

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM

Quorum noted

5:30 PM: Meeting called to order by Acting Chairman Beckert.

Roll Call: Mr. Beckert, Mr. Hirst, Mr. Fernald and Ms. Davis.

Pledge of Allegiance recited

Moment of Silence observed

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

5:31 PM Motion by Mr. Fernald, seconded by Mr. Hirst, to approve the minutes of September 11, 2014, as amended.

VOTE
3-0
Chair concurs

Motion by Mr. Fernald, seconded by Mr. Hirst, to approve the minutes of September 18, 2014, as amended.

VOTE
3-0
Chair concurs

Public Comment:

5:38 PM Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that she had copies of Item I-2 that has confidential information attached to it and gave the documents to the Town Manager.

5:39 PM Ms. (Janet) Saurman said that she was curious to know if the Board went by a particular set of meeting orders – Robert's Rules of Order – or any formal meeting orders that the Board might use. She added that she would like us to avoid the kind of thing that happened two weeks ago. She asked, if the Board had a set of rules, could they be published to all the Selectmen so that people are clear on how these meetings are run and what is said.

5:40 PM Mr. Lee said that he had in his agenda folder the By-laws and Rules of Order of the Eliot Board of Selectmen and, in that document, it talks to Ms. Saurman's question. He added that he could get that out to everybody if they didn't otherwise have it and any place else the Board might like.

The Board agreed to have them posted on the Town web site.

G1. Department Head/Committee Reports

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

There were none tonight.

G2. Administrative Department

5:42 PM 1) Town Manager Activities Report

Mr. Lee said that he included a couple of FYI's. He said that there was a one-page document from the Energy Commission that lists the projects that have been accomplished, to-date, starting back in 2010. He also said that he gave background information for a future workshop regarding proposed investments showing two examples of investing scenarios for the Board to start thinking about for the workshop.

Ms. Davis asked what Business Friendly Certification was about.

Mr. Lee said that you have to publish an ad in the newspaper that directs people, if they have any comments about a Business Friendly Certification, then they need to send their comments to a certain person at DECD (Dep. of Economic & Community Development), either positive or negative.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Lee to forward that ad to the Board.

Ms. Davis asked about the proposed sidebar agreement regarding a sergeant's position.

Mr. Lee said that had to do with the Police Chief and the union starting discussions about the sergeant's position, which is currently not in the contract, and would require amending the contract; that any proposed agreement would be submitted to him for review then to the Board for their review and possible approval.

Ms. Davis said that the Oldfield's Bridge structure was set in one hour and she was concerned with the amount of money they paid for that one hour.

5:45 PM Mr. Lee said that that was actually good news that it went in that quickly; that we were told that the site was so well-prepared that they were able to come right in and start setting those sections.

Mr. Hirst asked if that meant we were not necessarily charged the \$4,000.

Mr. Lee did not necessarily think that; that he hasn't actually discussed that with Mr. Moulton, yet, and has not seen all the bills; that that may be an estimated

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

amount based on the number of hours the crane has to be active. He added that he would pay attention to that.

Ms. Davis said that, in last week's warrant, there wasn't a breakout of the DPW time for Old Field's Bridge and asked how they were tracking that.

Mr. Lee said that Mr. Moulton was tracking that on a separate sheet; that we would do a complete tabulation, along with South Berwick, so we know the true costs of our manpower, equipment, etc. He added that he would be forwarding that information to the Board shortly.

5:47 PM **2) Amended Town Manager Goals**

Mr. Lee said that at the last meeting the discussion on the TIF alternatives, etc., was put on hold and it was suggested to him that it would be reasonable to remove it from his goals at this point.

Ms. Davis asked why we weren't thinking of alternatives.

Mr. Beckert said that they could continue to think about alternatives but that the comments last week were that we were going to move ahead with other more pressing issues. He added that nothing really concrete came forward at that meeting.

The Board discussed pros and cons of setting up a committee of interested residents to pursue TIF alternatives.

5:50 PM Ms. (Carol) Selsberg said that it was hard to submit ideas before we knew what would be allowed.

Mr. Lee said that at that last meeting it was his hope...that he had said to the Board that it was their turn to listen to ideas but the discussion went back to why we should not do this and what about this; that it really wasn't an idea generation meeting.

