

Shutesbury Select Board Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2021 Virtual Meeting Platform

Select Board members present: Melissa Makepeace-O'Neil/Chair, April Stein, and Rita Farrell

Staff present: Becky Torres/Town Administrator; Linda Avis Scott/Administrative Secretary

Finance Committee members present: Jim Walton/Chair, Susie Mosher, Ajay Khashu, Jim Hemingway, Bob Groves, Melody Chartier, and George Arvanitis

Personnel Board members present: Peg Ross, George Arvanitis, Melody Chartier, and Melissa Makepeace-O'Neil

Other Staff present: Town Counsel Donna MacNicol; Jeff Lacy, Michael DeChiara, and Linda Rotondi/Planning Board; Police Officer Kristen Burgess; Don Wakoluk/Tree Warden; Henry Geddes, Miriam DeFant and Mary Lou Conca/Historical Commission; Mary David and Miriam DeFant/Conservation Commission

Guests: Evan Turner, Michael Larkin, and Camille Littlefield/Amp Energy; Ken Lindsay, Michael Vinskey, Andrew Chabot, Robert Seletsky, Marina Gurman, Kevin Weir, Diane Kieval, Diane Jacoby, Brigid Murphy, Leslie Luchonok, Marianne Connor and other unidentified parties.

Makepeace-O'Neil calls the meeting to order at 5:37pm.

Agenda Review: The "Policy Academy Candidate" topic is moved to 6:55pm in order for the discussion to overlap with the Finance Committee.

Public Comment:

1. Mike Vinskey notes that he is glad the Select Board is moving forward with the policing study group. Vinskey refers to the suggestions in the Paul Vlach email ("A resident's thoughts on the police department transition") and to ensure it is sent to study group requests it be included in the 3.16.21 meeting minutes. Vinskey is concerned about an officer attending the next academy and encourages delaying this decision until after receiving the results of the study group.
2. Jeff Lacy notes that he recently rejoined the NextDoor Shutesbury list serve; the first post he read was an endorsement of the Amp project by Kevin Rudden/Administrative Assessor; reading this post could make folks believe that the tax rate will decrease by \$1.50; is this the kind of work the Select Board wants Rudden to be doing as a Town employee; is Rudden a policy maker; is it true funds will be used to bring down the tax rate? Lacy, as a Planning Board member, notes that he is available to answer questions about the solar bylaw.
3. Marianne Connor states concern about the proposal by Amp Energy and asks how she can obtain more information to understand what is being proposed and where she can best make public comment. Makepeace-O'Neil: the Town website has the information that the Select Board has available; at this point, no applications have been received; once received, the applications will go through the full review procedure.
4. Miriam DeFant states that Kevin Rudden's posts are misleading and she is concerned about their accuracy, i.e., that Amp may alter conservation provisions; people listen to Town employees differently than to others; when the Select Board opens the discussion about the solar bylaw, she and Henry Geddes, as Historical Commission members, are present to answer questions.
5. Robert Seletsky asks whether, as an elected body, the Select Board represents the will of the people. Makepeace-O'Neil: yes. Seletsky: in the case of the solar bylaw that was passed

almost unanimously last June, it does not seem appropriate for the Select Board to join with Amp Energy to possibly circumvent the bylaw.

6. Marina Gurman: Amp Energy is on a timetable to be granted a certain process; rushing the process can impact the health of our relationship with nature and ourselves; this is a microcosm of the larger global situation where these relationships are treated secondarily to the dollar bill, i.e., Monsanto's patenting the genetics of seeds while Indian farmers, using sustainable practices, have committed suicides; it is not a stretch to use this analogy with Amp threatening to take the Town to court.

