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Executive Summary

Littleton, Massachusetts’ Board of Selectmen (BOS) established the Town Government Study Committee (TGSC) in April 2006 for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the Town’s organizational structure and management systems and to report to the Selectmen with recommendations for further study and/or change. Specifically the TGSC was charged by the BOS to:

- Study the town’s organizational structure;
- Review the efficacy of the current structure;
- Evaluate the duties & functions of individuals, boards and committees;
- Examine models of government in comparable area towns;
- Study management systems/major function areas: financial, budgeting, personnel & procurement, public safety, public works, health, planning; and
- Prepare a final report of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The BOS selected eight (8) former elected and/or appointed town officials to participate on the TGSC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Initials*</th>
<th>Former Board/Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Knox, TGSC Chair**</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>BOS, current ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Gibson</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Knupp</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>BOS, Finance Committee, ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Long</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Masson</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Board of Assessors, Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Duggan McNamara</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td>BOS, Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Stewart</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Swift</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Board of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: initials used to denote interview assignments
** Stepped down as Chair in May 2007 following election to Board of Selectmen; replaced by Harry Swift

During the course of its work from April 2006 through June 2007, the committee conducted and completed the following:

- 26 Department Interviews
- 10 Town Board Interviews
- Six (6) Meetings with Officials of Other Towns
- More than 40 posted committee meetings
- Citizen Questionnaires
- Two (2) Public Forums
- Two (2) Meetings with the Department Of Revenue - Division of Local Services
- Numerous telephone conferences with the Massachusetts Municipal Association
- Presentation at Special Town Meeting (fall 2006)
• Numerous Status Update Meetings with BOS
• Presentation At Town Meeting (May 2007)

The Committee drew the following primary conclusions from the data collected during the course of their study:

• Sub-optimal town leadership has resulted in inefficient internal operations, and the erosion of public trust and confidence in Town Government;
• Strong, committed and loyal town employees and volunteers have helped “make up” for this situation;
• Leadership issues appear to stem from systemic and/or process-related inefficiencies;
• Town needs to implement changes to ensure effective management systems and processes irrespective of individuals in the roles; and
• Fewer interested candidates for, and increasing complexities associated with, the Tax Collector and Treasurer positions have resulted in unopposed elections for these positions for more than a decade.

In order to alleviate the issues it observed during its 14 month study, the Committee made the recommendations presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>STATUS (June 7, 2007)</th>
<th>Next Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Treasurer and Tax Collector positions from elected to appointed.</td>
<td>Accepted by Town Meeting on May 5, 2005 and Town Election vote on May 12, 2007.</td>
<td>Appoint positions when incumbents’ terms are up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new Department of Finance and Budget with Associated Manager</td>
<td>Accepted by Town Meeting on May 5, 2005 and Town Election vote on May 12, 2007.</td>
<td>Final vote required at Special Town Meeting on June 11, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish greater clarity in responsibilities in and assign more authority</td>
<td>Accepted by Town Meeting on May 5, 2005.</td>
<td>Selectman select, hire, and empower new TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Town Administrator (TA) position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require leadership training for senior elected/appointed officials</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Town Wide IT Coordinator</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Facilities Manager</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish policies to ensure consistent communications</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>STATUS (June 7, 2007)</td>
<td>Next Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all boards and committees dealing with property and permits utilize same tracking software</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve permitting system (checklist; coordinator)</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint HR Coordinator</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Town Hall lay out</td>
<td>Final plan being developed</td>
<td>Plan to be approved and executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Web Site</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade communications systems (phone, voice mail) town wide</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider making fire/police chief roles consistent (strong/weak)</td>
<td>Selectman placed Strong police chief article at Town Meeting Warrant; passed May 12, 2007.</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a guide for incoming board and committee members and a guide for new employees</td>
<td>Recommended by TGSC</td>
<td>Selectman discussion and action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

Littleton, Massachusetts’ Board of Selectmen (BOS) established the Town Government Study Committee (TGSC) in April 2006 for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the Town’s organizational structure and management systems and to report to the Selectmen with recommendations for further study and/or change. Specifically the TGSC was charged by the BOS to:

- Study the town’s organizational structure;
- Review the efficacy of the current structure;
- Evaluate the duties & functions of individuals, boards and committees;
- Examine models of government in comparable area towns;
- Study management systems/major function areas: financial, budgeting, personnel & procurement, public safety, public works, health, planning; and
- Prepare a final report of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The BOS selected eight (8) former elected and/or appointed town officials to participate on the TGSC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Initials*</th>
<th>Former Board/Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Knox, TGSC Chair</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>BOS, current ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Gibson</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Knupp</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>BOS, Finance Committee, ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Long</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Masson</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Board of Assessors, Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Duggan McNamara</td>
<td>KM</td>
<td>BOS, Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Stewart</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Swift</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Board of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: initials used to denote interview assignments

The TGSC met first on April 18, 2006 and, given the sensitive nature of the charge, agreed that the group needed clearly established boundaries for member conduct and group management. Accordingly, the committee adopted the following guidelines for individual and group conduct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TGSC Ground rules for Conduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open and Honest Communications (no limits so long as respectful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Others’ Opinions (disagree maturely and respectfully)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Acceptance of Different Views: No Right or Wrong (avoid early judgments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Personal Agendas or Preconceived Outcomes (maintain open-mindedness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect as much Information As Feasible (devote as much personal time as possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let the Data Guide the Conclusions and Recommendations (use the scientific method to the extent possible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Process
The committee determined early on that its recommended actions would most likely come from two primary sources:

- Problem areas for which solutions would need to be developed; and
- Opportunities for growth and continuous improvement.

The former category would be identified primarily through introspection, that is, the committee’s review and inspection of the Town’s internal processes through interviews, observations, and other means of Littleton-specific data collection. The recommendations associated with these issues would likely have a strong “prescriptive” theme, inasmuch as these would be specific challenges and problems that needed to be met and solved.

Recommendations based on the latter category would come through benchmarking with comparable and nearby towns, whereby the committee thought it likely it would identify applicable and beneficial “best practices” from those towns’ internal procedures. This second source of input might not necessarily be aligned with internal problem areas; on the contrary, some of the recommendations generated from this source would follow the spirit of continuous improvement, whereby any organization should seek to identify ways in which it can function better, even if the current state is not specifically deemed “problematic”.

With the recognition that the outcome would likely include recommendations for change in areas where there was not necessarily an observable problem that needed to be solved, the committee established the following general approach to completing our charge:

- Determine data needed
- Collect data
- Analyze data
- Identify areas for improvement, including requirements by which to test potential solutions
- Complete further data collection and analysis as necessary to develop findings, conclusions, recommendations
- Develop preliminary findings; present to BOS, Town Meeting, open public forum
- Expand findings into conclusions
- Prepare and present recommendations and implementation plan to BOS
- Present proposed recommendations and implementation plan to public forum(s)
- Prepare and make presentation to Town Meeting of any warrant articles that result from the committee’s recommendations
3.0 Data Collection

The TGSC prepared a nine (9) question interview questionnaire for the purpose of collecting “data” from the interviewing process. The questions were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What works well in your department? […]such as processes, systems, interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other departments/boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could be improved in your department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the day-to-day interaction of your department with other departments that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is part of the job? Could you compare that with how it works in other towns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would improve the interactions of your department with other departments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your department [or board] have specific operating procedures that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandated by Town Bylaws or State Statutes? If so, do they help or hinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency? … What would you change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if anything has [helped or] hindered your ability to meet changes in local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demographics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In planning for the delivery of services is there any one thing that could be done to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help you plan better for the changes you face over the next year, five years and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What organizational changes, if any, would benefit or be a hindrance to your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes, if any, would you like to make to town government?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the committee conducted interviews of departmental personnel, Littleton boards/committees, representatives from neighboring towns, and state agencies, using the interview questionnaire:

- 26 Department Interviews (listed in Appendix A)
- Eight (8) Town Board Interviews (listed in Appendix B)
- Six (6) Officials of Other Towns (listed in Appendix C)
- Department Of Revenue - Division of Local Services (listed in Appendix C)
- Massachusetts Municipal Association (listed in Appendix C)

In addition, the TGSC prepared a citizen’s questionnaire that was made available during September 2007 (at the primary election, Donelan’s market, Town Clerk’s office, and on-line). The committee received a statistically insignificant response; however, the questionnaire responses received were reviewed and considered during the data analysis phase. In addition, the committee held a public forum to present the preliminary findings and to collect additional public input. Seven (7) individuals attended.

Through February 10, 2007, the committee has conducted 31 scheduled (posted) meetings in addition to the interviews noted above. Overall, the TGSC has spent more
than an estimated ~600 person-hours in meetings or interviews (not including non-meeting review, research or reading time) since the committee was formed in April 2006. The responses to these questions were collected and discussed during the TGSC’s 26 posted meetings held during 2006 and the five (5) posted meetings held during 2007 (through February 10, 2007).

In order to keep the Board of Selectmen apprised of progress, the committee attended multiple BOS meetings to provide interim status updates. In addition, the BOS was invited to attend two specific committee meetings to provide input to the committee.

As the committee’s efforts focused on completion in conjunction with the Board of Selectmen’s planning the Warrant for the 2007 annual Town Meeting, several categories of recommendations emerged:

- Recommendations that would require by-law change (and thus articles on the Town Meeting Warrant);
- Recommendations that could be implemented through simple majority decision; and
- Recommendations for change that would require further evaluation to determine the specific plan elements, schedule for implementation, and potential budget implications.

These recommendations are presented in Section 6.0, Recommendations, following Section 4.0, Data Analysis and Findings, and Section 5.0 Conclusion Summary.
4.0 Data Analysis and Findings

In order to better analyze these data, the responses were entered into a spreadsheet. Once entered, the committee reviewed the data line by line and determined there were four major issue themes that came to light. These themes include: Communications, Systems, Staffing and Leadership. In addition, some answers did not fit any of the themes and were classified into a miscellaneous group. The spreadsheet is presented as Appendix F to the report. Following the sorting of statements from the interviews, according to the aforementioned categories, the following numbers of statements were extracted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statements Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the data were categorized by theme, they were then sorted by question to give the committee some sense of importance of each theme. As shown above, the number of statements was generally about the same in terms of response except for leadership which made up nearly a third of all statements. In order to prioritize the issues to allow us to make conclusions and provide recommended actions, we did a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) Analysis. Each response was reviewed to determine if the statement was a positive statement (Strength) or a negative statement (Weakness). The statements were then reviewed to determine if the statements could be used as an opportunity to improve government or if the statement posed a threat to the improvement of government.

Throughout and following the process of data collection, the TGSC reviewed the data, discussed the methods of and results of data analysis, and debated the appropriate steps or recommendations that would best mitigate the issues identified for improvement. In addition, as stated previously, the committee also reviewed and discussed the best practices that it had identified during meetings/interviews with employees/officials from comparable and nearby towns.
4.1 Communications
Communication is one of the most critical elements for any organization, and typically is
the defining factor between organizations that function smoothly and those which
struggle to operate at maximum efficiency. Therefore, as would be expected, there were
many comments received from employees, town boards, and other towns that referenced
communications. The data suggest both positive and negative… there is good
communication and at the same time areas in which communication can be improved.

The interview questionnaire used during the interviews of Littleton employees and
elected officials contained two questions directly related to communication:

- What is the day to day interaction of your departments with other
departments that is part of the job? …. and… Could you compare that with
how it works in other towns?
- What would improve the interactions of your department with other
departments?

4.1.1 Intradepartmental Communication
There were few responses concerning intradepartmental communication. Most of the
departments are so small that this type of communication was not an issue, and in the
larger departments, such as the schools, they felt communication worked well.

However, one issue raised concerning communication within a department is the
relationship between the staff of a board and the elected members. This may need to be
addressed by the individual members of each board. However, it is imperative that
members of an elected board be responsive to the staff working for that board. Not only
does a break in communication at this point in the chain slow down the work for that one
board, but it could easily affect the work of many other boards waiting for information or
decisions to be made.

4.1.2 Interdepartmental Communication
The majority of responses had to do with interdepartmental communication: lack of
regular interdepartmental meetings, such as regular department head meetings.
The cause of this alleged absence is something addressed in the leadership narrative,
although weekly or biweekly meetings of department heads was the most often suggested
area for improvement.

Town departments communicate now “for the good of the town”. One understated
concern was a situation where one personality in a department decided he/she did not
want to work with and communicate with a personality in another department. There is
nothing currently in the town structure insuring cooperation. Again, this is something
that could be addressed in the leadership narrative, but it should be noted that in a lateral
structure it is sometimes difficult to force cooperation if the groups involved are strongly
against it.
Other interdepartmental concerns could be addressed through technological improvements. Reporting issues between departments was often blamed on outdated software. Departments and boards depend on certain information in a timely manner and often it seems decisions are put off because they are waiting for information from other boards.

There were positives concerning interdepartmental communication and Littleton’s small size. Responses such as, “knowing faces makes it easier” and “I love the fact I can walk across the hall and it’s not a big bureaucracy” show that Littleton is still small enough where almost all of the town employees and staff know each other. This clearly is an advantage in communication.

4.1.3 Communications SWOT Analysis Summary of Threats:

- Interactions depend on personalities, however, because there is no central authority.
- Communication could be improved throughout all departments. There seems to be resistance to this because of independent departments protecting their territory.
- Could do a better job of public relations.
- Better communication with departments we provide services.
- Not that much interaction with the Highway, L & W.
- Dept and others are more reactive; should do more planning.
- Weekly or biweekly finance team meetings. Lack of this kind of collaboration causes mis-communications.
- Needs to be constant and better communication between departments regarding personnel and cash flow.
- Interactions with staff from other departments.
- Town Administrator’s office – holiday closing inconsistencies, communication with Finance Committee and Board of Selectmen, facility cleaning or lack thereof, scheduling multi-purpose Room for library events, and snow removal.
- Communication – the library frequently is the last to hear about various meetings.
- Monthly meetings of all those who are helping conduct business of the town - did this for a while some years ago, and lots of good things resulted. Meetings need to be regularly scheduled so that people can plan their schedules accordingly.
- Communication from accountant and/or treasurer, before transfers are made.
- Having a clear town government organization chart, showing staff reporting to the Boards. Boards going to the Finance Committee for funding approval with Town Meeting approving the budget would enable townspeople to see how the elected Boards relate to one another.
- A clearly defined process for incoming employees where accounts are established and policies are provided.
• Communication could be improved greatly. Boards/Management (Selectmen) in particular need to not rely on Administrator to provide information. He simply isn’t effective.
• Other departments also need to communicate to me when staff is leaving so that measures may be taken to safeguard data and resources
• Department works well with other departments except Treasury where there is no accountability of available funds

4.1.4 Communications SWOT Analysis Summary of Opportunities for Improving Process:
• Quarterly finance team meetings but not everyone attends.
• People with kids coming into town have high expectations for services and rights.
• There had been regular interdepartmental meetings facilitated by the Treasurer, although anyone would call a meeting if there was a need.
• Better communication between departments.
• Would like to see minutes and summaries of board (and other) meetings.
• Recommended a wider meeting of department heads and boards two or three times a year.
• More structured conversation such as regularly scheduled meetings BOS, FinCom, School Committee, Finance Team.
• Would like to see a Town newsletter (internal news).
• More frequent staff meetings.
• Weekly meetings with the department heads that reported to the selectmen, in an effort to improve communication.
• Communication would be #1, followed by leadership, and proper management.

There is significant room for improvement of communications within Littleton’s government. Some of that can come from a position of leadership holding department heads accountable for meeting regularly and keeping each other informed. Such staff leadership could also serve as a resource for direction when staff is not receiving adequate direction from their own boards. Other improvements can come from technological upgrades. Town operations are vulnerable to inefficiencies or worse, by just relying on the good will of departments to work together. Despite these concerns, this issue seems like a very realistic one to solve.

Discussions with other towns underscored the importance of regular communication. The TGSC believes that regular communication is a cultural element that requires leadership and cultivation. The development of a social operating system (of which communication is one part) will take time, and will be built on the foundation of a regularly scheduled set of meetings that always take place, and are used effectively for two way communication.
4.2 Systems
In conducting interviews with department heads, boards and officials from other towns, one reoccurring theme was Systems. There is much overlap between “Systems” issues and the other themes we uncovered in our review. For the purpose of this report, we have defined systems to mean both day-to-day work processes and actual hardware and software systems in use by the town. We also address a sub-set of hardware systems regarding the town’s web site. All three are discussed below.

4.2.1 Hardware and Software Systems
Half of the people interviewed voiced opinions, both good and bad, about the systems infrastructure used by the town. All agreed that there is a tremendous amount of paper generated by the town due to the reporting requirements of the State. The consensus was that the amount of paper could be reduced if there were coordinated systems in place that could alleviate redundant information. The wide area network has helped make the work processes more efficient.

The town currently uses “Admins” software as the backbone of the data information system. It is old, difficult to use and does not provide all the reports needs to operate efficiently. It was described as not user friendly and tedious as far as data input is concerned. Constant changes and upgrades are problematic and have kept some departments from doing their tasks efficiently. The accounting module is in need of updating and is very slow in processing data needed by every department to track budgets and report to their boards and various state agencies.

The State requires the Town to retain permanent records in paper copy which is very bulky and inefficient from an achieving standpoint. More data accessible on line would be more efficient and cut down inquiry response time between departments and between the town and the citizens. One suggestion, with some merit, would be to archive every parcel of land with all plans, documents, variances, special permits, assessments, etc. in one data base for more efficient access to information by every department. Digitized archives of information from every department in one place with easy access would be helpful.

4.2.2 Web Site, Phone System and E-mail System
The development of the web site over the last few years has helped meet the needs of the public to get information. There does not appear to be any central control or assignment of responsibility for either content or updating information on the site. The residents expect the town to have a web site and it needs better support than is currently available. This support would help in keeping data current on the site.

The town telecommunication system is very out-dated. There is no voice mail capability in the town offices except for individual answering machines in each department. Inter-office phone system capacity would facilitate better communication between offices and with the general public. There is no mechanism to transfer calls between offices. Callers must hang up and dial again if they want to speak to another department.
The need for a town enterprise wide e-mail system along with expanded and more reliable internet capability would enhance communication and productivity across all town offices. The town does not even have a town-wide mailing list in place.

4.2.3 Day-To-Day Work Processes
The committee did a fair amount of probing into the day-to-day work processes in each department to try to determine if efficiencies could be gained by modifying existing work processes. Each department works as a totally independent entity, setting its own hours, policies and procedures.

Some departments have checklists and written procedures which enable them to prioritize work. Most have set policies and structured routines that adhere to State reporting requirements and deadlines.

Related to the lack of a central database noted in item 1 above, there is a need for a more streamlined process for reviewing and issuing permits. There are independent checklists in each regulatory board that could be streamlined and more user friendly to the permit seekers.

It is the committee’s view and based on the data collected, that there is a lack of collaboration and strategic planning between boards and between boards and their direct reports. This is problematic when it comes to setting individual, department, and town-wide goals and expectations. The town and its employees would be better served if there were ways to infuse methods and skills across departments through professional development programs.

The TGSC identified during interviews with other towns that many town house layouts had been specifically developed with efficiency, cross-training, and better public service in mind. Upon further review of the layout of Littleton’s town house, coupled with further discussions with employees, the committee found that the layout of Littleton’s office space was inefficient, and could benefit significantly from re-alignment of like functions (e.g. permitting, finance) in the same general area.

4.2.4 Facilities
During the committee’s interview with the Finance Committee, Interim School Superintendent, and other towns the issue of Facilities Management was discussed. The FinCom felt very strongly that the Town would benefit directly and substantially from the creation of a Facilities Manager position, charged with managing building maintenance and custodial services, as well as capital projects. They noted that without one person charged with the responsibility for day-to-day facility management, lapses in maintenance would likely continue. Qualitatively, the FinCom and the TGSC felt that whatever directs costs were incurred by creating the position would be more than offset in direct and indirect savings generated by having “someone on watch”. The need for and benefits associated with the creation of a facilities manager position were echoed by several of the other towns interviewed.
4.2.5 Systems SWOT Analysis Summary of Threats:
- Too much paper and not enough automation.
- “Admins” software is out of date and ineffective in delivering needed data and reports.
- Frequent vendor software changes are problematic.
- Inconsistent system for numbering streets (odd numbers on even number sides of the street), can pose a public safety issue.
- Town is technically challenged when it comes to hardware and software systems.
- There needs to be a more streamlined and consistent permitting system. Need a digitized archive of data from all department in one place.
- Each department works independently so operating policies differ between departments.
- Selectmen need better procedure for signing weekly warrant. Accountant should not have to chase them down every week.
- No uniform hours of operation across departments. No system in place for coverage.
- Telephone system is grossly out of date and inefficient for employees and citizens.
- Physical layout of like service departments is not efficient for either function or use by citizens.

4.2.6 Systems SWOT Analysis Summary of Opportunities for Improving Process:
- Payroll function works well.
- Continue to work on Web site. Was received well when implemented but needs update and maintenance. Currently more than 122,000 hits to the site (since inception), averaging 20,000 per year.
- Assessing function works well with current software.
- Checklist for contractors in building department helps with permit process. Contractors have stated Littleton works better than most towns.
- Accounting has set policies and procedures that work well.
- Help Desk log maintained by IT department to assist in troubleshooting.
- Computer use policy in place.
4.3 Staffing

General overview of Littleton staffing: Most local government departments in Littleton are very small, with the exception of the School Department, followed by Police/Dispatch, Fire, Highway, and Assessors.

The following are the government offices of Littleton. Each is staffed by one or two permanent employees. Some are elected; others appointed. Some are full time; others part time. These offices may have seasonal help and many use the services of volunteers.

- Collector - 1 (Note: Collector and Clerk are each part time and each supports the other position part time as well.)
- Clerk – 1
- Town Administrator (Administrator and Assistant)
- Accountant (Accountant and Assistant)
- Treasurer (Treasurer and Assistant)
- Building Dept (Building Commissioner and Assistant; wiring, plumbing inspectors)
- Veterans’ Services – 1
- Park & Recreation – 2
- Cemetery – 2
- BOH – 1 Assistant (Professional Health Services provided by regional board)
- Conservation Com – 1
- Planning – 1
- ZBA – 1 PT

General observation: staffing is thin in many places many people wearing multiple hats. Backup is insufficient or non-existent in some cases. Jobs have evolved in ways that may no longer make sense. There is a Growing need for professional development of municipal employees. This is especially true for financial positions and raises the question of elected versus appointed positions.

As local demographics change from a rural community to bed room community, there has been a significant growth in expectations of citizens for more services and quicker response time from local government.

Growth of population, although slower than in neighboring towns, continues. Some departments may be able to have a slower rate of growth compared to population if helped by better computer systems. Others should be expected to grow proportionately to population. For example, schools and highways tend to grow in direct proportion to additional students and new roads.

Money for additional staffing and additional hours for existing staff is very tight. Reduction in state aid over recent years has exacerbated problems. Upgraded systems might help but are also under funded.
There is terrific cooperation among Townhouse staff and their dedication to the job and to the town is exemplary. Performance is excellent and self motivated, in spite of lack of “Leadership” from Boards.

4.3.1 Staffing SWOT Analysis Summary of Threats:

- Townhouse staff is “very thin”. There is no redundancy or backup of jobs. “Knowledge is one deep”.
- Personnel responsibilities don’t necessarily belong in treasurer’s office. Placed there by default.
- Increase in population has impacted workloads in all departments. Expectations of the public have increased.
- Advantages and disadvantages of filling positions via appointment versus election. If elected, the incumbent must be a resident which could be a hindrance in limiting the pool to only residents. Having only a pool of Littleton residents to choose from hinders your ability to find the right people for the job. Elected staff positions may not be the best structure. It makes succession planning very difficult.
- Coverage! There is no backup in many of the departments for sick, personal and vacation time.
- Staff is very thin. There is no redundancy. “We are heavily leveraged with the possibility of failure.”
- Wearing so many hats and having so many more chances for things to go wrong makes his job more difficult.
- Be more proactive in retaining current employees. There are more dollars lost in efficiencies in training new people than paying to keep the current staff.
- Personnel could be a little deeper so that they don’t “have a crisis” when someone leaves would be the biggest change…having some redundancy.
- Due to confidentiality issues, sharing of support staff would be difficult.
- Assistant’s hours have been cut in the face of more demands from citizens for information which still needs to be pulled by hand.
- We have virtually no custodial or maintenance service. Contract cleaners are ineffective. Senior Property Tax volunteers have done maintenance in the last year or so. Maintenance and / or repairs that are postponed due to short-term budget constraints, only makes the problem more critical down the road.
- We also need professional, properly paid staff in all departments. Sometimes it’s like this is a shelter workshop when we rely so heavily on volunteers (not that I don’t appreciate them, but it takes time to train, supervise, hand hold the volunteers).
- A lot of people come to town and expect services that mirror a suburb of Boston.
- Job is more reactionary with no actual planning. More resources would help.

4.3.2 Staffing SWOT Analysis Summary of Opportunities for Improving Process:

- We are fortunate: people all know the process.
- Our size seems to be right on the edge of needing a dedicated HR person.
- Department’s motto is “simple & sustainable”.

Final Revision
• Town has good people, who do what’s right for the town, in spite of (flawed) structure.
• The interactions with other departments worked well. Problems were usually due to a lack of resources in other departments.
• Good relationships with departments in town. Good treasurer is important for managing cash flow.
• Highway Department – Great! Plowing, mowing and special projects are done willingly and efficiently.
• Competent, creative and trained staff.
• The office structure works well. There is a job share system where 1 position is shared by 3 people.

The committee found that the Town Clerk, Tax Collector, and Treasurer positions had not been contested in 11 years. Coupled with the growing complexities of the positions, the committee observed that other towns appointed some or all of those positions. The committee observed that by changing some/all of these positions to appointed, the following would be accomplished:

• Greater pool of candidates (no longer restricted to Littleton residents);
• Direct supervision of these positions by others in government, such that poor performance could be managed on a timelier basis than elected positions; and
• Direct accountability to a supervisor.

This issue has generated one conclusion, and is discussed in more detail in Section 5.0 Conclusion Summary, and 6.0 Recommendations.

The committee identified a common theme in the interviews relative to staffing levels and efficiency. On review of the data, the committee found that improving the layout of offices in the town house (as discussed in section 4.2 Systems) would likely have the ancillary benefit of improved awareness in employees regarding basic requirements/processes associated nearby and/or related departments.

