

At a meeting of the Town Council holden in and for the Town of Gloucester on Sept. 20, 2018:

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present: George O. (Buster) Steere, Jr., President; Edward C. Burlingame, Vice-President; Walter M. O. Steere, III; William E. Reichert and Patricia Henry.

Also Present: Jean Fecteau, Town Clerk; Nichol Carroll-Barnes for the Town Solicitor; Gary Treml, Director of Public Works; Diane Brennan, Finance Director; Joseph DelPrete, Chief of Police; Ken Johnson, Building/Zoning Official; Karen Scott, Town Planner; Lori DeSantis, Tax Assessor; Gerald Mosca, EMA Director; and Robert Shields, Recreation Director.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

IV. Personnel Study- Interim Report by consultant - Discussion and/or action

Don Jacobs, consultant, stated that he has been working on a classification study and the last time he was before the Council, he spoke about the purpose of the study as well as the three (3) specific objectives that were to be accomplished. D. Jacobs stated that tonight he will bring the Council up to date and share what has been accomplished.

D. Jacobs stated that the purpose of the study was to review how the Town is currently paying positions and employees today. D. Jacobs stated that the study highlights two (2) standards that apply to compensation. D. Jacobs stated that the first standard is that compensation should be managed in a consistent way, and the second one is that it should be competitive, both internally and externally.

D. Jacobs stated that there are three (3) objectives, two (2) of which have been completed. D. Jacobs noted that the third one is partially complete. D. Jacobs stated that everything he is sharing with the Council he has already shared with the employees. D. Jacobs stated that he met with the employees on several occasions as well as Diane Brennan, Finance Director and Gary Treml, Director of Public Works. D. Jacobs explained that the process began by having the employees fill out a questionnaire regarding where they spend the bulk of their time and their opinion of the knowledge, skill and ability needed to do what they do. D. Jacobs stated that the questionnaire was submitted to the Department Head for his comments, and from that document, D. Jacobs wrote a job description. D. Jacobs stated that each employee received a job description for their specific position and then D. Jacobs came back and met with them to review the draft job description. D. Jacobs stated that he is not asking the employees to approve the job description, but to ask if they are accurate. D. Jacobs stated that, based on the feedback from employees, changes were made and sent back to the employees a second time for their acknowledgment and signature. D. Jacobs stated that this completed the first objective.

D. Jacobs stated that he then sat down with G. Treml and D. Brennan to advise them of a process to compare positions to one another using 13 position-rating criteria. D. Jacobs stated that an initial classification plan was developed. D. Jacobs stated that they have also collected market data from

a number of communities in Rhode Island; Burrillville, Foster, Scituate, North Smithfield, Smithfield, Hopkinton and Johnston.

D. Jacobs stated that all we are talking about this evening is a process to pay a position which isn't based solely on dollars and cents. D. Jacobs stated that the Council has in their packet a characteristic chart which shows what we mean by each of the five (5) grade levels of the Classification Plan. D. Jacobs stated that the characteristic chart describes the different levels of responsibility and accountability. D. Jacobs stated that he wants the Council to understand the process he followed leading up to the recommendation of a Classification Plan consisting of five (5) grade levels. D. Jacobs explained the grade levels to the Council, stating that he has underlined the level of supervision suggested for each one. D. Jacobs noted that the first four (4) levels are not exempt from overtime, meaning that they are all eligible for overtime. D. Jacobs described Grade Level 5, which require someone to analyze, evaluate and to hold people accountable and take disciplinary action if necessary. D. Jacobs further stated that level 5 could be a spokesperson for the department on a temporary basis (less than 2 weeks at a time).

D. Jacobs stated that he first established the different levels of responsibility and then went back and classified each position. D. Jacobs referred to another chart in the Council's packet which shows where he is recommending each position be classified, not based on dollars and cents, but based on how he has written the draft job descriptions.

Councilor Henry asked if D. Jacobs has written job descriptions yet. D. Jacobs replied in the affirmative but stated that the Council has not gotten them yet because he wanted them to understand and be comfortable with the process he is recommending to establish in terms of developing a classification plan. D. Jacobs stated that he will next put a salary range and explain how he used the market data to develop a minimum/maximum salary range for each of the five (5) grade levels and how the market data applies to each of the individual positions. D. Jacobs stated that he wants to roll out the whole plan in two (2) steps; tonight we are just talking about the Classification Plan, which is a significant change from what we have today.

