

**ADVISORY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
of
August 20, 2014**

A meeting of the Advisory & Finance Committee was held on Wednesday, August 20, 2014. The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Moody at 7:00PM and was conducted in the Mayflower II Meeting Room at the Plymouth Town Hall, 11 Lincoln Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

PRESENT**Fourteen members of the committee were present:**

Kevin Canty, Richard Gladdys, Michael Hanlon, Harry Helm, Kevin Hennessey, Michael Hourahan, Shelagh Joyce, Ethan Kusmin, Kevin Lynch, Christopher Merrill, John Moody, Harry Salerno, Marc Sirrico, Charles Stevens

ABSENT**One member of the committee was absent:**

Cornelius Bakker

AGENDA ITEMS**Meeting Schedule**

Chairman John Moody informed the committee that they were starting the process of hearing presentations about each Article on the Fall Town Meeting Warrant. Members should gather the information and to take notes because they will be referring back to their notes often.

Michael Hanlon said that the committee members should use notebooks with separate tabs for each article. He asked that each article be printed on its own sheet of paper so that they can be used in the binders.

Charles Stevens asked when the committee would be able to see the full warrant. Lynne Barrett responded that it was still in draft form but that she would find out if it could be shared at this time.

John Moody said that the Advisory & Finance Committee would be meeting weekly on Wednesdays at 7PM on August 27, September 3, September 10, September 17 and, if needed, on September 24.

He also announced the following upcoming meetings:

Town Meeting Motions Meeting: Wed 10/8, 8:30AM, Mayflower Meeting Room

Chairman John Moody is required to attend. First Vice-Chair and Second Vice-Chair are strongly encouraged to attend. It is not necessary for any other committee members to attend unless they would like to. This meeting is a review of the motions and the logistics of conducting Town Meeting.

Town Meeting Preview: Thurs 10/9, 7PM, Mayflower Meeting Room

The Preview is open to all and is televised. It is run by the Moderator and is like a dress rehearsal for Town Meeting.

A&F Committee Meeting: Sat 10/18, 7:30AM, Plymouth North HS

The committee always meets in the morning before Town Meeting. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 7:30AM but if there is a lot of business to handle, could be scheduled even earlier.

Town Meeting: Sat 10/18, 8AM, Plymouth North HS

Town Meeting Article Presentations

ARTICLE 25:

To see if the Town will vote to correct, ratify, and confirm its vote under Article 13 of the 2012 Fall Annual Town Meeting by voting to:

- (1) transfer care, custody and control from the Plymouth Airport Commission for airport purposes to the Plymouth Airport Commission for the purpose of conveyance in the name of the Town of Plymouth of Lot 1-2D on Map 99 of the Plymouth Assessors' Maps, the adjoining parcel on the southwesterly end thereof extending into Carver (Lot 1-2D and the adjoining parcel extending into Carver being shown as Lot 1-2D on a plan recorded in Plan Book 24, Page 444 with the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds), and a portion of Lot 10 on Map 97, collectively totaling approximately 28 acres, located on and off Federal Furnace Road in Plymouth, with appurtenant easements over, on and across Lot 10 on Map 97 and Lot 1-2B on Map 99, all acquired by the Town of Plymouth by instruments recorded with the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds in Book 4907, Page 283, Book 4991, Page 148 and Book 5607, Page 395; and
- (2) authorize the Plymouth Airport Commission to (a) convey in the name of the Town of Plymouth the above described property and pay \$1,060,000.00 (\$1,007,000 in DOT grants and \$53,000 in Airport Enterprise funding) in consideration of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the name of the Town of Plymouth, containing approximately 45.5 acres, and shown as Lot 1-2A on Map 99 and Lot 7 on Map 97, on and off Federal Furnace Road in Plymouth; and (b) authorize the Plymouth Airport Commission to submit the acquired land to a conservation restriction to be held by a municipal, state or charitable conservation organization or to transfer the care, custody and control of the acquired land to the Plymouth Conservation Commission for conservation purposes; and (c) and as funding therefor to raise and appropriate, transfer from available funds, or borrow a sum of money, for such purposes; and, further,
- (3) to authorize the Plymouth Airport Commission or other appropriate Town officials to apply for and expend any grants for such purposes, and to enter into all agreements and execute any and all instruments necessary on behalf of the Airport Commission on such terms and conditions as may be deemed to be in the best interests of said Commission and the Town of Plymouth; and that any grants received for the purposes of this Article shall be used to reduce the amount expended hereunder, or take any other action relative thereto.

