

Approved October 19, 2023

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Wednesday, October 11, 2023, 6:30 p.m.**

Madison Riley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Vice Chair Wendy Paul took roll call of members of Advisory in attendance.

Those present from Advisory Committee included Madison Riley, Chair; Susan Clapham, Secretary; Wendy Paul, Vice Chair; Gail Sullivan, Vice Chair; Al Ferrer; Christina Dougherty; Rani Elwy; David Prock; Tamara Sielecki; Hanna Bonin; Phil Jameson; Jay Prosnitz; Lucienne Ronco; and Donna Stoddard.

Absent: Pete Pedersen

Also in attendance were Meghan Jop, Executive Director; Tom Ulfelder, Chair, Select Board (SB); Marla Robinson, Chair, Wellesley Free Library (WFL) Trustees; Eric Arbeene, Director, Planning Department; Tom Taylor, Chair, Planning Board (PB); Kathleen Woodward, PB; Marc Charney, PB; Ann-Mara Lanza, SB; Beth Sullivan-Woods, SB; Linshi Li, WFL Trustee; Ann Rappaport, WFL Trustee; Maura Murphy, WFL Trustee; Jamie Jurgenson, WFL Director.

Citizen Speak

Mary Ann Cluggish – spoke about leaving a habitable world for our children and grandchildren and that in the past Wellesley was a leader in these efforts but Ms. Cluggish felt that nature is being destroyed bit by bit. Ms. Cluggish felt there would be a win-win solution for the town, the environment, and the Sisters if the attorneys on both sides worked together. Ms. Cluggish urged Advisory to vote no on Article 15 to allow the Wellesley Conservation Land Trust to do what it knows how to do best.

Michael Tobin, 45 Cottage Street -- spoke as President of Wellesley Conservation Land Trust. Mr. Tobin felt that the by-right amendment which would require a special permit is not adequate to protect the open space at 125 Oakland Street. Mr. Tobin cited a letter written by the NRC. He also stated that this is not about private landowner rights; the applicant is requesting a favor from the Town, which will increase their rights and the value of their property. Mr. Tobin felt that that the Town has the right to ask for considerations. Mr. Tobin referenced the Wellesley Conservation Land Trust's offer to purchase a conservation restriction at full appraised value of the conservation restriction which would allow the Sisters to raise funds and stay on the property, and would also protect the natural space for future generations. Mr. Tobin stated that conservation restrictions are not hard and cited other examples in town where conservation restrictions are being proposed and discussed. Mr. Tobin requested that Advisory not support Article 15 as presented.

Leslie Hanrahan, 5 Putney Road – asked Advisory not to support Article 15. Ms. Hanrahan felt the zoning bylaw change would allow a new owner significant expansion and intensification rights with no permanent conservation restriction. Ms. Hanrahan stated that the new amendment allows a new owner to double the number of buildings and add amenities that don't currently exist on the site such as pools, patios, and sports courts. Ms. Hanrahan stated that independent elderly housing use allows for expansion of dwellings for those over 62 and allows for commercial retail space. Ms. Hanrahan stated that the paving to support staff, visitor, and resident parking would be expanded for these uses. Ms. Hanrahan felt that the amendment was one-sided with no protections for the property's natural assets and would have a direct impact on Centennial Park. She felt the new owner would have no incentive to protect natural assets and that, without a conservation restriction in perpetuity, the trees could be cut down, wetland buffers built over, and new buildings would loom over Centennial Reservation. Ms. Hanrahan felt there

were many zoning options for the proponents to allow a sale to a new owner, cash flow, and the ability to for the Sisters to remain in their homes while protecting the property's natural assets. Ms. Hanrahan felt that the bylaw change expands the rights of a future owner but does not provide legal protection for the Town or the 42-acre natural asset at Centennial Reservation.

Raina McManus, 2 Mulherin Lane - asked Advisory not to support the zoning amendment at 125 Oakland Street citing the need to protect the natural resources and support the Town's goals of greenhouse gas reductions and natural resources protection. Ms. McManus felt the loss of the wildlife buffer at 125 Oakland would impact Centennial Park with increased noise and light. Ms. McManus further discussed climate change and requested that Centennial Park be protected.

