SELECT BOARD MEETING July 25, 2019 5:30PM

Quorum noted

A. 5:30 PM: Meeting called to order by Chairperson Donhauser.

B. Roll Call: Mr. Murphy, Mr. Lytle, Mr. Donhauser, Mr. Orestis and Mr. McPherson.

C. Pledge of Allegiance recited

D. Moment of Silence observed

NOTE: Mr. Donhauser said that before we move on to Public Comment, he would like to request that anyone who wished to speak to the SB please speak into the microphone. He added that it's not necessarily for our benefit but for the people at home and the recording; that he'll gently remind folks if they stand up and start talking without approaching the microphone.

E. Public Comment:

5:32 PM

Ms. (Janet) Saurman, Park Street, said that later in this meeting the SB will be discussing the acceptance of the resignation of the most recently elected member of the Budget Committee, Ms. Zotara; that her first committee meeting was July 9th and, attending just one meeting, she resigned. She encouraged members of the SB and Eliot citizens to view the video of this Budget Committee meeting and watch it in its entirety; that a full viewing will disclose two important points – one, the lack of knowledge of one member who, even though he's been voting on the library's budget request for years, appears to have no understanding of the purpose and workings of a public library in a small town; and, two, an unwarranted, condescending, and rudely-delivered comment from another Budget member warning Ms. Weeks that she better take off her library hat and put on her Budget Committee hat; in other words, one member of the Budget Committee telling another member of the Committee how she should think and behave as the newest elected member of the Budget Committee. She added that Ms. Zotara should not have been treated this way, Ms. Saurman appreciates her willingness to serve, she understands Ms. Zotara's decision to resign.

5:34 PM

Mr. (Charles) Rankie, Brixham Road, gave handouts to the SB and spoke to them regarding the timeliness of SB minutes and Town Manager powers and duties. (See attached documents,). Regarding the SB minutes, he felt that the current process in posting SB minutes failed to provide adequate transparency; that the current process hinders SB members of a most productive product process and use of their personal time, and citizens, as well. He felt it was important to have minutes done within a week of the meeting so that the members could develop an agenda and prepare adequately for the next meeting. He listed the minutes missing from the past several months, either not approved or not posted on the

website, and the impact of that in his ability to keep up with what is going on in his Town. He suggested mandating minutes be given to the SB secretary one day prior to the packet deadline for the SB secretary to edit and have the minutes back for the packet for the next SB meeting; that the then approved minutes would be posted within a week of their approval. He discussed his concern for important information being lost as the minutes are currently done and the need for this information to be presented in a timely manner for the SB to be able to do their work as well as possible.

5:44 PM Mr. Donhauser asked if Mr. Rankie meant approved by the SB secretary of the whole Board.

Mr. Rankie used the BOA approval process, as an example; that the draft minutes are done by their professional recording secretary, then sent to the BOA secretary for grammatical edits; that then the document is sent back to the recording secretary for re-drafting and given to the whole Board for approval; that the BOA secretary does not have the authority to approve the minutes.

Mr. Donhauser asked Mr. Lentz (PB Chair) how quickly their minutes came.

Mr. Lentz said that we look for them a week before we have a meeting; that we are a quasi-legal board, applications go from one meeting to the next, we're still running on that application, and it's imperative that we understand and remember.

Mr. Donhauser asked Ms. Lemire if there was software that could convert verbal into text. He also asked if she was physically typing every word.

Ms. Lemire said yes to both questions. She added that Dragon Naturally Speaking is one software program available; that she could read the spoken word and the software would convert it into text.

Mr. Donhauser said that he thinks the thing to do is to start with this meeting, seeing how fast we can make the minutes for this meeting occur and, then, work backwards to catch up.

5:49 PM Mr. Rankie suggested it wasn't for anyone here to come up with a solution; that it was the SB's job that it be mandated to be done.

Mr. Murphy said that it was his 15 years on the PB that taught him to get the minutes very fast because we needed them the next week, as Mr. Lentz said. He added that we aren't to tell the Town Manager what to do; that that requires a needed balance with oversight. He said that Mr. McPherson recently suggested doing the most recent, first, and then catch up.

Mr. Rankie said that, regarding Article III of the Charter, it is the SB's responsibility to instruct the Town Manager, although not department heads as that goes through the Town Manager; that if there is an inadequacy in a particular department, the SB is the direct link from the people to the Town Manager.

5:52 PM

Mr. Lee said that he recently sent out an email with Mr. McPherson's idea. He added that this is like a whole agenda item, here, to kind of straighten out how we do minutes and that he would like to start with this set of minutes, to have this be our priority, get them to Mr. Murphy, and try it one time; that he would be willing to buy the software if the recorder thought it might help. He said to let us work on this and to react to Mr. Rankie's idea and Mr. McPherson's idea he had floated.

5:53 PM

Mr. Rankie said that he would willingly give to Mr. McPherson his written description of how the minutes should be processed. He added that he would invite Mr. McPherson to make a motion that directly followed his outline with the addition of to catch up with delinquent minutes as soon as practicable.

Mr. Lentz said that the PB was in a similar situation a couple of years ago; that it's a lot of work but it starts with process and accountability and what is the flow of those minutes and documents; that with the Notice of Decision letters, we were way behind. He said that it didn't take long to sit down with Ms. Lemire and the Planner to discuss the flow we wanted for these minutes and what the schedule would be; that we have a schedule for everything now. He added that that's the beginning of it, as far as he is concerned.

Mr. Donhauser suggested Mr. McPherson work with the Town Manager to work on this issue.

Mr. Rankie said that he wouldn't mess around with committees; that he thinks if the SB mandates this, it is done; that the catching-up part is what you may need help with.

5:57 PM

Mr. McPherson asked, if we purchase that software, how long will it take to catch up with the minutes.

Ms. Lemire said that she would have to train the software and it takes a while.

Mr. Lee said that it takes a while for it to recognize the speaker's voice; that he doesn't think we could answer as to how long it would take to get caught up. He added that he does think it's a good idea to work on the current minutes, first, get those out, then work on the backlog later; that he thinks we've taken that message.

After further discussion, the SB did not make a motion but did agree that current minutes should be the first focus.

5:59 PM

Mr. Rankie said that the highlight of his second memo is of a few critical Town Manager powers and duties as stated in the Charter. He strongly recommended the SB read Article III of the Charter closely. He read and commented on his memo; "3.3A: Chief Executive and Administrative Official.", saying that, in his thinking, the problem with the minutes would have been taken care of by the Town Manager. He also read "3.3F: Appoint, supervise and control all Town employees and other officials pursuant to ordinances, policies and procedures of Town and State Law.", saying that we lost a talented Planning Assistant he believes was not well-directed; that we have had a cascade of different people in that office and we don't have continuity right now. He added that the current DPW Director, on administrative leave, is a talented man and submits that he wasn't supervised adequately; that he doesn't know all the details. "3.30: Shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Charter...", saying that reading this and knowing what's occurred, he submits that Mr. Lee hasn't done the job that he interviewed to do. He asked that SB to look at Mr. Lee's actions, to review things very closely, as they consider the Town Manager's contract renewal. He added that there are other qualified people out there, that he thinks Eliot deserves better, and that he said that with nothing else in mind other than business for the Town of Eliot.

F. Special Presentation: Peter Hall – Audit Report

6:05 PM

Mr. (Peter) Hall, Auditor, discussed the recently completed audit report, which included the full report and a one-page summary of the highlights of the audit. He said that, in the one-page summary for the audit ending June 30, 2018, the single, most important piece of information is the fact that the Town has received a clean, unmodified opinion on the financial statements, which means that those statements are correctly stated in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. He added that a three-page required document in the back of the report discloses two things – whether or not we had identified or reported any material weaknesses in the Town's internal control and whether or not we had identified any instances of non-compliance that were significant enough to be considered material; that this report disclosed no material weaknesses in internal controls and no instances of material non-compliance.

6:09 PM

Mr. Hall discussed the audit process; that it entailed several phases. The first was a risk assessment process whereby we, in familiarizing ourselves with the Town's finances, its structures, and its operating and financial procedures, tried to brainstorm and assess at the outset where we think the most likely, or most prevalent, areas for the potential for the financial statements to be materially misstated would lie; that that allows us to focus in on those higher risk areas within the Town's finances. He added that this was the first time working with the Town so there was a fair amount of time getting familiar with the Town's structure, financial condition, etc. He said that we then pursued two types of audit

procedures – "substantive auditing" where the year-end financial reports say X, Y, and Z and can we perform procedures that allow us to say yea or nay as to the correctness of those year-end amounts; that the other procedure is "tests of controls", which focusses on, regardless of whether the end results are correct, how well did the procedures that were used to get to those end results function. Overall, those procedures allowed us to express clean opinions on the Town's financial statements and report no material weaknesses and no instances of material non-compliance.