In discussions with other towns, and based on personal experience, the committee found that fully utilizing the Town Planner’s role to include permit coordination across all town-issued permits would provide significant benefit to public service. Many other towns have checklists of permits required and have a “first point of contact” identified on staff who would provide “treetop level” guidance regarding the permitting process (what is required, who to see, in which order to see each department, etc.).

Finally, the committee observed from employee interviews, as well as from actions at recent Town Meetings, a high frustration level regarding the human resources function. As the committee “peeled back the layers of the onion”, it found that much of the confusion could be mitigated by a stronger HR role (not necessarily full time) in conjunction with the recent re-birth of the Personnel Committee.
4.4 Leadership
This narrative summarizes the “Leadership” theme category. A total of 108 responses comprise this category representing nearly a third of the responses to our interviews. We believe leadership issues are the single biggest threat to change and efficiency that we found in the entire review process.

In order to aid in the analysis, the responses were further divided into the following sub-categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-CATEGORY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority, Support, lack of support.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, quality of work, improvement.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance, decision making.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL:**                                | **108** | 100 %

More centralized authority like a Town Manager or more authority for a Town Administrator would seem to be the general theme. A lot of the issues seem to be in the area of needing and getting decisions, coordination, and a catalyst to working together and improving inter-department relations. Further analysis of the sub-categories is presented below.

4.4.1 Authority, Support, Lack of Support
This sub-category of responses relate to need and/or response of authority from the Board of Selectman (BOS) or supervisors. The following themes are evident:

- The BOS need to show more leadership or be stronger, make decisions and be more involved, or to show more respect to employees.
- BOS and Departments need more support from FinCom.
- The BOS need to be more involved, provide more time for department heads and put in more time than the Monday meetings.

Additional comments are shown in the Leadership SWOT Analysis below.

4.4.2 Efficiency, Quality of Work, Improvement
This sub-category of responses relate to the efficiency of Littleton’s government. Included are the quality of work and improvements desired.

- Budget issues:
  - Sell off land not needed.
  - Better facilities maintenance.
  - Better fund state mandated requirements.
  - Better fund schools.
• Rules and negative comments that may be hindering efficiency:
  ▪ Policies not adhered to by dept. supposed to enforce them.
  ▪ Vendor: Town most dysfunctional town the vendor has dealt with.
  ▪ IT promises not fulfilled.
  ▪ Policies more important than solutions.

4.4.3 Guidance & Decision Making
This sub-category of responses relate to the guidance provided to town employees including decisions that need to be made.

• Lack of response or decisions not made.
• Good cooperation between departments but no central authority to make it happen.
• No defined hierarchy, isn’t someone who makes decisions.
• BOS engaged in day to day activities, should empower Administrator.
• Need clear delineation as to who owns the problem.
• Strong manager at the top like Finance Director and/or Town Administrator.
• No one who looks out for the whole business interests of town offices.
• FinCom appears to be setting policy vs. BOS.
• Departments assume more responsibility that could be centralized in a finance department. Charter would define.
• Difficult to enforce policy. Need clear written policies.
• Worry about political fallout.
• Role of elected boards should be crystal clear.
• Present Town Administrator role lends itself to be a hands tied position in dealing with employees.

4.4.4 Planning
This sub-category of responses relate to planning. There is a lack of planning because the BOS is reactive vs. proactive and have no town mission statement or strategic plan. BOS needs to be more proactive with planning and looking at the big picture with a more global perspective. Some planning ideas to consider include:

• Active planning cosponsored by more than one department.
• Continuously examine processes.
• Invest in infrastructure maintenance other than schools.
• Planning for economic development needed.
• Need financial plan.
• Recognize when plans no longer work.
4.4.5 Structure
This sub-category of responses relates to the leadership structure of the town. BOS and FinCom have tried to centralize without success causing more personnel issues. There is a need for strong financial team to address capital projects and long term financial planning. All financial planning currently done by volunteers. Some see a downside to one person making decisions but stronger Town Administrator can be productive & efficient, but negative if not the right person. Changing some positions from elected to appointed positions would insure qualified personnel v. someone just being elected to be elected. Littleton continues to be a “starter town” for employees. We observed that a better established personnel function is needed to make sure all employees are treated fairly and equally. Divisiveness due to inequities in pay is a threat to performance. There needs to be more respect for employee & their job functions.

Over the past several years the school department has been treated as an independent entity rather than as another department. Integration of the school department into the overall structure is critical. Too much “we v. they” going on.

4.4.6 Working Together
This sub-category of responses relates to how people and departments work together. Starting at the top with the BOS, there must be a better team approach to solving problems and moving the Town forward. Personal interaction is the key to a more efficient BOS. The constant bickering and unprofessional behavior by the board was brought to our attention in most interviews as being the one thing that prevents the town from solving problems and moving forward in a positive direction. There is no sense of cohesiveness outside the town offices. Police, Fire, and L&W do what they want, causing a lot of animosity. Relationships with non-union employees needs direct attention by the BOS.

4.4.7 Leadership SWOT Analysis Summary of Threats:
- Town lacks written personnel policies.
- Need to make Littleton a place where people want to stay. Avoid being the “Starter Town”.
- BOS needs to be more unified and show more leadership.
- Some former accountants appeared to be leaving for better compensation, but others, including the immediate past accountant, seemed to be more frustrated with the lack of support from the Selectmen.
- Issues “died on the vine” by lack of response or action.
- Guidance on administrative affairs is often not given. Often information is provided to board members in weekly/bi-weekly packages which requires action, but no action is taken. Board won't make a decision.
- Board of Selectmen is reactive, not proactive.
- One vendor indicates Littleton is the most dysfunctional town he has dealt with.
• There is good cooperation between the departments, although there is no central authority to make this happen. The process is totally dependent on personalities and on people getting along and self-aligning.

• With budget authority resting in the Finance Committee, that committee may actually be setting the policy rather than the Selectmen, who should be the policy makers.

• Handle finances holistically, not school side/town side. Had 6 budgets rounds last year.

• No one seems to be looking at the big picture. It seems like a “we don’t want to know” philosophy.

• Selectmen need to spend more time with the department on goals and priorities

• Would like to see more time from the BOS off camera.

• There is not a good culture in town government right now… but also a lot of anger.

• Who’s accountable; how do we measure that; how do we know we are getting the best out of departments… how do they know? This is more about customer service than financial management or measurements.

• Boards need to work more closely.

• Politics appear far more important than solutions to problems.

• We don’t behave like an entity – there’s no sense of cohesiveness outside the four walls of the town offices. Police, fire and L&W do what ever they want.

• Decisions aren’t made in a timely fashion and I frankly think service has suffered.

• The BOS must learn to treat the employees here with respect.

• The town administrator position lends itself to be a hands tied position in dealing with employees. It would be easier to have someone in a leadership position when issues arise.

• Over the past ~10 years the Selectman and Finance Committee have attempted to centralize on their own without success causing more personnel issues.

4.4.2 Leadership SWOT Analysis Summary of Opportunities for Improving Process (there appear to be more Leadership threats than opportunities to build upon):

• Other towns have issues with turf and funding which except for the divisions with the school department, Littleton does not have.

• Police and Fire work hand-in-hand. Police and Fire do a lot together vs. other towns. Can this teamwork be expanded across the town?

• Things are pretty “damn” good now. Can we build on this statement?

• L&W has a leadership model and management methods that have been pushed down into the organization

• L&W has a strong chain of command. Buck stops at GM’s desk

• Long range planning has been initiated
4.5 Miscellaneous

There are two primary sections that comprise the “Miscellaneous” category: findings that the TGSC developed based on interviews with DOR/DLS and other town’s personnel, and feedback from employee/board interviews.

4.5.1 DOR/DLS and Other Town Interviews

Discussions with DOR/DLS and board members/employees from other towns provided strong guidance to not pursue the charter process (too lengthy, cumbersome, difficult), nor to pursue the Town Manager form of government (there were strong recommendations to not go beyond what would be necessary to solve the town’s problems). The committee discussed these two findings at length, and ultimately agreed that neither charter commission or Town Manager were necessary.

4.5.2 Employee/Board Interview Responses

Not wanting to discount any data, the TGSC captured interview comments that did not clearly fit into the previous Communication, Systems, Staffing, and Leadership themes into “Miscellaneous”. We broke these comments into Strengths and Weaknesses to look for patterns and/or areas for improvement. While the committee did not draw any specific conclusions from these data, we include the comments here for review.

4.5.3 Miscellaneous SWOT Analysis Summary of Strengths:

- All activities are driven by State regulations and local by-laws.
- Over time the expectations of the town will change.
- Many mandated procedures by legislation, litigation, and good practices.
- Yes – local by-laws, some of which are weakly written and restricts enforcement. State requires in addition to building codes enforcement that the building department is responsible for checking the builders and their subcontractors have the proper worker’s comp insurance.
- All functions are mandated.
- Supportive townspeople, Library Friends, make good suggestions that result in improved services for all clients.
- The certification requirements help us provide good service to townspeople and the planning requirement helps to focus our resources on goals.
- Every thing is dictated by Town & State by-laws. This does not hinder efficiency.
- Always aware of where projects stand with other boards and dept.

4.5.4 Miscellaneous SWOT Analysis Summary of Weaknesses:

- Both said most of the duties or required by law. Local by-laws around voting and town meeting also direct their functions.
- Physical structure & safety issues prevent accreditation.
- State bidding laws which don't give you the best quality because of low bid laws.
• Lack of funding for capital improvements for heavier usage.
• No longer a farm community where people did things for themselves. Want to be in the country with city services.
• Can't keep pace with upkeep demand given the usage.
• A “zillion” statutes. Town bylaws can have some impact but not a big one.
• Change Town Meeting to April so that budget is set sooner.
• Planning needs to be fluid to take into account demographic changes and the general economy that effects the town's ability to function efficiently.
• Serving information needs of other town employees – we need to know what they need.
• The only mention of library in the Town Code concerns overdue materials.
• MGL's have no effect on our efficiency.
• I’d like to see town government acting FOR the taxpayer. Even a small thing like having employees park farthest from the Town House door, leaving the nearer spaces for visitors.
• There is a huge need for space & facilities to continue the progress of the Park & Rec. A community center would be the way to go.
• Would like to figure out how fits into job title. Job description does not match.
5.0 Conclusion Summary

Conclusions and Recommendations are inextricably connected. Accordingly, the TGSC presents a summary of the conclusions the committee has made from our data analysis and findings that were in turn collected from all our data sources:

- Employee interviews
- Board/Commission/Committee interviews
- Department Head interviews
- Public forum input
- Public questionnaires
- DOR/DLS interviews
- Similar Town Board and Department Head interviews
- Committee personal observations and experience with town government
- Committee personal work and life experience.

During the process of conducting interviews and collecting data, the committee was impressed by the positive, team-oriented attitude of the employees in the town house. The committee observed in town employees a consistent willingness to bend over backwards to help each other out and to get their work completed, in spite of less than optimal staffing. Nothing in the committee’s conclusions or recommendations should be construed to indicate otherwise. The foregoing commentary notwithstanding, the TGSC has drawn the following conclusions from the analysis of the data collected.

The reader is referred to the tables in the Recommendation section for a more robust discussion of the conclusions in the context of the recommendations they support.

5.1 Communications

C1. Overall communication between staff and the elected officials could definitely be improved.

C2. Communications between boards, departments, town employees and citizens is inadequate.

5.2 Systems

S1. The physical communication (telephone, email, voicemail, and data) system is inadequate to facilitate communication within the town and with the citizens.

S2. The upkeep of the town’s physical plant is not being systematically addressed.

S3. The current physical layout of the building is not conducive to the coordination of like services.

S4. Boards do not submit updates for the town’s web site in a timely manner. There is lack of clarity regarding who is responsible for updating the web site. The web site’s central calendar is not functional.

S5. The Assessors, Building Commissioner, and Board of Health use different software to store information about properties. As a result, there are occasional discrepancies between the number of bedrooms a residence is permitted to have (septic permit), versus the number of bedrooms on which the house is assessed.
5.3 Staffing

ST1. The increasing technical nature and requirements associated with several currently-elected positions (town clerk, tax collector, treasurer) has reduced the qualified, town-resident pool of potential candidates for those positions.

ST2. The town’s staffing is too “thin” in some places. There are not enough hours assigned to some positions. There may also be positions that the town should staff to better protect assets, limit liability, and/or improve services.

ST3. Staffing of related functions are inappropriately located in town offices with little to no opportunities for cross training, mutual backup, or other opportunities that could better optimize scarce resources and better serve the public. Some “savings” here could offset the need to potentially add resources elsewhere.

ST4. The Town Planner’s title is “Town Planner/Permit Coordinator”; however, from the data collected by the committee, it appears that the permit coordination effort does not extend to include all permits.

ST5. The number of employees employed by the town has grown to the point where a Human Resource function is warranted.

5.4 Leadership

L1. The organizational structure of the town is extremely flat, leading to potential and actual bottlenecks and confusion regarding roles and responsibilities.

L2. The authority of the town administrator is limited, and results in varying efficacy, dependent upon the skills, personality, and experience of the individual filling the position.

L3. Some functions, such as the human resources (HR) coordination function should report to the Town Administrator so that the administration of those functions is consistent for all town employees.

L4. The town does not have a centralized finance function (see first Leadership conclusion above).

L5. The town does not have a strategic planning process.

L6. There appears to be confusion regarding the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the Board of Selectmen, the Town Administrator, and the Finance Committee.

5.5 Miscellaneous

M1. Town does not need to form a Charter Commission at this time.

M2. A town manager is not needed at this time.
6.0 Recommendation and Discussion Tables

As stated previously, the TGSC has combined the discussion of conclusions and the recommendations they support into tables that are contained on the following pages. The conclusions and recommendations build on the data, data analysis and findings presented in previous sections of this report.

Notes regarding format of tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Category</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Statement of recommendation based on committee’s data analysis, findings, and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Specific conclusions that support each recommendation (note that some conclusions support more than one recommendation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Discussion</td>
<td>Presentation of the committee’s rationale for the recommendation. This includes alternative solutions/recommendations (if any) that were considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Arguments</td>
<td>Arguments in support of this recommendation not presented in Analysis and Discussion section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Arguments</td>
<td>Dissenting views (either minority committee opinion, or potential opposing opinions) not presented in Analysis and Discussion section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Preliminary summary of steps to be accomplished to put this recommendation “in play”. In some cases, the committee felt that its recommendation need further evaluation and/or planning, in which case the implementation included delegation to another group for that purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Budgetary Implications</td>
<td>This section, as the vagueness of the name implies, is intended to provide broad brush assessment of potential costs associated with each recommendation. In some cases (e.g. new phone system), the committee recognizes there is a cost, but feels the research into alternatives and costs should be completed later, and/or by others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 1:** Make the following currently-elected positions appointed:
- Treasurer
- Tax Collector

**Basis**
- **Conclusion ST-1:** The increasing technical nature and requirements associated with several currently-elected positions (tax collector, treasurer) has reduced the qualified, town-resident pool of potential candidates for those positions.

**Analysis and Discussion**
- These positions have grown incrementally over the past decades to require significantly greater training, background, and experience than in the past.
- During the same period, the demographic shift to many more two-income households has reduced the pool of potential candidates.
- There has been little to no competition for these positions during the past decade.
- When the last treasurer left the position, the Town was lucky that Don Armstrong was available and willing to take the role.
- Positions would be appointed by the Town Administrator, subject to the approval of the Board of Selectmen.
- Following robust internal discussion, and receiving input from others, the TGSC concluded that despite its initial support of placing the Town Clerk position into this recommendation, it was important for that position to remain elected. The Town Clerk is one of the checks and balances, the significance of which is underscored by the committee’s recommendation that more authority be placed in the Town Administrator.
- The alternative recommendation of no change was discounted because the committee felt that the town was living on borrowed time, as evidenced by the difficulties associated with the most recent filling of the treasurer position.

**Supporting Arguments**
- Need to increase the pool of qualified candidates
- Appointment will allow for a better functioning financial team (managers will have direct input on who fills the roles)
- Selectmen retain their approval (or non approval) role in the appointment process

**Opposing Arguments**
- We shouldn’t take the decision out of the hands of the voters
- There are candidates out there, they don’t come forward if the incumbent is doing a good job.

**Implementation Plan**
- Present by-law at Town Meeting
- Vote on ballot at Town Election
- If by-law passes, allow current office holders to serve out their terms (per Commonwealth statute)
- Implement search and selection process when term expires (to include incumbent, if appropriate)

**Potential Budgetary Implications**
- Not applicable
**Recommendation 2a:** Strengthen the Town Administrator (TA) position by implementing the following changes:

- The following positions would report directly to the TA: Highway Department Operations Manager, and Building Commissioner; and, if such positions are established, Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget, IT Director, Facilities Manager, and Human Resource Coordinator.
- The TA should be charged with ensuring that the performance review process is completed according to town policies.
- The TA would have a supervisory role with town house administrative personnel that are appointed by Boards, Committees, or Commissions (e.g. town planner, board of health executive assistant, conservation agent, assessor’s office staff, etc.). This would allow the TA to have input into performance reviews of these staff as well as coordinate facility hours, vacation coverage, etc. This role is intended to augment, not supercede the authority of the hiring board.

**Basis**

- **Conclusion L-1:** The organizational structure of the town is extremely flat, leading to potential and actual bottlenecks and confusion regarding roles and responsibilities.
- **Conclusion L-2:** The authority of the town administrator is limited, and results in varying efficacy, dependent upon the skills, personality, and experience of the individual filling the position.
- **Conclusion L-3:** Some functions, such as the human resources (HR) coordination function should report to the Town Administrator so that the administration of those functions is consistent for all town employees.

**Analysis and Discussion**

- The TGSC was created by the Board of Selectmen (BOS) in 2006 based on their self-acknowledgement that the functional leadership of the BOS and Town Administrator could be improved.
- Further, the TGSC decided early in its existence that its work should not be based on people or personalities; instead, the committee focused on structure, process, and codified requirements (i.e. by-laws) to ensure that town government would function effectively irrespective of the individuals in the elected and appointed leadership positions.
- The TGSC observed in the collection and analysis of data that the current BOS has gradually shifted into an oversight role in response to increasing day-to-day requirements/obligations associated with the operation of town government. The TGSC concludes that this transition is appropriate and healthy, but also concludes that a commensurate delegation of responsibility, authority, and accountability to the TA is a necessity for this transition to be effective.
- The committee understands that certain members of the current BOS desire to occupy the oversight role, yet are not comfortable with delegating commensurate responsibility and authority to the TA.
- The BOS can not have it both ways. Either they must delegate more, or they must re-engage in a much more substantive manner. The TGSC supports the strengthening of the TA role to augment and facilitate the transition of the BOS to focusing primarily on policy and procedure, vs. day-to-day operations.
- One alternative recommendation was to make no change to the TA role; this alternative would require the BOS to re-engage in the day-to-day running of the town, to meet weekly, to be available for office hour visits to the Town House for town business (e.g., signing the warrants). This alternative did not receive support as the committee supports the BOS focus on policy as opposed to day-to-day operations.
- Another alternative was to move to the Town Manager form of government, which was not deemed necessary (see Recommendation No Change-1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 2a: Strengthen the Town Administrator (TA) position by implementing the following changes (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis and Discussion (continued)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The TGSC unanimously agrees that these organizational changes (including roles and responsibilities) be enacted through by-law, voted by the town, to ensure that the roles and process are clear, unambiguous, and subject to change only by Town Meeting vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating a stronger TA position is imperative to the smooth function of town government. Times have changed, and the expectation that the BOS will be available on a day-to-day basis may be unrealistic. Commensurate with that shift in role, the TA must be more empowered to provide the day-to-day leadership that the BOS provided in times past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empowered TA leadership would enhance and improve the following functions: management of town house employees and policies, human resources, ensuring that time performance reviews are completed, economic planning, and strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposing Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is acceptable for there to be BOS/TA combinations that are relatively ineffectual; that’s democracy, and we need to let the voters keep control of that process by voting their opinions. Waiting several years to change the makeup of the BOS is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hire a Town Administrator with the experience and capacity to handle this type of responsibility/authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assuming it passes, work with TA to implement changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Budgetary Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potentially will need to provide an incrementally higher salary to attract TA candidates who possess the requisite experience for the role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At some point in the future as the Town grows, the creation of this position may require hiring additional support to better leverage the TA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 2b: Create a Department of Finance, to be managed by a newly created position of Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget.

- Either the accountant or the treasurer may staff this position (simultaneously with their other role)
- The following positions would report to this newly created role: treasurer or accountant (whichever function is not serving in the Assistant Town Administrator role), tax collector, chief assessor, and treasurer.
- The Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget (AAFB) would have responsibility for coordinating and driving the budgeting process through interfacing with the Town Administrator; Board of Selectmen; the Finance Committee; and the town’s department heads, boards, and committees.

Basis

- Conclusion L-4: The town does not have a centralized finance function.
- Conclusion L-1: The organizational structure of the town is extremely flat, leading to potential and actual bottlenecks and confusion regarding roles and responsibilities.
- Conclusion C-2: Communications between boards, departments, town employees and citizens is inadequate.

Analysis and Discussion

- Creation of a Finance Department, as the second part of Recommendation 2, complements the strengthening of the TA role and represents further development of a more leveraged organizational structure.
- The TGSC observed the need for better coordination of finance-related functions, and concluded that the best mechanism for accomplishing this goal was the creation of a better coordinated department.
- In interviews of other towns’ boards and personnel, the benefits associated with combining the financial functions (in those towns that had made this change), were tangible, and strongly recommended. Those benefits included (1) better efficiency through improved coordination and cross-training of staff, (2) better communication between the FinCom, BOS, department heads, and other boards/committees with budgets, and (3) better planning/scheduling of the budgeting process that allowed more time for last minute adjustments (as necessary).
- The TGSC, as presented in the discussion on Recommendation 2a, stated that its work should not be based on people or personalities; instead, the committee focused on structure, process, and codified requirements (i.e. by-laws) to ensure that town government would function effectively irrespective of the individuals in the elected and appointed leadership positions. Creation of the Finance Department, and the position of AAFB, will provide for more effective and time-efficient processing by coordinating the Town’s financial functions, under the leadership of the AAFB.
- The Town’s budget process for 2006 did not have a backup “book”, nor does the 2006 backup as it exists match the budget that was voted at Town Meeting. The accountant showed the committee the budget book she has developed for the 2007 budgeting process.
- As previously stated, the Town can rely on having the right people in the right places, or the Town can choose to create better assurance that this functionality will exist, independent of the personalities involved. It is the TGSC’s opinion that creating an organizational structure and leadership role will create a minimum performance standard that will ensure effective financial leadership.
- In the opinion of the committee, the transition of the BOS to a more oversight-oriented board has resulted in a void in the area of financial leadership. The Finance Committee has, to their credit, taken up this mantle and provided significant leadership in budgeting and financial administration. However, their role has been one of necessity rather than design, and the TGSC feels this proposed restructuring provides an important opportunity to “get it right”.

Final Revision
**Recommendation 2b: Create a Department of Finance, to be managed by a newly created position of Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis and Discussion (continued)</th>
<th>The TGSC specifically chose to entitle the position Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget as opposed to Finance Director. The primary argument for the title was that the Town should develop internal contingency succession planning for leadership roles. When the prior TA left, the BOS did not have one single meeting during his notice period in which to discuss transitional matters. Thankfully, the Town had competent personnel in Don Armstrong and Bonnie-Mae Holston who essentially “worked” the transition in advance of their official appointment as interim co-TA’s. By creating the AAFB role, the committee concludes that there will be a better prepared backup for the TA for vacations, illnesses, or for interim filling of the position, not to mention a second set of eyes and ears to assist the TA with the day-to-day management of town affairs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TGSC unanimously agrees that these organizational changes (including roles and responsibilities) be enacted through by-law, voted by the town, to ensure that the roles and process are clear, unambiguous, and subject to change only by Town Meeting vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Arguments</th>
<th>The size of the town’s operating budget, coupled with the growing complexities of navigating the regulatory and statutory waters, support pulling together the town’s financial functions into one department, and creating the new role of AAFB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A town with an annual budget of approaching $30 million needs to move its financial functions to an organizational structure with clearer lines of authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The organizational clarity associated with combining these functions will provide efficiency and leverage that is currently absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The creation of the Finance Department and the AAFB go together; one without the other will not be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This position will not require another manager/department head. It is expected that efficiencies associated with creating the finance department will more than offset the additional responsibilities associated with asking the treasurer or accountant to simultaneously take on the AAFB role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Opposing Arguments | The current state is acceptable; no need for change. The town can accept that the town’s financial management is subject to variability based on how well the departments work together. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Present proposed by-law for Town Meeting vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assuming it passes, BOS work with TA to identify and retain appropriate candidate for the AAFB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Budgetary Implications</th>
<th>Potentially will need to provide an incrementally higher salary to attract accountant or treasurer candidates who possess the requisite experience for the role.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At some point in the future as the Town grows, the creation of this position may require hiring additional support to better leverage the AAFB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 3:** The Board of Selectmen, the Finance Committee, and the Town Administrator should participate in appropriate leadership training. Once current members have participated, all newly elected or appointed persons should be required to participate in such training.

http://www.curp.neu.edu/sitearchive/thisweek.asp?id=2333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>• Conclusion L-6: There appears to be confusion regarding the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the Board of Selectmen, the Town Administrator, and the Finance Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analysis and Discussion | • The TGSC observed confusion amongst the BOS, TA, and Finance Committee regarding appropriate roles and responsibilities. This concern is addressed in part by Recommendation 14 (development of a guidebook for new board and committee members), but the committee felt that leadership training would assist the process.  
  • In the opinion of the committee, the transition of the BOS to a more oversight-oriented board without effective delegation to the TA has resulted in a void in the area of financial leadership. The Finance Committee has, to their credit, taken up this mantle and provided significant leadership in budgeting and financial administration. However, their role has been one of necessity rather than design, and the TGSC feels this potential restructuring provides an important opportunity to “get it right”. Taken in concert with Recommendation 2b (creation of a Finance Department and the position of Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget), leadership training should assist the senior leaders in the town with additional skills whereby they can effectively distribute responsibility appropriately.  
  • The Municipal Leadership Academy is MMA’s recently-announced, joint program with Northeastern University’s Center for Urban and Regional Policy. This program represents an applicable example of leadership training that could benefit the town’s leaders. Other, more-local and or less-costly programs may be available.  
  • While the implementation of this recommendation may seem onerous at the present time, once the current BOS, Finance Committee, and Town Administrator have participated, only newly elected/appointed officials need to participate. |
| Supporting Arguments | • Our Town needs the best leadership available. Let’s get the training we can afford and reap the benefits of building this type of training into the Town’s culture of success. |
| Opposing Arguments | • Too expensive, not worth it. |
| Implementation Plan | • BOS, Finance Committee, and new Town Administrator evaluate options  
  • Develop cost-effective plan for implementation |
| Potential Budgetary Implications | • Dependent on type of program and how many people attend. |
**Recommendation 4:** Appoint a town-wide IT Coordinator for the IT function at and between the light and water departments, schools, town house, police, fire, etc.). This position would report directly to the Town Administrator

**Basis**
- **Conclusion S-1:** The physical communication (telephone, email, voicemail, and data) system is inadequate to facilitate communication within the town and with the citizens.
- **Conclusion S-4:** Boards do not submit updates for the town’s web site in a timely manner. There is lack of clarity regarding who is responsible for updating the web site. The web site’s central calendar is not functional.
- **Conclusion S-5:** The Assessors, Building Commissioner, and Board of Health use different software to store information about properties. As a result, there are occasional discrepancies between the number of bedrooms a residence is permitted to have (septic permit), versus the number of bedrooms on which the house is assessed.

