

June 13, 2011

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MINUTES
JUNE 13, 2011**

Present: Thomas Creamer, Chairman
Mary Dowling
Mary Blanchard
Angeline Ellison
Priscilla Gimas
Shaun Suhoski, Town Administrator

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. following the Pledge of Allegiance.

T. Creamer announced that on June 14, 2011 between 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. there would be a special presentation at the Brookfield Elementary School cafeteria at 37 Central Street, Brookfield, MA regarding helping children with trauma and stress after a natural disaster, put on by people who specialize in this area. There will be preliminary information on what parents and educators can do to help to provide guidance and direct questions specific to events which have occurred here recently. The Publick House will hold a relief dinner on Wednesday, June 15th with proceeds going to the Sturbridge Relief Fund. He encouraged residents to attend.

T. Creamer expressed gratitude to the hundreds of volunteers who have amassed on a daily basis to provide services on behalf of the community and who still continue to call and commit their time and resources to this event. He said that what they have done is inspiring and a powerful example to all of us, as to what can be done working together. He encouraged people to continue to contact the Volunteer Resource Center because this will be at least a 6-12 month endeavor to restore a sense of normalcy to individual lives.

Appointment of Police Officer

Chief Ford appeared before the Board, and said that David Diogo had distinguished himself during the interviews for the position of Police Officer, and recommended that he be appointed. S. Suhoski supported the appointment.

MOTION: That the Board of Selectmen ratify the Town Administrator's appointment of David A. Diogo to the position of Police Officer effective June 20, 2011 at a starting rate of \$23.17 per hour subject to a six-month probationary period, by M. Blanchard
2nd: P. Gimas
Vote: All in favor.

Burgess School Committee Appointment

Three members of the Burgess School Committee appeared before the Board.

T. Creamer said that the appointment was an elected position and because of the fact that there is a vacant seat, the process for appointment consists of a majority vote between the Burgess School Committee and the Sturbridge Board of Selectmen. S. Suhoski said that the candidates were Megan Panek and Jennifer Harwich; the candidates had been notified of the change in date, but only one appeared before the Board. It was the consensus to go ahead with the interview.

Megan Panek appeared before the Board. She said that she has four children, moved back to Sturbridge eight years ago, and works at UMass Medical Center. When asked by M. Blanchard whether she plans to run for the position at the April Town Election, she said that she would like to see what the year would bring, in terms of what she had to offer.

M. Blanchard asked what M. Panek perceives to be the School Committee's role. M. Panek said that she perceives it to be a representation of the Town as a whole. The Town elects the officials and decides who will do the best job representing them as a whole, and what they want as a committee, whether it is full day kindergarten, a new school or new educational opportunities available to them.

A. Ellison, after informing the public of her position on the School Committee, asked M. Panek what she would contribute to the group. M. Panek said that both of her parents were educators, so she had grown up in the education system. She went to Burgess Elementary School and Tantasqua, and knows what the school system is about. She said that she has always paid attention to politics in Sturbridge and the surrounding communities, and feels strongly about the school system.

A member of the Burgess School Committee noted that a lot of the School Committee's role is focused on education policy; since the Education Reform Act, its role has been to develop bylaws and policies that will guide the school. M. Panek said that she has reviewed the policies and procedures, and although she does not have first hand knowledge of them, she could acclimate herself to them very quickly.

Another member of the Burgess School Committee said that one of the Superintendent's goals in the upcoming year was to improve communication and collaboration between the school and the community. She asked M. Panek what she could do in that area that could help Burgess. M. Panek said that there could be some improvement to the Town's website to make it easier to navigate. She noted that the Internet is a huge possibility. She suggested the use of

Facebook and noted that the social media is very popular item which could help the community right now.

A member of the Burgess School Committee asked whether M. Panek had considered running for the seat before, or did she start thinking about it once there was an open seat. M. Panek said that she had considered it and thought about it, but she has two children and wanted to make sure that she could handle it, as she realizes that it is a time commitment.

M. Dowling said that M. Panek was an excellent, very well qualified and enthusiastic candidate. She noted that the other candidate also looks qualified, but the Board does not have the opportunity to question the other candidate. T. Creamer said that although he was happy that M. Panek was present to answer questions, most of the determination was invested in looking at the paperwork that was in front of him. He noted that some people interview well, and others don't, so he based his decision on the information that was provided ahead of time. He said that regardless of whether or not both candidates were present at the meeting, he was sufficiently impressed with what he had on paper from M. Panek.