Discussion Topics:

1. Appoint Officer in Charge: Torres: the plan was for Dan Fernandes to come back as Officer in Charge (OIC) after his resignation as police chief became effective 3.6.21, however, because of Franklin Regional Retirement Board's requirements, Fernandes cannot work for the Town until he has received his funds from the Board. Torres continues: Kristen Burgess is a seasoned officer with five years of experience and has agreed to be OIC; the Select Board held an emergency meeting on 3.12.19 at 3pm and voted to appoint Burgess as Officer in Charge; Town Counsel Donna MacNicol recommends the Select Board retake the 3.12.21 vote during an open meeting. Officer Kristen Burgess thanks the Select Board for their trust; she does not take becoming OIC lightly and is confident she can lead for as long as is necessary; this is her fifth year as an officer with experience with in another department and with a network of support; she will continue to serve the community and keep people safe.
 - Stein moves and Makepeace-O'Neil seconds a motion to appoint Police Officer Kristen Burgess as Officer in Charge effective immediately. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.
2. Sirius Community & Temenos PILOT Agreements: Torres: the Sirius Community helpfully and generously agreed to PILOT increases over time; Temenos voluntarily increased their PILOT from \$650/year to \$850/year.
 - Farrell moves and Stein seconds a motion to approve the agreement between the Town and Sirius, Inc for a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) understanding effective to 6.30.2026. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.
 - Farrell moves and Stein seconds a motion to approve the agreement between the Town and Temenos, Inc. for a payment in lieu of taxes understanding effective to 6.30.2026. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.
3. Request for Appointment: Select Board members review the 3.15.21 email from Liam Cregan/ConCom Chair, "ConCom Vacancy Vote", letting the Select Board "know that the Shutesbury Conservation Commission voted to recommend Don Wakoluk to be appointed to fill a vacancy on the Commission left by Penny Jaques". Farrell: having a recommendation from the Conservation Commission and with the topic on the agenda, the Select Board should discuss the matter. Don Wakoluk notes he is available to answer questions and states that his work as Tree Warden overlaps with the Commission's work, he can lend expertise regarding trees, and will be a valuable addition as he is a certified soil scientist and can delineate wetlands if needed. Wakoluk continues: he can offer a neutral position and act without bias; in a lot of towns, tree wardens offer guidance to commissions without voting; in this case, the Commissioners decided he should be a voting member and will recuse himself

if needed. Wakoluk to Stein's question: he may need to recuse himself depending on who may be doing tree work in Town; these decisions though, are made in concert with Tim Hunting/Highway Superintendent.

Torres: former Conservation Commissioner Penny Jaques expressed reservations about appointing Wakoluk who previously served on the Commission; as a long standing member, Jaques does not feel Wakoluk would have the ability to respond evenly to all the issues that may come before the Commission. DeFant to Farrell: yes, Jaques did state her concerns to the Commission and we have had further discussion without Wakoluk present and with his permission; he has value to offer and we have not had any concerns; we felt he could be a valuable Commissioner and if there were issues, the Chair would bring them to the Select Board if they could not be resolved; with that in mind, we voted to appoint Wakoluk. Mary David/Commissioner agrees with DeFant: the Commission voted that Wakoluk would be a valuable asset.

Farrell asks Wakoluk for his reaction to the comments made by Jaques. Wakoluk: Jaques and I have had our differences in the past; all in all, his interactions have been positive; with Jaques, it has been a difference of science; Jaques did have a right to speak however it was an ad hominem attack that he let slide; he does not feel the extra scrutiny and questioning of his personality are necessary; likes and dislikes should not interfere with scientific matters. DeFant advocates for appointing Wakoluk; she appreciates his honesty, straightforwardness, and expertise; would hope we would welcome people with different styles and abilities; also, people grow and change.