AIRPORT COMMISSION

Tom Maher, Manager of Plymouth Airport, said that Article 25 "clarifies and corrects" the vote of Article 13 of the 2012 Fall Town Meeting. The 2012 Article involved the purchase of 45 acres as well as the sale of a parcel as partial payment towards the purchase. The wording now needs to be updated regarding specific parcel numbers and exact acreage, etc., basically "housekeeping components". Mr. Maher said that as part of the runway expansion project an adjacent triangular piece of land was sold to decrease the purchase price of the 45 acre lot.

Michael Hanlon said that he remembered that that triangular lot was supposed to be a buffer zone. Mr. Maher said that yes, the neighbors thought it would be appropriate to use that parcel to create a buffer between their neighborhood and the new runway.

Mr. Maher said that the airport received a state grant which covered 95% of the purchase.

Shelagh Joyce asked the amount of the state grant.

Mr. Maher said it was just over \$1 million.

Kevin Hennessey asked where the additional funding came from.

Mr. Maher said that the remaining \$53,000 was funded by the Airport Enterprise Fund, an enterprise account within the Town of Plymouth. This fund is self-supporting so the money comes from airport operations like leasing of land, sale of fuel, etc.

Kevin Hennessey asked about the total price of the purchase and if that included the land swap.

Mr. Maher said the total purchase price was \$1.06 million after the swap.

Michael Hanlon made a motion to approve Article 25. Harry Salerno, second.

John Moody asked if Mr. Maher would please provide a write up of the 2012 Article 13 and the new Article 25 showing what has changed (by striking through old language or underlining new language) so that it is more clear. Kevin Lynch agreed that would help to understand what, clearly and concisely, has changed. **The motion passes unanimously (13-0-0).**

ARTICLE 33:

To see if the Town will vote to transfer the following parcel from the Town Treasurer to the Conservation Commission for the purpose of maintaining protected open space:

Parcel ID	Road	Legal Reference	Tax Title
087-000-057G-000	Fuller Farm Road	Book 38584, Page 199 (Final Judgment)	#10424

or take any other action relative thereto.

Patrick Farah, Planning Department Staff, said that with Article 33, they were seeking approval to transfer Parcel 87-57G from the Plymouth Treasurer’s Department to the Conservation Department for Open Space purposes. In 2005 Great South Pond Place was accepted as a RRD (Rural Residential Development) with four buildable lots. Part of the development’s restriction was to maintain this fifth parcel as open space. Once the developer was through, the homeowners association either never formed or chose not to pay the taxes on the parcel. The town went through the foreclosure process and now owns the parcel. The Conservation Department is interested in the parcel because it is an unbuildable wooded parcel just under 500 feet from Great South Pond. It is also in Aquifer Protection Area 3 as well as a Priority Habitat Area.

Michael Hourahan asked if there were any covenants or conditions on the parcel.

Mr. Farah said that there is no building, no subdividing, and would be deed restricted to care and custody of Conservation.

Michael Hanlon said that the town has had issues with the tax title process before and that we need to make sure we are sure the process is complete and that the town actually owns and has clear title to the property.

Mr. Farah said that he believes the process was completed and showed the recorded judgment from Land Court and provided a copy to Chairman John Moody.

Richard Gladdys asked if Conservation had a plan or wish for the property.

Mr. Farah said that it is an important piece in the aquifer and priority habitat areas so that they plan to keep it as open space.

Michael Hourahan asked what the benefit to the town is to take the parcel in and transfer it. Mr. Farah said that the town already owns it and by transferring it to Conservation they can properly maintain and protect the land.

Michael Hanlon said that he was not sure where in Plymouth this property is located. He would like to see a map of Plymouth with the location marked.

Mr. Farah said that it is near Boot Pond Road off of Long Pond Road but that he would be happy to provide a map showing its location.

Kevin Hennessey asked if the deed restriction allowed the clearing of trees.

Mr. Farah said that is correct, there is no clearing of trees allowed.

Kevin Lynch asked how much property Conservation is currently maintaining.

Mr. Farah answered around 2,000 acres.

Shelagh Joyce asked what about the assessed value of the land.

Mr. Farah said that in 2010 it was valued at \$29,255 and that the tax bill was \$2,330.63.