**Analysis and Discussion**
- Funding should come from the following budgets, since all these entities should benefit from hiring an IT specialist: town operating budget, the school budget and the Light and Water department budget.
- The TA can leverage himself/herself through this role, and can provide some leadership during times of transition.
- An alternative solution would be to retain the services of a network consultant; however, these services are extremely expensive, and are usually intended to augment an existing IT function, not provide one.
- Another alternative would be to share the expense of a full time IT manager with an abutting town (Boxborough, Harvard, Ayer, etc.). This possibility should be evaluated.

**Supporting Arguments**
- This currently-open position needs to be re-filled. In the age of computers and electronic data, the Town can not afford to go without leadership in this area.

**Opposing Arguments**
- Enough existing town staff know enough about computers and networks that we can get by without this expense.

**Implementation Plan**
- Task the newly appointed TA with evaluating the needs and potential budget sources for the IT position
- Research abutting towns’ needs and resources to determine if potential synergies exist
- Develop plan for filling the role; implement ASAP.

**Potential Budgetary Implications**
- $ __
**Recommendation 5:** Establish a central facilities management function to manage the town’s physical plant (including schools, town house, police, fire, etc.). This position would report directly to the Town Administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion S-2: The upkeep of the town’s physical plant is not being systematically addressed and does not receive the attention it deserves leaving it vulnerable to inefficient and potentially poor maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis and Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost opportunities for bundling service contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance issues not addressed; potential for deterioration of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant efforts by multiple staff/boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved efficiency in managing town’s real estate and infrastructure investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage on contracted custodial and maintenance services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved maintenance planning and execution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional expense;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected efficiencies not guaranteed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appoint committee to evaluate alternatives, identify cost ramifications, and report back to BOS with recommendations for creating a “Facilities Manager” position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create the position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Budgetary Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ __</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 6:** Develop policies to ensure regular communications between boards, departments, employees and citizens. Such policies could consist of (but not necessarily be limited to) establishing the following regularly-scheduled meetings (frequency to be determined):
- Meetings attended by all town boards, committees, and/or commissions (posted, open, public meeting);
- Meetings of those department heads reporting to the Assistant TA for Finance and Budget;
- Meetings of those department heads reporting to the TA;
- Meetings of TA and other functional, non-TA reporting departments;
- “All hands” meetings for all town-employed staff.

**Basis**
- **Conclusion C-1:** Overall communication between staff and the elected officials could definitely be improved.
- **Conclusion C-2:** Communications between boards, departments, town employees and citizens is inadequate.

**Analysis and Discussion**
- Effective communication is not guaranteed by mandating meetings. However, the culture of a functional organization is built at least in part on a variety of social operating mechanisms, such as meetings.
- Such communication has improved lately, and development of a structured social operating system will build on the foundation that is currently being created.

**Supporting Arguments**
- Setting a schedule for meetings will create much greater imperative that they take place. When there are dates on a calendar, people notice and there is accountability for conducting the meetings.

**Opposing Arguments**
- Setting a calendar for meetings does not guarantee good communication. Good communication comes “organically” from good people doing good things. No structure is necessary.

**Implementation Plan**
- Appoint a cross-sectional focus group, led by Bonnie-Mae Holston, to identify the needs of the organization and develop an appropriate meeting/event structure and schedule.
- Publish a meeting schedule and KEEP TO IT.

**Potential Budgetary Implications**
- $ 0
**Recommendation 7:** All town boards that deal with properties and permitting should have access to, and utilize the same software for tracking property specific data (lot size, building parameters, actual number of bedrooms, permitted bedrooms, deed restrictions relative to septic permit, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Conclusion S-5:</strong> Property information is managed using different software systems by Assessors, Tax Collector, Board of Health, Building Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis and Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confusion for taxpayers, boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some taxpayers are assessed for improvements that BOH and/or Bldg Insp. didn’t permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced confusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Capital expense and training costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data entry/transition costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large expense for small universe of issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Appoint committee to evaluate alternatives, identify cost ramifications, and report back to BOS with recommendations to identify applicable software system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow recommendations of the committee to purchase appropriate software; populate with data, train, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Budgetary Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• $ 0 (for committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $__ (for purchase, implementation, training, data population, support, etc. associated with software)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 8: In order to provide better service to the public, the town should provide a systematic checklist/flowchart of permits required for various activities. The Town Planner/Permit Coordinator should be the “first stop” for permit-related inquiries, and should assist people in better understanding the full permitting process and guiding their efforts.

| Basis                                                                 | • **Conclusion ST-4:** The Town Planner’s title is “Town Planner/Permit Coordinator”; however, from the data collected by the committee, it appears that the permit coordination effort does not extend to include all permits.  
|                                                                      | • **Conclusion C-2:** Communications between boards, departments, town employees and citizens is inadequate.  
| Analysis and Discussion                                              | • The town is in the business of serving the taxpayers and public at large. As such, the town should start by providing better introductory guidance on the property development and/or renovation permitting process.  
|                                                                      | • The preparation and use of a checklist and flowchart of steps and interdependencies would provide the public with assistance they need.  
|                                                                      | • Further, these documents will assist Town employees in providing general guidance when a certain board office is closed.  
| Supporting Arguments                                                 | • This recommendation represents a simple solution to what has been an age-long problem. Preparation of the checklist and flow chart won’t take much time.  
| Opposing Arguments                                                   | • It’s the public’s job to figure this out… survival of the fittest. There is no incentive for the Town to make it easy.  
| Implementation Plan                                                  | • Appoint Maren Toohill to lead a team to develop these documents. Ask Beverly Cyr, Roland Bernier, and Barbara Chapin to join the team.  
| Potential Budgetary Implications                                      | • $ 0 (other than the paper on which the documents are printed)  
|                                                                      | • At some point in the future as the Town grows, the creation of this position may require hiring additional support to better leverage the permit coordinator.  

**Recommendation 9:** Establish an HR coordination function (by assigning this role to an existing manager) to provide consistency in pay, benefits and personnel management. This responsibility would report to the TA, and sit on and work closely with the town’s Personnel Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>• Conclusion ST-5: The number of employees employed by the town has grown to the point where a Human Resource function is warranted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analysis and Discussion | • The re-birth of the personnel committee has provided great momentum in this area. However, the role of HR coordinator should be one individual who could provide guidance to town employees and answer benefit- and HR-related questions.  
• The TGSC believes this function is a part-time role, and can be an overlay set of responsibilities for an existing town employee. The person selected for this role will likely need some rudimentary HR training.  
• The HR coordination function, when combined with the personnel committee, especially after that committee finishes their current work on job grades, etc., will provide town employees with a significant improvements in this area. |
<p>| Supporting Arguments | • Town employees need one stop where they can get HR information or get guidance on a personnel matter. The TA is not the right role, nor is the Personnel Committee. |
| Opposing Arguments | • We don’t need this level of bureaucracy |
| Implementation Plan | • Keep the Human Resource hours current assigned to the assistant treasurer in place, but for those hours, have that person report to the TA |
| Potential Budgetary Implications | • $ __ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation 10:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reconfigure the layout of the Town Hall to enable more effective interaction among similar departments (finance, permitting, etc.), and to improve service to the public.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis</strong></td>
<td>• Conclusion S-3: The current physical layout of the building is not conducive to the coordination of like services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Analysis and Discussion** | • Scattered “permitting” offices require taxpayers/public to traipse all over building to get needed information  
• Remote location reduces ability of employees to learn some of the rudiments of other board requirements (minimal cross-training), thus limiting their ability to cover for employees not in office  
• Internal inefficiencies result, and teamwork suffers.  
• Building use is not maximized. |
| **Supporting Arguments** | • Improved efficiency  
• Better customer service  
• Opportunity to purge out-dated or un-needed files, documents, etc. |
| **Opposing Arguments** | • Minor moving expenses |
| **Implementation Plan** | • Evaluate all space within Town House, and develop new approach for office layout  
• Implement plan ASAP. This recommendation has been put in motion with Police Chief Kelly working with Co-Interim Town Administrator Armstrong leading the effort. |
| **Potential Budgetary Implications** | • $__ (labor and expenses for moving) |
Recommendation 11: Improve town website function by:

- Mandating that all Boards submit final minutes for posting on the town’s website within one week of finalization.
- Mandating that the centralized calendar on the town’s website be updated with posted meeting dates, etc.
- Assigning to one person the responsibility for uploading web update information provided by Boards, etc. Ensure that the uploading/updating is completed on a timely basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Conclusion S-4: The town’s website is ineffectively utilized as a mechanism for communications within and between town departments as well as with the taxpayers and public.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analysis and Discussion | Boards do not submit updates for the town’s web site in a timely manner.  
It is unclear as to who is responsible for updating the web site.  
The web site’s central calendar is not utilized. |
| Supporting Arguments | Simple solutions, easily implemented |
| Opposing Arguments | Additional work for one employee; where are the hours coming from? |
| Implementation Plan | Develop and implement policy through IT Director and Town Administrator  
Evaluate need for additional support for web site maintenance |
| Potential Budgetary Implications | $0 (if no additional hours required)  
~$1,500 (for 2 hours per week additional time) |
### Recommendation 12: Upgrade the communication system (telephone, email, voicemail, data) and coordinate town wide

**Basis**
- **Conclusion S-1:** The physical telephone and voicemail communication systems are inadequate to facilitate communication within the town and with the citizens.

**Analysis and Discussion**
- Internal communications systems are inconsistent
- There is limited ability to transfer calls between offices/departments
- No voicemail system exists (only answering machines)
- There is inefficient communications between staff and with taxpayers/public

**Supporting Arguments**
- More efficient interdepartmental and external communication
- Better service/value to taxpayers/public

**Opposing Arguments**
- Expense
- Potentially increased maintenance, support, etc.

**Implementation Plan**
- BOS and Town Administrator appoint a committee (to include the IT Coordinator for the town) to evaluate alternatives, identify cost ramifications, and report back to BOS with recommendations for new (or used) phone system
- Purchase/implement new phone/voicemail system

**Potential Budgetary Implications**
- $0 (for evaluation)
- $__ (capital cost for phone system)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 13: Evaluate the potential benefits of consistent (i.e. strong or weak) police and fire department structure and reporting relationship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conclusion: no corresponding conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis and Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The TGSC feels that there should be consistency between the structure of the police and fire departments; thus the BOS is encouraged to work with the Police chief to evaluate establishing like structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposing Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Budgetary Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 14: Develop and provide to incoming board/commission/committee members and new town employees an operational guide for their role in town government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conclusion L-6: There appears to be confusion regarding the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the Board of Selectmen, the Town Administrator, and the Finance Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis and Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The development and use of an operational guide would assist current and prospective employees, elected officials, committee members, volunteers, and the general public in better understanding the responsibilities associated with each role/body, and how the boards/committees interact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is much boilerplate language available from state agencies and other towns that can be used to develop an appropriate for Littleton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This document will play an important role in establishing the culture of the town’s government and social operating systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing this sort of documents should provide newcomers to town government a road map to roles, responsibilities, requirements; frankly it will also help those who have been involved before!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposing Arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask the new TA to assemble a small, cross-functional team to develop a draft guide for review and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalize, and publish on the Town’s website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Budgetary Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation No Change-1: The TGSC does not recommend transitioning to a Town Manager form of government at this time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>• Conclusion M-2: A town manager is not needed at this time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>• Strengthening the Town Administrator position (see Recommendation # 2A) should “fuel” the needed improvements in more efficient town government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Further growth and increased complexity of statutory and/or regulatory requirements may warrant consideration at a future time; however, the committee believes that strengthening the Town Administrator role will suffice at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Arguments</td>
<td>• Littleton does not need (at the current time) the autonomous decision making and delegated hiring/firing responsibility associated with the Town Manager role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen the Town Administrator role now; this doesn’t preclude further strengthening in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing Arguments</td>
<td>• Leadership at the Board of Selectmen/Town Administrator level is so dysfunctional that major changes are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Board of Selectmen have become a remote, hands-off body, thus requiring the change to a much stronger day-to-day town manager style of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advertising for and hiring a Town Manager will increase the size and experience-level of the pool of qualified candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>• Form search committee for Town Administrator (underway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Budgetary Implications</td>
<td>• Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No Change-2: Littleton does NOT need to establish a charter commission at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion M-1:</strong> Town does not need to form a Charter Commission at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Analysis and Discussion** | The TGSC’s recommendations can be accomplished through policy changes, clarified/changed job descriptions, and/or enactment of revised or new by-laws. |
|  | Such a commission is an 18 – 24 month commitment, and the committee believes that such a delay in implementing recommended changes would increase or worsen the challenges the town is currently experiencing. |

| **Supporting Arguments** | Can’t wait 24 months to make changes |
|  | Changes can be made with policies and by-laws |
|  | Charter Commission can be formed at any time |

| **Opposing Arguments** | Let’s do it right the first time; bite the bullet and form the Charter Commission now. Can make some changes at this time, AND start the charter process; one doesn’t preclude the other |

| **Implementation Plan** | None |

| **Potential Budgetary Implications** | Not applicable |
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### APPENDIX A

#### Department/Board Staff Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Department</th>
<th>Person Interviewed</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Administrator</td>
<td>Timothy Goddard</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>17-May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspector</td>
<td>Roland Bernier</td>
<td>JK/MK</td>
<td>31-May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Comm.</td>
<td>Barbara Chapin</td>
<td>KM/JK</td>
<td>06-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Collector</td>
<td>Becky Quinn</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>07-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Clerk</td>
<td>Linda Knupp</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>07-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Donald Armstrong</td>
<td>KM/NL</td>
<td>08-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former School Super.</td>
<td>Paul Livingston</td>
<td>KM/NL</td>
<td>09-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>RS/RG</td>
<td>13-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>James Clyde</td>
<td>JK/MK</td>
<td>14-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Kenneth Mildren</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>16-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Beverly Cyr</td>
<td>HS/MK</td>
<td>16-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Maren Toohill</td>
<td>JK/HS</td>
<td>19-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Accountant</td>
<td>Gail Henry</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>19-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Steven Carter</td>
<td>RS/RG</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Electric Depts.</td>
<td>Savas Danos</td>
<td>MK/JK</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Marnie Oakes</td>
<td>RG/RS</td>
<td>27-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Rec</td>
<td>Lisa Paradis</td>
<td>NL/JK</td>
<td>29-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Town Counsel</td>
<td>Judith Pickett</td>
<td>KM/HS</td>
<td>07-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Theresa Campbell</td>
<td>RG/MK</td>
<td>14-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School Super</td>
<td>Diane Bemis</td>
<td>KDM/JK</td>
<td>06-Oct-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accountant</td>
<td>Bonnie-Mae Holston</td>
<td>JK/KM</td>
<td>01-Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Town Clerk</td>
<td>Diane Crary</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>29-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Collector (2nd mtg)</td>
<td>Becky Quinn</td>
<td>LM/HS</td>
<td>29-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashoba BOH Rep.</td>
<td>Ira Grossman</td>
<td>JK/HS</td>
<td>30-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (2nd mtg)</td>
<td>Maren Toohill</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>08-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### Board/Committee/Commission Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Department</th>
<th>Person Interviewed</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>Entire Committee</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>20-Sep-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Charles Ellis</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>25-Sep-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Selectmen</td>
<td>K. Eldridge, I. Pagacik, A. McCurdy</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>04-Oct-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Health</td>
<td>Entire Board</td>
<td>JK/RS/KM</td>
<td>04-Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Committee</td>
<td>Entire Committee</td>
<td>JK/KM/RG</td>
<td>14-Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Commission</td>
<td>Entire Committee</td>
<td>JK/RS/LM/MD</td>
<td>18-Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>Entire Board</td>
<td>JK/RS/LM/MD</td>
<td>21-Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Assessors</td>
<td>Entire Board</td>
<td>JK/RS/LM/MD</td>
<td>05-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Trustees</td>
<td>Entire Board</td>
<td>JK/RS/KM</td>
<td>11-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Rec Commissioners</td>
<td>Entire Board</td>
<td>JK/KM/RS/LM</td>
<td>12-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Selectmen</td>
<td>I. Pagacik, A. McCurdy</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetary Commissioners</td>
<td>Entire Commission</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>05-Mar-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light &amp; Water Commissioners</td>
<td>Three requests made; no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### Similar Town/Outside Organization Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groton</td>
<td>Town Admin.</td>
<td>Jean Kitchen</td>
<td>RG/JK</td>
<td>13-Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>Town Mgr.</td>
<td>Bernie Lynch</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>26-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>Town Mgr.</td>
<td>Maureen Valente</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>05-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Town Admin.</td>
<td>Stephen Delaney</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>19-Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Town Mgr.</td>
<td>Steve LeDoux</td>
<td>NL/JK</td>
<td>31-Aug-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Revenue</td>
<td>Division of Local Services</td>
<td>Joe Markarian, Chris Ketchen</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>02-Aug-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Town Admin.</td>
<td>Paul Cohen</td>
<td>RG/JK</td>
<td>10-Oct-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMMA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Peter Hechenbleikner</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>Several phone calls in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Revenue</td>
<td>Division of Local Services</td>
<td>Joe Markarian, Chris Ketchen</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>13-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TGSC Minutes
Town Government Study Committee: Minutes from the first meeting...

Day/Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2006
Time/Place: 7:30, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan M°Namara, Rod Stewart

Roland asked for items for an agenda and with input from others put the following on the white board:
- Introductions
- Concerns
- Objectives
- Parameters
- Reasons for this Committee
- Ground Rules
- Direction
- Next Steps
- Outcomes
- Recorder, Logistics, Posting, Meeting Facilitator.

After introductions that included some broad objectives and concerns, we explored some ground rules for our meetings. These included:
- Focus
- Open and Honest communication
- Respect
- Acceptance of different views; no right or wrong

We also discussed a few general concerns and thoughts including
- Discussion how the town will function in 20 years
- Dissent in town today and how it might affect our meetings & outcomes
- Outcomes that would improve efficiency and function of town government

We agreed that we need to have discussions with our town's employees and get their "lay of the land". In preparation for that we discussed inviting Tim Goddard to a future meeting to give us an overview of town government from his perspective.

Joe Knox passed out copies of a diagram of town government as well as some job descriptions. Mike Knupp said he would bring in the work of a committee he served on that looked into the functions of land use boards in town (Health, Planning, Zoning among others). Lynn Mason will bring in some organization charts of the town of Concord where she works.

Joe agreed to schedule rooms for upcoming meetings and Mike agreed to post them. Karen agreed to do minutes for this meeting. All agreed to May 1st as the next meeting date.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M°Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee
Day/Date: Monday, May 1, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason,
Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift.

Joe reported that Tim Goddard, Town Administrator, will attend the May 17th
meeting. We continued to discuss the "agenda" that we devised at the April 18th
meeting: how is town government done in Littleton and in other towns. Someone
from Sudbury and Chelmsford may come to speak to us on this subject. Joe is
working with Tim to arrange this.

We discussed interviewing our own townhouse employees as well as people
from other towns. Mike offered to put together a first set of questions that we
might review. We should send him questions as they come to us.

In these interviews we would be interested in how the employee saw his/her own
department (how well does it work; what could work better) and how the
employee saw his/her own department working with others in town (what are the
interactions; how well do those interactions "work"; what could be better).

We thought it would be helpful to look at the interviews both in terms of overall
functions and group them as such (financial, land management, public safety, as
examples) and have our questions reflect the "intra-" and "inter-" department
concerns (noted above) as well as human resource concerns. Finally, we
considered a customer survey of citizens.

We reviewed our charge from the Board of Selectmen and determined some
milestones that we will need to meet. These are listed on the next page.

We agreed that there would be “homework” for all of us to do and identified
resources:
- The Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)
- The MAPC Subregional group that Littleton participates in (MAGIC)
- The Commonwealth’s Department of Revenue (DOR)
- The Suburban Coalition

Lynn passed around two documents from Concord for us to look at: 1) "Section
VII Appendix", Overall Organization Chart; 2) The act that established Concord’s
selectmen/manager form of government. Joe will get a copy of the directory of
cities and towns for the Commonwealth. Finally, we agreed to meet on the
following dates: May 17th, May 24th, May 31st, June 7th, and June 14th.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.
Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
PRELIMINARY Milestones for the Littleton Town Government Study Committee

May
- Tim Goddard will provide an overview of Littleton Town Government
- Develop questions for surveys of:
  - Townhouse employees
  - Employees of other towns
  - Visitors from Chelmsford and Sudbury

May/June
- Complete May monthly report
- Conduct townhouse interviews
- Begin interviews of other towns’ employees
- Host people from Chelmsford and Sudbury
- Complete June monthly report

July/August
- Interim analysis of data thus far
- Preliminary report on findings
- Monthly reports

August/September
- Prepare and send out a customer survey
- Analyze results

September/October
- Draft final report
- Public meetings to present findings
- Prepare final report

November
- Deliver Final Report
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift.

The agenda for this evening included:
- Review of questions submitted to us by Mike
- Review of "managing Small Towns" document distributed by Roland
- Interview responsibilities (assignments)
- Discussion of Roland's meeting with people from the Suburban Coalition

Before reviewing the questions, Joe suggested that we should prepare a cover letter to explain what we are looking for when we interview townhouse employees. We went over the outline of such a letter and discussed the charge from Selectmen, the list of people who we believe we will be interviewing and other aspects of the letter. Karen agreed to develop a draft of the letter for our review at the next meeting.

We discussed who will be interviewed and ended up listing all the functions and offices on the handout of Littleton town government. To this we added three boards and some people from the School Department. After some discussion, we decided to do the following:
- Pick an initial eight to nine departments and interview them first. Those picked were: Tax collector, Accountant, Town Clerk, Police, Fire, Highway, Town Planner, Building Commissioner, and School Business manager.
- We would split up into pairs and two of us would interview a department employee or department head.
- We would do one round of interviews (4 to 5 departments) and then refine our questions or approach as necessary.
- We would provide examples of the questions we might ask to interviewee before the interview as an attachment to a cover letter confirming the appointment. We would also attach a copy of the charge from the Board of Selectmen and a list of other interviewees.

We also determined the best times members of the Committee could do interviews and listed those:
- Mornings only: Nate
- Nights: Rod, Lynn (able to do days occasionally) and Mike (we presume)
- Anytime (with sufficient notice): Joe, Karen, Harry, and Roland

We made changes in the questions prepared for us by Mike Knupp. The questions and the revisions are at the end of these minutes (Attachment 1).
Roland handed out sections of a document “Managing Small Towns”. Although out of print, it looks very useful. Roland found the sections he copied for us most relevant: the Chapter 1 (pages 1-17 and all of Chapters 5 and 7).

Roland also reported on a group called the Suburban Coalition. It is made up of representatives from a variety of towns in eastern Massachusetts. Littleton does not belong to this group. Roland met with two members who gave him advice on what we are doing.

We set an agenda for our next meeting. It will include
- Approve past minutes
- Finalize questions for our survey of employees
- Review cover letter and make changes
- Set up our teams and tentative schedule for interviews

We were reminded that the next meeting would be in Room 304, on Wednesday, May 31, 2006.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Questions for Town employees; updated May 24, 2006

The original question is in *italics* if substantially changed or deleted. The resulting questions (original or updated) are **bolded**. Any small changes to the original are in brackets [*].

Question 1: **What works well in your department? **[...such as] processes, systems, interactions with other departments/boards
Decision: No Change

Question 2: **What could be improved in your department? **
Decision: No Change

Questions 3: **Do you have any ideas that you think would improve how your department functions? **
Decision: Delete (seemed redundant to other questions)

NOTE:>>> We decided to reverse the order of questions 4 and 5 and change some of the wording.

Question (was) 4 (will be) 5: **Do you have any ideas that you think would improve the way all the departments in the town interact and work together? **
Decision: Change the wording to **What would improve the interactions of your department with other departments? **

Questions (was) 5 (will be) 4: **On a day-to-day basis, what other departments must you interact with to accomplish your tasks? **
Decision: Change the wording to **What is the day to day interaction of your departments with other departments that is part of the job? **... and...
**Could you compare that with how it works in other towns. **

Question 6: **Does your department or board have specific operating procedures that are mandated by Town Bylaws or State Statute? If so, do they help or hinder efficiency? ... What would you change? **
Decision: We had a discussion on this. We may pull or rephrase at the next meeting.

Question 7: **What, if anything has [helped or] hindered your ability to meet changes in local demographics? **
Decision: We simply added “helped or” before “hindered”.

Question 8: **In planning for the delivery of services is there any one thing that could be done to help you plan better for the changes you face over the next year, five years and beyond? **
Decision: No change
Question 9: *Would a change in the form of town government have a major impact on your department?* –Status Quo; -Strong Town Administrator Form; -Town Manager Form; -Home Rule Charter.
Decision: We dropped this for now.

Question 10: *If you were Queen/King for a day, what [structural] changes would you make in town government?* 
Decision: We added "structural"
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date:       Wednesday, May 31, 2006
Time/Place:    7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees:    Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Lynn Mason,
               Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart.

