

TOWN OF CONCORD PERSONNEL BOARD
AGENDA

October 13, 2022

5:15 p.m.

Select Board's Room, Town House

The public may also attend via Zoom video conference:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89097603287?pwd=ZEZpWjNXenBDZGFXTU1GUWtuQ0c1dz09>

One tap mobile: +16465588656,,89097603287# US (New York)

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

Meeting ID: 890 9760 3287

Passcode: 944661

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes**
 - 07/25/2022
 - 8/31/2022
 - 9/7/2022
3. **Continuation of Employee Appeal**
 - Presentation by management re reasons for actions that were recommended
 - Personnel Board questions
 - Discuss next steps
4. **Classification & Compensation Study**
 - Updates from Project Manager Kellie Hebert:
 - Confirm comparable communities
 - Project progress
5. **Personnel Study Task Force**
 - Plan for Discussion w/Select Board
6. **Tentative Meeting Schedule**
 - Wed, 11/9/2022 @ 5:15 p.m.
 - Mon, 11/14/2022 (TBD, w/Select Board)
 - Wed, 11/30/2022 @ 5:15 p.m.
7. **Public comment**
8. **Adjournment**

Documents to be distributed with packet, available at: <https://concordma.gov/452/Personnel-Board>

- Minutes of 7/25, 8/31, and 9/7/2022 meetings
- Copy of MEAM survey as provided by Jim Coakley at 9/7/2022 meeting
- Comparable community recommendations

Other documents that may be referenced:

- Employee Appeal Procedure PPP #25
- Employee Appeal of Classification & Compensation Plan Submitted 8/5/2022 (9/7/2022 packet)
- PSTF Final Report, available at: <https://concordma.gov/2954/Personnel-Study-Task-Force>

PERSONNEL BOARD
TOWN OF CONCORD, MA

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

July 25, 2022

4:00 p.m.

1st Floor Conference Room, 141 Keyes Road
&
Videoconference

This was a Joint Meeting of the Personnel Board and Personnel Task Force

Acronyms: PSTF = Personnel Study Task Force

PB = Personnel Board

Present from the Personnel Board (all in-person): Bill Mrachek (Chair), Nancy Crowley, Elizabeth Cobbs

Other Attendees: Anne Rarich (PSTF), Paul Macone (PSTF), Ruth Lauer (PSTF), Erin Mulcahy, Anna Trout, Ned Perry, Amy Foley, Karlen Reed, Christopher Carmody, Anita Tekle, Alan Cathcart, Michael Gibbons, Kelly LaFleur.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call: After the PSTF was called to order, Bill Mrachek called the PB to order:
 - Roll Call: William Mrachek: here; Nancy Crowley: here; Elizabeth Cobbs: here
2. PSTF Minutes: motioned to approve the minutes for last week's PSTF meeting. Approved by those members.
3. Correspondence:
 - Anita Tekle is putting together a summary report for the PSTF.
 - Anne Rarich is working on a draft invitation for the open forum at the end of August, so Town Manager will be sending it out to employees.
 - Ruth Lauer and Anne Rarich will be meeting with Town Manager next week to address the schedule of meetings.
4. Discussion on PSTF Report:

Anne: Key points for this meeting: sharing with the PB about the work and output for the PSTF. Interested in PB feedback:

Bill: What activities did you get involved with that will impact the PB Charter? Response: We did not tackle this topic.

Bill: From 2021 Town Meeting, there was discussion of Article 7, specifically, the article was to remove from the PB any role in administering hands on roles for personnel management. Did the PSTF examine/explore/discuss anything about eliminating the role of the PB —i.e. elimination of the role for the PB in the administration of HR issues.

Paul Macone Response: my recollection: unanimous to retain the PB.

Bill: but my specific question is related to the role in “administering town personnel—i.e. classification and compensation role.”

Anne R.: No, not directly. We recognized that the policies needed were about moving the system to more streamlined approach—giving more of a role to the PB and less role for the Town Meeting. We then looked at bylaws vs. policies.

Ruth L.: we were unanimous in the strong role for the PB, with a strong role for it as outlined in 1985 and in the bylaws... we struggled in that we could not see where—a place or time—where it was set to stop the PB from acting. “We will recommend that the town retain a strong PB, as appointed by the Select Board.” The work of the PB will be the same as in the bylaws and the 1985 administrative code until which time that the select board update the 1985 bylaws.

Anne R.: It was 1955 when the PB was formed. Now, we need to look at the 21st century Board and employee management.

Ruth L.: We are looking at recommendations that the Town Manager, the Select Board and PB (or other body) engage.

Bill M.: Duties #2: of the PB role: I’d like to understand if you investigated specifics of what the role should be.

Anne R.: in the final report there will be 2 matrices: bylaw by bylaw—keep, recommend or rescind specific roles.

Bill M. —that sounds fine—but I’m trying to focus on what the future role of the PB should be—we need specifics.

Ruth Lauer: we do have specifics— PB should meet more regularly with more documentation to meet the needs of the duties.

Bill M.: so what should we do?

Anne R.: specific management duties to support the employees.
HR responsible for Payroll, PB is to look at the strategic aspects....

Liz Cobbs: Looking back over what the PB has done in the past (reference to Anita Tekle’s report and information sent around by Ned Perry), it appears that there was more that the PB did in terms of support for the overall culture for employees in town. I think that is a great role for the PB, to work with and advise the Town Manager strategically on issues related to employee management. It seems that there are two issues here—one systemic and one cultural. Regular meetings—and regular meetings with the right people there—including reporting to Select Board and regular meetings with the Town Manager. In terms of culture: We all have the same goals:

to ensure that Concord is a great place to work, where employees feel valued and connected to the town. That would be an exciting role for the PB, in collaboration with the Town Manager and the Select Board.

Nancy Crowley: PB for a while, even in regular meetings has just had Comp and Classification discussions, which has gotten boring. We would do more if we were given more to do. We had fewer meetings because not much to do... also, I often thought that HR, employee confidentiality, etc. it became a stopping point, held us back due to legal issues. I thought we were well prepared to do what we had to do, but we'd all like to be more productive. I don't think it should be disbanded. I think we should have more to do to help the town. The new company that will come in to look at comparables will be great—there will be several meetings with that group—GovHR. Personally, after being on the PB for a long time and doing what we were asked to do, it felt bad when the PSTF were looking at us critically—we don't want to be let go, we'd like to do more, we would have done more, and now it looks as if we are headed in that direction.

Anne Rarich: agree with Liz's comments that this is about systemic issues... how did we get chopped off from the collaborative approach.

Bill M.: The Select Board has a big role here—we'd look to them to see what the PB's future should be. Ultimately, we rely on the Select Board to guide us in a revamped role. This topic, it's a large topic and it should be managed, but also understand that the Select Board is busy.

Paul Macone: You folks are only going to be as good as what you've been given.... The bylaws go into a lot of activities... I want to assure you that we see a disconnect...we see that you are only given a narrow role.

Anne R.: then the narrow role gets even more narrow....

Ruth L.: And what is the role of the Select Board.

Bill M.: We've struggled to have 5 full members for about 10 years.....

Nancy C.: thinking back, Nancy Beeuwkes—there were 5 members at that time...but HIPPA and privacy issues really stymied the work of the PB and I think at that point, it started to get more difficult to have full membership for the PB.

Bill M.: we should have some leeway to make decisions, confirmed with the Select Board meeting. Outside of our scope is spending money. I'd like to have the committees to propose what they should be doing... and I'd like to encourage the Select Board to include bylaw amendments in the 2023 Town Meeting.

Nancy C.: basically, it was just us at the meetings with Amy...it would be nice to have Select Board members, or the town manager to come to our meetings... it would be nice to have these interactions... from an HR position, we need to know what we can do to meet with employees—

but we need guidance. Recently, the Town is focusing on DEI issues—this point should be one where the PB is involved.

Bill M.: my point #2—I appreciate that an employee survey would be necessary. What did you learn from the survey that you did send out? What do you learn? What would you do differently?

Ruth L. : ask more specific questions—we asked aggregate group questions, which meant we got a lot of varied answers... the questions could be better organized...we were looking to “listen” we did not have a specific purpose around training needs or etc. We thought we are supposed to be “Listening” and so we tried to hear and learn.... It was not supposed to be a “job satisfaction survey.”

Bill M. : Surveys are a science.... (Anne: We put a lot of effort into it...)

#4: What research was conducted on other municipal personnel bylaws? Did you review these communities bylaws and list best practices?