6:12 PM

Mr. Hall said that this is a June 30, 2018 set of financial statements; that he would sure love to be here, today, talking about June 30, 2019 financial statements, as he is sure the SB would prefer that as well; that the Town Manager, the Treasurer, and so forth, are aware of the timing that unfolded over the last period of time; that the Town experienced significant turnover in the Treasurer's position. He added that we had initially planned to come in in September of 2018 but as a result of the significant turnover, there wasn't a separate person functioning in the role of Treasurer, per se; that we weren't able to start our auditing procedures until December 2018, when Mr. Miles came on board as Treasurer; that he has done yeoman's work in getting up to speed and is a very talented young man. He added that we came back in March to complete the bulk of our fieldwork and, frankly as he's acknowledged to the Town Manager and Treasurer, our firm then experienced a pretty significant turnover that set us back by several months. He said that he wanted to underscore the extent to which we are appreciative of Mr. Miles, our point person, and Ms. Albert as, just as we were brand new to the Town of Eliot, so was he, and he hadn't been here for any of the time that was under audit; so, it was a bit of a challenge; that he wanted to thank Mr. Miles, the Town Manager and Ms. Albert on behalf of our firm; that they were all very helpful and worked very diligently in working with us.

6:17 PM

Mr. Hall said that, in the course of performing the audit, there were a number of things we came up with for observations and recommendations we think should be considered for possible refinement or improvement to internal processes, specifically with respect to the financial accounting process, which the particular letter explains in more detail. There were a limited number of areas where the year-end balances in question had not been fully analyzed, reconciled, and adjusted, mostly with respect to transfers that were made towards the end of the year from the general fund to the various reserve accounts and, also, the recording of the proceeds, to-date, at that time of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Sewer Bond instrument; that these were things we worked with Mr. Miles on and were able to get resolved to at least within an appropriate degree of materiality and, in this letter, just recognize, going forward, that those types of situations would not recur. The second observation was more food for thought and certainly not reflective of anything that is wrong in the present structure; that one thing that proved to be a bit of a stumbling block is we tried to work with the Town to

reconcile reserve accounts which are tied to three investment accounts (Key Private Bank); that you are using funding accounting, and using it quite well, but there does not currently exist a one-to-one correspondence between a particular

custodial account at Key Private Bank and the fund within TRIO; that there are parts of various funds that are physically held in several of the different wealth management accounts at Key; that the totals agree in both cases but, in trying to work through how these all needed to be adjusted to prepare the financial statements, it was almost like dealing with a Rubics Cube because there was not that ready one-to-one correspondence between the three. He recommended that the Town could maintain one big custodial account and continue to do the internal paperwork to reflect what's really going on or adopt a practice whereby, if you are going to maintain separate custodial accounts, that a particular account agrees to a particular fund within the chart of accounts. Either one of those two approaches would, he thinks, work fine and there's nothing wrong with what you're doing now, either, it's just a little bit more cumbersome and, perhaps, it needs to be. He said that the third item we commented on was with respect to the Town's accounting for its paid time off or accrued compensated absence obligations; that what we noticed was that the reporting that's obtainable from the payroll module in use (software) doesn't, for example, take into account that there are caps per your Personnel Policy based on seniority. He said that now that we've done it once, going forward, if there isn't any better way to handle that, we

certainly can live with it, adding that any time you have to introduce human involvement into something like that, there's always risk for human error and, if

there's a way to automate that, it might be worth exploring. He said that, regarding the final recommendation, like many towns, Eliot doesn't currently have an in-house mechanism for recording and tracking and computing the cost-basis and the accumulated depreciation on all the different capital assets that you acquire and hold over time – land, buildings, infrastructure, vehicles, and so forth; that for many small towns it's just not feasible for them to do that on their own and, so, farm it out to their auditor and we have software that allows us to do that. He clarified that that is not contrary to generally-accepted auditing standards; that

that being said, best practice would be for the Town to be, at some point,

certainly open to exploring and implementing some of these thoughts.

6:20 PM

6:27 PM

Mr. Hall said that the final thing he wanted to touch base on was the level of your general fund, or undesignated fund balance, which is typically viewed as a very important number because it's a gauge of the Town's liquidity and your position going into each subsequent fiscal year. He added that, on June 30, 2018, your unassigned fund balance was just over \$2.9 million; that he knows from reading your minutes that you talk a lot about this, as well, so he's probably beating a dead horse but one of the typical ways we look at that fund balance is whether it's

gravitating toward tracking that, itself; either a series of excel spreadsheets or you can buy off-the-shelf fixed asset or capital asset software, which can be used fairly straightforwardly. He added that he has talked with Mr. Miles and he is

sufficient, not sufficient, perhaps excessive; that the fund balance for Eliot represents about 18% of your annual general fund or about 65 days of your average daily expenses; that from his perspective, that's a reasonable level. He clarified that the two rules of thumb that we typically use are either that it might be pegged at 10% of your commitment plus one month's expenditure, and using that measure, you are actually above that threshold (\$2.7 million); that the other benchmark is that the unassigned fund balance ought to represent about three months, or 25%, of your total annual expenditures (\$4.1 million); so, the current level is in between those two benchmarks and is certainly reasonable.

6:31 PM

Mr. Donhauser said that, in a footnote regarding our deposits, there is a certain amount in banks that's insured and some that is not (over \$250,000), it says that the Town does not have a policy covering custodial credit risk for its deposits and, from time-to-time, the deposits may exceed limits of the FDIC insurance coupled with collateralization agreements. He asked if the collateralization agreements help with the insurance.

Mr. Hall said absolutely; that he believes it is collateralized; that he didn't bring his work papers with him but he can follow up on this.

Mr. Lee said that he's sure it's collateralized because he remembers we lost basis points in order to collateralize.

6:33 PM

Mr. Donhauser asked if Mr. Hall found our due-to due-from accounts within our accounting system in balance or did Mr. Hall have to make some adjustments.

Mr. Hall said that we made one adjustment in that area; that he doesn't recall the amount; that it was less than materiality but, when we first ran that test, they were not in balance.

Mr. Donhauser said that it was noted in a footnote that, during 2018, that there's a new GASB (governmental accounting standards board) statement related to post-employment benefits called OPBE and we were required to record an approximately \$172,000 liability; that when we recorded that liability, our fund balance went down by that same amount, did it not.

6:34 PM

Mr. Hall said that it did not because, just like the GASB 68 pension accounting standards, the OPEB standard follows the same exact concept with respect to other post-employment benefits other than pension; that it is a liability that is only reflected at the government-wide financial statement level; so, it doesn't hit any of the individual funds. He added that it did reduce your net position, which is a government-wide measurement, but it had no impact on your general fund.

6:35 PM NOTE: Mr. McPherson left for a fire call and returned at 6:44 PM.

Mr. (Jim) Tessier, Johnson Lane, asked if custodial accounts and reserve accounts could be explained.

6:39 PM

Mr. Hall said, hypothetically, we have \$7 million of all these other funds; that you have the general fund where most of the Town's business takes place and, then, you have all these other reserve funds, and you have several dozens of them; that they are grouped within the accounting system into different groups. There is a Fund II group, a Fund III group, a Fund IV group, etc.; that that's on the one hand and, then, on the other hand over at Key Private Bank, there are three different bank accounts, or investment accounts, and these three custodial accounts hold, in total, \$8 million, as an example, and the dollars they represent within the accounting system also represent \$8 million; that when he first started working through this process, his presumption was that he had three separate Key bank accounts and he has three different fund numbers in the accounting system; that he would assume that everything that's in this first custodial account ties to the sum of everything that's in Group II, and so forth and so on; that what he found was that that's the case for most of the individual pieces of the different fund groups, but there are some exceptions, and so it wasn't a streamlined process.

Mr. Tessier asked if this was something we needed to be addressing at the Budget Committee level.

Mr. Hall said no.

G. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

6:44 PM Motion by Mr. Orestis, second by Mr. Murphy, to approve the emergency meeting minutes of July 2, 2019, as amended.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

H. Committee Resignations and Appointments

6:45 PM 1) Budget Committee Resignation – Megan Weeks Zotara

Mr. Donhauser said that he was somewhat alarmed by the previous comment on this topic, asking if there were any questions or comments from the Board on this.

Mr. Murphy said that he called up this meeting, and went through it, and it was kind of interesting. He added that he could not hear some of the things that were said because of over-speaking; that he couldn't detect any particular attack but he thinks there were things going on and there was lots of over-speaking of each other. He also said that Eliot people shouldn't be attacking each other; that that would be unconscionable; that any citizen is free to be on any board or committee.

