

**SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM**

Quorum noted

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

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

Absent: Mr. Murphy (excused).

C. Pledge of Allegiance recited

D. Moment of Silence observed

E. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

F. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

5:32 PM Motion by Mr. Lytle, second by Mr. Orestis, to approve the minutes of June 27, 2019, as written.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes

Mr. Lytle – Yes

Mr. Orestis – Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

G. Department Head/Committee Reports

5:33 PM 1) Public Works: Backhoe Bids

Mr. Robinson said that we reached out to four vendors and received three back for the replacement of the current backhoe – Beauregard Equipment (Case), Nortrax (John Deere), and Milton Cat (Caterpillar). After reviewing all three bids, it is my recommendation that the Town of Eliot accept the Milton Cat for the lease/purchase price of \$22,702/year for the term of five years, with \$0 payout at the end. The reasons for this recommendation are Caterpillar's longevity and product support of CAT equipment is second to none. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Donoghue asked if there was a trade-in with the existing backhoe.

5:34 PM Mr. Robinson said that there would be, which is included in the lease/purchase price.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

Mr. Lee said that the document showed that Milton Cat showed a purchase price of \$130,000, less a trade-in of \$25,000, with a bid price of \$105,000. After five years we own it.

Mr. Donhauser asked if there is an interest rate.

Mr. Robinson said that Caterpillar is 3.4%. I want to say that John Deere is around 4.5% or 4.6%. Beauregard didn't give us any figures on a lease/purchase. He added that delivery on the Caterpillar would be 2½ to 3 weeks.

5:36 PM Mr. McPherson asked about any warranties that come with this.

Mr. Robinson said that a standard factory warranty comes with these. He added that the John Deere machine we are dealing with right now is not safe for employees working around it.

5:37 PM Mr. (Pete) Sanborn, Nortrax, Westbrook representative, said that I submitted a bid on two different backhoes for this. Other than the differences in price of the two machines, I included that I have had this account with the Town of Eliot for a short period of time – 10 months to a year, or so – and I had heard about some of the troubles they had on the current model and maybe some service issues with our Westbrook branch. We have recently hired a number of highly-qualified guys that have come from other dealers. I know that CAT support has been strong in the past but their Scarborough location has had some personnel changes that may affect that. We certainly have the most road-techs on the road in this area for support on the machines. To just take care of a little bit of that discomfort on the previous two models, I put a significant warranty in this bid – 5 years and 4,000 hours, the hours being about what they would put in over 4-5 years. A power train, hydraulic extended warranty on top of full coverage for the first year just so, if there were any issues, that that was something that would be, with significant cost items, covered under this warranty for the life of the first five years. There are many, many models of these L-Series backhoes. They have been out now for 4 or 5 years and we have numerous backhoes throughout Cumberland and York Counties that I believe are all operating in a safe manner. He said that we could address any safety concerns the Board might have.

5:39 PM Mr. Donhauser asked if, with a warranty item, do you come to us or do we bring the tractor to you.

Mr. Sanborn said that the warranty list of coverage is included in the bid. Travel time and mileage is not included with that coverage. It's the parts and labor for it, to and from the machine would be a separate charge. I don't believe anybody else put any extended warranty, whatsoever, in their bid. I felt that was a reasonable thing to do.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

5:40 PM Mr. Donhauser asked about the horsepower.

Mr. Sanborn said that I submitted two models; that they are the same tractor but the second option in my bid is a heavy-lift option machine, which has the same engine but is pumped up a little more and he submitted that to cover that exception regarding horsepower. He further discussed particular specs to clarify what was different and what was virtually the same and equal in performance.

There was further discussion regarding 2-wheel braking versus 4-wheel braking and how various hoses are constructed and why.