Ms. Saurman said that, if a committee is formed then they will undoubtedly be asking for some funds; that every time a committee comes up there is a bit of a price tag with it, which is fine with her, but to keep that in mind. She added that to have a committee would mean that you would focus in and have a few folks try with more specific intention to do what the public hearing didn't.

Ms. Davis suggested they have an informal workshop to specifically address this.

Mr. Pomerleau discussed his frustration with this whole process.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

Mr. Beckert asked the Board what they wished to do moving forward.

Ms. Davis moved, second by Mr. Hirst, that the Board of Selectmen set a date on an off Thursday to have a workshop to discuss the ideas that have been previously submitted and solicit additional ideas and public participation.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Lee discussed giving enough time to give notice that we will have a workshop, encourage people to attend, and so forth.

5:58 PM Mr. Lentz suggested working up the criteria for good projects ahead of the workshop.

The Board scheduled a workshop for November 6th at 5:30 PM.

Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Lentz, saying that that had to be the premise by which we screen projects; that he could flesh that out and possibly be a starting point for the workshop and for any committee formed.

Ms. Selsberg suggested doing a simple bullet list of criteria and put it on the web site so that people would know, who do come to the workshop, what can be done.

It was also suggested that the attorney suggestions and resident submissions be put on the web site, as well.

DISCUSSION ENDED

During the discussion, the Board agreed by consensus to hold a workshop to discuss TIF alternatives.

3) Marshwood Estates Update

Mr. Lee said that the application for the loan money to fix the ongoing water problems at Marshwood Estates was tabled. He added that he met with the Drinking Water Program folks in Augusta and they strongly advocated that the Maine Bond Bank (MBB) fund it but there is a new staff at the MBB and has become a rather conservative, risk-averse body, which has never been the case before; that the understanding is that these loans are second-position loans; that the application came in 6 out of 48 applications and they (DWP) are dumbfounded why it isn't going forward. He said that he wrote them a letter supporting going forward with this loan and will go up to the MBB in November to strongly advocate in favor of this loan.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

6:05 PM 4) Sawgrass Lane Sewer Update

Mr. Lee said that he received new information from the EPA, NHDES and MDEP that they believe the new air-monitoring trailer will be up and running sometime at the end of October and November 1st is their planned deadline, that it would be there no longer than one year, all stickers from the trailer will be removed so as not to scare people; that it will be surrounded by a 7-foot vinyl fence and set in the cul-de-sac in such a way as to not block anyone's view. He added that they worked to find the best location to pick up the potential effect by the modelled plume. He added that he has not heard back from Sawgrass Lane residents but there is still the question of the private sewer. He clarified that the Town clearly owned the cul-de-sac so we can place the trailer there.

6:08 PM 5) Use of TIF Funds Update

Mr. Lee said that it was very clear in the attorney's memo that whether we go cash or we bond, no matter what the project is, we still have to go to the voters for approval.

Ms. Davis said that at the September 18th meeting a warrant to repair the existing sewer was removed from the November Warrant because a resident claimed to have paperwork that obligated the entire Town to pay 100% of the repairs to the existing sewer system; that the Town Manager was directed to get the paperwork and consult with the Town attorney and no review that she was aware of had been done to this point.

Mr. Beckert said that Item G2-6 on tonight's agenda was the original paperwork.

6) Sewer Funding Updates

Mr. Lee said that he had to wait a couple of weeks before he received the paperwork from Mr. Bradstreet, that it was in tonight's packet, and was given to the attorney for review. He also said that he created a memo today from a meeting he had with Mr. (John) True, a professional (municipal sewer) engineer (with the State since 1984); that he just received a lot of good material from Mr. True today that he would put in the Board's boxes for their review. He added that we are moving quite rapidly trying to resolve this because we want to be able to do something in June. Mr. Lee said that Mr. True has been doing this for more than 30 years and that this paperwork would not bind us in any way, shape, or form; that Mr. True knows nothing of anything at the State or federal level that would give us any guidance as to how the Town wanted to go about this. He added that Mr. True gave us a survey of municipalities and how they broke up paying for this type of thing and there is no common standard. He said that this puts this back in

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

the Board's lap, as a policy matter; that the only thing they tell you is that however you divide the cost must be fair, proportional, and equitable; that there has to be a justifiable basis for why you choose whatever ratios you choose. He added that, as an example, a couple of meetings ago they discussed how 47% was stormwater and 54% was sewerage so we called it a 50/50; that that would be a rational basis.