Torres would have hoped that Wakoluk would bring forward the fact that he has a "no trespass order" issued by Cows, Inc. as does DeFant; these orders restrict their ability to conduct site visits on Cows property; if Wakoluk is appointed, two out of five members cannot make site visits on Cows property; the ANRADs (Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation) are almost complete so this may not be an issue. Torres asks Wakoluk, if he is appointed, to fill out the necessary paperwork with the Ethics Commission as DeFant did. Wakoluk agrees to fill out the required paperwork and will talk with Cinda Jones/Cows, Inc. about releasing the "no trespass" order. Torres: DeFant and DeChiara tried asking C. Jones to release the order and were denied. Makepeace-O'Neil confirms that the Commission can continue to conduct site visits. DeFant: two ANRADs have been completed; primarily, the peer review consultant Emily Stockman/Stockman Associates has been conducting the ANRAD site visits with TRC, the consulting firm hired by Amp Energy, which Commissioners can attend. Stein would like to further consider the matter. Farrell is ready to vote though will wait for Stein. Makepeace-O'Neil: since Stein would like to wait, this item will be on the 3.30.21 agenda. Makepeace-O'Neil thanks those who participated in the discussion.

4. Plan Solar Bylaw Review with Planning Board: Torres explains that the purpose of the agenda item is to plan next steps for reviewing the solar bylaw; Planning Board Chair Deacon Bonner suggests the Planning Board and Select Board meet with Town Counsel Donna MacNicol on 3.30.21; using an outside attorney could be discussed this evening. Makepeace-O'Neil suggests an attorney with solar experience. Farrell is concerned about whether our bylaw could be challenged because it is too extreme and de facto makes it impossible to do solar development in Shutesbury; they were approved by Attorney General's (AG's) office though there is the question from the Amp side that they could be

challenged. Stein refers to the 11.4.20 letter from the Office of the Attorney General and the comments regarding Section 8.10 and the Dover Amendment (General Laws Chapter 40A, Section 3) and the need to consult closely with Town Counsel; why not seek outside guidance.

Town Counsel Donna MacNicol joins the meeting. Farrell explains that she is interested in hearing MacNicol's take on Amp's position that this bylaw could be challenged, threatening litigation, as it makes it nearly impossible to do solar in Shutesbury and her thoughts about outside counsel and a scope of work. MacNicol feels ambivalent about outside counsel as this is standard letter from the AG's office; their job is to decide whether the bylaw is legal or not and if there have been any relevant issues in the court and to ensure interpretations are per case law; case law cited in the AG's memo indicates that Land Court judges have allowed some challenges to solar bylaws; the AG's office is aware that case law is changing everyday therefore seeks to ensure that town counsels are looking at current case law to ensure the bylaw can be applied as intended. MacNicol continues: it is a complex bylaw; per Chp. 40A §3, solar can be reasonably regulated; with the AG's approval, this is a legal bylaw on the books.

MacNicol: on the other side, the Town could find someone who is an expert in solar zoning to advise the town; no attorney will be able to say whether the bylaw could be challenged and every word will be approved or not; you will do your very best to reasonably regulate per the bylaw; she is not sure what an outside attorney could do for the Town at this point. MacNicol to Stein's question: this is standard procedure for sign and solar bylaws; for any zoning bylaw that touches on first amendment issues and solar, the same kind of AG response is received.

Jeff Lacy/Planning Board: in addition to working with MacNicol during the bylaw review process, he ran the solar bylaw by land use attorney Bob Ritchie as well; if outside counsel is hired, he asks to be interviewed by that person. DeFant to the Select Board and Torres: if an outside attorney is hired who is knowledgeable about solar, they may also have represented developers. MacNicol: you would want a municipal attorney who does zoning, i.e., Bob Ritchie who was municipal counsel and has worked with the AG's office. MacNicol continues: developers will come in and push hard; they do threaten to litigate if they do not get what they want; threatening litigation does not need to put the Town in an adversarial position.

Stein: we are a little community working with a multi-national corporation; the Town needs to have strength. MacNicol: Shutesbury has the talent and ability to shepherd the Town through the process and needs the time to do so; this is not just about taxes and solar, there is the memorandum of understanding, the operations manager, third parties; it is overwhelming because there are major complex issues including whether the community thinks it is in their best interest; if the developer is pushing too fast, it is hard; the Select Board is capable of making the political and financial decisions and the Planning Board is able to do the permitting. MacNicol continues: you need to look at the big picture and make choices; do we need an economist or an actuary, what are the accurate figures; you need to determine what experts are really needed.

