

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

The following Town Officials were in attendance:

Supervisor:	Douglas LaGrange
Councilperson:	Adam Greenberg
	Bridgit Burke
	William Hennessy
	Daniel Leinung
Town Clerk:	Diane Deschenes
Town Attorney:	Michael Naughton

**1. Call to Order**

Supervisor LaGrange called the COVID update meeting to order at 1:32 PM. We are meeting via Zoom pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 202.1 which includes not having public meetings. Before getting started, a roll call attendance was taken.

Supervisor LaGrange said just a quick update on things. The County Executive's updates that he forwards to the Board are a little more up to date. He did just receive an update from the Sheriff's office that he hasn't gotten a chance to go through yet. The one today is for yesterday but as of Tuesday there has been an uptick in the County. As far as COVID goes in the Town, we have five cases and 17 quarantined at the moment. We have one that's called a PUI. A PUI is someone who is believed to have COVID but we are awaiting results on that test. It's a new category. Today's are a little bit better. It used to be they listed all the cases in the first run of addresses and then they went with the contacts after that so it was relatively easy to say 163 cases in the County and 900 quarantines. All of a sudden they were having them all mixed together so he was looking at cases, quarantines or contacts as it says, and PUIs. He'll try to review yesterday's numbers and shoot out an email to you later to give you an update there. For now, we have 5 cases in town, 1 awaiting a test, and 17 quarantines.

We talked the other day and Sarah Kavanaugh put together some of the Federal and State law language and had a good start for us to understand all this stuff on how we might address employees that have varying degrees of having to stay home, whether it's because they are a positive case, whether they are quarantined, whether a family member is quarantined, and then we start getting into the lesser in a sense situations, not directly COVID but could be when you have a child that maybe has the school closed or the child has a cold and they say they can't come to school or daycare until he or she has a test. The thought process was because we didn't continue our earlier resolutions. He thinks the last one expired in June or July. We want to be able to address it as these things come up. A couple of instances have come our way lately. We should have something a little more concrete as far as a resolution goes. He sent you what Sarah had for us. It's kind of a start of a resolution. He's heard a little bit from Dan and Bridgit so let's discuss it.

Councilperson Leinung said that our initial resolution dealt with somebody being diagnosed with COVID and/or under quarantine order and they stay at home with full pay for the duration of the quarantine period. He thinks we already had that somewhere. This is more specific as Doug just said to instances where the persons themselves are not directly impacted by COVID but they have a family member or dependent child or somebody who they are the caretaker for. So between State law and Federal law he thinks a lot of this is already required or covered but he doesn't think it hurts in our policy to make sure that it's clear for our employees as well what our policy is going to be. He thinks from patching together all the Federal and State laws it looks like the minimums would be if somebody is caring for an individual in their household including a dependent child that is subject to a mandatory or precautionary quarantine order. Then we should and he thinks we are actually obligated to allow that person to care for that person without needing to use their accrual times. He thinks the decision that we need to make is under Federal and State law. They are allowed to get up to two-thirds of their pay for that quarantine time without using their accruals. We could say if you're going to do that we can pay you 100% of your pay with the possibility of also trying to work from home. He wanted to get Michael's opinion on that whether we can say someone can be compensated for that time without using accruals and also by saying you need to try and work from home. He just wants to make sure that that's okay to say. That's one piece. The decision for us to

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

make is two-thirds or 100%. Supervisor LaGrange said that he doesn't think we have to make the two-thirds decision because that's already law. We just have to say if in any certain instance we want to go to the higher level. Councilperson Leinung said that that's right. Do we want to go with current law at two-thirds or do we want to go to 100% without using their accruals or do we want them to use their accruals to get to 100%? Supervisor LaGrange said that Sarah has a comment. He asked her to come in since she's dug in so much.