The agenda for this evening included:

- Approve past minutes
- Finalize questions for our survey of employees
- Review cover letter and make changes
- Set up our teams and tentative schedule for interviews

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of April 18, 2006 and May 1, 2006 with no corrections. It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of May 24, 2006 with one correction.

Karen distributed a draft letter that would precede our interviews with town employees. It was edited and then approved. Karen will send the template out to the committee and each interview team will edit the letter as appropriate to confirm upcoming interviews.

We reviewed the questions updated at the previous meeting and made some final corrections. The final approved list is attached to this set of minutes.

Assignments for the first round of interviews are as follows:

Rod and Roland       Fire and/or Police
Lynn and Harry       Town Clerk and/or Tax collector
Karen and Nate       Accountant
Mike and Joe         Building Commissioner

Next meeting scheduled for June 7, 2006.
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn at 8:30

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, June 7, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Review interview data thus far
  - Discuss how to organize data
- Set up next set of interviews

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of May 31, 2006

Review of interviews: Mike passed around answers to our interview questions from the Building Commissioner. We discussed some of the Commissioner's concerns, observations and needs. Included was a need for more administrative help and better software.

We agreed to continue with the interviews and then compile a spread sheet with a summary of the findings. Mike agreed to bring in a laptop and we will work on this as a committee.

Other towns:
It was reported that Groton might be going to a town manager. Their current town administrator is leaving. Joe will contact her and possibly set up a meeting.

Upcoming interview schedule:
Lynn and Harry: Tax Collector, Town Clerk, Accountant, Assessor
Roland and Rod: Police and Fire Chiefs
Joe and Mike: Highway Department
Karen & Nate: Treasurer, School Superintendent, School Business Mgr.

Our next meeting will be June 14th in Room 103. We agreed to continue with weekly meetings for the remainder of June. Joe will schedule the room. He or Mike will get these posted: June 14th, 21st, and 28th.

We discussed the citizens' survey and agreed that if we do this it will be later in the summer after we finish a number of the employee interviews. Related to this, Mike reported that the building commissioner felt that one of the changes over time was an increase in citizens expectation of service... both the amount of service and the expectation of a quicker response time from his office.

With the evening's business completed, it was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Questions for Town employees  
Approved at TGSC meeting, May 31, 2006

Question 1: What works well in your department? [...such as] processes, systems, interactions with other departments/boards

Question 2: What could be improved in your department?

Question 3: Deleted

Question 4: What is the day to day interaction of your departments with other departments that is part of the job? .... and... Could you compare that with how it works in other towns.

Question 5: What would improve the interactions of your department with other departments?

Question 6: Does your department [or board] have specific operating procedures that are mandated by Town Bylaws or State Statue? If so, do they help or hinder efficiency? ... What would you change?

Question 7: What, if anything has [helped or] hindered your ability to meet changes in local demographics?

Question 8: In planning for the delivery of services is there any one thing that could be done to help you plan better for the changes you face over the next year, five years and beyond?

Question 9: What organizational changes, if any, would benefit or be a hindrance to your department?

Question 10: What changes, if any, would you like to make to town government?
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, June 14, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Hear Reports and discuss
- New assignments
- Organization of final data: Mike's spreadsheet
- Update of assignment chart: Karen's suggestion
- Groton interview and future town interviews
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of May 17, 2006 with three corrections. It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of June 7, 2006 with no corrections.

Review of Reports:
Harry and Lynn went through their interviews of the Tax Collector and Town Clerk. Each was the assistant of the other and so this was a joint interview.

Rod went through the interview that he and Roland did with the Police Chief. Karen went through her interview with the School Superintendent. Karen also reported on the interview she and Nate did with the Treasurer.

Upcoming Interviews:
Next week's agenda will include reports on various department heads already scheduled. Due to various schedules, Mike agreed to schedule an interview with the Board of Health (Mike and Harry) and with the Light & Water (Mike and Karen).

Mike outlined his proposed spreadsheet that we might use in a final report. All agreed on his approach. Joe had a question on Karen's proposed update of the tracking spreadsheet. It was agreed to hang on to dates of interviews.

Joe reported on his meeting with Jean Kitchen, the Groton Town Administrator. We discussed interviews with other town administrators and agreed to set up some standard questions next week for those interviews. Joe also reported that he has been asked to attend the next BOS meeting, Monday, June 19, 2006. He will hand out minutes and give the BOS an update.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn at 9:10.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Nate Long,
Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Hear Reports
- Decide Further interviews
  - how to analyze
  - committees and boards?
- Questions for Towns?
- Additional Towns?
- Summer Schedule
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of June 14, 2006 with no corrections.

Reports:
Karen and Nate reported on the interview with the School Department's Business Manager, Matt Lucey. Harry reported on the interview he and Mike had with the Board of Health Administrator, Beverly Cyr and on the interview he and Lynn had with the Chief Assessor, Ken Mildren. Joe and Harry reported on their interview with Maren Toohill, Planner for the Planning Board.

Next Interviews:
Park & Rec. Nate & Joe
Con. Com. Karen & Joe
Librarian Rod & Roland
Light & Water Mike & Karen

Towns:
Chelmsford... Bernie Lynch will meet with us in Littleton on July 12th
Others that may be interviewed... Sudbury and Georgetown.

Next Meetings:
June 26th and July 12th. [Postscript... June 28th was cancelled.]

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 5, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Roland Gibson, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Questions for Towns
- Interview with Town Officials from Sudbury
- Hear Reports of recent interviews
- Discuss Data
- Additional Towns?
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of June 14, 2006 with corrections.

Reports:
Rod and Roland reported on their interviews with the Fire Chief, Steve Carter and the Library Director, Marnie Oaks.

Interviews with officials from other towns:
We came up with the following questions for interviews with other town officials:
1. What form of government did the town have?
2. What problems did they have?
3. Why did they change?
   a. What prompted the change?
4. What change procedure did they use?
   a. How did they “sell” to the town and what was the town’s overall reaction?
5. If you did it again, would you do it differently?
6. Did the new form of Government fix the problem?
   a. If so, how?... If not, why?
7. What new problems were introduced?
8. What was your timetable?

Interview with Sudbury Officials:
Time brought in the four people from Sudbury:
- Maureen Valente, the Town Administrator
- Larry O’Brien, current member of the Board of Selectman and formerly on the Planning Board
- Kirsten Roopenian, former member of the Board of Selectmen and member of the “blue ribbon” committee.
- Bob Jacobson, chair of the Finance Committee.
After introductions, Joe asked them to outline some of their experiences. Maureen noted that she is on the "Form of Government Committee" within the MMA (Massachusetts Municipal Association) and is not here to sell the idea of town manger form of government. Each town is unique and needs to find its own solution to problems. However, no town wants to re-invent the wheel.

The team provided a brief history of the process that brought them to where they are today. It began prior to 1994 when the "Sudbury Foundation" funded a study of local government. A blue ribbon commission was set up to do the study and they determined the need to convert to town manger form of government. They went with a special act (in the state legislature) and not with a charter.

The new form of government began July 1, 1996. The town administrator applied for the job but someone else was hired. Maureen was hired as Finance Director and then took over as Town Manger was the first Town manager left for a job in Westford.

The justification for changing to a town manager was the size of the town (18 thousand people) and a rapid rate of growth. In response to a question on what population number might trigger going to a town manager, they did not have a number. In response to a question on the how far they were from buildout, they said that they were working with an estimate of 30,000 people for a population by mid century. They had over 2,000 buildable lots remaining in the year 2000. Both of these were factors in the decision to go to a town manager form of government.

The blue ribbon commission found the day to day operation of the town should not fall on the BOS and Executive Secretary. They were concerned with the growing complexity of finance and the management of government in general. Later in the discussion, it was mentioned that the Accounting office had some fundamental problems.

Maureen provided handouts and directed us to one that had excerpts from their budget planning document titled, "FY07 Proposed Budget and Financing Plan". We first went to page 8 which was the "Statement of Mission and Values for Determining Goals of the Board of Selectmen" and then to pages 9-12, "Board of Selectmen GY06 Goals, Progress and Budget Implications for FY07". As her team would reiterate throughout the meeting, today the BOS leads the town with these policy statements (derived from a new Master Plan). This helps them focus on the priorities. They also do self measurement via the report on progress. This all came after the town decided to move to a town manger form of government.

Elected boards were policy makers and the Town Manager managed town employees to the mission statement and goals set down each year. She feels
that the process works well... all the pieces and "wheels" are coming together
and producing results.

The following Boards are elected: Planning, Library, Park & Rec., Health, and
Assessors. Two are appointed by the Town Manager with the approval of the
BOS: Conservation and Historical. Others are appointed by the Town Manager.
These include: Zoning and Council on Aging. Other parts of town government
were reorganized. A new Public Works department was created consolidating
various related functions. Also a Finance Department was created. All report to
the Town Manager.

The group made a point of noting that this a long process and ten years later it is
still a work in progress. Over the past and coming year Maureen is reorganizing
her reports to six department heads. When she started she had over 20 direct
reports. It is important to have a performance appraisal system and use it
consistently. It helps employees and reduces lawsuits.

Because the BOS has goals and objectives, the rest of the boards are following
suit. It is a boost to their goals if they can get their projects on the BOS goals list.

There were "bumps in the road" as they changed over. Many complained at first
(boards and employees). The boards came along with the help of town meeting.
Those employees who were performing well did well under the new regime.
Those who had problems performing left.

The group remained until after 9:00. We thanked them for their time and all they
shared with us. After they left, Lynn gave us a handout from the Department of
Revenue. Joe reminded us of upcoming interviews. Next week the Chelmsford
town manager will be coming to speak.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 12, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Hear Reports
- 
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of July 5, 2006 with no corrections.

Reports:
Joe reported on a call from Selectman McCurdy asking for clarification of the committee’s charge and activities to date in light of rumors at the Town House. Joe explained to him that this committee is not a charter commission nor has there been any discussion to date regarding any department reorganization or pre-determined candidates for any office.

Mike reported on the interview with the Electric Light and Water Executive Director. Joe reported on the interview with the Highway Operations Manager. Nate reported on the interview with the Park & Rec Director. Lynn reported on the interview with the former Town Accountant. It was noted that a common thread throughout these interviews was a lack of overall budget training and a need for stronger personnel management.

Recent changes in government have included the frequency of the Board of Selectmen’s meetings from weekly to monthly.

Mike asked the committee to review his interviews data base to check the groupings of the questions and answers.

Next Interviews:

IT Director       Mike

Future Meetings

Joe stated that the DOR has resources that could be very helpful to our process. He will schedule a meeting with them.
Georgetown representatives are scheduled for 7/19.

Public Involvement

There was discussion about the timing of soliciting public input. August might be difficult getting responses due to vacations.

Committee Report

In discussing the timing of the Committee’s Report, Joe said that the Board of Selectmen had expressed to him that the committee should take as long as needed to complete their tasks in order to be as thorough as possible. Tentative timing would be a report from this committee in the fall with any resulting action at the 2007 Annual Town Meeting.

Upcoming Towns:

Chelmsford… Bernie Lynch will meet with us in Littleton on July 29th

Next Meetings:
July 19th and 29th

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift, Mike Knupp, Lynn Masson

The agenda for this evening included:

- Stephen Delaney, Georgetown Town Administrator
- Approve past minutes
- Hear Reports
- Discussion
  - BOS & FinCom Interviews
  - Process
- Schedule Data Review
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of July 12, 2006.

Reports:
Roland and Mike reviewed the interview with the IT Coordinator

Interview
After introductions, Stephen Delaney gave a detailed description of his role in and the functioning of Georgetown town government. He serves as Town Administrator, Acting Finance Director, HR Director and other minor posts. There is no formal charter but the structure was created under a special act of the legislature. When he began in Georgetown 3 years ago the town was in crisis staff and finance-wise. There was a fractured delivery of services and no central accountability. One support he enlisted was Suffolk University to develop a strategic plan. The structure in Georgetown is flat, similar to Littleton's. He explained that managing without specific straight line authority requires building cooperation among departments and an understanding that they are all on the same team. A Town Manager has appointing and contracting authority, whereas a Town Administrator/Executive Secretary usually has a blend of those authorities. He advised that a Town Administrator or Town Manager should stabilize the town’s finances, understand the condition of the audit, know the Board of Selectmen, develop a plan (identifying hot issues, outlining goals), and be a good listener. He favors the Town Manager form of government where possible, especially in regard to HR liability issues.

Stephen suggested Swampscott as another information source for our committee since they went through a change in structure within the last 5 years, as well as the MMA.
BOS & FinCom Interviews
The committee felt these interviews should be scheduled to ask their input on their roles and situations regarding the current town government structure. It was also moved, seconded and voted to include the School Committee. Mike will redraft the questions, similar to those asked of staff, with the addition of Question 3: How would you define the role of your board in town government. He will also draft a cover letter. It was the consensus of the committee that each member should receive the questions and give their input to their chairman. The chairman or his/her representative should then be asked to report back to this committee.

Discussion Re Format of Committee Report
Members felt that there should be an executive summary, findings of facts (including staff/committee interviews and outside sources), addendums with specific source material, and reflections or observations or recommendations resulting from our fact-finding. There will be more discussion on this going forward.

Next Meeting: July 26th.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason,
Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Interview with Bernie Lynch, Town manager, Chelmsford
- Letter & Questions to BOS, Fin Com, and School Committee
- Look at the data thus far.

Minutes: The previous minutes were held until next week.

Discussion of data: Various ideas were proposed for how to assess the data that has thus far been collected by Mike using the interview responses. We might look at short, mid and long term suggestions that come out of each questions; we might look at each question and determine the most critical issues; other ideas were suggested as well. Roland went to the board to outline what we had discussed thus far and came up with the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Data</th>
<th>Common Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning Recommendations Other

Further discussion will continue at our next meeting. Some members did not have Mike’s second recap sheet and asked that it be sent to them.

Bernie Lynch, Chelmsford Town Manager:
Tim and Mr. Lynch arrived for the discussion of Chelmsford’s experience going from Executive Secretary to Town Manger and related issue. We began with introductions and a brief outline of our backgrounds. Joe outlined our responsibilities and all thanked him for giving us his time and wished him luck in his new position in Lowell.

Bernie then outlined his history in Chelmsford. He was there three years as Executive Secretary and the rest of the 20 + years as Town Manager. Prior to that, Chelmsford went through an enormous growth spurt in the years from 1960 to 1970. In 1960 the population was 15 thousand; in 1970, it was 31 thousand. Various study and charter efforts went on in 1956, 1972 and later in the 1970s.
After Proposition 21/2, the fiscal pressures combined with the complexity of government brought the town to a decision to look at the charter and make changes. One factor was the lack of coordination in the townhouse. His example was the decision of the collector and clerk to close their offices on Wednesdays. These were separately elected people and the Executive Secretary could not dictate office hours. After the charter, both posts came under the Town Manager.

There were two factors that seemed to actually prompt the charter change. Bernie called them “legislative” and “executive”. The first had to do with problems at Town Meeting. A contingent of people with a single issue could move town meeting to a vote that was difficult for the town to carry out. The example was an amendment to the budget that left the town a half million dollars short with no way to pay. The people left the meeting after the vote and the administrator and selectmen were forced to do unwise layoffs as a result.

The other factor was the disorganized way the budget was prepared in the first place. There “wasn’t a sense of coordinated financial management”. In the late 1980s a charter proposal was put before the people with both legislative and executive changes: representative town meeting and a town manager with significant central authority. It narrowly passed. The representative town meeting sends 18 members from each precinct (162 people in all) to town meeting. These people understand and take responsibility for the decisions and recognize that they will need to undo problems in subsequent town meetings.

The remainder of our meeting dealt with the changes from Executive Secretary to Town Manager and the way Chelmsford set up the town manager function. The charter set up various department managers that report to the town manager. Each manager is appointed by the town manager with Board of Selectmen approval. Each employee is hired by the department manager with Town Manager approval. We went into some of the department organizations (such as the Finance Department and Community Development Department) but not all. Bernie will send us their annual budget book that outlines all of these functions.

The charter also put many boards and committees under the Town Manger. The town manager appoints all of the members of these boards (Appeals and Conservation are among these). Some boards are still elected: Health, Sewer Commission, Planning and Library Trustees. As with Sudbury, some, but not all of the staff who work for those boards work under the Town Manager.

The charter also gave the Town Manager full control over the budget. Bernie puts the whole thing together; reviews with the BOS (but does not need to get their approval); and presents the budget to town meeting.

Bernie feels that these changes have brought a higher level of professionalism. Most of the previous staff remained in their posts even after the change but expectations for how people handled their jobs changed and there was more
consistency in hours of operation, etc. across the townhouse. He indicated that the turnover came mostly in the financial departments; less in the others.

Some questions came up at this point:
Q: When they formed the charter, how did they present it to the town?
A: By law, they needed to send copy of the charter to every home in town

Q: How did they make the case for the changes?
A: Op-ed articles in the paper that pointed out the problems of Chelmsford’s size and complexity in governing.

Q: You pointed out that pre-charter, the agencies were not pulling in the same direction. Who now decides what direction?
A: Combined decision of the Town Manager (with input from the department heads) and the Board of Selectmen.

He went on to outline how direction is set. Each June or July, the Town Manager and BOS have a retreat and determine the following year’s goals. These are broad goals about traffic or economic development for example. The Town Manager then goes to the staff to work out more specific plans and takes those back to the BOS.

Q: Who assesses how well the plan worked?
A: There are three ways:
  • The BOS and Town Manager at the start of the next retreat.
  • Quarterly reports from the departments
  • The evaluation of the Town Manager by the BOS... his performance is measured...
    o Against goals and plans
    o On how well he works with various boards
    o How well budget, etc. is prepared for town meeting
    o How he handles media, citizens, etc.

This prompted the question...
Q: [So] What do the selectmen do?
A: Licensing; review of reports from the Town Manager and department heads.

After some more discussion on specifics of the organization (the budget he sends to us will have this in detail) he was asked about personnel.

Q: Who is in charge of Personnel?
A: Pre-charter it was under a personnel bylaw. The charter did away with the bylaw and set up new rules and regulations. The Town Manager is in charge of Personnel along with a 5 member Personnel board. One member is elected by the employees; the other 4 are citizens appointed by the Manager.
Q: There was a question on costs pre and post charter
A: They spend more on Planning now. They had no planner prior to the charter change. However, generally he felt that they have saved money. They work smarter; have reduced headcount; and use regionalized purchase groups. As an example they have reduced the number of people in the collector’s office from 5 plus seasonal help to 4 with no seasonal help during a time when the volume of work has increased significantly (quarterly tax bills, more sewer and excise revenues, etc). But cash flow is better and more automated. There is a significant amount of electronic bill paying.

Q: What system is used by the financial people
A: MUNIS for [heavy duty] tasks and Vadar is used by the collector.

Q: Any software used by land management people?
A: They have some GIS software.

The final Question was on the process for replacing him.

A: By charter, he appoints an acting town manager if he only going to be away for a few days. For long term absences (or in this case, resignation), the charter says that the BOS will replace him using a 9 person screening committee. There is some controversy currently on how that is being set up.

With no further questions, we all thanked him for his time and wished him luck in Lowell.

It was after 9:00 so it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan MªNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, August 02, 2006, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Mike Knupp, Rod Stewart

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Interview with Joe Markarian & Chris Ketchen, DLS
- Appointment with the Town Administrator
- Process with the BOS, Fin Com & School Committee questionnaires
- Information Matrix
- Miscellaneous

Minutes: It was moved, seconded and VOTED to accept the minutes from the previous 2 weeks without correction

Interview with DLS:
Joe Markarian & Chris Ketchen arrived and we introduced ourselves. Joe gave the task force an overview of the Department of Local Services (DLS) and their roles in helping local government. They have also spoken to Groton and Hopkinton. Groton is just beginning to look at possible change; Hopkinton has recently made some changes. His office does financial management reviews. He notes that there are recurrent themes in the questions towns are addressing. He asks us to think in terms of what prompts the town to think it needs a government study. He also advised that we consider process as well as structure.

He gave the task force a great deal of information on the benefits of a charter along with the observation that a town does not to take that route to make effective changes. A charter does give some underlying process to town government but is always general. If a town does a charter, it also needs the more specific bylaws.

A town can do one of three things:
- A full charter process. This involves putting the charter question on the ballot AND having people on the ballot that would be running for seats on the charter commission. The commission proceeds as it sees fit and is only required to have one public hearing. The output of the commission goes first to the Attorney General (to be validated ... much as warrant questions do each year) and then comes to the citizens for a vote. In all, this is a two-year process.
- A Government Study group, such as our task force, can come to some conclusions and propose changes to the bylaws. The BOS could put a time frame on this work. The proposal would then go to the BOS (or could be put on the ballot by citizens) and voted on.
- A special act of the Massachusetts Legislature could be required if some of the proposals (either Charter or bylaws) change some aspects of town government.
More work would need to be done to differentiate what things require a special act. An example might be creating a Finance Manager. It can be done by a special act after the Town Meeting votes it by simple majority. Typically, the Legislature would require a town-wide ballot vote as a condition of passing this. However, even this might not be a suitable example. Either Joe or Chris thought that the legislature passed a law allowing towns to do this via bylaw only.

As others have said, to ensure professionalism in certain offices, there is a trend toward appointed rather than elected people... such as treasurer and collector.

The most interesting points for many task force members were
- Any number of changes can be incorporated via bylaws
- The scope of the Town Administrator’s job can also be expanded significantly without necessarily changing the job to Town Manager.
- An important key, they felt, was to include job descriptions, performance evaluations, and other accountability factors in any proposed changes.

Q: Does the size of a town give an indication of whether it should be headed by a town administrator or town manager?
A: Not entirely. Chris gives an example of Wellesley that has a town administrator with very limited authority. Yet he “manages” a wide number of functions that do not report to him and does this through leadership and consensus. An alternate example is Great Barrington. Although small, about 10,000 people, it is also the hub of a region, so having a town manager seems to make sense.

The question for any town is whether to go to charter, special act (of the legislature) or simply bylaws. It was pointed out that going initially with some bylaws doesn’t preclude doing additional changes down the road or eventually going to a charter: try some things before going with whole cloth changes. It could build confidence and comfort with change.

There are questions of perception and what will fly in terms of changes. For us, he would recommend a report that started with a ‘narrative’ of our findings followed by some proposed bylaw changes. That way the narrative is being debated and not the specifics of the bylaws.

Most helpful... they both offered their review of any draft that we might come up with. They also recommend:
- Clarify responsibilities and Insure accountabilities
- Keep as simple as possible
- Write this in a way that will not elicit extreme reactions; palatable

It is important that the changes empower the Town Administrator and/or Town Manager and establish accountability. They saw the administrator and/or manager creating the budget process and the capital improvement process. This person would
consult with the treasurer, collector and others and then make a presentation to the
BOS, School Committee and Fin Com jointly.

A question was asked about the importance of modeling changes in the town over
time... looking at 2000 through today, and then out to 2010 or 2020. Chris noted
general trends. He sited:
- People are not volunteering as much
- Laws and finance are getting more complicated
- Specific issues are hitting cities and towns now and over the upcoming
  years... post-retirement medical costs will become a growing issue in 2009
  and thereafter, for example
- There will be a growing need for professionalism in all the financial areas and
  increased specialization in some. Joe notes that municipal accounting, for
  example, is of some concern to those looking at this.

In short, Chris said that this all points to the need for greater professionalism in town
government. To the point of the question, he said that our cities and towns have been
around for hundreds of years and will evolve and adapt over the next hundred.

Going to specifics and in response to some questions, it is important to be aware of
risk management and liability... therefore it is important to have good HR bylaws.
They point to Hopkinton, Needham and Burlington as examples to look at. In answer
to another question about well-run towns, they point to Burlington, North Andover,
Lennox, and Hopkinton.

They recap some of the themes what we should keep in mind:
- Aim for objectivity, sustainability, accountability,
- Try to think of all process in government
- Insure a clear line of responsibility to the top
- Try to anticipate problems
- Communicate with the town...
- Anticipate and answer frequently asked question early

Before they left, we thanked them for their advice and help and for the offer to review
any draft that we come up with. They gave Joe Knox their web site and contact
information.

It was after 9:00 so we decided to adjourn. Before we did, Roland handed out two
articles on how to handle qualitative data. Mike recommended them as well... he had
used them in formulating his matrix.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date:       Wednesday, August 09, 2006, 2006
Time/Place:     7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees:      Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

The agenda for this evening included:
- Minutes
- Update on questionnaires out to School Committee, Fin Com & BOS
- Review of Data
- Miscellaneous

Minutes: The Minutes of August 2, 2006 were approved with four corrections

Update on Questionnaires:
The School committee has the questionnaire and the chair is hoping to have the response back to the task for soon. He is eager to schedule a meeting with us. The chair of the Fin Com has the packets but there is no further word on whether they have been distributed to the members. The BOS has the packets and the chair has contacted Joe. They are interested in our timetable... would like an update... but assures Joe they are not hurrying us. They are looking forward to an informational report.

Data:
Mike had done a lot of work pulling together the responses to department questionnaires. He then sorted them on themes. Of the 319 items in his summary, the breakdown by category was as follows:
- Communication 62
- Systems 61
- Staffing 69
- Leadership 103
- “Other” 24

Mike noted that he had some problems assigning items to leadership or staffing so we should look at both. We sorted the items by themes and decided that there were just too many items to review as a group together. We decided to pick numbers out of a hat and assign two people in the task force to each of the first four categories. Each team of two would work on the “narrative” of the category independently and report back to the group in two weeks. ALSO each team would review “other” for those things that might relate to their category.

We discussed how to present the information and also how to get additional input from the citizens. All feel it is important to get input from the town and to let people in town know what we have been doing over the last few months.
We then reviewed last week's presentation clarifying what we believed was required by various options of charter/bylaws, special act, and bylaws only. It will depend on what changes we may end up recommending.

There will be no meeting next week unless the School Board Chair is ready for a meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, August 23, 2006, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Minutes
- Discussion of a Press Release
- BOS Meeting
- Update on questionnaires out to School Committee, Fin Com & BOS
- Themes
- Miscellaneous

Minutes: There was not a quorum to vote on Minutes from the meeting of August 9th.

Discussions:
Rod handed out a sample press release and there was some discussion on its content and when to release it. Included in the discussion was when the Board of Selectmen would be ready for us to meet with them. It was agreed that we would update the sample press release with comments and send them back to Joe. We returned to the question of a survey of the public and possibly using the Light & Water mailings for that. Tabulating results would be easier if people responded online but not all people can do that. It was suggested that we send out the mailing but ask that whoever can do it online do so.

