonwealth.

Separate counsel outside of Town has determined that legislation such as this has legal standing.

The State has granted Towns and Municipalities the right to regulate sale of tobacco. If not preempted by the State, we can go forward with this legislation.

No entity shall sell or distribute flavored tobacco except in retail tobacco stores. How many are there? A: Two at one point, but now only Cigars and More may be tobacco only.

Lily Huang Store Owner: We currently only sell mint, menthol or plain tobacco of Juul.

So the concern is only in the changing of the definition of what constitutes a flavor.

Could adults still be able to purchase these products? Or ask for a medical letter? An adult can purchase these products in one or two places already so not sure it would serve the purpose of keeping children away when they are not allowed in those stores anyway. Concerned about those people who rely on access to e-cigarettes because they stopped smoking other tobacco products. Beef up enforcement instead of banning product.

Unflavored vaping products are readily available in retail establishments. Just looking for a delivery system for nicotine.

Nicotine addiction is not good in and of itself so substituting one form for another is dubious and there are many ways to stop smoking. Also, kids will get hooked early on with flavored tobaccos.
Banned flavored cigarettes showed that most will not migrate to unflavored but will switch to menthol. Eliminate menthol entirely and the choice will be very clear, We anticipate seeing lower tobacco use overall as a result.

Kids getting tobacco products mostly through convenience stores or from their social circles (older siblings or friends) and 6% from internet.

If someone is addicted they will go wherever they need to go to get that addiction satisfied. Need to recognize our limitations as a Town.

If someone is a smoker now, they will get what they want. But we want to prevent kids from getting access and becoming lifelong smokers or vapers.

This is the start of a trend and will take off quickly.

According to the Brookline Center for mental health, social anxiety and vaping are two social and mental health problems especially among teenagers and I don’t think we have fully begun to realize what this is doing to families and young people.

Kids vape because it looks cool and they will do it regardless of what the Town says. Marketing to a particular demographic is disingenuous because marketing people can just market to other groups. The law is for adults – and given that we are pushing so many marijuana shops to get their tax dollars, this by-law amendment smirks me as a bit hypocritical. We are constantly doing things to small businesses in this town, death by a thousand cuts and stopping them at every turn. Motives are good, well-intentioned but too much of an interference where the Town shouldn’t interfere and there’s a question the effectiveness anyway.

Passing this sends a message to kids that these delivery systems are just as dangerous as regular cigarettes. Kids get addicted faster than adults. Flavored vaping systems allow for deeper inhalation and have faster results.

Take a slightly lesser aggressive approach and allow for some exemptions.

There are alternative ways to consuming cannabis other than smoking or vaping.

The petitioner noted that vaping and its damaging effects – cell level of lungs mimics or is worse than actual tobacco. You will see the same outcomes eventually with people who vape. It looks very much the same as cigarettes.

Q: Are these products subject to FDA approval? A: No, slipped under radar.

This issue extends beyond the Town of Brookline and we tend to take on global issues that may or may not affect things that happen here. Tough reconciling support for marijuana and objections to e-cigarettes however these e-cigarettes should be banned but on the State level and not municipal level.

Abuse of these products is 9 times higher among teens over adults.
A **MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on Warrant Article 19 to the May Annual Town Meeting.

By a **VOTE** of 12 in favor, 4 opposed and 4 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on Warrant Article 19 to the May Annual Town Meeting.

2. Further discussion and possible vote on FY 20 School Department Operating Budget

Michael Sandman gave a further overview of the subcommittee’s discussion and deliberations at their meeting on March 14th to vote a recommendation on this budget to the Advisory Committee. The subcommittee’s final report is an elaboration on the subcommittee’s preliminary report shared at the April 2nd Advisory Committee meeting.

Superintendent Bott shared data about special education costs (one year old) of other communities. Priorities for a November Town meeting bring in one FTE, restore supplies, and frontline guidance position that was in the override for next year into this year.

**QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Correction to a table – increase 22.38, page 15 in Budget Book. Dollars are the same.

86.5% of budget is for salary so what does this translate into number of actual people?

ClearGov.com Brookline is a resource for comparing Brookline Schools and expenditures with other communities throughout the Commonwealth.

Difference between School and Town side are in pensions. Revenue covering the costs come out of the School Town Partnership. Better control over costs – done based on head count and biggest cost is health insurance and OPEBs.

Add a section on how override money has been spent. Understand that some was reallocated to replace money that School was expecting that didn’t materialize. Some things were funded on the Town side but what did we cut on the Town side?

The Town funded items specifically earmarked in the override. Some departments didn’t get their expansion requests.

Q: We focused on numbers but behind these numbers are people. Read Superintendent’s letter to community and goals at the start of the 2018-19 school year on the PBS’s website, can you summarize for us how you think you are doing in terms of those expectations and how things are going?

The Superintendent responded that there was a lot in that document and the goals were ambitious. Update provided to the School Committee a few weeks ago and we are on target – new math curriculum in Gr. 6, 7 and 8 then K-5 year after. Literacy – special education on how we can increase training for specific reading disabilities – add training to current schools. Where we are behind is in emergency preparedness training. A week ago, the staff at the High School trained with the Police Department on new procedures on how to respond to crisis events.
Pierce and Lincoln will go through this soon and in the fall the rest of the schools will go through this training. With everything going on, quite pleased with progress.

Mini CIP may have to be readjusted to respond to complaint filed with the State regarding lack of accommodation for special needs students in the K-8 schools. All of the mini-CIP money may need to be spent to make those accommodations, many of which will be made at Pierce and specifically to the nurse’s office.