Farrell: first, she has a copy of a report done by the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission about solar bylaws that is helpful and user friendly; it provides templates for bylaws and samples of those that have been passed; our bylaw does not include a provision for battery storage and how it is to be regulated; for protection, safety issues related to lithium ion batteries should be an addition to our bylaw; secondly, she agrees with MacNicol that there are so many layers to the issue and some outside assistance is in order. Farrell suggests that during the meeting with the Planning Board, there be a discussion about holding a public informational forum prior to annual town meeting about what we do and don't know and get some read from the community, i.e., may be an informational survey; there is a lack of information and some disinformation. The joint Select Board and Planning Board meeting to include MacNicol is scheduled for 4.5.21 at 6:30pm. MacNicol: a scope of services, where we need input, will need to be discussed.

DeChiara thanks MacNicol and acknowledges her as a great resource for our Town and notes that he and Lacy had a comprehensive and thoughtful process with MacNicol during the bylaw amendment process. DeChiara refers to the 3.1.21 meeting with Amp Energy and that the Planning Board's goal for the bylaw was reasonable regulation; we want to have solar, however, the concern is how it will happen; the fear of being sued is because it cost lots of money; we need to go slow and determine how we want to proceed; any consideration of an outside expert should be a joint conversation with the Planning Board. DeChiara agrees with Farrell about the need for the bylaw to address battery storage which is now required by the SMART (Solar Massachusetts Renewable Target). MacNicol: step one, make a list of the issues and what kind of experts may be needed; the Select Board and Planning Board need to agree on zoning changes; is this developer on some kind of timeframe and does this matter; make as comprehensive a list as possible so the right issues are brought forth.

Henry Geddes/Historical Commission: the Commission has been hard at work developing guidelines for the preservation aspects of the solar bylaw; these recommendations and guidelines will be available in a week; this is not about unreasonable regulation; it is about a way to preserve aspects of our environment. Lacy: the Planning Board needs to be included in developing a scope of work; in the AG's letter regarding the 2008 zoning bylaw overhaul, the section that was questioned the most, Article V, has gone on to become a State model. Farrell seconds MacNicol's suggestion about putting together a list of issues; these also need to be compiled to help frame a public forum. Stein and Torres agree to compile the list. MacNicol: keep in mind that Amp wants the public entity designation; under the SMART program, they are very limited regarding siting though if they have the public entity designation, they get protection regarding siting; that is the reason they are pushing so hard to get the exemption. MacNicol notes that DeChiara's email (3.14.21 "following up on solar MOU") spells out the advantages of the public entity for Amp Energy. Marina Gurman relays a message from Mary Lou Conca who reports calling the County Sheriff who advised her that "no trespass orders" last one year and that Conca feels it is a violation of privacy to talk about individual trespass orders in an open meeting.

5. Regional Assessment: Torres refers to the 3.11.21 email from Doug Slaughter/Director of Finance Amherst Pelham Regional Schools detailing budget projections using the 55% and 65% assessment formulas; on 3.9.21, the Select Board, School Committee and Finance Committee all voted to support the 65% statutory assessment method; the budgetary difference will be in how much "choice money" is used. Torres recommends the Select

Board send a letter to the Regional School Committee, ahead of their vote, confirming the position taken by all three of Shutesbury's bodies.

Jim Walton calls the Finance Committee to order at 7:03pm.

6. Police Academy Candidate: Farrell explains that she raised the need to confer with the FinCom regarding the Select Board's thinking about sending Officer Kristen Burgess to the full time academy. Makepeace-O'Neil: there have been some changes in State law, effective 7.1.21, requiring part-time officers to, in some way, have full-time training; the implementation of the law is pending; we have an opportunity to send Burgess to the full-time academy in the fall which is why the Select Board wants to check in with the FinCom; Burgess knows she needs to sign an agreement to work for the Town for five years after completing the academy and, if not, repay the prorated academy fee; wages are paid while an officer attends the academy.