We discussed the survey results from the BOS, FinCom and School Committee. There was some confusion as to whether we were expecting one combined report from each board or individual responses. Joe noted that he had asked for individual responses. With that cleared up, it was suggested that Joe give the boards a deadline so that we might get these back and tabulated.

Some members had write-ups of their portion of the themes. We reviewed these and discussed various approaches to organizing a final report.

We will continue to work on themes at our next meeting.

With no further business, we adjourned shortly after 9:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, August 30, 2006, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

The agenda for this evening included:
- Minutes
- Minutes: posted, fall schedule, FinCom on Sept 20th, BOS
- Narratives
- Process: determine needs first?
- MISC

Minutes: The Minutes for August 9th and August 23rd were approved with no corrections.

Discussions:
Joe announced that there have been problems getting our minutes posted. From now on we will go through the Town Clerk for posting minutes and upcoming meetings.

The proposed calendar for the next few weeks…
Wednesdays, at 7:30, in the Town Offices building: Sept 6th, 13th, and 20th
Monday, at 7:00, possibly in the Light and Water Building, Sept. 25th

We discussed the narratives, especially the Communications one done by Lynn and Nate.

Discussion then went into how we will present our findings. Mike offered the following outline that was agreed to by all:

I Executive Summary
II Findings
   A: Employee
   B: Boards & Committees
   C: Citizens
   D: Other Towns and State input
III Recommendations
IV Practices
Appendices

We still need to do citizens input and discussed a survey put together by Fall elections. After some discussion, Mike offered to rephrase many of the questions used when we surveyed employees and various board members.
We are unlikely to be done in the original 4 month window but we can see the following schedule as likely:
- Short report at Fall Town Meeting
- Full report for the Town Report
- Possible article suggestions for Spring Town Meeting

We discussed a press release and added information about the surveys coming up. We will look at Mike's survey questions and the updated press release at the next meeting.

We adjourned at 8:30

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date:       Wednesday, September 6, 2006
Time/Place:     7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees:      Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Nate Long, Harry Swift

Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting of August 30th were approved with one correction.

Meetings: All meetings through October are now posted in the Town House.

Citizen Survey: There was final discussion regarding the questions and format. Mike will take care of printing them. They will be available at the primary election on 9/19/06. We need a poster to call attention to them. Other methods of publicizing them and soliciting input were discussed, including a newspaper article (Lynn to write), on the Town’s website, on Channel 8. Suggested spots to collect them were the Town House, Donelan’s, the Library, and mailing them to the Selectmen’s office. Deadline for submission is October 9th.

With no further business, we adjourned at 7:50 pm/

Respectfully submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, September 13, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting of September 6, 2006 were approved with no corrections.

The Agenda for the evening was:
Minutes
1. Website
2. Arrangements for Posters: Primary Election & other locations
3. Cable TV
4. Meetings with FinCom, School Committee, BOS
5. Data

Next week, the 20th, we will be meeting with the FinCom. They will be here at 7:30. Following that we will meet on Monday, September 25th possibly with the School Committee and possibly in the Conservation Commission room. Meetings in October will be scheduled for Mondays @ 7:00 either in the BOS room or in the Library conference room.

The issues with Minutes not getting posted have not been resolved. There are still problems with our meetings getting posted on the web site. Joe has spoken with both the Chair of the BOS and the Town Administrator.

The posters and questionnaires are ready to go to various places in town including outside the polling location on Primary day. Other places include the Library, Donelan’s, and the Town Offices. Publicity about the questionnaire is going into the paper and on Cable TV. On the question of an interview with Cable TV, we decided to wait on a “call in” portion until we are closer to having some answers.

We discussed ways of approaching the data and looked at various approaches. One would be an executive summary at the beginning of the entire document and then having each section with a brief identification of the problems found (using bullets) followed by a narrative explaining each. This outline will at least help us get to the next step before we make a final decision on the format of the document. We want to explore the issues to get the best design for the output.

We adjourned at 8:40

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304
Attendees: From the Town Government Study Committee: Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift
Attendees: From the Finance Committee: Ken Adam, Fred Faulkner, Susan MacDowell, Allen McRae, Richard Montminy, Dave Stevens, Steven Venuti

Joe welcomed the Finance Committee and we introduced ourselves. Joe gave a recap of our interviews with employees and people from other towns. He then asked the Fin Com to outline their responsibilities.

Fred Faulkner began by saying that he has been on the Fin Com for 21 years and that generally the committee does three things: run the budget process; suggest cuts; and, occasionally, “when push comes to shove” make cuts. An example of the third was when state revenue numbers change just as the budget is going to the printer.

The Fin Com has been a “de facto board” that is sometimes called to help with various town wide issues such as personnel. They are not always comfortable with that but do contribute. This flows from the fact that they are the only entity in town that actually oversees every board, committee and department in town. They have the best view of the broader issues of town government. In the budget process they can make strong recommendations and even cuts in all budgets except the School budget. In all of this, they work collaboratively with all these departments and committees.

Members of the Fin Com did remark that they have been doing more overall budget direction and longer term planning that they used to do. There is a lack of that in the town and budget issues over the last few years have amplified the need for that work. Their “number’s guy”, Steve Venuti runs spreadsheets and projections that help them see out into the future. They recognize the need to do this work in order to protect the bond rating and so keep borrowing costs as low as possible for the town. There is no one in town government who does this.

Dick Montminy gave an overview of the process they use:
- In Late September, they send a memo to all departments with guidelines as well as information on what revenues look like from the state and other sources
- In mid-November, they meet with each committee and board. They will meet several times with the BOS and School Committee over the next months.
- After all of those meetings, they “crunch” the numbers; hold public forums; and put together their final budget and their insert to the Town Report.
- It all goes to the printer in mid-March

Dick also notes that during this process each member is a liaison to one or more committees, departments or boards. Each group that comes before the Fin Com can meet with this person as often as needed to help work out problems.
One of our members asked the Fin Com ... if any of them had a blank sheet of paper, what suggestions would they make in terms of the structure of town government. Some of the responses included:

- There needs to be someone in charge in terms of “running this building day to day”.
- The BOS needs to be engaged.
- Changes in the physical layout of offices could go a long way to improving service; gaining some economies; and making the town offices work more smoothly. For example Building Services and Board of Health should be in proximity to each other. [We noted that we have heard this before and have seen things like inspectional services co-located in other towns]
- Leadership... people look to the BOS for leadership but the current BOS appear to see themselves as a Board of Directors and not the managers of the town... needs more hands on.
- The biggest recommendation they had was for a facilities manager. We are sitting on over $80 million in assets and no one is planning for preventive maintenance or doing what needs to be done.

One of our members asked about elected versus appointed positions. All seemed to agree that the Treasurer should be appointed... for all the reasons we have heard before. Some on the Fin Com would like to see the Tax Collector also appointed and one member would like to see “all” appointed, including the town clerk.

However, the Fin Com cautioned that if all our work was to produce meaningful results, we would need to be very specific in our recommendations: clear targets; clear road to get to those targets; probably draft articles for town meeting. We discussed bylaws that focus not just on positions or job descriptions but on processes... even “core duties” for Selectmen.

The biggest concern from the Fin Com is that no one is planning for the future except what they have been doing with their spreadsheets and projections.

It was after 9:00 and we thanked the Fin Com for their time. It was not lost on us that every one of them was there and contributing to the discussion. The offered to come back as we got closer to the end and help in any way we might need.

Other business:
Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting of September 13, 2006 were approved with two corrections.

Upcoming meetings:
NOTE... new meeting day is MONDAY
- Sept. 25th 7:00 P.M. Room 304 (Usual Meeting Room)
- October 2nd 7:00 P.M. Cooper Room at the Library
October 9th   NO MEETING
Oct 16th    7:00 P.M.   Room yet to be assigned
Oct 23rd    7:00 P.M.   Cooper Room at the Library
Oct 30th    7:00 P.M.   Cooper Room at the Library

Posters and Questionnaires:
Joe, Lynn, Rod and Harry worked out some issues on positioning posters and on picking up questionnaires.

We adjourned at 9:20

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
PRELIMINARY Milestones for the Littleton Town Government Study Committee

May
- Tim Goddard will provide an overview of Littleton Town Government
- Develop questions for surveys of:
  - Townhouse employees
  - Employees of other towns
  - Visitors from Chelmsford and Sudbury

May/June
- Complete May monthly report
- Conduct townhouse interviews
- Begin interviews of other towns’ employees
- Host people from Chelmsford and Sudbury
- Complete June monthly report

July/August
- Interim analysis of data thus far
- Preliminary report on findings
- Monthly reports

August/September
- Prepare and send out a customer survey
- Analyze results

September/October
- Draft final report
- Public meetings to present findings
- Prepare final report

November
- Deliver Final Report
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday October 23, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Mike Knupp, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift, Roland Gibson, Nate Long

Minutes: The committee voted to approve the minutes from October 16, 2006

Discussions:
Roland and Joe discussed their visit to the town of Harvard

The committee created an outline for its upcoming presentation to the Board of Selectmen. Mike showed all members the slides he created and it was decided to use these slides to help illustrate ideas during the presentation.

The committee agreed to meet with as many town boards as possible. The following boards were identified.
-Board of Health
-Planning Board
-Conservation Commission
-Light & Water Commissioners
-Library Commission
-Housing Authority

With no further business, we adjourned shortly after 9:00.
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, October 30, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Rm 103, Town House
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Masson, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

There was discussion re having a half-hour call-in show on the local TV station. Mike had a concern about being able to fill that length of time before the committee has reached any conclusions. On the other hand, Joe is concerned that when the final findings are presented that citizens will be unaware of any of the issues.

It was decided that the Town Meeting presentation 11/14 should be essentially the same as what is given to the Board of Selectmen on 11/6.

Members formatted some general preliminary conclusions:

Strengthen the organization to a more formal, centralized structure for the day to day operations, such as planning and budget, to address the current weak coordination among departments.

Create a stronger top position (currently Town Administrator) with more departments reporting directly to this position.

It was noted that the budget/finance function currently leaves too much control with the FinCom with no centralized financial function within the Town House staff.

Change some elected positions to appointed positions due to the increased technical nature of the jobs.

Upgrade the communication system and coordinate it town-wide.

Enhance the IT structure which does not appear adequate at this point.

Establish a central facilities management function.

Develop policies to address the irregular communications between boards, departments, employees and citizens.

Centralize the HR function to address inequities in pay, benefits and personnel management.

Address the layout of the Town House to see if it could be more conducive to interaction among similar departments in order to improve service.
Improve the web site to make the information more timely with a centralized calendar that is fully functional.

The Light and Water Commission, Board of Health, and Planning Board have been contacted about being interviewed. Joe will also ask the Personnel Board.

Rod and Mike reminded members that any reorganization should be with the goal of better meeting the town’s needs and not built around personalities. A charter may not be necessary; other tools include job descriptions and by-laws.

It was suggested that we ask the BOS, when we deliver our report, to confirm that this is the direction they want us to pursue. It was asked if another citizen survey should be tried, but the consensus was that we have enough data to draw conclusions, so another survey at this time is not needed. An open forum could be scheduled in Jan/Feb.

Next meeting Rm 304 7pm; then with BOS 8pm.

We adjourned at 8:30

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, November 6, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town House Offices, Room 304
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNameara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Joe handed out the current set of slides that will be given to the Board of Selectmen later in the evening. Harry prepared large poster board copies of the most important slides for the presentation.

Discussions:
• The was a brief discussion about the possibility of a questionnaire before Town meeting and it was agreed there would not be enough time.

• We discussed both the presentation to the BOS later that evening and the presentation to the Town Meeting and agreed they would be essentially the same with changes coming from feedback later that evening.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED that Joe would make the presentation to the BOS later that evening and Harry would present the poster boards so that they might be easily seen by the TV camera.

• We decided that we would do public forums as soon as possible after Town Meeting and decided on early December provided we could get an appropriate room.

• Joe reported that he is still trying to get other town committees to meet with us, including the Planning Board, the Personnel Committee, the Conservation Committee, and the Board of Health.

We agreed that at our next meeting, the night before Town Meeting, we would continue planning for the public forums and continue work on the issues. With that we adjourned at 8:00 to meet with Selectmen at their meeting in Room 103.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNameara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, November 13, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, High School Library
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Lynn Masson, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift
Also attending: Anita Harding, Cathy Coughlin, both representing non-union town employees who have sponsored the personnel bylaw warrant article at Special Town Meeting 11/14/06

It was moved, seconded and voted to accept the minutes of Oct. 16 and Oct. 23 without corrections.

Anita and Cathy distributed copies of their proposed by-law and described the events leading up to the development of the proposed by-law. In 2001 there was a study done to develop the grade/step compensation grid along with the policy to have performance reviews once per year. In 2004 the grid was updated to market rates, but staff was cut and there were no raises. Performance reviews have not happened. In FY06 a 2% across-the-board increase was given. In the meantime, union contracts have been updated on top of which a 2% bonus was awarded. The Personnel Committee has been inactive. At the 2006 Town Meeting at the request of staff a $0.50 per hour increase was given. The proposed by-law was developed from Hopkinton and Lancaster by-laws, incorporating existing town policies.

The Personnel Committee was reactivated by the Selectmen in August of this year. They completed a new market study that is now with the Board of Selectmen. The BOS told the staff that they favor policies over a by-law because it allowed greater flexibility. The feeling of the staff is that procedures should be consistent across-the-board and the current policy does not insure that.

When asked by committee members what other recommendations the staff would have, Anita and Cathy responded with having (1) regular department meetings and (2) honest, fair and open hiring policies.

Next meetings are 11/20 in the High School Library and 11/27 in Rm. 103. The Open Forum is scheduled for 7:30 p.m. on 11/27.

Joe will schedule us on other boards’ meeting nights.

We adjourned at 9:00

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes of the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, November 20, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, High School Library
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Minutes of 10/30, 11/6 and 11/13 were accepted with a minor correction.

The Public Forum at 7:30 p.m. 11/27 is posted on Channel 8 and the town's web site. The preliminary findings will be presented and citizens will be asked for input for further consideration. In answer to Roland’s question regarding the desired outcome, members agreed that it was to share information we’ve gathered and to solicit and gather any pertinent opinions and information. It was agreed that we would not get into a debate about any conclusions at this time. Harry suggested that if there was minimal attendance that we should just repeat the Town Meeting presentation.

Members agreed that the Oct. 30 minutes list of issues (same as in the presentation) is a good starting point from which to develop our end product. The final report should have specific steps in an action plan in order to implement any changes that this committee might recommend. All should continue to review the themes and sections and add any missed items. The difficulties of change, especially if it is perceived to result in a relinquishing of power, were discussed. We should make an effort to include anyone affected by possible suggested changes in the conversations regarding those changes. It was clarified that noting the concentration of the budget/finance function with the FinCom is not a criticism of that committee. We will solicit their opinion about what, if any, budget responsibilities should be shifted to the staff.

Regarding the Town Administrator's open position, the opinion of this committee is that an interim should be hired until any structural changes are identified, rather than advertise for a permanent candidate at this time.

Next Steps

Joe will email list of preliminary findings to committee members. Each should suggest further topics/issues to be included in the outline.

The list with additions will be presented at the open forum 11/27, where additional input will be solicited. Harry will prepare the posters.

Meeting scheduled 12/21 with the Planning Board, Rm. 103, time TBD.

Joe will continue to contact boards to arrange meeting times.

The committee will continue to add specifics to the list of issues in order to develop final conclusions and recommendations.
Littleton Town Government Study Committee

Minutes, November 20, 2006

We will schedule a Saturday session in January to develop the specifics of our conclusions and recommendations. Joe will aim for Rm 106 on Jan. 6th at 10 a.m.

The DLS will be asked for advice of the best methods for implementing any solutions recommended by this committee.

Next meeting 11/27 7:00 pm, forum at 7:30 pm

We adjourned at 8:40

Respectfully Submitted,

Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, November 27, 2006  
Time/Place: 7:00, Town House Offices, Room 103  
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan, MªNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

This committee conducted a brief meeting prior to the open forum.

TGSC Meeting:
Joe reminded us of upcoming meetings with town officials and boards:
Board/Committee                Date                  Location
Board of Health                Monday, December 4, 2006  At Light & Water
Planning Board                 Thursday, December 21, 2006 Room 103
Personnel Committee            TBD
Our working meeting            Saturday, January 6, 2007

Discussions:
On a meeting with the Personnel Committee, Joe noted that they meet on Thursdays at 8:30 AM in Room 103. Many of us will have a difficult time getting to this meeting.

Open Forum:
Joe and then Nate presented our committee’s history and process. This was essentially the same presentation given at Town Meeting.

Steve Sussman asked about the budget impact of our likely recommendations. Various committee members responded that we have not factored those into our recommendations but, for many, we do see some efficiencies and for others a potential cost. A facilities manager would likely be a cost but Joe noted that it would likely be a shared set of responsibilities and costs between the town budget and school budget.

John Bowers said he was "chagrinned" that we received so few responses to our survey. He also wanted to add that he believes the town is well run. Some of the town’s recent problems may have more to do with certain people in certain roles and not necessarily systems. He also wondered why some officials continue to be elected. He mentioned Treasurer and Tax Collector and then added “maybe” Town Clerk and Assessors.

Various committee members responded. We have focused on the structure not people. We have discussed how much we should “tweak the dials” and agree that we do not want to do too much.

Alex McCurdy commented that the TGSC’s work is “very important to the future” of our town. We are setting a framework for that future. As he has mentioned.
before, he has a strong feeling that the democratic process in choosing a wide number of board members is an important part of the framework. He also spoke about not rushing our work. In light of the upcoming resignation of the current Town Administrator, he would suggest to his board (the Board of Selectmen) that they choose an interim Administrator and wait for our recommendations and Town Meeting before settling on a final selection. He made it clear he was speaking for himself and not for his board.

Discussions between and among committee members and citizens looked at the degree of centralization of an Administrator’s role as well as hiring and promotion policies. Joe Gaffney, chair of the town’s Personnel Committee was able to answer some questions and contribute to the discussion.

The discussions concluded and the forum and meeting adjourned by 9:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Town Government Study Committee
Minutes December 12, 2006

Present: Harry Swift, Mike Knupp, Rod Stewart, Roland Gibson, Joe Knox

Meeting started at 7:05

Minutes for Nov 27 were approved.

Discussion on the meeting between Bonnie Holston, Town Accountant, and members Karen Duggan McNamara and Joe Knox will take place when Karen is present. Joe brought copies of the 2002 Session of the General Court, Chapter 315. This chapter deals with the special Act that formed the Finance Dept. in Lancaster. While this will not be exactly what we might be looking to accomplish it is very informative on how the Finance dept can be organized with certain officials having two roles.

Discussion was held on the possible ways an appointed position could be filled. Taking the Treasurer as an example, the Treasurer could be appointed by:
1. the Selectman with non screening committee
2. the Administrator with no screening committee
3. having a screening committee recommending a certain number of candidates to the Admin and having the Admin. make the appointment
4. having a screening committee recommending a certain number of candidates to the Selectman and having the Selectman make the appointment
5. having a screening committee with the Admin. as Chair, recommending a certain number of candidates to the Selectman and having the Selectman make the appointment
6. having the screening committee recommend a large pool of candidates to the Admin., having the Admin. select 3 candidates with the Selectman making the final choice
It was agreed that this should be ironed out at our Jan 6th meeting.
To organize the Jan 6 meeting, Joe will list all the areas of concern that the
committee has brought forth and send that list to Roland and Mike. How will
organize a process of discussion for that meeting. Members are free to
send a list to Joe who will compile it for Roland & Mike.

Discussion was held on what we should present to the Selectman at their
meeting at 8:30 dealing with the appointment of the new Town
Administrator. It was agreed to request the following:
1. An Interim Admin. should be selected
2. The appointment of the new Administrator should not take place until
   after Town Meeting
3. The committee will have a by-law comprehensive enough to deal with
   appointed positions, will have complete duties of the Administrator, and a
   selection process

Meeting adjourned at 8:15

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Knox
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, December 18, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town House
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Masson, Rod Stewart

Minutes of 12/12 were accepted as distributed.

Personnel Committee Update: It was noted that the Personnel Committee is dealing with many of the same issues as this committee has discovered. They advised this committee not to let cost be a road block to finding solutions. They are aware of the difficulty of communications within the Town House staff, as well as among committees. They would like to see consistency and collaboration of responsibilities with Policies and Procedures and equitable compensation among the staff. They were fully supportive of appointing officers with the more technical duties rather than having them be elected. They expressed concerns about which authority should have the appointing authority. Their time table seems to mesh with the TGSC’s timetable as far as having the goal of action at the Spring 2007 Town Meeting.

Presenting Findings to BOS: There was discussion about whether it would be more effective to present our findings to the Selectmen in smaller groups before a formal meeting with both committees fully represented.

Town Administrator Search: There was discussion about the candidates for TA and what qualifications would be right for Littleton and the possible future direction of the position. It was moved, seconded and voted to elect Mike Knupp as the representative of the TGSC on the TA Search Committee.

At 8:05 the Committee joined the Conservation Committee at their meeting. We explained our preliminary findings to bring them up-to-date with our status.

We adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Masson
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Thursday, January 11, 2007
Time/Place: 6:30 P.M., Town House Offices, Room 304
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan, M Namara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

This meeting was called to discuss the position of TGSC representative to the Town Administrator Selection Committee. After discussion, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to affirm Michael Knupp as the TSCS representative to the Town Administrator Selection Committee. The vote was unanimous, 6 YES.

We also agreed to compose a letter to the Board of Selectmen explaining why we voted to reaffirm Mike. Harry volunteered to do that.

We agreed that this should put no pressure on Mike and that he has our support if he should choose to decline our selection. If that contingency arose, we would address another selection at a subsequent meeting.

Joe noted that we will be meeting with the Town Accountant next Tuesday at 6:00 P.M. to further discuss the financial offices of the town. She was very informative at the initial interview with Joe and Karen and, we believe, can give us additional insight into the next round of our discussions. She needs to attend the FinCom meeting at 7:00 so this will be limited to an hour.

Joe asks all to read the minutes of our last meeting carefully. These look like they will be our suggestions for bylaw changes and we want them to be carefully worded.

Joe also asks that we bring lists to the next meeting of...
  - Additional proposed bylaw changes
  - Recommendations for changes that will not be proposed bylaw changes
  - Other comments that will also be in our Final Report

We will need to check, but we believe we are working with a deadline of late February to complete work for the Town Report.

Finally, we discussed the meeting with the Library Trustees later in the evening. Three of us could not attend but Joe, Rod and Karen would be attending.

With business completed, we adjourned at 7:25.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Saturday, January 20, 2007
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town House Offices, Room 103
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Minutes:
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of January 8, 2007 with one correction. It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of January 8, 2007 with no corrections.

Letter to BOS
The draft of a letter to the Board of Selectmen was modified and then signed by all present. It registered our concern that a member of our committee who happened to be a former Selectman was characterized as a “good old boy” with various connotations that implied. Due to his resignation from the Town Administrator Selection Committee, the letter also informed the BOS that Karen Duggan McNamara will sit in his place.

Elected to appointed offices
We then turned our attention to our previous vote on elected offices. With some better wording from the Acts of the Commonwealth, we updated our previous motions on three elected offices.

NOTE>>> The arbitrary titles below “Article 1, Article 2...” are made here for our own convenience and do not reflect where they would be positioned on a final town warrant.

Concerning the position of Town Treasurer, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to propose the following article for the Town Meeting Warrant.

ARTICLE – 1
To see if the Town of Littleton consistent with MGL. Ch. 41 Section 1B, will vote to have the elected position of Treasurer become an appointed Treasurer of the Town. If approved and the office becomes appointed, any incumbent serving at the time of voter acceptance continues to serve until the remainder of his or her term expires. If a person is elected to the position at the same time the change to an appointed status occurs, the newly elected office holder serves until an appointment is made. Unless otherwise stated in by-law, the appointment is made by the Selectmen for a term not to exceed three years.
Concerning the position of Town Clerk, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to propose the following article for the Town Meeting Warrant.

**ARTICLE – 2**
To see if the Town of Littleton consistent with MGL. Ch. 41 Section 1B, will vote to have the elected position of Town Clerk become an appointed Town Clerk of the Town. If approved and the office becomes appointed, any incumbent serving at the time of voter acceptance continues to serve until the remainder of his or her term expires. If a person is elected to the position at the same time the change to an appointed status occurs, the newly elected office holder serves until an appointment is made. Unless otherwise stated in by-law, the appointment is made by the Selectmen for a term not to exceed three years.

Concerning the position of Town Tax Collector, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to propose the following article for the Town Meeting Warrant.

**ARTICLE – 3**
To see if the Town of Littleton consistent with MGL. Ch. 41 Section 1B, will vote to have the elected position of Tax Collector become an appointed Tax Collector of the Town. If approved and the office becomes appointed, any incumbent serving at the time of voter acceptance continues to serve until the remainder of his or her term expires. If a person is elected to the position at the same time the change to an appointed status occurs, the newly elected office holder serves until an appointment is made. Unless otherwise stated in by-law, the appointment is made by the Selectmen for a term not to exceed three years.

We then addressed the goals of this meeting: work on the Town Administrator position’s duties and reports and whether we would suggest a Finance Department.

We have agreed that there needs to be a realignment of functions in town government. We also agree on the alignment of financial functions under one person be that the Town Administrator or a Finance Director that falls under the Town Administrator. We have also been made aware of the limited service town employees and citizens have with the lack of a Human Resources person. That function has been the responsibility of the assistant to the Town Treasurer and with the potential change in the Treasurer’s position, it is our general feeling that the function needs to be closer to the Town Administrator.

Going back to the Finance functions, we reviewed the changes that were made in a town of comparable size, Lancaster. We proceeded to adapt some of the language from Chapter 315 of the Acts [of the Commonwealth] for our use.

After discussions on various parts of this Act, we made the following changes and agreed that they should be part of a Finance Organization. We also agreed that the head of this department could more properly be called the Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget and report to the Town Administrator. This leaves the Human Resources function entirely with the Town Administrator and gives the town the enough
resources to adequately coordinate the management of the town, both finances and personnel... problems that have been raised by many.