MOTION: To appoint Megan Panek to the one-year position to the Burgess School Committee, by a Burgess School Committee member.

2nd: Another Burgess School Committee member.

Vote: Eight in favor.

Tantasqua Regional School Committee Appointment

Six members of the Tantasqua Regional School Committee appeared before the Board. T. Creamer said that there was one applicant for the open position, Dr. Susan Waters.

William Haggerty of the Tantasqua Regional School Committee expressed concern about moving forward without the opportunity of having a sufficient pool of candidates. He noted that things had moved very fast after Mr. Simanski's passing, and did not think that people had sufficient time to respond to the June 3rd deadline. It was the unanimous decision of the Tantasqua Regional School Committee to reopen the position to obtain a larger candidate pool.

MOTION: To reopen and re-advertise the position to obtain a larger candidate pool, by W. Haggerty.

2nd: J. Ehrhardt

M. Dowling asked that in the event that the second search also produces only one candidate, would it continue to by their position, or at that point would they be prepared to go forward with one applicant. W. Haggerty said that he could

only speak for himself, and he would be willing to move forward at that point. He said that it seemed that the deadline had come very quickly, and he would like to see that people have a sufficient opportunity to respond.

A. Ellison stated that she was appointed by the process and knew the vote could move forward.

T. Creamer asked when it had been advertised. P. Gimás noted that Mr. Simanski had passed away in April. M. Blanchard said that the vacancy was not posted immediately. W. Haggerty asked about the normal period of advertising. S. Suhoski answered that 10 days was the advertising period. Gary Galonek said that whether it was posted or not, it was known that there was a vacancy well in advance. S. Suhoski said that under the statute, if the position isn't filled within 30 days by joint vote, the Selectmen can fill the position on their own.

P. Gimás said that the candidate is extremely well qualified, and would fill the position for one year; if the candidate was not well qualified, she could understand the need to re-advertise.

M. Blanchard said that the legal notice was posted in the newspaper on May 20th, with a deadline date of June 3rd, which was a shorter period of time than the other legal ad. S. Suhoski pointed out that it did exceed the 10 day requirement, and it was posted on the Town's website on May 18th. M. Blanchard said that the motion may negate that 30 day option; if the position is not filled within 30 days, then the Board of Selectmen may appoint a candidate.

James Ehrhardt said that it is discretionary, not a requirement that the position be filled within 30 days. He said that there was the ability to extend it. A. Ellison asked what the Committee was looking for in a candidate, since the person who applied has a doctorate degree and has served the community in multiple aspects. W. Haggerty said that they would like to have a choice. M. Blanchard said that the qualifications of the applicant are not being questioned, but the process is, whereas other people have expressed their views to the Tantasqua School Committee that if the timeframe for response hadn't been so short, they may have applied for the position. She noted that the current candidate is well qualified and may be the most qualified, if this is extended.

M. Dowling said that she appreciated the fact that the Committee wants choice, but the Town Charter states the deadline be 10 days, and this was 12 days. She said that the lack of choice is not a persuasive argument or a determinative factor when a candidate is well qualified. She noted that if it were an elected position and only one person ran, that person would be in. She said that with all due respect, the other people were interested after the fact. She said that she would not support the motion.

P. Gimas said that the candidate that did apply had found the time to step forward to become the Volunteer Resource Coordinator after the tornado, and has shown her commitment to the Town of Sturbridge and has shown the same commitment to the School Committee. She said that the candidate's credentials are flawless.

G. Galonek said that Mr. Simanski's shoes will be difficult to fill, as he was a very beloved member of the community. He said that there was nothing in the next agenda that would force them to rush to choose a replacement.

Vote: 7 in favor; 4 opposed. The motion carried.

T. Creamer said that the Board has been forced into a level of inconsistency in the manner by which it appoints. He said that the Board's position on appointments is to make appointments based solely on the Charter, within the timeframe of the Charter, regardless of any extenuating circumstances, and that the majority vote of this Board was to remain consistent with past practice and remain consistent with the Town Charter irrespective of any outside influences; however, the majority position on this Board was defeated by one member of this Board and a majority vote of the School Committee. He said that his position would always be that the Board must stick directly to the Charter, and appointments must be based on consistency.

