



## Natick Finance Committee

Pursuant to Chapter 40, Section 3 of the Town of Natick By-Laws, I attest that the attached copy is the approved copy of the minutes for the following meeting:

**Town of Natick Finance Committee**  
**Meeting Date: February 15, 2018**

The minutes were approved through the following action:

Motion:	Approval
Made by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Mr. McCauley
Vote:	7 – 0 – 0
Date:	3-20-2018

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Evans

Secretary

Natick Finance Committee

**NATICK FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**February 15, 2018**

**Natick Town Hall**

**School Committee Meeting Room 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

This meeting has been properly posted as required by law.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

David Coffey, Member

Bruce Evans, Clerk

Patrick Hayes, Chairperson

Michael Linehan, Member

Robert McCauley, Member

Jerry Pierce, Member

Philip Rooney, Member

Daniel Sullivan, Member (left meeting at 8:00 p.m.)

Jim A. Scurlock, Member

Dirk Coburn (arrived at 7:10 p.m.)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Cathleen Collins, Vice-Chairman

Cathy Coughlin, Member

Linda Wollschlager, Member

Kristine Van Amsterdam, Member

David Gallo, Member

**AGENDA:**

1. Public Concerns/Comments
2. Meeting Minutes
  - a. Meeting Minutes for February 1, 6 and 8, 2018 – Review and Approve
3. Old Business
  - a. Finance Committee and Sub-Committee Process and Scheduling
4. 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing
  - a. Article 3 – Elected Officials Salaries
  - b. Article 18 - Amend By-Law Article 24 Regarding Procedure for Appointment of Police Chief (Will be Rescheduled)
  - c. Article 4 – Personnel Board Personnel Classification & Pay Plan (Will be Rescheduled)
  - d. Article 19 – Amend By-Law Article 24 Regarding Procedure for Appointment of Fire Chief (Will Be Rescheduled)
  - e. Article 20 – Amend By-Law Article 51: Alarm Systems
  - f. Article 21- Amend By-Law Article 72: Building Regulations
  - g. Article 22 – Amend B-Law Article 76: Regulations Regarding Historical Significant Buildings, etc.

5. Adjourn

**CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman, Patrick Hayes

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/CITIZENS CONCERNS:**

None.

Mr Hayes: We will not hear Article 18 - Amend By-Law Article 24 Regarding Procedure for Appointment of Police Chief, Article 4 – Personnel Board Personnel Classification & Pay Plan and Article 19 – Amend By-Law Article 24 Regarding Procedure for Appointment of Fire Chief.

Mr Hayes: It is not official but the Personnel Classification and Pay Plan will seek No Action. Articles 18 and Article 19 are not ready for hearing and the Sponsors were not available. Those Articles will be moved to sometime in March. We have nothing going on next week. When we get back 2/27 we will not meet because of Special Town Meeting we will meet on March 1, 2018

**MOTION**

Move to open the Natick Finance Committee 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Evans
Seconded by:	Mr McCauley
Motions or Debates:	None.
Vote: Carried	9-0-0

**Article 22** – Amend Zoning By-Law Article 76: Regulations Regarding Historical Significant Buildings, etc.

Sponsored by the Charter & By-Law Review Committee

Steven Evers, Historic Commission and Carol Gloff, Member, Charter and By-Law Review Committee

The Charter and By-Law Review Committee is wrapping up its work, we have three Articles on the Spring Town Meeting Warrant and our term will end at the end of spring Town Meeting. With regard to Warrant Article 22 there are three changes suggested. In Section 5h and 5i, there is a term “preferably preserved” which is not defined. Mr. Evers, Chair of the Natick Historic Commission checked with the state Historical Commission and got the definition for the term “preferably preserved.” The State Historic Commission noted that preferably preserved and historically significant were different terms and we needed to clarify our By-Law. Mr Evers noted that they added 2a because the state wanted consistency amongst demolition, alterations and related By-Laws throughout the state. They want to make sure all the various cities and towns have the same language and/or definition of terms so there’s a consistency for legal and enforcement purposes. One of those was to add the phrase about the building being “at least 50 years or older” which is part of the definition of a historical property. Section 2 subsection f has a proposed change which you can see in the redlined version. In Section 3b, we propose to delete a sentence – also at the request of the state. The Mass Historical Commission in Chapter 40A Section a-d defines what the duties and responsibilities of a Historical Commission are and one of those is to record the assets of the community in regard of the assets of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We are charged with recording our historical assets. This conflicts with what was written into the By-Law as a Town Meeting amendment that talks about nomination of properties to be inventoried.

