

**TOWN OF CONCORD PERSONNEL BOARD**

**AGENDA**

**September 7, 2022**

**5:15 p.m.**

**Select Board's Room, Town House**

**Board members will meet in person.**

**The public may attend in-person or via Zoom video conference:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89619389545?pwd=SmFmM2JSWlVMMExucUFhVFczRHl6Zz09>

One tap mobile: +13017158592,,89619389545# US (Washington DC)

Dial by your location: 877 853 5257 US Toll-free OR 888 475 4499 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 896 1938 9545

Passcode: 041556

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Employee Appeal**
  - Presentation of written appeal submitted by employee Jim Coakley
  - Determine next steps
- 3. Classification & Compensation Study**
  - Discuss and confirm the following as proposed by GovHR Consultants:
    - Selection of comparable communities
    - Selection of benchmark positions
  - Discuss other potential data sources per Personnel Bylaw
  - Agreement to proceed forward with GovHR's proposed survey methodology
  - Public comment
- 4. Personnel Study Task Force**
  - General updates & discussion
- 5. Approval of Minutes**
- 6. Adjournment**

**Materials to be used during the meeting will be posted at: <https://concordma.gov/452/Personnel-Board>**

**Documents Expected to be Used or Referenced at the Meeting:**

- Employee Appeal Procedure PPP #25
- Employee Appeal of Classification & Compensation Plan Submitted by Jim Coakley
- Attachment to Appeal – Correspondence between J. Coakley & Town Manager Lafleur
- GovHR Scoring Key for identifying comparable communities
- Recommendations for comparable communities from GovHR USA
- Minutes from prior meetings (pending)

TOWN OF CONCORD  
Personnel Policy and Procedure #25

**Employee Appeal Procedure**

*Date Issued: September 11, 1992*

**Purpose and Scope**

The purpose of this document is to establish a procedure for the timely and careful review of employee issues related to employment. Any Town employee may use this procedure to appeal:

- a.) an alleged violation, misinterpretation or misapplication of the provisions of the Town's Personnel Bylaws, the Personnel Policies and Procedures (PPP's), or any other departmental or town-wide rules and regulations which govern personnel practices and working conditions, or
- b.) any disciplinary action taken against the employee.

This procedure is not available to employees subject to collective bargaining agreements with the Town. Such employees are covered by the grievance procedure included in their collective bargaining agreement.

**General Provisions and Limitations**

An employee may be represented by any individual(s) of his/her choice at any and all stages of this appeal process.

No employee shall be subjected to reprisal as a result of filing an appeal under this procedure.

Failure of the employee to file an appeal within the required time periods specified for any level of this procedure shall constitute an abandonment of the appeal action. Failure of the Town to act within the required time periods shall result in an automatic advancement of the appeal to the next step. Time limits specified in this procedure may be extended by mutual agreement between the employee and the Town.

**Procedures**

Every attempt will be made to settle an issue at the lowest possible level of this process. Only upon mutual agreement between the employee and the Town may any stage of this process be waived.

**Step 1 - Supervisor**

Within fifteen (15) working days following knowledge of the event or action on which the appeal is based, the employee shall notify his/her immediate supervisor, in writing, of the nature of the issue being appealed. Within ten (10) working days of being notified of the issue, the supervisor shall meet with the employee, investigate the issue, and provide the employee a written response.

**Step 2 - Department Head**

If the issue is not resolved with the supervisor, the employee may appeal the action further by notifying his/her department head of the issue, in writing, within ten (10) working days of receiving the supervisors answer. Within ten (10) working days of being notified of the issue, the department head shall meet with the employee, investigate the issue, and provide the employee a written response.

**Step 3 - Town Manager**

If the employee is not satisfied with the department head's response, he/she may appeal to the Town Manager. Such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Town Manager within ten (10) working days

after receipt of the department head's response, with a copy also sent to the Personnel Director. This written appeal shall explain the issue involved and the resolution sought and shall include a copy of both the supervisor's and Department Head's responses.

The Town Manager may appoint a designee to review the appeal. Any such designee shall not be the concerned department head.

The Town Manager (or his/her designee) shall hold a meeting with the employee, the department head, and any other concerned parties within ten (10) working days after receipt of the appeal. The Town Manager (or his/her designee) will also conduct such other investigation of the issue as deemed necessary.