Concerning the financial management of the town, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to propose the following article for the Town Meeting Warrant. (Again note that “Article 4” does not represent anything other than a title for our own convenience)

**ARTICLE - 4**

To see if the Town of Littleton will establish in accordance with MGL Chapter 43C, Section 14, a Department of Finance and Budget and accept the following:

**Section 1.** There is hereby established in the Town of Littleton a Department of Finance and Budget. The department shall be managed by an Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget (AAFB) who shall be appointed by the Board of Selectmen for a term of three (3) years unless otherwise stated in a by-law.

**Section 2.** The AAFB shall have all the powers and duties presently vested in one or more of the following positions: Town Accountant, Treasurer (if appointed), Tax Collector (if appointed) or Chief Assessor. The following offices, if appointed and their collective staff shall be become part of the Department of Finance and report to the AAFB: Town Accountant, Town Treasurer, Tax Collector, IT Director and Chief Assessor and shall be under the supervision of the AAFB.

**Section 3.** The AAFB shall be responsible for coordinating the fiscal management practices of the accountant’s department, the tax collector’s department, the treasury department, the assessing department. The AAFB shall be responsible for administering budgeting including financial reporting, accountability and control, financial and programmatic implications on current and future policies to all town departments and the Board of Selectmen. The powers and duties of the AAFB shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) to coordinate with all town departments and manage the collection of all budget and financial information, including the forecasting of revenues for the forthcoming fiscal year in order to prepare an annual budget for the annual town meeting;

(2) to set policies and procedures for the collection of all revenues due and owing to the town of Littleton as a result of tax levies, and the issuance of licenses and permits;

(3) to review, on a yearly basis, the various town trust funds, and to insure that funds are prudently invested.

(4) the AAFB shall be the chief procurement officer for the town of Littleton:
(5) to report to the Board of Selectmen and Finance Committee concerning all financial matters affecting town government;

(6) to coordinate with the Massachusetts Department of Revenue pertaining to all matters on their municipal calendar; and

(7) to coordinate and manage all financial information received from the Board of Assessors to forecast future financial growth and anticipated revenues, and advise the Board of Selectmen, Finance Committee and Town Meeting accordingly.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to all state, federal and municipal statutes, laws, regulations and by laws, the Department of Finance and Budget shall make detailed estimates of all money necessary to maintain the proper operation of government.

SECTION 5. The Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget shall report to the Town Administrator.

Responsibilities of the Town Administrator:
The committee then focused on those functions and areas that were of concern to those we interviewed, both employees and other boards. These included:
   Managing money
   Managing people

With the above work done on an the Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget, it was now left to look at a better way of managing people, performance reviews, personnel policies, and day to day operations of town government. We identified reporting structure as might now exist if the above articles were adopted along with additional reports that might come, such as a future Facilities Manager.

We divided town employees into three group. The first group of employees fall under the Board of Selectmen. Some or all might fall under a Town Administrator. The second group work for other elected boards... each office employing one to four employees. These are the employees that might have some "dotted line" reporting responsibilities to a Town Administrator.

The third group also represents employees of departments run by an elected board. However these departments have many employees with well established personnel policies and procedures and would not have "dotted line" responsibilities to the Town Administrator. With further consultation with the Personnel Committee, there may be an oversight duty for the Town Administrator for all employees for purposes of Insurance, Benefits or other specific Human Resource requirements.
Employees Reporting (at some level) to the Town Administrator:
1. Those who report to the Board of Selectmen: the employees of large or small departments whose reporting structure falls (or will fall, if earlier articles are passed) under the Board of Selectmen... either directly or indirectly.
   - Police Department
   - Fire Department
   - Dispatch (under Police)
   - Highway
   - Building
   - Future IT Person
   - Accounting ➔ Finance Department
   - Treasurer
   - Tax Collector
   - Potential Facilities Manager
   - Custodians
   - Town Clerk

2. Those who report to other boards (elected and appointed), most of whom work in the town office building. A key attribute is that the staff is very small and is likely to remain so (1 to 4 people).
   - Planning
   - Health
   - Conservation
   - Assessors
   - Park and Recreation
   - Council on Aging
   - Cemetery
   - Schools
   - Library

The difficulty of the meeting was in the wording of an article that would be clear and still represent the requirements that we have heard from multiple interviews both with employees and boards.

The goal is to have the day to day work environment and the annual performance review guidelines administrated in a fair an even way so that employees of both Group 1 and Group 2 believe that there is a fair system for all. There is the additional, and important, goal of consistency to those who use the services of the town offices.

We did not finalize an "Article 5" but we did develop language that moves toward the goals just stated.

Day to Day Administration: The Town Administrator will set the day to day operation of all employees in the town offices. This will include setting the hours of operation (with input from the employee’s elected or appointed board), overall calendar and other coordination issues.

The Performance Review Process: In order to insure consistent review across various departments, Performance Reviews shall be administered by the Town Administrator.
- Input from the Town Administrator to other Departments:
  The Town Administrator shall provide input to the annual review of all town employees that he or she comes in contact with in the normal operations of the office. This will include all employees who work in small departments and report to an elected or appointed board. It will also include input to the School Committee,
Water and Light Commissioners, and Library Trustees for those employees in their departments that have frequent interaction with the Town Administrator (Department Head, Business Manager, and others as deemed appropriate by the boards)

Other discussion points regarding the Town Administrator's position:
We discussed, but did not resolve, whether the PD and FD should remain with the BOS and not be put under the Town Administrator. We also discussed the need to assess and report on the financial implications of a "new position" (Finance Director or Assistant Town Administrator for Budget and Finance) and a Facilities Director.

Finally, we looked to our plans for this meeting and assessed what needed to be done at the next and future meetings. We have drafts of the bylaw wording for changing the three elected offices to appointed offices. We have mostly completed the Finance Department and the selection committees and criteria for BOS reports. We have partially completed the Town Administrator's position.

To do: complete the work on the Town Administrator's position; list recommendations that will not likely become "bylaws"; prepare our report to the Board of Selectmen on February 12, 2007; connect with Town Counsel and DLS for review; finalize our proposed articles for the Town Report; prepare our report for the Town Report; and revisit various boards and employees. We adjourned shortly after noon.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2007  
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town House Offices, Room 103  
Attendees: Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Because this was a small group, we concentrated on our next priorities and some assignments for the next Saturday meeting.

Priorities:
1) Complete the Town Administrator work
2) Recommendations that we plan on making that do not require a bylaw
3) Prepare our report of the Town Administrator
4) A report back from two members after they talk to the Town Clerk and Tax Collector

We gave ourselves assignments for the next meeting. The first three were in sequence. The rest were for all members.

1) Karen ... get out the January 20th minutes so that additional ideas for “Article 5” can build from that.
2) Joe, send Karen and all the notes from the flip chart done on January 20th
3) Rod, pull these together and add ideas on an “Article 5”
4) Harry, will begin an executive summary for the Board of Selectmen meeting on February 12th. He will look at our narratives done early on and try to pull bullets from them. This will identify the problems that our report is addressing.
5) ALL... we will each bring our list of “Recommendations” to the next meeting. These are those things that we want to include in our report but are not likely to result in a bylaw.
6) ALL... we should each look at “Article 5” and answer the question “what else goes into this?” We have the Review's, reporting, Selection Committees for both the direct reports of the Board of Selectmen and for those who report to the Administrator.

We also discussed that it was important that we meet again, and possibly multiple times, with the Personnel Committee to insure we are not in conflict nor have holes that neither group is addressing.

Minutes:
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes for December 18th. Two members who did not attend on the 18th abstained.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2007
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town House Offices, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNama, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

Because this was a small group, we concentrated on our next priorities and some assignments for the next Saturday meeting.

Priorities:
1) Complete the Town Administrator work
2) Recommendations that we plan on making that do not require a bylaw
3) Prepare our report of the Town Administrator
4) A report back from two members after they talk to the Town Clerk and Tax Collector

We gave ourselves assignments for the next meeting. The first three were in sequence. The rest were for all members.
1) Karen ... get out the January 20th minutes so that additional ideas for “Article 5” can build from that.
2) Joe, send Karen and all the notes from the flip chart done on January 20th
3) Rod, pull these together and add ideas on an “Article 5”
4) Harry, will begin an executive summary for the Board of Selectmen meeting on February 12th. He will look at our narratives done early on and try to pull bullets from them. This will identify the problems that our reports is addressing.
5) ALL.... we will each bring our list of “Recommendations” to the next meeting. These are those things that we want to include in our report but are not likely to result in a bylaw.
6) ALL... we should each look at “Article 5” and answer the question “what else goes into this?” We have the Review s, reporting, Selection Committees for both the direct reports of the Board of Selectmen and for those who report to the Administrator.

We also discussed that it was important that we meet again, and possibly multiple times, with the Personnel Committee to insure we are not in conflict nor have holes that neither group is addressing.

Minutes:
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes for December 18th. Two members who did not attend on the 18th abstained.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNama
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Saturday, February 3, 2007
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town House Offices, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Agenda:
- Where do we want to be ...
- Report on an interview with the Nashoba Board of Health Agent
- Report to the Selectmen
- Finish the work on the Town Administrator position
- Recommendations
- Search Committee

After a brief discussion on where we are going, the two members who interviewed Ira Grossman, the Health Agent assigned to Littleton by the Nashoba Board of Health, reported on the interview. There are problems with the movement of paperwork between the Littleton BOH Nashoba; and permit applications getting to appropriate boards both within Littleton (Planning and ZBA, for example) and to Nashoba.

In the discussion that followed, the question was asked: “Who is in a position to oversee the various pieces of town government?” The answer from others on the Committee was the Board of Selectmen... or more precisely “The Board of Selectmen normally does this.” To this point, a member recommended that we each do a Google Search on “Board of Selectmen Responsibilities Massachusetts” and we will find a clear list of responsibilities put together on the web sites for various towns.

Town Administrator Search Committee (TASC):
The new representative of this Committee to the TASC, Karen McNamara, asked members if it would be their wish to bring our work on the Town Administrator’s position to the next TASC meeting, scheduled for February 14th. All agreed as long as I note to the TASC that these suggested bylaws are only just going to the BOS and have not been “approved” by the BOS. Karen also reported, for those who might not have known, that the Search Committee has only met once thus far.

We then continued with reviewing a draft report for the BOS and the proposed articles. There were various changes suggested and agreed to for improved wording. Harry and Rod agreed to send out an versions to all for our next meeting.

Minutes:
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to accept the minutes from the January 24th meeting with no corrections.

We adjourned at 11:15

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Saturday, February 10, 2007
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town House Offices, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara,
           Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Agenda:
- Minutes
- Articles
- Facility Manager; Police Chief?
- Strong Chief

Minutes:
There was one correction to the minutes of January 24, 2007. It was Moved,
Seconded and VOTED to accept the corrected minutes of January 24, 2007 and
accept the minutes of February 3, 2007 with no corrections.

Miscellaneous:
Joe reported that the Police Chief and Acting Town Administrator, Don
Armstrong were not beginning renovations but merely expanding storage
capabilities in the town office building.

Any discussion on strong chiefs was tabled to a future meeting.

Articles and the Report:
The committee then took up changes to the Proposed Articles and Report to the
Board of Selectmen. Each is attached to this set of minutes.

- The proposed articles is titled: (Draft) Proposed Warrant Articles of the Town
  Government Study Committee. The revision of the Articles is called “Rev 8”
  and it is dated February 10, 2007

- The Report is titled (Partial Draft) Report of the Town Government Study
  Committee and is dated February 10, 2007.

NOTE... For anyone copying the Report..., please note that the Windows
“creation date” erroneously has February 17, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Monday, February 12, 2007
Time/Place: 7:30 P.M., Town House Offices, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

NOTE: These minutes are from the TGSC presentation to the Board of Selectmen at the regularly scheduled BOS meeting.

Joe gave some opening remarks; Mike handled the power point presentation; Lynn gave our recommendations; Karen gave our conclusions.

All Selectmen gave glowing remarks to the TGSC for the time we have put into the work and for the results. Most have been omitted here for brevity. Any interpretations of the meeting are in brackets [...] 

Ken Aldridge
The BOS commissioned this study believing the town needed some changes. His goals were...
1) Full time accountable leadership
   • Our part time boards do a fine job. [If there was a “but” here either he didn’t finish the thought or I didn’t get it down]
2) Want to increase our talent pool. Here he gave the example of the effort that went into the initial search for a Treasurer until Don stepped forward
3) Improve communications
   • Some progress
   • BOS, School Committee and Fin Com doing better
4) Improved efficiency... putting like areas together
5) Better ways of handling budget

He said his biggest concern is that while he flat organization does present problems, it does allow for checks and balances. He doesn’t want to loose that.

[*** The takeaway here is the need for accountability in the new structure.]

Alex McCurdy
Agrees with our assessment that the employees are doing an exceptional job.
Observes
• We can not take the voters out of deciding the future of the town. They are at the top of an organizational structure.
• Communications is broken... we should say it more explicitly, and...
• ... show where communications is broken

Reed Augliere
• Suggests doing a clustering exercise. Separate the “doable” from the things that are more challenging to the town.
• Wants us to identify…
  1) Most critical
  2) Most controversial
  3) Other? [Didn’t get what else are in these categories]
• On elected versus appointed, he did his own research. He’s good with tax collector and treasurer. He called the appointed town clerk “uncommon” and linked this with “checks and balances”
• Second Cluster… consolidation of the Town Administrator functions… there are three issues: efficiency, costs, checks & balances.
• Third Cluster: Realignment of the responsibilities
  o Less controversial
  o Greatest effectiveness [I think that’s the word… can’t read my note here!]
  o HR suggestion and Facilities suggestion … “outstanding”
• “One Last Thing”: We want to sell the correct set of recommendations to the town. For each recommendation we need…
  o Clear specifications of the problem
  o Collection of evidence for the that problem
  o Then the connection of the recommendation to the problem
He suggests maybe a pro & con to each recommendations. Mike noted here that we had talked about a SWOT exercise for each and that met with Reid’s approval
• “Another thought” on the bylaws… do we really want the town administrator’s search in the bylaws
• Back to how the town will view this… it is very “opaque” to the average person. We should have the structure of the town as it is; what doesn’t work; then structure of town and how that helps fix problems.

• [my observation… he went through the docs thoroughly… lots of mark-ups]

After some discussion with us, Ken opened it up to the public. Hugh Ernesy suggested that we use influential people like “Margaret” Harvey to help sell the town.

Michael Whitney had some good suggestions that were not unlike the SWOT approach.

Didn’t record others.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan M’Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Cooper Room in the Library
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

Joe and Chris from the DLS joined us and gave us feedback on the Articles. There was a fairly long discussion on ballots and how most towns would do this. All changes to the Articles were noted by Rod and will be sent around separately.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 230
Attendees: Joe Knox, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan M'Namara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift
BOS Attendees: Alex McCurdy and Ivan Pagacik

Joe welcomed our special guests and thanked them for attending. The discussion was wide ranging. Among the subjects covered:

Question: Would these Articles go on the Warrant
Answer: Ivan and Alex said yes. While not speaking for all selectmen, they believe that this is the intention of their board.

Both Alex and Ivan want to have a full and open discussion of the merits of the various articles with the committee but will vote that these articles will go on the warrant as “place holders”. There is an understanding that we or others may want to make changes to some of the wording (or possibly pull an article) after our committee receives feedback from the BOS, other boards and the public.

Ivan asked a question on hiring and firing which prompted a change in our wording in parts of both Article 4 and Article 5.

Alex led a discussion of the appointing authority of the Town Administrator for the three positions under that position: Treasurer, Tax Collector and Accountant. He repeated the concern he voiced at an earlier meeting. Does this contain sufficient checks and balances? We want to allow for the strengths of the various positions and be sure there is balance for the good and to limit the negatives.

After various proposals, we re-worded those sections of the article so that the Board of Selectmen have final say over the hiring and firing of those positions should we have both a Town Administrator and an Assistant Town Administrator.

There was some discussion of Article 3, an appointed Town Clerk. There is generally less support for this than for Article 1 and 2.

After the various changes were made to Revision 11 of our Draft, both Alex and Ivan left.

We adjourned at 9:15

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M'Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Saturday, February 24, 2007  
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 230  
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan, M²Namara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

This focus of this meeting was to prepare the final wording of the Articles to be submitted to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant. It was decided that we would vote on each article separately. We were updating Revision 12 of the Articles. Only the changes are recorded here. The final document is separate.

**Article 1 (concerning the position of Town Treasurer):**  
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to submit this article as written to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant.

**Article 2 (concerning the position of Tax Collector)**  
The article as written contained a typo. The change was made from “Treasurer” to “Tax Collector”. It was then Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to submit this article to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant with this one change.

**Article 3 (concerning the position of Town Clerk)**  
The article as written contained a typo and the wording was changed from “Treasurer” to “Town Clerk”. It was Moved and Seconded to submit this article the Board of Selectmen for the warrant with this one change.

Discussion followed on the merits of continuing to include this article given the feedback we have received from the Board of Selectmen and others. After the discussion it was VOTED to NOT submit this article to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant. The vote was 4 NO and 3 YES.

**Article 4 (concerning the establishment of a department of finance and budget)**  
The following changes were made to the REV 12 version of this article:
- Section 2, third line: change the word “officers” to the word “positions”
- Section 4, subsection 1: change “coordinating and managing” to “coordinating, managing,” [removing the ‘and” and inserting appropriate commas]
- Section 4, subsection 6: Change to now read “ensuring the town’s timely reporting to the Massachusetts Department of Revenue (DOR) in accordance with all requirements of the DOR municipal calendar.”
- Section 4: Add a subsection 7 to read “and perform other duties as directed by the Town Administrator”

It was then Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to submit this article to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant with the changes listed above.

**Article 5 (concerning the hiring process and duties for Town Administrator)**  
The following changes were made to the REV 12 version of this article:
- In the first sentence add the word “approve” so that it reads “To see if the Town of Littleton will approve a bylaw defining the hiring process and establish the duties and responsibilities of the Town Administrator”
• Section 3: Insert the phrase “and removed by” to make consistent with other sections of this article and Article 4. The last sentence would now read “The department heads shall be appointed by and removed by the Town Administrator subject to the approval of the Board of Selectmen.”
• Section 4: Remove this section (it relates to, and is already in, Article 4)
• Fix the numbering of remaining subsections due to the removal of section 4 and to a mistake with no subsection 6. With the new numbering the REV 12 subsections would read 1 through 9.
• Add an additional subsection, now subsection 10, that would read: The Town Administrator shall perform other duties as directed by the Board of Selectmen.

It was then Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to submit this article to the Board of Selectmen for the warrant with the changes listed above.

Other discussions:
During the discussion of the Town Administrator’s duties, the question of managing the town’s farm/orchard came up. Rather than adding to this article it was agreed that we would bring this to the attention of the Personnel Board and see if they would put that in the job description of the Town Administrator.

Future plans:
Our committee still needs to work on developing the “Pros and Cons” for these articles. Some of us have yet to provide feedback on the first cut of the SWOT analysis. The first will be done at our next meeting. The second can be done offline over the next week and brought back to a future meeting.

Meetings with Boards, town employees, and public forums. It was agreed that we need to get back to all boards and to key employees that are impacted by our proposed articles. We gave Joe our calendar options and agreed on the following:
• We will meet on Wednesday, February 28th at 7:00. Joe will find a room.
• We will ask the Fin Com to meet with us at the earliest convenience of both boards
• We will ask the Board of Assessors to put us on their agenda to go over the final articles and get their feedback.
• We will invite all boards to join us in a meeting for feedback.
• Joe will set up interviews with the Treasurer, Tax Collector (and Chief Assessor?)

Lynn distributed a copy of the Table of Contents for Concord’s “Committee Handbook, something that will be in the Recommendations of our final report. Harry distributed a proposed organization of the “Issues, Problem, Impact Analysis, Solution and Cost” for the various recommendations we will be doing. Mike asked for copies of key minutes and reports that supplement that report... possibly using them as appendices.

We adjourned at 9:30

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan M'Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Saturday, March 3, 2007
Time/Place: 8:00 A.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan M²Namara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Committee continued to work on the Report that will be presented to the Board of Selectmen. Changes made in the Communications section were approved by Nate and Lynn. They had written the original section.

We reviewed other recent suggested inserts and incorporated a number of changes. The Committee also made some numbering fixes. Two suggested updates on the IT section were tabled for further discussion.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to accept the March 2nd draft of the report as amended at this meeting.

We adjourned at 9:20 A. M.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M²Namara
Town Government Study Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
March 17, 2007

In Attendance: H. Swift, R. Stewart, J. Knox, M. Knupp, N. Long, K. McNamara

1. Meeting called to order by Chairman Knox.

2. Committee reviewed Articles to be placed on the Warrant for the May Annual Town Meeting.
   a. It was moved, seconded and voted unanimously to accept Articles 9 and 10 as revised by Town Counsel and the ballot questions as submitted. Ms. McNamara had not yet arrived at the time this vote was taken.
   b. Article 11 was discussed and debated. The following changes were voted and approved:
      1. Change the sub-section numbering to be consistent.
      2. Change the wording in Article 11, Section 3 to read: The AAFB shall have direct authority over and conduct performance reviews for the following current and future department heads unless specified by statute. The department heads shall be appointed by and can be removed by, the AAFB and the Town Administrator subject to the approval of the BOS.
         (1) Town Account
         (2) Town Treasurer if appointed
         (3) Town Tax Collector if appointed
         (4) Chief Assessor (With approval of the Board of Assessors rather than the BOS)
      3. Change the wording in Article 11, Section 4.1 to read: Coordinating, managing budgetary and financial information, forecasting revenue for the forthcoming fiscal year, preparing the Finance Committee’s annual budget in advance of the annual town meeting and coordinating and managing the budget and financial information throughout the year;
   c. Changes in the wording in Article 12, Section 6 were voted by the committee to read: The Town Administrator through the AAFB shall be responsible for the budget process across all town departments to coordinate the Finance Committee’s budget to be presented to Annual Town Meeting.
   d. The Committee voted to accept the Committee’s report submitted Mr. Swift with amendments to be put into the Annual Town Report.
   e. Next meeting will be the public forum at 7:00 PM on Monday, March 19, 2007 in room 103 of the Town Hall.
   f. Motion to accept the meeting minutes of 2/28/07, 3/3/07, and 3/17/07 was made and voted.
   g. Moved and voted to adjourn.
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, April 4, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The committee discussed the objections of the Board of Assessors to the wording of the proposed Article establishing the Department of Finance and Budget. Both Nate and Lynn had previously reported that the Board of Assessors very much liked the idea of this and our other articles but could not support this article without some changes in wording.

They were concerned with Section 3 of the article and saw the potential for the Assistant Town Administrator for Finance & Budget (AAFB) taking away too much authority from the BOA or putting the chief assessor in a difficult position between the BOA and the AAFB.

Lynn reiterated that the BOA was very much in favor of the direction of the article and of this section but concerned only with the wording that had consequences we would not intend and they did not wish to see.

After some discussion it was decided to split Section 3 into two sections. Section 3A would drop "(4) Chief Assessor..." but all before that would remain unchanged; section 3B would have specific wording for the Chief Assessor.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to propose the following language for Section 3 of this article:

Section 3A:
The Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget shall have direct authority over and conduct performance reviews for the following current and future department heads unless otherwise specified in by law or statutes as structured below. The department heads shall be appointed by, and can be removed by, the Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget and the Town Administrator subject to the approval of the Board of Selectmen.

   (1) Town Accountant
   (2) Town Treasurer if appointed
   (3) Town Tax Collector if appointed

Section 3B:
The Assistant Town Administrator for Finance and Budget, subject to the approval of the Board of Assessors, shall have direct authority over, conduct performance reviews, appoint and remove the Chief Assessor.
Joe agreed to send that wording to Tom Harrington for review. Lynn would inform the Board of Assessors of our vote.

The committee discussed a new development. Tom Harrington had reported to Joe that some of the articles would need to go to ballot before town meeting. After discussion with the interim Town Moderator, it was agreed that the articles could be presented at Town Meeting on Saturday but no vote would be taken at that time; they would be tabled. They would then go to the ballot as scheduled and the Town Meeting vote would be taken the following week when Town Meeting would be resumed.

The committee asked Joe to ask Harrington to double check all of this. There was nothing like this in the version of the law many on the committee had read nor had the DLS brought this up.

We discussed ways of presenting our articles to the public for their review. Mike will write an article for the local paper. Harry will update the presentation for local cable. Joe will check with both the paper and cable. Joe will also ask the Library if copies of both the presentation and final report can be left there for people to take. If yes, Mike’s article and the cable presentation will note that.

The committee has not reviewed the rest of the final report beyond the articles and those other recommendations done for the presentation to the Board of Selectmen. We agreed that we would take that up at our next meeting and that we should all bring the latest copy of the final report to the next meeting.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to adjourn at 8:10.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan M\textsuperscript{2}Namara, Rod Stewart
Also Attending: Ken Eldridge, chair of the Board of Selectmen member
Various members of the Personnel Committee

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED unanimously to accept the minutes of April 4, 2007 with no corrections.

Joe updated the committee on his conversations with the DOR and others concerning the need for a Town Meeting vote after the ballot vote on Article 11.

To recap the requirements for our recommended articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Annual TM Vote</th>
<th>Ballot</th>
<th>Subsequent TM Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>May not count</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>May be necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ken Eldridge explained the Board of Selectmen's votes supporting (or not) the four articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>BOS Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Voted to Support (Unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Voted to Support (Unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Voted to Support (3 for, 2 against)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voted not to support as a bylaw; but agree to implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ken reiterated the commitment to support article 12 as a policy but believed it should be a policy and not a bylaw. He suggested that Tom Harrington did not know of other towns who implemented this as bylaw. We suggested that we had found a number of them and noted that much of the language was lifted from another town's bylaw, with some deletions and changes appropriate to the circumstances in Littleton.

It was agreed that Ken would present the articles at Town Meeting with an overview and that we would follow up to address further questions.

Our committee then worked with Joe Gaffney and others on the Personnel Committee to insure that their article and our various articles were not in conflict. There were no issues to address.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to adjourn at 9:10 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan M\textsuperscript{2}Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

The Committee reviewed the wording of the four articles being presented to Town Meeting, especially the wording of Articles 11 and 12.

Joe and Mike reported that since the Board of Selectmen were not supporting Article 12, it will be presented as a citizen's petition of the Committee's by Mike Knupp.

We agreed that we would provide a handout of the final wording. We also reviewed who would speak to which articles.