6:48 PM

Mr. Lentz, Creek Crossing, said that he's not going to make a comment on the letter, itself, and he urged the SB to hold their opinions until the Budget Committee has had a chance to read that letter as a unit; that we don't operate as individuals but as a unit. He added that we don't have a meeting for a few weeks and, as a group, we haven't seen or discussed the letter of resignation. He added that he attended that meeting for the first 40 minutes and then he had a public hearing for the PB and he had to leave. He said that there was a lot of chatter about things that were not on the menu; that the item on the agenda was to discuss the subcommittee's findings on the library and it turned into a very emotional situation – he said, she said, things taken out of context, misunderstandings, misinterpretation. He added that he doesn't know what the SB wants to do about that but he agrees with Mr. Murphy and he doesn't think any of that happened in that meeting. He added that he went back and viewed the video and, again, he will hold his opinion of the letter; that each one of us has opinions but, as a Board, we haven't sat and talked about that.

6:50 PM

Mr. Donhauser asked Mr. Lentz if he was asking the SB to not act on this resignation.

Mr. Lentz said that he is asking the SB to hold any action they decide to take on the content of the letter.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Budget Committee Chair, said that she attended that meeting and will also hold comment on the content of the letter. She added that she saw no attack and she also reviewed that tape; that she would surmise that, if you look at the Charter under Section 6.3, it says "The Budget Committee shall act independently from the Select Board and Town Manager."; that the Budget Committee has the authority to appoint, if they choose to, when there are vacancies on that committee until the next election occurs; that she would also interpret that any resignation should be accepted by the Budget Committee. She added that that will be on the agenda for the August meeting.

6:52 PM Mr. Murphy disagreed; that he believes that membership of committees is controlled by the SB.

Mr. Donhauser asked if Ms. Zotara would mind if the SB tabled this to the next meeting or is she dead set against being on that committee.

Ms. Zotara said that she has resigned from the committee; that she has made up her mind and would just like to state that everybody has their own opinion as to how the meeting went and based on her feelings of how that meeting went, she made the decision to make the resignation; that she slept on it for several nights. She talked with her family about it, and the decision was made that she could not work with this particular group of people. She added that she didn't feel it was going to be conducive for the Town of Eliot; that she can do her work, here, in other ways. She said that, with that said, she would ask people to just watch the video and make their own opinion; that from what she understands, you can hear the video and suggested people also watch the body language because it is huge in that video. She also added that, as a taxpayer and voter in this Town, she thinks that Mr. Lee is doing a fine job.

6:55 PM Mr. Donhauser said that the question is whether we are allowed to accept this resignation. He added that he understands she has resigned and the SB can't force her to be on that committee; that what he would like to do is table this until he can find out if we actually have the authority to accept her resignation.

Mr. Lee said that the SB clearly has the authority to accept the resignation tonight; that what he thinks the SB has been asked by Mr. Lentz and the Budget Committee Chair is that they, themselves, would like to discuss the resignation letter, as a group, and then be able to give some feedback to the SB about accepting it, possibly.

6:56 PM Mr. Lentz said that, based on the notes that the SB has in their packets, it appears there was a meeting with the Town Manager and some of the Library folks; that he's not sure it was over this letter.

Mr. Lee said that it was; that they felt compelled to come in and see him, in person, and tell him what they thought had happened.

Mr. Lentz said that he thinks Mr. Lee should be compelled to sit with the Budget Committee, then, as well, and hear the other side of it.

Ms. Saurman said that she thinks one point is that there is some confusion sometimes, in the Town, who one would go to; that had that happened to her, she probably would have gone to the Town Manager. She added that if the Budget Committee thinks that the information should have been shared with them, that's

fine. She said that she wanted to point out that she, too, has a hearing loss and she listened to the tape and had no problem hearing, whatsoever; that that tape was clear to her that that comment was made about taking your hat off as a library person and, instead, putting your hat on as a Budget Committee person, and it wasn't made in any polite, humor-filled way, it was made in a way that showed frustration, in her view, on that Budget Committee member's part. She pointed out that this member had not even been on the Committee for 40 minutes before the comment came out. She said that Ms. Zotara was more than willing, she said several times, that's she was there to learn and she wasn't even given the courtesy of being there to learn. She said, finally, if the Budget Committee doesn't hear hostility in that comment, and that's how you all talk to each other all the time, that's even more concerning. She added that there's nothing wrong with the person making the comment reaching a point of frustration about the concerns with the budget and the Library; that's one point; another point is speaking just rudely to another person, and no one would leave that meeting thinking they were welcomed, wanted, or that their opinion would even be heard after that kind of comment from that Budget Committee member; that if the other Budget Committee members don't have the courage to say that's not how we speak to each other, then we're all in trouble.

7:00 PM

Mr. Orestis said that, according to the Charter regarding Budget Committee vacancies, they can appoint a replacement but it has to be posted for 14 days, until the next election, of course. He asked, if the letter of resignation is in and we choose not to act on it tonight, when does that 14 days start, who posts that, whose authority is it to do that.

Mr. Lee said that his sense is that, if you don't accept the resignation tonight, the next meeting we have is August 8 and, by that time, he doesn't know if the Budget Committee will have met and made a kind of written submittal to the SB, or not; that, if you postpone it, it will be on August 8th.

Mr. Orestis asked why we would postpone that, as it was very clear that she no longer wants to be on that committee anymore; that it doesn't make any sense to not vote on that tonight.

7:01 PM

Mr. Murphy said that at the time the Charter Commission met and this subject was brought up, the way it was presented to the Charter Commission and approved it was concerning only open positions that were on the ballot that were not filled; that resignations at any other time didn't apply at all; that they are controlled by the Ordinance Governing Boards, Commissions, and Committees.

Mr. Orestis said that, for the record, read "Vacancies of the Budget Committee members, other than the anniversary term expirations, may be filled by the Budget Committee as soon as possible after posting the vacancy for 14 days. Each

appointee shall serve until the next town election." He said that that's what it says in the Charter and, if we're going to get into ordinances versus the Charter, maybe we need a legal opinion, but that's what it states in the Charter and, as of late, it's pretty apparent that we want to make sure that we want to follow the Charter.

Mr. Lentz said that that was the intent.

7:04 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that this situation occurred last year; that we met in August and she believes, at that time, we chose not to fill that vacancy and wait until the November election. She added that this Charter is pretty clear that it is the responsibility of the Budget Committee, not the SB, to look at that vacancy and determine whether they want to appoint somebody or they want to wait. She said that the Charter was what the voters voted on and this is what should be followed.

Mr. Donhauser said that it definitely memorializes it; that the Charter is what the voters voted on and, so, under the current situation we have, the Budget Committee can appoint their own members.

7:05 PM

Mr. Orestis said that he took an administrative approach to it but he just wanted to say thank you; that he hasn't had a chance to watch the video, yet, so he doesn't know but it's something that he will do; that he does appreciate Ms. Zotara coming here and he has read her letter. He added that he wanted to make sure there was a human side as well as an administrative side of what we're trying to do here.

Mr. Donhauser said that he has watched the video and he will watch it one more time, given the comments that were made tonight.

7:06 PM

Mr. McPherson said that he has not seen the video, either, but he will make a point to before the next meeting and before he comments on it.

Mr. Tessier said that he is a member of the Budget Committee and was at the meeting. He specifically addressed Ms. Saurman's comment, saying that the Budget Committee is seven members and, in his years on the committee, it has always been very respectful between the members; that there is a lot more than one meeting in deciding how a committee operates.

7:07 PM

Ms. (Jan) Cerabona said that she listened to the video; that she loves the Library and she thinks there's a lot going on about how people understand what this Library is all about and what happens when you have a trust, what the responsibility is of the trust and what the responsibility is of the Town to best serve the people. She suggested that people might step back, relax, and think a little about what they're doing and what it is we want. She added that she didn't

find some of the things said...and the statement that bothered her was "Get a lawyer and break the trust."; that we are one fortunate community to have that library, and what it stands for, and people ought to understand that, if you lose the trust, it won't be long before we lose the funds and the Library won't exist. She said that we need to figure out what the balance is between the Town's responsibility and the trust's responsibility.

7:09 PM

Mr. (Robert) Pomerleau, Cedar Road, said that he watched the meeting, did not agree with the accusations, and encouraged everyone to watch it and make up their own mind. He added that, if there was any hostility there, it didn't come from the Budget Committee. Regarding the Charter requirements, he said that the ordinance covering boards and committees is about appointed boards, not elected; that the Charter makes it clear that the Budget Committee is elected and they answer only to the legislative body; that this Budget Committee is the best the Town has ever had and the most detailed group that has saved this Town hundreds of thousands of dollars in budget errors; that they are all there with the same common goal and that's the big picture benefit to the entire Town.