Sue McKay, 186 Oakland Street – referenced the letter signed by many residents that requests conservation restrictions or other vehicles be used to protect the existing open space at 125 Oakland Street in perpetuity. Ms. McKay further stated that a buyer and plans are unknown and repeated some of the concerns cited by other speakers. Ms. McKay clarified that Friends at Brookside did not hire an attorney to recommend the special permit. She stated that they have been advocating for natural resource protection in perpetuity at 125 Oakland Street. Ms. McKay requested that Advisory not support the amendment.

Dr. Martin Moore – Ede, 110 Hundreds Road, - urged Advisory not to support Article 15. Dr. Moore-Ede cited his experience as a Harvard Medical School professor and work identifying the circadian clock in the human brain. Dr. Moore-Ede felt that Centennial Park provides a space for residents to escape the stress of every day. He asked for protection of the sanctity and integrity of Centennial Park.

Article 2 – Additional Contract Settlements

Meghan Jop, Executive Director, presented the remaining two (2) contracts that were negotiated for the Wellesley Police patrol officers and for the Library. The settlement fundamentals and parameters were reviewed, and the contract details were summarized.

Questions

- Does having a higher educational degree have an impact on the base pay in the patrolman's contract?
 - Yes. A master's degree is 25% and a bachelor's degree is 20%.
- Is this education incentive new with this contract or has it been in place?
 - It's been a long-standing provision, but it was a flat rate. The flat rate is being eliminated and, to remain competitive, the percentage rate is part of this contract.
- Are the percentage-based incentives one time or annual?
 - It's annual.
- Is the education incentive included in the base pay for benefits?
 - Yes, in terms of retirement.
- Regarding the tuition reimbursement increasing from \$10,000 to \$15,000, is that the entire pool for the department?
 - Yes.
- A question was asked as to the percentage increases each year: salaries lag behind those in other communities, but because these are 3-year contracts, there is nothing that can be done to increase salaries during the contract term?
 - Yes, unless there is a change in employer or working conditions which would bring us back to the table for impact bargaining.

Article 10 – Library Director contract

Marla Robinson, Chair of the WFL Trustees, presented new information regarding the motion under Article 10. Since previously presenting to Advisory, the Trustees have worked with Town Counsel to simplify and clarify the motion. Based on Town Counsel's understanding that the Trustees have the authority to enter into a contract, the Trustees are now asking Town Meeting to allow the Board of Trustees to set that salary for the library director within that contract. The Trustees have the authority to hire, manage, review and if needed, dismiss the library director. It was further stated that all town employees currently on contracts have salaries set by those who manage the contract, and it was felt that the library board should be no different. The library director will remain in the job classification system, just as other town employees on contracts do. The Trustees will continue to provide a fiscally responsible budget with the director's salary. The money will be in the budget which will be reviewed by Advisory and ultimately approved by Town Meeting for appropriation. The contract will be a standard contract that follows other contracts in town. It will identify salary and other benefits.

Questions

- Appreciation for the library system was expressed. It was felt that if a contract is required per Massachusetts law, then it makes sense to have a contract for the library director. Concern was expressed about taking the job outside the salary classification plan so that it is different than other directors' salaries. If it stays within the job classification system could that be stated in the contract or be part of the motion?
 - The job stays in the job classification schedule and the contract will be handled no differently than the other contracts. The salary will be set by the Trustees. The Trustees will look at three (3) different things – what is happening in town in that salary classification, what is happening for library directors in competing towns, and the salary of the library director if there is a current library director. All of this will be brought before Advisory when the FY25 budget is presented.
- A comment was made that the understanding is that the current salary is at the higher end of the range of the current salary range. Could the salary go outside of that range over the term of the 3-year contract?
 - Yes, that is possible, and the six (6) existing contracts go outside their range. The Trustees would be transparent because it would be shown in the budget. Advisory and Town Meeting could vote down the budget or remove money from the budget.
- Concern was expressed about equity across the town departments.
 - Focus on human assets in town is important and should be prioritized. There are six (6) non-school contracts all managed by the Select Board and there are at least seven (7) independent and elected boards in town. It was felt that this is a great way to prioritize human assets and to build upon and promote internal equity within the Town. A recent Swellesley Report article was cited and comments from the Select Board were highlighted.
- A comment was made about the timing since the Town received grant money for a comprehensive study of pay schedules and compensation. Concern was expressed about changing the bylaw before we have information from the study.
 - It is an equity issue. It was felt that the contract is important for protection and that anybody signing a contract would look at salary, which is an essential part of a contract. It was felt to be the right thing to do to be competitive and to give authority to the Trustees who review the director and potentially dismiss a director. This is similar to the trust in the School Committee and Select Board to enter into fair and honest contracts.