Harry Helm asked if there were any disadvantages to not transferring the property.

Mr. Farah said the property would just sit there unmaintained.

Michael Hourahan asked if the Town looked at selling the property to the existing abutters.

Richard Vacca, Conservation Planner, said that the land can not be developed so is really not sellable in that sense. He also added that there is a consequence to not transferring the property because of the aquifer protection, rare species habitat, and passive recreation potential. By not transferring the property to Conservation, those elements would be lost.

Kevin Canty clarified that it is not that the lot may not be sold, it is that no one would want to buy it because they could not do anything with the land.

Mr. Vacca said that is correct.

Kevin Canty said that the value in transferring is that someone would look over the land.

Mr. Vacca said that yes, Conservation in conjunction with the Natural Resources Ranger would look over it. There would be a land use plan developed for that parcel like they have for all of their parcels.

Kevin Lynch asked if the parcel is accessible to the public.

Mr. Vacca said that he is not sure how accessible it is but that he would evaluate it.

Ethan Kusmin asked if there were any empty abutting lots had water frontage.

Mr. Vacca replied that there were none.

Richard Gladdys asked if this parcel was offered to abutters at any time to keep it on the tax roles because they might have liked the opportunity to purchase it.

Mr. Vacca said that as part of the tax title process the list goes out to the public and there are several opportunities during the process for individuals to purchase the parcel. No one purchased the parcel.

John Moody asked if abutters are specifically notified in the tax title process.

Mr. Vacca said that his presumption is that they were notified and they had an opportunity to purchase it if they were interested.

John Moody said to wrap it up, there were 5 lots in the development which included 4 buildable lots and one open space lot. Then the developer left and all the homeowners had to do was collect dues and pay the taxes on the 5th lot and for some reason they did not pay taxes and gave up ownership of the lot.

Kevin Hennessey asked if it is common for this to happen with new developments. There seems to be a loophole for developers where the property eventually comes off tax roles and costs the town money in the long term. He asked if there was anything we can consider to prevent it from happening.

John Moody said it is a problem for the Town. It achieved the objective of retaining open space but did not achieve the second objective of receiving tax revenue. While Mr. Hennessey's point is well taken, it is beyond the role of this committee. He said that it is a much bigger problem in Town not only with taxes on a parcels but also roads and streets with developers not paving, creating proper drainage, building sidewalks and other items that they promised. Then when the developer leaves, the town is stuck with the problem. It is up to the Planning Board and Economic Development to make sure these things that are supposed to happen do happen and maybe keep the bond if the homeowners association is not created as it should be.

Harry Helm asked which developer received this permit in 2005 and whether they were from out of town or were local.

Mr. Farah said the name is Fantoni Development Corp.

Michael Hanlon made a motion to approve Article 33. Christopher Merrill, second.

Kevin Lynch asked what role the Advisory & Finance Committee has and is it possible to advise the Planning Board so things like this do not "land in our lap".

John Moody said the Advisory & Finance Committee is appointed by the Town Moderator, that it is advisory to Town Meeting which is the legislative branch. Our primary focus is on the "finance" dollars and cents but the "advisory" role allows us to go beyond finance. While this committee has the ability to influence other boards and committees, that is not an official role of this committee.

Ethan Kusmin pointed out that on the flip side of this development, the town earned taxes from four new waterfront lots and got a free 2 acre wooded lot, so the town did well overall with this deal.

Richard Gladdys added that there will be an added financial ramification if Conservation receives this transfer. Abutters will be able to claim their property "borders conservation land", so their property values will increase and therefore taxes paid to the town will also increase, so it is a win-win.

Kevin Hennessey said that there is a flaw in the whole idea, that it would be nice to keep the whole deal whole and taxable.

Harry Salerno said that the transaction makes sense and that if Conservation wants the parcel, he will defer to them.

Marc Sirrico said that we should be careful not to look too much into it, that we should look at the big picture like Ethan Kusmin said. We made out on this deal, there is always a give and take of doing business and we now have control of this lot.

Harry Helm agreed that in this instance it worked out but also agreed with Kevin Hennessey that developers are taking advantage. Yes, there is more tax base because of the development but now the town has the added cost of upkeep, it is an added cost and it is an issue.

Kevin Canty said that the intentions of the Planning Board are to go into a deal with the ideal circumstances. It would be great if a developer would follow through with everything but when they don't, there are consequences. In this case the Town is still coming ahead, but that is not true of all deals.