7:11 PM

Mr. (Larry) Zotara said that he is Megan's husband; that he would say this as clearly as he can and it has nothing to do with his wife. He was there as a public person and everything was going fairly good until it got to the point where she was told, "You can say yes or no but there's no conversation, no comments, no talk about it.", and that's construed as a passionate person about something she believes in; that maybe he is wrong but it sounds like people are against it, at times, and that's bias the other way; that he just wants to be clear that people understand that. He added that this was the first meeting and to not even get through it because of that...it just needs to be looked at closely.

7:13 PM

Mr. Orestis said that it seems, according to the Charter, that our role in this situation is not to accept the resignation but to declare a vacancy on the Budget Committee. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Lee said that he wasn't sure as he's never run into this issue before.

Mr. Donhauser said that Ms. Zotara is not going to serve on the Committee and we should be able to accept her resignation.

Mr. Lee said that he absolutely thought we should accept her resignation tonight.

Mr. Donhauser agreed.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy reiterated that a vacancy could not be posted until the Budget Committee's August meeting and discussion on whether to appoint

someone until the next election. She added that Ms. Zotara did submit her letter of resignation to the Budget Committee.

Mr. Donhauser asked for a motion.

Mr. Orestis moved, second by Mr. Murphy, that the Select Board accept, with regret, the resignation of Megan Weeks Zotara from the Budget Committee.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:15 PM 2) Aging-in-Place – Elizabeth Castillo

Ms. Elizabeth Castillo was present.

Ms. Castillo said that she didn't come with prepared comments and that this has been an eye-opening experience. She said that she has never participated in a town government but she is very eager to serve the community in any way that she can regarding the topic of elder care. She was impressed that Eliot has an Aging-in-Place Committee; that she moved her, with her family less than a year ago; that she is a Geriatrician at York Hospital and worked in that capacity for a couple of decades in academia and in non-profits, never in the private sector; that she's also done a lot of research in her capacity of her Ph.D. and cultural and medical anthropology; so, she is very concerned about issues of health equity and certainly very committed to serving the elder population and their families who love them in Southern Maine and here.

Mr. Donhauser asked for clarification of her work at York Hospital.

7:17 PM

Ms. Castillo said that she is a Geriatrician, she's both a Hospitalist for about 50% or 60% in the in-patient setting and she is initiating a geriatric service in the outpatient setting, as well; that we are trying to integrate improved health care for elders and their families across the in-patient and out-patient spectrum. She added that she is certainly new to the process of committee participation and she looks forward to the advice from anyone who can guide her in that process.

Mr. Lee said that her educational background is amazing for this particular area.

Mr. Donhauser agreed.

Mr. Orestis moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board appoint Elizabeth Castillo to the Aging-in-Place Committee as an alternate member for a term expiration of June 2020.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:18 PM 3) Planning Board Appointment – Christine Bennett

Mr. Lee said that Ms. Bennett could not be here tonight and she expressed her regrets; that she did want to be here and he told her that, because it's a reappointment and everyone knows her fairly well, it probably would not be an issue.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board approve the application of Christine Bennett for a term as a regular member of the Planning Board through June 2022.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

I. Department Head/Committee Reports

7:20 PM

1) Planning Board: Final Marijuana Establishments Ordinance and Growth Permit Allowance for November Ballot

Mr. Lee thanked the Adult Use Cannabis Committee, who were wonderful to work with, and thanked the PB, as they did a lot of work putting together the Chapter 11 for Marijuana Establishments, etc. for our Town. He added that there is one administrative piece that we are a little bit concerned about - §11-8 (b) (Line 233), which reads: "Upon the filing of a completed application for a Marijuana License, the town administrative assistant shall immediately schedule a public hearing on the application before the Eliot Select Board to occur within 14 days." He clarified that we would like to see the 14 days be 30 days; that we've run into this with the Special Amusement License and Ms. Albert put in a nice memo explaining why we think 30 days is more appropriate; that that is the only change we would recommend; that he also recommended that this be put on the November ballot, as amended, with the 30 days instead of 14 days, just as a matter of administrative simplicity on our end.

7:23 PM

Mr. Murphy discussed adjusting the formatting of the first two pages in Eliot Code §33-190, recommending capitals and roman numerals be used for clarifying designations of the sections rather than repeat the small letters in parentheses to indicate tier breakout.

Mr. Donhauser agreed that was a good observation; that that was an easy change and didn't change the wording but just clarifying the hierarchy of the subset.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board accept the proposed Marijuana Establishment Ordinances, to be put on the November ballot, with the following changes: to re-outline both documents properly and to change the 14-day public hearing period to 30 days.

DISCUSSION

7:27 PM

Mr. Tessier said that, at the beginning committee meetings, there was quite a lot of discussion that the State was raising tax revenues and none of that was coming back to the Town to help the Town offset the additional expenses the Town might incur as a result of setting up these establishments; that he hasn't read anything in the paper that the State has changed that. He asked if that is still the case that the State does not intend to provide any revenue back to the Town. He asked if, in fact, the State doesn't intend to provide the Town with any revenue to help offset additional expenses, why are we rushing to put this on the November ballot when we are likely to incur additional expenses to operate the Town.

Attorney Rines, specializing in the marijuana legal field, said that the legislature did put forth a bill that would have allocated tax money to municipalities but virtually every bill that was up at the legislature last year was tabled due to the fact that they wanted to get the recreational law, rules, everything buttoned up first. He added that, whether or not they will reconsider that, he doesn't know.

7:29 PM

Mr. Lee said that in the legislative bulletin there was pretty strong...that they indicated pretty strongly that Governor Mills and the legislature do feel that Maine would be the only place where the local jurisdiction is not getting something back for hosting and he thinks she is looking for at least 10%.

Attorney Rines said that he doesn't have a crystal ball and he doesn't know if it will get tied up with something else but there was an earnest lobby and many cosigners on the bill; that Governor Mills has come out in support of having communities receive some of that tax revenue; that he doesn't know if it will be on the next legislative docket. He does know that the State has been taking this seriously and there's been a lot of flack from municipalities and individuals; that it is on their radar.

7:30 PM

Mr. Orestis asked if we had any anticipated costs out there that shows a substantial cost increase.

Mr. Lee said that he read an article about Colorado and, from what he read, what was anticipated in terms of calls for service, etc. did not bring much of an uptick, at all.

Mr. Donhauser asked if we have an application fee.

Mr. Lee said yes; that it's very expensive, actually. We have an application form and there's an application fee, which is quite expensive and, depending on what you are applying for, it can really climb right up there; that one got as big as \$10,000, if he remembers correctly.

7:31 PM

Mr. Tessier said that he wasn't trying to compare Eliot, Maine to Northampton, MA, however, we had a family get-together back in the fall, his brother came up and stayed in Northampton; that when he left his hotel, there were all these policemen outside, there were long lines out and around the block and he asked the police what was going on; that they said that there was the marijuana store right there and we're the police detail assigned to control the crowd. He added that he has no idea what it's going to cost but it can't be said that there isn't potential for additional costs and, so, if we don't know what that cost potentially could be, and we don't even have any estimates, he doesn't understand why we're rushing off to pass this when we don't know what it's going to cost.

7:32 PM

Mr. Pomerleau said that there is a big difference between revenue-generating and cost-covering; that there aren't many municipalities that have moved forward with the ordinance, yet, and those with great reluctance because there is no revenue component, yet; that the way those who have passed it are dealing with that is that they have established very substantial fees and fines that they have estimated

would cover the cost of administration, police coverage, etc.. He added that that's not the same as a revenue-generating component which, when they first started, would have been quite significant at 10% or whatever it was; that he does believe that the current legislature is re-examining that. He said that he could say, from his personal perspective, absent a revenue component, he doesn't see why he would personally vote for this.

7:33 PM Mr. Donhauser asked, without the ordinance, how we operate.

Mr. Lee said that we would be an opt-out community; that you are automatically an opt-out community if you don't create an ordinance that details how you're going to deal with recreational marijuana; that this draft ordinance is an opt-in and the PB was asked to do all this work and he would hate to think, now, late in the game people are coming forward having some reservations about it; that he thinks you put it out there and let the voters decide.

7:34 PM Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that, regarding what happened in Northampton, if that were a police detail, would it be treated the same as an electric company needing a detail where it wouldn't be the Town paying the cost, it would be that business; that doesn't that, in fact, become a small revenue for the Town.