- At this point the Trustees don't know exactly what the contract would look like or the exact amount of money. But there isn't money in the budget to go crazy. The Trustees would be responsible within the parameters of their budget and available funds.
- A comment was made that it is important that people who understand the industry be permitted to do what is best for the library. The level of transparency was appreciated. A question was asked if Advisory would review the contract?
 - All contracts are public documents. If Advisory wanted to see the contract during the budget presentation it could be provided, and the Trustees would identify the salary.
- A comment was made that it seems that other contracts in town are negotiated behind closed doors, and would this contract look the same as the other contracts in town?
 - The actual negotiation for contracts is done in executive session, but once the contract is agreed to, it is a public document.
- Lise Olney of the Select Board clarified the quote that was previously cited and explained that the compensation inequities cited were related to union employees and trying to bring them up to competitive rates and the quote was not related to this issue.
- Concern about equity was raised again and there was a discussion about the six (6) contracts under the Select Board and that they don't make reference to a level or salary.
- A comment was made that the Human Resources (HR) board at their meeting were undecided in terms of support for the salary component of the contract. Do the Trustees have HR support on this now?
 - The HR board was supportive of a one-year contract. They didn't know whether they supported a three-year contract. The Trustees needed to research the best way to frame the motion and understand the responsibility and ability to enter into a contract. The Trustees have been in touch with the HR board but at this time the Trustees don't have an answer.
- When will the Trustees present to the HR board?
 - HR did not have experience with the current contracts. This is the first time this type of situation/contract has come to them, but the Trustees will be in front of them.
- A comment was made that the contract will include language to financially protect the Town. If the Trustees were to set the salary and it were a three-year contract, the rate of pay for the duration of the contract term would be set at the rate recommended by the HR Board for the 50/60 series employees as approved by Town Meeting.
 - The rate of pay would be set in year one and the salary increases for years two and three would increase by the percentage increase set for the 50/60 series employees; this is how the other contracts in town are written.
- Clarification was requested that the contract doesn't refer to the range, but to a salary set in year one. So, although increased by the 50/60 series approved increase, could the salary go outside of the range in years two and three?
 - Yes, that is possible.
- Clarification was provided that Advisory doesn't make decisions on salary and that Advisory advises Town Meeting. Therefore, why would Advisory be better than the salary classification system and HR board to make decisions on the appropriateness of a salary?
 - The Trustees bring a budget to Advisory with details on how much each employee is being paid. There is very little room in the library budget. Advisory votes up or down on the library budget that is presented. Advisory doesn't approve the budget but advises Town Meeting. Town Meeting appropriates the money and Town Meeting could choose not to appropriate the money. If the money is not appropriated, then the Trustees can't meet the obligation under the contract. The contract does state that it's dependent on appropriation.
- Does Advisory have the ability to challenge line items in individual budgets?

- No, Advisory does not have line-item authority. There have been motions at Town Meeting to reduce budgets. A motion can be made to reduce a line item in Article 8.
- A comment was made confirming that Advisory advises and does not have the ability to change motions. It's not Advisory's role to say whether or not a proposed contract would be within what is recommended. Advisory could express an opinion when discussing the library's budget, but it is Town Meeting that decides whether or not to have a direct impact.
 - The Trustees have an obligation to stay within the budget guidelines and that fiscal responsibility is taken very seriously.