We also agreed to post a meeting for our committee for the morning of Town Meeting if we should need to decide anything at the last minute before Town Meeting. Joe agreed to do the posting.

We adjourned at 8:35 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date:       Wednesday, May 2, 2007
Time/Place:     7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees:      Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart

The Committee reviewed the wording of the four articles being presented to Town Meeting, especially the wording of Articles 11 and 12.

Joe and Mike reported that since the Board of Selectmen were not supporting Article 12, it will be presented as a citizen’s petition of the Committee’s by Mike Knupp.

We agreed that we would provide a handout of the final wording. We also reviewed who would speak to which articles.

We also agreed to post a meeting for our committee for the morning of Town Meeting if we should need to decide anything at the last minute before Town Meeting. Joe agreed to do the posting.

We adjourned at 8:35 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Tuesday, May 29, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Committee discussed the upcoming Town Meeting on Monday, June 11, 2007 at 7:00 P.M. It will be at the Middle School.

Before going on with further business, the committee discussed the chairmanship. The committee felt that Joe should continue as Chair. Given that the Tom Harrington recommended against that, it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED that Harry Swift become the new Chair.

The committee then discussed the recommendation on IT. After a vote to accept one of the bullets, it was determined that we were looking at the wrong version. We agreed with the most recent version and the earlier motion and vote was withdrawn.

Minutes:
It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to accept the following Minutes:
• April 4, 2007 with one change to correct the day/date
• April 17, 2007 with no changes
• May 2, 2007 with one change... Roland Gibson did not attend

We went back to reviewing our final report. Harry will put a summary page in the report.

In preparation for the Special Town Meeting, Rod presented a letter he offered to send to the Littleton Independent and Lowell Sun. We recommended some minor changes and thanked him for doing that.

Next meeting will be on Tuesday, June 5, 2007.

We adjourned at 8:10.

Respectfully Submitted
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Tuesday, June 5, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Town Office Building, Room 203
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Nate Long, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Committee moved from it's scheduled meeting room (Room 103) to the Conservation Commission Office due to a conflict. Harry Swift convened the meeting at 7:30.

We went over a draft of the final report and an upcoming presentation to the Board of Selectmen. After that presentation, unless there is some need for our committee in the fall, we will probably dissolve. Rather than present at the June 18th meeting BOS meeting (Harry and Mike will not be able to attend) or wait until the next scheduled BOS meeting (July 9th), we asked Joe if he might ask the Board of Selectmen if we could have our own meeting on June 26th. It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to ask Joe to do this.

We discussed the final report and agreed on the following changes:

- Rword the “Town Hall Layout” summary.
- Drop the names of individual BOS members and simply put “Board of Selectmen” on the cover page
- Date the report June 5, 2007... the date of final approval
- Some changes to the Acknowledgement page
- Add the unapproved minutes (May 29th and these, June 5th) to the end of the report but flag as yet to be approved.

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the first four above earlier in the meeting and it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve the fifth bullet later in the meeting. The final report will be dated June 5, 2007, will be designated with both a version number and “final report”.

Our final order of business was to discuss the long postponed dinner that we have been planning for ourselves since February. We agreed on a restaurant and some available dates. Roland agreed to work the calendars of all of us, including those not attending.

We adjourned at 8:35.

Respectfully Submitted
Karen Duggan McNamara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

***PENDING APPROVAL***

Day/Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2007
Time/Place: 7:00 P.M., Middle School
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Mike Knupp, Nate Long, Lynn Masson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The Committee convened briefly after Special Town Meeting to approve minutes from our last two meetings: May 29, 2007 and June 5, 2007

It was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to approve minutes from both dates.

We adjourned after the vote.

Respectfully Submitted
Karen Duggan McNamara
APPENDIX E

Reports from Interviews with Boards/Officials of Similar Towns

(includes minutes of those interviews that occurred at scheduled TGSC Meetings)
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Roland Gibson, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift, Mike Knupp, Lynn Masson

The agenda for this evening included:
- Stephen Delaney, Georgetown Town Administrator
- Approve past minutes
- Hear Reports
- Discussion
  - BOS & FinCom Interviews
  - Process
- Schedule Data Review
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of July 12, 2006.

Reports:
Roland and Mike reviewed the interview with the IT Coordinator

Interview
After introductions, Stephen Delaney gave a detailed description of his role in and the functioning of Georgetown town government. He serves as Town Administrator, Acting Finance Director, HR Director and other minor posts. There is no formal charter but the structure was created under a special act of the legislature. When he began in Georgetown 3 years ago the town was in crisis staff and finance-wise. There was a fractured delivery of services and no central accountability. One support he enlisted was Suffolk University to develop a strategic plan. The structure in Georgetown is flat, similar to Littleton’s. He explained that managing without specific straight line authority requires building cooperation among departments and an understanding that they are all on the same team. A Town Manager has appointing and contracting authority, whereas a Town Administrator/Executive Secretary usually has a blend of those authorities. He advised that a Town Administrator or Town Manager should stabilize the town’s finances, understand the condition of the audit, know the Board of Selectmen, develop a plan (identifying hot issues, outlining goals), and be a good listener. He favors the Town Manager form of government where possible, especially in regard to HR liability issues.

Stephen suggested Swampscott as another information source for our committee since they went through a change in structure within the last 5 years, as well as the MMA.
BOS & FinCom Interviews
The committee felt these interviews should be scheduled to ask their input on their roles and situations regarding the current town government structure. It was also moved, seconded and voted to include the School Committee. Mike will redraft the questions, similar to those asked of staff, with the addition of Question 3: How would you define the role of your board in town government. He will also draft a cover letter. It was the consensus of the committee that each member should receive the questions and give their input to their chairman. The chairman or his/her representative should then be asked to report back to this committee.

Discussion Re Format of Committee Report
Members felt that there should be an executive summary, findings of facts (including staff/committee interviews and outside sources), addendums with specific source material, and reflections or observations or recommendations resulting from our fact-finding. There will be more discussion on this going forward.

Next Meeting: July 26th.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Lynn Masson
June 12, 2006

Meeting with Jean Kitchen, Town Administrator – Groton

Roland Gibson & Joe Knox

Notes

1. Jean is leaving her position, which may be a factor influencing change. She felt a vacancy may have created an opportunity. She appears to be a very confidant, competent, and knowledgeable person. She believes that the Selectman is considering changing the position to give the Administrator more authority. Groton’s structure is very much like Littleton’s – decentralized, every dept. is independent. Jean strongly believes that Groton needs a “strong” administrator or Town Manager, one person to ‘oversee’ the decision-making process. Someone who has Someone who has a holistic view, can set priorities, and see that things get done, in a timely manner. Care needs to be taken when defining roles. They are quite clear about who does what: Treasure-Tax Collector, Asst. Assessor, Town Accountant…discuss Revenue, Expenditures and factor in New Growth – determine Tax Rate, separate from BoS. Some departments avoid disconnect by requiring ‘sign-off’ sheet, i.e. BoH, Building Permits, etc. Nevertheless, some situations can develop that demonstrate disconnect, lack of communication or shared planning, i.e. Highway Department paved a road. Some time later, the Water Dept wanted to dig up the road to accommodate new water service.

2. BoS sets directions, priorities, develop policy, based on Master Plan, which is revised every 10 years.

3. Groton’s Selectman are currently considering the possibility of making some structural changes. Jean thinks the change will be by special act or by-law changes. Groton has a permanent TGSC but Jean thought that committee was not being fully utilized right now. Jean felt that the Selectman might not have officially asked them because they had looked into a Charter previously, and might lean that way now. (Interesting because the document that Roland provided suggested that a committee that is not meeting should be dissolved.)
4. Finance Dept. At present she meets with the Assist. Assessor, the Accountant, and the Treasurer - Tax Collector (recently changed to a combined office and is appointed). They have no Financial Director but she feels that is a needed position.

5. Her job description is similar to Tim Goddard’s.

6. Jean felt strongly about a process be used that guarantees someone qualified be in the position. Elections do not always provide that guaranty – she leaned towards appointment.

7. Groton’s technology differs from dept. to dept.

8. She ranked Groton’s government efficacy 6 on a scale of 1-10.
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 5, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Joe Knox, Mike Knupp, Roland Gibson, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Questions for Towns
- Interview with Town Officials from Sudbury
- Hear Reports of recent interviews
- Discuss Data
- Additional Towns?
- Miscellaneous

Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and VOTED to approve the minutes of June 14, 2006 with corrections.

Reports:
Rod and Roland reported on their interviews with the Fire Chief, Steve Carter and the Library Director, Marnie Oaks.

Interviews with officials from other towns:
We came up with the following questions for interviews with other town officials:
1. What form of government did the town have?
2. What problems did they have?
3. Why did they change?
   a. What prompted the change?
4. What change procedure did they use?
   a. How did they “sell” to the town and what was the town’s overall reaction?
5. If you did it again, would you do it differently?
6. Did the new form of Government fix the problem?
   a. If so, how?... If not, why?
7. What new problems were introduced?
8. What was your timetable?

Interview with Sudbury Officials:
Time brought in the four people from Sudbury:
- Maureen Valente, the Town Administrator
- Larry O’Brien, current member of the Board of Selectman and formerly on the Planning Board
- Kirsten Roopenian, former member of the Board of Selectmen and member of the “blue ribbon” committee.
- Bob Jacobson, chair of the Finance Committee.
After introductions, Joe asked them to outline some of their experiences. Maureen noted that she is on the "Form of Government Committee" within the MMA (Massachusetts Municipal Association) and is not here to sell the idea of town manger form of government. Each town is unique and needs to find its own solution to problems. However, no town wants to re-invent the wheel.

The team provided a brief history of the process that brought them to where they are today. IT began prior to 1994 when the "Sudbury Foundation" funded a study of local government. A blue ribbon commission was set up to do the study and they determined the need to convert to town manager form of government. They went with a special act (in the state legislature) and not with a charter.

The new form of government began July 1, 1996. The town administrator applied for the job but someone else was hired. Maureen was hired as Finance Director and then took over as Town Manger was the first Town manager left for a job in Westford.

The justification for changing to a town manager was the size of the town (18 thousand people) and a rapid rate of growth. In response to a question on what population number might trigger going to a town manager, they did not have a number. In response to a question on the how far they were from buildout, they said that they were working with an estimate of 30,000 people for a population by mid century. They had over 2,000 buildable lots remaining in the year 2000. Both of these were factors in the decision to go to a town manager form of government.

The blue ribbon commission found the day to day operation of the town should not fall on the BOS and Executive Secretary. They were concerned with the growing complexity of finance and the management of government in general. Later in the discussion, it was mentioned that the Accounting office had some fundamental problems.

Maureen provided handouts and directed us to one that had excerpts from their budget planning document titled, "FY07 Proposed Budget and Financing Plan". We first went to page 8 which was the "Statement of Mission and Values for Determining Goals of the Board of Selectmen" and then to pages 9-12, "Board of Selectmen GY06 Goals, Progress and Budget Implications for FY07". As her team would reiterate throughout the meeting, today the BOS leads the town with these policy statements (derived from a new Master Plan). This helps them focus on the priorities. They also do self measurement via the report on progress. This all came after the town decided to move to a town manger form of government.

Elected boards were policy makers and the Town Manager managed town employees to the mission statement and goals set down each year. She feels
that the process works well... all the pieces and "wheels" are coming together and producing results.

The following Boards are elected: Planning, Library, Park & Rec., Health, and Assessors. Two are appointed by the Town Manger with the approval of the BOS: Conservation and Historical. Others are appointed by the Town Manger. These include: Zoning and Council on Aging. Other parts of town government were reorganized. A new Public Works department was created consolidating various related functions. Also a Finance Department was created. All report to the Town Manger.

The group made a point of noting that this a long process and ten years later it is still a work in progress. Over the past and coming year Maureen is reorganizing her reports to six department heads. When she started she had over 20 direct reports. It is important to have a performance appraisal system and use it consistently. It helps employees and reduces lawsuits.

Because the BOS has goals and objectives, the rest of the boards are following suit. It is a boost to their goals if they can get their projects on the BOS goals list.

There were "bumps in the road" as they changed over. Many complained at first (boards and employees). The boards came along with the help of town meeting. Those employees who were performing well did well under the new regime. Those who had problems performing left.

The group remained until after 9:00. We thanked them for their time and all they shared with us. After they left, Lynn gave us a handout from the Department of Revenue. Joe reminded us of upcoming interviews. Next week the Chelmsford town manager will be coming to speak.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan M²Namara
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2006
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 103
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Nate Long, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan McNamara, Rod Stewart, Harry Swift

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Interview with Bernie Lynch, Town Manager, Chelmsford
- Letter & Questions to BOS, Fin Com, and School Committee
- Look at the data thus far.

Minutes: The previous minutes were held until next week.

Discussion of data: Various ideas were proposed for how to assess the data that has thus far been collected by Mike using the interview responses. We might look at short, mid and long term suggestions that come out of each question; we might look at each question and determine the most critical issues; other ideas were suggested as well. Roland went to the board to outline what we had discussed thus far and came up with the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Data</th>
<th>Common Themes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communications</td>
<td>• Systems</td>
<td>• Staffing</td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further discussion will continue at our next meeting. Some members did not have Mike’s second recap sheet and asked that it be sent to them.

Bernie Lynch, Chelmsford Town Manager:
Tim and Mr. Lynch arrived for the discussion of Chelmsford’s experience going from Executive Secretary to Town Manager and related issues. We began with introductions and a brief outline of our backgrounds. Joe outlined our responsibilities and all thanked him for giving us his time and wished him luck in his new position in Lowell.

Bernie then outlined his history in Chelmsford. He was there three years as Executive Secretary and the rest of the 20 + years as Town Manager. Prior to that, Chelmsford went through an enormous growth spurt in the years from 1960 to 1970. In 1960 the population was 15 thousand; in 1970, it was 31 thousand. Various study and charter efforts went on in 1956, 1972 and later in the 1970s.
After Proposition 21/2, the fiscal pressures combined with the complexity of government brought the town to a decision to look at the charter and make changes. One factor was the lack of coordination in the townhouse. His example was the decision of the collector and clerk to close their offices on Wednesdays. These were separately elected people and the Executive Secretary could not dictate office hours. After the charter, both posts came under the Town Manager.

There were two factors that seemed to actually prompt the charter change. Bernie called them "legislative" and "executive". The first had to do with problems at Town Meeting. A contingent of people with a single issue could move town meeting to a vote that was difficult for the town to carry out. The example was an amendment to the budget that left the town a half million dollars short with no way to pay. The people left the meeting after the vote and the administrator and selectmen were forced to do unwise layoffs as a result.

The other factor was the disorganized way the budget was prepared in the first place. There "wasn't a sense of coordinated financial management". In the late 1980s a charter proposal was put before the people with both legislative and executive changes: representative town meeting and a town manager with significant central authority. It narrowly passed. The representative town meeting sends 18 members from each precinct (162 people in all) to town meeting. These people understand and take responsibility for the decisions and recognize that they will need to undo problems in subsequent town meetings.

The remainder of our meeting dealt with the changes from Executive Secretary to Town Manager and the way Chelmsford set up the town manager function. The charter set up various department managers that report to the town manager. Each manager is appointed by the town manager with Board of Selectmen approval. Each employee is hired by the department manager with Town Manager approval. We went into some of the department organizations (such as the Finance Department and Community Development Department) but not all. Bernie will send us their annual budget book that outlines all of these functions.

The charter also put many boards and committees under the Town Manager. The town manager appoints all of the members of these boards (Appeals and Conservation are among these). Some boards are still elected: Health, Sewer Commission, Planning and Library Trustees. As with Sudbury, some, but not all of the staff who work for those boards work under the Town Manager.

The charter also gave the Town Manager full control over the budget. Bernie puts the whole thing together; reviews with the BOS (but does not need to get their approval); and presents the budget to town meeting.

Bernie feels that these changes have brought a higher level of professionalism. Most of the previous staff remained in their posts even after the change but expectations for how people handled their jobs changed and there was more
consistency in hours of operation, etc. across the townhouse. He indicated that the turnover came mostly in the financial departments; less in the others.

Some questions came up at this point:
Q: When they formed the charter, how did they present it to the town?
A: By law, they needed to send copy of the charter to every home in town

Q: How did they make the case for the changes?
A: Op-ed articles in the paper that pointed out the problems of Chelmsford's size and complexity in governing.

Q: You pointed out that pre-charter, the agencies were not pulling in the same direction. Who now decides what direction?
A: Combined decision of the Town Manager (with input from the department heads) and the Board of Selectmen.

He went on to outline how direction is set. Each June or July, the Town Manager and BOS have a retreat and determine the following year's goals. These are broad goals about traffic or economic development for example. The Town Manager then goes to the staff to work out more specific plans and takes those back to the BOS.

Q: Who assesses how well the plan worked?
A: There are three ways:
   • The BOS and Town Manager at the start of the next retreat.
   • Quarterly reports from the departments
   • The evaluation of the Town Manager by the BOS... his performance is measured...
     o Against goals and plans
     o On how well he works with various boards
     o How well budget, etc. is prepared for town meeting
     o How he handles media, citizens, etc.

This prompted the question...
Q: [So] What do the selectmen do?
A: Licensing; review of reports from the Town Manager and department heads.

After some more discussion on specifics of the organization (the budget he sends to us will have this in detail) he was asked about personnel.

Q: Who is in charge of Personnel?
A: Pre-charter it was under a personnel bylaw. The charter did away with the bylaw and set up new rules and regulations. The Town Manager is in charge of Personnel along with a 5 member Personnel board. One member is elected by the employees; the other 4 are citizens appointed by the Manager.
Q: There was a question on costs pre and post charter
A: They spend more on Planning now. They had no planner prior to the charter change. However, generally he felt that they have saved money. They work smarter; have reduced headcount; and use regionalized purchase groups. As an example they have reduced the number of people in the collector’s office from 5 plus seasonal help to 4 with no seasonal help during a time when the volume of work has increased significantly (quarterly tax bills, more sewer and excise revenues, etc). But cash flow is better and more automated. There is a significant amount of electronic bill paying.

Q: What system is used by the financial people
A: MUNIS for [heavy duty] tasks and Vadar is used by the collector.

Q: Any software used by land management people?
A: They have some GIS software.

The final Question was on the process for replacing him.

A: By charter, he appoints an acting town manager if he only going to be away for a few days. For long term absences (or in this case, resignation), the charter says that the BOS will replace him using a 9 person screening committee. There is some controversy currently on how that is being set up.

With no further questions, we all thanked him for his time and wished him luck in Lowell.

It was after 9:00 so it was Moved, Seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNamara
TGSC Interview Narrative

Date of Interview: August 31, 2006
Person Interviewed: Steven Ledoux, Westford Town Manager
Interviewer(s): Joe Knox, Nate Long

The Town of Westford has had a town manager form of government for almost 20 years (since 1988). Current Town Manager, Steven Ledoux, has been in his position of 7 years.

Town Facts:
- Westford is a town of 22,000 residents
- Open town meeting is usually attended by 400-500 residents. These are held on Saturday’s which he feels leads to the small turnout.
- Board of Selectmen, School Committee, and Finance Committee sit at the front of town meeting

Town Government Structure:
- Elected positions include: Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, School Committee, Board of Health, Library Commission. Employees for a particular board work for that board (but they also work well together).
- Town Manager appointments include: Park & Rec Commission, Water Commission, Board of Assessors, Finance Director (who is also the Treasurer). Selectmen appoint the Conservation Commission.
- Chief of Police is strong; Fire Chief is not strong
- Town Manager’s budget is the one that goes to town meeting. Finance Committee only makes recommendations. To make a change to the budget they would have to do it on the floor of town meeting.
- Town Manager has an annual review by the selectmen and a 3 year contract. Town Manager conducts 20 annual reviews of other town employees.

Structural Positives:
- Town and school department share IT resources and personnel. This is something Ledoux instituted himself and is clearly proud of. He said there was some resistance from the superintendent but the school committee got on board and the consolidation began. “The school committee realizes that working with the town looks good to the public.” Brookline was the only other town they could find with consolidated IT between the town and school department. There is one IT director with four others working for him/her and a couple of school employees now work for IT.
- Every Friday during the budget season Ledoux holds a “joint chairs meeting” which is a budget meeting with department heads. Included are the Town Manager, School Committee Chair, Finance Committee Chair, Chair of Selectmen, School Superintendent and Finance Director.
Littleton Town Government Study Committee

- If there is the possibility of a conflict between departments Ledoux will hold a joint boards meeting to head off any potential problem.
- Town charter instructs the town to do 5 year financial forecasts.
- Set up of town hall allows employees from different departments to work in the same general area and allows one employee to have at least a basic knowledge of the workings of another department. This permits employees from different departments to be cross trained so that they can fill-in for each other. It also makes it easier for the public to use town hall because all the departments from a certain area (ex. permitting) are in the same office.

Structural Negatives:
- Ledoux feels that it would be better if the employees from each separately elected board worked under the town manager instead of the current system of working for each board independently. However, there is a personnel by-law in place which covers ALL employees. In this by-law the town manager decides days off and office hours for all departments whether they are under the town manager or working for their individual board.
Town Government Study Committee

Interview with Harvard Town Administrator Paul Cohen
TGSC Members – Roland Gibson and Joe Knox
Friday, October 20, 2006

Paul Cohen has been a resident of Harvard for 11 years and has held his current position as Town Administrator (TA) for 5. He is leaving in November to become the Town Manager of Chelmsford.

The Town of Harvard’s town organization is much like Littleton in that it has evolved over time into its current form. They have no Town Charter. With a population of 5,600, many positions are part time. When an individual is away from work, there is overlap in departments to ensure services are provided. The TA’s Job Description, which is developed by The Harvard BoS, gives him responsibility for day-to-day operations, with departments that fall under the jurisdiction of the Selectman. (Police, Fire, Public Works, Finance Dept., which includes Assessors). TA responsibility includes Building Facilities, with the exception of the schools, which has a separate facilities manager. Public Works department takes care of all facilities – buildings, fields, etc.

The Finance Committee, which is appointed by the Moderator, is responsible for recommending a budget. Budget development includes a great deal of education, collaboration and teamwork. In the preliminary round, Department Heads meet with the TA, who prepares an integrated budget, to present to the Selectman. Dept Chairs meet with the BoS to determine priorities. The FinCom then meets with the smaller depts., such as Planning Board and BoH, and finally with the School Committee, to deepen their understanding of priorities. The FinCom then has a joint meeting the BoS and School Committee, where they all work collaboratively to work out any changes. When the budget is finalized, it is presented at TM by the FinCom, with all agencies in agreement. If a resident attempts to allocate a special amount to one dept., all agency representatives speak with one voice, to support the budget submitted.
What makes things work?

1. The BoS sees its role as **Policy development**. They delegate day-to-day operations to TA, who oversees implementation.
2. A strong tradition of collaboration and willingness to ‘work things out’.
3. When an over-ride is necessary, one package is presented and leadership speaks with one voice.
4. Town philosophy and expectations.
5. Key positions are well compensated. Hire good people and let them do their job.
   (Translation – avoid micromanagement.) Some positions are less well compensated.

They have a 5-year Capital Planning Committee made up of the BoS, School Comm., Town Admin., FinCom, and School Superintendent. The Planning Board is responsible for developing the Master Plan.

The Town Hall does have a Land Use Office that includes Cons Com, Planning Board, ZBA and the BoH. The part time Building Inspector has a separate office.

The Town Accountant is also the Finance Director and the School Business Manager. The Treasurer, Tax Collector and Assessors all work in the Finance Dept and are all appointed. IT is handled by the School Business Manager and funded by the school dept. Everything is done electronically.

The Town Clerk is elected but the BoS funds a part time position for that office.

Employee benefits are driven by School Dept., and integrated with the rest of the town agencies, i.e. insurance, etc.

The Harvard Athletic Association substantially supports youth athletic programs. The Community is willing to pay fees, which reduces School Budget.
Minutes for the Town Government Study Committee

Day/Date: Wednesday, August 02, 2006, 2006  
Time/Place: 7:00, Town Office Building, Room 304  
Attendees: Roland Gibson, Joe Knox, Lynn Mason, Karen Duggan Mc Namara, Mike Knupp, Rod Stewart

The agenda for this evening included:
- Approve past minutes
- Interview with Joe Markarian & Chris Ketchen, DLS
- Appointment with the Town Administrator
- Process with the BOS, Fin Com & School Committee questionnaires
- Information Matrix
- Miscellaneous

Minutes: It was moved, seconded and VOTED to accept the minutes from the previous 2 weeks without correction

Interview with DLS:
Joe Markarian & Chris Ketchen arrived and we introduced ourselves. Joe gave the task force an overview of the Department of Local Services (DLS) and their roles in helping local government. They have also spoken to Groton and Hopkinton. Groton is just beginning to look at possible change; Hopkinton has recently made some changes. His office does financial management reviews. He notes that there are recurrent themes in the questions towns are addressing. He asks us to think in terms of what prompts the town to think it needs a government study. He also advised that we consider process as well as structure.

He gave the task force a great deal of information on the benefits of a charter along with the observation that a town does not to take that route to make effective changes. A charter does give some underlying process to town government but is always general. If a town does a charter, it also needs the more specific bylaws.

A town can do one of three things:
• A full charter process. This involves putting the charter question on the ballot AND having people on the ballot that would be running for seats on the charter commission. The commission proceeds as it sees fit and is only required to have one public hearing. The output of the commission goes first to the Attorney General (to be validated ... much as warrant questions do each year) and then comes to the citizens for a vote. In all, this is a two-year process.
• A Government Study group, such as our task force, can come to some conclusions and propose changes to the bylaws. The BOS could put a time frame on this work. The proposal would then go to the BOS (or could be put on the ballot by citizens) and voted on.
• A special act of the Massachusetts Legislature could be required if some of the proposals (either Charter or bylaws) change some aspects of town government.
More work would need to be done to differentiate what things require a special act. An example might be creating a Finance Manager. It can be done by a special act after the Town Meeting votes it by simple majority. Typically, the Legislature would require a town-wide ballot vote as a condition of passing this. However, even this might not be a suitable example. Either Joe or Chris thought that the legislature passed a law allowing towns to do this via bylaw only.

As others have said, to ensure professionalism in certain offices, there is a trend toward appointed rather than elected people... such as treasurer and collector.

The most interesting points for many task force members were

- Any number of changes can be incorporated via bylaws
- The scope of the Town Administrator's job can also be expanded significantly without necessarily changing the job to Town Manager.
- An important key, they felt, was to include job descriptions, performance evaluations, and other accountability factors in any proposed changes.