Director of Equity and Inclusion is looking at different cohorts and providing supports and laddering people into higher paying and more prestigious jobs. Equity is not just about students but also about the educators. We have changed recruiting practices and are quite pleased with the results. Cultural competency training is on-going and will begin embedding it with new teachers and from that other things are happening. Reviewing how our programs are supporting our students.

A MOTION was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on the FY20 PSB request for $119,841,548 in operating funds.

By a VOTE of 14 with 2 opposed and 2 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the FY20 PSB request for $119,841,548 in operating funds.

A MOTION was made and seconded to adjourn; there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Documents Distributed at Meeting

- Schools Subcommittee Recommendation FY 20 Operating Budget – School Department
- Human Services Subcommittee Report on Warrant Article 19
- Public Comment regarding Warrant Article 19
The Advisory Committee will hold a public meeting on Wednesday, April 10, 2019 at 7:30 on the following item:

1. Review and possibly vote on Article 19 Amend Article 8.23.1 of the Town’s General By-Laws – Tobacco Control. (Ishale)

2. Further discussion and possible vote on FY 20 School Department Operating Budget

3. Other business

The public is invited to attend. However, unless otherwise indicated for any specific agenda item(s), this meeting is not a public hearing so public comments will not be taken at the meeting. The Advisory Committee welcomes written comments, which will be circulated to members of the Committee if they are sent to lportscher@brooklinema.gov no later than 12:00 noon on the day of the meeting. Subcommittees of the Advisory Committee hold public hearings on any matter on which the Advisory Committee makes a recommendation to Town Meeting. Members of the public are encouraged to attend subcommittee public hearings if they wish to comment on any item under deliberation by the subcommittee.

Sean M. Lynn-Jones, Chair H: 617-738-6228, W: 617-495-1463, slynn-jones@brooklinema.gov
Carla Benka, Vice-Chair H: 617-277-6102, rcvben@earthlink.net
March 26, 2019 Human Services Subcommittee Report on W.A. 19
Proposal to Amend Article 8.23 of the Town’s General By-Laws: Tobacco Control

The Human Services Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee (AC) held a public hearing on March 26, 2019 to receive public comments on Warrant Article 19. In attendance were co-petitioners Anthony Ishak, Pharm.D. (TMM 1); Kate Silbaugh, J.D. (TMM 1); and Neil Gordon (AC, TMM 1). Also attending were Jonathan Winickoff, M.D. (precinct 8 resident, pediatrician, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School); D.J. Wilson, J.D. (Massachusetts Municipal Association (MMA)); business representative Adam C. Ponte, J.D. (Fletcher Tilton PL, Coalition for Responsible Retailing); and local business owners Harshad Patel (Kurkman’s Market), Nipun Patel (Gimbel’s Liquor), Atul Patel (Bay State Food and Liquor), Lily Hong and Matthew Chan (Village Convenience), Fahd Iqbal (Brookline Sunoco), Jemin Patel (Cigars & More), and Sukhjinder Gill (One Stop Market). Other attendees included Assistant town administrator Justin Casanova-Davis (Select Board) and subcommittee members Ben Birnbaum (chair), David-Marc Goldstein (TMM 8), Kim Smith (TMM 6), and Claire Stampfer, M.D. (TMM 5).

The article proposes a ban on the sale of all flavored tobacco products in Brookline, including menthol, mint, and wintergreen.

Co-petitioner Dr. Ishak pointed out that Brookline has incrementally enacted legislation to reduce the negative impact of tobacco in our town. Flavored tobacco products have targeted youth, and menthol has targeted the black and LGBTQ communities, who disproportionately purchase menthol products, which raises equity concerns. Flavoring and menthol products are designed to lead to deeper inhalation, which prolongs nicotine exposure and increases addiction. The sweet flavoring in flavored tobacco contains many of the ingredients found in Kool-Aid and candies, making them enticing to kids.1 Up to 90% of tobacco users start before the age of 18. According to the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH), illegal sales to minors in Brookline is 25% higher than the state average (8.89% vs. 7.09%). A 2015 study reported in a Healthy Brookline showed a 4% usage of non-cigarette tobacco in middle school.2 A 2017 study in the American Journal of Preventive Medicine suggest that banning flavored products without banning menthol flavored ones leads to migration of use by adolescents to menthol products.3 The American Heart Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Thoracic Society, and World Health Organization all recommend some form of ban or restriction of flavored products. The petitioners worked with the MMA, the Public Health Advocacy Institute at Northeastern University, and the Town Counsel’s office developing the warrant article. San Francisco and Providence already have a ban of some form. Brookline would be the fifth town in Massachusetts to do so following Somerville, Needham, Ashland, and Dover. If approved by Town Meeting in May, the bylaw change would require review by the Attorney General (AG), which would give businesses time to adjust, and choose other profitable items to sell instead. Dr. Ishak called on “businesses to work with us to protect our youth.”

---

Mr. Wilson provided some historical context, pointing out that in 2009 the federal government banned the sale of flavored cigarettes, except mint, menthol and wintergreen. In 2012, Providence, RI enacted a city ordinance extending that prohibition to other types of traditional tobacco (e.g., spit, chew, cigar, loose) and to e-cigarette solutions, but exempting qualifying adult-only smoking bars. In 2013, the federal appeals court sided with Providence in a lawsuit. Given that Massachusetts is in the same federal district as Providence, the ruling provided a legal basis for Massachusetts cities and towns to do the same, but the smoking bar exemption was extended to qualifying retail tobacco stores (i.e., tobacconists, vape shops). Most cities and towns in Massachusetts followed the Providence ordinance language, which also exempted mint, menthol and wintergreen and allowed certain qualifying stores to be exempt from this sales restriction. Somerville, Needham, Ashland, and Dover recently voted to remove the exemption for mint, menthol, and wintergreen from their health department policies and classify them as flavors. Brookline now seeks to do the same, but also to remove the exemptions for smoking bars and retail tobacco stores. Ms. Silbaugh restated that Brookline, although not the leader in this area, would be better protected from exposure because of the requirement for AG review of the town bylaws.