J. Ehrhardt said that he was a member of a regional committee which does not make many appointments, but when they do they like to make sure that they have full availability of choices. M. Blanchard said that this situation is different because it is a joint appointment; the timeframe listed in the Charter for appointments being published is for Town Administrator appointments and other appointments. She said that this particular type of joint appointment is not referred to in the Charter.

T. Creamer said that when distinctions like that are made, it opens the Board up to a lot of scrutiny. He said that he wanted it to be clear so that people know that the appointments the Board makes are going to remain consistent with the practices of over the last couple of years. He said that they need to determine what needs to be done now to reopen and repost the vacancy.

P. Gimas said that the Board of Selectmen is being asked to add another 14 days onto the process, after the vacancy has already been advertised, when there is a more than competent candidate in front of them. She said that she had a problem with the integrity and transparency of that. She said that Dr. Waters is exceptional and has worked with adolescent students, has a doctorate in educational leadership, nursing and health sciences. T. Creamer agreed, and added that there is an issue with inequity. He noted that it was not the policy of the Board to take this course.

June 13, 2011

J. Ehrhardt said that the Burgess School Committee appointment was also a joint appointment, and they could have requested an extension; they did not do that, but it was their right. He felt that it would not have been an issue of integrity, only a choice of the committee, and that is how a joint session works.

Dr. Susan Waters said that she wanted each of them to know that what she has to offer is National Institute of Health multimillion dollar grant management experience. She said that she worked at UMass Medical School in the Research Department. She understands budgetary issues, collective bargaining and curriculum policy making, and has been involved in this for the past 20 years. She said that she was surprised that they felt that they needed more choice. She had met the deadline. She said that as a resident of Sturbridge and as an applicant for the position to represent the Town of Sturbridge, she was not clear as to their motives and their purpose in serving the adolescents of the regional school district.

A. Ellison said that Fran Simanski had mentored her while she served on that committee, and he had stressed the need to be consistent and to do what is right, based on policy.

T. Creamer noted that the motion was made and passed, so they should find a way to determine what the next phase will be. W. Haggerty said that with all due respect, the Board should respect their point of view, and he found it offensive that their motives were being questioned. T. Creamer said that his point was well taken. He said that the Board could not accept anything that would go beyond the 10 days as stated in the Charter. J. Ehrhardt said that they are guided by a regional body. S. Suhoski said that it would be 10 days from the posting of the vacancy, the publication date of the legal notice, which may take a couple of days to get into the newspaper.

MOTION: To re-advertise the vacancy for 10 days from the point of publication, by J. Ehrhardt.

2nd: G. Galonek

Vote: 7 in favor; 4 opposed.

It was the consensus of the Board to direct the Town Administrator to submit the vacancy posting to the newspaper by 12:00 p.m.

Dr. Susan Waters withdrew her application to the Tantasqua Regional School Committee, as she did not think that the climate was one in which she would want to become involved. She said that she would give the matter further consideration and then decide as to whether or not she will resubmit her application. She thanked the Board and the committee for their time.

Charter Review Committee

June 13, 2011

Members of the Charter Review Committee and Finance Committee appeared before the Board. T. Creamer said that the Board had requested a joint meeting with the Charter Review Committee and Finance Committee to address outstanding questions, concerns and comments regarding the Charter Review Committee's recommendations. He said that the objective was to have a discussion in which if there were significant points of disagreement between the recommendation made by the majority viewpoint of the Charter Review Committee, and if there is any type of dissention among the Finance Committee or Board of Selectmen, they will try to find some middle ground in order to put forward amendments that are acceptable by all. He said that the elected members of the Board of Selectmen may find important questions and may stand on a particular recommendation from the Charter Review Committee based upon that. He said that the Board's objective, as an elected body, is to try to find a way to address things to have the best document going forward.

W. Haggerty said that the committee had met earlier in the month and they appreciated Kevin Smith getting questions that the Finance Committee had with respect to the committee's recommendations. He said that the proposals as written continue to stand as the report of the Charter Review Committee. He said that they would be agreeable to letting the Board go ahead and make any changes that needed to be made. He noted that the Charter Review Committee was charged to make recommendations to the Board, not to write articles.