5:46 PM Mr. Robinson said that, with the pros going towards CAT over what we've dealt with with the John Deere, the John Deere warranty ran out at 5 years on the hydraulic system and, on the hydraulic pump, 5½ years. We replaced that to the tune of \$6,000, without (my) labor. Hydraulic hoses have been an endless headache with this machine. As far as CAT goes, they use heavy hose on every application on the machine. In terms of longevity, CAT has outdone them all; that nothing can outdo a CAT as to how smooth they run because of their construction. Downtime is huge when we have a breakdown. If we have something under warranty, we have to pay the mileage and trucking to haul it to Westbrook. CAT will come to us. If it leaves, it will be gone 2-5 days depending on how serious the breakdown is. Regarding parts, if I call Caterpillar at 4PM and if Scarborough didn't have the part, it would be in Scarborough, no matter where it came from in the country, by 7AM the following morning. He clarified, regarding 2-wheel braking versus 4-wheel braking, that we don't trailer our backhoe. It's on the road just as much as it is digging. When it's in the traffic and you have to stop on a dime, you want to stop on a dime. He added that they call it 4-wheel wet disc. The John Deere is rear-wheel braking. I still recommend the CAT.

5:48 PM **Mr. McPherson moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board purchase the Milton CAT from Scarborough, Maine on a 5-year lease/purchase in the amount of \$22,702 per year.**

Mr. Orestis thanked Mr. Sanborn for his time and his honesty in this discussion.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

H. Administrative Department

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

5:58 PM 1) Town Manager Report(s)

Mr. Lytle came back to this to ask about **Line #105's** four items.

Mr. Lee said that #1 was about the new ticket system. #2 was to go back to one Harbor Master, with money in the next budget for one Harbor Master although the Harbor Master would like the Deputy to say because he helps him with quite a few things. I am not recommending a Deputy in the next budget because I feel much more comfortable with my level of knowledge. #3 is regarding an offer by the clerks to handle 'normal' mooring renewals, with the Harbor Masters handling the others. #4 regarded the possibility of having online mooring registrations.

5:49 PM a. Southern Maine Fish & Game – Noise Update

Mr. Lee read a letter from Norman Chenard, President, updating the improvements they have made and future improvements they are working to complete. It does sounds as though they have made some efforts at reducing sound at the gun range and they have an engineer who is working to help them further reduce that.

5:50 PM b. Annual Sewer Notice – New Initiative

Mr. Lee said that we have never put out a sewer report and, based on resident feedback, we did put out an annual sewer report this year, including it in the 4th quarter billing. He thanked the Town Clerk for coordinating that initiative.

5:51 PM c. Planning Board Update – Marijuana Establishments

Mr. Lee said that this was from Shelly Bishop (CEO) to the PB that talks about the updates they are doing to the Marijuana Ordinance for Marijuana Establishments and clarifying the definition of 'public facility' to remove the word 'road', which has become very problematic.

5:52 PM d. Students Studying Stormwater

Mr. Lee discussed a letter from a middle school student who used the Town Stormwater site to help in her project, thanking the Town for the great resource.

5:53 PM e. CMP – Herbicidal Treatments

Mr. Lee read the notification from CMP of the application of herbicides to transmission powerline rights-of-way to reduced tree-related power outages. The notification includes information for abutting landowners who object to the use of herbicides.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

This information will be posted at the Town Hall, on the Town website and sent out on the Town Alert system.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Hansom Road, asked if CMP notified, ahead of time, which roads they are going to do and give homeowners the opportunity to have conversations. She explained that a couple of years ago she went to work and came home to discover they had been on her land and basically hacked her woods down and left a mess there. When she contacted them, they basically said it was her problem and it cost her money to clean up their mess. She reiterated that it might be helpful for CMP to notify the Town ahead of time where they are going to be cutting to give homeowners an opportunity to have that conversation.

5:56 PM Mr. Lee said that CMP notifies us by town. You don't get road-by-road. I think you would have to assume that if you are near a power transmission corridor, it's probably going to be affected. He agreed that it would be good if CMP listed the roads.

Mr. Donhauser said that the letter indicated that CMP uses 'qualified contractors' and would think they must know where they have to go.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that I can tell you they aren't very qualified. I had a conversation with the 18-year-old kid they hired who basically had no training, from my conversation with him. They are outside contractors that are hired to come in.

Mr. Donhauser asked if there was a remedy to this.