Q: Does the size of a town give an indication of whether it should be headed by a town administrator or town manager?
A: Not entirely. Chris gives an example of Wellesley that has a town administrator with very limited authority. Yet he "manages" a wide number of functions that do not report to him and does this through leadership and consensus. An alternate example is Great Barrington. Although small, about 10,000 people, it is also the hub of a region, so having a town manager seems to make sense.

The question for any town is whether to go to charter, special act (of the legislature) or simply bylaws. It was pointed out that going initially with some bylaws doesn't preclude doing additional changes down the road or eventually going to a charter: try some things before going with whole cloth changes. It could build confidence and comfort with change.

There are questions of perception and what will fly in terms of changes. For us, he would recommend a report that started with a ‘narrative’ of our findings followed by some proposed bylaw changes. That way the narrative is being debated and not the specifics of the bylaws.

Most helpful... they both offered their review of any draft that we might come up with. They also recommend:

- Clarify responsibilities and Insure accountabilities
- Keep as simple as possible
- Write this in a way that will not elicit extreme reactions; palatable

It is important that the changes empower the Town Administrator and/or Town Manager and establish accountability. They saw the administrator and/or manager creating the budget process and the capital improvement process. This person would
consult with the treasurer, collector and others and then make a presentation to the BOS, School Committee and Fin Com jointly.

A question was asked about the importance of modeling changes in the town over time... looking at 2000 through today, and then out to 2010 or 2020. Chris noted general trends. He sited:

- People are not volunteering as much
- Laws and finance are getting more complicated
- Specific issues are hitting cities and towns now and over the upcoming years... post-retirement medical costs will become a growing issue in 2009 and thereafter, for example
- There will be a growing need for professionalism in all the financial areas and increased specialization in some. Joe notes that municipal accounting, for example, is of some concern to those looking at this.

In short, Chris said that this all points to the need for greater professionalism in town government. To the point of the question, he said that our cities and towns have been around for hundreds of years and will evolve and adapt over the next hundred.

Going to specifics and in response to some questions, it is important to be aware of risk management and liability... therefore it is important to have good HR bylaws. They point to Hopkinton, Needham and Burlington as examples to look at. In answer to another question about well-run towns, they point to Burlington, North Andover, Lennox, and Hopkinton.

They recap some of the themes what we should keep in mind:

- Aim for objectivity, sustainability, accountability,
- Try to think of all process in government
- Insure a clear line of responsibility to the top
- Try to anticipate problems
- Communicate with the town...
- Anticipate and answer frequently asked question early

Before they left, we thanked them for their advice and help and for the offer to review any draft that we come up with. They gave Joe Knox their web site and contact information.

It was after 9:00 so we decided to adjourn. Before we did, Roland handed out two articles on how to handle qualitative data. Mike recommended them as well... he had used them in formulating his matrix.

It was moved, seconded and VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Duggan McNama
APPENDIX F

SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and/or Threats) Analysis

(Table showing direct responses from staff/boards interviewed, categorized as Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and/or Threats)
## Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactions with BOS is OK. Access to Schools and L&amp;W good. Working with BOS, School Committee and Fin Com good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a good feedback loop in budget planning. Plans for the coming year cut but aren't told until the budget is done (or nearly done) and don't get explanations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant and Treasurer need to work together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly finance team meetings but not everyone comes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employees' expectations of benefits may outpace what town can deliver... they get complaints about changes. Retirees will become a bigger piece of this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People with kids coming into town have high expectations for services and rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both have industry contacts and network with others in their same positions, and both feel that this town works as well as any. Neither has participated in association activities as much as desired due to budget and time constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State email network of (similar position)... posts a question in the morning, she has 25 – 30 responses by 3 pm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both feel that communication is the key to the smooth operation of the town. Good communication and cooperation depends on getting the right people in the right positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There had been regular interdepartmental meetings facilitated by the Treasurer, although anyone would call a meeting if there was a need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall communication between staff and the elected officials could definitely improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor communication between regulatory departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOH doesn’t move quickly on building permit issue, and inspector issues permit because he can’t wait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better communication between departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactions depend on personalities, however, because there is no central authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He relies on Town Administrator, the town treasurer and town accountant heavily and works with the Town Clerk in getting ready for town meeting. These interactions have worked well during his time in Littleton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loves the fact he can walk across the hall and it’s not a big bureaucracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common goals and objectives help communications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good relationships with departments in town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Fire Dept. “Uncharacteristically good” &amp; interact well with Highway Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication could be improved throughout all departments. There seems to be resistance to this because of independent departments protecting their territory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular department meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get very few complaints and operate very efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Could do a better job of public relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better communication with departments we provide services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily with accounting and treasury.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Theme Class</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Opportunity To Change</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Interactions with other departments very well. Positive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Keeping communication lines open. Continue to improve within the other departments and within the Fire department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Knowing faces makes it easier when he needs something</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Keep communications open</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Dept and others are more reactive; do more planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Weekly or biweekly finance team meetings. Lack of this kind of collaboration causes miscommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Would like to see minutes and summaries of board (and other) meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Recommended a wider meeting of department heads and boards two or three times a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More structured conversations such as regularly scheduled meetings BOS, FinCom, School Committee, Finance Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Would like to see a Town newsletter (internal news)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Needs to be constant and better communication between departments regarding personnel and cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E-mail communication, between staff, really easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More frequent staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Interactions with staff from other departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treasurer’s office – payroll, deposit of funds collected, reports on funds managed by Commissioners of trust, benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Accountant’s office – statements indicating status of budget (amount spent, remaining), and other fund accounting practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Town Administrator’s office – holiday closing inconsistencies, communication with Finance Committee and Board of Selectmen, cleaning or lack thereof, scheduling multi-purpose Room for library events, and snow removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>IT – complete support for all of our computer needs, new computers, software purchase and installation, repairs and troubleshooting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Council on Aging – we’ve done some interactive programs with the C O A, and use volunteers from the Senior Property Tax Relief program to help with library tasks, resulting from budget cuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to the Library and Historical Society resulted in an Eagle Scout project organizing and boxing records in Town Vault, to keep them in good condition for posterity – an excellent example of what can happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Communication – the library frequently is the last to hear about various meetings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Monthly meetings of all those who are helping conduct business of the town - did this for a while some years ago, and lots of good things resulted. Meetings need to be regularly scheduled so that people can plan their schedules accordingly. A meeting ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Communication from accountant and/or treasurer, before transfers are made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Having a clear town government organization chart showing the staff reporting to the Boards. The Boards going to the Finance Committee for funding approval with Town Meeting approving the budget would enable townspeople to see how the elected Boards relat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SWOT Analysis Components Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A clearly defined process for incoming employees whereby accounts are established and policies are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Communication could be improved greatly. Boards/Management (the Selectmen) in particular need to not rely on Administrator to provide information. He simply isn’t effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Other departments also need to communicate to me when staff is leaving so that measures may be taken to safeguard data and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly meetings with the department heads that reported to the selectmen, in an effort to improve communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication would be #1, followed by leadership, and proper management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction is a triangle between Park &amp; Rec, Highway, and School Departments. The three department heads have been “able to figure it out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We interact well with other departments when we have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Department works well with other departments except Treasury where there is no accountability of available funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work well together as whole. In some cases maybe a head to talk to about problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Payroll and Personnel functions work well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There is a tremendous amount of paper due, in part, to state requirements. Could be automated (software) but no time/money to do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Consider bi-weekly payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too much paper... it could be reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Computer software, called “Admins” is old, difficult to use and does not provide the reports needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Better computer systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Better computer systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The State requirement to retain permanent records is bulky. Both have as much information as possible electronically, but some things need to be stored on paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The development of the web site in the last few years has helped meet many needs of the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>People expect towns to have a web site now and it needs to be better supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Having more support for the website might help in keeping the information current.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Has undertaken a major organization effort in getting the files in the office under control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Getting more organized definitely helps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Assessing functions work ok. The computer aided mass appraisal (CAMA) software application works well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>“Admins” software is not as good; it’s not user friendly and input is tedious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Frequent vendor software changes are problematic. IT cooperates and helps with this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There is no system, there are even numbered houses on the odd numbered side of the street. The ideal time to deal with this would have been with the implementation of the 9-1-1 system, but it is too important from a public safety perspective to not do no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>One change is more people not being home during the day making it harder to get inspection data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More data on line would be helpful and might save money by saving live response time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Eliminated elected staff (full-time) positions. Appointments offer greater candidate pool. Also, reporting to a Town manager assures continued competent performance. Town manager government provides authority commensurate with responsibility as opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>It's important to deliver data so the things can be assessed. But, it takes a lot of time and energy to get the data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Budget practices, dept is creative, flexible, work well, and relations with union are good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Streamline, make more efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The department has developed a set of checklists for developers/builders to understand what is required of them to obtain permits and pass inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Has been told that our process is better than most other towns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Software changes and the IT department have kept department from being more efficient. Software is not a “one size fits all” solution. Town is technically challenged when it comes to state of the art systems and software.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Need a more streamlined process for reviewing and issuing permits. There is no regulation that requires BOH approvals to issue building permits but can’t issue occupancy permit without approved septic plan. Would like bylaw requiring septic approval prior to bldg permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digitized achieves of information from every department in one place for easy access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests an archive of every parcel that contains all plans, documents, variances, special permits, etc so buyers, sellers, and all town departments have knowledge base in one place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting has pretty set policies and structured routines. These must be adjusted as the volume of work increases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each department works as if it is totally independent so policies differ between departments. Agreements between departments may be in conflict with the law putting the Town Accountant in an enforcement position; no other position has enforcement authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The number one priority should be updating the accounting package, admits. It is very slow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good system to priories work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Routine tasks like inspections, plan approvals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures help. Also, getting to know other departments better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration and strategic planning. They have annual targets for upcoming 3 years; publish them; reformulate as needed over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>They all could be better at infusing methods and skills (professional development) in what he called “real time.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to get more timely data from accountant and treasurer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure is screwed up between department and accountant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need updated IT infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warrant signing procedure needs attention from BOS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to address technology tools for paying bills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology demands more than they use to be (web site example).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT assistance has been great!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>With so many part time staff, a Logbook is maintained to ensure important information is recorded and available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded and more reliable internet capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform hours in Town Offices, with departments covering for each other during lunch and vacations. The library continues to get complaints from people who take time off from work to do business at the Town Offices, and find that the offices are closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town-wide mailing list; e-mail list – all boards, commissions, employees, and grouped as such.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Town-Department-Wide Master Planning Calendar would benefit all departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-office phone system capacity would facilitate communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved software would go a long way to improving the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>A formal Help Desk and Inventory tracking system that helps me keep track of work orders and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Consistent versions of Operating Systems work well; few manual processes exist within the department</td>
<td>We should offer more formal training in basic computer applications for all the departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Work daily with any number of users to assist them in doing their jobs</td>
<td>We have policies that were adopted by the BoS that each computer user is asked to sign and abide by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Wide Area Network has helped make my work more efficient.</td>
<td>Web based forms and business should be encouraged for all the permitting departments; more forms should be made available from all the departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Recognizing that the citizens are out at work during the day and would appreciate web access to things</td>
<td>A phone system with a voice mail option instead of all these silly answering machines (some departments won’t even use answering machines – they fear that they won’t have time to return calls.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revolving accounts are ancient and tough to work with.</td>
<td>Possible groups of departments, as it is now if you go on vacation the office closes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Theme Class</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Opportunity To Change</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFFING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More time to do planning and think about how the town could save more money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outsource payroll function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Recommend that the town invest in an interim person when someone likes the Treasurer, Accountant, etc. leave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Combine Treasurer and Collector. Something to consider over the next 5 years. Longer term we might also think about Finance Director. If we do, that person should be responsible for longer term financial policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Town house staff is “very thin” by which he means there is no redundancy or backup of jobs. “Knowledge is one deep”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Personnel responsibilities don’t necessarily belong in treasurers office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other towns combine Treasurer and Collector... easier for banking and cash management. It would require two clerks: one for cash reconciliation and one for collector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The job description for the position is “cast in state law” and takes precedence over what town might want to do. The “what” can’t be changed but the “how can be changed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Combined Treasurer/Collector in the next 5 years. A Finance Director... long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Combine Treasurer &amp; Collector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Think about a Finance Director or a “Budget Analyst” that would look at long term planning and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good partnership between the Town Clerk, Tax Collector and Board of Registrars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Changing Town Meeting to Saturday may be challenging in staffing it with the registrars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Increase in population has impacted their workloads, and that seems to be the case in all departments. Expectations of the public have increased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>People may be busier so they don’t volunteer for committees as frequently as they might have in the past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counting on the support the IT and the Accountant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Duties and staffing would be more difficult if they didn’t share offices and responsibilities as they currently do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Feels it is fine at present. Our size seems to be right on the edge of needing a dedicated HR person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Manager form of government is not needed at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>If there are competent people in the existing positions, there would be no need for change at this time. The risk is getting good people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Advantages and disadvantages of filling positions via appointment versus election. If elected, the incumbent must be a resident which could be a hindrance in limiting the pool to only residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Felt change in the structure now on top of the recent changes due to transitions of personnel would be very difficult. Recommended longer range thinking about this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Coverage! There is no backup in many of the departments for sick, personal and vacation time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Hire a good accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>department’s motto is “simple &amp; sustainable”. When they lose an employee this makes it easier to replace them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Theme Class</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Opportunity To Change</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Staff is very thin. There is no redundancy. “We are heavily leveraged with the possibility of failure.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Wearing so many hats and having so many more chances for things to go wrong makes his job more difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>It makes sense to have one overarching person in charge of technology for Littleton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Town has gotten larger which creates more of a workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The personnel could be a little deeper so that they don’t “have a crisis” when someone leaves would be the biggest change...having some redundancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Be more proactive in retaining current employees. There are more dollars lost in efficiencies in training new people than paying to keep the current staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Elected v. appointed - having only a pool of Littleton residents to choose from hinders your ability to find the right people for the job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Funding! Lost 25% personnel in the last few years well below national standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Biggest change is transient traffic – budget cuts seriously impacts safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Loss of money and staff reduction hinders – impacts safety, also increases workload on remaining staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Due to confidentiality issues, sharing of support staff would be difficult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Return to staffing levels of 14 months ago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Town has good people, who do what’s right for the town, in spite of (flawed) structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Department has fallen behind in systems and staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Assistant’s hours have been cut in the face of more demands from citizens for information which still needs to be pulled by hand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Reinstall admin. Hours to previous level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The interactions with other departments worked well. Problems were usually due to a lack of resources in other departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The increasing budget has added volume to the required activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Elected staff positions may not be the best structure. It makes succession planning very difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Increase staffing levels to stay ahead of problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>It’s future impact on call volume. Not yet, but the potential to get tight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Looking at better ways to staff full time hours. 6 – 6 vs. 7 – 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Will need more coverage when volunteers are at work as things increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>When staff increases – Day Time officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Would like a high level Accountant to replace Gail Henry – someone like her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Affordable housing can sometimes bring in additional student costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Good relationships with departments in town. Good treasurer is important for managing cash flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Use to many volunteers to do core tasks. They should be value added service not status quo service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Staff meetings – budget cuts impact morale and capacity to enable staff development, i.e. staff meetings have been reduced to 3 or 4 a year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Theme Class</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Opportunity To Change</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength</strong>: Competent, creative and trained staff</td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: We have virtually no custodial or maintenance service. Contract cleaners are ineffective. Senior Property Tax volunteers have done maintenance in the last year or so. Maintenance and/or repairs that are postponed due to short-term budget constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: School Department – work closely with some teachers and school librarians, in the past. Current budget limitations adversely impacts work with school librarians</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: To Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength</strong>: Highway Department – Great! Plowing, mowing and special projects are done willingly and efficiently</td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: An aging population needs more daytime hours, while two-income families need library hours in the evening. Budget cuts that required cutting hours exacerbate the tension between these two interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: Missing services to maturing adults getting ready for retirement, and teens that cannot yet drive.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: The Town needs to re-institute the position of Facilities Manager in order to protect its investment in infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: The Town needs to re-institute the position of Facilities Manager in order to protect its investment in infrastructure</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: I don’t see any advantage to adding another layer of financial management to town government. What exists needs to be made effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: Keep the Town Website up to date. The last selectmen’s Minutes are for March 20th.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: We also need professional, properly paid staff in all departments. Sometimes it’s like this is a sheltered workshop when we rely so heavily on volunteers (not that I don’t appreciate them, but it takes time to train, supervise, hand hold the volunteers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: The overall poor maintenance of the building</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: Some towns rely exclusively on vendors to do support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: The IT priorities aren’t in order. When conflicting needs exist, the LELWD wins and everyone else waits.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: The IT priorities aren’t in order. When conflicting needs exist, the LELWD wins and everyone else waits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: Return the department to being an autonomous entity or incorporate it into the future Finance Department</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: We owe it to the Town to maintain the physical plant far better than we do now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: A centralized Building &amp; Grounds crew (including schools) for the entire town.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: The office structure works well. There is a job share system where 1 position is shared by 3 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength</strong>: The office structure works well. There is a job share system where 1 position is shared by 3 people</td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: A lot of people come to town and expect services that mirror a suburb of Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: Job is more reactionary than actually planning. More resources would help.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: As population has increased so has the demand for services. More time is required for service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong>: Job is more reactionary than actually planning. More resources would help.</td>
<td><strong>Opportunity To Change</strong>: As population has increased so has the demand for services. More time is required for service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Town lacks a Personnel Policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Littleton is a starter town for personnel...make it more attractive to stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Suggest a person or team to outline financial policy before hiring a Financial Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treat the people better and have better Personnel functions and organization...possibly a separate Personnel function reporting to someone other than the Treasurer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>BOS needs to be more unified and show more leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Planning for Economic Development is needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>We need to better fund schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Better maintenance of our facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sell off extra parcels of land that the town doesn’t need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Some former accountants appeared to be leaving for better compensation, but others, including the immediate past accountant, seemed to be more frustrated with the lack of support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are indeed public servants in these positions and we strive to follow the law and meet the needs of the public as best as they can within the law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Board has put some strict rules around admin position and it may be hindering efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Issues “died on the vine” by lack of response or action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Guidance on administrative affairs is often not given. Often information is provided to board members weekly/bi-weekly packages that requires action, but no action is taken. Board won’t make a decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Board is reactive, not proactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Vendor indicates that Littleton is the most dis-functional town he has dealt with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Stronger Town Administrator or a Town Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Stronger, more involved Board of Selectmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Get the school department integrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There is good cooperation between the department, although there is no central authority to make this happen. The process is totally dependent on personalities and on people getting along and self-aligning themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More comprehensive personnel bylaw and policies. Examples of inequities that result from current structure are often seen between union and non-union personnel. There is no personnel staff to explain or deal with these perceived inequities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Carrying out state statute is each department’s top priority. However, it should be properly funded. There are mandated regulatory functions that should be funded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>With budget authority resting in the Finance Committee that committee may actually be setting the policy rather than the Selectmen, who should be the policy makers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Departments assume much more responsibility that could be centralized in a finance department because there isn’t a centralized finance department. A Charter would define these responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treat the school department as a department rather than an independent entity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Personal interaction in working relationships is key to this town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There isn’t a defined hierarchy. There isn’t someone in the town who makes a decision. The causes some confusion. Everyone has the best intentions but it still can be very difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>In Littleton selectmen are engaged in day to day activities. Should empower Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Have one decision maker in the town as opposed to multiple.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other towns have issues with turf and funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Felt he could improve his administrative skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see Town Manager who could make decisions in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Centralization of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Town Manager or person who has authority to make decisions, in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Handle finances holistically, not school side/town side. Had 6 budgets rounds last year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Worries about political fallout of decisions made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>When the town hires a good person, make sure they hold on to them by paying fairly and treating them with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn’t think the town has grown enough in population to warrant a change in the structure of town government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Hire people based on competency and not who you know or as a political favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Better leadership from the board on priorities and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There could be more of a team approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Strong manager at the top, such as a Finance Director and/or Town Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>No one seems to be looking at the big picture. It seems like a “we don’t want to know” philosophy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Someone with a global perspective to do longer range planning. Now things are done too much in a vacuum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Someone to oversee and coordinate finance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>This office mostly deals with the small departments in Town Hall, and it seems that the “powers that be” don’t fully realize how necessary these departments are to generate revenues to keep government functioning, so these departments aren’t given the necessary resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Need a clear delineation on who owns the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Selectmen need to spend more time with the department on goals and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Need to invest in other infrastructure maint besides schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Long term financial plan that would allow us to complete our infrastructure plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Town Manager or person who has authority to make decisions, in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Public Works Commission similar to L&amp;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Strong financial team to address capital projects in organized manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Police and Fire work hand-in-hand. Police and Fire do a lot together vs. other towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Respect others’ jobs and what they have to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Things are pretty “damn” good now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Grew up in town with a Town Manager. Sees some downside to one person making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Would like to see more time from the BOS off camera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Not sure the town is ready for a Town Manager. Can see how a Town Manager could offload work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Likes the way things are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town manager can be productive and efficient, but is a negative if not the right person. Could cause problems, animosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Don’t see the need to rush into a Town Manager. Would need a good sell job for Town Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Has leadership models and methods that he has pushed down into the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There is not a good culture in town government right now... a lot of anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The town doesn’t have a mission statement nor a “codified strategic plan”; something that all departments can “align to”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Who’s accountable; how do we measure that; how do we know we are getting the best out of departments... how do they know? This is more about customer service than financial management or measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>We have a strong chain of command. Buck stops at GM’s desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boards need to work more closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Politics appear far more important than solutions to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Needs to be a strong administrator that coordinates the delivery of town services. Not run departments but coordinate the budgets and act as liaison and mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster plan is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long range planning has been initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustees are supportive and interested. Individual mailboxes are available for trustees and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform policies on holiday closings should be set up on an annual basis, well in advance, and then adhered to; posted on the web site and publicized in local press publications, and recorded on answering machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active planning of cooperative programs cosponsored by more than one department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Committee function is limited to special projects. It needs to be active, on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The relationships with non-union employees need concentrated attention to protect the major investment we have in intelligent, trained and dedicated personnel. Departments to be able to count on fair and equitable treatment of wages and benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We cannot have the divisiveness of one Department Head getting a 12% raise, while others go without even a cost-of-living adjustment, or new hires being given raises, while others go without, or union workers getting regular increases, and non-union workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With good people, we can do just about anything, but inequities impact morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town-wide planning needs to be proactive. All departments need to be included in town planning for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting the needs of teenagers. When will the Teen Center become reality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The role of elected boards should be made crystal clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STRENGTHS, WEAKNESS, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Theme Class</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunity To Change</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>We don’t behave like an entity – there’s no sense of cohesiveness outside the four walls of the town offices. Police, fire and L&amp;W do what ever they want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>It is difficult to enforce policy because of the “strip mall” mentality that exists for some department heads. Clear and consistent written policies and procedures should govern much of what we do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I would continually examine our processes to ensure that what we do still makes sense in the current context – we do way too many things here because “that’s how it’s always been done”. We need to look for and employ best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>We need to be able to recognize when our plans no longer work given shifting economics, for example. Encourage communication, encourage exploiting available technologies, make the town office hours consistent across all the departments; cross train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Decisions aren’t made in a timely fashion and I frankly think service has suffered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Policies aren’t adhered to by the department that is supposed to enforce them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Promises are made by IT management to placate users but all too frequently go unfulfilled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The BoS must learn to treat the employees here with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Establishing a simple, concise, easy to remember &amp; repeat Mission Statement that all of us could use as a touchstone when making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right now, we’re 18 departments all pulling on scarce resources in different directions. Whichever department has the most mass often “wins” – kind of a “might makes right” scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Getting more support from the finance committee and selectmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>There isn’t a person who looks out for the whole business interests of the town offices. Everyone is own their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The town administrator position lends itself to be a hands tied position in dealing with employees. It would be easier to have someone in a leadership position when issues arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A strong personality in town administrator government can go around the back door and get things done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Having one person look over the business interests of the town would be the biggest benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Change to a town manager form of government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Have some positions change form elected to appointed. I’m in favor of getting the best person for the job and not the best resident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Board has experienced members. Knows they will stick to the same ground rules for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Long range plans are not defined and they should be. A unified planning approach is needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Define job descriptions and be specific about interaction between departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Over the past ten years or so the Selectman and Finance Comm have attempted to centralize on their own without success causing more personnel issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Possible appointment of Treasurer/Tax Collector, protects professionalism and would help prevent communication breakdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Theme</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>Opportunity To Change</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both said most of the duties or required by law. Local bylaws around voting and town meeting also direct their functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>All driven by State regulations and local bylaws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Over time the expectations of the town will change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Physical structure &amp; safety issues prevent accreditation</td>
<td>Physical structure &amp; safety issues prevent accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many mandated procedures by legislation, litigation, and good practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – Local bylaws, some of which are weakly written and restricts enforcement. State requires in addition to build codes enforcement that the building department is responsible for checking the builders and their subcontractors have the proper worker’s comp insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>All functions are mandated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>State bidding laws which don’t give you the best quality because of low bid laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of funding for capital improvements for heavier and heavier usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>No longer a farm community were people did things for themselves. Want to be in the country with city services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can’t keep pace with upkeep demand given the usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>A “zillion” statutes. Town bylaws can have some impact but not a big one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change town meeting to April so that budget is set sooner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning needs to be fluid to take into account demographic changes and the general economy that effects the town’s ability to function efficiently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive townspeople, Library Friends, make good suggestions that result in improved services for all clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serving information needs of other town employees – we need to know what they need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>The only mention of library in the Town Code concerns overdue materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGL’s have no effect on our efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>The certification requirements help us provide good service to townspeople and the planning requirement helps to focus our resources on goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’d like to see town government acting FOR the taxpayer. Even a small thing like having employees park farthest from the Town House door, leaving the nearer spaces for visitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a huge need for space &amp; facilities to continue the progress of the Park &amp; Rec. A community center would be the way to go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to figure out how fits into job title. Job description does not match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Every thing is dictated by Town &amp; State by-laws. This does not hinder efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>Always aware of where projects stand with other boards and dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>