Mr. Lee agreed that that would be an outside detail; that the other thing is that that was a unique circumstance; it was the first store, on the first day, in a college town and the only game in town, that it got swarmed for the first few days and has tempered out now.

7:35 PM

Mr. Lentz said there was a need to emphasize that, if we pass this ordinance, we will opt in and he thinks that needs a little explanation to some voters. He added that he doesn't personally have a problem with the ordinance; that he thinks some people are frightened by it but, at the last election, we had that non-binding question and he was surprised that the majority of the people said that they want it. He was disappointed that we had a public hearing in the May/June timeframe and, then, one last week, and only a few people showed up with very few questions.

Mr. Pomerleau said that the PB did their work based on the response to the advisory question and he doesn't know how we would do it any other way.

7:37 PM DISCUSSION ENDED

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes

Mr. Murphy – Yes Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson – Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

J. Administrative Department

7:38 PM 1) Town Manager Report(s)

Mr. Murphy asked, regarding **Line 48**, about the first word – 'testing'.

Mr. Lee said that it was correct because he was testing that emails worked within a group.

Line 82 wording was corrected from 'trunk' to 'truck'.

Mr. Murphy asked, regarding **Line 127**, about the skate park re-use and grant requirements.

Mr. Lee said he and the CSD Director have been working on an approval from the State, as we got part of that facility through a grant and we have to go back to them if we want to change the use in some other manner, such as pickleball or create a different but equal-sized recreational field in another location; that we are trying to figure out if we will get approval from the State, if we budget some money, if we need a question on the ballot because, originally, the grant was accepted at Town Meeting.

7:43 PM Mr. Donhauser asked, regarding Line 67, who was paying for the surveyor for the Staples fence removal.

Mr. Lee explained that we will, initially, and it will get tacked onto Mr. Staples' bill.

Mr. Donhauser asked if the next step, assuming we take the fence down, is to get a Writ of Execution to collect the fines and any additional costs.

Mr. Lee said that that was correct.

2) Financial Report(s)

There were no questions or comments.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Budget Committee Chair, said that, in the past, we have repeatedly asked to get the financial reports electronically and were receiving them for a while, and she is requesting, again, if we can receive that.

7:44 PM At this time, the SB took a recess.

7:50 PM The SB meeting reconvened.

3) Request for Quit Claim Deed: Tim Pickett (part of Map 23/Lot 8)

Mr. Tim Pickett was present.

Mr. Lee said that the SB has a municipal quitclaim deed in their packet that needs to be amended, as it goes back to 2018, and we have the wrong signatures on the document. He explained that Mr. Pickett has been trying to figure out this little lost piece of land; that nobody seems to own but it appears that we may own it. He invited Mr. Pickett to speak to this.

7:51 PM

Mr. Pickett said that the map shows the small sliver at the back end of the piece he is buying from his friend; that he thinks the quitclaim is the solution for this, as nothing has really changed in the last year. He would like to have this thing solved because he could, perhaps, benefit from some wetlands mitigation that he has to do in order to just get access to the land that he ever wants to have hopes of doing anything with.

7:52 PM

Mr. Lee said, regarding the quitclaim, since this is sort of an unknown piece of property that seems to have fallen out of the CMP transmission line somewhere along the way, a quitclaim only releases whatever interest we may have in it; that if it's not ours, we aren't giving away anything special, we're just saying that if, for some reason, it is proven to be ours, we gave away some land back there; that it is landlocked and not accessible.

Mr. Pickett said that it's not possible that the abutters own it and he thinks Ms. Painchaud's best maps were from 1970; that there are records from Public Service of NH (PSNH) and CMP showing transaction in 1958 and 1959 that this slot was taken out of there. He always thought this fell off the far end of the Brooks Memorial Cemetery land but he can't get cooperation from the people that manage that; so, he's back here.

7:54 PM Mr. Orestis asked if we have the authority to give away land, as a SB, or is that something that needs to go to the voters.

Mr. Donhauser said that that was a good question and that, perhaps, we should put this on the November ballot.

Mr. Lee said that this has been perplexing to hm and Mr. Pickett; that he has been trying to help Mr. Pickett by getting ahold of the cemetery folks, and he got a response, but they wouldn't work with Mr. Pickett. He reiterated that all we are releasing...Mr. Pickett thinks that this may be our property.

Mr. Pickett said not exactly; that his friend paid taxes on it for 29 years and he (Mr. Pickett) is now paying taxes on it.

7:55 PM

Mr. Lee agreed but we can't find title to it to prove ownership, in some sense; that almost by default Mr. Pickett believes that it probably must belong to the Town and we don't show it as a Town-owned property; so, we are only giving up whatever rights we might have had on that land; that he doesn't know if we need to go back to the taxpayers but he doesn't know how we acquired it.

Mr. Tessier said that he believes our requirements are that, if you take land for non-payment of taxes, you can authorize selling it after getting the Conservation Commission (CC) to review it and agree.

Mr. Donhauser asked for clarification.

Mr. Tessier said that, if you are agreeing to give away, or sell, the land, you have to get the CC to at least agree that that's good to do; that he doesn't know if that's been done.

7:57 PM

Mr. Pickett said that he could get a map from Civil Consultants that they drew and it has William Bronson written in that strip of land; that they did surveying and the deed describes the land in question.

Mr. Lee suggested that the survey may have been in error but we just don't know; that maybe we need to go to the CC, maybe we need to go to the voters, he doesn't know; that he wanted Mr. Pickett to come in to see if there was any willingness on the part of the SB to do what we might want to do, whatever that might be, but to see if we can help him out with this thing.

7:58 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy asked if the gentleman, who believed he owned it prior to Mr. Pickett, was paying taxes on it, and Mr. Pickett's been paying taxes on it all these years, and you determine that it, in fact, belongs to the Town, wouldn't they be eligible for reimbursement of all those taxes they paid over the years.

Mr. Lee said some; that that's why he would advocate that we release whatever claims we have on this but maybe we need to do a little background work if someone is going to question how we went about this. He asked if the SB wanted him to do some work on this to find out from the attorney...

Mr. Donhauser said that it appears to him that we need to go to the voters; that he agrees with Mr. Orestis that we don't have the right to give up the rights to a piece of property whether we own it or not; that the voters can and how we explain that is beyond him.

7:59 PM

Mr. Orestis said that, if we play this out and we do issue the quitclaim and don't have a right to do it, then you do what needs to be done on that land and it comes back that it was never right to do what Mr. Pickett wants us to do, what happens then. He added that he remembers the meeting when Mr. Pickett brought this up, and it was kind of the same situation, do we have the authority to do this, and he thinks we still don't have the answer to that; that we still have more legwork to do; that as awful as that is and as much work as Mr. Pickett has put in, he thinks it would be worse for us to make a decision on this tonight and, then, in five years have it come back when we never really had the authority to do it to begin with.

8:00 PM

Mr. Donhauser said that we have until September 8th so we still have time to get it before the voters.

Mr. Lee agreed, saying that he can get answers back from our attorney in short order and have this back before the SB on August 8th.

The SB agreed to table this item until the next meeting.

8:01 PM 4) Land from the Estate of Lillian Crowell - Deed

Mr. Lee said that this is that conservation land for \$18,500; that we did quite a bit of back-and-forth with the lawyer because it was a little unclear in that it's not dissimilar to Mr. Pickett's situation about the deed not readily...her attorney and our attorney finally came to an agreement that this would be the form of the deed; that they are okay with it and he wants to make sure the SB is okay with it before we conclude this deal. He said that both attorneys agreed that this was the best possible form to convey what she wants to convey and what we want to own. He recommended, if it looks okay with the SB, to authorize us to receive this deed in its format based on the opinion of Attorney Saucier.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board approve this deed representing the land purchased from Deborah M. Berthiaume.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

8:05 PM 5) Discussion: November's Ballot

Mr. Lee just wanted to remind that September 6th is the absolute final date to get everything to our Town Clerk if it's going to be on the November ballot. He added that, so, far, he has revised TIF Development Program, Recreational Marijuana Establishments, Sewer Ordinance and Appendices, number of Growth Permits; with regard to the number of growth permits, he might need some help but they're not changing the number of growth permits from last year to this year.

8:06 PM

Mr. Lentz said that we sent out surveys and got replies back that there is no issue with 24; that, in 2018, we used 17 out of the 24 and, with this current year, we've only had 7, so far, that have been taken out so the curve is going down and it's a safe number.