T. Creamer said that he appreciated the fact that the Charter Review Committee has made it very clear that the recommendations, whether the Board of Selectmen agrees with them or not, were put forward. He noted that the decisions should be made by the voters.

Kevin Smith said that the document they are working from is the April 26, 2011 version of the Town Warrant, only what had been presented to them for review. He noted that they are not a policy setting group.

M. Dowling said that it was the Finance Committee's opportunity to come forward with their questions. T. Creamer said that the Finance Committee may bring a question or may solicit a level of clarity that may not have previously existed.

K. Smith said that regarding Article #39, Section F: delete Section F and replace it with the following. The definition: the word "to" is there twice. Article #1: Amend Section G to become Section H and the language referred to, replace that with the word "with." T. Creamer said that there may have been a transmission error as it related to getting into the warrant. He said that there was no issue with the Charter language itself, but how it ended up as verbiage in the warrant article. It was the consensus to change the word "to" to "with." Peter Levine said that the words "Massachusetts General Laws" should be spelled out, as opposed to "MGL."

T. Creamer said that everyone should be working off of the same document. He said that K. Smith could review his changes and the Board could review them, and rather than taking a lot of time dealing with “ifs” or “withs” which are not substantive unless they drastically change the overall article, he suggested that they deal with the most important things first. He said that there were articles of a substantive nature that there were questions about, as opposed to things along the lines of housekeeping.

M. Dowling thought that the Finance Committee had voted “no action” on the substantive one because they had to deal with the housekeeping work. She said that the Board would like to start with the substantive recommendations of the Charter Review Committee. K. Smith said that there had previously been a question on whether the Charter Review Committee had been using the correct version of the Charter. M. Dowling wanted to know whether the Finance Committee had questions on the recommendations of the Charter Review Committee. She noted that the Board had postponed moving it forward at Annual Town Meeting because the Finance Committee had not had sufficient time to review everything. She did not think they should debate the grammatical errors.

T. Creamer said that when the Board had discussed it on May 2nd, they had indicated jointly that they would like to meet at some point after the Annual Town Meeting, putting off the recommendations of the Charter Review Committee, and try to find any sticking points that may need better clarification, and define the rationales that may not have come forward and what could be done collectively to try to find a way to better understand and perhaps embrace some or all of the recommendations from the Charter Review Committee.

Heather Hart said that they had requested that the Finance Committee submit questions to them; they received seven questions, and none of them addressed any of the substantive changes to the Charter. She noted that most of them were grammatical. She said that the Charter Review Committee and the Finance Committee should meet to discuss this, then make a final presentation to the Board of Selectmen.

K. Smith said that concerns were expressed regarding the Charter Review Committee’s recommendations on the citizen articles. M. Dowling said that they were two totally different things; the citizen petitions are different from the Charter Review Committee’s Charter. K. Smith said that it is not much different than the warrant article being discussed. M. Dowling said that the citizen petition is entirely different, and they were not there to discuss the petition articles. K. Smith said that the Finance Committee was concerned that the Charter Review Committee had been using the wrong version of the Charter, which was their reason for taking no action. M. Dowling said that it had been clarified by the Town Clerk. K. Smith said that by the time it had been clarified by the Town Clerk, the timeline was exhausted to get the Finance Committee book to the

printer. He said that the Board needed to provide them with something to discuss. M. Dowling asked whether they wanted the Board to put together the warrant articles for Special Town Meeting. She asked whether they had questions, other than the seven questions that had been submitted to the Charter Review Committee.

T. Creamer said that the Finance Committee had come before the Board under a different impression than the Board of Selectmen and the Charter Review Committee. He was unsure how that misunderstanding had come about, but the Charter Review Committee had come under the same impression that the Board of Selectmen had. He said that it was intended to be a work session to try to address some things and perhaps get clarification on some things on which they had disagreed. K. Smith said that they do not want to be seen as a board making policy, as that is not their job. M. Dowling said that the Board was not asking them to do that. She said that they need to start devising the Special Town Meeting warrant, put forward the articles, vote on them, and give them a month or two until October.