Dr. Winickoff commented that he sees adolescents who attend Brookline High School, all of whom are either using JUUL/e-cigarettes or have friends who do so. The most popular flavor is mint in towns that have banned other flavors. Menthols are also the most popular type of combusted tobacco among adolescents. In 2018, it was reported that e-cigarette use was 25% among high school seniors. In higher socioeconomic status (SES) towns, where kids have the funds to support their addictions, the use is even greater.

Representatives of the business community voiced their opposition to article 19. First, Mr. Ponte, who, citing attorney-client privilege, declined to name his firm’s clients, pointed to Brookline businesses’ 100% Food and Drug Administration (FDA) compliance for the past three years, indicating that store owners were not found in sting attempts to be selling to minors. He claimed that products were purchased elsewhere, such as from Amazon and other online sources. Local business sales to minors is not a problem a Brookline. Thus, the article will have no practical effect. Second, he suggested that use and possession be considered a violation, as is the case with alcohol. At present, nothing can be done if kids are caught smoking. Third, he referred to the issue of “harm reduction.” The ban will have the practical effect of removing less harmful non-combustible products and encourage the use of more harmful ones. Finally, he viewed store owners are the “first line of defense” and suggested that the town work with them to address underage use.

Local business owners indicated that the ban would affect all stores, including adult-only ones. They commented on the high costs of operating a business in Brookline and indicated that they would suffer financially because much of their business revolves around the sale of flavored products. It was pointed out that customers want “one stop shopping” and opt to buy other items while in the store to purchase flavored tobacco/nicotine products. They pointed out that these products can be purchased in neighboring communities or online. In their written statement, they expressed concern that a ban would spur the growth of an illegal underground market.

In written comments, Michael Siegel, M.D., Boston University School of Public Health, acknowledged the problem of youth vaping, but expressed concern that efforts to address it would “throw the town’s former smokers who rely on e-cigarettes to keep them off real cigarettes under the bus by banning” the former and allowing the latter to remain on store shelves. He referred to a recent U.K. study in the New England Journal of Medicine, which
concluded that e-cigarettes were twice as effective as the nicotine patch in helping smokers quit completely. He concluded that there was no public health justification for banning e-cigarettes while keeping combustible ones on the shelves, and added that there would be differential treatment on the basis of brand (e.g., Marlboro versus Newport). He suggested an option for Brookline to pursue to protect public health and to reduce tobacco-related disease and nicotine addiction—that is, ban the sale of all nicotine products. This option would allow all products to “compete on a level playing field,” avoid providing incentives to former smokers to return to smoking, and limit youth access to these products.

The article’s proponents attempted to rebut Dr. Siegel’s testimony, a copy of which will be shared with the AC. The article cited did not compare e-cigarette use versus the U.S. standard of care, which includes counseling, gum and bupropion. The U.K. study provided counseling, but not bupropion or other approved medications. Nicotine liquid in Europe has a lower concentration than that in this country. More people transitioning to e-cigarettes from combustible cigarettes were still using at the end of the study (80% versus 9%). Behavioral counseling was included in the study quit groups, but in the U.S. it is often not included when patients try to quit. The study only looked at those who smoked about 15 cigarettes per day. If e-cigarettes are banned, e-smokers are likely to stop. Youth prefer menthol if flavored products are not available, thus the need to ban menthol too. Prior meta-analysis has shown that e-cigarette use increases the chances that youth and young adults will smoke combustible or regular cigarettes by threefold.

During the discussion phase, a subcommittee member commented on the problem of nicotine addiction and the “false narrative” that e-cigarettes were healthier than regular cigarettes. It was pointed out that the petitioners indicated that they had consulted with the Town Counsel’s office and the Health Department when developing the article. To date, we have received no recommendation from the health department, which would come from its Advisory Council on Public Health, which meets on April 25. A subcommittee member mentioned that she regularly reads the NEJM and is aware of the health issues surrounding the use of flavored tobacco. Another subcommittee member said he would like to hear from the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) as to the potential effects on local businesses, as was the case when the town banned smoking in restaurants.

The subcommittee voted 3-1-0 to recommend favorable action on the article.

---

Foley’s Liquors
Victor Barakat
228 Cypress Street

Brookline Sunoco
Fahd Iqbal
454 Harvard Street

T.J. Convenience
Yomiris Rodriguez
182 Thorndike Street

Mall Discount Liquors
Chirag Patel
525 Harvard Street

Village Convenience
Lily Hong
1 Harvard Sq.

Kurkman’s Market
Harry Patel
227 Cypress Street

Brookline Superette
Soon Lee
18 Pleasant Street

Cigars & More
Jemin Patel
1298 Beacon Street

One Stop Market
Sukhjinder Gill
321 Cypress Street

Brookline Wine & Spirits
Shinder Singh
294 Washington Street
April 01, 2019

To: Brookline Select Board
   Town Meeting Members
   Dr. Jett
   Mr. Kleckner

Re: Proposed Town Meeting Article 19

Dear Select board, Town Meeting Members, Dr. Jett, and Mr. Kleckner:

We are writing to express our strong concerns with Article 19, which calls for the prohibition of sales of menthol, mint and wintergreen tobacco and vapor products. We sincerely hope that you will give our perspective the attention it merits based on fact, and our credible role as responsible members of the Brookline community.