Mr. Lee said that that doesn't need to go on the ballot because it is not being changed. He added that we were asked to do a non-binding advisory question on Agri-tourism and we agreed we would put on a non-binding question regarding chloramine, which question he ran by the pertinent group, and it reads, "Portions of Eliot are served by public water from Kittery Water District. Recently, the idea of changing their water treatment from just Chlorine to Chlorine plus Ammonia (Chloramine) has been discussed. What is your view?" Choices were to support, not support, or no opinion. Finally, the SB asked about the skate park in his Manager's Report and he doesn't think we'll need this on the ballot because, in speaking to the fellow at the State, all we need to do is satisfy his agency and he will allow us to re-purpose it; so, he will scratch that question and the growth permit number. He added that, for the next agenda, he was hoping that we will have something in the way of some TIF documents for review and we may also want to consider an August 1st workshop, from tonight, to talk about some of these.

8:09 PM 6) Discussion: New TIF Proposal

Mr. Donhauser said that, on July 18th, the SB had a workshop with the TIF Committee and the SB, by consensus, voted to proceed to the voters in November with a revised development program which, again, would include Route 236 sewer and a revised map to remove some properties and add or expand other lots on Route 236; that there are some recommended lots to be added and also to be removed.

Mr. Lee said that we would put everything up on the website. He added that he thinks this is one where you should take a formal vote to advance a new TIF proposal to voters in November, the details of which to be worked out.

Mr. Orestis said that it might be in the best interest of the SB, in his opinion, for us to wait until we gather more details before we make a motion.

8:10 PM

Ms. (Cindy) Lentz said that this is not the menu that she voted for, sewer on Route 236; that all of a sudden what she voted for doesn't seem to be working and, so, we take a direct path to Route 236; that you were elected to carry out what the voters voted for. She added that she would like to know why a municipal planner was not hired to help this committee; that they are not professional people.

8:12 PM

Mr. Lee said that we are not done preparing information, yet; that we may well engage an economic development person and/or planner in looking at what the build-out potential might be of these lots. He explained that the TIF Committee did try to find a way to make this work up there and we don't think it's even remotely practical; that this SB has already decided that sewer and water on Route 236 is the highest need for this community and they have agreed that it is going on the ballot as such.

Ms. Lentz asked about the importance of sewer down River Road.

Mr. Murphy said that that could come afterwards as a result, and easier.

Mr. Lee said that we know that a lot of people, especially people in this room right now, do not agree with us; that he is sure we will be having public hearings and, at that point, will be the opportunity to voice that this is dumb, you're not listening to voters. This SB has a different view and this SB is a different Board.

8:14 PM

Ms. Lentz asked, if you put this on the ballot and voters vote it down, again, what is your next alternative.

Mr. Orestis said that he thinks Ms. Lentz's concerns are valid but, in his understanding of what happened, is that voters in the last vote didn't vote down sewer on Route 236, it was never included in the menu. He added that he thinks she has a fair point as to why a municipal planner wasn't hired by the committee; that the information we have from the committee, at this point, is that it is not plausible with what we have down here to run sewer ,with the parcels that are on the menu, to make it work.

Mr. Lee said that it's wetland, it's zoned wrong.

Ms. Lentz said that the Townspeople will get nothing out of this; there will be no rec hall for senior citizens, no daycare, or anything like that, no parks; that it will be 20 years of construction on Route 236.

8:15 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that this Town has voted down that sewer four times. She added that this Town voted a plan in, it was the Village plan, there was an implementation committee formed and, from day one, it was loaded with people who wanted the sewer on Route 236; that you have responsibility to the voters of this Town to implement that. She said that that committee never made efforts to fully implement that plan.

8:17 PM

Mr. Lee said that, when people join committees, he doesn't tell them how to think. He added that he told the committee the purpose of the committee when they first met and, then, on several different occasions because there were a couple of people who never saw this working but, then, they really did look at what they needed to look at and that he insisted on; that we did a walk through the Libby land, brought a soil scientist with us, who determined it's mostly wetland; that it may be appropriate for housing, which blew up in our face when senior housing was going to go in over there, he couldn't imagine how a commercial entity would be received by the neighborhood. He said that we looked at Frost Tufts to see if we could do eco-tourism down there but, again, we would have to go all the way through a suburban neighborhood, put something commercial at the end of it, and we would have to re-zone it; that it was just an ill-conceived plan.

Mr. Lentz said that we spend \$200,000+/year on stormwater and that is about illicit discharges going into that river; that all of the work has been along that river that's ben done so far. He asked if they didn't think that that becomes a priority when it comes to putting sewer in.

8:19 PM

Mr. Lee said that we have to use it for economic development; that we can't use it for anything we want. He added that it has to have something at the end of the pike, so, if we are going to run water and sewer all the way to Frost Tufts, which we looked at and thought might be good to extend that way; that we know that section of Town will be in trouble someday but the problem is that we're going to have to re-zone the whole thing and tear apart a neighborhood by making it all commercial down there, and neither that or Goransson is commercially zoned. He said that we would have to go to the voters to change that so neither of these parcels were zoned properly to begin with so you are really going to have to accept it as a fact that we had some parcels in there that don't really work.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy asked if they will also accept that this Town has said, four times, no to Route 236 sewer.

Mr. Lee disagreed, saying that they said no four times to various proposals, how to fund two pump stations, and so forth.

8:20 PM

Mr. Lytle said that he thinks we need to go and look at Route 236; that the State is going to re-do that whole road and, if they get in there and re-do it, we will never get down through there. He added that, recently, the Fire Department had a problem getting water down through there for the fire; that they need water and we should take the sewer with it.

Mr. Pomerleau said that he doesn't think for a minute that this SB has taken a leadership role; that in your Charter-required requirements to execute the will of the people, which was the vote for this village plan...from day one you should have hired professional people to develop the pros and cons, identify the obstacles, propose solutions for overcoming them; that we knew there was wetland, we knew it wasn't zoned right, and those are all obstacles that can be worked with; that zoning is changed for the purposes of development every day and not like I can't be done. He added that, with this committee, anybody willing to watch knew their objective from the first meeting, which was a total focus on getting sewer onto Route 236. With further examples, he said that you said you put together a committee that was moving forward in good faith to implement the plan the voters gave you but he thinks you all show a gross disrespect and contempt for the will if the voters; that it's the 'same old', 'same old', tail wags the dog, minority rule and why go with another proposal because you do what you want; that that's why people are apathetic and don't show up. He added that he thought you all should be ashamed of yourselves and, you, you need to look up the definition of manager.

Mr. Donhauser interrupted Mr. Pomerleau to tell him he needed to be civil; that he can make all the comments he wants but asking that he be civil.

8:25 PM

Mr. McPherson said that he might be wrong but Route 236 is going to be dug up in 2022 and we need to put water down Route 236, which is part of the TIFF, for obvious reasons with the last two fires we've had out there and he can tell you, from standing on that pump panel, about water. If we're going to put water on Route 236, have it dug up, doesn't it make sense to put sewer with it.

There was some contentious discussion back and forth.

Mr. Donhauser said that we have before us a consensus, he believes, but asked Mr. Orestis if he thought we should suspend.

8:26 PM

Mr. Orestis said that he thinks that, for the purposes of this and knowing the subject matter at hand, it might make sense to have those details fleshed out before we make a motion to put it on the ballot, knowing the situation, rather than

voting for something and putting it on the ballot without any details to it; that we do have time.

Mr. Lee agreed we have time; that, in fact, under Old Business, he wants to talk about this ESR to actually do some of that background work that needs to be done.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that there is currently a TIF plan that the voters voted for and approved, and the State approved, asking when is this Board, this Town Manager, going to have that committee implement what they voted for.

8:27 PM

Mr. Donhauser clarified that it wasn't a plan, it was a menu of items for the voters to consider, and there was one item left off – the elephant in the room – sewer; that what we are saying is to keep the same menu but let's do all options. He explained that one thing that needs to be understood, and he thinks many people miss, is that economic development is what we're looking for; that if you don't believe in economic development, then you don't believe in economic development, but you can't just run a sewer down along the river and call it economic development.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that she fully understands that and that's why there was a menu item on there for things to look at, in looking around the State at what other towns have approved. She reiterated that we do have a plan that was approved by the State and that committee never, in good faith, worked to implement that plan; that, as a citizen, she would request their written report of everything that they looked at and why that wouldn't work.

8:29 PM

Mr. Pomerleau said that Mr. Donhauser has repeatedly said that it's nothing but a menu; that it's a plan, with an introduction, a history, etc. He added that you don't go to DECD and have them approve a menu, that you have them approve your plan; that a menu is part of the plan; that you really ought to read it.