Ms. Davis, referring back to the September 18th minutes, said that Mr. Bradstreet stated that *"those pumps are functional and were put in 6-7 years ago; that they have a 15 to 20-year shelf life; that we'll do what we've been doing minus the expansion and, if one breaks, we'll fix it; that they are alternating pumps and are cycled every day or every other week; that we have spare pumps in the hole and what else is wrong with them. He added that if a pump goes out (whether new or old) we rectify that, supposedly, with generators and he didn't think an imminent failure is what it was led to be."* She added that this was a very specific statement and runs contrary to everything we have been working to over the past three years. She asked if Mr. Moulton could address that.

6:18 PM

Mr. Moulton said that it was not just the pumps; that it was the infrastructure of the pump stations, themselves. He discussed the failure of one of the two feed lines carrying sewer from the well house at Station #2 to the Pump Station, which then takes the sewer down to Pump Station #1 and, if the other one failed, we could have a catastrophic event; that that is just one of many things that are wrong with the system. He added that they could fix the pumps but they were not efficient and were not meeting the needs for what we have; that sometimes we have to cycle pumps two at a time to meet the current needs.

Mr. Beckert said that it was his understanding that, if we get into a major storm event, then those pumps are running constantly; that they don't even have time to shut down. He agreed that we lost a line recently and were able to avert a major spill; that we have to look at the infrastructure and rely on the engineers and what is the actual conditions of those facilities at this point in time.

Ms. Davis agreed regarding the engineers but she thought Mr. Bradstreet's concern is the expense for the sewer users; that for her, since the pumps are good and since we're only upgrading for future use, is there a way to take the money that is being collected now and maybe fix the lines piecemeal, then do the upgrades later as more funds are collected so we are not whacking them as hard as we might have to if we do all of the upgrades at once.

Mr. Moulton clarified that we are not upgrading the pumps for future use but upgrading the pumps for current needs, with plans for future use; that we are doing two things – improving and replacing that are failing that will cause imminent failure and, also, planning for the future; that out of the \$1.5 million,

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

\$1.3 million is the upgrades and improvements necessary to keep the current system moving; that the difference in cost is to add another pedestal for another pump for future expansion. He said that the system is outdated; that it is over 30 years old and these pumps have a 30-year life cycle; that the bills for maintenance this year are already exceeding what they were last year.

Ms. Murphy asked for clarification on the age of the pumps – 6-7 years old or 30 years old.

Mr. Moulton said that the pumps are 30 years old; that they have been rebuilt and are continuously rebuilt because they break down.

6:20 PM

Ms. Saurman said that as someone who will be impacted by this she appreciates that the Town is trying to do a thorough job of exploring this with a lawyer and relying on the experts; that she would not like to be the Town in this position because they could not win no matter what they do. She suggested that, if this was viewed as a collective problem in the community, that is mandated by the government to have sewer, that we could then all solve together, then that would go a long way to helping the residents of South Eliot feel like we are a valued part of the community. She added that we (South Eliot residents) are just trying to do what the government said we had to do to keep the land and the river well-taken care of.

Ms. Murphy said that, if we are going to look at the sewer system as a collective issue for the Town she thought, then, that we also have to consider those that are on septic and is that going to be a collective issue for the Town when someone has to replace their septic system.

Mr. Beckert said that it was his opinion that she was comparing apples to oranges; that private sewer is not the responsibility of the municipality.

Mr. Hirst said that with two failures, one outside of Pump Station #1 and one outside of Pump Station #2, we have to assume that all the pipe is horribly deteriorated; that he saw the pipe as it came out of the ground and it was terribly tuberculated and a huge mess; that we need to assume that all of the infrastructure is in a similar condition.

6:25 PM

7) Park Street – Prescriptive Use Update

Mr. Lee said that the memo from Attorney Van Hemel said, *“The legal basis for the Town’s position is that by law under Title 23 M.R.S. §§ 3451-3453, any obstruction to a public right-of-way may be removed by the Town at the expense of the owner who is responsible for the encroachment or obstruction.”* Mr. Lee said that the attorney further stated, *“The Town has the discretion to remove,*