Michael Hanlon said he supports this Article because he believes it is the right thing to do but that this is a problem. The Town is not getting what it asked for. It happens often and it is a problem that needs to be addressed.

Shelagh Joyce said that as a follow up, Fantoni Development Corp. should not get approval to build another subdivision in Plymouth. This has happened before in town where developers who do not follow agreements with the Town are allowed to continue building new subdivisions.

Returning to the motion on the table to approve Article 33, the vote was unanimous (13-0-0)

ARTICLE 30:

To see if the Town will vote to accept the provision of Chapter 32, Section 20(4)(h) to allow the Plymouth Retirement Board to expend a portion of its funds to increase the Treasurer's stipend from \$1,500 to \$3,000 annually, as the custodian of the funds for the retirement system, or take any other action relative thereto.

PLYMOUTH RETIREMENT BOARD

Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance and representing the Retirement Board, presented Article 30. She is a member of the Retirement Board and made a request to that Board in March to accept the local option to increase the Treasurer's stipend from \$1,500 to \$3,000 annually. The Retirement Board approved this request and it is now going to Town Meeting for approval.

In Massachusetts, the Town Treasurer is required to be the Treasurer for the Retirement System. There are 106 towns (a few of which are actually county systems) where this occurs. Of all 106, Plymouth is the largest and being Treasurer for the Retirement System is a huge responsibility. Preparing the monthly cash reconciliation reports are a large and time-consuming process with so many retirees and checks each month.

Harry Helm asked what the other towns are paying for a stipend.

Ms. Barrett said that towns are paying between \$1,200 and \$3,000. There are at least 5 towns paying \$3,000:

	Town Budget	Population
Maynard	\$33 million	11,000
Stoneham	\$63.9 million	33,000
Holyoke	\$124.2 million	40,000
Leominster	\$104.3 million	42,000
Salem	\$133 million	60,000

By comparison, Plymouth has a budget of \$190 million and population of 60,000 and has the largest retirement system.

Richard Gladdys said that essentially this is giving a \$1,500 raise to the Treasurer.

Ms. Barrett said that is correct.

Michael Hanlon said that the Treasurer of the Retirement Board is the Town Treasurer and asked if there were any other paid stipends.

Ms. Barrett said that the Retirement Board has a director and 3 staff members that are paid a salary. She said that she, herself, receives a stipend of \$3,000 per year as Ex-Officio, which Town Meeting adopted back in the 1990s. She also said that the Treasurer does a lot more for the Retirement Board than she does.

Michael Hanlon asked if there is extra effort that the Treasurer must go through during the normal course of the work day to manage these duties.

Ms. Barrett said that the system has increased drastically, that there is a lot more activity, there is more involved in those duties than there was 10 years ago. That is why she requested the increase in the stipend.

John Moody asked if the \$3,000 stipend for the Ex-Officio, as well as the proposed \$3,000 stipend for the Treasurer, are paid out of the Retirement System operating funds.

Ms. Barrett answered yes.

Harry Salerno asked how long the stipend has been \$1,500.

Ms. Barrett said since the establishment of the Retirement System, which has been a long time.

Harry Salerno asked for a time estimate regarding how many hours the Treasurer spends performing the duties of the Retirement Board Treasurer.

Ms. Barrett said it is about 8-10 hours per month.

Michael Hanlon asked if the Selectmen have heard the article yet?

Ms. Barrett said no, that they are hearing it on August 26th.

Shelagh Joyce asked why the City of Boston, Town of Framingham, Town of Springfield are not offering the \$3,000 stipend.

Ms. Barrett said that they might be. The 5 towns she listed are not the only ones that are paying a \$3,000 stipend, but they are the only ones paying the \$3,000 that provided the information in a salary survey.

Harry Salerno asked why we were looking at this item in isolation, why we aren't looking at the whole compensation package for the Treasurer and then making a decision.

Ms. Barrett agreed with the concept but said that the Treasurer's position is a union position and salary is determined by the union based on the work for the Town not for the Retirement Board. The work for the Retirement Board is not part of union negotiations.

Richard Gladdys asked how this increase would affect the Retirement Board.

Ms. Barrett said that the Retirement Board discussed and approved it in March and incorporated it into their budget already.

Christopher Merrill made a motion to approve Article 30. Ethan Kusmin, second.

Harry Salerno asked if the Town Manager was in agreement with the stipend increase.