Response: We did but most are unionized so it’s very different therefore (100% unionized in Maynard for example). Collins Institute did study on Lancaster and a second town... eg. Littleton— we looked at the makeup of their PB: a Select Board and FinCom members are also on the PB in this town.... MMA has a lot of information on Personnel Boards.

Nancy: GovHR—will also compare to other municipalities... it came to us from Kellie Hebert.. They had a lot of information

Anne R.: Note: we can go to 5:30? Yes.

Bill M.: Much Appreciation, got my points done.

Nancy C. : I’ve been able to discuss my frustrations, and am hopeful that GovHR should also help us.

Paul M: Agree that there is a wealth of experience on the PB— Nancy’s background, Bill’s background. It would be terrific to have the town benefit more from your skills.

Nancy C: a great meeting—very helpful to understand where things are. We’d like to do more and we’d love to do more, but will align as we’ve discussed here.

5. PSTF Upcoming Meetings:

PSTF: August 8th: meeting will be here in this room

September 6th: Election dates

Planned Public meeting: August 29th at 1:00pm at the Light Plant...good parking and good hybrid capabilities... will allow employees to have a chance to present their concerns....

6. Public Comment:

Terri: thank you, very helpful...yes, it's been challenging with the volunteer—recruitment table at AG Day for volunteers... specifically—PB approved Comp and Classifications... Town Meeting... has to approve it... it is a challenging position, but it is a State Law... so what can we do?

Paul M. I think we should also look at the departures of employees who have left and not returned in the past 6 years—50% of the town employees left in a short amount of time... I want to see this data. General questions asked and the data came from the retirement board...

Terri A: Is there a summary of that that could be sent out? I can make that request to HR (Amy Foley) so that we can confirm the 50% turnover... benefit eligible people who were contributing to the retirement program....so we need to reconfirm these figures with HR. 6 years of data-pre-covid, covid, and post-covid...reasonably consistent over the 6 years....

Done with Public Comments?
Seem to have no comments....

7. Adjournment:

Ms. Crowley moved to adjourn the PB meeting at 5:30 p.m.; Ms. Cobbs seconded

➤ Roll Call: William Mrachek: Aye; Nancy Crowley: Aye; Elizabeth Cobbs: Aye

The PSTF also adjourned at this time.

PERSONNEL BOARD
TOWN OF CONCORD, MA

Meeting Minutes (**DRAFT**)

August 31, 2022

5:15 p.m.

VIDEO CONFERENCE CALL

Present from the Board: Nancy Crowley, Bill Mrachek. Liz Cobbs,

Others Present: Amy Foley, Joellen Cademartori, Linda Escobedo, Kellie Hebert, Stephanie Oliver, Terri Ackerman, Mark Howell, Ned Perry

1. Call to Order:

Mr. Mrachek called the meeting to order at 5:15 pm

- Roll Call: Nancy Crowley: present; Elizabeth Cobbs: present, William Mrachek: present

2. Classification & Compensation Study

- a. Presentation by & Discussion with Joellen Cademartori, CEO, GovHR USA
- b. Overview of planned approach, methodology & timeline
- c. Comparable communities, other market data, and benchmark titles

Amy: Prior to the presentation, Amy encouraged Board members to think of the By-Laws for the committee, especially Section 5: Classification plan and Section 6: Compensation plan.

- By-law demands a uniform classification system and we have that. This project is going to support those same efforts. The By-laws talk about periodic review of the compensation plan, and the Board should take those plans into account (e.g. comparable rates of pay for jobs in commercial and business and consumer price index for Boston and Mass.). Each year, we do some level of comparison, but this project will outline more comprehensive assessment of comparable communities. It may be that the Board votes on the specific list, and the concepts that will be outlined in the presentation this evening.

Bill M.: Introduced Kellie Hebert: she is the project lead, guiding this process; she is the go-to person for the town to Joellen.

Nancy to introduce herself: grew up in Concord, Nursing and a BS in management. Worked in a lot of management roles, including at Emerson hospital in town. Started nursing home staff support and clinical support management business. Became Executive Director of independent and assisted living programs in Concord (13 years). Continued working at the Sr. Living Company, in charge of quality

improvement, compliance with corporate level responsibilities, including responsibility for human resources. In retirement, on Boards and Committees.

Liz Cobbs introduction: PhD in Sociology, 19-year career in Merck, building and running teams in Japan, Europe, US, and global HQ teams. Management including budgets and HR responsibilities.

Joellen Cademartori: Co-own Gov HR, doing consulting since 2011. Prior to that, 24 years serving NC, MA and Evanston IL local government, administration, HR consulting, professional development. Team works exclusively with local governments. I understand the jobs needed in local government—and hope to learn even more from Concord employees. Look forward to working with you.

Today, Joellen presents the overview.

Earlier today, there was the first of three meetings organized to share publicly what the work of GovHR will be in Concord. That presentation was in-depth look at one area of the study, but tonight, will present on the whole study.

1. Have an analysis of comparable communities in Massachusetts. We look at all sources to understand comprehensively:
 - per capita income, equalized per capita income, tax levy, state aid, etc.
 - One unique area is that we have a Concord Light program...we may need to be strategic in looking at the data on this type of service.
2. Compensation: Because we have 150 classifications in this study, we are looking to expand to ensure that we have all the data required to reach all of these areas. We don't always go to private sector, it's not public information so hard to determine the level of comparability, (hard to make it relevant).
3. Classification: we bring in the employees to understand their perspectives. There will be three meetings altogether. A) an overview of the study, b) detail on the tool we use to complete job factor analysis (the JAQ). We will refer to JAQ frequently throughout this work.
 - a. Allows employees to update job description—with 9 different job factors (i.e. education/training, years of experience, level of independent judgement and decision-making, responsibility for Policy development, work complexity/planning, contact with others in/outside one's department, supervisory responsibilities, physical demands of the job, and use of technology or other specialized equipment).
 - b. We Score the results and then we develop the classification plan: it a) allows for internal equity and b) it's unique to Concord (if an employee were to shift to another town, they would likely have different position parameters).
4. Benefits of such a study: comparability (developing comparable communities), internal equity (unique for Concord), pay equity, pay competitiveness, durability... if changes are to be made in size or scope, then this kind of study will be very helpful (both the unique assessments for the town that we will make and the comparative aspects of the review).
 - a. Pay equity: goes hand in hand with MA state level internal equity... pay competitiveness will be important aspect of the program and recommendations.

- b. It will also support the durability of the system: we will recommend how to maintain the classification and the compensation planning going forward (should be useful for ~10 years).
5. Project Aftermath: Draft of a final report, with more feedback and support from the GovHR team. Hands on support as we investigate the report and learn to apply the new information.
 - a. Scoring tools and a manual to review on the class/comp research will be provided.
6. Currently: reviewing comparable communities—Light Plant consideration will be managed separately. A) determining benchmark position, b) strategizing on gathering salary information, c) developing employee interview schedules (this part to start in October).

Comments:

Nancy: comprehensive program, I was able to attend the public meeting today; it was very comprehensive, gave me confidence in the work you will be doing.

Bill: a hypothetical question: we have lots of different levels in Concord—what is the mechanism to identify the level at which the benchmark should take place?

Response: there is a lot of specificity in Concord that does not always exist elsewhere. We might then recommend consolidating titles—we generally look to the most general title so we can get the comps.

Bill: surveys sent to other municipalities... how can you ensure that the benchmark you create to represent will represent all our people?

Response: pay ranges cover that level of difference, where people in different levels in their position (e.g., with different levels of longevity, skills, etc.); will be captured in the classification process. If there is a job that peels off into something else, we can still recommend the pay scale based on the equity review. This point is a good one—it indicates why we need more than a simple comparison with other towns, but also internal equity review.

Pay ranges will be recalculated after we gather the comparative data and do the equity assessment.

Amy: org structure of the Light Plant—we are less likely to have pay ranges there, which will be a challenge.

Response: we will create a range off the actual salaries based on the actuals that we get.

Liz: Ranges should encourage some understand of growth in the roles, and foster a more positive culture for our employees.

Amy: reminder that keeping bylaw's provisions for Comp and Classification in mind is key.

Open Comments:

Mark Howell: I understand that the presentation was about the study nuts and bolts. I'm also interested in the outcomes of the study – including retention, attracting employees, --these strategic issues are important to support the town in this way vs. other towns. And 2 specific things: with the light plant, because utilities are regulated, could you get comp information from

them? Lastly: will job classifications that result be clear enough to define that the dept. head or supervisor might want to create/classify in the future? Thank you.

