

Personnel Board Meeting  
Wayland Town Building – Selectmen’s Office  
Meeting Minutes  
September 28, 2012 8:00 am

Members Present:

N. McCarthy (NM), J. Evans (JE), N. Willard (NW)

Also in attendance: J. Senchyshyn (JS)

Public Comment:

None

STM – Article 5 Discussion

The Board initiated a discussion of Article 5 of the 10/3/12 warrant. The article seeks to establish a separate article at Annual Town Meeting to fund Other Post Employment Benefits, generally referred to as OPEB. NW asked if union had raised the issue of OPEB funding. JS responded that they had not.

MP arrived at 8:10 am

MP asked how many retirees are in each category and if retirees contribute towards the premiums. JS stated that approximately 90 retirees were in non-Medicare plans and 410 were in Medicare supplemental plans, and that they did contribute towards the premiums. He noted that contributions varied by plan; retirees on non-Medicare plans paid the same rate as active employees.

Members discussed Medicare eligibility and asked if all retirees were eligible. JS responded that employees hired after the 1986 date that established federally mandated Medicare contributions do so in the amount of 1.45%. Members asked if pre-1986 employees were eligible for Medicare. JS responded that he did not believe they were eligible. [Note: no distinction was made in the discussion between Part A and Part B]

The Board inquired into OPEB evaluations. JS responded that he believed evaluations were on a 3 year cycle and the next projection would be available in late 2013. [Note: The actuarial evaluation is every 2 years and the next projection should be available in the spring of 2013]

The Board discussed whether it should take a position on this article. MP noted that residents may look to the Board for advice. JS distributed a document which identified the BOS and FinCom positions on each STM article. Each member was polled and responded that the Board did not need to take a position on Article 5.

NW moved to adjourn the meeting. MP seconded the motion, but noted that motions to adjourn did not need to be seconded. Four members having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed. The Board adjourned at 8:45 am.

---

John Senchyshyn  
ATA/HRD