We are the de facto tobacco control division for Brookline; a responsibility we take extremely seriously. Our commitment to keeping tobacco out of the hands of Brookline’s youth is demonstrated by our Food and Drug Administration (FDA) inspection compliance rate of 100% for the last three years. Our compliance rate with state and local tobacco regulations speaks plainly to the fact that we are your partners in preventing youth use of, and access to tobacco and nicotine products.

The paradox of Article 19 is that, if adopted, it will actually result in three major negative consequences while missing the mark the sponsors claim to be aiming for:

First, it will move even more vapor products out of the highly regulated and independently verified convenience store retail environment and thereby create a substantial void of any ability to police Brookline youth access to all tobacco and nicotine products;

Second, it will, according to law enforcement data, contribute to the growth of the unregulated, untaxed, illegal, underground market which not only makes tobacco and nicotine more widely available, it also funds and supports other illicit activities like illegal drug sales and terrorism;

Finally, as legitimate national and international public health experts have attested, Article 19 will have negative consequences to public health by further taking away products that will legitimately consign legal-aged adults to the use of combustible tobacco products.

You have heard and will hear more from those who seek, not only to ban menthol, mint and wintergreen, but whose real desire is to make tobacco and nicotine unavailable within Brookline’s boundaries that retailers and experts who testify
against Article 19 are not being truthful in our testimony. It is up to your sound, unbiased analysis to determine the most pertinent, applicable facts regarding whether or not Article 19 is anything more than a feel-good regulation. As you exercise the serious public obligation to do so, know that we are your partners in tobacco control. Retailers remain the key component to deny youth access to the products they should not have access to or permission from the state or community to use as they chose.

We cannot do it by ourselves and taking it out of the regulated retail environment doesn’t make it any less available, as is proven by the fact that acts like raising the legal age of purchase to 21, and banning other flavors in the past have failed to adequately address youth possession and access.

Please, keep an open mind and let logic and fact guide your decision making in the days and weeks to come. Article 19 may feel good, but it will result in more harm and those who truly care about public health should not ignore that harm.

Respectfully yours,
Dear Members of the Human Services Subcommittee:

I am a physician and a professor in the Department of Community Health Sciences at the Boston University School of Public Health. For the past 32 years, I have been a tobacco control researcher and anti-tobacco advocate. I played a major role in lobbying across the state for 100% smoke-free bar and restaurant regulations. I worked with colleagues at the Massachusetts Municipal Association and the Massachusetts Association of Health Boards to promote smoke-free regulations and helped numerous individual boards of health in the state to enact smoke-free bar and restaurant laws. I have also testified as an expert witness for plaintiffs in eight different lawsuits against the tobacco industry, including the infamous Engle case which resulted in an unprecedented $145 billion verdict against the cigarette companies. I have published nearly 100 peer-reviewed journal articles relating to smoking and tobacco use. In short, I am a long-time, committed anti-tobacco researcher and advocate.

Today, I want to call your attention to one particular age group of residents of Brookline who are using flavored e-cigarettes in record numbers. In fact, the use of flavored e-cigarettes and vaping products is running rampant among this age group throughout the country. A recent survey of this age group revealed that 85% of those who vape prefer flavored e-cigarettes, including 74% who use fruit flavors and 66% who use dessert or pastry flavors. Nearly half (49%) of vapers in this age group used candy, chocolate or other sweet-flavored e-liquids.1

If you think we’re talking about teenagers, think again. The study in question was a survey of adult vapers in the United States; specifically, adult ex-smokers who had quit successfully using e-cigarettes and who are currently relying upon these products to keep them from returning to cigarette smoking.

While there were nearly 16,000 of these former smokers in the study, national estimates suggest that there are at least 2.5 million adult vapers who rely upon e-cigarettes to keep themselves off highly addictive and deadly tobacco-burning cigarettes.2 And most of these former smokers are reliant upon flavored e-liquids, because the whole point of vaping for adult smokers is to get away from the taste of, and dependence on tobacco.

It is true, of course, that a worrisome proportion of youths are vaping, and most of them — like their adult counterparts — enjoy flavored, as opposed to tobacco-tasting, e-liquids.

But even more worrisome is that the town of Brookline, in an effort to address the problem of youth vaping, may inadvertently throw the town’s former smokers who rely upon e-cigarettes to keep them off real cigarettes under the bus by banning the sale of all e-cigarettes while allowing the real cigarettes to remain on store shelves. This is throwing the baby out with the bath water.
Here’s the problem: While youth vaping, and especially the use of Juul, is a serious problem, the reality is that youth are not the only ones who use these products. E-cigarettes are responsible for at least 2.5 million former smokers having quit smoking completely. If these products are taken off the shelves, it will likely cause a large number of them to return to smoking because it will become much easier for them to just pick up a pack of Marlboros than to continue purchasing their e-cigarettes.

A recent study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* found that e-cigarettes are twice as effective as the nicotine patch in helping smokers quit completely. These products are truly a life-saver for literally millions of former smokers.

The proposed Article would eliminate the sale of all e-cigarettes in Brookline. However, it would allow the sale of the majority of cigarettes to continue unabated. This means that it will actually be easier for both youth and adults to get access to a Marlboro than to a cherry vape. What possible justification is there for eliminating the sale of fake cigarettes, but allowing the real ones to continue to be sold?

