

**Union Budget Committee Meeting Minutes
November 28, 2012**

Committee Members Present: Christine Savage, David Shaub, Doris Vertz, Jody Wentworth, John Mountainland, John Field, Laura Curtis, Lincoln Hawes, Nate Pease, and Terry Bracket

Committee Members Absent: Erik Amundsen and Scott Sabins

Also Present: Jay Feyler, Greg Grotton, Sara Moore, and Elmer Savage

1. **Call Meeting to Order:** by Chair at 7:00 PM.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance:** Given by all who wished.
3. **Approval of Minutes for 6/25/12 meeting:** Motion made by Terry Bracket to approve minutes as written. Seconded by John Mountainland. Unanimous.
4. **Budget Committee Ordinance Work Session:**

Initial Discussion - Jody Wentworth started the session by noting the past mixed feelings regarding Section 2 of the ordinance at the past last Town Meeting. John Field mentioned that he felt that if we do come up with some improvements as a result of this meeting that the majority of the Budget Committee and the Selectmen are in favor of, we may have a better chance of getting the public to accept it. Greg Grotton stated that he agreed that Section 2 was the biggest problem and thought that the Budget Committee should come up with changes that are workable for them and then present it to the Board of Selectmen. Then we can all go to the town with the same wording to get it done right once and for all. John Field and Jay Feyler helped clarify that the ordinance approved by the voters at the June 1998 annual Town Meeting was the version that we are currently operating under and is the one that we will be proposing improvements to. Jay Feyler made copies of the 1998 version for those people who did not have them. John Field suggested that we start at the beginning of the ordinance go down through it section by section. Jody Wentworth inquired as to where the basis for the 1998 version comes from. Buddy Savage and Greg Grotton speculated that likely samples from other towns or from the MMA were adapted to produce the 1998 Ordinance.

Section 2 - John Field asked about how we might clarify what exactly is meant in Section 2 where it states “No other official”. Jay Feyler said that normally officials are elected, but it may be good to define it. John Field stated that at the end of the ordinance we might want to add a section called “Definitions”. Dave Shaub said that if we struck that second sentence that begins with “No” and ends with “member”, we have not lost anything. We will be giving the electorate the opportunity to select twelve of us. We have said that you have to be a registered voter. What else do we want to say? We don’t want to exclude any registered voters do we? So why not get rid of that whole sentence which at best is confusing? Greg Grotton responded that we don’t want to nominate a selectman to be on the Budget committee as an example. John Field mentioned that he had noticed that the Town of Appleton Budget Committee ordinance states “No town official or employee receiving over \$500 per year in compensation from the Town of Appleton may be a member.” He also relayed that the Town of Hollis ordinance states “No other elected official or Head of a Town Department may be a member”. I hear you Dave, but the Town has voted twice in a row against having employees on the committee, but there might be a compromise that could be sold. Dave said “my point was that if you stand somebody for election then the voters choose who they want and it’s patently obvious that if there are five