Response: on retention piece: we are looking at comp/classification... there is a lot with the whole program that will impact retention, but might have some areas of retention that is beyond the scope of the project. On Light Plant: we will try to look at the utilities—private and public sectors are both impactful here, we do understand that. In re: to the last question: yes, the classification program will allow/support the new positions to be developed more easily.

We have recommended to other clients that they have to change classifications, until the positions are possible to change. It really will depend on how the study plays out.

Kellie H. Question: could Joellen summarize the methodology for picking the comp communities—you seem so far to go beyond the identified sample size—but unclear how you are choosing. How do you go beyond the basic level to look at another level of comparison (those with Light Plants, those without).

Response: The final assessment also looks at the financials. There is a ranking of communities that also includes the range around financials of the towns (1.5x up and down for financials for all light plant communities—where they fit in vs. the comps,) in other words, we'll look at financials with those communities that have Light Plants, in addition to other factor assessments.

Kellie: may need to bring back to Personnel Board to understand the comp communities that you will use (i.e. for agreement/acceptance).

Bill: taking up on what Mark Howell has said about retention—PB will likely get more involved with the culture of work in the town; this may come after we absorb the Personnel Study Task Force (PSTF) recommendations.

I think that Compensation and Classification issues should remain important to the work of the Personnel Board. We also will be helpful to look at career growth pathways—would like us to look at these issues but want to caution that we need to focus on the Comp/Classification work with this study.

Liz: definitely, an order to the work that the Personnel Board has to take on—this study would impact other work, so let's focus here and then the recommendations from the PSTF to be incorporated into Personnel Board responsibilities. While there may be some overlap, I'd assume that with the new study in hand and the PSTF recommendations, we would then look at what we can do to address "culture" issues (e.g. hiring, retention, etc.) that can help Concord rebuild a reputation as a top place to work.

Bill: Amy suggested that we need to look at the benchmark communities—Select Board is going to ask us to focus on the Personnel Board by-laws---the bylaws indicate that the PB is responsible for the salary ranges, the uniformity of positions in their classifications—all seems to be clear in the work of GovHR.

Amy: Note that by-laws 6.3 ---we as PB need to periodically review the Comp Plan.... “it should take into account the following: rates of pay in comparable towns across Massachusetts—we would be using the final list of comps... rates of pay in commercial establishments in these communities might be also an option... Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and clerical workers (COLAs)

Bill M.: Perhaps we should look at 6.3 bylaw in the future---any changes would have to be ratified by Town Meeting (so we need to live up to it as it now stands). I think the PSTF may guide us here as well. I also think that we should have at our next meeting, the spreadsheet to understand how the comparable towns are recommended by GovHR. It looks like the next meeting agenda is going to be quite full.

Response from Kellie: we already have a criteria list of towns—we have now discussed adding to that list. We can give you enough time to review in advance of next week’s meeting –if you return questions to Kellie or Amy, we will endeavor to respond to questions at the meeting next week. (We will be ready!)

Bill: So, we now have two major agenda items for next week’s meeting. Can we do that? Amy: we can look for other dates –it’s been a challenge to get everyone together and to set regular meetings. Bill: let’s try again for September...

Ned Perry: Thank you for the work you are doing. To keep the PB whole, we are trying to get you more members. Also, in the past, we had the comp list of towns from the past—it would be interested to understand how we compare then and now.

3. Personnel Study Task Force - Update

Terri Ackerman here to share with us—there was a public forum that was rescheduled for September 19th (date confirmed after this meeting). After the public hearing, they will finalize the report and come to the Select Board to present.

There has not been further correspondence with the PSTF since the joint meeting held last month. Expect that there will be a brief presentation to the Select Board, but PB should ask questions about the Bylaw changes that might be recommended, etc. Need to confirm the time and place for that meeting...Amy / Kellie will confirm and resend an email about date/time/place. The meeting was cancelled and rescheduled for a reason that we won’t discuss tonight.

4. Public Comment

No further public comment.

5. Approve minutes

Minutes for June 16 and July 21 were reviewed/approved.

Ms. Crowley made a motion to approve the minutes of the 6/13/2022 minutes. Ms. Cobbs seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Cobbs: yes; Ms. Crowley: yes; Mr. Mrachek: yes

Ms. Crowley made a motion to approve the minutes of the 7/ 21/2022 minutes. Ms. Cobbs seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Cobbs: yes; Ms. Crowley: yes; Mr. Mrachek: yes

6. Adjournment

Ms. Crowley made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Cobbs seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Cobbs: aye; Ms. Crowley: aye; Mr. Mrachek: aye

Materials Used or Referenced at the Meeting:

- Presentation slides utilized by Joellen Cadematori, GovHR
- Proposed Project Timeline – Class & Comp Study
- Announcement of Study to Employees, 8/10/2022
- Employee Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) – Class & Comp Study
- Minutes of 6/16/22 and 7/21/22 Personnel Board meetings

Town of Concord Personnel Board
DRAFT Minutes
September 7, 2022
5:15-7:30pm, Hybrid Meeting
Select Board's Room, Town House & Videoconference

Present from Personnel Board: Bill Mrachek, Nancy Crowley, Elizabeth Cobbs (all in person) Additional Attendees: in person: Amy Foley, Kellie Hebert, Jim Coakley, Ann Breitenwischer, Marty Boormeester, Jay Stiga, Dave Wood, Kerry Lafleur; on Zoom: Terri Ackerman, Ned Perry, Stephanie Oliver, others

1. Call to Order

Bill Mrachek called the meeting to order at 5:15pm

Roll Call: Nancy Crowley: present; Elizabeth Cobbs: present, William Mrachek: present

2. Employee Appeal

- Presentation of written appeal submitted by employee Jim Coakley
- Determine next steps

- All 5 people present, all employed between 15-40 years. The key issue in question was to better understand how the decision was made to move ~5 peoples' salary range 3%, when the rest of the employees were given a 9% increase on their salary ranges. (~30people).

- Jim Coakley presented on behalf of the 5-person appeal. He asked for a more concise explanation of how the MEAM data was used to determine the changes, indicating that he had also investigated the same data but did not agree that the data led to the conclusions that were given to them.
 - Bill M. confirmed that the request was to have the Personnel Board review the data as an independent review. Comment: perhaps the Town Manager had done so? (response: no other group/person had weighed in on this issue.
 - Jim C. agreed that they would like the PB to review as the independent body.

Bill M: In terms of your salary, you did receive a raise this year. Response: yes.

Bill: so your concern is specific to the salary range increase, not current salary? Response: yes.

Jim C: We felt our positions were devalued—that we'd like to be valued in the long-term.

Nancy: the difference is 6% between what other folks got as a range (9% increase in range). Vs. your range increase of only 3%—and it is about future value and recognition? Response: yes.

Bill: clarified that while some of the discussion got into the weeds in the emails, so I want to be clear that for example—the point about retirement plan—disadvantaged into retirement plan—that is off the table? Response: Yes, it's off the table. Bill: Good —we don't deal with the retirement issues, so that's good.

Liz: there seem to be two approaches—there is a trust issue and there is a concern about the salary range—what is its impact and how does the data get you there. I'd like to see that analysis of the data and how it was assessed by Dave and Amy.

Bill: I'd like to continue to talk with Steve. GovHR could lead to a change again in the ranges that are set out. I have confidence that they will do a good job.

Personnel Board needs to look at the data and understand what the review should be. I think we can do this but we have to coordinate quickly to find a time to meet so we can handle efficiently.

Ann B.: I'd like to say that we work as a family—so how can you pick 5-10 people out of 30 people and give them different ranges?

Ann B.: we understand that the line people needed more to entice new workers—but how can that override other workers? We don't feel it is fair. It's just not fair.

Bill: I think we've satisfied the agenda: Next steps: Personnel Board will act as an independent reviewer of the data. Thank you for your time tonight.

Let's use good judgement to move it forward in a timely manner. The Personnel Board has a charter here to respond after we look at all the data to look at what was done.

Nancy: very nice job to put together the materials, much appreciated. I do feel we'd like to get back to you sooner rather than later—we appreciate that.

Bill: there are always two sides, both have to be valued and heard— and in this case there is a determination needed. Personnel Board does not have the absolute authority to change the decision but we can make a recommendation. Thank you for putting the data together.

Marty B.: Linemen need be increased, we understood that—but now my job is ranked below the linemen and that does not seem fair either.