Mr. Tessier said that he is as frustrated with this as you are because the Town has been going at this for a long, long time; that the previous TIF committee, at the end of their time working in this process, they had a consultant and that consultant said that he saw four different options; that one was to do nothing, one was a village district, another was economical development along Route 236, or a combination of two and three. He said that the TIF committee came to the SB asking for funding to have a viability study done for those different options and that was shot down; that, as a result, the rest of us in this Town don't really have a good understanding of what to vote on because we don't know what can work and what can't work.

Mr. Donhauser said that he is 100% behind doing exactly that.

Mr. Tessier asked why we don't do that, why don't we get the studies done; that once we know what are the options and the possibilities for each one of them working, then the residents can make an educated decision about what really might work and what might not. He added that, then, maybe we could avoid all of this back-and-forth; that it seems to him that that would be a good idea.

8:32 PM

Mr. Lee said that it's not as though this decision has come up months ago and we've been sitting around, the decision to give up on the village plan being impractical, and so forth, only happened a couple weeks ago; that, now, he just wants to make sure that we're all on the same page because he does intend to bring in an economical development person to talk about build-out potential and also an ESR to give us a scope and idea of how much it's going to cost to run hydrants and water down Route 236, and how much of an upsizing we need to do on the sewer. He added that there will be information coming but he's only had a couple of weeks and it takes a little bit of time.

8:33 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that you are willing, and you have no authority to spend any TIF money on that, to have someone look at Route 236 sewer, which is not approved by the voters, yet you're not hiring someone to look at the village plan; that that makes no sense.

Mr. Lytle said that the last time we met with the TIF Committee they talked about the village plan and, from his understanding, there was nothing there and wasn't worth building up or this area out here, it was all wet. He added that the Committee is planning to have several meetings on putting sewer on Route 236 but this is only the beginning of it.

Ms. Lentz said that she agreed with Mr. Lytle; that her problem was that we had the money, at hand, why not bring in professionals to say 'this' area is wet but 'this' area over here can be used. She added that she did not know that the State was digging up Route 236 and she will take that because she does think it's important to have hydrants out there but she doesn't want it shoved down her throat that all this business is going to come to Eliot; that Route 236 is a thruway.

8:35 PM

Mr. Murphy said that he was confused about this village idea when the TIF is still for economic development and the village is going to have very little economic return.

Ms. Lentz said that he doesn't know that.

Mr. Lee replied that we do, to some extent; that we know that Frost Tufts is a Town-owned property and, unless we were to develop it and sell it off as privately owned, it will never have any additional value.

8:36 PM

Ms. Saurman said that she has been following the TIF Committee work; that she doesn't understand why, in a democracy, there is a problem with asking voters to vote again. She added that it's a matter of a checkmark and if they still don't want it, they still don't want it. We elected a different SB and have different people who have different views about our community and are willing to think and, perhaps, do something differently than the last Board did; that that's what happens when you have elected officials making your decisions and, if the Town becomes unhappy with the way you all voted, they'll vote you out; that that's how it works in America. She is tired of being told that because the voters voted something down one, or twice, or a hundred times, that they can't be asked again; that her answer has always been that, in 1848, women started asking for the right to vote and, in 1919, we got it; so, she is really glad that the women, and joined by the men, kept asking and thinking it was important enough for women to have the vote. She said that, if some of the people are opposed to this, then fine; that it's going to go to the voter and the voter will decide not to do it. It's not that big a deal, the voters can just vote it down.

8:38 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that that statement would hold true, and she wouldn't fully disagree with it if some good faith effort had been put forth on what they voted on. There was no good faith effort put forth, there was no professional put forth, and where are their documents showing that this isn't going to work, is there a written report.

Mr. Lee disagreed with that; that he was at the meetings, and it did take a couple of meetings to get a couple of people off the mark that they just hated the plan that was in front of them, but he did remind them that that's what we were here for and we have to try to do something positive with this plan; that eventually everyone got on the same page and we really started looking at the Goransson property; that we had them come in to meet with us and we walked the site with a geo-scientist; that Frost Tufts is a park, it's Town-owned, etc.; that this group looked at it and it was, frankly, easy to say that this doesn't have many good options. He didn't need a professional to tell us that; that it was self-evident to all these people and he's not going to tell them how to think.

8:40 PM

Mr. Lentz said that he is thinking about people in this Town some 10 years ago, when they had the vision to put together the Comprehensive Plan, which talked about village, mom-and-pop shops, a little public transportation, more sidewalks, places where they could park and they could walk. He asked why, 10 years ago, did people have that vision and now, all of a sudden, it can't be done; that there's something very wrong.

Ms. Saurman said that this comment is a bit self-serving but she started the meeting making observations about what she'd seen on the Budget Committee, and she's pretty sure she's going to take a lot of heat for that because of an

opinion and an observation that she made; that she just wants to point that the points that you're hearing about the work the TIF committee did is also just individuals opinions and observations.

Mr. Donhauser asked if we want to take any action on this item.

Mr. Lee said no; that he'll put it on the next agenda with some more information.

8:41 PM Mr. Orestis said that there are some good points that have been made, obviously, on both sides, asking if it would be possible to put some sort of RFP together for a professional to examine the current menu that we have so that we can get something out and, perhaps, get some bids.

Mr. Lee said that anything is possible; that it certainly throws November well off; that that's okay, you are the policy-makers, you tell him what to do.

Mr. Orestis said that we can table that comment and discuss it at the next meeting but he thinks it's something to think about.

8:42 PM Mr. Lytle said that we can't keep putting things off; that we've got to do something.

Mr. Donhauser suggested Mr. Lytle make a motion.

Mr. Lytle moved, second by Mr. Murphy, that the Select Board approve this menu addition.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Donhauser said that there is a motion on the floor to move forward, assuming a consensus to proceed to the voters in November for the revised development program that will essentially include Route 236 and revising the map, removing some properties and adding some.

Mr. Murphy said that he would specifically like it to say sewer and water.

Mr. Donhauser agreed sewer would be added and water is already on the plan.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that, in response to Mr. Lytle's comment, Mr. Orestis' suggestion would do just that; that it would move the current plan, approved by the voters and DECD, forward.

DISCUSSION ENDED

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

8:45 PM 7) MMA Executive Committee – Voting Ballot

Mr. Lee said that this is a very routine thing; that every town in the State gets to vote on the people who will be on the executive committee of the Maine Municipal Association. He recommended approval of the ballot in favor of the listed candidates.

Mr. Donhauser moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board approve James Gardener, Jr. for Vice-President; Jon Beckman, David Cyr, and Ivan McPike as Executive Committee Member of the Maine Municipal Association Annual Election.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

8:46 PM 8) Final Review: Job Descriptions

Mr. Donhauser asked for a motion to approve the job descriptions, as presented.

Mr. Orestis moved, second by Mr. McPherson, that the Select Board approve the job descriptions, as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

8:47 PM 9) Approve Warrant(s)

Mr. Donhauser moved, second by Mr. Murphy, that the Select Board approve A/P Warrant #119 in the amount of \$720,211.24, dated July 11, 2019; A/P Warrant #1 in the amount of \$59,813.25, dated July 11, 2019. Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

K. New Business:

8:48 PM 1) Appoint Negotiating Sub-committee

Mr. Donhauser said we are going to appoint a sub-committee to negotiate with our union and, in the past, it's been him and Mr. Orestis; that if there is any member that feels strongly that they would like to be on that committee then, perhaps, somebody would make a motion.

Mr. McPherson said that we had an issue with the Public Works contract last time and the Charter clearly states that the SB is the sole negotiator for all union contracts; that if you choose two members of the SB, that's it on the committee, asking if that was correct.

Mr. Lee said that the way we did it before is that, first off, there is one Budget Committee member, and we had a negotiating sub-committee, which we did with Mr. Donhauser and Mr. Orestis. He talked about the concern that the SB had felt in that they weren't being kept in the loop with the negotiations; that he thought you can go forward with two people plus a Budget Committee member but what he thought we ought to do is have bi-weekly updates in here about what's taking place in the negotiations.

8:49 PM Mr. Murphy said that those would all have to be executive sessions, of course.

Mr. Lee said that they would have to be.

Mr. McPherson said that the sub-committee, in the past, included department heads, asking if that was correct.

Mr. Lee said right; that this time around, he thinks he made it pretty clear that he isn't supposed to be in there, especially because he's both the Town Manager and the department head of this particular group of people; that it is not his intent to do that and he told that to Mr. Bob Bower, who is our labor attorney, and Mr. Bower said that he would kind of shepherd the process.

8:51 PM

Mr. Pomerleau said this whole subject came up when the Charter was formed; that from a legal standpoint, the SB is the only negotiation body allowed to sign the contract with the union but the SB has the authority to form a sub-group to represent them. The sub-group doesn't carry any authority; that they act on behalf of the SB and nothing is approved until it comes to the SB. He added that the department heads that were on with the negotiating team were there in an advisory capacity only; that you can proceed as you have always done, it doesn't violate the Charter in any way.