Within fifteen (15) working days following the meeting, the Town Manager (or his/her designee) shall issue a written decision to the employee.

#### Step 4 - Personnel Board

If the employee is not satisfied with the Town Manager's response, he/she may appeal the issue to the Personnel Board. Such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Personnel Board (via the Personnel Director) within ten (10) working days after receipt of the Town Manager's response. This written appeal shall explain the issue involved and the resolution sought and shall include copies of both the Department Head's and Town Manager's responses.

The Personnel Board shall meet to consider this appeal within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the written appeal. All concerned parties shall be notified in writing by the Personnel Director of the date, time and place of the Personnel Board's review.

All non-disciplinary appeals shall be heard and considered at an open meeting of the Personnel Board. All disciplinary appeals shall be heard and considered during executive sessions of the Personnel Board unless the concerned employee requests that such appeal be considered in an open meeting.

The employee and/or his/her designated representative and the Town Manager may present any written or verbal testimony to the Personnel Board which they believe relevant to the issues involved and to cross-examine any witnesses presented. The meeting need not be conducted in accordance with technical rules relating to evidence and witnesses, but shall be conducted in a manner most conducive to determining the facts.

The Board may choose to carry over its deliberations to a future meeting, if necessary. The Personnel Board shall issue an opinion to all concerned parties on the appeal at the conclusion of its deliberations.

#### Step 5 - Town Manager

The Personnel Board's opinion shall be advisory to the Town Manager. The Town Manager shall reconsider the issue in light of the Personnel Board's opinion and shall, within ten (10) working days of receiving such opinion, issue a final written decision to the employee and the Personnel Board. The Town Manager's decision at this point shall be final and binding.

## **Personnel Board Appeal of Classification and Compensation Plan 2022**

### **Purpose and Scope**

This appeal is being filed to request clarification of the following decisions regarding the Classification and Compensation Plan 2022:

- Why the decision was made to selectively exclude 4 positions held by the longest tenured employees when every other position in the EM and EL groups received a 9% structure adjustment.
- Why EM-1 positions were the only ones excluded from the structure adjustment in the EM group.
- Why 2 positions EL-2, EL-3 were re-classified to new EL-2A, EL-3A designations to selectively exclude the positions from the 9% structure adjustment in the EL group.
- Request a review of the analysis performed by Dave Wood and Amy Foley utilizing Municipal Electric Associations of MA salary survey to arrive at the exclusion of the positions from the structure adjustment.

### **Step 1 - Supervisor**

The Assistant Director and Lead Electrical Engineer were spoken to directly, neither were consulted about or had any knowledge why the positions were excluded. Engineering Dept members were informed in staff meetings leading up to Town Meeting that structure adjustments were to be across the board in the EL and EM groups. Please feel free to verify these statements directly with them.

### **Step 2 - Department Head**

The employees involved in this appeal feel the exclusion was a discriminatory act by the Light Plant Director, therefore an honest or forthright response would not be received. The only explanation of the decision by the Director was given to the Town Manager.

### **Step 3 - Town Manager**

Jim Coakley requested and was granted a meeting with the Town Manager on behalf of the group. Kerry contacted management involved in the decision and followed up in email. The email responses are included with the appeal for the board to draw their own conclusions. Also included is email correspondence between Jay Stiga and the Town Manager.

### **Summary**

We recognize and acknowledge that the exact procedures and timelines defined in PPP#25 have not been followed. The employees involved in the appeal do not take this action lightly and took time to decide to move forward. There were and are concerns due to the current organizational culture, as referred to in the Town Managers responses. Despite the risks, the group felt we could not in good conscience let the discrimination go unchallenged. The positions in question have not been hard to fill because the people in those positions are long standing, older and proud employees of the Town of Concord.

**Expectations**

- Independent review of the analysis that led to the decision to exclude the employees.
- Ability to continue our long-tenured, proud service to the ratepayers of Concord and strive to earn raises within our salary structures.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,  
Ann Breitenwischer (Meter Supervisor)  
Martin Boermeester (Utility Electrician)  
Jim Coakley (Senior Engineering Technician)  
John McGarry (Meter Technician)  
Jay Stiga (Senior Engineering Technician)

## Jim Coakley

---

**From:** Jim Coakley  
**Sent:** Monday, June 6, 2022 10:17 AM  
**To:** Kerry Lafleur  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Kerry,

Thank you for the additional response, but I don't consider it clarification.