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

partially remove, or not remove any given obstruction as circumstances may dictate and is not obligated to remove all obstructions everywhere just because one obstruction was removed at one location. The election by the Town not to remove an obstruction at any given time or location will not constitute a waiver or license for the obstruction to remain in future." Mr. Lee said that 'prescriptive use' does not apply to Towns in roads; that the encroachments can be required to be removed or the Town can do that at its own expense; that just because one item, perhaps, has to be removed because of the project does not necessarily mean that we have to correct or implicate anyone else that isn't in the way of the project. Mr. Lee said that, despite the concerns, the Town has the right and obligation to recognize that right-of-way (ROW) and utilize it to put in the storm water; that if we have to ask somebody to move something then they will have to move it; that if we don't have to ask someone to move something then the Town can let it go. He added that it didn't mean in the future that, if we had to do ditching that we won't come back to say something has to be removed. He said that he thought that was the answer everyone was looking for – if I have to move it doesn't everyone have to move it or doesn't the Town have to move the whole road – and the answer is no.

6:29 PM

Ms. Saurman said that she appreciated the Town's efforts in this and is satisfied enough with the results. She discussed the implications of not only the property owners not knowing the correct boundary lines but the Town not knowing, as well.

Ms. Davis said that the original memo from the attorney suggests we need to get property lines formalized; that the Powers' have expressed to her that the main problem is not the fence but knowing where their boundary lines are and this does not formally address that.

Mr. Beckert said that it does; that the survey done in 2012 and recorded at the York County Registry of Deeds, Plan 366 Page 11, was done and paid for by the Powers and recorded in Alfred by the Powers and that sets the boundary locations. Mr. Beckert said that he thought they had gotten the answer from the attorney regarding 'prescriptive use'; that the survey speaks for itself based upon the reputation and stamp on that survey; that it has been paid for and recorded in Alfred by the Powers; that this project needs to move forward. Mr. Beckert said that, per Mr. Van Hemel's advice, for us to discuss it any further other than this is the Town's stand (and the law) on the ROW and 'prescriptive use' rights issue, that we shouldn't discuss any further other than to move forward with the project.

Ms. Davis said that she was not sure how the Power Family or others on the road would feel about this and she didn't think they should move forward until the Board hears from them. She added that, according to the paperwork, there is no deadline for this, and she thought the other residents still needed to weigh in; that

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

we, and the residents, just got this today and she thinks the Board needs to hear from them before we proceed.

6:37 PM

Ms. Saurman said that she would just like to say that she is here; that, as far as she knows, she was the person who requested from the Board a legal opinion; that she is here and she is the person saying thank you for doing it, it didn't work out the way that she had hoped; that she just wanted to point out the Town was mixed up, as well. She asked at what point was the citizen held responsible for asking the questions, requesting answers, getting them, showing up for the answer and saying thank you.

Mr. Lee asked Ms. (Christy) Rabasca, storm water consultant, what the deadline was for us.

Ms. Rabasca clarified that, since we are no longer doing the access-portion of the project, which design needed to be completed by the end of December of this year (grant for the design piece), as at the August meeting we decided not to do the access. She added that the other deadline that we have would be within the MS4 Permit, which requires the Town to identify what maintenance has to get done, prioritize it, and then implement that program, and we specify the dates by which that program needs to get done. She said that we did all that last year and this was a project that needed to be designed last year and constructed this year.

6:43 PM

Mr. Lee said that he would prefer not to but he didn't think, necessarily, that the world was going to stop if we wait a couple weeks to hear feedback from the people who are impacted. He did added that his concern is that the legal opinion that we have is such that, almost regardless of how they feel, etc. it's not really going to change anything; that he didn't know what else could be brought to this except a law suit that would change the outcome.

Mr. Moulton said that there were a couple of other residents who have been impacted and they have given verbal agreement to have easements to allow the Town to do the work; that the Town is in the process of drafting these easements to do this project.

Ms. Rabasca said that the deadline is June 30, 2015; that that is when this permit year ends.

Mr. Beckert asked the Board, as a whole, what their pleasure was as far as allowing the Powers to respond.

Mr. Lee said that his only suggestion if this is the direction of the conversation the Board might want to look at G.3.1 as part of it; that we have bid this out, bids have come back, bids were too high; that we have had to negotiate a lot of stuff

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

out of their bid to be done in-house by DPW in order to keep this within the reduced budget and, so, to the extent this gets pushed off beyond a reasonable period these bids, he thought, have a shelf life, for example, that this price will be good for 30 days and they could pull their bids if we wait too long.

Ms. Davis took exception with those bids and discussed what she saw as a discrepancy in the bid pricing.