D. Jacobs commented that there is no difference between Driver Laborer 1 and Driver Laborer 2; they essentially have the same level of responsibility and both require a CDL license. D. Jacobs stated that he will recommend a change in title to "equipment operator" for these positions.

D. Jacobs stated that the other document in the Council's packet is a summary chart showing the salary range for the grade levels, both hire range and market equity range. Councilor Henry asked if there is an actual. D. Jacobs replied in the negative, stating that he did not want to show a lot of dollars and cents because he is trying to separate the classification process from the compensation process. D. Jacobs further explained that he has not yet had a chance to meet with the employees to give them the opportunity to ask questions. D. Jacobs noted that we have taken one department of the Town to look at, but ultimately have to be aware of how the other departments are being compensated. D. Jacobs stated that the next time he meets with the Council, he will have a detailed compensation plan which will include the salary range, the rates of pay for the individual employees in their respective positions and how long each employee has been in their current position. D. Jacobs stated that those three (3) criteria are used to define the word "competitive". D. Jacobs stated that he is meeting with the employees next week.

D. Jacobs explained that the word "benchmark" on the chart means market driven numbers that come directly from the market data. D. Jacobs stated that he has developed a minimum and

maximum linked to the benchmark for each position. D. Jacobs noted that as the market adjusts, the benchmark will change. D. Jacobs stated that this is a market driven compensation plan, not a cost of living plan. D. Jacobs stated that once the Council determines how much money they can afford to spend, this process will recommend how to spend that money. Councilor Henry asked if the data from the seven (7) communities has been averaged. D. Jacobs replied in the affirmative, stating that he rules out the low and high data and uses the midpoint data to develop the benchmark. D. Jacobs stated that once the Council is comfortable with the plan, grade levels and ranges, the question is “where do we go from here”. D. Jacobs stated that he will have a complete plan with detail by the end of next week. D. Jacobs asked if the Council had any questions or concerns.

Councilor Reichert questioned the description of Grade Level V and the requirement of a Bachelor’s degree or a master craftsman level. D. Jacobs stated that when we use the term “bachelor’s degree”, it is synonymous with saying a master craftsman level of knowledge, just as an associate’s degree is comparable to a journeyman level of knowledge. D. Jacobs noted that the knowledge could be obtained by a degree, years of experience or both. D. Jacobs stated that there will be language in the job descriptions to that effect. Councilor Burlingame stated that he understands what D. Jacobs is saying, but recommends that “Bachelor’s degree” be taken out because when people see that in a position description, they will not know what was just explained to the Council. Councilor Henry stated that D. Jacobs may want to use this as a template for other departments. Councilor Burlingame stated that in the case of DPW, he does not think it applies. Councilor G. Steere agreed that it is the perception of the word “bachelor’s degree”. Councilor Henry commented that it is important not to put our own personal assumptions onto the description part of what people may or may not have.

Councilor G. Steere asked D. Jacobs to send the Council the information next week so they would have time to review it before they meet. D. Jacobs stated he could be ready for either meeting in October. Councilor W. Steere stated it is important that all Council members are present. Councilor Reichert stated he won’t be present at the next meeting. There was Council consensus to continue the discussion at the October 18th Town Council meeting.

V. Open Forum - For Agenda Items

- A. (Not a verbatim transcript) Hannah Morini stated that she has comments regarding the Solar Ordinance. H. Morini stated that she works for Green Development and has been working for over two (2) years with a lifelong farmer and landowner in Gloucester, spending a lot of time (reviewed meetings attended) and money on the project with National Grid to secure a viable interconnection cue spot. H. Morini stated they laid out a plan that met all requirements. H. Morini stated this left the family farm intact and anything else was a non-starter for the family. H. Morini stated that it is a tough choice for landowners to give up some of their land for renewable energy.

Councilor Henry asked H. Morini who she is representing. H. Morini replied that she works for Green Development and they are working with the Phillips family on Elmdale Road. H. Morini stated that solar allows farmers to stay viable as a farming business but keep the land in their family. H. Morini pointed out that the previous ordinance would allow the family to keep a huge swath of the property forested and intact and allow them to make steady year-round income from leasing some land for solar. H. Morini stated that this new ordinance eliminates that choice.

Councilor Henry asked Ms. Morini who she was representing. Ms. Morini stated, again, she works for Green Development and has been working with the Phillips family, White Oak Farm. H. Morini gave her perspective on solar energy.