- The question was why the decision was made to selectively **exclude** 4 positions held by the longest tenured employees when not some but **every** other position in the EM and EL groups got 9% structure adjustment.
- Have you looked at the Municipal Electric Associations of MA salary survey yourself? Did you review the analysis done by Amy & Dave?

I made my attempt to help start a culture change by going directly to you and got status quo. I came to you because I've been disrespected, devalued and discriminated against by the decision. You reviewed and back the decision. I think we've both stated our positions and will have to agree to disagree. Good luck with the classification study and organizational culture changes.

Jim

**James Coakley**  
**Sr. Engineering Technician**  
1175 Elm St, PO Box 1029  
Concord, MA. 01742-1029  
p. 978-318-3114 f. 978-318-3105



---

**From:** Kerry Lafleur <klafleur@concordma.gov>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 4, 2022 1:36 PM  
**To:** Jim Coakley <jcoakley@concordma.gov>  
**Cc:** Kerry Lafleur <klafleur@concordma.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Hi Jim,

Thanks for the response. I'd like to provide an additional response for the purpose of clarification.

- I understood the question to be why the decision was made to adjust some FY23 grades by 9% but others only by 3%. To answer that question, I went to the people involved in making that decision (Amy & Dave) who are still employed by the Town. Talking to others who were not involved in this decision-making process would not have helped to answer this question.
- It will be through the upcoming classification and compensation plan review where we will be working with employees and their direct supervisors to better understand roles, responsibilities and the value of each position.

You raise another issue about Group 4 retirement which I don't remember talking about but did look into further. The Town of Concord and the Concord Retirement System are two separate and distinct entities. The Town of Concord determining that the position of Senior Engineering Technician was an on-call engineer didn't automatically result in the Retirement System moving it from Group 1 to Group 4. However, I did find that on February 24, 2016, the Retirement Board voted to accept the position of Senior Engineering Technician into Group 4. The Personnel Board determines position classification for the purpose of compensation. The Retirement Board determines position classification for the purpose of retirement benefits.

I stand by statement that the 2019 action was in response to internal equity.

Finally, you mentioned that SMT only talks to SMT. I've heard this many times before and agree that this is the way things have been done in the past. I don't like it and never have, but unfortunately, it's part of the organizational culture and it will take some time to change. I hope you're willing to work with me to make that happen.

Kerry

---

**From:** Jim Coakley <[jcoakley@concordma.gov](mailto:jcoakley@concordma.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 12:20 PM  
**To:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Kerry,

Your response is disappointing and status quo for what long tenured employees come to expect from senior management. SMT only speaks with SMT, in this building Dave only speaks to his SMT. Looking into this you went no further than speaking with the two SMT members who are responsible and would never admit to an error.

- My move from MP-2 to EM-1 was done to separate the position in preparation for going to the Personnel board to get all call engineers into Group 4 for retirement, something that should have been automatically done the second I was made an on-call engineer. That is why Jay Stiga was recently promoted into the position because he was becoming a Call Engineer. Any statement that it was done for equity is **untrue**.
- You stated "MLP's don't have a similar position, the range as a whole was determined to **still** be competitive, based upon the 2019 reclassification and subsequent COLA adjustments." I'd like to know who made this determination? My immediate supervisors were not contacted to find out what I do here on a day to day basis and what my value is to the department.

I'm just going to stop there. I've had my say, you've given me your response and I've given you 2 weeks to look into it. I appreciate your offer to meet and talk again but I don't see the point.

Thank you  
Jim

**James Coakley**  
**Sr. Engineering Technician**  
**1175 Elm St, PO Box 1029**  
**Concord, MA. 01742-1029**  
**p. 978-318-3114 f. 978-318-3105**



**From:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 30, 2022 2:40 PM  
**To:** Jim Coakley <[jcoakley@concordma.gov](mailto:jcoakley@concordma.gov)>  
**Cc:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Hi Jim,

I'm glad that we were able to meet earlier this month. I take very seriously any and all employee concerns and hope that by working together we can make Concord a place we can all be proud to work! Since we met, I've had the opportunity to talk with both Amy Foley and Dave Wood to better understand the review and analysis that led to development of the FY23 Compensation Plan, EL- Electric Labor and EM-Electrical Management grids. As mentioned, Dave and Amy had been working with former Town Manager Crane since (at least) last summer to address:

- compensation for CMLP positions which have been particularly hard to fill (line workers); and
- compensation equity (internal & external) for many of the EM positions. (The source for comparing external equity was the most recent Municipal Electric Association of MA (MEAM) salary survey)

When I took over as Interim Town Manager in January, the analysis had been completed and it was determined that a 9% grade/ range adjustment was warranted for certain (but not all) positions, and this is what was submitted in January for the Annual Town Meeting Warrant. Please note that this proposed adjustment was to keep positions competitive with market/ peer communities but does not mean that individual salaries will automatically increase by 9% in FY23. Each employee's compensation will be considered individually in determining FY23 salary adjustments, within the approved ranges.