3. Classification & Compensation Study

- Discuss and confirm the following as proposed by GovHR Consultants:
 - o Selection of comparable communities
 - o Selection of benchmark positions
- Discuss other potential data sources per Personnel Bylaw
- Agreement to proceed forward with GovHR's proposed survey methodology
- Public comment

Amy has opening remarks: at last meeting, identified the bylaws about Comparable communities and benchmark positions have to be reviewed—we need to confirm what we want to review... please note that we'd like to have comparable communities discussed and (at least somewhat) finalized by tonight.

Kellie: we last met with Joellen to discuss the comparable towns. I was intrigued that the list of towns are different than in the past (when last study was done).

NOTE: Acronyms are used in the document provided. Definitions follow:

DOR: Dept. of Revenue for Commonwealth of MA— they have comparable municipal database

EQV: EQualized Valuation—used by the state—value of the land divided by the population

There is also a color code in the document we are reviewing (doc was also shared on line). The color code (yellow/orange) was not clearly explained, but there was a link to towns that have light plants because many of the “first list’ of 18 towns do not have light plants. Additional towns added were to include more light plant employees for the range.

- Color code: compiled by GovHR. Yellow = light plant is included from original list vs. Orange: communities added, with their full scoring... to identify more towns with light plants—Shrewsbury- they also have a broadband component (as do we), so would help us.
- Scored communities when from Sudbury (100) to Lexington (69). Our original idea was to cut off at 80 points, but we lowered that point values we took.

Bill: plan would be to take municipalities with light plants... so what if Littleton and Groton only were looked at for their Light Plant

Kellie.... Groton and Littleton...have relatively low point scores... so GovHR was thinking that they would not be used in the comparison.

Bill: difficulty with that statement—if someone is looking to change jobs, they won’t worry about our point score system...scores are irrelevant to their decision to leave. So, not sure how these criteria actually will

Kellie: that would get too cumbersome.... There are 14 comparable when we look at Light Plants... If not looking at the Light Plant, then we are already surveying 18.

Amy: Clarified that in the version on the screen, Light plants are not in yellow – in the packet, Light Plants are yellow -- listed out which ones – Belmont, Reading, Wakefield, Wellesley, Hingham, Marblehead, Danvers, Ipswich, Mansfield, Shrewsbury, Littleton, and Groton (12)

Bill: not a great fan of using the point system...worried we’d overlook communities where we’d lose people to ...I’m losing the objective here...

Kellie: We’re looking for agreement/disagreement on the rationale for using the top 18 listed here.

Nancy: The bottom line is to put it all together so that we can understand the classification for different jobs....

Kellie: yes, we are not going to Groton or Cambridge, as these places are outside of our financial comparisons... note that Lexington, though looked at, is low scored—we are still looking at it here because it is close by and would be used as a comparable for individual workers....

Kellie: they will then look at classification of jobs that then GovHR will start to look at the actual work done (Nancy: that is all included in their review assessment program).

Bill: this is not science—it is judgement that must be used here.

Bill: is there a place to find comparable # of employees (union/non union)? Response: No, not easily available.

Amy: I'd like to talk more about proximity...we've looked at Groton and Littleton—because they were in before and they are close by. I'd like to reserve right to go back to them later (not cut out specifically).

Nancy/Bill: same question—only Light Plant positions will be reviewed in the additional six?

Kellie: would like to leave them in.

Nancy: ok with the algorithm.

Liz (summary of comments): I feel that the criteria used to choose comparable communities rely too much on the economics of the towns. I'd like to see other criteria included. It is important to assess "ability to pay," but it's also important to look at other factors, e.g. do we have approximately same # of employees for similar sized towns?

Liz: Not fully comfortable with the algorithm used, but will agree to use it, especially if we leave it open to have additional towns added into the assessment.

Amy: each of the consultants in the studies done earlier have used similar data points—and these communities are the ones that come up—we've asked the consultants if we've missed any other communities—

Bill: my experience was in the private sector—we did not use 8 factors, but rather 3-4 factors.... Not sure it made a difference in the overall choices.

When we look at EQV and Assessed Value—mostly they zero out because most of them got all the points in those categories....so not sure that we need to make it a big deal...
Not sure it would mean a lot in the end....

Nancy: I'm ok with where it is now.... Basic things are most important here. I've done this kind of assessment is fine—and we did hire GovHR to be the specialists here. No dispute with your questions, but think it is fine and we should move forward.

Bill: So Nancy—are you comfortable with the 18 plus the 6 —and hold on to Littleton and Groton—they are so close, and they have good departments. Understanding that the Light plant work should include the Light Plant.

Amy: remember, once we have the data we can reassess.

Liz: I motion to agree to the list, with understanding that we may ask for additional comparisons.

Nancy: Second the motion

Bill: OK, before we close out the discussion, let's ask for public comments from on line?

Ned Perry—352 Bedford Street.... I was interested in this process today, compared to what we did in 2007, when I worked in this area. I thought this has been a great discussion, good points raised... I note that there is only 9 of the 18 towns that were assessed in the 2007 review. Based in my understanding of where employees come from and go to.... Natick, Andover—these are towns that are often reviewed and compared....I would delete Burlington and Wakefield —why? When they have far less per capita income in these two towns, (so the assumption is that they would not attract employees from Concord due to salary.

Amy: confirming that we need to be able to add some communities to the comparison.

Kellie: we may have a problem when it comes to a “Water Sewer Enterprise”do these towns have that? These towns that Mr. Perry brought up may have this comparable enterprise...

Nancy: can we get started and then add in more?

Liz: is there more money required for a longer list?

Kellie: will speak with Joellen tomorrow and look at the Water Sewer Enterprise issue.... Not sure that they are going to start tomorrow... so we have some more time...

Bill: is there more cost for including more municipalities?

Kellie: at this point no..

Bill: Ok, so let's accept the 26 towns for now, but with allowance for additions to this list so that we are able to revisit it.... 18 and 6 and 2...everyone on this list... with the understanding that with Personnel Board Chair, with Amy and GovHR will work together to weigh in again.

Bill: I did mention about career growth, management training and other categories of reasons that make people stay in a community.... Our objective is to keep building on what Concord needs to be....

Bill: Back to a motion...

Nancy: so we are now voting..

Bill: we have 18, 6 and 2 towns... motion was to include all of these ... and include any other towns that are deemed necessary.

Nancy: what would you want, Amy? If there is a dramatic change in the approach or philosophy...then if not, we'll handle it without having to come back to the Board....

Amy: somebody on the Board to liaise would be helpful.

4. Personnel Study Task Force

- General updates & discussion

PSTF: Forum was rescheduled to 9/19 (9/12 was cancelled). The 19th was going to be a presentation to the Select Board.... Forum on the 19th... this is for citizens and employees.... Not clear yet when report

to the Select Board.... PSTF would be reporting their results to employees and citizens.... And Terrie Ackerman also indicated we could attend and ask questions there.

Amy: can ask questions of the Task Force there, at the public meeting.

Bill: There was an 8.8 final report was stopped from being released (although the final report seems to have been released to a lot of people....).... I'm trying to understand how many people have seen that document that was determined to be inappropriate? Troubling to me.

Nancy: PSTF—it was put together to critique the PB job... I thought they'd go over everything here, rather than in a public meeting—like we're an afterthought.

Amy: the joint meeting; that was supposed to serve that role...but I understand that there was not an in-depth enough discussion as the materials were not shared at this point.

Bill: The sooner we wrap up the better. (Nancy) Agree.

Nancy; thought that the wrap up would be with the Select Board presentation.

Bill: while we have to wait to see what the PSTF recommendations are—

Nancy- I'm still saying that it would be the right way to do it—to have the PSTF discuss with us first prior to stating it with an audience. That's my comment.

Liz: agreed with Nancy.

5. Approval of Minutes

(TBD) Amy: Liz, will you please get out minutes from the joint meeting! (Yes)

General Discussion (re Agenda Item 4, PSTF)

Terri Ackerman: clarification please. Select Board entertains the PSTF and they present to the Select Board.... But then Select Board might also ask for our reaction from PB and we should be ready... but recognize that it is up to the Select Board.

Terrie: I think the Select Board would like to get the reactions from the Personnel Board. So, do you have a meeting time prior to 10/3 when the Select Board is to hear from the PSTF..... if you could react that night to the report, that would be great. Or perhaps we need to delay the 10/3 meeting until we can give you the time to review and provide feedback.

Bill: we will seek a meeting time to allow for that review and then we'll get back to you.