5:57 PM Mr. McPherson said that this letter clearly states that this is to prevent outages along power transmission lines. These are not distribution lines. As far as I know, they don't use chemicals in my front yard. With distribution lines, CMP takes 10 feet on either side of the power line and they don't have to bang on doors. This clearly states transmission lines only.

6:02 PM **f. Financial Reports**

Mr. Lee said we are about 50% through the year and about 50% expended, some of which are up-front expenses. We are actually doing quite well.

6:03 PM **2) Public Safety Impact Fee**

Mr. Lee said that we are seeing more and more towns using this, citing Kittery as an example. Kittery excludes the first \$100,000 when new buildings go up and then charge an impact fee of \$5.00 per \$1,000 of value over that which would go directly into a Public Safety Capital Improvement Fund; that we have a CIP laid out for all that. I would recommend that we take an honest look at this. I think Chief Muzeroll can speak more to the numbers and building permits and what we can anticipate.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

6:05 PM Chief Muzeroll said I brought this to Mr. Lee based on research I had done. I've looked nation-wide for a simple system that would be cost-effective for the community. He discussed the variety of systems available out there and that Kittery seems to have the most simplistic approach to a public safety impact fee. By law, you can establish a public safety impact program and it allows for certain things that fee can be used for. I pigeon-holed it just for public safety equipment and facilities, which would make it easy to manage. Our intent tonight is just to see if the SB is receptive with going forward with something like this and, if it does move forward, then we would fine-tune it for a public hearing with data to answer questions and create a position paper to support our efforts. From 2000 to 2019, we've seen about a 15% growth in the community. Between 2000 and 2020, we could see approximately another 400 housing units without much changing. If we take a look at averages for the next five years, with 35 units per year, we're going to be looking at 175 new units, which is just residential and doesn't take into consideration any commercial construction we may have. This impact fee would be for both residential and commercial construction. I pulled the building permits for the last four years (2016-2019) and used \$5.00 per \$1,000 for everything over \$100,000. Over that four-year period, there would have been a little over \$100,000 available for that fund. That is revenue that would be used to offset the increased demands on the public safety system – police and fire. I've been talking for the past year about the cell tower upgrade, which is about an \$85,000 project that, if we had something like this in place, could have been funded through such an initiative. Looking forward, we know this Town is going to continue to grow and, based on our projections, it makes a lot of sense that we use that as a revenue source to support infrastructure and equipment upgrades for police and fire. Even if it's only \$30,000/year, it will still have to have oversight through the SB or whatever your policies are to establish that. It would have an impact on our requests for capital improvement funds and would be a reduction of what would be asked for through taxation.

6:11 PM Mr. Donhauser said that I think it's a good idea.

Mr. McPherson asked how you would split the funds between police and fire.

Chief Muzeroll said that once it would go through the process and become an ordinance, I believe it would be up to the Town Manager and SB to develop oversight policies for the expenditure of those funds. It would be who has the most need, whether it's a combined need or individual need.

Mr. Lee said that we could also take a look at the historical breakdown of what we spend on public safety, how much goes to the Fire Department versus the Police Department.

6:12 PM Chief Muzeroll said that I certainly don't want to get into a territorial battle with any other department. I'm sure it could be negotiated by need.

Mr. Lytle asked for clarification regarding the list of impact fees in the Kittery ordinance.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

Mr. Lee said that this is a list of all kinds of charges but the only one we want you to pay attention to, in particular, is the public safety impact piece of that entire listing of their fees that they charge people. That would be the \$5 per \$1,000 of value on new construction, residential or commercial, over the first \$100,000 basic construction.

6:14 PM Mr. Donhauser said that I think it's a great idea for the Town.

Mr. Lytle agreed.

Mr. Orestis said that, for a \$600,000 house, the impact fee would be about \$2,500.

Chief Muzeroll said it would be \$5/\$1,000 for \$500,000, yes. He added that this would not be a money tree. It is a reasonable source for revenue to offset some tax burden. You can do whatever rate you want. Kittery is just an example.

Mr. Orestis said that he would be in agreement that this is something to pursue.

Mr. McPherson agreed.