Mr. Moulton clarified that \$90,000 (engineer estimate) was originally budgeted for the project and then was reduced in anticipation of potentially receiving grant money to \$60,000. He added that the actual construction costs, as required and bid, gives you the actual cost. He said that it did come in above bid; that the original budget number was \$90,000; that we only had \$60,000 so we've made adjustments in discussions with the contractor to reduce things; that his department will take on some of the intermittent things that can be done at minimal or no cost to the Town to reduce the budget back down to something we can work with so that we could proceed. He agreed that the project deadline was June of 2015 but the deadline to do it this time of year would be current, now, because of paving plants and when they close. He said that it can be pushed off but that he didn't recommend it; that they bid it and these bids are only good for a certain period of time; construction, the way it is going, prices could go higher next year. He added that we are already looking at the fact that we've sent something to the State to move forward with the project; that we are already looking forward to next year's project on Pleasant Street for budget purposes, as we promised the State that we would do; that he felt that if we move backwards we will never have enough funds to move forward. He discussed the organization and scheduling involved in lining up projects and how disruptive it might be to not follow that schedule.

6:52 PM Discussed was the original bid being \$85,000, which included a contingency, when you don't have a design, for the engineer's estimate; that the economy drives costs.

Mr. Beckert said that we've discussed the 'prescriptive use' issue with the attorney's letter; that that they have beat that to death and it was his opinion that waiting two weeks for anybody to respond is not going to do a thing. He added that it was fairly clear to him, in reading these documents, that 'prescriptive use' does not apply, here, with the Town; that the Town is not going to lose their ROW because someone thinks they have 'prescriptive use'. He said that the other issue was that, if the Powers disagree with their own survey, which they paid for and recorded in Alfred in 2012...what else was there to disagree with. He added that the Powers agreed the fence needed to come down. He reiterated that he saw no need to wait two weeks.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

There was further discussion regarding delaying this decision.

Ms. Davis moved that the Board of Selectmen delay this decision for two weeks while, A. The Powers have an opportunity to respond to this situation and B. while we possibly get quotes from more than two people for the work to be done.

There was no second and the motion failed.

Mr. Moulton said that they did seek a third bidder but they opted not to bid because of their work schedule; that we posted it per Town policy and have met the requirements of Town policy; that there was a third bidder, initially, but chose not to bid because of their workload.

7:01 PM Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen go forward with the Park Street Drainage Project with Brex Corporation for \$68,168, forthwith, on the basis that we are on solid legal ground.

VOTE

2-1 (Ms. Davis against)

Chair concurs in the affirmative.

Mr. Hirst said that the bid memo says that "the Town will waive the bond requirement and all retainage will be returned to the contractor upon job completion." He said that he objects to waiving the performance bond requirement and could impact the cost (\$2,000). He asked if he could amend his motion to raise the amount of the project cost from \$68,168 to an amount that includes the provision of the performance bond.

There was discussion regarding a specific amount to add for the performance bond.

Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen modify the previous motion to include \$2,200 (not to exceed) for the performance bond on the Park Street Project with Brex Corporation.

VOTE

2-1 (Ms. Davis against)

Chair concurs in the affirmative.

7:08 PM **8) Post TAN Issuance Policy – Draft**

Mr. Lee said that this was put off to allow the Board time to review this; that this is a requirement when we have TAN borrowings.

Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen adopt the Post Issuance Compliance Policy as shown as G.2.8, dated 10/9/2014.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

VOTE
3-0
Chair concurs

9) York County Valuations – FYI

This was informational regarding the impact to next year's budget.

G3. Public Works

1) Park Street Storm Water Bid

This was previously discussed.

7:15 PM 2) Additional Kittery Plant Upgrade Information

Mr. Lee discussed the meeting he had with Kittery in which they were reminded that Eliot, under the IMA Agreement, was supposed to have an opportunity to review any sewer improvement or upgrade plans prior to Kittery bidding; that Kittery understood that, that they overlooked that and apologized. He added that they liked our suggestion that each April, prior to the deadline, there be an annual meeting between Eliot and Kittery regarding new, upcoming plans and discuss the IMA. He said that they indicated they have a \$4.4 million project to which Eliot is an 8.33% financial party, except for Pump #7 where we are a 90% financial party; that they also have a \$7 million project that Eliot is not a financial party; that they had no other capital plans for the next five years. He said that Kittery is making it clear the Pump #7 is not being designed to accommodate any additional flows from Eliot. He discussed the need for Eliot to know when flow fluctuations might go up or down due to changes initiated by Kittery.