Not only will this likely result in many former smokers going back to smoking but it may also lead to many youth figuring out that it is much easier for them to smoke than to try to track down an e-cigarette.

The last thing in the world that we should be doing is to give tobacco cigarettes, which kill more than 400,000 Americans each year, a competitive advantage over fake (electronic) cigarettes, which contain no tobacco, involve no combustion, are much safer than combustible cigarettes, and whose use has not been implicated in a single death despite 12 years on the market.

My message to you today is that there is simply no public health justification for banning electronic cigarettes but allowing combustible tobacco cigarettes to remain. I believe that the Article under consideration is inconsistent with the protection of the public’s health and that it has no public health justification. What possible justification can you give for removing e-cigarettes from stores, but allowing those very same stores to sell Marlboros and Camels, two of the most dangerous consumer products in history?

Moreover, by choosing to ban menthol cigarettes, but leaving all other cigarettes untouched, the town would be making a decision that is arbitrary and capricious. Essentially, what the town would be doing is to ban Newport, Kool, and Salem, but allow the continued, unfettered sale of Marlboro and Camel. There is no public health rationale for singling out certain cigarette brands for a sales ban but not others. As I’m sure you know, these brands are equally deadly.

In fact, the scientific evidence shows that menthol cigarettes are no more dangerous than non-menthol cigarettes. The FDA has made it clear that there is no cigarette brand that is any safer than another cigarette brand, and in fact, it is illegal for any cigarette manufacturer to claim that its brand is safer than another brand on the market. Is Brookline actually prepared to argue that Marlboro cigarettes are safer than Newports?
The data on cigarette brand preferences among youth also do not provide a justification for banning menthol cigarettes and giving non-menthol cigarettes a huge competitive market advantage. In fact, the majority of youth smokers prefer non-menthol cigarettes. The overwhelmingly most popular brand among youth smokers is Marlboro, with Newport being a distant second. How does it make sense, then, for the Board to ban Newport sales, but not the sale of most Marlboros?

Although the proposed regulation would restrict the sale of menthol cigarettes, it leaves entire shelves of non-menthol cigarettes unregulated and easily available. These are the very cigarettes that are the most prevalent among both youth and adult smokers.

In summary, public health laws, by definition, must have the effect of protecting the public’s health and saving lives — and they must not be arbitrary. This proposed flavor ban will actually harm the public’s health by making it more difficult for ex-smokers to choose a less harmful option. Moreover, the Article is arbitrary and capricious because it regulates cigarette brands differently with no valid health justification. The proposed Article does a huge favor not for the public’s health, but for Marlboro, which is going to see a windfall in the ex-smoker market as all of its competition from vaping products and most of its competition from the No. 2 brand (Newport) is eliminated.

If the town of Brookline really wants to protect the public’s health and is sincere in wanting to reduce tobacco-related disease and nicotine addiction, then there is an option that is readily available: ban the sale of all nicotine-containing products—electronic cigarettes and all tobacco cigarettes alike. This would allow vaping products to compete with cigarettes on a level playing field, avoid the incentivization of former smokers to return to smoking, and protect youth from easy access to vaping products and tobacco cigarettes, all at the same time.

I urge you to set an example for cities and towns across the state and nation by banning the sale of all combustible cigarettes, not just menthol brands.

---


March 18, 2019

Re: Proposed Amendment to Article 8.23

Dear Select Board Member,

I write in support of the proposed amendment of Article 8.23 of the Town's General By-laws that would ban the sale of all menthol and flavored tobacco products. As a physician I have seen the grave consequences of tobacco addiction. In recent years we have witnessed a dramatic increase in the use of electronic cigarettes, especially among adolescents and young adults, creating a new, easy method of nicotine addiction. While touted by some to be an effective tool for smoking cessation, the long term health consequences of this product are still very uncertain. Of greater concern is the risk the routine use of these products will have on the long term health of youth who use them, as well as for the potential risk of addiction to other tobacco products. Not surprisingly, flavored products (such as bubble gum, grape and cherry vanilla), have a natural appeal to children; such flavored products illicit deeper inhalation of tobacco and are more addictive, while providing a false sense of safety. The fear that vaping products will lead to increased tobacco use appears to have been realized in an unfortunate recent reversal in the decline of tobacco use in children under 18 years of age. As a Brookline parent I am particularly concerned about the availability of flavored products in our community and the common use within our schools.

Thus, for the wellbeing of our community, I would encourage you to approve the ban of all flavored tobacco products within the town of Brookline.

Sincerely,

C. Christopher Smith, MD

Director, Internal Medicine Residency Program,
Associate Vice Chair for Education,
Beth Israel Deaconess Medical School
Associate Professor of Medicine,
Harvard Medical School
A letter that was sent to the Select Board that I would like for the Advisory Committee to be aware of for the Article 19 discussion.

Thanks
Anthony

Jennifer L. Beach, Chair
Benjamin Franco
Bernard Greene
Heather Hamilton
Nancy Heller

March 19, 2019

Dear Select Board Members,

We write to you as concerned parents and physicians in support of the ban on the sale of flavored tobacco (including menthol) products in Brookline.

Tobacco has a long history of negative consequences on the health of children and adults alike (from cancer to increased cardiovascular risk to worsening respiratory illness such as asthma). Flavored products in particular, though, are targeting our youth as evidenced by the increased utilization in our middle and high school aged children. These flavored products have made smoking more enticing to our youth and are sweetened to a level that is purposefully meant to be attractive to children (eg. with bubble gum and grape flavors).