Article 14 – Amend LHR bylaw to exempt attached ADUs

Tom Taylor, Chair of the Planning Board (PB), provided some context to the ADU bylaw. When Town Meeting passed the ADU bylaw at 2022 ATM, it was believed that the intent of Town Meeting was for the bylaw to be “by right,” not “by right unless Large House Review (LHR) is triggered.” The intent of this amendment is to make certain it is by-right. In addition, building an ADU has specific requirements that add cost and complexity. The PB is attempting to fix the impediment for attached ADUs. The PB is comfortable with the trade-offs and felt that the greater good was to make the adjustment to the bylaw.

The PB proposed this article as a proactive approach, instead of a reactive approach, to what is believed to be an impediment to creating attached accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which are also referred to as in-law apartments or granny flats. ADUs are a separate dwelling on the property and are subordinate to the primary dwelling. The Planning Department/PB has received feedback from homeowners and builders about the time and expense to go through LHR, which requires a number of plans and documents from homeowners. The time varies, sometimes taking up to 90 days with an additional 30-day appeal period.

There have been three (3) detached ADUs to date that have gone through the process. There have been no attached ADUs, and Planning feels the proposed amendment may be a solution. This is not solving a housing crisis, but it is a tool in the toolbox to provide additional housing. Originally it was estimated that 5 to 10 ADUs would be built per year. This change to the bylaw may increase the number from the existing three (3). Planning understands the concerns expressed about the potential for someone to use this bylaw to avoid LHR by claiming the space is being used as an ADU and then abandoning it. An attached ADU cannot be accessed from inside the primary dwelling and firewalls are required. There must be a separate entrance for the ADU. The ADU must be subordinate to the principal dwelling and must match the style architecture of the primary dwelling. The PB feels that the operational requirements in the ADU bylaw and the permitting requirements are sufficient to close these loopholes. In addition, the owner must submit an annual certification attesting that the ADU is complying with the bylaw. The determination whether an ADU meets the criteria is under the jurisdiction of the Building Inspector. The finishing of attics would not allow ADU use because ADUs must have a separate exterior entrance, firewalls, windows, etc.

The PB considered the consequences of not having attached ADUs go through the LHR process and believes the benefits outweigh the impact of bypassing the LHR process for the construction of ADUs. The PB feels the proposed amendment will follow the intention behind the ADU bylaw by allowing attached ADUs “by right.”

Questions

- Would the attached ADU follow other zoning bylaws such as lighting and tree protection and preservation?
 - The tree protection bylaw only protects trees within the “tree yard,” which refers to a certain perimeter around the edge of the property. A tree in the middle of the property can be removed and special permission is not needed. Most homes are in the middle of a

lot and attached ADUs will be attached to the house and most people don't have large trees close to their house. The lighting bylaws don't apply to residential homes.

- Concern was expressed about potential unintended consequences of not having the LHR but support for ADUs was expressed.
 - The PB understands that there are trade-offs but didn't feel that they were enough not to amend the bylaw.
- Overall support for ADUS and for providing a variety of housing options in Wellesley was expressed. However, it was felt that data would have been helpful in the decision-making process. A question was asked if the Town will know who is living in the ADUs.
 - If someone wanted to avoid LHR by building an extra space as an attached ADU, they would not be able to access it from the primary house. And firewalls need to be built which is an expense. It is unlikely someone will build an ADU for another purpose, and then have to access it from outside the primary structure. The PB is trying to take a proactive approach based on feedback.
 - Planning does not track who is living in the ADUs, but the homeowner fills out an annual affidavit certifying the ADU.
- What within the bylaws specifically give comfort that someone won't put up an ADU that is disruptive to their neighbors; there seem to be many bylaws regarding new construction?
 - There are setbacks from the property line for each district so someone cannot build right up to their neighbor's yard. An ADU can be no larger than 900 square feet. People also like their houses to look symmetrical. The building inspector will make sure that the ADU matches the rest of the house. Most people prefer the privacy of trees.
- Do detached ADUs go through LHR?
 - Yes, they can go through LHR, and it depends. The path for the detached ADU starts with the Zoning Board of Appeals to get a special permit to allow the use of having a detached ADU. If the additional 900 square feet triggered LHR in the TLAG for their district, then they would go to LHR. The PB felt that this should stay in place because the detached ADUs are outside the confines of the house, and it was felt there should be more oversight for those. Each district has a different threshold, and it is not based on lot size.
- Is LHR a zoning bylaw?
 - Yes, it is a zoning bylaw. The LHR section of the bylaw is silent and if someone wants to add an attached ADU it triggers TLAG. When the ADU bylaw was written it was a separate part of the zoning bylaws and the LHR bylaw was not rewritten at that time. The ADU bylaw was not connected to other parts of the zoning bylaw.
- If the intent of the ADU approval was to have "by right" use, is the definition of "by right" to comply with zoning bylaws and the LHR is a zoning bylaw?
 - The spirit of the ADU bylaw was for attached ADUs to be by right. The intent of the amendment is to bring it back to the spirit.
- What happens if someone does not certify the ADU? What happens to the ADU?
 - The zoning enforcement officer is alerted. If someone believes a zoning violation occurs, it is researched, and a violation issued. There is an appeal process as well.
 - A comment was made that Wellesley is the only community in the state that has LHR and TLAG. In the state's housing choice initiative, ADUs are one of the tools being encouraged but it had to be by right.
- What is the address of the ADUs?
 - Not sure.
- Is there a requirement that the ADU be lived in?
 - No.
- A question was asked about zoning enforcement and the penalties.