people standing for the three spots that the electorate will vote according to their desires. I suspect that they wouldn't give a person who is a selectman a second vote on the budget. The Selectmen already got their opportunity to raise their hand or not on the warrant. Greg Grotton said that it's that one sentence that really came to light a year or so ago because you folks were discussing an individual on the board and one point I made was if you've got a Department Head that is on the Budget Committee and he is also preparing a budget, it's a little bit like, here is what I want, here is what I want you guys to vote on and here are the reasons why. You got a Department Head doing two things, making his own budget and then voting on his budget. Dave Shaub said the history of that and I've been doing this eight or ten years now, is that the person who is involved is very helpful to provide information and has recused himself from actually voting. Nate Pease said what good is it for him to be on the Committee if he has to recuse himself from voting. Dave Shaub stated that last year we had fifty votes or so and there is one that had to do with his department. John Field said that if you were a Department Head and I happen to like you and even though you have abstained from voting, I still feel that I really want to make you happy and give you your budget. Jody Wentworth said that there is where the biggest conflict has come, the influence that takes place. My feeling is that should be changed. Dave said one more thing on the other side is that we have always have invited Department Heads to our meetings, they have been very helpful to the discussion, but I agree that they should not vote on their budget line. Greg Grotton said just to play devil's advocate, a Department Head that is also a member of the Budget Committee has an unfair advantage over other Department Heads because that person sits in on all the reviews of all departments and has more than one opportunity. Dave stated that he would be willing to change that section to keep Department Heads off the committee if that's where we are going. Maybe we need less interested persons at our disposal. John Field stated that the Town of Hollis has a section that says that "No member of the Budget Committee shall vote on any budget before the Committee that has any financial interest in the said Budget, whether it is direct compensation as wages or financial compensation or gain to other family members" or something similar to that. I think that if it is the sentiment of the Town, that they really don't want people on the Budget Committee that are receiving compensation, then I think if we define that a little better.. I would like to present this as a motion that if we change that sentence to read "No other official or employee receiving over \$500 per year in compensation from the Town of Union may be a member." Dave Shaub said "I could live with that". Motion seconded by Nate Pease. Christine Savage asked, "Do we need to note the amount of compensation?" Maybe they get \$450. Maybe they get... Jody Wentworth said putting a number on it really defines the thing, we could use a lower number; you could say "any compensation". I guess that is what we have here when you read between the lines, but we are trying to spell it out a little clearer. Laura Curtis asked why department heads couldn't be on the Committee and not vote on their own budget. They have been very informative and helpful to us in our meetings. Nate Pease said they should come before us then. Laura said they are registered voters, to disqualify them, I just don't think it's fair. Nate Pease said that he doesn't think that any elected official or employee should be on the Budget Committee. Buddy Savage said that the issue arose when it came to per diem Fire and Ambulance people and it was the attorney's opinion that we couldn't exclude them. With the \$500 limit you would exclude a fair number of ambulance personnel and some of the Firemen. I hear you on the Directors and the Fire Chief, but because somebody volunteers on the Fire department or works for the Ambulance Service. That seems a little tough to me and wouldn't pass muster with the attorney either. Terry Bracket said that if we put "No elected official or Department Heads" it would suffice. There was interest in this, but John Field reminded everyone that we have a seconded motion to vote on. We could vote against that and then vote on this other idea. Jody asked him to restate his motion and the vote was 2 in favor and 8 opposed. Motion fails.

Nate Pease suggested that we change that to "Department Heads". John Field made a motion that we change that sentence to read "No other official or Head of a Town Department may be a member". Motion seconded by Nate Pease. Jody Wentworth asked if the attorney had a reason why we couldn't set our own ordinance. Jay Feyler responded that he had talked to the attorney in regards to a person that had been on the Committee for a long time. The attorney related that you could not remove that person as they had been duly elected by The People. Jay said that it was the Maine Municipal Association's opinion that you cannot, other than through a Personnel Policy, prohibit someone from running for office. Anybody! You could get challenged, even with the old ordinance, because they have a right to run for office. It's part of their Constitutional right. There are towns who deal with this with their Personnel Policy. They don't allow employees to serve on any other