Terrie: we could probably ask the chairman to put off that meeting time....

Bill: if PSTF present first and then the PB comes back to provide feedback at a separate meeting later.

Bill: My preference is that the presentation to the PSTF go forward, and at a subsequent meeting, we'd present to the SB.

6. Adjournment

Nancy: motion to end this meeting at 7:37pm. Liz: Second.

Roll Call: Nancy Crowley: aye; Elizabeth Cobbs: aye; William Mrachek: aye

Documents 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
- Copy of MEAM survey distributed by Jim Coakley
- GovHR Scoring Key for identifying comparable communities
- Recommendations for comparable communities from GovHR USA

MEAM Survey as provided by
 Jim Coakley @ 9/7/2022
 Personnel Board Meeting

SYSTEM	ANNUAL REVENUE	# OF METERS	GENERAL MANAGER		ASSISTANT GM	SYSTEM ENGINEER	LINE DIV SUPER	FIN'L MANAGER	CIO / IT DIRECTOR	METER DIV SUPER	TELECOM MANAGER	TELECOM ENG	MARKETING MGR	CUST SER MGR	ACCOUNTANT
			COMP / YEARS / EFF DATE		COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS	COMP / YEARS
ASHBURNHAM	\$ 5,200,000	3,100	\$ 184,700 5.0 08/16/21					\$ 95,826 6.0							\$ 64,896 10.0
BELMONT	\$ 24,753,862	11,732	\$ 197,800 1.0 01/01/21	\$ 173,400 1.0	\$ 146,000 6.0	\$ 139,275 36.0	\$ 137,000 8.0	\$ 122,500 9.0	\$ 133,875 43.0				\$ 120,100 0.5	\$ 84,000 2.0	
BOYLSTON	\$ 3,872,828	2,400	\$ 129,104 10.0 07/01/21												
BRAINTREE	\$ 79,476,000	17,000	\$ 248,007 18.0 01/01/21		\$ 198,071 21.0	\$ 162,250 4.0	\$ 100,000 22.0	\$ 161,777 15.0		\$ 167,435 23.0	\$ 129,010 20.0		\$ 159,500 35.0	\$ 75,000 1.0	
CHESTER	\$ 1,139,771	699	\$ 58,877 8.0 07/01/21												
CHICOPEE	\$ 55,719,000	26,584	\$ 195,725 0.4 01/01/21		\$ 128,398 2.0	\$ 130,915 5.0		\$ 128,544 5.0	\$ 99,569 3.0		\$ 86,819	\$ 67,080 1.0	\$ 89,440 14.0	\$ 94,286 2.5	
CONCORD	\$ 27,943,052	10,060	\$ 183,037 11.0 07/01/21	\$ 154,839 2.0	\$ 127,994 2.0		\$ 104,645 3.0	\$ 147,450	\$ 95,147 20.0	\$ 128,520 1.0	\$ 98,296 1.0		\$ 106,056 11.0	\$ 86,079 2.0	
DANVERS	\$ 40,561,690	13,347	\$ 167,000 9.0 07/01/21	\$ 146,100 3.0	\$ 148,385 11.0	\$ 120,943 2.0	\$ 100,000 1.0	\$ 106,296 6.0	\$ 143,482 11.0					\$ 68,500 6.0	
GEORGETOWN	\$ 8,830,148	3,471	\$ 176,789 9.0 01/01/21			\$ 142,369 3.0									
GROTON	\$ 10,414,102	5,004	\$ 197,795 14.0 05/01/21			\$ 133,771 2.0									\$ 67,829
GROVELAND	\$ 6,013,000	2,969	\$ 156,000 5.0 01/01/21												
HINGHAM	\$ 30,728,348	10,667	\$ 194,000 1.0 07/01/21	\$ 161,500 1.0	\$ 191,874 11.0	\$ 189,253 2.0	\$ 170,007 19.0	\$ 140,046 14.0					\$ 102,273 10.0	\$ 90,192 17.0	
HOLDEN	\$ 13,900,000	8,411	\$ 141,499 1.0 04/01/22	\$ 124,496 0.0		\$ 114,088 1.0							\$ 79,117 0.0	\$ 72,370 0.0	
HOLYOKE	\$ 67,944,110	19,495	\$ 249,165 22.0 04/01/21	\$ 182,000 1.0	\$ 148,392 38.0	\$ 130,241 1.0	\$ 152,119 4.0	\$ 158,089 19.0	\$ 148,539 19.0	\$ 181,394 9.0	\$ 107,129 3.0	\$ 123,694 5.0	\$ 123,950 1.0	\$ 105,116 15.0	
HUDSON	\$ 25,863,584	13,344	\$ 263,544 7.0 03/15/21	\$ 169,046 3.0	\$ 78,413 1.0	\$ 123,620 7.0	\$ 110,467 4.0		\$ 128,441 3.0				\$ 80,765 2.0	\$ 63,469 4.0	
HULL	\$ 8,338,404	6,228	\$ 175,070 6.0 01/01/21	\$ 147,565 3.0				\$ 91,545 19.0							
IPSWICH	\$ 17,000,000	7,200	\$ 162,000 5.0 07/01/21			\$ 155,000 20.0			\$ 127,000 20.0				\$ 78,000 3.0	\$ 95,000	
LITTLETON	\$ 35,246,000	7,500	\$ 225,000 3.0 07/01/21	\$ 155,000 3.0	\$ 125,872 3.0	\$ 141,458 2.0	\$ 143,739 7.0		\$ 130,073 23.0				\$ 91,420 7.0	\$ 47,436 6.0	
MANSFIELD	\$ 25,111,716	10,362	\$ 190,968 5.0 07/01/21		\$ 131,472 19.0	\$ 217,732 24.0	\$ 104,972 3.0		\$ 145,828 18.0			\$ 72,072 22.0			
MARBLEHEAD	\$ 17,594,154	10,290	\$ 179,978 3.0 04/08/21		\$ 116,161 7.0	\$ 144,519 4.0	\$ 122,775 6.0								
MERRIMAC	\$ 5,132,306	3,138	\$ 148,600 06/07/21												
MIDDLEBOROUGH	\$ 49,462,820	17,515	\$ 196,824 10.0 08/01/21	\$ 160,000 0.6	\$ 130,500 6.0	\$ 184,000 21.0	\$ 112,000 2.0						\$ 112,000 2.0	\$ 78,400 2.0	
MIDDLETON	\$ 13,700,000	3,800	\$ 211,358 5.0 01/25/21			\$ 180,263 6.0			\$ 100,401 33.0						
NO. ATTLEBORO	\$ 28,276,470	13,500	\$ 173,120 3.0 11/01/20		\$ 128,273 2.0	\$ 138,058 2.0	\$ 142,901 15.0	\$ 115,095 6.0	\$ 107,848 31.0					\$ 113,300 1.0	
NORWOOD	\$ 68,242,641	15,984	\$ 191,690 1.0 07/01/21	\$ 195,517 7.0	\$ 162,242 35.0	\$ 176,286 5.0	\$ 146,386 7.0			\$ 166,370 19.0	\$ 138,514 1.0				
PAXTON	\$ 3,108,880	1,964	\$ 121,729 3.0 01/01/21	\$ -											
PEABODY	\$ 51,990,357	26,462	\$ 203,000 3.0 01/03/21	\$ 172,424 2.5	\$ 164,671 4.5	\$ 148,629 1.0	\$ 144,447 5.0	\$ 144,447 18.5	\$ 118,342 3.5				\$ 90,710 3.5	\$ 90,710 7.9	
PRINCETON	\$ 4,000,000	1,504	\$ 149,200 1.0 10/22/20											\$ 59,987 2.0	
READING	\$ 88,311,977	31,620	\$ 220,452 8.0 01/01/20		\$ 142,641 31.0	\$ 142,170 3.0	\$ 162,315 10.0	\$ 146,560 1.0	\$ 144,269 13.0					\$ 114,555 31.0	
ROWLEY	\$ 7,758,000	3,101	\$ 165,450 3.0 07/01/21			\$ 160,556 3.0									
RUSSELL	\$ 848,856	470	\$ 96,740 14.0 07/01/21												
SHREWSBURY	\$ 31,984,228	15,000	\$ 196,518 1.0 07/01/21	\$ 170,014 10.0	\$ 112,142 3.0	\$ 128,000 0.5	\$ 138,000 0.5	\$ 141,750 1.0		\$ 142,000 10.0		\$ 143,000 0.5	\$ 85,000 0.5	\$ 85,277 12.0	
SOUTH HADLEY	\$ 14,065,187	7,914	\$ 198,945 5.0 01/01/21		\$ 140,273 5.0	\$ 143,603 29.0	\$ 147,909 7.0	\$ 127,587 7.0		\$ 137,337 3.0	\$ 92,964 2.0	\$ 100,485 2.0		\$ 77,272 32.0	
STERLING	\$ 8,386,000	3,950	\$ 141,750 1.0 01/01/21						\$ 99,000 1.0					\$ 63,550 4.0	
TAUNTON	\$ 97,592,855	38,930	\$ 234,850 6.0 01/01/21	\$ 196,730 3.0	\$ 156,652 31.0	\$ 186,354 12.0			\$ 139,699 7.0	\$ 151,919 8.0	\$ 143,018 12.0		\$ 159,992 6.0	\$ 132,870 30.0	
TEMPLETON	\$ 7,063,107	3,648	\$ 148,894 11.0 07/01/21			\$ 118,219 11.0	\$ 78,372 26.0							\$ 61,847 3.0	
WAKEFIELD	\$ 37,054,700	13,002	\$ 205,971 15.0 01/01/21		\$ 105,731 4.0	\$ 150,062 4.0	\$ 164,629 8.0	\$ 136,881 14.0					\$ 117,860 5.0		
WELLESLEY	\$ 35,544,881	10,190	\$ 170,000 2.0 07/01/21	\$ 165,865 1.0	\$ 137,576 1.0	\$ 135,185 0.0	\$ 118,379 2.0						\$ 97,960 3.0	\$ 93,259 3.0	
WEST BOYLSTON	\$ 7,462,191	3,725	\$ 169,150 10.0 08/02/21	\$ 132,125 1.0									\$ 70,262 27.0	\$ 69,181 3.0	
WESTFIELD	\$ 85,500,000	18,300	\$ 231,500 1.0 01/01/21		\$ 150,500 1.0	\$ 178,000 4.0	\$ 197,165 9.0	\$ 172,266 4.0		\$ 140,899 1.0		\$ 134,500 5.0	\$ 160,000 1.0	\$ 122,500 6.0	
UPPER DECILE	\$ 69,365,977	20,192	\$ 231,835 14.0	\$ 187,407 5.0	\$ 164,428 31.0	\$ 184,706 21.9	\$ 164,166 19.0	\$ 160,671 17.8	\$ 145,360 32.4	\$ 170,227 19.8	\$ 140,316 16.0	\$ 138,750 13.5	\$ 159,648 17.9	\$ 113,928 26.1	
UPPER QUARTILE	\$ 37,931,448	13,875	\$ 199,959 9.5	\$ 172,424 3.0	\$ 149,973 17.0	\$ 165,759 8.0	\$ 147,148 9.5	\$ 147,228 14.0	\$ 142,536 22.3	\$ 166,370 10.0	\$ 133,762 9.8	\$ 131,799 5.0	\$ 119,540 9.3	\$ 94,029 10.5	
MEDIAN	\$ 21,174,008	9,236	\$ 183,869 5.0	\$ 161,500 2.3	\$ 138,925 5.5	\$ 142,986 4.0	\$ 137,000 7.0	\$ 140,898 7.0	\$ 129,257 18.5	\$ 142,000 8.0	\$ 107,129 2.5	\$ 112,090 3.5	\$ 100,117 3.3	\$ 81,200 4.0	
LOWER QUARTILE	\$ 7,684,048	3,604	\$ 160,500 2.5	\$ 147,565 1.0	\$ 128,064 2.3	\$ 133,057 2.0	\$ 104,809 3.5	\$ 127,826 5.0	\$ 110,472 8.0	\$ 137,337 1.0	\$ 95,630 1.3	\$ 79,175 1.3	\$ 86,110 1.3	\$ 67,997 2.0	
LOWER DECILE	\$ 3,987,283	2,356	\$ 140,260 1.0	\$ 129,073 0.8	\$ 112,544 1.1	\$ 122,817 1.0	\$ 96,661 2.0	\$ 117,317 1.6	\$ 99,819 3.2	\$ 122,616 1.0	\$ 90,506 1.0	\$ 69,576 0.8	\$ 78,782 0.5	\$ 62,658 1.3	
AVERAGE	\$ 28,778,381	10,590	\$ 181,295 6.3	\$ 153,331 2.6	\$ 139,647 11.1	\$ 150,529 7.7	\$ 129,809 8.4	\$ 139,235 9.2	\$ 125,894 17.7	\$ 146,097 8.3	\$ 113,679 6.5	\$ 106,805 5.9	\$ 106,911 7.3	\$ 83,726 8.4	