When I asked specifically about your position, Senior Engineering Technician, I was told that it was last looked at in 2019 and at that time, was moved from MP-2 to EM-1, based upon an analysis of internal equity. (For reference, the maximum of the EM-1 range is approximately 12% higher than MP-2.)

The position was also considered as a part of this most recent review, and although the market data is limited for it, as most MLP's don't have a similar position, the range as a whole was determined to still be competitive, based upon the 2019 reclassification and subsequent COLA adjustments.

I also took a look at your current compensation and see that it is about 10% below the FY23 maximum for EM-1, so there is still a good opportunity for salary growth. Further, as I mentioned, we are starting a comprehensive Classification & Compensation Study in June. Bids are due on June 2, and we expect to have a contract signed with an outside (unbiased) vendor by the end of June. I've attached a copy of the RFP for this study and additional information may be found here: <https://concordma.gov/bids.aspx?bidID=103>. As you know, this type of comprehensive study is well overdue, and it is unfortunate that it had not been identified as a priority before now. Going forward, it is my intention to make sure we identify a specific compensation strategy and stay current with our analysis, so we don't find ourselves in this situation again.

While you did not mention other co-workers by name, you did indicate that some of the most senior staff at CMLP were also concerned with the FY23 salary adjustments. Please feel free to share this email with them, and/ or encourage them to reach out to me directly. While you do have room to grow in your range, I note that several other of your co-workers are already "maxed" out and thus currently capped at the annual COLA. Understanding how to fairly compensate long-tenured employees is also a goal of this upcoming study, and we hope we can learn what other communities are doing and then implement best practices moving forward.

I hope this information is helpful, and I'm happy to meet with you again if you'd like to do so. Also, I am scheduled to host an employee meeting on July 7 at CMLP. Hope to see you there!

Kerry

---

**From:** Jim Coakley <[jcoakley@concordma.gov](mailto:jcoakley@concordma.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2022 4:42 PM  
**To:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Kerry,  
I wanted to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. I felt there was no one else within the town organization I could turn to and appreciate you hearing me out.

Thanks  
Jim

**James Coakley**  
**Sr. Engineering Technician**  
1175 Elm St, PO Box 1029  
Concord, MA. 01742-1029  
p. 978-318-3114 f. 978-318-3105



---

**From:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 13, 2022 3:53 PM  
**To:** Jim Coakley <[jcoakley@concordma.gov](mailto:jcoakley@concordma.gov)>  
**Cc:** Joseph Repoff <[jrepoff@concordma.gov](mailto:jrepoff@concordma.gov)>; Jeff Cosgrove <[jcosgrove@concordma.gov](mailto:jcosgrove@concordma.gov)>; Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting

Hi Jim,

Thanks for reaching out to me. I'm happy to meet with you and am available as follows:

- Monday, 5/16: 10AM – 1PM, or after 4PM
- Wednesday, 5/18: 9AM, or after 4PM
- Thursday, 5/19: 9:30AM or after 3:30PM
- Friday, 5/20: 9AM – 1PM

Please let me know what works best and where you would like to meet.

Kerry

---

**From:** Jim Coakley <[jcoakley@concordma.gov](mailto:jcoakley@concordma.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 13, 2022 9:20 AM  
**To:** Kerry Lafleur <[klafleur@concordma.gov](mailto:klafleur@concordma.gov)>

Cc: Joseph Repoff <[jrepoff@concordma.gov](mailto:jrepoff@concordma.gov)>; Jeff Cosgrove <[jcosgrove@concordma.gov](mailto:jcosgrove@concordma.gov)>

Subject: Meeting

Kerry,

I would like to schedule a meeting with you next week at your earliest convenience.