committees. They do it that way and it seems to hold up in court because it's a condition of hire. Union does not currently have this in our Personnel Policy. We have a statement in there that you cannot be politically active on Town time. Dave Shaub asked can the Selectmen add this to the Personnel Policy. Jay said that it is easier to change the Personnel Policy than an ordinance because the Board of Selectmen can do that. John Field asked if the Town had asked our attorney to put their opinion in writing with maybe some case history referenced as suggested by Greg Grotton at a past Selectmen's meeting. Jay said that had not been done because the Select Board did not vote on it and that doing so would cost money to do that research. Jay said that normally we talk to MMA attorneys, but we have not done any research. It's obviously in other Town's ordinances. It's all depending on if somebody wants to challenge it. Dave said "No other official" seems to refer to something that official above it, but there isn't anything. So when we make the subject of that sentence the "Official" or the "Employee" it needs to be defined. Nate stated, "The way it's worded now it could be somebody part-time. It could be somebody cutting bushes." Jay said "It could be the Election Clerk". Nate mentioned that you've got to put something in that defines it better. Jody said that if we put "Department Head" in, it would pretty well clarify it. Buddy said that he didn't remember exactly what the problem was with the Ordinance revisions proposed by the Selectmen at the last Town Meeting. It seems what was proposed would cover what we are talking about. It said that no other official or employee of the town may be a member and that Ambulance and Fire per diem members are not considered employees under this ordinance. So it says that any other employee but per diem people are not permitted to serve. Christine said, but now we go back to Ballot Clerks. They are employees of the Town, they get paid. You give them seven or eight bucks an hour to work for three hours and they can't serve? Nate said if you just put Department Heads it would eliminate all of your headaches. John Field said I think we need a compromise. The feeling seems to be that we like to have some employees on there, but we have to sell it to the Public which have voted twice against it. Department Heads seems logical to me and other people could serve. Greg said I agree with John. I think it should be "Department Heads". If someone could get up and explain the reasoning for it to The People, then they might understand it. Just throwing the stuff out with changes to it is a little difficult sometimes. I personally would like to see it go that way, and should we decide to do so, we could take it up with the Personnel Policy. Doris Vertz said why don't we say "No other appointed or elected official or Department Head of the Town may be a member"? I think that defines it a little bit better. Jay said if you use the word appointed and elected, number one you have ... I think Eric is still on the School Board, he is an elected official. Appointments that the Town makes to Appeals Board and all these other Committees, you eliminate a lot of people. Greg mentioned that members of the Veteran's Committee would be eliminated. John Field said that he thinks the aversion is financially based. So if somebody is not making any money and is elected to some other board, I don't think anyone cares. Jody mentioned that we had a motion that was seconded that prohibited Department Heads from serving and was there any more discussion? Terry asked if the motion on the floor eliminated the Ballot Clerks and things of that nature. Christine asked who would be "No other official". John Field said that if we define Town Officials and I think Town officials are the Selectmen and the Town Manager, I don't think anyone else is a Town Official. Jay agreed, if you look in the Town manager and Selectmen ordinances, they call all the Selectmen officials. Nate said that right now it would include the Treasure too. Dave said the Town Clerk would be also. Jay said that if we use a definition section to define officials, it will take care of those questions. Dave felt that if we left out "officials" and simply prohibited Department Heads we would be keeping people who prepared a budget off of the Committee. John Field said we have to explain this to The People and it has to be what they want. Greg said that his only feelings on this are that he is a strong one for black and white. If you don't put something in there specific, you are going to be sitting right around these tables again next year discussing the same thing. Who is an official? If you have it in writing, it's done, it's over with. Otherwise it is going to keep coming up. John Field said we could add explanations to a definitions section that would explain Town Officials or Town Department Heads. Dave questioned whether this proposal was running opposite of the legal opinion we have. Jay responded that everybody has different ordinances and it's only a problem if someone seeks to challenge it. Jody asked John Field to re-state the motion. The motion is to replace that sentence with "No other official or Head of a Town department may be a member" and with the stipulation that we will clarify what is meant by Town Official and Department Head in a Definitions Section within the Ordinance. Vote was 8 in favor and 2 opposed. Motion carries.

Jay asked if we should include additional changes to Section 2 that the Board of Selectmen developed for last year's proposal. Those are to change the part that currently reads "Vacancies shall be filled within 60 days by appointment of the municipal officers for the unexpired term." to now read "Vacancies may be filled by appointment of the municipal officers until the next annual Town Meeting." The reason for this is that someone may resign from the Committee after budget deliberations and with the 60 day restriction; there would not be enough time to make an appointment before the annual Town Meeting. John Field also proposed a change to section 2 that begins after the sentence "Members shall serve for terms of 3 years, except that they shall continue in office until their successors are elected." A statement that says, "Four members are elected from the floor each year at the annual Town Meeting. Terms shall be staggered, that of four members ending each year." We all know how it is done, but some people may not. Jody said that he thinks it should be spelled out so that there is no question. Dave suggested that this helpful boilerplate type stuff could be added to the Definitions Section. John Field also proposed the following be added to the very end of Section 2, "Registered Union voter and not a Town Official or Department Head requirements are to be added to the appropriate Article for the annual Town Meeting Warrant. Moderator will remind The Public of the requirements." If we are going to keep requirements and don't remind The People of those requirements, then we are going to have people nominated that don't qualify. Someone may not be a registered voter for example. Greg responded that I think what he is trying to say is to make sure The People are aware who they can nominate. So that it is written in the Warrant that you can't nominate for example, elected officials, Department heads or something like that. Jody wondered if this could be included in the Definitions Section. John Field said that if we don't do this somebody that doesn't qualify will be nominated from the floor and we will elect them. Buddy said if someone not eligible was elected they wouldn't be sworn in, but then you are left with a vacancy. Greg asked if someone not eligible was nominated, can we ask the Moderator to speak in the middle of nominations and reveal the issue to the voters. Some felt that there would be an opportunity to challenge an ineligible person once that person had been nominated. Jody asked why we couldn't have that reminder with the Warrant Article so we'd have it right there and it wouldn't get confused. John Field said that is what he was thinking, so Ronnie could just read it off prior to nominations. If we nominated Jay for example, and somebody seconded it, I don't know if we would have an opportunity. I think it goes straight to the vote. Jody said if we can clear it up before we run into trouble, we would be a lot better off. Dave asked do any of the Town officials act as a Parliamentarian at Town Meeting when we go outside the rules of the game or step out of bounds. Christine replied that was the Moderator's responsibility. Jay said that The Clerk could to refuse to swear in somebody, but then we may have legal issues. I think without putting it in the ordinance, maybe we could put it in the Definitions Section. We could have the Moderator do it. Once he does, it wouldn't get forgotten and he would likely do it for years. We don't have in in there every year. John Field reminded that we always manage to put "Selectmen or Budget Committee Recommend" on the Warrant articles why couldn't we put in these requirements in parentheses next to the Warrant Article for election of Budget Committee members. Jody said that would insure that it wouldn't get forgotten.