SYSTEM	GENERAL MANAGER SALARY / OTHER COMP		ASSISTANT GM SALARY / OTHER COMP		SYSTEM ENGINEER SALARY / OTHER COMP		LINE DIV SUPER SALARY / OTHER COMP		FIN'L MANAGER SALARY / OTHER COMP		CIO / IT DIRECTOR SALARY / OTHER COMP		METER DIV SUPER SALARY / OTHER COMP		TELECOM MANAGER SALARY / YEARS		TELECOM ENG SALARY / YEARS		MARKETING MGR SALARY / YEARS		CUST SER MGR SALARY / YEARS		ACCOUNTANT SALARY / YEARS	
ASHBURNHAM	\$ 165,656	\$ 19,044								\$ 95,826														\$ 64,896
BELMONT	\$ 195,800	\$ 2,000	\$ 170,800	\$ 2,600	\$ 128,600	\$ 17,400	\$ 118,300	\$ 20,975	\$ 137,000		\$ 122,500		\$ 112,700	\$ 21,175								\$ 120,100		\$ 84,000
BOYLSTON	\$ 124,904	\$ 4,200																						
BRAINTREE	\$ 220,688	\$ 27,319			\$ 168,928	\$ 29,143	\$ 130,000	\$ 32,250	\$ 100,000		\$ 147,070	\$ 14,707			\$ 147,441	\$ 19,994	\$ 129,010				\$ 145,000	\$ 14,500	\$ 75,000	
CHESTER	\$ 58,877																							
CHICOPEE	\$ 195,725				\$ 128,398		\$ 130,915				\$ 128,544		\$ 99,569				\$ 86,819	\$ 67,080		\$ 89,440		\$ 94,286		
CONCORD	\$ 175,837	\$ 7,200	\$ 153,689	\$ 1,150	\$ 126,844	\$ 1,150			\$ 104,645		\$ 140,250	\$ 7,200	\$ 95,147		\$ 128,520		\$ 97,696	\$ 600		\$ 106,056		\$ 86,079		
DANVERS	\$ 167,000		\$ 142,500	\$ 3,600	\$ 135,690	\$ 12,695	\$ 120,943		\$ 100,000		\$ 106,296		\$ 143,482										\$ 68,500	
GEORGETOWN	\$ 165,789	\$ 11,000					\$ 115,690	\$ 26,679																
GROTON	\$ 197,795						\$ 133,771																\$ 67,829	
GROVELAND	\$ 148,000	\$ 8,000																						
HINGHAM	\$ 180,400	\$ 13,600	\$ 150,000	\$ 11,500	\$ 135,720	\$ 56,154	\$ 132,993	\$ 56,260	\$ 165,693	\$ 4,314	\$ 140,046									\$ 91,395	\$ 10,878	\$ 87,443	\$ 2,749	
HOLDEN	\$ 141,499		\$ 124,496				\$ 114,088																\$ 72,370	
HOLYOKE	\$ 234,165	\$ 15,000	\$ 172,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 148,392		\$ 130,241		\$ 145,619	\$ 6,500	\$ 158,089		\$ 148,539		\$ 172,894	\$ 8,500	\$ 107,129		\$ 118,194	\$ 5,500	\$ 118,450	\$ 5,500	\$ 105,116	
HUDSON	\$ 258,544	\$ 5,000	\$ 164,046	\$ 5,000	\$ 78,413		\$ 118,620	\$ 5,000	\$ 110,467				\$ 128,441									\$ 80,765	\$ 63,469	
HULL	\$ 172,000	\$ 3,070	\$ 145,000	\$ 2,565					\$ 91,545															
IPSWICH	\$ 156,000	\$ 6,000					\$ 120,000	\$ 35,000					\$ 107,000	\$ 20,000								\$ 78,000	\$ 95,000	
LITTLETON	\$ 225,000		\$ 155,000		\$ 125,872		\$ 141,458		\$ 143,739				\$ 130,073									\$ 91,420	\$ 47,436	
MANSFIELD	\$ 184,968	\$ 6,000			\$ 130,997	\$ 475	\$ 130,832	\$ 86,900	\$ 104,972				\$ 99,403	\$ 46,425					\$ 71,547	\$ 525				
MARBLEHEAD	\$ 179,978				\$ 116,161		\$ 144,519		\$ 122,775															
MERRIMAC	\$ 145,000	\$ 3,600																						
MIDDLEBOROUGH	\$ 196,824		\$ 160,000		\$ 130,500		\$ 184,000		\$ 112,000												\$ 112,000		\$ 78,400	
MIDDLETON	\$ 202,858	\$ 8,500					\$ 134,763	\$ 45,500					\$ 100,401											
NO. ATTLEBORO	\$ 168,920	\$ 4,200			\$ 128,273		\$ 138,058	\$ -	\$ 142,901		\$ 115,095		\$ 107,848											\$ 113,300
NORWOOD	\$ 190,590	\$ 1,100	\$ 168,417	\$ 27,100	\$ 132,142	\$ 30,100	\$ 146,286	\$ 30,000	\$ 146,286	\$ 100					\$ 143,520	\$ 22,850	\$ 115,514	\$ 23,000						
PAXTON	\$ 116,979	\$ 4,750																						
PEABODY	\$ 203,000		\$ 172,424		\$ 164,671		\$ 148,629		\$ 144,447		\$ 144,447		\$ 118,342								\$ 90,710		\$ 90,710	
PRINCETON	\$ 149,200																							\$ 59,987
READING	\$ 220,452				\$ 142,641		\$ 142,170		\$ 162,315		\$ 146,560		\$ 144,269											\$ 114,555
ROWLEY	\$ 156,000	\$ 9,450					\$ 121,056	\$ 39,500																
RUSSELL	\$ 96,740																							
SHREWSBURY	\$ 191,718	\$ 4,800	\$ 170,014		\$ 112,142		\$ 128,000		\$ 138,000		\$ 141,750				\$ 142,000				\$ 143,000		\$ 85,000		\$ 85,277	
SOUTH HADLEY	\$ 194,314	\$ 4,631			\$ 139,568	\$ 705	\$ 142,979	\$ 624	\$ 147,909		\$ 127,587				\$ 136,698	\$ 639	\$ 92,352	\$ 612	\$ 100,485				\$ 77,272	
STERLING	\$ 141,750														\$ 99,000									\$ 63,550
TAUNTON	\$ 234,850		\$ 196,730		\$ 156,652		\$ 186,354						\$ 139,699		\$ 151,919		\$ 143,018				\$ 159,992		\$ 132,870	
TEMPLETON	\$ 142,150	\$ 6,744					\$ 111,726	\$ 6,493	\$ 76,089	\$ 2,283														\$ 61,847
WAKEFIELD	\$ 191,471	\$ 14,500			\$ 102,731	\$ 3,000	\$ 143,062	\$ 7,000	\$ 155,629	\$ 9,000	\$ 134,381	\$ 2,500									\$ 112,860	\$ 5,000		
WELLESLEY	\$ 170,000		\$ 158,870	\$ 6,995	\$ 133,445	\$ 4,131	\$ 128,190	\$ 6,995	\$ 111,384	\$ 6,995											\$ 93,829	\$ 4,131	\$ 89,128	\$ 4,131
WEST BOYLSTON	\$ 165,150	\$ 4,000	\$ 128,125	\$ 4,000																	\$ 70,262		\$ 69,181	
WESTFIELD	\$ 192,500	\$ 39,000			\$ 140,000	\$ 10,500	\$ 163,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 182,165	\$ 15,000	\$ 157,266	\$ 15,000			\$ 132,399	\$ 8,500			\$ 127,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 145,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 7,500
UPPER DECILE	\$ 221,119	\$ 17,426	\$ 172,212	\$ 13,060	\$ 155,826	\$ 30,100	\$ 152,940	\$ 50,880	\$ 160,978	\$ 11,400	\$ 154,207	\$ 14,912	\$ 144,033	\$ 41,375	\$ 156,114	\$ 21,708	\$ 134,613	\$ 18,522	\$ 135,000	\$ 7,100	\$ 145,000	\$ 14,750	\$ 113,928	\$ 6,826
UPPER QUARTILE	\$ 196,056	\$ 11,000	\$ 170,211	\$ 9,249	\$ 139,892	\$ 23,272	\$ 143,000	\$ 36,125	\$ 145,953	\$ 7,998	\$ 146,032	\$ 14,780	\$ 137,293	\$ 33,800	\$ 147,441	\$ 19,994	\$ 122,262	\$ 11,806	\$ 124,799	\$ 6,500	\$ 117,053	\$ 13,595	\$ 93,392	\$ 5,816
MEDIAN	\$ 177,908	\$ 6,000	\$ 159,435	\$ 4,500	\$ 131,570	\$ 10,500	\$ 131,954	\$ 23,827	\$ 137,000	\$ 6,500	\$ 140,148	\$ 10,954	\$ 115,521	\$ 21,175	\$ 142,000	\$ 8,500	\$ 107,129	\$ 612	\$ 109,340	\$ 5,500	\$ 92,625	\$ 8,189	\$ 81,200	\$ 4,131
LOWER QUARTILE	\$ 154,300	\$ 4,200	\$ 148,750	\$ 2,850	\$ 127,201	\$ 2,075	\$ 121,028	\$ 6,870	\$ 104,809	\$ 3,299	\$ 127,826	\$ 6,025	\$ 102,051	\$ 20,588	\$ 132,399	\$ 8,500	\$ 95,024	\$ 606	\$ 78,782	\$ 3,013	\$ 86,110	\$ 5,125	\$ 67,997	\$ 3,440
LOWER DECILE	\$ 139,840	\$ 3,282	\$ 135,313	\$ 2,424	\$ 112,544	\$ 705	\$ 117,517	\$ 2,812	\$ 96,661	\$ 1,410	\$ 117,317	\$ 3,910	\$ 99,453	\$ 20,235	\$ 122,616	\$ 3,783	\$ 90,139	\$ 602	\$ 69,314	\$ 1,520	\$ 78,782	\$ 4,566	\$ 62,658	\$ 3,025
AVERAGE	\$ 175,477	\$ 9,308	\$ 158,257	\$ 7,451	\$ 132,126	\$ 15,041	\$ 135,737	\$ 25,886	\$ 127,887	\$ 6,313	\$ 136,420	\$ 9,852	\$ 119,637	\$ 29,200	\$ 139,377	\$ 12,097	\$ 110,220	\$ 8,071	\$ 104,551	\$ 4,508	\$ 103,855	\$ 9,168	\$ 83,173	\$ 4,793