Mrs. Kavanaugh said that in the Federal law it's acceptable for the employers to require them to work from home if they can. If they themselves are sick you can't ask them to work from home because the assumption is that they are too sick to work from home. If they are home because a child is quarantined and they themselves are not showing symptoms or sick you can request that they work from home if possible. If they are unable to, like they can't remote in, then that's okay. It's acceptable to ask them to work if they can. Supervisor LaGrange said that it's quite similar to like what we've done before. Councilperson Leinung said that that's the first one where you are actually dealing with someone that's specifically related to COVID. He can go back and forth whether we want to do two-thirds or 100%. One hundred percent kind of incentivizes that person to stay home more which is either a good thing or a bad thing because that might incentivize them to stay home whereas maybe they have a spouse who will not be reimbursed at 100% and it makes sense for the person whose going to be reimbursed 100% to stay home. He doesn't know how much that would actually deal with us because that's a specific time of having someone be subject to a COVID order.

The other instance is where like his kids' school is closed because there is a COVID case in the school and the school is closed or the school goes remote for weeks at a time. He thinks that's a different situation in the sense that there is a requirement under State and Federal law that you have to allow them to take what's equivalent to paid family leave. It's not paid family leave but it's equivalent to that. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that it's the Expanded Family and Medical Leave Act. Councilperson Leinung said that that's two-thirds pay, as well. For now he would be much more open. For that one he thinks we would stick more to the two-thirds pay and allow people to use their accruals to get up to the 100% for that because that could last for a while. There is no real risk of that employee coming back early and possibly spreading COVID as much as having someone in your actual household be subject to it. Supervisor LaGrange said that he agrees with that logic personally. He thinks that if there is direct contact or there is quarantine or State/County action to have someone stay home he thinks we stick with what we've done with the 100%. He does think that there should be some incentive to not take advantage of it too much. Like he said, if a child has a cold and the daycare or the school says they don't want them to come until they have a test showing negative and the person is out 3-4 days, whatever it might be, he thinks that's when the two-thirds rule should be in place rather than pay them 100% or any other situation like that, a school closed or whatever. That's his opinion. Anyone else?

Councilperson Hennessy said that he thinks sticking with the framework that we have for our plan right now is consistent and stay with the 100%. If we look at whether you change it after a time period or you bring in a time period, we can discuss that. He's not looking to go down to two-thirds right now. Councilperson Leinung asked for anything? Even if school is closed? Councilperson Hennessy said that he's not ready to make that. Supervisor LaGrange said that we have our resolution from before but we really need to have something new today to cover all bases. Councilperson Burke said she would go to the two-thirds for anytime you are caring for someone else, whether it's isolation or not, but he really doesn't feel strongly about it and will go with the group consensus. Councilperson Greenberg said that he's good with the two-thirds on somebody who hasn't been exposed. That makes sense to him. He guesses that there are situations that we need to talk about because it's not clear to him exactly. Sarah, you can clarify this and I know Dan referred to these as laws. Are they laws? Are they recommendations? Mrs. Kavanaugh said that it's Federal legislation. It's the Families First Coronavirus Relief Act. It's in effect to two-thirds so it is a law. There is also State legislation but the State legislation doesn't add anything to the Federal so it's not a concern really. If you're paying attention to the Federal, you are fine with the State. Councilperson Greenberg asked if two-thirds is the minimum? We are committed to that. There is no wiggle room or choice. We could do anywhere between two-thirds and 100%? Mrs. Kavanaugh said yes and in a particular situation, and this has been a situation that we've been confronted with a couple of times with slight variations, but really it's the same thing that is under the emergency paid sick leave of the FFCRA qualification #4 that states "caring for an individual subject to an order described in #1 or self-quarantine as described in #2." It goes into more detail but let's say the