Mr. Beckert asked if Kittery really thought it was smart to not plan for future expansion, at this point, when they are upgrading Pump Station #7.

Mr. Lee said that Kittery has no confidence that Eliot will be extending sewer anytime soon and, if we do, we will be entirely on the hook for upgrading that pump station because they are not going to spend money in anticipation of something that may never happen.

Mr. Hirst asked why we are partners on Pump Station #7 for 90%, since that pump takes in all of the shipyard, he believed.

Mr. Lee said that he could not answer that.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

Mr. Jack Murphy said that it was his understanding that the shipyard did not go through Pump Station #7.

It was discussed that the percentage was flow-based.

7:18 PM Ms. Davis said that because we will be paying 90% she thought the Town should press a little harder to try to get this updated in a more cost-effective way.

Mr. Lee discussed the negative impression by Kittery and their reluctance to spend any of their money to accommodate Eliot at this time. He suggested that anything more would have to be at a Council level between the Eliot BOS and Kittery Town Council. He added that Kittery is pretty far down the road on this project and we would have to turn this around pretty quickly, if it's doable at all. He agreed with Ms. Davis, saying that he was disappointed and very short-sighted but he did not believe Eliot had much clout to force any change.

Mr. Hirst said that he believed that during storm events that we are already exceeding our 200,000 gallons/day allotment; that he thinks it highly likely that Eliot will adopt some alternative plan for the TIF, which could include the Village; that if EPA comes in requiring Eliot to sewer the properties along the river to the South Berwick line, which seems reasonable, he thinks it is really short-sighted not to build something into Pump Station #7, even if it is just another pad for a bigger pump.

After further discussion, the Board agreed, **by consensus**, that the Town Manager would contact Kittery verbally, followed by a letter requesting a prompt meeting between the Kittery Town Council and Eliot Selectmen.

3) Surplus Equipment: Discussion re: Public Sale

This was put off to a future meeting.

G4. Public Safety

There was nothing for this.

New Business:

There was no new business.

Old Business

7:28 PM 1) InforME PayPort – ePayment System – Contract Terms

Mr. Lee said that this was an as-you-please contract; that either party can notify the other and get out immediately; that he requested the Board approve this.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)

Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen give the Town Manager to enter into a contract with inforME Maine PayPort ePayment Utility and Property Tax Service.

VOTE

3-0

Chair concurs

2) Insurance Dividend Status – Report on Use of Insurance Reserves

This was an answer to clarify the insurance reserve status.

Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen put the \$7,760 into the Insurance Reserve Account.

VOTE

3-0

Chair concurs

Mr. Lee was directed to research how Eliot might get into an insurance pool and the costs in terms of the upcoming budget. He was also directed to do a cost analysis based on historical expenditures for self-unemployment.

7:35 PM 3) FEMA/Insurance Reimbursement – Draft Policy III

Mr. Lee reviewed the edits requested by the Board.

Mr. Hirst moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Board of Selectmen adopt the revised 9/29/2014 Reimbursement Policy or Correspondence I.3 dated 10/9/2014.

VOTE

2-1 (Ms. Davis against)

Chair concurs in the affirmative.

Selectmen's Report:

7:40 PM Ms. Davis said that she wanted to make note that correspondence she received for this meeting was denied for this agenda, yet, other items received at the last minute were entered.

Mr. Beckert said that her comment was so noted.

7:42 PM Mr. Hirst said that he visited the Old Fields Road bridge project, saw some of our people working diligently and a couple of South Berwick's people working diligently. He said it looked to him like a marvelous job and congratulated the Eliot DPW and South Berwick DPW for working together so well.

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING
October 9, 2014 5:30PM (continued)**

Mr. Fernald discussed a sewer scam that was currently going on.

Mr. Lee explained that people are getting letters in the mail that warns them that they are responsible for their water mains from their house out to the curbside and you can buy insurance so that if something happens the company will come in, up to \$6,000...it has been deemed a scam.

This information will be posted on the Town web site.

Executive Session

There were no executive sessions.

Other Business as needed

There was no other business tonight.

Adjourn

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 PM.

VOTE

4-0

Chair concurs

DATE

Mr. Grant Hirst, Secretary