SYSTEM	WORKING FOREMAN	LEAD LINEMAN	1st CLASS LINEMAN	2nd CLASS LINEMAN	APP LINEMAN	SUB FOREMAN	SUBS TECH	OFFICE MGR	CUST SER REP	BILLING PERSON	ELECTRICIAN	METER TECH	FIBER TECH	CUSTODIAN	LAST CBA INCREASE DATE	LAST CBA INCREASE %	NEXT CBA INCREASE DATE	NEXT CBA INCREASE %	NEXT CBA INCREASE DATE	NEXT CBA INCREASE %	% HEALTH INS PAID BY TOWN
ASHBURNHAM	50.43	47.72	46.61		25.85				27.58						06/30/20	0.00%	06/30/21	3.00%	06/30/22	3.00%	75.00%
BELMONT		54.16	51.55	40.25	34.20		51.55		29.55	31.88		40.25			01/01/21	2.00%	01/01/22	2.62%	01/01/23	3.00%	75.00-80.00%
BOYLSTON	50.05		47.17	43.73	38.09			32.30		29.72					07/01/21	3.00%					63.00%
BRAINTREE	61.73	60.29	51.68	47.35	43.00				30.06	47.03	54.24	48.94	48.15	34.63	04/01/21	3.00%	04/01/22	3.00%	04/01/23	3.00%	50.00%
CHESTER	40.15	36.00		24.09						19.22											80.00%
CHICOPEE	55.22	51.13	48.78	43.05		52.50	43.40	50.49	25.88	25.30		35.19	35.37	35.94	07/01/21	2.50%	07/01/22	3.00%	07/01/23	3.00%	70.00%
CONCORD	57.60	53.49	51.09	41.12	36.47				28.72	32.33	41.41	35.87	41.43	31.00	07/01/21	2.00%					55.00%
DANVERS		53.62	48.73	41.24	28.87	53.62	48.73		33.42			45.52	22.54	22.99	07/01/21	2.00%	07/01/22	2.00%	07/01/23	2.00%	70.00%
GEORGETOWN	51.96	48.42	45.99		29.39			40.12	36.50						01/01/21	2.50%	01/01/22	2.50%	01/01/23	2.50%	70.00%
GROTON		55.40	50.89	44.86	38.79			51.53	34.97			40.08			05/01/21	3.00%					87.50%
GROVELAND	53.47	49.05	46.37	40.24	28.00			36.97	33.17						01/01/21	2.50%	01/01/22	2.75%	01/01/23	2.75%	75.00%
HINGHAM	56.18	51.99	49.55	44.55	33.41				33.60			37.53	32.97	32.97	01/01/21	3.00%					50.00%
HOLDEN	50.98		47.38	41.52	32.27				29.48	25.73					07/01/21	1.00%	07/01/22	2.00%	07/01/23	2.00%	75.00%
HOLYOKE	52.20	49.98	48.48		43.63	56.30	46.75	36.06	29.58			36.15		25.09	04/01/21	3.00%	04/03/22	2.75%	04/02/23	2.75%	50.00%
HUDSON	55.99	54.57	50.84	42.59	35.68	47.02	42.40		31.24	31.24		43.34			05/01/21	2.50%	05/01/22	3.00%	05/01/23	3.00%	50.00%
HULL									26.05	28.76					01/01/21	2.00%	01/01/22	2.00%	01/01/23	2.00%	75.00%
IPSWICH	53.73	51.12	47.63	40.62	36.02	54.66	40.62	30.50	25.33	27.91	56.16	40.62		21.57	07/01/21	2.50%					65.00%
LITTLETON	58.09	55.13	52.20	43.22	32.94				32.00			40.57			01/04/21	3.00%	01/03/22	3.00%	01/02/23	3.00%	70.00%
MANSFIELD	53.60	50.87	47.49	40.09	32.99	48.28	40.89		34.68	34.68		37.71			07/01/21	3.00%					70.00%
MARBLEHEAD	55.57	51.94	48.55	42.34		51.94		43.25	33.37	36.85		45.35			07/01/21	2.75%					83.00%
MERRIMAC	53.50	48.64	46.32	38.09	32.29			35.50	30.99						07/01/21	2.75%	07/01/22	3.00%	07/01/23	3.25%	55.00%
MIDDLEBOROUGH	62.34	55.58	50.17	39.93	35.18		39.94	36.74	33.36	33.87		37.47		34.69	01/01/21	3.00%	01/01/22	0.00%	07/01/23	0.00%	50-75%
MIDDLETON	59.49	55.40	53.28	30.85				40.89	31.91						03/12/21	2.75%	03/12/22	3.00%	03/12/23	3.00%	60.00%
NO. ATTLEBORO	57.70	51.85	48.20	39.38	34.31	51.85	48.20		33.35	37.30		33.60			07/01/21	3.00%	07/01/22	3.50%			75.00%
NORWOOD	52.53		48.03	37.20		33.71		40.92	32.42		48.03		39.31								80.00%
PAXTON	51.50	47.03	45.26	37.58	34.11				32.87	29.62											75.00-80.00%
PEABODY	52.73	49.70	41.26		36.54	47.41			30.06	30.06	42.74	39.17		30.06	01/01/21	1.00%	07/01/21	TBD	07/01/22	TBD	85.00%
PRINCETON	50.88		44.26	42.70	29.71				26.78						01/01/21	3.00%	01/01/22	3.00%	01/01/23	3.00%	85.00%
READING	60.95	57.81	53.85		46.89		53.84		36.78	47.69		48.30			01/01/21	3.00%	01/01/22	n/a	01/01/23	n/a	71.00%
ROWLEY	54.84		48.19	41.04	26.86			41.04		32.68					07/01/21	3.00%	07/01/22	3.00%	07/01/23	3.00%	52.50%
RUSSELL			45.40					22.11		19.77					07/01/21	3.00%					85.00%
SHREWSBURY	53.79		47.35	41.49	35.09	47.35	41.49		31.77	28.75		35.09	35.09		07/01/21	2.85%	07/01/22	TBD	07/01/23	TBD	73.00%
SOUTH HADLEY	53.38	41.01	48.21	41.77	30.82				47.04	34.38	44.29		39.21	31.38	07/01/21	3.00%	07/01/22	3.00%	07/01/23	3.00%	60.00%
STERLING	52.06	49.06	46.14	37.49	29.78			33.53	18.00	28.83		32.90	34.66		07/01/21	2.00%					80.00%
TAUNTON	66.61		58.14		50.88			62.11	32.07	32.07		49.60		37.75	01/01/21	3.00%	01/01/22	3.00%	01/01/23		75.00%
TEMPLETON	48.92	46.61	44.94	38.53	31.02				28.48						01/01/21	2.25%					75.00%
WAKEFIELD		54.07	50.24	44.56	28.33	54.07	49.72		39.88	35.97					07/01/21	2.75%					75.00%
WELLESLEY	57.00	54.52	47.80	39.64	33.26	38.73		45.11	31.65	40.65	43.88	35.40	31.98		07/01/21	4.00%	07/01/22	4.00%	07/01/23	TBD	75.00%
WEST BOYLSTON	52.79	50.04	45.25	41.12	32.71			33.78	31.39	31.39					07/01/21	2.50%					80.00%
WESTFIELD		50.27	48.53	43.61	41.00	42.00			30.00	30.00	40.00	44.13	41.52	34.33	04/01/21	3.00%					77.00%
UPPER DECILE	60.66	55.40	51.84	44.47	42.60	54.48	51.37	50.80	35.74	38.64	54.82	48.02	41.52	35.69							
UPPER QUARTILE	57.00	54.34	50.22	42.79	36.47	53.34	48.98	42.70	33.36	34.53	49.58	43.93	40.37	34.63							
MEDIAN	53.60	51.13	48.20	41.12	33.41	50.07	45.08	38.55	31.71	31.39	44.09	39.63	35.37	31.38							
LOWER QUARTILE	52.06	49.06	46.43	39.58	30.82	47.10	41.34	34.21	29.53	28.80	42.41	35.94	33.82	25.09							
LOWER DECILE	50.52	47.03	45.26	37.50	28.44	39.71	40.65	31.76	26.42	25.56	40.99	35.10	31.98	21.85							
AVERAGE	54.48	51.18	48.47	40.50	34.50	48.53	45.63	39.61	31.50	31.99	46.34	40.13	36.57	30.23							