Ms. Barrett said yes the Town Manager, as well as the Board of Selectmen, were in agreement.

Michael Hanlon said that he is not inclined to give his support, it does not feel right. He understands that the Treasurer is an important position but the job description includes these duties and they are compensated for it. He doesn't like "side deals" so he is not going to support it.

Michael Hourahan feels that it is coming out of the blue to the committee and asked if this the only way to increase the stipend from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

John Moody said that Advisory & Finance or Town Meeting are not increasing the salary, we are authorizing the acceptance of the local option of Mass General Laws. It is an important distinction, and a great number of communities have already adopted it.

Kevin Hennessey asked if there was a process where the committee could get answers before the meeting. He is interested in learning what the typical compensation is of the Treasurers of those other towns mentioned earlier.

John Moody said that this is the process and the committee meets once to discuss each Article.

There are options. Once the packet of information is received and there are questions, like with this Article, feel free to call Lynne Barrett or Melissa Arrighi or Tom Kelley to discuss and gain knowledge before coming to the meeting. There is no other group process to gather information because it would most likely violate Open Meeting Law, so anything done has to be done as an individual. As a member of the Advisory & Finance Committee you have a right to request any records and any information to facilitate your role. You are at liberty to ask.

Richard Gladdys said that he is in support of this Article. The Retirement Board is paying for it and since they are in favor of it, it makes sense because they know this topic best.

Ethan Kusmin agreed with Mr. Gladdys, the Retirement Board knows more about this and they are willing to pay so it makes sense. He asked if it is correct that the Committee does not have to make a decision right now, if they could table it until they get questions answered.

Kevin Hennessey said he would like to get more information.

John Moody said that deferring or postponing the decision is an option following Roberts Rules of Order. All Committee members should get a copy, review it, and understand how to operate a meeting within Parliamentary Law.

Harry Salerno asked for verification that the Article was simply to adopt the law and not to increase the stipend. The law gives them the tool to do so but does not automatically do so.

Ms. Barrett said that was accurate. Every town retirement system pays their Treasurer by this statute. If we adopt this local statute, the Retirement Board will have the option to increase the stipend.

Marc Sirrico said he has voted against more than one issue in the past if he has not received the pertinent information. Everyone on the committee has an individual vote and it goes on record who voted for and who voted against. You always have that option at your disposal.

Michael Hanlon said that by accepting the provisions of Chapter 32, Section 20(4)(h), it would be naïve to assume the stipend is not going to increase from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Shelagh Joyce asked if the committee votes to accept the statute and the stipend increase goes through, will the stipend affect the Treasurer's pension when they retire.

Ms. Barrett said yes that any stipend, if it is part of their regular duties, is subject to retirement.

Ms. Joyce said that this decision will therefore have future financial implications on the Town.

Charles Stevens said that it was said earlier that the \$1,500 is coming from the Retirement Board but it is not coming from the Retirement Board, it is a \$1,500 charge that the taxpayers of Plymouth will have to cover.

Kevin Hennessey asked if that \$1,500 is actually coming out of tax revenues or is coming out of what is put into the retirement system.

John Moody answered that it is coming out of the Retirement System coffers, funded partly by taxpayers and partly by employees.

Charles Stevens said that it is funded by taxpayers.

John Moody said that is not 100% correct.

Charles Stevens said in general numbers that most employees in the town of Plymouth live out their contribution to the retirement system within about the first two years of retirement and the rest comes out of either the state or the town taxpayer coffers. So this is a taxpayer bill.

John Moody said that those are interesting numbers. What he does know is that most town employees contribute 12% of their salary to the pension and that money is passed to the Retirement Board. The Retirement Board invests those funds and generates income as a result of those investments. He finds it difficult to believe that would be consumed in 2 or 3 years, especially because money invested over time grows a lot.

Returning to the motion on table, the motion fails (6-7-0). Kevin Canty, Richard Gladdys, Ethan Kusmin, Christopher Merrill, Harry Salerno, and Marc Sirrico voting in favor. Charles Stevens, Harry Helm, Kevin Lynch, Shelagh Joyce, Michael Hanlon, Kevin Hennessey and Michael Hourahan voting against.

So the Advisory & Finance Committee will not recommend Article 30 to Town Meeting.