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

individual is a dependent child. In that instance you are required to pay two-thirds of their pay up to 80 work hours or 70 if they work a 35 hour week. So, if it's themselves they've been quarantined or they've had a positive test and they have a quarantine order you have to pay 100%. If they are taking care of someone else who has been quarantined, like a child or a parent that lives with them or something, you pay two-thirds. The question we run into is whether the Town, and we don't have to, wants to be more generous than we have to be in that circumstance. In that specific circumstance do we want to pay 100% or something in between, the two-thirds that we have to pay anyway and 100%? Councilperson Greenberg said that the only thing he was trying to drive at here is that the only decision we're making today, the only thing we have a choice in, is two-thirds versus 100% or somewhere in between for the people who are not directly exposed. On that question he leans toward the two-thirds because he can see where we don't want to incentivize staying home and he also thinks we are going to be running into problems like school closures and things like that where we may not be talking about a week or two here. We may be talking about three months. Supervisor LaGrange said that those are two separate issues. Councilperson Greenberg said that that's where he's at and then we have two separate issues in Town where you have (this is shorthand it may not be true for everybody) the Highway Department where you have the essential workers and the non-essential workers on the Town payroll and should we be differing among those people? In other words we need the Highway Department for snowstorms. We're going to have to have those people. If we have a rule in place that says they are getting paid and schools are closed, Kenny's not here now, he's curious how many on our staff does that effect because we can't have half of our Highway Department staying home? Councilperson Leinung said, "Isn't part of that too, Sarah correct me if I'm wrong, isn't there part of it that there is no other child care available?" If you have a spouse that's home it doesn't necessarily apply. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that that's not under #4. It's a separate thing. You could do 75% or 100% on reason #4 which isn't about the school closing. Councilperson Leinung said right, it's about the caring for people. Mrs. Kavanaugh added to leave it at the minimum required by the Federal law that covers when schools are closed because they had an outbreak or something and they can be closed for a month or six weeks. Doing the one thing does not mean the other thing is done. There are two separate issues. The one is if your kid has been quarantined specifically or the doctor says they have a fever and cough and you need to keep them home until you get a test or something like that. That is only for two weeks maximum. You can leave it at the two-thirds or go up to 100%, 75%, or whatever. The school closure thing is the extended family leave and that's what Adam was talking about. If you have multiple employees with kids all going to that same school you could have quite a few affected. There are two separate issues that you can act differently on. Councilperson Burke said that if a person says to us, "My choice is to stay home" and we know they could get daycare but we can't force them, right? Mrs. Kavanaugh asked if she was talking about the school closure thing? Councilperson Burke said either one, the school closed or the quarantine if the person chooses to stay home but could get daycare. Councilperson Leinung added, "Or they have a spouse." Mrs. Kavanaugh replied that she hadn't really thought about the daycare. It's like if the doctor says they are sick and they could have it she couldn't imagine anybody else being willing to watch them. Councilperson Burke said that they have to go by the provision if daycare isn't available. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that you can ask them to attest that they can't find other daycare or there is no other person that can watch them. Councilperson Leinung said that he's more concerned about when schools are closed and are they actually providing direct care to a dependent? Supervisor LaGrange said that it's two separate issues. Councilperson Greenberg said that it is but we might run into that so we need to kind of talk about it and decide if we want to have different policies for different things. Supervisor LaGrange asked if he is understanding this right? He wanted to just summarize. According to Federal law if someone is quarantined or a case they are required to be paid 100%. Mrs. Kavanaugh said yes. Supervisor LaGrange said that we have to pay 100% so we are covered under Federal law there and we don't have to change anything. The second grouping is if you are caring for someone in your home or is under quarantine, one or the other, then that is to be paid at 66% under Federal law. So that is some wiggle room and he's getting a feeling that we want to do 100% with that. Is he correct there? Councilperson Leinung said that he's okay with the 100%. If people really think we should stay at two-thirds he's fine with that as well. He thinks we don't want people coming back as much if there is a confirmed or possible case in the household. That one we'd want to encourage people to stay home more at the 100% but you're saying doing two-thirds, as well. Supervisor LaGrange said that that we already went 100% already. Councilperson Leinung said we've done that in the past. Supervisor LaGrange agreed. The middle group is where we have to decipher. We've already done it before. It would encourage people that may be exposed and still waiting to find out whether a kid or spouse or whatever has results and they are under quarantine by the State. Supervisor LaGrange