H. Morini stated that if the Town is trying to limit solar, she would encourage them to keep the percentage of usable acreage as it was, but to increase the buffers and setbacks to protect residential property values and to allow larger projects where it is possible. H. Morini further stated that by limiting the feasible projects in Gloucester, the town is pushing out the benefits of tangible taxes, the energy reliable benefits, and the ability of the active farming community to keep doing what they are doing. H. Morini stated that the new ordinance prohibits solar installations on prime agricultural land, but pointed out that there is no rule stating that a farmer couldn't sell house lots on prime agricultural land.

H. Morini stated there are habitats and meadows that can be created between the solar rows and spoke of new concepts using pollinator bees.

Councilor W. Steere asked H. Morini if she would advocate that concept. H. Morini replied in the affirmative. Discussion followed on affordability. H. Morini stated that solar should not be a "one trick pony" and all other uses being denied.

Councilor W. Steere questioned stripping off top soil to make money. H. Morini stated that if top soil is allowed to be removed it should be used else where on the property. Councilor Henry stated that meadows between solar panels sounds lovely but that she hasn't seen anyone proposing that. H. Morini stated that could be a requirement.

Councilor Reichert stated you don't even know you will get an agreement with National Grid after you have stripped the land. Councilor Reichert discussed shave pruning instead of clear cutting. Timing was discussed regarding the interconnect agreements and work being done on property. Councilor Reichert stated these are some of the concerns to be discussed at Council's public hearing.

- B. Roger Phillips, owner of White Oak Farm
Mr. Phillips discussed his family farm history. Mr. Phillips stated leasing a portion of their property would give them sustain ability. Mr. Phillips stated there would be very little land to be cleared and only one homeowner (nephew) lives nearby and they were aware of this plan before they purchased. Mr. Phillips stated that limiting to a 5 acre solar array would be difficult due to expense of setting system in place and the interconnection to National Grid's power system.
Mr. Phillips was advised to come to the Town Council's Public Hearing on the proposed ordinance amendments.

VI. Consent Items - Discussion and/or action

- A. Town Council Meeting Minutes of September 6, 2018
- B. Tax Assessor's Additions & Abatements - August 2018
- C. Finance Director's Report - August 2018

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to TABLE to October 4th the Approval of the Town Council Meeting minutes of September 6, 2018; to APPROVE the ADDITIONS to the 2018 Tax Roll in the amount of \$52,929.77; the ABATEMENTS to the 2015 Tax Roll in the amount of \$232.48, the 2016 Tax Roll in the amount of \$226.58, the 2017 Tax Roll in the amount of \$217.03, and the 2018 Tax Roll in the amount of \$3,551.67; seconded by Councilor Burlingame.

Discussion: None.

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Proposed Pavilion Event (with possible exemptions from rules & regulations)
Scarecrow Festival - Discussion and/or action

Councilor G. Steere asked Mark Rechter if he is looking for the same exemptions as last year. M. Rechter replied yes, basically the same. M. Rechter stated that the only thing that came up was regarding rabbits, and he has contacted DEM who stated that any livestock can be on display as long as it not for sale and signs are provided stating that the rabbits do not have to be inoculated. M. Rechter stated they will provide paper towels and hand sanitizer.

Councilor Henry asked B. Shields if he was all set with event plans. B. Shields answered in the affirmative.

MOTION was made by Councilor Henry to grant the use of the pavilion to the Chepachet Grange #38 and the Gloucester Library for their Gloucester Scarecrow Festival to be held on Saturday, October 13, 2018, or in case of rain, Sunday, October 14, 2018, and to grant relief from the following regulations in Article 3-221-18:

1. Relief from Subsection E: granting permission to set up a grill, a minimum of 50 feet from the Pavilion, subject to applicant receiving a Department of Health permit.
2. Relief from Subsection I: granting permission to set up signage outside of the wall.
3. Relief from Subsection K: granting permission to close the parking area to traffic the day of the event.
4. Relief from Subsection O: granting permission to sell grilled food, under the stipulation a Department of Health permit shall be received by applicant, and there shall be a fire extinguisher on premise.
5. Cleanup and trash removal will be the responsibility of the Applicants, Chepachet Grange and the Library.
6. The applicants, Chepachet Grange and the Library, will work with the Chief of Police regarding a Police presence for safety.
7. Subject to Fire Department requirements, to include a hose on site.
8. Signage will not be affixed to the Pavilion.

Seconded by Councilor Reichert.