In our jobs as medical providers we see how difficult it is for our patients to quit these products as well as the myriad harmful health effects they cause. Banning the sales in our town would decrease the avenue for access and thereby help prevent our children from becoming addicted to nicotine products.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Beach, MD (Internal Medicine) at 62 Circuit Road
Jonathan Cluett, MD (Orthopedics) at 62 Circuit Road
Tanaz Ferzandi, MD (OB/Gyn) at 71 St. Mary’s Street
Jeffrey Zarin, MD (Orthopedics) at 71 St. Mary’s Street
Julie Dollinger, MD (Pediatrics) at 46 Brook Street
Julia Lindenberg, MD (Internal Medicine) at 6 Conant Road
Both as a long-term voter/resident of Brookline and parent of two BHS graduates and as a Pediatrician at Boston Children’s Hospital’s Adolescent Substance Use and Addiction Program, I am writing in support of Warrant Article 19. As one of only a handful of pediatricians in the country who are board certified Addiction Medicine Specialists, I know quite a lot about the usage patterns and have seen first hand the deleterious effects of nicotine, smoking, e-cigs, Juuls, etc. on children and young adults. I was asked to address the question of flavored products in particular and there is no question but that the use of flavored tobacco products increases experimentation and usage of tobacco products among the young. This applies to all flavoring agents, including menthol/mint flavored products as well as such pernicious creations as crème brûlée and mango. Further, there is no question but that usage of flavored Juul or e-cigs or other tobacco products lead to higher rates of nicotine addiction and progression to actual smoking (Chaffee, 2018) and there is also a strong correlation between e-cig use and marijuana use. E-cig use predicts both subsequent marijuana use among youth (Dai, 2018) and is strongly associated with alcohol and other drug use (Curran, 2018). Therefore, since flavored products make tobacco and e-cig use more attractive to youth, we strongly support Warrant Article 19’s efforts to eliminate these flavored products. This is an easy and important step. As noted above, the potential benefits are many.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions,

Patricia

Patricia Cintra Franco Schram MD

Assistant Professor of Pediatrics
Harvard Medical School
Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics
Addiction Medicine
Adolescent Substance Abuse Program
Boston Children's Hospital
300 Longwood Ave- Fegan 10
Phone: 617-355-2727 (ASAP)
Fax: 617-730-0252

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, dissemination, copying, forwarding or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.
Advisory Committee School Subcommittee
Report on the PSB FY20 Budget
Wednesday April 10, 2019

The School Subcommittee held a two-hour public hearing on the School budget on March 5, 2019 attended by the five subcommittee members, Superintendent Andrew Bott, Deputy Superintendent for Administration & Finance Mary Ellen Dunn; Interim Deputy Superintendent for Student Services Casey Ngo-Miller, Budget Analyst & Accounts Payable Manager Jeremy Stull, School Committee members Jennifer Monopoli, Chairperson David Pollak, and Barbara Scotto, and Bob Miller, TMM Precinct 8 and President, BEU.

The subcommittee held a further two-hour meeting on March 14 attended by the five subcommittee members and Dr. Bott, Ms. Dunn, and Ms. Ngo-Miller. The five subcommittee members met on April 10 to vote on a recommendation to the Advisory Committee.

BACKGROUND

The School operating budget plus benefits costs and Building Department expenses for the Schools accounts for about 62% of Brookline’s total operating budget.

In past years, we focused on explaining the budget in terms of how much money was being spent and where it was spent, and on how funds provided by operating overrides had been used. In the last three years, PSB’s budget as explained by the budget book has become increasingly comprehensible. This year, it includes both program-by-program expenses and school-by-school expenses down to the level of the salaries paid to fill each teaching position. Furthermore, all staff have been classified in a way that links the line item in which their salaries are carried to what they actually do. Personnel costs account for 85% of the budget, so reading through the details of staff costs provides an excellent window into where money is spent, as well as an understanding of the size and complexity of PSB’s operations.

Given the availability of this data and the detailed explanations of each program is explained, it no longer seems necessary to “translate” the budget book to those who read it. We do recognize that many Town Meeting members do not read the budget in depth, so we have provided a summary of the operating budget request to Town Meeting. Note that the summary of expenditures does not include two major PSB expenses that carried in the Town budget – the cost of PSB staff health care benefits and the cost of services provided by the Building Department. Benefits costs attributed to PSB are $27,690,841 and Building Department costs are $5,460,368. Grants are expected to contribute $5,036,009 to the FY20 budget.