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

clarified that a person in the house was. That we could do at the 66%, the two-thirds, or we could do any number above that or 100% which we've done. Then we have the third group that spurred this on a little bit and that's the group that doesn't have a confirmed case, doesn't have a forced quarantine so to speak, a kid with a cold, can't go to school or daycare because they are waiting for a test to be sure they don't have COVID. That one is the one he'd be leaning toward at the two-thirds pay. Councilperson Leinung added that the schools are closed in general. Supervisor LaGrange agreed. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that what Doug just described fits under #4. It's the same thing. You said it's a third group, but if their kid is sick and they are not taking them to school and they are requesting the leave, they have to be seeking a test. Supervisor LaGrange said that if they are seeking a test they'd fall into the second group. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that the fact that they have to be pursuing testing, like a confirmation or whatever, and the fact that they have to have a medical care provider who has indicated or the Department of Health or whatever that it's possible they have it and they should seek testing, is already in the law so we don't have to add any language or elaborate on that. Supervisor LaGrange added, "Unless we want to go to 100%." Mrs. Kavanaugh said even then you don't, if you word it properly. It's assumed that we are following all of the other requirements in the resolution she passed around that states that the only thing we are doing is changing it to 100%. Supervisor LaGrange said that his question is what about a daycare? Say the child has a cold and we don't want them to come unless they have a test. Councilperson Leinung said that that would be that second group. Supervisor LaGrange said okay they have to give us something that says we are requesting a test before this child can come back. That would prevent someone from saying my kid has a cold; I might get a test. We have to have some sort of assertion to say that they have to have a test to come back.

Councilperson Burke added that, in terms of the testing, she's not really clear on what's available right now. There is rapid testing and there is still the longer, more involved testing. Do we prioritize one over the other? Supervisor LaGrange said that the rapid testing seems to be much less reliable percentage-wise. That only does a couple of light swabs in the nostrils. The more aggressive testing that we are used to hearing about is much more reliable. The rapid test takes a couple of hours and the longer test they used to say would take a week or 10 days. Now they are still saying that, but it's coming back within 2-4 days. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that you don't have to dictate that at all because who dictates that is the school or the Department of Health. She's showing Doug something. She can't go into detail because she's not going to disclose the private health situation of an employee, but she's showing him an example of what the school required. It has a spot there for the doctor to say that they sent the kid for testing and then it has the test results. We didn't have to be involved in that at all because the daycare provider is following the Department of Health recommendations. It's kind of out of our hands and we don't have to do anything. It's already being done. Councilperson Burke said that she would just encourage that the parents try to do something to be prompt in their seeking of the test. Councilperson Leinung said that he actually had to do this with his son a week ago. If he has a runny nose he can't go to school unless he gets a COVID-negative test. So we brought him to an urgent care on a Monday and we got the result back 24-36 hours later, and that was going to an urgent care. He thinks the returns for the test now are 24-48 hours and that's not the rapid testing. You show up. You can do a walk-up test and you can get it back in 24-48 hours. To Sarah's point, in the resolution we do say "have COVID or suspected of having COVID" which would include this test for a cold. He doesn't think we need to specify that anymore. Supervisor LaGrange said that they are expressing COVID systems and that's why the school or whoever is sending them home and for a test.

Mrs. Kavanaugh said that this was passed on October 2<sup>nd</sup> and it's really not relevant anymore. The current resolution doesn't say anything about charging employees caring for a dependent. She took that from the language of the updated Federal advice. It covers everything and if it's not in this, it says that we are going to follow detailed Federal advice. There are 178 frequently asked questions. There are detailed rules about specific things and questions and we don't really need to do anything about that. Councilperson Leinung said that if someone comes in and says they want this we can refer them to whatever guidance is already out there. You have to provide a test before you come back. He thinks she's right. We don't necessarily need to put that in the resolution. Mrs. Kavanaugh added that all we have to say is the coverage, whether it's 100% or two-thirds. Councilperson Leinung agreed. Mrs. Kavanaugh said a very narrow specific just to that and then we're safe just saying we're going to follow all the rules; we're just changing this one aspect. Supervisor LaGrange said that Michael hadn't chimed in. Everybody has had this resolution that Sarah worked up.