The basis of our demolition/alteration By-Law is any building that has been inventoried by the historic and archeological assets of the Commonwealth. That further sentence makes no sense in terms of Mass General Laws which instructs us to record the assets without public consent, without property ownership notification but by law as a responsibility to our community. Our By-Law is basically unlawful regarding our duties and responsibilities. They don't accept nominations, we don't do nominations. In fact, since this By-Law was accepted we've already inventoried an additional 300 properties in the town of Natick. Ms Gloff noted that the state was sent the entire By-Law so they could see where we used the term "preferably preserved" and the gentleman from the Mass. Historic Commission went through it and this sentence caught his eye and he said you can't have this sentence in there.

From Novus Agenda:

To see whether the Town will vote to amend Article 76 of the Town of Natick By-laws as follows:

1. In Section 2, sub-section F: a. After the words "which is" in the first sentence, delete the word "(1)" and insert the words "in whole or in part fifty (50) years old or older and which has been determined by the Commission or its designee to be significant based on any of the following: (1) it is"; and b. Add the word "it" after the word "(2) in the first sentence; so that Section 2, sub-section F shall read: "Historically Significant Building or Structure: Any regulated building or structure which is in whole or in part fifty (50) years old or older and which has been determined by the Commission or its designee to be significant based on any of the following: (1) it is associated with one or more historic persons or events or with the architectural, cultural, economic, political or social history of the Town of Natick, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and/or the United States of America; or (2) it is historically or architecturally important by reason of type, period, style and method of building construction, or represents the work of a particular architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures."; and
2. Add a new sub-section H to Section 2: "Preferably Preserved: Any Historically Significant Building or Structure which the Commission determines, following a public hearing, that it is in the public interest to be preserved rather than demolished, altered or relocated. A Preferably Preserved Building or Structure is subject to the six-month demolition delay period of this bylaw."; and
3. In Section 3, sub-section B, delete the sentence "Further nominations to said inventory shall occur only after notice to the assessed owner of the building or structure and a public hearing on said proposed nomination.";

#### Questions

Coffey: How does Town Counsel feel about these changes? Gloff: To my knowledge Town Counsel is fine with these revisions. We discussed the "preferably preserved" with him. I did not discuss the removal of the sentence. McCauley: Is the 50 year standard a state regulation as far as a historically significant building? Evers: Most states use 50 years as the dominant provision for using a demolition By-Law – ours did not mention 50 years. Linehan: Does this mean that unless a property is 50 years old it cannot be considered historically significant? Evers: No, the fact that the inventory is still the basis of our jurisdiction not 50 years or older. 50 years or older is a qualification under the fact that it's already been inventoried. So it's an "inventoried property" . . . it could be a 1960's solar house.

**MOTION**

Move referral to the Historic Commission.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Coffey
Seconded by:	None
Motions or Debates:	
Vote:	

Move to recommend favorable action on subject matter of Article 22

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Evans
Seconded by:	Mr Pierce
Motions or Debates:	<p>Mr Evans: I think this is well thought out, although we'd like to get town counsel's opinion in most cases I think given that the state has declared the sentence that's deleted as being unacceptable I figure that's a pretty safe bet. I urge support.</p> <p>Mr Pierce: Thank you for cleaning this up and all your work on the By-Laws.</p> <p>Mr Coffey: I would ask that it not be passed for two reasons, I would like to have Town Counsel weigh in on this matter and quite frankly, just because the Mass Historical Commission's approved it – when these By-Laws were passed the Attorney General's office approved this language, as anything that comes out of Town Meeting has to run through the AG's office for review. I think this language being in here provides protection to property owners in the town of Natick. The language they are trying to strike out requires that before a building gets listed by the registry that there be notice to the assessed owner and a public hearing. What's wrong with telling somebody that your property interest in this piece of property that you own is subject to change and we're going to have a hearing about it before we do it. It's due process and if our town By-Laws give property owners greater rights than state law there's nothing wrong with that. There are numerous instances where state law gives greater protection to citizens than federal law and even municipal wardens can give protections. We can give more protections but not less. To be able to change an owner's property – change or possibly diminish what someone can do with their property – I think that's unconscionable and I won't support this.</p> <p>Mr Hayes: I will request that Town Counsel to offer an opinion as t to the deletion of the language from section 3b, in advance of town meeting. If given that response from him there seems to be a disagreement of the law on the request from the state, I will alert the members to that and any member can request reconsideration.</p>
Vote: Carried	8-1-1