Discussion: Councilor W. Steere asked if it should be stated that no political signs are allowed. It was stated and agreed by applicant that this is understood.

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry

NAYS-0
MOTION PASSED

B. Route 44 Access from Douglas Hook Road & Post Office access and egress - Discussion and/or action

Councilor G. Steere stated there was discussion at the last meeting about exiting Douglas Hook to Route 44 when cars were parked on the corner. Councilor G. Steere noted that Council had determined they, in fact, asked for the spaces to remain previously. The Chief stated he has had discussion with the State Traffic Engineer and it was determined that if Council went to the State Traffic Commission, there would be signage and they would lose a parking spot. The Chief discussed the possibilities regarding line of sight and losing parking spaces. Councilor Burlingame asked the Chief for his recommendation. The Chief stated he has not had many accidents and finds that particularly when the town has events, parking is needed. Councilor Burlingame suggested eliminating some spots between post office exit and Douglas Hook. The Chief stated the first spot is definitely a problem. Councilor Burlingame suggested letting the State Traffic Engineer make a recommendation. Discussion followed on possibilities. Councilor Henry stated she is not in favor of taking away parking spaces. Councilor Burlingame stated he is getting resident complaints. Councilor W. Steere stated he thinks the bigger problem is the post office exit as opposed to Douglas Hook. The Chief agreed the post office exit is more difficult to maintain a line of sight. Councilor Henry stated she feels coming out of Chestnut Hill on to Route 44 is more difficult. Councilor W. Steere stated we need to be careful what we end up with when state reviews. Councilor G. Steere stated for every parking spot taken there could be another sign on the sidewalk. Councilor G. Steere stated we need to give thought to specifically what Council wants to ask for. The Chief stated when Council decides he will support with the state. Councilor Henry stated she is for doing nothing.

MOTION was made by Councilor Burlingame to TABLE until October 4, 2018 the discussion regarding Route 44 Access from Douglas Hook Road & Post Office access and egress; seconded by Councilor Reichert.

Discussion: none

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere and Reichert
NAYS-Henry

MOTION PASSED

VIII. New Business

A. Proposed Pavilion Use - Gloucester Business Association- "Halloween" - Discussion and/or action

Vincent Lepore, Pres. of the G.B.A. stated Council has been given a plan for this year's event, which is exactly the same but suspected to be a bigger crowd. V. Lepore stated they are working with the Chief to address handling more people. V. Lepore asked if the Town could donate one of the police details out of their contingency fund. Councilor Henry stated Council cannot ask the Chief to donate. Atty. Kane stated it would have to be on a future agenda to vote on if Council decides to do that.

MOTION was made by Councilor Henry to waive the Pavilion at Kent Field - Rules & Regulation #N for an event to be held by the Gloucester Business Association on Saturday, October 27, 2018 from the hours of approximately 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and to give the GBA

permission to close the parking area during that event to secure the area; seconded by Councilor Burlingame.

Discussion: none

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

B. Proposed for Adoption: Williams Mills Conservation Area - 2018 Hunting Rules and Regulations - Discussion and/or action

Councilor G. Steere stated in 2009, the Council designated the Conservation Commission as the steward of the property known as the Williams Mills Conservation Area and each year the Conservation Commission submits its hunting rules and regulations for approval.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ADOPT the 2018-2019 Rules & Regulations for the Williams Mills Conservation Area, under the stewardship of the Conservation Commission; seconded by Councilor Burlingame.

Discussion: none

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

C. Gloucester Code of Ordinance - Proposed Amendment 1st Reading
Gloucester Zoning Ordinance Sec. 350, Article VII Special Regulations,
§350-46 Solar facilities - Discussion and/or action

Councilor G. Steere stated the Planning Board has adopted a draft of proposed amendments to the Solar facilities ordinance and they have forwarded the draft to the Council for their consideration. Councilor G. Steere stated the draft to be considered by Council is available tonight and will be available to the public. Councilor G. Steere stated in lieu of reading the proposed draft amendments may be explained at this time and no changes will be considered until the public hearing.

Discussion:

Karen Scott, Town Planner, reviewed the work of the Planning Board when considering amendments in response to the solar moratorium currently in place. K. Scott explained the Board focused on land use compatibility, significant tree cutting, property value impacts and public safety. The Board spent a considerable amount of time working on these proposals over five meetings.

K. Scott stated the (Planning) Board primary policy direction focused on the protection of existing residential neighborhoods and the protection of the Town's natural resources, particularly forest cover as it not only contributes to the character of the Town but to conserving towns' water supply and quality.