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

Attorney Naughton said here's what he's thinking. He's just kind of listening to everyone on these things. If we just want to follow Federal and State law, really we wouldn't do anything other than rescinding the prior policy we had that people get 100% pay. If we just want to follow the minimum we would not be doing any fancy resolutions except rescinding that prior resolution and we would advise what we understand to be in Federal and State laws on this and what benefits there are. If somebody wants to do more than that, and he's kind of hearing that most people are saying two-thirds sounds about right, following Federal law on this for incentive reasons, etc., but Bill has indicated he'd like to do a little bit more. If you wanted to find some kind of middle ground on that it seems that it's that first week where people don't have their testing done and their test results back. If you wanted to you might want to consider saying that for the first week for those people that fall into that category they would receive 100% and for all other situations it would go back to Federal law which is two-thirds, and if it's a recurring situation where the same employee has to take care of a kid you could either continue that and if it happens again months later or you could just say for subsequent events you would follow Federal law at two-thirds. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that it's limited to 80 hours the whole time it was passed, so from April 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup>. It's not each instance. She just wanted to let people know that she forgot to mention that earlier because she knows there was some question in the October meeting. Let's say they use a week. That's all they will get at the 100%. They won't get it again. She just wanted to point that out. Supervisor LaGrange said what if they only used one week. Are they okay to use another week? Mrs. Kavanaugh said yes. Supervisor LaGrange said that it could be two separate occasions but only a week each time. Mrs. Kavanaugh asked if we want to just make it up to 40 hours? You could say for a seven-day period, a maximum of forty hours, we would pay 100%. Do you see what she's saying? That way all we're altering is one week of it instead of the two weeks that the law covers. Does that make sense? Supervisor LaGrange agreed. Mrs. Kavanaugh added that by saying 40 hours and let's say you're out for 28 hours and then a month later they are out for 12 hours they would get 100% because that is a total cumulative of 40 hours. Do you see what she's saying? They could have two incidents. That's how the current law was except that it's probably not a two-week period. It is possible, as Michael was saying that this resolution can specify that for the first week or for a one-week time period for 40 hours we will pay 100% and after that it follows the Federal two-thirds. You could say that if you wanted to limit it to a week instead of two.

Councilperson Hennessy said that he's not married to 100% forever. His only concern is the difficulty in defining it and secondly the subjective capability of it if we have a situation that we're familiar with now that all of a sudden there is another situation, you know how employees are going to be; Well A got this, why can't B get that? When you start having a threshold for something like that you may open yourself up to that kind of thing. We are all working in a new environment and he gets that. We are doing the best we can. He understands that. He just wanted to point out that potential. The other thing is that we may want to consider two weeks in case it can encompass a quarantine period of somebody and it may enter into that period. Is that what we are talking about right now? Not necessarily, but he could see where a two-week period tying in a quarantine or an element of that might tie in. That's another way of looking at it. He's not married to a 100% in perpetuity of course. He just thinks it's something we have to be careful with when we have an element where we may have to have a subjective decision made and it could look different upon others. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that when the Department of Health issues a quarantine, let's say a kid has been exposed at school, like there is a known contact in their school and they issue a 14-day quarantine. It doesn't say it can only be seven days if they get a negative test. It's 14 days. It doesn't matter whether they have a negative test two days later or not; they can't go back to school. Councilperson Hennessy said that he knows directly. A family member had to do one because of their workplace. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that in that case it's not like the employee has a choice. If they get their kid tested they can get them out of quarantine earlier. It's going to be two weeks no matter what, like Bill is saying.

Councilperson Greenberg said that he's fine with Michael's idea of basically rescinding our previous resolution, following the Federal guidelines and seeing how it goes. We can change this at any time. If we run into a situation where we see that it's not working or for some reason people are coming when we don't feel they should come or people are taking advantage in some way that we don't think they should be we can revisit. In the meantime he would assume some research has been done on this topic and that those guidelines come from a place of study that we don't have all the facts on. He would at least initially like to follow their guidelines until we see that they don't work for us for