Approved October 19, 2023

- The zoning enforcement officer could provide this information.
- A comment was made that these are some of the questions that might come up at Town Meeting such as addressing, enforcement, and penalties if an ADU is not properly being used.

Discuss and Vote 2023 STM Warrant Articles

Article 2, Motion 1

Susan Clapham made, and Gail Sullivan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 1, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to amend the vote taken at the Town's 2023 Annual meeting and to increase the sum appropriated to the Board of Public Works by the amount of \$233,541 to support the agreed-upon pay schedules as set forth in the article and the motion.

Discussion

- Appreciation and acknowledgment of the Town's effort in negotiating agreeable contracts for the employees of the town was expressed for all six (6) contracts and resulting motions. Support for the settlements was expressed.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 1, 13 to 0.

Article 2, Motion 2

Susan Clapham made, and Rani Elwy seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 2, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to amend the vote taken at the Town's 2023 Annual meeting and to increase the sum appropriated to the Board of Public Works by the amount of \$27,548 to support the agreed-upon pay schedules as set forth in the article and the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes

Approved October 19, 2023

Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 2, 13 to 0.

Article 2, Motion 3

Susan Clapham made, and Jay Prosnitz seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 3, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to amend the vote taken at the Town’s 2023 Annual meeting and to increase the sum appropriated to the Select Board for Public Safety by the amount of \$20,202 to support the agreed-upon pay schedules as set forth in the article and the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 3, 13 to 0.

Article 2, Motion 4

Susan Clapham made, and Lucienne Ronco seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 4, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to amend the vote taken at the Town’s 2023 Annual meeting and to increase the sum appropriated to the Select Board for Public Safety by the amount of \$292,498 to support the agreed-upon pay schedules as set forth in the article and the motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made that there was a large effort made by the Town to try and address Wellesley's competitiveness with other like communities in our area and in the state. The efforts that were put into place to negotiate this and to recognize the work and the pay scales for the employees in Town were acknowledged.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes

Approved October 19, 2023

Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 4, 13 to 0.

Article 2, Motion 5

Susan Clapham made, and Donna Stoddard seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 5, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to amend the vote taken at the Town’s 2023 Annual meeting and to increase the sum appropriated to the Select Board for Public Safety by the amount of \$254,407 to support the agreed-upon pay schedules as set forth in the article and the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 5, 13 to 0.

Article 2, Motion 6

Susan Clapham made, and Hanna Bonin seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 2, Motion 6, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town vote to appropriate and add the sum of \$97,465 to the amounts appropriated at the Town’s 2023 Annual Town Meeting to the Wellesley Free Library and Facilities Management Department to support the agreed-upon pay schedule as set forth in the article and the motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made agreeing with earlier comments about the amazing library that serves the Town beautifully.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes

Approved October 19, 2023

Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 2, Motion 6, 13 to 0.