T. Creamer said that people had come to the meeting with different impressions of what was to take place. P. Gimás said that it was going to be a three-way work session. She said that the Finance Committee was going to present their points of view and everyone was going to discuss it together and get it going. T. Creamer expressed the need to keep things focused, and recommended that the Charter Review Committee schedule a meeting with the Finance Committee if they want to review any of the articles that have come forward. It was his sense that there was not going to be any substantive change on the Board's end.

T. Creamer suggested that the Finance Committee meet independently with the Charter Review Committee. K. Smith said that they typically review the warrant as the Finance Committee, come up with questions and concerns, then ask the department head or committee to meet with them to answer their questions. M. Dowling suggested that to be consistent with the procedure that they typically follow, to create a new warrant article which will be put on the Special Town Meeting warrant.

A. Ellison said as a political science major, she had learned that the different branches of government: legislative, executive and judicial all make policy, intentionally or not. She stated for example that the Supreme Court's job is to interpret the law, and in doing so, create policy. She said that although the Finance Committee's stated role is not to create policy, they in fact do so by interpreting and reviewing the inconsistencies and language and how things are actually applied.

MOTION: To table this discussion from the Board of Selectmen's point of view, with all due respect, and take it up at a Board of

Selectmen meeting; and come up with new warrant articles to present to the Finance Committee, by M. Dowling.

2nd: P. Gimás

Vote: All in favor.

W. Haggerty said that until the Board puts the warrant articles through to the Finance Committee, it would be fruitless to discuss them. T. Creamer said that a motion was made to terminate the discussion. He suggested that as government bodies representing the citizens of Sturbridge, they should simply admit to a misunderstanding as to what their role would be at this meeting collectively; they have clarified the parameters of discussion and will take it up at another time. He suggested that they end it on an amiable note, that they simply did not communicate all of their intentions as much as they could have done.

Cleaning Services Contract Award

T. Creamer asked whether the contract would cover the public rest rooms. He said that if it is part of the Sturbridge Tourist Association funds, the Town could be paying twice to clean the public rest rooms. S. Suhoski said that it could be answered through allocating the operating budget, and an allocation from the Sturbridge Tourist Association budget to meet this contract. He noted that it is a consolidated bid, and it is just a question of the funding source. T. Creamer said that \$6,000 out of betterment is going toward cleaning the rest rooms. S. Suhoski recommended the alternate, which would increase the differences so instead of cleaning the Town Hall and Center Office Building twice a week, it would be done three times as an alternate to the bid, and was within budget. T. Creamer said that there is \$7,000 in STA article #14, dedicated to the Rt. 20 rest rooms, then \$6,000 in betterment. He noted that there is a total of \$13,000 that has been committed to cleaning and maintaining the rest rooms on Route 20. He asked that if money has already been approved from the STA article for that purpose, whether that \$13,000 would be deducted from the \$40,000. S. Suhoski said that the bid is broken out by property. He said that there is a fixed dollar amount of \$4,680 for the rest rooms in the bid, as indicated on the spreadsheet. He said that he would speak to the Finance Director and report back to the Board on how that contract will be allocated. T. Creamer requested clarification. M. Blanchard said that the money has been appropriated at Town Meeting; it is just a matter of how it will be paid out.

Electrical and Plumbing Fees

T. Creamer said that there had been a recommendation from staff, and the Board had discussed whether or not to waive the electrical and plumbing fees for those people who were impacted by the tornado; then there was a question as to how to pay the \$35/inspection charge. He said that a suggestion had come from staff as to whether the Board would entertain the idea of just charging the \$35 that is paid to the inspector. He asked the members of the Board if they would be

amenable to offering up a motion where the Town would waive the Town's share of inspection fees for those individuals within the impact zone of the tornado.

MOTION: So moved, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: P. Gimas

Vote: All in favor.

Committee Appointment

MOTION: That the Board of Selectmen ratify the appointment of John F. Clancey of Woodside Circle to the Cable Advisory Committee for an indefinite term, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: A. Ellison

Vote: All in favor.

M. Blanchard requested a list of positions that have not yet been filled. S. Suhoski said that there are openings on the Housing Partnership Committee and the Economic Development Committee. He said that he received four applications for the EDC and other people have indicated their intent to apply. He will interview the candidates soon.