**Article 3:** Elected Officials Salary – Sponsor, William Chenard, Acting Town Administrator

*Presenters: Bill Chenard and Diane Packer, Town Clerk*

Mr Hayes: In the Town of Natick we have a single elected official's salary and that is the Town Clerk. We have had discussions in the past in this committee of how to assess the job performance of the Town Clerk. We have asked for and received information on what other towns pay their Town Clerk. Members we are not talking about job performance – Town Meeting and the voters decide that with their votes.

Mr Chenard: In Natick we look at salary increases based on a number of factors. We look at if we were to have to attract that person to fill the position what would we have to pay to replace the person. We look at job performance, initiatives and goals. I will say that Ms. Packer has done an incredible job with two key areas that were caused by the Municipal Modernization Act, Public Records Requests and Early Voting. She has done an incredible job setting up and following through with public records requests – this will keep the town out of trouble and avoid fines from the AG's office and get records to people when they request them.

I'm proposing a 2 ½% increase to \$94,100.00 for FY19. We took a look at area communities we looked at five communities - all are FY18 salaries: Wellesley \$89,631, Framingham \$101,430, Wayland \$70,505, and Needham \$99,839. That's an average of \$91,101 – if we were to take Wayland out the average would be above what we're proposing tonight.

Questions:

Mr Rooney: Last year (FY16), the salary was \$85,000, then it went to \$91,800 and that was an 8% increase and I thought the justification last year was the early voting contribution. I understood the reasons for it last year – I'm having difficulty understanding that same rationale for this year.

Mr Chenard: I'm not saying it's because of early voting and Municipal Records Act work, I'm saying it's because of the job she's doing with those things. That is the number we would be proposing for department heads. It starts out at 0 and the cap was just over this number. I think it's important that the Town Clerk have a competitive salary even though she is elected. Although it would be perfectly acceptable to flatten the town clerk's salary at 0% increase I think that's the wrong decision.

Mr Rooney: The rationale that it's comparable to other communities - I have trouble with that because I don't know what the responsibilities of the Town Clerk in any of these communities.

Mr Chenard: The Town Clerk's responsibilities are in many communities less than what we demand of the position in Natick.

Ms Packer: Most of the Town Clerk's responsibilities are laid out in Mass State Law. Some clerks are also public records officers and some are not. The majority have some role in it, other than that, all clerks are the election officers, they are responsible for the open meeting law, maintaining and keeping conflict of interest information, they are the clerk of representative town meeting, they are responsible for sending By-Law and Charter changes to the AG's office. So most of the responsibilities of town clerk are similar in each community.

Mr Rooney: Did you say this position has a job description or doesn't?

Mr Chenard: Not within the Personnel By-Law – it's statutory.

Mr Rooney: Should I interpret this as not having a pay range – in theory it would never hit a cap?

Mr Chenard: That is correct that is the way the statute is written.

Mr Rooney: But the statute does not demand that there has to be pay increases?  
 Mr Chenard: Absolutely not.  
 Mr Linehan: We haven't seen the personnel pay plan – do you know what the percentage they're using just as a town thing?  
 Mr Chenard: There are no percentages in the Personnel Pay Plan - it's merit-based – there's a salary band for every job.  
 Mr Linehan: I meant the salary adjustments to the salary bands  
 Mr Chenard: There are no adjustments to the salary bands.  
 Mr Coffey: What are the average raises town employees are getting this year percentage-wise?  
 Mr Chenard: For Personnel Board employees it ranges from 0 to just below 2% - there were some up to 2 ½ and 3% but the average is just below 2%.  
 Mr Coffey: People got as high as 3%?  
 Chenard: There were two that got higher they were market driven.