Thank you

Jim Coakley

**James Coakley**

**Sr. Engineering Technician**

1175 Elm St, PO Box 1029

Concord, MA. 01742-1029

p. 978-318-3114 f. 978-318-3105



**Town of Concord  
2007 Salary & Benefits Survey  
List of Participants**

Acton  
Andover  
Arlington  
Belmont  
Chelmsford  
Danvers  
Groton Electric Light  
Lexington  
Mansfield  
Natick  
Needham  
Shrewsbury  
Sudbury  
Wellesley  
Weston  
Westwood  
Winchester

---

Note: We gathered data for the following communities from the  
Massachusetts Municipal Personnel Association Benchmark Title Salary Survey.  
(They did not respond directly to the survey)

Bedford  
Burlington  
Hingham  
Ipswich  
Littleton  
Marblehead  
Tewksbury  
Westborough  
Westford

---

<b>1. Population: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>18,491</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	12,327	18,491	18,491	27,737	15	
2.00	9,246	12,326	27,738	36,982	11	
2.50	7,396	9,245	36,983	46,228	7	
3.00	6,164	7,395	46,229	55,473	3	
All Others					0	
<b>2. DOR Income Per Capita: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>152,245</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	101,497	152,245	152,245	228,368	15	
2.00	76,123	101,496	228,369	304,490	11	
2.50	60,898	76,122	304,491	380,613	7	
3.00	50,748	60,897	380,614	456,735	3	
All Others					0	
<b>3. EQV Per Capita: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>385,820</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	257,213	385,820	385,820	578,730	15	
2.00	192,910	257,212	578,731	771,640	11	
2.50	154,328	192,909	771,641	964,550	7	
3.00	128,607	154,327	964,551	1,157,460	3	
All Others					0	
<b>4. Total Assessed Value: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>6,827 Million</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	4,551	6,827	6,827	10,240	15	
2.00	3,413	4,550	10,241	13,654	11	
2.50	2,731	3,412	13,655	17,067	7	
3.00	2,276	2,730	17,068	20,481	3	
All Others					0	
<b>5. Tax Levy: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>100.8 Million</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	67.2	100.8	100.8	151.1	15	
2.00	50.4	67.1	151.2	201.5	11	
2.50	40.3	50.3	201.6	251.9	7	
3.00	33.6	40.2	252.0	302.3	3	
All Others					0	
<b>5. Total Budget: Maximum 15 Points</b>						
<b>120.2 Million</b>						
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points	
1.50	80.1	120.2	120.2	180.3	15	
2.00	60.1	80.0	180.4	240.3	11	
2.50	48.1	60.0	240.4	300.4	7	
3.00	40.1	48.0	300.5	360.5	3	
All Others					0	
<b>7. State Aid: Maximum 5 Points</b>						

5.84 Million					
Factor	Minimum Range		Maximum Range		Points
1.50	3.89	5.84	5.84	8.76	5
2.00	2.92	3.88	8.77	11.68	4
2.50	2.34	2.91	11.69	14.60	3
3.00	1.95	2.33	14.61	17.51	2
All Others					0

**8. Proximity in Miles: Maximum 5 Points**

Factor:	Points
1 to 10 Miles	5
11 to 20 Miles	3
21 to 30 Miles	1
All Others	0

**Initial screen:**

Massachusetts communities with populations between approximately 9,200 and 37,000, within 30 miles of Concord in Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk and Worcester Counties, and with an EQV Per Capita greater than

**Sources:**

(1) Massachusetts Department of Revenue Division of Local Services, Municipal Databank/Local Aid Section (most recent data available) for: Population; DOR Income Per Capita; EQV Per Capita; Total Assessed Value; Tax Levy; State Aid; and Total Budget. <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/at-a-glance-and-community-comparison-reports>

(2) Google Maps: Proximity (lowest mileage listed)

**Note:**

Each of the eight criterion contain ranges to assess comparability with the Town's data. For example, each of the four ranges for the Town's population is developed using a factor of .5 percent (+/-). To determine the population range that will receive a score of 15 (most similar to the Town), the Town's population is multiplied by 1.5 (maximum range) and divided by 1.5 (minimum range). The Town's population is then multiplied and divided by 2.0, 2.5 and 3.0 to determine ranges of decreasing similarity (and subsequently decreasing "comparability points").