Section 3 – John Field proposed several changes to this section. Laura asked that his proposal regarding the Secretary position be handled as a separate motion because of problems with how his proposal was worded. Based on suggestions from John Field, Christine and Jody, the following changes to the first paragraph in Section 3 were offered as a motion. 1. Add "Vice Chair" after Chairman in the first sentence. 2. Add "at the 1st scheduled Budget Committee meeting after the annual Town meeting" after members in the first sentence. 3. Add "In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chair shall preside." After the sentence that reads, The Chairman shall preside at all meetings. 4. Add an "s" to the word "proceeding" in the last sentence. The proposed revisions to read as follows.

"The committee shall annually elect a Chairman, Vice Chair and a Secretary from among its members at the first scheduled Budget Committee meeting after the annual Town Meeting. The chairman shall call meetings as necessary or when so requested by a majority of members of the Municipal Officers. A quorum necessary to conduct business shall consist of at least a majority of members. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings. In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chair shall preside. The Secretary shall maintain a record of all proceedings including all correspondence of the Committee." Seconded by Christine Savage. Unanimous.

In regards to the Secretary position, John Field cautioned that we may not always be able to elect a Secretary from among the ranks of the Committee. There seems to be a lack of interest in the position and I'm finding out that there is more to this note taking than meets the eye. It would be great if we could use one of the Town's Secretaries because they are highly skilled and do a very good job. I understand that there was confusion as to whether they could participate at Budget Committee meetings because of the "No employees" that was in the ordinance before. Now that we are clarifying that, we need to somehow state it so that we can have a non-voting Secretary by majority vote. Jody agreed that we should have that option. Dave said that he would second that. Laura said that her issue with this when it was first mentioned were the words "may hire". She wasn't in favor of just hiring someone to do minutes. We have to stipulate that we would get this person the same way as the other Committees. John Field said that it will still cost us if we use the Town secretary. John Mountainland asked if we could request the secretary from the Selectmen. Terry said the word "request" is better than the words "may hire". Greg cautioned that if we are to look outside for a Secretary, it will have to be budgeted. Jay said that Marci used to be funded as Secretary out of the \$500 allocated annually to the Budget Committee. John Field asked if the Planning Board used one of the Town secretaries or do they elect one from among their members? Jay responded that Helen does the minutes for them. Dave related, based on his experience, that you miss out on a lot of the discussion if you are serving as Secretary. I would like to see all members of the Budget Committee free to think outside the box and if they serve as Secretary they will not have that opportunity. John said he agreed that you cannot do a good job at both. Greg said that you need to leave the wording somewhat open in case a Town Secretary is not available. With the help of many others, John Field made a motion to add "The Committee may request a non-voting Secretary by majority vote." after the first sentence in Section 3. Seconded by Terry Bracket. Unanimous.

Section 4 – John Field felt that since twelve members of the community are elected to serve on the Budget Committee and because most other Committees and Town Departments are represented in the annual Town Report, the Budget Committee ought to submit an annual summary to be included in the Town Report. His motion to add a sub-section "E." that reads "The Budget Committee chairman shall submit an annual summary to be included in the Town's Annual Report". Seconded by Doris Vertz. Unanimous.

John Field made a motion to add a sub-section "F" that reads "No member of the Budget Committee shall vote on any budget before the Committee that has any financial interest in the said budget, whether it is direct compensation or gain to other family members". Seconded by Doris Vertz. Unanimous.