**MOTION**

Move to recommend favorable action on Article 3, that the Town vote to fix the salary and compensation of the following elected officer of the Town for the Fiscal Year July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 as provided by section 108 of Chapter 41 of the Massachusetts General Laws: Town Clerk: \$94,100.00 \*\* Note that this proposal reflects a 2.5% salary increase from \$91,800 and rounded to the next whole \$000.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Evans
Seconded by:	Mr Sullivan
Motions or Debates:	<p>Mr Evans: Last year was a catch up year that was making up for a market adjustment. We were way out of whack from other nearby communities. I think she deserves this increase and I urge support of this.</p> <p>Mr Sullivan: I did a little bit of research this afternoon – I researched the town of Franklin because it is often pointed to as a comparable for Natick in many areas. They had a Town Clerk who retired with the salary at \$85,000 and Town Meeting lowered the salary to \$76,000, They had a difficult time getting anyone to run for the job they are in the process of making a second adjustment to that salary this year and they are into the \$90s. The Clerk is in charge of both annual Town Meeting in this town and when you consider the number of sessions that's a good 35 nights a year that the Town Clerk spends on Town Meeting alone. I'm in support of this motion.</p> <p>Mr Coffey: I urge we accept this. There's a model of efficiency in this clerk's office which is amazing on a day to day basis.</p> <p>Mr Coburn: This feels like a very appropriate range for comparable positions in a wide variety of comparable organizations. I think if anything the proposed compensation may be a bit of a bargain for the town – I'm happy to support it.</p> <p>Mr Pierce: Thank you for your hard work.</p>
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

**Article 20:** Amend By-Law Article 51: Alarm Systems

Sponsored by the Charter & By-Law Review Committee

Carol Gloff, Member, Charter & By-Law Review Committee

From the Novus Agenda 2/15/2018

To see whether the Town will vote to amend Article 51 of the Town of Natick By-laws as follows:

1. In Section 1, paragraph b: a. Add the words “or vehicle” after the words “whose premises” in the first sentence; and b. Delete the words “except for alarm systems on motor vehicles” at the end of the first sentence; and c. Add the words “or vehicle” after the words “the premises” in the second sentence; and d. Add the words “or vehicle” after the words “the premises” in the third sentence”; so that Section 1, paragraph b shall read: “The term "Alarm User" or "User" means any person on whose premises or vehicle an alarm system is maintained within the town. Excluded from this definition and from the coverage of this by-law are central station personnel and persons who use alarm systems to alert or signal persons within the premises or vehicle in which the alarm system is located of an attempted unauthorized intrusion or holdup attempt. If such a system, however, employs an audible signal emitting sounds or a flashing light or beacon designed to signal persons outside the premises or vehicle, such system shall be within the definition of "alarm system," as that term is used by this by-law, and shall be subject to this by-law.”; and

2. Replace Section 1, paragraph g with the word “deleted”; and

3. In Section 6, paragraph a: a. Add the words “, with the exception of motor vehicle alarm users,” after the first words “Every alarm user” in the first sentence; and b. Add the word “, addresses,” after the word “names” and before the words “telephone numbers” in the first sentence; so that Section 6, paragraph a shall read: “Every alarm user, with the exception of motor vehicle alarm users, shall submit to the Police Chief and the alarm company who maintains the system at the police communications console the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of at least two other persons who can be reached at any time, day or night, and who are authorized to respond to an emergency signal transmitted by an alarm system, and who can open the premises wherein the alarm system is installed. The names, addresses and telephone numbers of the responders must be kept current at all times by the alarm user and the alarm company.”; and

4. Replace Section 6, paragraph b with the word “deleted”; and

5. In Section 7, delete the first and last sentences, so that Section 7 shall read: “Permission is not required to test or demonstrate alarm devices not transmitting emergency messages directly to the police department.”;

Ms Gloff: This was in front of Town Meeting in the fall but the Police department requested that we add car alarms – we did that and it passed Town Meeting but there were a number of questions about a few sections that people felt there was still confusion. So we went back to this By-Law Article and found a few places where we hadn’t done the best job making it clear where vehicle alarms are included. We also removed verbiage about reporting information about car alarms to the Police department and language about alarms reporting directly to the police department as that is no longer done.

Hayes: Is the red-line reflective of all the changes from fall Town Meeting?

Gloff: Yes, as voted by fall Town Meeting – so those changes are no longer tracked.

Questions

Mr Evans: Has this been reviewed with the Police department?



Gloff: I don't know if they have looked at this clean up. The original changes were at the instigation of the Police department. These changes were made after that because of suggestions made after/at Town Meeting.