Farrell: former Police Chief Fernandes indicated that there would be no increase in the Department's budget and that part-time officers will cover Burgess' shifts. Burgess: the western MA academy starts in the fall however there are no dates yet; she will need to have a physical before applying and another one before attending the academy. Stein asks if the full time training is sped up for someone with the part-time academy. Burgess to Stein's question: the full-time training is not sped up for someone with the part-time academy; there is no guidance yet whether new legislation will change this.

Torres: the training lasts about 4.5 months; the decision is being considered now due to the time needed for the application and the need to ensure Burgess is in line for a place. Torres continues: it may be a year before the State determines other training paths; Burgess is now the OIC, the Select Board has confidence in her ability and Fernandes was talking about this before he decided to resign. Torres recommends supporting Burgess in attending the academy and suggests the Select Board write a letter to the State about the need for POST (Police Officers Standards and Training) legislation guidance. Groves referring to Vlach's email and statements from Senator Jo Comerford: he has the strong impression that there are many towns in the same situation and it is unlikely that the State will impose strict requirements in the near future; it is not urgent for Burgess to attend the academy; we are forming a study group and it would be poor timing to continue the existing structure.

Burgess: there is constant communication from the Commonwealth re: POST; they most certainly will be mandating what we are stating and the majority of small towns are preparing for the mandates that are coming. Makepeace-O'Neil to Groves: our police department needs to continue to function during the study. Vinskey notes that he is reiterating what he said earlier (during public comment): right now, there is flux in what the State will require; with information from the study group pending, we do not know what the outcome will be and sending someone to the academy may not be recommended. Vinskey continues: the past track record on sending officers to academy is that one signed the agreement and paid back the prorated academy fee and one did not sign the agreement; research is needed; spending money on salary, covering shifts, and the cost of the academy is not appropriate at this time. Mosher: first, we dealt with the issue of officers leaving after attending the academy by creating the agreement and, second, by waiting for the study group, she is not sure that having someone attend the academy would not work into those recommendations; sending Burgess to the academy would address the immediate needs of our Town.

Farrell adds that the study committee will take a while and recommendations may not be made until the 2022 town meeting; to operate with the police department without full time academy training is not a good idea. Stein agrees, has hope for Officer Marcus Johansson and is impressed with how Burgess works in the community. Makepeace-O'Neil: regardless of the study, we need our officers to be fully trained in every aspect they can possibly be.

- Farrell moves the Select Board approve Officer Kristen Burgess applying to the full-time police academy; Stein seconds the motion. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries. Burgess thanks everyone for their support.

At 7:21pm, Peg Ross calls the Personnel Board to order; roll called members present are Peg Ross, Melody Chartier, George Arvanitis and Melissa Makepeace-O'Neil.

7. Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) for Town Employees: Makepeace-O'Neil: this is the annual conversation about the COLA; contract employees agree to accept what is agreed upon for non-contract employees. Torres: the contract positions are the police chief, town administrator, highway superintendent and fire chief; it is part of the contract to accept what is given to Town employees; the police union contract will be going into negotiations soon. Makepeace-O'Neil: the COLA options are from 0-3%. Torres: the FY21 COLA was 3%. Torres to Stein's question: the impact on the budget is \$6,700 per percentage point, i.e., a 3% COLA will have a \$20,100 impact on the budget. Groves notes that he voted against last year's 3% COLA due to the pandemic; the Town needs to hold wages steady; according to the data, we went above the inflation rate last year; we have already made a down payment on this year with last year's 3%.