Municipality	Population	Max. Points	Income Per Capita	Max. Points	EQV Per Capita	Max. Points	Assessed Value (million)	Max Points	Tax Levy (million)	Max. Points	Total Budget (million)	Max. Points	State Aid (million)	Max. Points	Proximity (miles)	Max. Points	Total Points
<b>Concord</b>	<b>18,491</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>152,245</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>385,820</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6,827</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>120.2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5.84</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>
Sudbury	18,934	15	120,466	15	271,042	15	5,198	15	96.0	15	112.8	15	6.75	5	8	5	100
Winchester	22,970	15	121,868	15	377,913	15	8,983	15	112.1	15	142.4	15	11.54	4	13	3	97
Westwood	16,266	15	123,062	15	320,554	15	5,079	15	86.6	15	103.4	15	8.02	5	23	1	96
Wayland	13,943	15	143,103	15	304,005	15	4,204	11	77.2	15	92.7	15	6.53	5	8	5	96
<b>Belmont</b>	<b>27,295</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>97,965</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>360,538</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9,664</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>111.7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>140.9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12.48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>92</b>
Weston	11,851	11	333,105	7	570,849	15	6,816	15	87.3	15	102.7	15	4.45	5	8	5	88
Hopkinton	18,758	15	87,002	11	237,487	11	4,853	15	82.6	15	100.6	15	9.45	4	24	1	87
Burlington	26,377	15	53,983	3	307,110	15	7,950	15	129.8	15	162.0	15	10.32	4	10	5	87
Bedford	14,383	15	76,027	7	305,877	15	4,297	11	73.5	15	109.3	15	8.90	4	5	5	87
Acton	24,021	15	72,152	7	205,691	11	5,103	15	99.3	15	108.9	15	2.70	3	6	5	86
Dedham	25,364	15	60,879	7	231,176	11	6,085	15	97.1	15	122.8	15	9.96	4	21	1	83
<b>Reading</b>	<b>25,518</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>68,897</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>227,975</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6,200</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>82.4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>111.1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14.82</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>83</b>
Westford	24,643	15	66,152	7	209,433	11	5,466	15	88.1	15	118.9	15	20.27	0	10	5	83
Lynnfield	13,000	15	88,287	11	269,895	15	3,934	11	50.7	11	63.2	11	5.75	5	20	3	82
<b>Wakefield</b>	<b>27,090</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>53,217</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>211,646</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6,148</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11.10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Wellesley</b>	<b>29,550</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>211,460</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>457,666</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13,305</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>155.4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>184.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10.94</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>81</b>
Needham	32,091	11	119,154	15	360,854	15	11,312	11	170.8	11	208.0	11	13.96	3	18	3	80
Lexington	34,454	11	131,387	15	390,990	15	14,045	7	218.2	7	268.7	7	16.49	2	7	5	69
<b>Hingham</b>	<b>24,284</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>127,975</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>327,057</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8,044</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>123.9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10.14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Marblehead</b>	<b>20,441</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>94,092</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>340,458</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7,251</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8.27</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>91</b>
Natick	37,006	7	62,985	7	256,717	15	9,806	15	130.8	15	170.9	15	15.20	2	14	3	79
Andover	36,569	11	87,282	11	255,097	11	9,659	15	165.5	11	198.6	11	14.24	3	25	1	74
Westborough	21,567	15	58,864	3	211,255	11	4,529	11	83.7	15	119.9	15	15.24	2	23	1	73
Chelmsford	36,392	11	56,760	3	180,014	7	6,814	15	111.9	15	148.5	15	17.82	2	12	5	73
<b>Danvers</b>	<b>28,087</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>48,406</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>204,666</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6,018</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>86.9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>117.2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11.01</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>72</b>
Ipswich	13,785	15	68,857	7	235,517	11	3,443	11	44.3	11	58.6	7	6.06	5	38	0	67
<b>Mansfield</b>	<b>23,860</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>53,922</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>179,993</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4,526</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>72.4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>107.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>
Arlington	46,308	3	65,927	7	276,303	15	12,517	11	142.9	15	189.9	11	23.53	0	22	1	63
<b>Shrewsbury</b>	<b>38,325</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>59,686</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>177,909</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6,984</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>98.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>156.4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26.54</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Littleton</b>	<b>10,141</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>58,520</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>219,516</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2,278</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5.61</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Groton</b>	<b>11,315</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>68,993</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>179,691</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2,110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>44.7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>

= Has Light Plant