Meals Tax Update

Lynne Barrett reported that the Meals Tax went into effect on July 1st adding the local option of .75% to the 6.25% previously charged. Plymouth is one of ten local communities that adopted this local option within the past year. Bourne and Carver also did so within the past year.

Regarding Meals Tax, the Department of Revenue website is only updated quarterly. Meals tax is paid monthly to the Department of Revenue, it then goes to the State, and then to the Town on a quarterly basis. Plymouth will receive its first payment on September 30th. So in the first year, we will only collect 10 months of revenue.

The Town also pays Meals Tax for the adult meals at the School Department.

Charles Stevens asked if there was any feel for what July receipts may have been.

Ms. Barrett said that the trend has been an increase of 3-4% over the same month the prior year.

Mr. Stevens asked if the construction on Samoset has negatively impacted downtown and the waterfront businesses.

Ms. Barrett said she did hear concern but is not sure what impact that will have on these numbers.

John Moody thanked Ms. Barrett for the update.

Budget Sub-Committees

John Moody said that the Advisory & Finance Committee was trying to start the Sub-Committees earlier this year to enable conversations to start earlier in the budget process. The Committee's charge is to advise Town Meeting which acts on behalf of taxpayers. Sub-Committee preference forms were then collected from each member present at the meeting.

MEETING MINUTES

February 19, 2014:

Ethan Kusmin moved to approve the minutes of the February 19, 2014 meeting. Michael Hourahan, second. Charles Stevens said that he was upset that the recommendations from Sub-Committee C were not included in the minutes. He said those recommendations should be added to the meeting minutes so they go on permanent record. **Charles Stevens made a motion to postpone approval of the February 19, 2014 minutes until the recommendations are added. Marc Sirrico, second.** Michael Hanlon added that all recommendations from all sub-committees should be added to the minutes. **Motion to postpone carries unanimously (8-0-5), with those not in attendance at the 2/19/14 meeting abstaining.**

April 3, 2014:

Marc Sirrico said that he was the lone dissenting vote regarding the proposed new Town Hall but that the reasons he stated at that meeting were not included in the minutes. He did not want to go back and change the minutes now, but feels it is important to include such discussion in minutes going forward. John Moody said that he agreed that details like that are important to include in meeting minutes. He said town meeting members are always interested in what the rationale is for those in opposition of various topics. Richard Gladdys agreed that those are types of questions he hears most often. **Michael Hanlon made a motion to accept the minutes of the April 3, 2014 meeting. Shelagh Joyce, second. Motion carries unanimously (7-0-6), with those not in attendance at the 4/3/14 meeting abstaining.**

April 5, 2014:

Michael Hanlon pointed out one grammatical error in the minutes and asked that it be fixed. Shelagh Joyce said that we need to be consistent with how we take minutes. John Moody pointed out that we had been short staffed and various committee members had stepped in to take minutes, but that Ms. Joyce's point is well taken. **Michael Hanlon made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2014 minutes as amended. Harry Salerno, second. Motion carries unanimously (7-0-6), with those not in attendance at the 4/5/14 meeting abstaining.**

April 16, 2014:

Michael Hanlon questioned three sentences in the minutes which were unclear. Those three sentences were then restructured by John Moody. **Michael Hanlon made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2014 minutes as amended. Harry Salerno, second. Motion carries unanimously (8-0-5), with those not in attendance at the 4/16/14 meeting abstaining.**

May 21, 2014:

Marc Serrico and Shelagh Joyce said that they were not in attendance at the meeting and to please correct that in the minutes. **Michael Hanlon made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2014 minutes as amended. Harry Salerno, second. Motion carries unanimously (8-0-5), with those not in attendance at the 5/21/14 meeting abstaining.**

July 16, 2014:

Charles Stevens made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2014 minutes. Ethan Kusmin, second. Motion carries unanimously (12-0-1), with one not in attendance at the 7/16/14 meeting abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENT

OLD/NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

Harry Salerno commented that we need to make meeting minutes a priority item and stay on top of them. John Moody agreed that we should have them ready and approved as soon as possible.

Charles Stevens asked John Moody if there were any updates regarding conference calling or proxy voting for the Advisory & Finance Committee Meetings. John Moody said that he has not made significant progress regarding that but that is was on his to do list.

John Moody reminded the committee that there is a meeting next week, Wednesday August 27 at 7PM.

ADJOURNMENT

Charles Stevens moved for adjournment. Chris Merrill, second. The motion for adjournment carries unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:39PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kere Gillette