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
Concord	18,491	15	152,245	15	385,820	15	6,827	15	100.8	15	120.2	15	5.84	5	0	5	100
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
Belmont	27,295	15	97,965	11	360,538	15	9,664	15	111.7	15	140.9	15	12.48	3	11	3	92
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
Reading	25,518	15	68,897	7	227,975	11	6,200	15	82.4	15	111.1	15	14.82	2	17	3	83
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
Wakefield	27,090	15	53,217	3	211,646	11	6,148	15	83.5	15	108.5	15	11.10	4	17	3	81
Wellesley	29,550	11	211,460	15	457,666	15	13,305	11	155.4	11	184.7	11	10.94	4	16	3	81
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
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
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
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
Municipal Light Plant Only																	
Hingham	24,284	15	127,975	15	327,057	15	8,044	15	93.0	15	123.9	15	10.14	4	40	0	94
Marblehead	20,441	15	94,092	11	340,458	15	7,251	15	76.3	15	97.6	15	8.27	5	32	0	91
Danvers	28,087	11	48,406	0	204,666	11	6,018	15	86.9	15	117.2	15	11.01	4	28	1	72
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
Mansfield	23,860	15	53,922	3	179,993	7	4,526	11	72.4	15	107.6	15	21.92	0	40	0	66
Shrewsbury	38,325	7	59,686	3	177,909	7	6,984	15	98.5	15	156.4	15	26.54	0	32	0	62
Groton	11,315	11	68,993	7	179,691	7	2,110	0	36.3	3	44.7	3	1.01	0	19	3	34
Water Only																	
Lincoln	7,014	3	156,203	15	331,302	15	2,342	3	35.5	3	44.78	3	2.42	3	4	5	50
Littleton	10,141	11	58,520	3	219,516	11	2,278	3	45.2	7	58.8	7	5.61	5	12	3	50