T. Creamer said that in a situation where there are no individuals who have submitted applications for board and committees, when only one application has been received, then those individuals should be interviewed and be provided the opportunity for appointment, as opposed to sending the vacancy notice back out to be re-advertised. He added that unless during the interview process the individual does not meet the qualifications, he did not want to have the appearance of putting off appointments until the right people have applied. S. Suhoski said that was the case with the Cable Advisory Committee appointment that the Board had just made. He had put the name forward before he had the opportunity to speak with him; it had been a telephone interview, but he was the only applicant.

M. Dowling said that she agreed with the Chairman's position that one applicant does not mean that the appointment can't move forward, unless the person is not qualified. She said that the Board could take action on the Economic Development Committee, for example. S. Suhoski said that he just needed time to speak with all of the individuals, then bring the appointments forward. T. Creamer said that regarding the Economic Development Committee, if there is difficulty determining whether people are on the committee or not, because that has been a non-functioning committee for over a year, the Board might consider starting with a new EDC. S. Suhoski said that there are two members that are interested in remaining on the committee: Kevin MacConnell and Donald Miller. He noted that another member, Steve Dalberth, is interested in transitioning away from the committee, as he is busy with other pursuits. T. Creamer said that the Board has expressed the need to reconfigure the EDC or re-write their

mission statement in light of the master plan, and in light of the commercial tourist revitalization, in light of Chapter 43D expedited permitting and in light of the single tax rate. He noted that there are things that exist now that did not exist when the EDC was formed. He said that Tractor Supply and Ocean State Job Lot had indicated that one of the key reasons why they came to Sturbridge was the expedited permitting and the single tax rate. He said that filling the shops on Route 20 is important for the Commercial Tourist Revitalization Plan, but filling the shops on Route 20 alone will have no impact on the tax base of the community, because those properties are paying taxes whether they are vacant or full. He said that increasing the tax base will come from development in areas that current either have no development or may become condominium-type developments. He said that the EDC should be looking at the global aspects of how to bring in the high tech jobs, how to bring in something like a college into Sturbridge. He said that if other committee members shepherd the new members of the group, it would be nice if someone were to stay on for a bit to do that, but he was more concerned with the Board trying to give them a mission statement that is appropriate to all of the things that have been accomplished, such as Chapter 43D and the single tax rate.

S. Suhoski said that there were some very good candidates for the EDC, and more people have expressed interest in serving than there are seats. T. Creamer suggested that S. Suhoski consider interviewing everyone and start fresh, with the exception of the appointment the Board had just made, with was Donald Miller.

M. Blanchard requested a list of open seats, and suggested that S. Suhoski write a report on how he had come to a decision on all of the appointments. T. Creamer noted that the new bylaws do not go into effect until the Attorney General signs off on them.

T. Creamer noted that there is a citizen seat open on the Sturbridge Tourist Association.

MOTION: To nominate T. Creamer for the Board's position on the Sturbridge Tourist Association, by P. Gimas.

2nd: M. Dowling

Vote: All in favor.

M. Blanchard said that T. Creamer would have to recuse himself when the REAS Foundation goes before the Sturbridge Tourist Association regarding the Feast and Fire event. T. Creamer said that the Feast and Fire event is held only once a year, and he would recuse himself. M. Dowling said that it was the nature of that committee that at least occasionally individual members would need to recuse themselves because they would benefit economically from something being brought forward, or a competitor is coming forward with something. T. Creamer said that there are times when members of that committee are voting

on things that impact them, which is a problem with the makeup of the committee. He said that it is a conflict by its very nature. He said that he was comfortable with that.

S. Suhoski said that he was thinking of having Joel Bard of Kopelman and Paige come in to give the Board a litigation update, then the Board could ask questions about how things are handled. T. Creamer said that the Board wanted to have Town Counsel come in so that some concerns could be addressed, such as delays in answering information requests from the Board and the Town Administrator, and what appeared to be conflicting opinions from Town Counsel. It was the consensus of the Board to ask Joel Bard to meet with them on June 27th.

Amendment to Common Victualler License

S. Suhoski informed the Board that he had received an application to change the name of the owner to Guispad, Inc., d/b/a McDonald's Restaurant. M. Blanchard asked who the previous owner had been. It was the consensus of the Board to hold action pending more information.