Section 5 – John Field made a motion that we re-number the current Section 5 to Section 6 and add a new Section 5, entitled "Public Notice of Meetings which includes the following statements. "A. All meetings where a quorum of Budget Committee members are present require Public Notice. and B. The Chairman is responsible for coordinating all meetings with the Town Manager who will then notify all members and the General Public through the best means possible." Seconded by Doris Vertz. John Field noted that it is not written in this ordinance if a bunch of us get together and go to a School Board meeting and we get talking about Town business, or other people less familiar could be in violation. If it is spelled out here, then you read the ordinance, you know what is expected. Jay said the law reads in the manner that you normally post your notices for like Selectmen's meetings and all that. Normally we do that on the website and we put it out at here. We don't spend money for newspapers and all that. John Field stated there is a timeframe too. Jay said the 14 day notices are for ordinances and Public Hearings and not for regular meetings. Literally, I could post a Selectmen's meeting at 7:00 this morning and send it to the Press and say we are having a Special Selectmen's meeting at noontime. Normally we try to do it a couple of days ahead of time. The new law states I think, unless it is an emergency, 48 hours. John Field said whatever the requirements are we should have it in our ordinance. The motion was re-read by John Field and seconded by Doris Vertz. Unanimous.

John Field made a motion to add a Section 7 entitled "Definitions." That would include "Town Official" and "Town Department Head" or any others that are needed. We can leave it up to Jay to fill in the needed definitions. Dave noted that we have also used the term "Municipal Officers". We can indicate that they are the same as Town Officials in this section. No voted was taken on this motion. John Field stated that he would write up the ordinance with the proposed changes in red and turn it over to Jay, and then it's in the

Selectmen's hands. The main thing is that we support it when the Selectmen present it to the Public. I think for the most part we have a majority vote here on everything.

Final Discussions - Jody said that the only other thing that he would like to bring up again is that in our Town Report it says "Budget Committee Recommends". Rather than do that, I like to see the vote published so that The People have a chance to think that over a little bit. It brings transparency to the whole thing so no one thinks we just rubber stamped it. I've heard rubber stamp I don't know how many times. I'd just rather see our vote published rather than "Budget Committee Recommends". John Field mentioned that the Town of Warren lists the vote counts for both the Selectmen and the Budget Committee. Christine asked if Jody wanted a vote count like "Budget Committee recommends 7 to 1." You want the actual vote? We did that in Warren. Jody said that the Town of Rockport does this and publishes the Selectmen's vote as well. Christine said if it's unanimous you can put unanimous in the Report. Jody said that it brings the transparency through to The People and takes the questions away. John Field said he did see how that could be covered by this ordinance because the Selectmen own the Town Report. What they put in there is up to them. Jody said this has nothing to do with the ordinance; I just wanted to bring this up while we had the Selectmen here. We had talked about it before and I think we voted to bring it to them. I just wanted to bring it back up again at this time. Buddy said that he is OK with it and the only problem he sees is that the way the Selectmen currently goes over the budget. When we go through it, if there are no objections to certain items, we move on and then the only real vote we have taken is for the final budget. I would hate to see the Budget Committee vote go in there unless the Selectmen were the same way. The way we have done it in the past, it is the consensus of the Board on all the items. It says Recommended by the Selectmen because that's our budget and by our final vote, it's recommended by all of us. We have to go through each line like you do and vote on every individual part. Which will change the way we operate a bit, but that's fine. I think it needs to be the same criteria for the Budget Committee as it is for the Selectmen. Greg said that he'd like to see us bring it up for discussion because I like the idea myself. Nate said that he wouldn't have any problem if his name was printed in the votes. If the actual vote is nine to two recommended by the Budget Committee, what's the problem with printing it? John Field asked Buddy if the Selectmen voted on the budget line by line as they worked on each department and at the end you vote on the whole thing. Buddy responded, we don't usually take official votes. If the consensus is that there is not a problem with the section, we move on to the next one. We bring back the items we have questions about. We like to see the bottom line and go back and rework some questionable items. By the time we get to the end, if the bottom line is something we are happy with, it may change the opinion of some of the items back a ways, but we've normally gone through and if there were no objections on any items and we are unanimous in our agreement on it, we move on. As long as we perform a vote on those we were unanimous on and then brought back some that there were some questions about. We brought each of those up and re-voted on them. Then we would actually have an individual vote on each item, but generally if we have been pretty much in agreement on each line, we move forward until we get to the end and only come back to those individual items that we wanted to go back over. John Field said that makes sense. I understand why you do it that way. Nate said that's the way it should be done in your position; you are in a different position. Buddy said if we are going to show those individual votes, we may want to take a more formal vote on each individual line because I want it to be on even footing. If the voter's impression is that the Selectmen approved all of those lines, because there is no vote listed, but they see the Budget Committee individual votes, they might... It's not working on the same playing field. John Field said that he could see because of the different sizes of the two boards it would carry a whole different meaning if the Selectmen voted 4-1 and the Budget Committee voted 10-2 on the same item. Buddy said if there is no vote listed for the Selectmen, it might look its fine for us, let's move on, but we really do have discussions on each item.