K. Scott listed the proposed amendments and gave an overview of each:

1. Proposed a change to the way solar energy systems are defined, rather than defining by wattage the P.B. proposes solar land coverage which is essentially the footprint of the solar energy system, which would include everything inside the fenced area. Small systems cover up to 1,750 sq. ft. Medium systems cover up to 40,000 sq. ft. Large systems cover up to 200,000 sq. ft. Utility scale systems, which is a new category, can cover up to 20 acres, which is the maximum solar land coverage permitted in this ordinance and is compatible with the 5 MW size limit that is in the current ordinance.

2. This proposal concept was to articulate and incentivizes areas the Board felt were most appropriate for solar development, including rooftops, contaminated sites, gravel banks, quarries, parking lots and industrial zones. Under this concept rooftop solar is permitted, by right, in any zone in any size with administrative review only. Lot coverage is permitted to be increase if solar is proposed on any of the areas thought to be most appropriate.

3. A new category of solar was added, solar canopies, which are solar energy systems located on new elevated structures that host solar panels and provide shelter to parking areas, driveways or walkways underneath.

4. Small scale solar is permitted in all zones subject to modest performance standards and administrative review

5. Medium scale solar is permitted in all zones except the Village District subject to Performance Standards and Major Land Development Review by the Planning Board.

6. Large scale solar is permitted in all zones except the Village District subject to performance standards, Major land development review by the Planning Board and a special use permit from the Zoning Board.

7. Utility scale solar, the largest type of solar, encompassing roughly more than 5 acres is permitted in the Industrial zone only subject to performance standards, major development plan review by the Planning Board and a special use permit form the zoning board.

K.. Scott provided an overview of the performance standards previously mentioned.

- a. Height – 12 feet, 20 feet for solar canopies, zoning district max for roof mounted.
- b. Setbacks – The Planning Board was concerned about compatibility to residential property. All medium, large and utility solar systems in the agricultural/residential zones will require a 200 foot undisturbed setback (new language) from all property lines. Solar in Industrial and commercial zones will meet the applicable setbacks unless it abuts a residential zone, then the lager setback applies. This is comparable to the setbacks currently required which was 150/200 feet depending on the size. It was only from the roadway but now it applies to all property lines, better protecting neighboring residential properties.
- c. Solar Land Coverage – the area within the security fence – is 15% of land suitable for development in the agricultural/residential zones – which slightly lower than what is permitted now at 20% but still a generous increase from the 4% permitted for all other uses in the zone. In other zones, it is what is permitted in the underlying zoning – 25% for commercial, 30% in industrial with an opportunity to go to 50% as previously outlined. Solar canopies are exempt from this requirement

- d. Screening – this was a huge concern for the Planning Board as this really has an impact on existing residential properties, including their property values. The screening requirement was enlarged from 20 feet and 6 feet at planting to requiring all medium, large and utility scale solar requires a 50 foot vegetated buffer on all sides, 8 feet at planting, designed by a landscape architect to ensure opacity year round.
- e. Forest Impacts – No more than 20% of the forested area in residential zones may be cleared for solar. This is a decrease from the 40% currently allowed but does come more in line with the other uses in the zoning district. The Board put a lot of thought into this number. Right now, major residential subdivisions are required to be conservation subdivisions, setting aside up to 70% of the land suitable for development as permanently protected open space. The Forest Impacts Section does not specify land suitable for development must be preserved, just forested area (which could be wetland areas); therefore the percentage is slightly lower than that for residential development but comparable. No limit on clearing in B-1, B2, or I zones as the Town doesn't limit clearing for other commercial development. Generally not in close proximity to residential wells.

K. Scott concluded the ordinance overview except to add that the Planning Board forwarded an advisory opinion to the Council recommending adoption of the Ordinance amendments and confirming that the ordinance amendments as proposed are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes of zoning as outlined in state law.

K. Scott offered to answer any specific questions on any of the language in the draft zoning ordinance update.

Councilor Reichert asked if any consideration was given to situations such as Mr. Phillips as that is what this is for. Councilor Reichert stated they have already sold half of their land and that was one of the reasons for this in my book.

K. Scott stated there was a lot of consideration given and that the Planning Board's policy guidance was protecting existing residential neighborhoods from solar encroachment.

Councilor Reichert stated a lot of this should be told to them before so they know what they can do as now it is a roll of the dice.