It was the consensus of the SB for this to be pursued.

6:16 PM **3) Kittery Water District Proposed Charter Amendment/Letter of Support**

Mr. Lee said that Kittery Water District (KWD) is amending their charter (from 1907) and would like letters of support from the Town of Eliot and Town of York. He invited Mike Rogers, KWD Superintendent, to speak to this.

Mr. Rogers explained that we have six items that we would like to amend and have Deane Rykerson, State Representative, sponsoring this bill in the legislature in a couple of weeks. He explained that the first change expands the corporate limits of the district. Currently it is a very small number of about 2,400 people and only those people have the right to vote in district affairs and run for trustee. The proposed language will open it up to all customers that reside in our service territory (Kittery, Eliot, York). The second item gives us the flexibility to have our annual meeting and election in September, October, or November instead of one particular month. The third provides that trustee elections may take place in more than one accessible location. Currently it is at our office and we are proposing to have it at the community center, which is a much larger location, but this language allows flexibility to have elections take place in any of the three towns. The fourth item modifies the legal voters to include all residents who receive water from the district, having to be both a customer and a resident. The fifth item provides that elections will be held by ballot without the necessity of a meeting. Since 1907 it's all been done by hand vote. The sixth item clarifies the nature of the organizational meeting of trustees following the annual meeting of election and trustees, which clarifies confusing language

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

in the charter. The last just assures that the property tax data will continue the same it has always been. KWD is exempt from taxes in the Town of Kittery but we're not exempt in Eliot or York, which means that, by changing the charter, it won't change any of the tax status.

6:21 PM Mr. Lee asked if, you wanted to have voting spots in York and Eliot and Kittery, does the KWD in some way recompense the towns for holding their portion of the costs.

Mr. Rogers said yes.

Mr. Donhauser asked how many trustees there are currently and where do they reside.

Mr. Rogers said that there are three and they all reside in Kittery. If the proposed change goes through, trustees could be from any of the three towns as long as they are customers and residents. Voters for this would be verified before being allowed to vote.

6:24 PM Mr. Lee said that Mr. Rogers and the trustees are hoping that the SB likes the sound of their proposal and would be willing to write a letter of support to go with the legislation that Deane Rykerson is submitting, as it would strengthen the likelihood of it being passed in the legislature.

Mr. Orestis said, in full disclosure, I'm a water user, so I would be in favor of opening up getting some level of representation. So, I'm sure the water users, as a whole, would appreciate that. Opening it up to all 5,400 users makes sense to me.

Mr. Lytle was supportive and believed something like this should be done.

Mr. Donhauser and Mr. McPherson were not opposed at all.

It was the consensus of the SB to support this and have Mr. Lee draft a letter of support.

6:26 PM **4) Rescind the Pay Plan/ Amend Personnel Policy**

Mr. Lee said that he has several reasons for rescinding the pay plan that he included in his memo – based on old 2017 data; all remaining non-union staff is either at, near, or over the last step and received only 1.3% last year versus 3.0%, which harmed morale; we lost at least one staff member, possibly two, because of the pay plan; hard to find Planner, CEO, and Assessor positions and the pay plan does not help attract someone. The current budget does not follow the current pay plan. It calls for a 2.5% increase for non-union staff. The pay plan would limit it to 1.5%, if any steps remain for that employee. In most cases, the remaining few that are on the pay plan after the formation of this union are either at max or over max currently. I recommend we amend the personnel policy by removing the portion that has to do with the pay plan. He added that this is just a first reading and I am not looking for any action. He clarified that he is not using the existing

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

pay plan in the current budget. Our consultant was never of the opinion there should be a maximum pay.

6:30 PM Mr. Donhauser asked if it was fair to say that, as a result of this pay plan that was developed by a previous SB, it actually caused the administrative union to be formed.

Mr. Lee said that it may have been a contributing factor.

Mr. Donhauser said that he and Mr. Orestis are on the union negotiating team and we are trying to be consistent across all the unions, which is difficult if you have different groups of employees on one plan, unions on different plans, and even the three unions we have, have somewhat different plans. They have the ability to look at each other's plans and, so, it becomes more and more difficult to negotiate from an administrative or management position. By having a variety of different pay plans with different groups of people, it is probably not an efficient way of managing the Town.