Used Car License – Change of DBA

S. Suhoski informed the Board that he had received an application from Robert Cassim, owner of Sullivan's Auto Sales at 33 Main Street, seeking to change the business name to Sullivan's Auto Sales d/b/a Garfield, Inc.

MOTION: That the Board of Selectmen approve the change in name from Sullivan's Auto Sales to Sullivan's Auto Sales d/b/a Garfield, Inc. in accordance with the application dated May 27, 2011, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: A. Ellison

Vote: All in favor.

Community Development Block Grant Update (Sturbridge Retirement Co-op)

S. Suhoski said that following a productive discussion between Jim Mazik of the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC), Town Planner Jean Bubon and Sturbridge RCC manager Mary Berry, he elected to partner with the PVPC for development of a potential CDBG application that would be directed towards wastewater treatment to alleviate a MassDEP consent order for that neighborhood. He submitted to the Board a copy of the correspondence documenting the partnership. The CMRPC had done some initial consulting, but the team believes that PVPC has more sufficient capacity to complete this task and at zero out-of-pocket cost. He noted that utilization of regional planning commissions is exempt from procurement under MGL Chapter 30B.

MOTION: That the Board have the Town Administrator work with the proposal presented by Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: A. Ellison

Vote: Four in favor; P. Gimás abstained, as she resides there.

Retirement of Barbara Search as Council on Aging Director

MOTION: That the Board of Selectmen accept the resignation of Barbara A Search from the position of Council on Aging Director effective July 15, 2011 with deep regret and gratitude for her service to the community, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: P. Gimás

Vote: All in favor.

M. Dowling commented that Barbara Search has been an asset to the Town, and wished her the best of luck. T. Creamer added that she has been an incredible advocate for the seniors and has done a great deal for them. He noted that the community is better because of it.

Tornado Response

S. Suhoski informed the Board that Town staff has put in countless hours, some outside of their normal discipline, to do whatever they can to assist, in response to the devastating tornado of June 1. He said that management and response activities have consumed a great majority of administrative attention. He thanked and recognized all of the Town staff who have worked tirelessly and selflessly throughout the ongoing effort.

S. Suhoski noted that on Monday, June 6th the Board had voted to authorize him and the Finance Director to begin looking at the process for deficit spending authorization for the tornado response. He said that Barbara Barry, Finance Director, had provided a memo giving the formal vote to declare the emergency, referencing the statute to allow deficit spending. He said that it needs to be conveyed through a letter. He said that the importance of this is that the Town has incurred immediate response costs of clearing roads, getting them open for utility crews, overtime costs, etc., and it would allow the Town to proceed, even though as of yet there is no formal appropriation. He said that in the coming weeks as cost estimates come in, and contracting for debris management, he and Barbara Barry and others will be working to bring options to the Board to deal with dollar amounts. They need to have some method of dealing with the immediate crisis.

T. Creamer said that it was his preference to see every member of the Board's signature on this, as opposed to only the Chairman's signature.

June 13, 2011

MOTION: That the Board of Selectmen sign the formal letter to Gerard D. Perry, Director of Accounts, Division of Local Services, verifying that the Board of Selectmen declare a local emergency to health and safety in Sturbridge, and to seek the ability to deficit spend, by M. Blanchard.

2nd: A. Ellison

Vote: All in favor.

P. Gimas announced that volunteers can to every day at 10:00 a.m., 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. to SIMS, sign up and be assigned a site. She said that many business owners and residents have expressed disappointment that the situation did not warrant the attention of a U.S. Senator. She said that Senator Kerry came out to visit the area and was very concerned about the damage. He spoke to some of the families on Willard Road. T. Creamer said that Senator Kerry was impressed with the level of work that had been done by volunteers, which was a great tribute to people in this community who have put in a lot of hours and continue to do so.

M. Dowling thanked everyone who had taken part in the Memorial Day Parade, the Veterans' Agent and the people who had attended to give honor to our fallen veterans.

S. Suhoski said that Joni Light is on the Finance Committee, and she had indicated to him that she would step down from the Sturbridge Tourist Association. T. Creamer added that the position on the STA is open, under the new structure that was recently approved.

MOTION: To adjourn, by M. Blanchard

2nd: P. Gimas

Vote: All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Knowles

BOS Clerk

Date