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

some reason. Supervisor LaGrange said that this resolution covers that and especially if we want to leave it at the 100% for those instances if we're all in agreement with that and we will also void the previous resolution. Councilperson Greenberg said, to go back to what Michael was saying, we don't need this resolution. We just need to revoke our previous resolution. He would prefer to do that so that we're not complicating it in some way or there is some way in which this resolution doesn't line up the way it should. All of these things that we're talking about, the two-thirds in the one case and otherwise 100%, that's all in the Federal law. Councilperson Hennessy asked if he could ask a question to clarify what Sarah said? If the child is home for a two-week quarantine period we are only going to pay the father or mother 100% for week one and not 100% for week two. Is that what you are saying? Councilperson Burke replied not if we just revoke and don't put in the new resolution. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that Michael was saying a week if it was a possibility or choice. If they are home for two weeks they get two-thirds. That's the law. Councilperson Hennessy said that he would say that if they have to be home two weeks they should get 100%. That's his position. He can understand the two-week threshold. That's what he's thinking on that line. Mrs. Kavanaugh said that her concern is if that's what you want then we need to do a new resolution because the one on October 2<sup>nd</sup> does not specify that. It's talking about just the employee, although she believes the intent was to cover it if the resolution itself does not make that clear. Supervisor LaGrange said that in answer to Adam, we are getting back to that middle group; the Federal Government says we have to do two-thirds. It seems like some of us are thinking we want to do 100% there. So that's why a new resolution is still important. Councilperson Burke said that maybe we could do a vote. She just want to move the conversation along because she has to leave at 2:30 PM. Supervisor LaGrange said that the other thing to is remember that if it's 14 days that could be 10 days at the most. The person would have to use time to supplement the 66% if that was the case and it depends on how those two-week quarantines fell. There are a maximum of five working days in a week obviously. There is still some legal room there. Just a point, that's all.

Attorney Naughton suggested going back to Bridgit's thing and before you have a formal motion why don't you poll the Board to see where they fall on this. The question really is do you want to just follow the Federal government guidelines on this which provides the two-thirds. Flesh that out. He's hearing from Bill that his preference is to go to the 100%. Just find out where people stand on that and then you can get the motion going.

Supervisor LaGrange said that he's inclined to do 100% also. Councilperson Hennessy said that if you want to go in order of seniority he's 100% for two weeks and then you can go two-thirds after. Councilperson Greenberg added that he's following the Federal guidelines and seeing how that goes for a little while. If it's not working for some reason, then changing. Councilperson Leinung said that he keeps going back and forth. From Adam's perspective he thinks that's kind of the cleanest way to do this and if it starts to be an issue we can go back or grant an exception. We can go back and change it. It might make sense for ease of everything just to go back with the Federal and State, too. The State follows the Federal so it's Federal and State for the two-thirds. He thinks he's fine with that. Councilperson Burke said that she's going with the majority. Town Clerk Deschenes said that it's split. Councilperson Burke said that she will go with Federal and State law. Supervisor LaGrange said that either way it's a generous policy. Either way we are taking care of the employees. That's fine. We just need a resolution to say what? Councilperson Burke said just that we revoke the prior resolution. Supervisor LaGrange said that it can't be on each individual. Attorney Naughton asked if he could make a suggestion. Adam, do you want to make a motion to rescind the October 2<sup>nd</sup> policy of compensation and that we will revert to following Federal and State laws regarding these situations regarding COVID and then we can see where it goes? That would be the clean way to handle it. Councilperson Greenberg said that he thought that's what we were doing when Bridgit agreed with me and Dan. Supervisor LaGrange said that we didn't have an official resolution. Do you want to adopt that? Councilperson Greenberg added that he knows it was made on October 2<sup>nd</sup>. He doesn't know if we need to be more specific on what we are revoking. Does anybody know what we called it or the number? Town Clerk Deschenes said that she can look up the number. Supervisor LaGrange's screen froze up and he got kicked off. Supervisor LaGrange signed back in and advised that the resolution number was 2020-204 passed on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Resolution 2020-218**

Councilperson Greenberg offered the following and moved its adoption:

Resolved that the Town Board of the Town of New Scotland does hereby rescind Resolution 2020-

Town of New Scotland  
Special Town Board Meeting  
10/23/2020

204 that passed on October 2, 2020. We will be revoking that law and following State and Federal laws and guidance on this issue.

Councilperson Burke seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken:   Supervisor LaGrange    Aye  
                                  Councilperson Greenberg Aye  
                                  Councilperson Hennessy Nay  
                                  Councilperson Leinung   Aye  
                                  Councilperson Burke     Aye

All present and voting, the motion carried (4 Ayes – 1 Nay)

Councilperson Greenberg said that he just wanted to be clear on the vote. We are meeting on Fridays about COVID and we can change this at any time. He's open to that. He just thinks this is a good starting point. Councilperson Burke and Councilperson Leinung agreed.

**2. Adjourn**

Councilperson Burke made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Councilperson Leinung. The meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM.

---

Diane R. Deschenes, Town Clerk