Torres reviews the inflation rates: 2.24% for 2021, .64% for 2020, 1.81% for 2019 and 2.44% for 2018; Social Security COLAs: 1.3% for 2021, 1.6% for 2020, 2.8% for 2019 and 2.0% for 2018; we need to take into account that the national ideal for the Consumer Price Index (CPI) national ideal is 100 and that Massachusetts is 127. Hemingway: the 2021 increase in inflation is due to the spike in oil prices therefore we need to use last year as a reference. Torres: the inflation rate numbers are based on an October date. Hemingway: it is not a reliable figure to use. Mosher: consider the fact that the numbers do not tell the whole story; our salaries are commensurate per FRCOG; we need to be a good employer for our employees and many of our employees are tax payers who go above and beyond their job descriptions; in the past, COLA increases went to cover increases in health insurance costs; .62% may not be a reliable number due to the pandemic. Lacy: you need to keep in mind that the majority of the taxpayers are not Town employees; when he worked for the State, he seldom received a 3% COLA; 3% is pretty excessive.

Arvanitis: both the 2020 and 2021 inflation rates are related to oil; 2020 is an anomaly year; we need a standard, i.e., the Consumer Price Index; anything less than a 1% COLA is an insult to our employees. Arvanitis suggests considering a rolling average of the last three years' inflation rates; people complain that Social Security does not keep up with inflation. Arvanitis: there is one Town employee who feels they are underpaid; COLA increase are not a lot of money in the budget and will not hurt the taxpayer, however, what will the loss of an employee cost. Groves: we are conflating different issues; we need to base the increase in COLA on an average of inflation numbers and Social Security and keep the COLA and raises

separate; we need a formula to use every year; last year was an anomalous year; we have people who have lost their jobs and there are those who have not been negatively impacted. Mosher points out that the Federal, State and Town governments have worked to help taxpayers during the pandemic.

Khashu: what would it require for our Town to agree to a standard as per Arvanitis; would the Personnel or Select Board vote to codify a standard that could deviate if there are special circumstances. Torres: as per Makepeace-O'Neil, the Personnel Board will recommend to the Select Board who is the approving body; the Personnel Board has tried to tackle a COLA standard in the past, however recently lost their chairperson. Makepeace-O'Neil: agreeing to a standard is a good concept. Torres: the Consumer Price Index is 1.7%, the inflation rate is .62%, and the Social Security COLA is 1.3%. Stein notes that these are national figures. Hemingway: has the FinCom or Personnel Board looked into what neighboring towns are doing; Leverett may use the CPI and the Personnel Board uses the FRCOG list for salary guidance.

Torres: per FRCOG, we were in the bottom for a number of positions. Arvanitis states that he will present FRCOG data to the Personnel Board 3.18.21; of the fourteen positions, five are below average and one is the lowest and some of these are specific jobs that require training. Torres to Mosher's question: FRCOG does not collect yearly COLA increases; the Small Town Administrators of MA (STAM) usually sends around lists and the COLAs vary from year to year though are usually 1.5 -3%. Khashu prefers establishing a standard such as using the Social Security average for last the three years of 1.9% and adding some increment, such as .25 - .5%, to adjust for the region to end up with a COLA of 2.15 – 2.4%. Farrell suggests asking the Personnel Board to decide on the benchmarks to be used and to consider how MA is different from the rest of the country. Torres recommends using three years of data. Chartier confirms the need for a standard and notes that the benchmarks need to be apples to apples comparisons and, for comparison, use like towns with similar budgets. Groves affirms the need to use standard indices; salaries are a separate issue; Massachusetts may have a higher standard however that does not mean a higher COLA. Arvanitis emphasizes the need to ensure employees are getting enough. Torres cites past COLAs: in FY18 it was 1.5%, FY19 was 2.5%, FY20 and FY21 it was 3%. Makepeace-O'Neil: the average is 2.4%. Lacy likes the idea of benchmarks linked to something real.

Mosher suggests sending the discussion back to the Personnel Board; there is time to do so because the annual town meeting is not until June. Arvanitis agrees with Mosher about having the time to make a decision and agrees with Lacy on the need for a benchmark.