Hayes: The red-line version has a mistake "deleted" and the same for section 6b with the word "deleted."

Ms Gloff: They will both be corrected in the redline version you get from me.

Mr Linehan: If a vehicle is registered out of town does that create any difficulty for Police in enforcing vehicle alarms that go off too much?

Ms Gloff: I think that's up to interpretation.

Mr Linehan: Is there a method of enforcement against the host of the guest whose vehicle is causing the problem?

Mr Gloff: It's a good question – I don't have an answer.

**MOTION**

Recommend favorable action on Warrant Article 20 of the Spring 2018 Annual to Amend By-Law Article 51: Alarm Systems with 2 additional changes with changes to redline discussed at FinCom meeting 2/15/2018

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Sullivan
Seconded by:	Mr Pierce
	Mr Sullivan: Thank you and the committee for all your hard work.
Motions or Debates:	Mr Pierce: Thank you very much.
Vote: Carried	10-0-0

**Article 21 – Amend By-Law Article 72: Building Regulations**

Sponsored by the Charter & By-Law Review Committee

Carol Gloff, Member, Charter & By-Law Review Committee

To see whether the Town will vote to amend Article 72 of the Town of Natick By-laws as follows:

1. Change the title of Section 5 to "Height Requirements at Intersections, including Driveways"; and
2. In the first paragraph of Section 5, replace the word "streets" with the words "public ways"; and
3. Add the sentence "No fence, shrubbery or other object located within fifteen (15) feet of the intersection of a public way and a driveway shall be maintained more than three (3) feet above the street grade measured at said intersection." as the second paragraph of Section 5; so that Section 5 shall read: "Section 5 Height Requirements at Intersections, including Driveways In any lot which abuts an intersection of two or more public ways, no fence, shrubbery or other object which is located within fifteen (15) feet of such an intersection, shall be maintained more than three (3) feet above the street grade measured at said intersection. No fence, shrubbery or other object located within fifteen (15) feet of the intersection of a public way and a driveway shall be maintained more than three (3) feet above the street grade measured at said intersection.";

Gloff: This proposed change was brought up by one of our committee members. This changes tries to limit people from putting up fences that are so high they block the view

of oncoming traffic of vehicles coming out of a driveway. We are proposing to change the word street to “public way” and to add a sentence that uses the same criteria for how high and how much of a set-back a fence needs to have when there’s an intersection of a public way and a driveway “no fence shrubbery or other object located within fifteen feet of the intersection of a public way and a driveway shall be maintained more than three feet above the street above the street grade measured as said intersection.

Questions:

Mr McCauley: If there isn’t a driveway involved, if it’s just an intersection is that covered?

Ms Gloff: I believe there is a sentence already in the By-Law that covers that.

Mr McCauley: If this passes are present structures grandfathered?

Ms Gloff: I think – although I am not an attorney – I think this will be in effect going forward I don’t think it will be retroactive.

Mr Coburn: Was there any consideration given to whether a fence taller than 3 feet might be transparent rather than opaque?

Ms Gloff: I can’t say that we specifically looked at it in that way but we talked about a lot of different ways to address this – we finally decided that there were so many different possibilities that we would go with the language that mirrored the intersection language.

Mr Alan Grady, Precinct 3, member of the Safety Committee and Charter and By-Law Committee: David Gusmini is on the Safety Committee so he would be reviewing this. Lieutenant Lauzon s on the Safety Committee so he would be reviewing this as well. I took this to the Safety Committee and Lieutenant Lauzon, Mr. Gusmini and I visited the site and all agreed this is a safety issue. So we’ve had several conversations and a site visit by all and I would be happy to take this back to the Safety Committee again.

Mr Rooney: Procedural Question: I heard something new that I didn’t hear before Mr. Grady discussed the Safety Committee. Is the genesis of this article address a specific location?

Mr Grady: No, there’s a specific problem on Speen Street where a gentleman who called regarding his neighbor erecting a fence that impinges upon his ability to safely enter Speen Street without driving into oncoming traffic in order to see.

Mr Rooney: And there was no other remedy?

Mr Grady: Correct, because the fence was legally constructed. The current By-Law only speaks to a street that is intersecting another street, it does not cover a driveway intersecting another street. So that was something to change, to incorporate a driveway intersecting a street.

Ms Gloff: Mr. Errickson drove around a small part of the town and saw a number of other examples where visibility where a fence impedes the visibility of a driver coming out of a driveway into traffic.

