

Sturbridge Finance Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
May 3, 2011  
Town Hall  
7:00 pm

**Amended 5-10-11**

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm with the following members present: Kevin Smith (KS), Arnold Wilson (AW), Larry Morrison (LM), Prescott (Scott) Arndt (SA), Patricia Affenito (PA), and Mike Serio (MS).

Members Absent: Robert Williams (RW).

Motion to recess in Conference Room 2 and reconvene in Veteran's Memorial Hall made by PA, seconded by AW. Vote 6-0-0. Mary Redetzke (MR) and Richard Volpe (RV) joined the meeting at 7:02 pm.

Motion to approve the 4-28 minutes as amended made by SA, seconded by MS.  
Vote 7-0-1.

Invited Guests: Randy Redetzke (RR), Penny Dumas (PD), Mike Caplette (MC), John Kittel (JK), resident and Peter Levine (PL), resident.

Audience: Mary Blanchard (MB), member, BOS, Charles Blanchard (CB), Tom Creamer (TC), Chair, BOS.

**ATM Warrant (version 5-3-11 #2)**

KS asks for a motion to reconsider Article 40-Charter Amendment-Numbering (**formerly 46 in version 4-26-11**)-Charter Amendments-Procedural Enhancements: motion to reconsider made by MS, seconded by AW. Vote 8-0-0. General discussion: change the name of the article to Numbering of Charter Provisions; change Section 8-6 to Section 8-7. Motion to approve as amended made by AW, seconded by LM. Vote 8-0-0.

Article 44-Community Preservation-Trail Development (**version 5-3-11 #2**): PD says this article no has no language that references the Riverlands property. Motion to approve as written made by AW, seconded by MS. Vote 7-0-1.

Article 45-General Bylaw Amendment-Conflict-of-Interest: motion to recommend no action made by AW, seconded by MR. General discussion: SA makes the point that an unintended consequence of this amendment is that a resident cannot petition a town board on his/her own behalf when that resident is a member of that board. LM says the bylaw strives to regulate a behavior when that individual is functioning on a board. MB and CB make the point that this new language has not been reviewed adequately nor have all consequences been debated. RR asks why business relationships have not been included in this bylaw? JK says he serves on industrial boards where there has been much

conversation about recusal; he goes to say that an individual will recuse him/herself when another party is uncomfortable. MR makes the point that there is a loss of information and resources when a person is not permitted to speak or deliberate an issue. TC makes the point that an individual can make a minority vote into a majority vote by a relation on a different board. AW says the intent of this bylaw is reasonable but this is a complex issue and that rewording it is not our responsibility this evening. MS says the attempt is fine but it is too specific; it needs more consideration. PA requests the removal of the first sentence. Vote on the existing motion 6-2-0.

RV left the meeting at 8:40 pm.

Article 46-General Bylaw Amendment-Town Official Appointments (**version 5-3-11 #2**, pg. 39 of 40): JK and PL are here to discuss changes to the language of this bylaw amendment: MC says the basic rule of scope is 'where are we today?' LM says that paragraph 4 does not allow for the eventuality that no applicant is qualified for the open position. MC says that in his opinion, this article cannot be modified, therefore can only discuss possible substitute motions at the ATM.

PA left the meeting at 8:50 pm.

Discussion continues on Article 46: PL says the language was intended to cover the Town Moderator. AW says the language is confusing, makes a motion to recommend no action, MS seconds. General discussion ensues: LM asks about adding the word appointed to paragraph one and also if this will apply to the two Zoning Board of Appeals positions that are appointed. Answer yes. LM asks also if a postmark on mail is acceptable if that piece of mail is received after the deadline? JK answers that the responsibility should fall on the applicant to make sure the application arrives in a timely fashion. KS asks for the rationale behind this bylaw. JK and PL want to know whom to ask about an applicant. KS makes the point that the BOS, Town Moderator or the Town Administrator would have the records. LM asks if every applicant has the opportunity to conceal the fact that she/he has applied for a position. JK/PL make the point that this only applies to appointed positions. MS asks if applicants can request confidentiality? PL just wants the rationale for selection to be explained. CB believes the current system of appointing town officials works. TC, however, gives the history of a recent appointment that in his opinion was not handled appropriately. JK just wants the process spelled out for everybody. KS asks what is the timeframe for making the appointment after a selection has been made? JK makes the point that if no applicant is qualified, then the open application period would be repeated. MC asks if this applies the appointment of a Deputy Town Moderator? JK/PL both answer no, since it is only one person, not a committee. JK makes clear that the emphasis is on the outcome of the process. KS questions MC whether this is one article or two? MC believes it is acceptable as one. Vote on the existing motion to recommend no action 2-3-1. CB believes this change will result in fewer residents stepping forward to serve the town. MS supports the idea but wonders if the burden is too much. Motion to approve as amended made by SA, seconded by LM. Vote 4-2-0.

Article 47-Non-Binding Referendum Re: Town Hall Front Doors (**version 5-3-11 #2**, pg. 40 of 40): discussion: language is amended to end the first sentence at public and delete the rest of the text at the top of the article. Motion as amended made by SA, seconded by MR. Vote 6-0-0.

Motion to adjourn made by KS at 10:40 pm.