---

1 See Town of Brookline FY-2020 Financial Plan, Pages IV-141 and IV-61
## Expenses, not including Benefits & Building Dept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY18 Actual FTE</th>
<th>FY18 Actual $</th>
<th>FY19 Budget Nov. TM FTE</th>
<th>FY19 Budget $</th>
<th>FY20 Budget FTE</th>
<th>FY20 Budget $</th>
<th>FY20 to FY19 change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross school budget expenses</td>
<td>Personnel 1,240.49</td>
<td>1,276.72</td>
<td>$94,622,356</td>
<td>1,313.60</td>
<td>$104,014,289</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>$5,535,841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services 9,741,022</td>
<td>10,542,721</td>
<td>$98,478,447</td>
<td>11,699,864</td>
<td>1,157,142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies 1,922,502</td>
<td>2,051,297</td>
<td>$1,288,570</td>
<td>1,102,213</td>
<td>(186,357)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 593,018</td>
<td>1,364,723</td>
<td>$1,191,685</td>
<td>1,173,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital 1,140,010</td>
<td>1,364,723</td>
<td>$1,191,685</td>
<td>1,173,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1,140,010</td>
<td>1,364,723</td>
<td>$1,191,685</td>
<td>1,173,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1,140,010</td>
<td>1,364,723</td>
<td>$1,191,685</td>
<td>1,173,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>FY19 Budget Nov. TM*</th>
<th>FY20 Budget</th>
<th>FY20 Prelim to FY19 variance %</th>
<th>FY20 Prelim to FY19 variance $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Appropriation</td>
<td>$104,758,343</td>
<td>$110,583,255</td>
<td>$117,354,211</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>$6,770,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS Bus Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Moved to revolving fund</td>
<td>-100.00</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total T-S Partnership $</td>
<td>$104,758,343</td>
<td>$110,658,255</td>
<td>$117,354,211</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>$6,695,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; fees</td>
<td>$696,016</td>
<td>$696,016</td>
<td>$717,523</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>$21,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rental</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>Moved to revolving fund</td>
<td>Moved to revolving fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Breaker Funding</td>
<td>$1,873,044</td>
<td>1,688,705</td>
<td>1,769,814</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>81,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Fund expense reimb’s</td>
<td>50,680</td>
<td>150,680</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-100.00</td>
<td>(150,680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>358,680</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-100.00</td>
<td>6,289,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$107,603,083</td>
<td>$113,552,336</td>
<td>$119,841,548</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>$6,289,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>($415,806)</td>
<td>($173,424) *</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes adjustments made at Nov. 2018 TM to offset the FY18 deficit
DISCUSSION

The following list of the PSB budget’s main sections may be helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Section</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>112,238,810</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Overview</td>
<td>PSB Core Values; use of 2018 override funds; summary of expenses; summary of revenue including state aid, grants and reserve funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 1 – 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Detail</td>
<td>Listing of department codes; notes on the budget book</td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Line item detail for School Committee and central office expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 37 – 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services</td>
<td>Classrooms program explanations &amp; expenses: The “3 R’s” and a wide range of complementary programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 63 - 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Services and Student Services (in the next row) provide most of the in-classroom services PSB offers. These two categories account for $97,072,797 of PSB’s $112,238,810 in salary costs, or 86.5% of the total.²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Special Education &amp; related health services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 149 - 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The percentage of special education students in Brookline is comparable to the percentage in similar municipalities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookline’s proximity to the Longwood Medical Area does attract families whose students require a high level of medical care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Instruction</td>
<td>Expense detail by school, including staffing and staff salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 174 - 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section provides a level of insight into school-by-school operations that was previously not available in the budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary/Other School Services</td>
<td>Expense details for health services; athletics; student activities; transportation; and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 254 – 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuitions</td>
<td>Tuition payments by PSB for students who are enrolled in out-of-district schools such as</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 282 - 289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Based on the salary costs of members of BEU’s Units A and B plus paraprofessionals, not including athletics stipends. See the table on Page 16 of the FY20 budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Section</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>112,238,810</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>county voc-tech schools and special education programs. Out-of-district tuition for special education is projected to account for $5,417,857 in FY20. <em>Depending on the year, State “Circuit Breaker” about 1/3rd of these expenses. The formula provides 72 - 74.6% of the costs in excess of $50,000 for student placed out of district. Receipts from Circuit Breaker funds are projected at $1,769,814 for FY20.</em></td>
<td>Page 290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Services</td>
<td>Reference to sections of the Town budget covering shared services: IT; Building; Parks; Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, Grants &amp; Donations (draft)</td>
<td>Grants including federal, state &amp; local; gifts. The expected total receipts from grants is $5,036,009. <em>This section is a draft because the final amounts of some FY20 grants have not been confirmed</em></td>
<td>Pages 1 – 80³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Funds</td>
<td>PSB administers 13 revolving funds related to school activities plus the Adult Education revolving fund. See Pages 2 – 4 of this section for a summary of these funds. <em>State law defines how revolving funds are managed. In some cases, surpluses are accumulated within the fund for exclusive use of the supported program. For other funds, surpluses are available for general operations. State law allows PSB to use operating funds to cover deficits in its revolving funds.</em></td>
<td>Pages 1 - 34⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the intense discussion in 2018 regarding school enrollment projections, it is worth noting that K-8 enrollment increased by 21 students and High School enrollment increased by approximately 65 students, for an overall increase of approximately 86 students. The increase at the High School was driven largely by the difference in the size of the kindergarten classes of 2009 (the entering freshmen) and 2006 (the graduating seniors).

The subcommittee discussed three broad themes and one specific concern with PSB staff. As has been the case in the last three years, the level of detailed knowledge and willingness to explain those details was very helpful to the subcommittee.

³ Separate pagination
⁴ Separate pagination
The first theme has to do with the nuts and bolts of managerial accounting. The second, more strategic theme has to do with the efficient delivery of programs, which translates into the efficient use of available funds. The third theme concerns special education, and particularly out-of-district tuition.

Theme #1: Managerial Accounting Nuts & Bolts

PSB ended FY18 with a deficit caused by the fact that some expenses were not visible to the central office until late in the fiscal year even though they had been incurred earlier. While the individual items were small, they added up. In other cases, the budgeted amounts for some line items were exceeded. For example, stipends are budgeted for teachers who coach teams or advise student activities, but the increase in stipends due to increases in contractually agreed salary levels was not built into the budget. That deficit was offset by the November 2018 Town Meeting, which shifted funds from the FY19 PSB budget to cover the FY18 deficit.

That created a potential budget gap for FY 19. PSB has spent considerable time and effort to assert control over what had previously been viewed as fringe items, and we do not expect another end-of-the-fiscal-year surprise from the same causes. Among other steps, spending against the FY19 budget without central office approval was frozen last fall as a means reducing the FY19 gap.