Councilor G. Steere stated there was a lot of discussion regarding Mr. Phillips that didn't make it to the ordinance. Councilor G. Steere stated after attending all of the meetings, a lot of the votes were 4 to 3. Councilor G. Steere stated the Planning Board voted on different set backs before it was passed. Councilor G. Steere advised members to take a good hard look at ordinance before the meeting and encouraged them to discuss with the members about your concerns. Councilor G. Steere stated there will be more discussion at the public hearing.

MOTION was made by Councilor Burlingame to SET a Public Hearing for the consideration of the proposed amendments to the Gloucester Code of Ordinance, Zoning Chapter Section 350; Article VII Special Regulations, Chapter 350-46 Solar facilities for October 18, 2018; seconded by Councilor Reichert.

Discussion: none

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

- D. Resolution of Adoption for Gloucester Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan: Entitled “Strategy for Reducing Risks from Natural Hazards, Town of Gloucester, Rhode Island 2018 - Discussion and/or action

Councilor G. Steere stated the Town Planner and EMA Director have worked on an update of the Gloucester Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan and the plan is now ready for adoption by Council. Councilor G. Steere stated the Final Plan is in Council’s packet.

Councilor Henry thanked for a good job on the plan including all the good information included. G. Mosca outlined the process to bring the plan forward, meetings, approvals, etc. G. Mosca stated that the government has recently come out with \$200,000,000 in grant funds which we could apply towards once the plan is adopted. G. Mosca thanked everyone involved for their help, especially the Town Planner. Councilor G. Steere thank G. Mosca and K. Scott.

The Plan is to be adopted by Resolution, which was read by Councilor Reichert:

RESOLUTION 2018-03

To adopt the FEMA approved Strategy for Reducing Risks
from Natural Hazards
Town of Gloucester, 2018

WHEREAS, the Town of Gloucester recognizes that the threat natural hazards pose to people and property; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Gloucester has prepared a multi-hazard mitigation plan, hereby known as the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Natural Hazards, Town of Gloucester, 2018 in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000; and

WHEREAS, the 2018 plan identifies mitigation goals and actions to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property in Gloucester from impacts of future hazards and disasters; and

WHEREAS, adoption by the Town Council demonstrates their commitment to hazard mitigation and achieving goals outlined in the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Natural Hazards, Town of Gloucester, 2018,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Gloucester Town Council accepts and adopts the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Natural Hazards, Town of Gloucester, 2018.

George O. Steere, Jr.
Gloucester Town Council President

Jean M. Fecteau, CMC, Town Clerk

Dated this 20th day of September 2018

seconded by Councilor W. Steere.

Discussion: none

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

E. Personnel

1. Resignation

a. Gloucester Police Department: Captain - Discussion and/or action
Councilor G. Steere stated Council has received the resignation of Captain Joseph Mattera.

MOTION was made by Councilor Reichert to ACCEPT the retirement of Captain Joseph Mattera from the Gloucester Police Department effective September 9, 2018; seconded by Councilor W. Steere.

Discussion: Councilor W. Steere stated for the record this is a retirement and expressed his thanks to Captain Mattera.

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry
NAYS-0

MOTION PASSED

IX. Town Council Correspondence /Discussion

A. Councilor G. Steere stated the Council has received correspondence from the G.B.A. regarding a dedication gathering at the Job Armstrong Building on Saturday, Sept. 22nd at 10:00 a.m.. Councilor G. Steere stated this will be to dedicate a bench placed there in honor of Rose Lavoie.

B. Councilor G. Steere stated Council has received correspondence from the G.B.A. regarding posting on the town's website for the Trick or Treat on Main Street event on October 27, 2018.

X. Department Head Reports/Discussion
None

XI. Bds. and Commissions Reports/Discussion

A. Councilor Henry asked G. Trembl about a sign for G.M.P. Councilor Henry questioned if we have ordered a sign after past discussion. B. Shields will check after first quarter to determine if he has funds for a sign in his budget.

XII. Open Forum

A. George Charette, 312 Chopmist Hill Road, addressed the issue of speed in the town of Gloucester. Mr. Charette suggested more speeding tickets would help the speeding problem.

XIII. Adjourn

MOTION was made by Councilor Burlingame to ADJOURN at 9:05 p.m.; seconded by Councilor Reichert.

VOTE: AYES- G. Steere, Burlingame, W. Steere, Reichert and Henry

NAYS-0
MOTION PASSED