Article 6

Susan Clapham made, and Al Ferrer seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 6, Motion 1, as proposed by the School Committee, that the Town vote to authorize the School Committee to grant a utility easement to Verizon Communications at the Hunnewell School, as set forth in the Article and the Motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made that based on last week’s presentation this seems very straightforward even though it is not clear why Verizon needs this.
- A comment was made that the easement is essential for completing the work at Hunnewell.
- If the motion is not needed, it will be pulled before Town Meeting.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 6, 13 to 0.

Article 10

Susan Clapham made, and Donna Stoddard seconded a motion for favorable action on Article 10, Motion 1, as proposed by the Board of Trustees of the Wellesley Free Library, that when the trustees execute a written contract with the Library Director, they will have the authority to set the salary of the director, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 30.7 of the General Bylaws, as set forth in the Article and the Motion.

Discussion

- What is the timing of the compensation and pay schedule review? Is HR involved in setting the salary for those contracts that are currently outside the range for the position?
 - The current contracts have different tests for provisions. The deputy chief and assistant chief are no longer in the compensation plan. For other contracts the requirements are set in the contract including compensation which is inclusive of fringe benefits. Depending

on the board, the HR staff may assist with comparable salary data, but the HR board does not weigh in on the Select Board negotiations for staff such as the Executive Director. It was felt that there is a disconnect between the HR board and the managerial. It was also felt that the classification plan is not accurate. For example, given the breadth of the public safety responsibilities for the fire chief, the Group 63 classification is low. This shows the flaw in the classification plan that will hopefully be rectified once the proposed study is completed. It was felt that, if the computational classification moved away from the Hay system to more of a point system, it might realign some of the positions. But the HR director needs to be appointed before the study can begin.

- Support for the motion was expressed as because it is a precedent already set within the town because there is a pay schedule that's not up to date and perhaps needs some modifications.
- A question was asked as to the genesis of this request and whether there are other departments that would like a contract for their director?
 - It is not known with respect to the library. Some department heads would prefer a contract as there are many directors who report to boards. For the library director, there is a Mass General Law that is being referenced. This does not exist for directors in other departments.
- A comment was made that it seems that the salaries for the existing contracts are out of range because the classification was not set properly. Does it say specifically in the contract that they will stay within the range or that they are at a certain level within the classification plan that's not specified in the contract.
 - That is not specified in the contract. Each contract is unique, but for the majority the 50/60 series is referenced and indicating in the out years to receive the same percentage increase as that for the 50/60 series.
- Support for the contract for the library director was expressed because it is the law, and it seems to be the best practice. Trust for the WFL Trustees was expressed. But concern was raised about the necessity to make the change due to the challenges of the current political environment, as many groups are dealing with changes and challenges. Concern was expressed about the unfinished HR board discussion because it was clear they did not come to a consensus on whether the salary should be tied to the contract. Concern was expressed about the timing of this request.
- Additional concern was expressed about the timing of this request for STM rather than the ATM in the spring when the HR department will have staffing and will be looking at some of the struggles related to the systems currently in place and the challenges with the Hay system regarding salaries. It was felt that the HR board did not have a full and complete discussion on this. Concern was expressed about going forward with the motion as setting precedent for some of the other director positions. The HR working group will be doing important work with the classification plan and the rebuilding of the HR department. It was felt that it would be helpful to understand what HR says on this issue.
- Clarification provided that voting on the motion is not voting on whether the Library can offer a contract. Library Trustees can create a contract without Town Meeting approval. The Trustees are seeking only to set the director's salary outside of the salary classification plan.
- Concern was expressed about the long term and how disparate the increases under the contract will be and pay equity 10 years from now.
- Additional concern was expressed over timing and amending a bylaw without all the information from a study. It was further commented that the library originally presented information on the need for a contract, but they can do that without Town Meeting approval.
- Support for previous comments was expressed and it was felt these are HR issues that are being addressed and that it is premature to do this before the study has been completed.
- A comment was made that when the Library Trustees first presented, it was in the context of protecting the library director from political pressures but there was no mention of that tonight.