**MOTION:**

Move to refer Article 21 – Amend By-Law Article 72: Building Regulations to the Public Safety Committee and Community Development.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Coburn
Seconded by:	Mr Linehan
Motions or Debates:	Mr Coburn: I applaud taking seriously what sounds like a problem in several locations and coming up with something but I don’t think we have the right tool to address it yet. In part,

	<p>because I don't think it contemplates enough variations of the possible configuration of things that it might apply to. I would hope that in a referral there would be some more language to be a little more flexible to apply to different situations like the case of a transparent fence. My hope in referral is that the language can encompass more situations or be more flexible.</p> <p>Mr Linehan: There are many roads in town that are not like Speen Street. To put this kind of restriction on those areas where it is not necessary for safety I think would be inappropriate. I believe on Speen Street if the public way includes the sidewalk and further to the property line. In many instances the public way is a much greater area than simply the roadway. This does not make sense where there's a good distance from the front property line to the roadway. I'm a little concerned that it's a sledgehammer answer to a tack hammer problem and that's why I urge referral at this time.</p> <p>Mr Coffey: If there were language in her that said something like, "no fence, shrubbery or other object located within fifteen feet of the intersection of a public way which obstructs the view of motorists" that way a four foot chain link fence would be okay under these provisions. Given the fact that we're not going to fix anything that's already broken I think referral might be a good way to send this back and fine-tune it to include that type of language. I'm not swayed by some of the arguments I don't think children walking to school are at risk that much – if you are walking on a sidewalk you need to pay attention to a car pulling out of a driveway and the driver needs to pay attention to the sidewalk we cannot regulate common sense. I don't think we need By-Laws that take into account every human action. I urge referral.</p>
<p>Vote: No Recommendation</p>	<p>4-5-0</p>

**MOTION:**

Move to recommend favorable action on Article 21 – Amend By-Law Article 72:  
Building Regulations

<p>Moved/Motioned by:</p>	<p>Mr Evans</p>
<p>Seconded by:</p>	<p>Mr McCauley</p>
<p>Motions or Debates:</p>	<p>Mr Evans: I like this suggestion because it's actually a fairly specific and narrowly defined. It gives the ZBA or the Police a tool that can prevent a traffic hazard. The Safety Committee have vetted this and have said it is not draconian and it's broad enough to encompass nuisances. I am going to urge support.</p> <p>Mr McCauley: It's not just traffic it's kids too – when they're walking to school and there are obstructions for drivers it's not a safe situation. I think this is an appropriate safety measure and I'm supporting it.</p> <p>Mr Rooney: I'm supporting this. I don't think it's onerous. It's not asking anyone who has an existing condition to do anything it's only affecting someone who is going to do something new</p>

	with a piece of property and they can appropriately plan. I don't thing referral is going to gain us anything so I urge we support it and move on. Mr Hayes: I will support favorable action. I'm comfortable with the language and the inclusion of the word "public ways" at a street. Often things can be improved with time but I'm not sure it's the case here ... I will support this because I think it's appropriate.
Vote: No Recommendation	5-4-0

**SCHEDULING**

MR Hayes: It is not official but I expect at this point that the Personnel Board and Personnel Classification and Pay Plan Article the sponsors will seek not action. We will not take action on that tonight we will have it on a later agenda. Article 18 and Article 19 are not ready for prime time the Selectmen wished to be here as the sponsors of those articles but they were interviewing new Town Administrator candidates this evening and they didn't have their articles ready. Those two articles will be heard sometime in March but not March 1<sup>st</sup>. Lastly, we have nothing going on next week. Tuesday the 27<sup>th</sup> we will not meet because Special Town Meeting #1 is that night. We will come back again on March 1<sup>st</sup> assuming Town Meeting only goes one night.

**MOTION**

Move to close the 2018 Spring Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles – Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Evans
Seconded by:	Mr Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	9-0-0

**OLD BUSINESS**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MOTION**

Ineligible:

Jim A. Scurlock, Member

Move to approve Finance Committee Meeting Minutes for February 8, 2018

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Pierce
Seconded by:	Mr Hayes
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	8-0-0

**ADJOURN**

**MOTION**

Motion to adjourn.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Pierce
--------------------	-----------

Seconded by:	Mr Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote Carried	9-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.