Torres: the 3.18.21 Personnel Board agenda is an executive session with a special purpose; the COLA topic cannot not be taken up until the next meeting. Personnel Board members plan to meet on 3.25.21 at 6:00pm to consider a COLA standard. Stein to Walton's question: the Select Board will make a decision based on what the Personnel Board recommends. Makepeace-O'Neil notes that she and Chartier and Arvanitis, who both serve on the FinCom, are on the Personnel Board. Groves hoped it could be done tonight and asks why the FinCom will be out of the loop.

Mosher: as a matter of process, we are asking the Personnel Board to come up with a recommendation for a benchmark and there are two members of the FinCom on the Personnel Board. Khashu concurs: now the Personnel Board can do the work. Walton agrees with benchmark concept though the FinCom has been involved with and should be part of the process; we are looking at a long-term solution; the next FinCom meeting is scheduled for

3.23.21. Arvanitis notes that the FinCom does not have to recommend what the Personnel Board and Select Board agree to; having received good direction from this meeting, he and Chartier will report back to the FinCom. Mosher: the FinCom's role is to find solutions; points have been made and we are in the ballpark; the Personnel Board will do the work. Walton agrees with Arvanitis' explanation: as a FinCom, we can work with the decision and weigh in before the final budget. Makepeace-O'Neil: as per Khashu, there can be deviations. Walton: the concept makes sense. Stein: Chartier and Arvanitis will bring the FinCom's input to the Personnel Board. Makepeace-O'Neil: we are all present tonight to inform the Personnel Board and Select Board. Groves: the FinCom should have a hand in the consensus on the way to measure the COLA each year except in special situations and hopes the Personnel Board can do this without conflating it with other issues; we are trying to establish a policy and the FinCom will look at it closely. Torres notes that 40% of the members of the Personnel Board are also Finance Committee members.

Administrative Actions:

1. Select Board members will sign vendor warrants totaling \$185,803.28.
2. Select Board members will sign payroll warrants totaling \$98,651.83.
3. Stein Moves and Farrell seconds a motion to approve the 2.23.21 meeting minutes. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye. The 2.23.21 minutes are approved as presented.
4. Stein moves and Farrell seconds a motion to approve the 3.1.21 meeting minutes. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye. The 3.1.21 minutes are approved as presented.
5. Carry over consideration of the 3.4.21 minutes to the 3.30.21 meeting.

At 8:12pm, Farrell moves and Stein seconds a motion to adjourn the meeting. Roll call vote: Farrell: aye, Stein: aye, and Makepeace-O'Neil: aye; the motion carries.

At 8:12pm, Ross moves and Arvanitis seconds a motion to adjourn the Personnel Board. Roll call vote: Arvanitis: aye, Makepeace-O'Neil: aye, and Ross: aye; the motion carries.

At 8:13pm, Walton moves and Khashu seconds a motion to adjourn the Finance Committee. Roll call vote: Arvanitis: aye, Chartier: aye, Hemingway: aye, Khashu: aye, Mosher: aye, Groves: aye, and Walton: aye; the motion carries.

Documents and Other Items Used at the Meeting:

1. Paul Vlach 3.3.21 email: "A resident's thoughts on the police department transition"
2. Agreement between the Town and Sirius, Inc. for payment in lieu of taxes
3. Agreement between the Town and Temenos, Inc. for payment in lieu of taxes
4. 3.15.21 email from Liam Cregan/ConCom Chair: "ConCom Vacancy Vote"
5. 11.4.20 letter from the Office of the Attorney General regarding "Shutesbury Annual Town Meeting of June 27, 2020 – Case #9829"
6. Michael DeChiara 3.14.21 email: "following up on solar MOU"
7. "Projected Inflation Rate in the United States 2010-2021"
8. Social Security "Automatic Cost-Of-Living-Adjustments received since 1975"
9. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics "Consumer Price Index Summary"

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Avis Scott
Administrative Secretary