6:32 PM Mr. Orestis said that, when you say 'no increase' you mean no more steps. There is still the COLA.

Mr. Lee clarified that STEP is a 1.5% increase in this plan, as it stands, and last year, as an example, is where I came up with the 1.3% COLA, explaining how he broke that down between those who received the 1.3% and those that received 2.8% (STEP plus COLA).

There was discussion regarding the difficulty of hiring in our current pay plan, for example, a planner with credentials, because we are competing with other towns that probably don't have maximums.

6:33 PM Mr. Lee said that when I hired the CEO, I put her at the second to last STEP in order to attract her and had to tell her that, after a year or so, we may not be able to do any more. That did not help hiring, I can assure you. He also said that the pay consultant instructed us to go out and find operationally-similar towns; that the SB had selected towns more based on valuation. We didn't have comparable positions that came back with enough data but used it anyway; that I felt it was off to a bad start at that point.

6:35 PM Mr. McPherson said, regarding the union negotiations, I think it's very important to keep them separated, as hard as that is, and let them negotiate their own contracts to be in line with their particular needs.

Mr. Donhauser said that salaries and wages in the Town of Eliot comprise the largest portion of the budget and so it's important we address this. I think we should look into this further and bring it back at a future meeting.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

6:36 PM Mr. (Jim) Tessier, Johnson Lane, said my recollection is that you put a plan in place and one component of that plan is that you reassess it periodically for potential increased wage ranges and adjust the maximum salaries for additional steps. The comparable towns aren't locked in stone and can be looked at and reassessed. It seems to me that a lot of work was done putting this all together and throwing it away might not be the best solution. Maybe revising it to make it better suited to the Town might be a better approach.

Mr. Lee agreed that that might be another way to approach it, to allow us to go out and survey towns that are operationally similar and do a reassessment of what those salary ranges look like. I'm currently doing that for the planner position and, if I take just the data that I'm finding for the planner position, I can tell you that we're not close.

6:38 PM Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Hanscom Road, said that a lot of work went into that wage study and I hope this SB would look at all the information. The towns that were chosen were fair and I do object to the negative vibe that the Town Manager is bringing to a former Board. The intent wasn't to cheat the employees, here, and the wage study did show that some were overpaid for their position; so, there was that period of catch-up. As far as the steps go, Mr. Lee proposed a 2.5% and asked if he was also including step increases into that 2.5% for these employees.

Mr. Lee said no.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy agreed with Mr. Tessier that this plan did call for a re-evaluation at certain points. The Town spent a lot of money on this, asking the SB not to throw it out as it was a valid document.

6:39 PM Mr. McPherson asked who fired the compensation consultant.

Mr. Lee said that it was the Select Board. They came to a philosophical disagreement about maximums and being redlined. When he disagreed with the Board on that position, they felt we could take it on and do it ourselves to finish it up with the data that had been collected.

Mr. Donhauser said that I think it's fair that we should revisit the plan.

Mr. Lee said that, if it's the SB's pleasure, I don't mind putting together another quick survey and going out to operationally similar towns and revamp this thing, as Mr. Tessier spoke about. We either have to revamp it or we have to rescind it.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that Mr. Pomerleau has a lot of the data that could answer those questions. While you are doing this consideration, I would urge the Board to possibly invite him here to discuss how it came to be the towns that were chosen. She added that every job has a beginning and end value and simply because you come to the

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

end life of that position because you've been here for years, you don't create this raise and continue to pay them.

6:41 PM Mr. Orestis said I would argue that there should be cost-of-living increases.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy clarified that she was not talking about COLA raises but only step increases.

Mr. Lytle asked how hiring was evaluated with trained versus untrained potential employees.

6:43 PM Mr. Lee said that the thinking was, although it says Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc. across the top, it really isn't your first year in service. It's kind of flexible in so far as, if a person has 5 or 6 years of experience, such as a police officer for example, you can look at this and I can place them on Step 5, for example, as a starting point. If it's a brand-new young guy that's got to go to the Academy and green as can be, that starting rate is probably what you are going to use.