Dave mentioned for some years, he and Donnie Hill asked that the Budget Committee not be informed of how the Selectmen voted on the budget. For a while we were told and then we were asked our opinion. I think a couple of times recently we have not found out, and our discussion is much richer if we don't know what the Selectmen already did. Greg said when the budget goes to you; you already know what we have done. Dave said "I know your number that you are suggesting, but I don't know your vote. I don't see Selectmen approve or recommend. Christine said that wouldn't be there because it's their budget. Dave said the reason I am bring it up is I'm not sure you want the world to know that you had disagreement. I think we should argue like mad

here and then act like a bunch. Act like a group outside. You were indicating that most of the time the Selectmen kind of reach a consensus. You are not all comfortable to the same extent, but you go to the voters as a group with ideas for them to turn up or down. I would argue for us not going to the box score which introduces negativity that we don't gain a lot from. Not knowing how the Selectmen voted is a good thing. John Field said that with the way they are currently doing it, they can get to the bottom line and not like it and then go back and change a couple of lines and then have a different bottom line. That is an important part of what they do and we don't have that option. Buddy said that if the box score is put in there for the Budget Committee and isn't for the Selectmen, it might give the impression that there may not be any dissent on some issues. With the Selectmen, I assure you, there are some. Whichever way we go, it kind of needs to be the same. John Field said that he agreed with Jody. If we were able to do it, as a citizen looking at my Town Report the week before the meeting, knowing those votes I think would be helpful. If it is just well everybody approves, there is no sense for me to go to Town Meeting. Nate said if we are just "rubber stamping" all the way down through it, that's not the way the country runs. You ought to be able to see that with the Congress we have. Jody said at the last Town Meeting there were quite a few items that said "Budget Committee Recommends" that could have used more discussion, but it was getting a little late and they kept getting approved faster and faster. Ronnie was surprised and was a little speechless. If they could see the votes, there might a little more forethought and there would be a little more discussion on the articles. Whenever they see "Budget Committee Recommends", they say we might as well go with it. That's how I feel and I have had a lot of people say the same thing to me and that's why I'm bringing it up. They do it in the Towns of Warren and Rockport. I think it's worth discussing.

John Field said he would get the minutes done so that we can approve them when we meet in the spring on the budget. I'll get the changes to the ordinance off to Jay as soon as I can. That way we can put it in their hands. It will be up to the Selectmen to tweak them as they see fit. Once the the Selectmen get an opportunity, they will refine it and move it forward. Buddy said the "Official" definition may produce some issues because it will include a few more people than the "Municipal Officers" which are just the Selectmen and Town manager. I assume Town Clerk would be in there. There may be some that could be a little debatable. Jay said he would have to look up the state definitions.

5. **Set next meeting date:** To be determined when annual Town Budget is ready for review.
6. **Adjourn:** Motion made by Dave Shaub to adjourn. Seconded by Christine Savage. Unanimous.

These minutes were approved on 4/17/2013 with the following amendments.

Page 3 – Spelling correction to word 'Treasurer'. "... now it would include the Treasurer too."

Page 5 – Spelling correction to word 'Unanimous' at end of first Section 5 paragraph.

Page 6 –

1. Word 'did' corrected to 'didn't' in sentence "John Field said he didn't see how that could ..."
2. Spelling correction to word 'get'. "...we move forward until we get to the end..."
3. Added omitted word 'like'. "...it might look like its fine for us, let's move on..."
4. Spelling correction to word 'bringing' in sentence "Dave said the reason I am bringing..."

Page 7 – Deleted repeated word 'the' in sentence "Once the Selectmen get an opportunity..."