Mr. McPherson said that we had an issue with the Fire Department the last time because we had a very strong opinion from the Public Works Director that had to be corrected; that that opinion went into that contract, as that's what the Public Works Director wanted and he has no business negotiating that contract.

Mr. Pomerleau said that that's what he wanted but, eventually, the negotiating team and SB had to buy in to that opinion.

Mr. Donhauser asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board approve Mr. Donhauser and Mr. Orestis as our negotiating team for the union negotiations.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Mr. Orestis – Yes Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

8:55 PM

Mr. Donhauser, notifying the public, said that at the end of the day yesterday Mr. Moulton was terminated by the SB for violations of our Charter and personnel policy and there is a letter being prepared by our Town attorney that will document further the underlying reasons why Mr. Moulton was terminated. He added that, at this moment, that is all he can say until we receive that letter; that that letter then becomes sort of a public document.

8:57 PM ESR-33 – Underwood Engineers

Mr. Lee said that this is a request for engineering services; that we can't pay for anything related to sewer from the TIF so they put together a proposal that was going to upgrade the last work that they did on sewer, which was several years ago. He said that that cost is about \$2,800; that the cost to do the water engineering/probable cost is \$7,000, and then there's public meetings, which would be the SB and/or the TIF Committee, as needed, and the estimate is about \$5,100' that he believes we would have to pro-rate those meeting prices to reflect both infrastructure pieces – the total of \$9,800 between water at \$7,000 and sewer at \$2,800; that we would have to figure out that ratio and any public meetings would have to be paid, in part, with sewer funds. He would recommend that the SB authorize this ESR with \$2,800 plus a pro-rated portion of public meetings so we can get to work figuring out what the cost would be on these things, recognizing that \$2,800 plus a portion of the meeting costs are going to have to come out of the sewer fund.

8:58 PM

Mr. Orestis said that, at that workshop, he was of the opinion that we should wait on this until after the vote because he is not in agreement with using sewer funds or general funds to pay for this study. He said that it seems it's going on the ballot and asked what would be the harm to wait a few months.

Mr. Lee said that we have heard tonight that people want a lot more information about what they're voting on. He added that the TIF Committee has asked for this from the SB. He added that we are also conferring with DOT to make sure we are timing it with them.

Mr. Orestis clarified that it says NH DOT.

Mr. Lee said that he would change that.

Mr. Lytle moved, second by Mr. Murphy, that the Select Board approve ESR-33, as presented.

DISCUSSION

9:02 PM

Mr. Orestis said that we have a plan that has been voted on by the Town; that there are some individuals in Town that seem to think that a good-will effort has not been made towards putting that plan, or menu, in place. Here we are tonight voting on services, \$2,800 of which will come out of the sewer fund to pay for something that isn't even on the menu, yet. So, his whole point is shouldn't we wait or add water to the old plan rather than spending money out of the sewer for something that may not even end up on the menu; that to him it doesn't seem that it makes sense.

Mr. Lytle said that he doesn't quite agree with it because we just approved putting water and sewer on Route 236.

Mr. Lee clarified that the SB approved putting a different development plan on the ballot that would include sewer.

Mr. Lytle said yes; that that is wat we need to do; that we need this in order to get the information out.

Mr. Orestis aid that there is \$2,800 coming out of the sewer fund to fund something that might not be passed by the voters.

Mr. Lee said that he was pretty sure that the 700 sewer users would probably favor using \$2,800 to add all those commercial establishments into our base to help defray some of the costs that we have currently, like the \$1.7 million for pump stations.

9:04 PM

Mr. Orestis agreed, granted that this passes in November.

Mr. Lee said that this was how we were advised by the attorney, if you were going to do this; that she said we would have to take it out of either the general fund or sewer; that he's here, tonight, for the TIF Implementation Committee, per the suggestions of Shana Cook Mueller making this request so that we can have some information about what we are getting into and why we are doing it, are we sure DOT is doing this type of project, etc.

Mr. Donhauser said that the purpose, as he understands, is to determine exactly from what point to what point, if we were to implement the change to the plan we just approved, in order to tell the voter and give them full information; that we have to have a value of how much is the sewer, if you put a sewer on Route 236 – what does that cost, what size is the pipe, and how far are you going and from where and, to do that, they have the original plan and are looking to update the cost from 2012 to 2019; that it's allowing the engineer to re-calculate the cost of that sewer if, in fact, it was ever done. He added that he certainly understood Mr. Orestis' concern.

9:06 PM

Mr. Orestis said that, personal opinion aside, he thinks there's some validity to the idea of maybe...why hasn't this effort or this proposal or this money been put in place to examine the current menu. He added that he's just thinking logically, here, if we're going to spend X amount of money on something that isn't approved, why haven't we put the same level of effort into something that was approved.

Mr. Lee said that he can only speak from what he heard from that committee and that committee felt there was no value in going any further with any other studies because of the zoning changes, the wetlands, going into residential neighborhoods, the brouhaha over the Libby land, undoing a recreational field. The only thing we spent money on, as a group, was to have a wetland scientist come out with us, walk it with us, and see if it was suitable, or how much of it was suitable; that you've seen those maps and how much is unsuitable, and that truly felt like throwing good money after bad to them.

9:07 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that, if you look at the original TIF map, most of Route 236 is also wetland and it's in the flood zone. She added that the Town Manager has made a statement that the 700 sewer users would support spending this money to look at that, hoping there would be a build-out, and that would then help them with their rates. She said that, if we use Kittery as an example, they wanted to put in a business park and that has pretty much fallen flat on its face because nobody came there. She asked, if people aren't coming to Kittery, what makes you believe they are going to build here on Route 236. She asked if you then get into a situation where you've put the sewer in, costs have escalated for what you have to pay for Kittery, and people don't come to build, who bears the cost of that; that it's not the whole Town, it's those 700 sewer users and that ought to be conveyed to the sewer users.

9:08 PM

Mr. Lee clarified that they were projecting a business park and they have not had any success in developing out; that we have properties that currently exist, even if they're not built out; that they had a bunch of empty lots that they hoped would fill up and that's a very, very different scenario.

9:09 PM Mr. Lytle moved the question.

Mr. Pomerleau said that one thing he would advise them not to do is to tell sewer users that this would result in a reduction of their rates when you have no evidence as to that; that you don't know whether that will result in a decrease or increase in sewer rates; that it all depends on the development success.

Mr. Donhauser asked for a motion on moving the question.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board move the question to end the discussion and vote on the motion on the floor.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

9:11 PM

Mr. Donhauser reminded the SB that the motion before us is to approve ESR -33 to approve engineering by Underwood Engineers for the total amount of \$14,900, \$2.800 to come from sewer funds and the remainder to come from the TIF fund, with the pro-ratio for public meetings.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser - Yes

Mr. Lytle - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Mr. Orestis - No

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

L. Old Business:

There was no old business.

M. Selectmen's Report: Seeking Committee Members

Mr. Murphy said that there were six committees that need thirteen members.

There were no Selectmen reports.

N. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

O. Adjourn

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 PM.

VOTE 5-0 Motion approved

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary

S/Mr. John J. Murphy, Secretary

Date approved: August 8, 2019

Jobnitted July 25,2019

To:

Eliot Select Board

Fm:

C. L. Rankie Jr. /4

Subject:

Select Board Minutes

July 25, 2019

The current process and posting of Select Board (SB) Minutes fails to provide adequate transparency. Additionally, the process as is today hinders SB members of a most productive process and use of their personal time. Citizens too are hindered.

Below is a listing of minutes (March to Today) and the status of these minutes:

Meeting Date	Approval Date
July 24	The state of the control of the state of the
July 18	
July 11	
July 2	
June 27	
June 13	
May 23	
May 16	June 27
May 9	
April 25	June 27
April 11	June 27
April 4	April 25
March 28	June 27
March 18	
March 14	June 27
March 11	and the same of th
The state of the s	•

Posted on our Eliot Website as of today for 2019 are February 2,14,21,28 – March 11,14,18,28 – April 4,11,27 – May none – June none and July none.

I recommend the following to correct this situation. Mandate that minutes of a previous SB meeting be given to the SB Secretary for proof reading one day prior to your current meeting package deadline. A corrected copy of these minutes be included in each SB Member's meeting package for review. At the SB Meeting the previous meeting minutes be reviewed, corrected and approved. The now approved minutes and applicable attachments be posted on the Eliot Website within one week of their approval by the SB.