- Support was expressed for this motion was expressed and concern about the continued discussions with boards about losing staff due to inadequate compensation. It was felt that the study results won't be available until the spring. It was felt that the Trustees would not increase the salary above everyone else and that they would try to maintain it within a level the position currently is in.
- A comment was made that by drawing up a contract, the trustees can set a competitive wage for the director, and they have a limited budget. Increases will be in line with town guidelines going forward so it is the first year that needs to be competitive, and they know what other library directors earn.
- Support was expressed as it was felt that the library trustees would make appropriate decisions about the contract as they indicated in their presentation.
- Support was expressed but there was concern that other boards would want to do this.
- It was felt that the library was best positioned to complete a competitive analysis of salaries for the position rather than the HR department. An additional comment was made that budget increases are set each year, and the department needs to propose a budget within those guidelines. It was felt that the library has been straightforward and transparent.
- Clarification was provided that the library trustees are looking for a longer contract for the current director but there is a possibility that for future directors, they might look at a one-year contract because that allows them to see if the director will work out.
- The library board is an independently elected board and they do not report to the Select Board. The Select Board negotiated the other six (6) contracts and did not need to go through HR. HR has not been involved in these types of contracts. Initially when the library trustees presented to HR and to Advisory, they thought they needed approval for a contract, but they can set their own contract with the library director without Town Meeting approval. The protection of the library director was the priority but now they want the ability to set the director's salary.
- A comment was made that at the HR meeting the data on comparable salaries was not available.
- A comment was made that there was a 44% turnover of library directors between 2021 and 2022. It was felt that having a good contract and a good salary was important for retention.
- Respect and appreciation for the library was expressed but setting the salary outside the classification system was a concern. It was further commented that the current director's salary is above the midpoint and it's a good salary. Concern was expressed about the impact of this on other departments. It was noted that Advisory is not the governing body to make any decision up or down on salary, so it feels odd to put the burden on Advisory to make recommendations on a salary within a budget. Concern about the timing was also expressed as the study and survey have not been completed.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - no

Al Ferrer - yes

Christina Dougherty - yes

Rani Elwy - yes

David Prock – yes

Tamara Sielecki - no

Gail Sullivan -no

Hanna Bonin - yes

Phil Jameson - yes

Jay Prosnitz - no

Lucienne Ronco - yes

Donna Stoddard - yes

Susan Clapham – no

Approved October 19, 2023

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 10, 8 to 5.

Article 14

Lucienne Ronco made, and Donna Stoddard seconded a motion to un-table the vote on Article 14.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

The motion on Article 14 was un-tabled, 13 to 0.

Discussion

- Support for ADUs and the efforts to create diverse housing was expressed. Concern was expressed that there was potential for things to go wrong but that there are good things that could happen. Optimism was expressed even though the evidence is lacking. Trust in the enforcement provision was expressed so that people do not take advantage of the loophole. It was expected that the Planning Board would monitor this and adjust if necessary. Support for the amendment, with concerns, was expressed.
- Support for the amendment was expressed and the work of Building A Better Wellesley was cited. It was felt that the expense and time involved in a LHR is not in the spirit of the ADU bylaw. It was felt that the Planning Department will monitor this.
- Several members expressed support for the amendment and agreement with the previous comments.
- A comment was made that it seems that the requirements for an ADU with a separate entrance and firewalls and the size of the ADU will control the loophole.
- A comment was made that Planning is trying to be proactive and thinking ahead of ways to further enable the creation of ADUs.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – yes
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin - yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes

Approved October 19, 2023

Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 14, 13 to 0.

Administrative/Liaison Updates/Minutes

Minutes Approval

Christina Dougherty made, and Hanna Bonin seconded a motion to approve the October 4, 2023, minutes.

Roll Call Vote

Wendy Paul - yes
Al Ferrer - yes
Christina Dougherty - yes
Rani Elwy - yes
David Prock – abstain
Tamara Sielecki - yes
Gail Sullivan -yes
Hanna Bonin – yes
Phil Jameson - yes
Jay Prosnitz - yes
Lucienne Ronco - yes
Donna Stoddard - yes
Susan Clapham – yes

October 4, 2023, minutes were approved, 12 to 0, with one abstention.

Al Ferrer made, and Christina Dougherty seconded a motion to adjourn.
A roll call vote was taken, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Meeting Materials [October 11, 2023, meeting materials](#)

- Draft 10/4/23 minutes
- Article 2 Unions – WPD and Fire