Mr. Orestis said, in thinking through this, if we, for example, froze salaries five years ago (COLA increases) and all of a sudden, we go into the market and realize that position is worth \$10,000 to \$15,000 more. That is the whole purpose of this, to come back in, re-evaluate, and finding that position is now worth X amount. We just have to figure out what that process looks like. As Mr. Lee said, this is a first reading and it sounds like the Board is in agreement that this is something we should re-visit.

6:44 PM Ms. (Donna) Murphy urged the Board not to throw out the pay plan but re-assess it, as those pay plans are valuable when you are negotiating union contracts to know what the value of those jobs are.

Chief Muzeroll said, as a member of the pay plan, I had not heard the Town Manager was thinking to do away with the pay plan but I haven't heard any alternative proposal to the pay plan. For as convoluted as the pay plan may have been, and I still think some of the data captured was a little odd, if we're going to replace it let's get everyone in on this to hash it out and see which way to go. If Mr. Lee has a plan, then present it. If it's not agreeable to the SB, then re-visit it. I think it should be re-visited anyway.

Mr. Tessier said that he was on the board of a non-profit in NH and went through a very similar process with our staff of about 10 people. There is an outfit in NH that's similar to the MMA here in Maine and every two years they do an assessment for the non-profits, using specific criteria to place them in a particular category. They broke it down and had a list of all the different job descriptions and pay scales based on the size of the non-profit. They also talked about benefits, as those are a big part of the compensation, as well.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

6:47 PM Mr. Lee said that the MMA does put out a salary survey, which is searchable, and is probably where I would begin. I totally agree with Mr. Tessier about the benefit portion; that that was one thing I disagreed with the pay consultant on, as he thought that was secondary. If I go back out to assess, I will use a more thorough survey to include benefits paid and look at it as a compensation package.

Mr. Tessier said that I think it's important to find an easier way to do this, using current data, and look at it periodically.

The SB agreed that Mr. Lee could move forward to do research and bring that back.

6:49 PM **5) AIP Workshop on Senior Tax Assistance, March 2, 2020 at 5:30 PM – No Correspondence**

This was informational.

6) Revisions to Marijuana Establishments Ch. 33-189

This has already been discussed.

7) Approve Warrant(s)

Mr. Donhauser moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board approve A/P Warrant #87 in the amount of \$155,898.74, dated January 3, 2020; A/P Warrant #89 in the amount of \$944,805.74, dated January 13, 2020.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes

Mr. Lytle – Yes

Mr. Orestis – Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

I. New Business:

6:51 PM Mr. Tessier said that the presentation done tonight by the DPW Director was very-well done.

J. Old Business:

There was no old business.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

K. Selectmen's Report:

6:52 PM 1) Seeking Committee Members

Mr. Lee said that there are two different awards out there – the Spirit of America Award and the American Legion Fabian Drake Award. You can make a nomination by writing to me, the SB, drop off a letter, putting down the name of the person and which award you are nominating for.

6:53 PM Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Budget Committee Chair, updated the SB to let them know that Diane Holt is not going to be available until April, as she is in Florida, and won't be able to attend any meetings including the one we will be voting at. She will hopefully be watching the video streaming and comment in writing. She has sent us one piece of correspondence at this time.

L. Executive Session

6:54 PM Mr. Donhauser moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board enter into executive session as allowed by 1 M.R.S.A. §405(F) Publicly-prohibited information: Tax Abatements.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes

Mr. Lytle – Yes

Mr. Orestis – Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:20 PM Out of executive session.

Mr. Donhauser moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board abate the real estate taxes on account # 2471 for the balance of 2018 taxes.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes

Mr. Lytle – Yes

Mr. Orestis – Yes

Mr. McPherson - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

SELECT BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2020 5:30PM (continued)

M. Adjourn

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 7:21 PM.

VOTE

4-0

Motion approved

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary

S/ Mr. Richard Donhauser, Chair

Date approved: February 13, 2020