Two other factors increased pressure on FY19’s budget vs. actual expenses.

First, the food service and athletics revolving funds have been in deficit for several years. In prior years, the deficits were covered by unexpended reserves, and those reserves are no longer being built in to the budget. Note that it is an acceptable practice for the operating budget to subsidize revolving funds, but such funds should not close out the year in deficit.

The food service deficit has been exacerbated by changes in school menus that did not resonate with the customers – the students. That resulted in drop in demand and thus a drop in revenue. The School Committee has gone out to bid for a new food services contract, has tweaked the menu, and it is considering an increase in the cost of some types of meals in order to keep the food services deficit under control. One problem is that the cost of meals provided at no cost or at a subsidized cost exceeds the federal reimbursement for those meals. That difference has to be made up either by charging the rest of the students more or by subsidizing the food service revolving fund.

Second, following several years of declines in the number of special needs students for whom PSB was paying out-of-district tuitions, a handful of special needs students who could not be educated within Brookline programs moved into the district, resulting in a 27% increase in out-of-district costs. As noted above, the budget includes a total of $5,417,857 for out-of-district tuition in FY20 for an expected cohort of 52 special needs students.
Theme #2: Efficient delivery of programs

Each year, we see forecasts for structural deficits in both the Town and School budgets. The following year, the budget for the then-current year has been balanced, but the structural deficit projection for future years remains in place. This annual recession of the deficit horizon is not a game, but rather the result of conservative current budgeting and conservative future projections by both Town and School.

In FY20, the projected deficit that had been predicted in the spring of 2018 for PSB in FY20 materialized. A decrease from FY19 projections in the amount of revenue the Town collects and the continuation of FY 19’s higher level of out-of-district tuitions for special education students. And the reserves that were once sprinkled through the School budget are gone, first because of a laudable change in the budgeting philosophy of PSB and then because it was impossible to balance the budget and retain reserves that are, in fact, appropriate.

Quoting from the PSB Executive Summary of the FY 20 budget dated 2/22/2019, “In prior years, the School Department utilized a variety of reserve and contingency accounts…. [The] School Committee repeatedly expressed its concern that due to the overall tightness of the budget there is less ability to absorb unforeseen events…. The School Department is managing this tightness with greater accuracy in budgeting and reporting.”

The School Subcommittee expressed its concern somewhat differently. Our question was how PSB would be able to manage anticipated cost increases, let alone unforeseen events. The short answer is that the Superintendent and his senior staff are focused on delivering programs more efficiently. To cite a simple example, it may be possible to schedule ELL specialists who work in more than one school in a way that reduces their travel time.

Cross-referencing the program-by-program detail in the FY20 budget with the school-by-school data will help in this analysis. The reclassification of staff to allocate their salaries to the programs they deliver is equally important, since that reclassification increases the accuracy of program costs.

Last, PSB is still using a chart of accounts that predates the 1993 Education Reform Act. Our chart of accounts is out of date. This may seem like a nuts-and-bolts accounting matter, but it has strategic implications.

At the very least, it affects the accuracy of the costs attributed to programs. For example, the China Exchange program is charged to High School general expenses and could be charged to its own program account. This specific case is a minor issue compared to the matter of analyzing how to improve the delivery of larger programs with far higher costs, but it exemplifies the overall chart of accounts problem.
PSB lacks the staff time to tackle this task, but there is growing awareness by the Treasurer and Comptroller that this is an issue.

**Theme #3: Out-of-district tuition for special education**

As noted previously, out-of-district costs took an unexpected 27% jump in FY19. This was the result of a handful of students who require out-of-district services moving into the district. The transportation costs alone for one such student can hit $20,000, so it doesn’t take a significant increase in the overall number of students to throw the budget out of balance.

PSB has built a reserve into FY20’s budget, and there has been discussion of setting up a $1 million special education stabilization fund. Any drawdown of that fund would have to be made up the following year, but it would greatly reduce the likelihood that the current year’s budget could be thrown out of balance by a small change in the number of students requiring out-of-district services.

**Specific concern: School supplies budget**

The subcommittee also expressed concern about the reduction of the budget for school supplies. Brookline has had a pattern of asking parents to buy school supplies that are typically provided by the school district. Parents also have to pay for the participation of their children in athletics and numerous other student activities such as field trips. These costs can total $1,000 in the course of an academic year.

Last year, the Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Finance made a strong case for increasing the supplies budget to cover costs that have been passed on to parents. However, the budget gap that opened in FY19 when funds were reallocated to close the FY18 gap resulted in a decision to reduce the funds available for supplies below the amount originally authorized for the remainder of FY19. The FY20 supplies budget for all purposes is $661,658, a reduction of $250,152 from FY19’s budget. If there are surpluses in other accounts, we urge the School Committee to increase the supplies budget.

**Other Comments**

We continue to ask the Schools to use the method the Town has adopted for taking an average per FTE for the cost of benefits to each program and including an estimate of benefits costs below the line for each program budget, or at least in a footnote to each program budget. The cost of benefits adds approximately 33% to the cost of salaries. Omitting that estimate from the summaries of program costs understates those costs in the eye of the public, and perhaps in the eye of PSB employees.
RECOMMENDATION

By a vote of __ to __ with __ abstentions, the School Subcommittee recommends _____ action on the FY20 PSB request for $119,841,548 in operating funds.

Subcommittee:

Dennis Doughty
Bobbie Knable
David Lescohier
Mariah Nobrega
Michael Sandman, chair